Reconstruction Effects in Passive and Scrambling in Japanese[*]

HAJIME HOJI
University of Southern California

1. Introduction

The typical treatment of the English passive (e.g., (2b)) in the generative tradition is as in (1b).

(1)   a.   NP1   V   NP2.
      b.   NP2$_i$ be V-en t_i (by NP1).
(2)   a.   John broke the vase.
      b.   The vase was broken (by John).

Informally speaking, *-en* is understood to have the following two effects, forcing the movement of NP2 as indicated in (1b).[1]

(3)   a.   The *V* of *V-en* loses its external argument.
      b.   The internal argument of the *V* of *V-en* can no longer be 'licensed'

[1]   Among the early standard references are Burzio 1986 and Jaeggli 1986.

as an object; i.e., the Case cannot be assigned/checked in the object position.

In effect, then, *be broken* in (2b) is much like the intransitive *break* as in *the vase broke*. Both in *the vase was broken* and in *the vase broke*, the surface subject is understood to originate in the object position and get raised to its surface position due to the considerations alluded to in (3b). This type of movement is called *A-movement* and is understood to be involved in sentences of the form in (4) as well (e.g., (5)).

(4)   NP$_i$ seems to NP [t_i to VP]

(5)   John$_i$ seems to Mary [t_i to be a nice person]

Japanese has a pair that appears to correspond to (1).

(6)   a.   NP1-ga   NP2-o   V-Tns
              -NOM   -ACC

      b.   NP2-ga   (NP1-{ni/niyotte})   V-(r)are-ru/ta
              -NOM   -by   -PASS-

(7)   a.   Mary-ga   John-o   hihansi-ta
              -NOM   -ACC   criticize-PAST
           'Mary criticized John.'

      b.   John-ga   Mary-ni/niyotte   hihans-are-ta
              -NOM   -by   criticize-PASS-PAST
           'John was criticized by Mary.'

In both (1) and (6), the 'object' in the active sentence corresponds to the 'subject' in the passive, and the 'subject' in the active sentence corresponds to an oblique in the passive.

The functional equivalence, however, does not necessarily mean the sharing of the same formal properties.[2] In other words, it is not clear that (6b) has a structure like (8), involving the same type of movement as in (1b) and (4).

(8)   NP2-ga$_i$ (NP1-{ni/niyotte}) t_i V-(r)are-Tns

Whether it does or not will have much bearing on the overall characterization of the Japanese language one might pursue. For example, if *-rare* in Japanese had the effects in (3b), necessarily resulting in a structure like (8), that would provide support for the view in (9).

(9)   There are items in Japanese, as in English and other languages, that bear a feature responsible for agreement/checking (a formal feature that is hypothesized to be responsible for obligatory displacement of elements); and agreement/checking plays a central role in the generation of Japanese sentences.

In contrast to (9), a thesis like (10) has been pursued in Fukui 1986, 1993,

---

[2] See, for example, Chomsky 1976: 181-183 and Hoji 2003: note 80 for some concrete illustration of this point.

and Fukui & Sakai 2003; see also Kuroda 1988.[3]

(10)   No items in Japanese bear a feature that is responsible for agreement/checking; and hence agreement/checking plays no role in Japanese, unlike in English and other languages.

If (10) is correct, the Japanese passive morpheme *-rare* should not have the property that results in the effects in (3b). Note, however, that the hypothesis in (10) does not necessarily entail the absence of movement in general in Japanese, since it need not be assumed that every movement should be driven by formal feature agreement/checking.   And it is reasonable that an NP can undergo 'scrambling', distinct from A-movement of the sort involved in (1b) and (4), as argued below.

The choice between (9) and (10) in regard to passives in Japanese should thus be contingent upon (i) whether Japanese passives involve movement as indicated in (8), and (ii) whether such movement has properties of A-movement of the sort that is understood to be involved in the derivation of (2b) and (4) in English.

I will argue that examination of the reconstruction effects for variable binding in passive sentences in Japanese leads us to conclude that movement observed in the Japanese passive is not A-movement but rather the same type of movement involved in the derivation of the so-called scrambling construction in Japanese as analyzed in Ueyama 1998.   Since some instances of 'scrambled order' have been argued in the literature to be in effect due to A-movement, the thesis to be defended below can also be understood as denying the claim that 'scrambling' in Japanese can be an instance of A-movement.

2. Reconstruction effects in the Japanese 'scrambling' constructions

Following Ueyama 1998, let us refer to the sentences of the form *NP1-NOM   NP2-DAT/ACC   V* and those of the form *NP2-DAT/ACC   NP1-NOM* as *SO-type* (Subject-Object word order) and *OS-type* (Object-Subject word order) sentences, respectively.   It has been known that *NP2-DAT/ACC* in the OS-type construction in Japanese may show either A- and A'-properties.   Thus the OS-type generally allows BVA(*QP*, *so-ko*) in (11a) as well as (11b).[4]

---

[3] It is assumed here that the differences among languages are attributable solely to the differences in (the functional domain of) the lexicons of the languages, as in Borer 1984, and Fukui 1986.

[4] Given in (i)-(iii) is the minimally necessary background to the present discussion concerning the formal basis of the type of BVA that we are concerned with; see Hoji 1998, Ueyama 1998, and Hoji 2003 for more details.

(i)   BVA(*A, B*) expresses an intuition that (i) B does not have an inherent value of its own, and (ii) the value of B co-varies with the value of A.   (e.g., BVA(*every boy*, *his*) in *every boy loves his mother*)

(ii)   *FD(α, β)* is a formal relation established between two linguistic objects, and it has

(11) a. 'Absence of the WCO effects':
        QP-ACC/DAT   ... [... *so-ko* ...]-NOM ... V
    b. Reconstruction effects:
        [... *so-ko* ...]-ACC/DAT ... *QP*-NOM   ... V

In part on the basis of the observation that the effects in (11a) and (11b) never obtain simultaneously, as illustrated in (12), Ueyama (1998) argues that the OS-type construction is structurally two-way ambiguous, and calls the type which shows the effect in (11a) 'Deep OS-type', and the one that shows the effects in (11b) 'Surface OS-type'.

(12) (Ueyama 2002: Section 3.2, (47))
    ?*[So-ko$_i$-no   kaikeisi-o-sae]$_j$ [so-itu$_j$-no   kookoo-no
       that-place-GEN accountant-ACC-even that-guy-GEN high:school-GEN
    sensei]-ga [subete-no   zidoosyagaisya]$_i$-ni *ec$_j$* suisensita.
    teacher-NOM every-GEN   automobile:company-DAT   recommended
    '[Even its$_i$ accountant]$_j$, [his$_j$ high school teacher] recommended
    to [every automobile company]$_i$.'
    Intended (but impossible) interpretation:
        $\forall x$ (*x*=automobile company) [it holds of even *y*, who is *x*'s ac-
        countant, that *y*'s high school teacher recommended *y* to *x*]

Ueyama's (1998) analysis of the two OS-type constructions, which I adopt here, is as follows.[5]

(13) Surface OS-type:
    PF: NP$_1$-DAT/ACC   [NP-NOM   ... t_1 ...]   ($\leftarrow$ PF movement)
    LF: [NP-NOM   NP-DAT/ACC   ...]
(14) Deep OS-type:
    PF: NP$_1$-DAT/ACC   [NP-NOM   *pro$_1$*   ...]
    LF: NP$_1$-DAT/ACC [*pro$_1$* [NP-NOM t_1 ...]] ($\leftarrow$ LF movement of *pro*)
                                                (*pro* acting as an empty operator)

According to Ueyama 1998, the OS order in *Surface OS* is derived by the PF movement of the O across the S, and in *Deep OS*, the clause-initial O is 'base-generated' in an A-position above IP, and is related to 'its theta posi-tion' by means of (i) the 'base-generation' of an empty nominal (repre-sented as *pro* in (14)) in 'the theta position' with which the O is associated, (ii) the LF adjunction of the empty nominal to the IP, and (iii) the formation

---

the properties given in (iii), and a certain type of BVA(A, B) (e.g., BVA(*even Toyota*, *it*)) arises only if FD(*t*, *it*) is established at LF, with the *t* being the trace of *even Toyota*.

(iii) a. (Hoji 2003: (83))
        *FD(α, β) if α does not c-command β.
    b. (Hoji 2003: (84))
        Given FD(α, β), the value of β must be identical to that of α.

[5] A 'pre-QR' structure is given as an LF representation, to avoid unnecessary complications that might result from adding another trace in the representation.

of the predication relation between the O and the IP (or the lambda predicate that the IP gets mapped to).

Given this analysis, one might suspect that an overt nominal category A can appear in place of the empty nominal in (14), as long as it is possible for A to function in essentially the same way as the empty nominal. Examples like (15) suggest that such is indeed the case; see Hoji 2003: Section 3.1 for discussion on various related issues including the judgmental fluctuation on the relevant examples and its theoretical characterization.

(15) [*Toyota-ni-sae*]$_1$ [*so-ko*-o tekitaisisiteiru kaisya]-ga [*so-ko*-ni]$_1$
   Toyota-DAT-even that-place-ACC be:hostile company-NOM that-place-to

   Nissan-o suisensita
   Nissan-ACC recommended

   '[*To even Toyota*]$_1$, the company which is hostile to *it* recommended Nissan to *it*$_1$.'

Notice that the presence of such an overt nominal (let us call it *resumption*) is possible in Deep OS but not in Surface OS, as is expected under Ueyama's (1998) account of the OS constructions in Japanese. We are thus led to expect that resumption disambiguates the OS construction, forcing it to be Deep OS, hence making it impossible to obtain reconstruction effects. The unavailability of the intended BVA in (17) (in contrast to (16)) confirms this expectation.[6]

(16) a. [*So-ko*-o tekitaisisiteiru kaisya]$_1$-o *Toyota-sae*-ga *ec*$_1$ uttaeta
    that-place-ACC be:hostile company-ACC Toyota-even-NOM sued

    '[The company which is hostile to *it*]$_1$, *even Toyota* sued *ec*$_1$.'

  b. [*So-ko*-o tekitaisisiteiru kaisya]$_1$-o Nissan-ga *Toyota-ni-sae*
    that-place-ACC be:hostile company-ACC Nissan-NOM Toyota-DAT-even

    ec$_1$ suisensita
     recommended

    '[the company which is hostile to *it*]$_1$, Nissan recommended *to even Toyota ec*$_1$.'

(17) a. *[*So-ko*-o tekitaisisiteiru kaisya]$_1$-o *Toyota-sae*-ga
    [*so-ko*-o]$_1$ uttaeta

  b. *[*So-ko*-o tekitaisisiteiru kaisya]$_1$-o Nissan-ga
    Toyota-ni-sae [*so-ko*-o]$_1$ suisensita

Resumption is thus possible only when the 'dislocated' phrase in the OS construction exhibits A-properties, and this constitutes strong supporting evidence in favor of Ueyama's analysis of the OS constructions in Japanese, as opposed to the other analyses offered in the literature.[7]

---

[6] The observations that resumption is possible in Deep OS but not in Surface OS and that reconstruction effects are not observed with resumption are made in an unpublished work by J.-R. Hayashishita in 1997; see Ueyama 1998: Appendix A.2, Appendix B.1.1.

[7] I will return to this briefly in Section 6.

Summarized in (18) are the aspects of Ueyama's (1998, 2002) analysis of the OS construction in Japanese that are crucial to the present discussion.

(18) a. Reconstruction effects obtain only in Surface OS (i.e., in the OS construction that is derived by the PF movement of the O over the S).

b. The O in the OS construction necessarily shows A-properties (hence no reconstruction effects), if the theta-position corresponding to the O is occupied by resumption.

3. Reconstruction effects in Japanese passives

Turning to passives, reconstruction effects are observed in examples like (19) but not in examples like (20).[8]

(19) Reconstruction of BVA in Japanese passives:

a. [soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**niyotte**
   it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student -NOM Abe Prof.-by
[itutu izyoo-no kaisya]$_1$-ni __ suisensareta
  5:or:more-GEN   company-DAT   was:recommended
'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by Prof. Abe to [five or more companies]$_1$'

b. [soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**niyotte**
   it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student-NOM   Abe Prof.-by
[Toyota-ni-sae]$_1$ __ suisensareta
        -DAT-even   was:recommended
'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by Prof. Abe to [even Toyota]$_1$'

(20) a. *[soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**ni**
  it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student-NOM Abe Prof.-by
[itutu izyoo-no kaisya]$_1$-ni suisensareta
  5:or:more-GEN   company -DAT was:recommended
'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by Prof. Abe to [five or more companies]$_1$'

b. *[soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**ni**
   it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student-NOM Abe Prof.-by
[Toyota-ni-sae]$_1$ suisensareta
        -DAT-even   was:recommended
'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by Prof. Abe to [even Toyota]$_1$'

With resumption, the BVA in (19) becomes unavailable, as illustrated in

---

[8] A full paradigm would include acceptable examples like (20), where the BVA reconstruction is not at stake.

(21).[9]

(21) a. *[soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**niyotte**
　　　 it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student -NOM Abe Prof.-by
　　　[itutu izyoo-no kaisya]$_1$-ni soitu-ga suisensareta
　　　 5:or:more-GEN company-DAT   was:recommended
　　　'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by
　　　Prof. Abe to [five or more companies]$_1$'

　　 b. *[soko$_1$-ni hairitagatteita   gakusei]-ga Abe kyoozyu-**niyotte**
　　　 it-DAT   wanted:to:work:for student-NOM   Abe Prof.-by
　　　[Toyota-ni-sae]$_1$ soitu-ga suisensareta
　　　 -DAT-even   was:recommended
　　　'[a student who wanted to work for it$_1$] was recommended by
　　　Prof. Abe to [even Toyota]$_1$'

The similarities between OS-type constructions and the passive observed above suggest the possibility that the examples in (19) are instances of Surface OS while those in (20) are not.   If such is indeed the case, the 'base order' of (19) should be as in *NP-ni NP-ga V-rare*, among the argument NPs, and *NP-ga NP-ni V-rare* can be derived by the PF movement of *NP-ga* across *NP-ni*, giving rise to the reconstruction effects in (19).   Before we turn to the various predictions made under such an analysis, I will first try to state the hypothesis about the passives in Japanese I wish to pursue.

4. Hypothesis about Japanese passives

The case-marking on *NP2* differs between (6a) and (6b).   Given the assumption that the marking with *-ga* and *-o* reflects the argument structure of the predicate in question, it seems reasonable to assume that the addition of *-rare* affects the argument structure.   The observation that there are two sentence patterns with *-rare* that correspond to (22)—the so-called indirect passive (as in (23a)) and direct passive (as in (23b))—suggests that there are two *-rare*'s, as proposed in Kuroda 1979, and that one has an argument-taking property and the other an argument-reducing property.[10]

---

[9] The status of (21) is not due to the use of *so-itu* as resumption.   Examples corresponding to the English translations in (i), where *so-ko* is used as the resumption, are also unacceptable (while their status without the resumption is analogous to that of (19)).
(i)　　　　[a company that wanted to join it$_1$] was recommended by Mr. Abe to {[five or more organizations]$_1$/[even this organization]$_1$}

[10] The phonetic string corresponding to (23b) can in fact be of the structure in (23a).   I.e., nothing seems to prevent (i-b) from being the passive counterpart of (i-a), with the argument-taking *-rare*, where *NP2* is the external argument taken by the argument-taking *-rare*, and *ec2* is an empty nominal that is anaphorically related to *NP2*.   The case-markers in the parentheses are provided below just to clarify what is intended.
(i)　　a.　　ec1(-ga) ec2(-o) V
　　　　b.　　NP2-ga [$_{VP}$ ec1(-ni)   ec2(-o)   V]-rare

7

(22) NP1-ga   NP2-o   V
(23) (Corresponding to (22))
    a.   NP3-ga [$_{VP}$ NP1-ni   NP2-o   V]-rare
    b.   NP2-ga (NP1-ni(yotte)) V-rare

The former takes an NP (as its external argument) and a VP as its complement, assigning the NP the experiencer theta-role. *NP-ni* within the VP that expresses the agent remains to be an argument of the V; see footnote 11. The 'base' form of the passive with the argument-taking *-rare* is thus as in (24b) (as proposed in Kuroda 1965: Chapter 5, 1979), with (24a) being its active counterpart.

(24) a.   A-ga (B-ni) (C-o) V   (e.g., 'A introduced C to B')
    b.   D-ga [A-ni (B-ni) (C-o) V]-rare

The argument-reducing *-rare* eliminates an argument of the V to which it is attached[11], and the 'base' form of the passive of this type corresponding to (25a) is as in (25b), and it is possible for an adjunct *NP-niyotte* to appear, for example, at the sentence-initial position in (25b) (e.g., *NP-niyotte (B-ni) C-ga V-rare*). [12]

(25) a.   A-ga (B-ni) C-o V (e.g., 'A criticized B', 'A introduced C to B')
    b.   (B-ni) C-ga V-rare (e.g., 'C was criticized', 'C was introduced to B')

I assume, crucially, that *C* in (25b) can be marked by *-ga* in situ, by a version of the case-marking mechanism of Kuroda 1978, the crucial aspect of which is that it assigns *-ga* to the *first unmarked NP* and *-o* to the rest of the *unmarked NPs* in each cycle.[13] This allows *C* to stay where it is in (25b). Given that (24b) and (25b) are the 'base orders', the other 'word

---

We will address the issue of how to identify an instance of passive with the argument-reducing *-rare* in the next section.

[11] *V-rare* with the argument-reducing *-rare* is then identical in their formal properties as an unaccusative verb.   Although I cannot supply any relevant examples in this paper due to space limit, reconstruction effects of binding and scope in the examples with an unaccusative verb are observed exactly as expected under the view pursued here.   This provides confirmation that the movement in such examples is what is involved in the OS construction, as in the case of examples with the argument-reducing *-rare*, and is not the A-movement of the sort involved in (1b) and (4) in English.   See also Section 6.

[12] The agentive *NP-ni* is an argument but the 'agentive' *NP-niyotte* is an adjunct.   *NP-niyotte* means something like 'due to ….', and nothing special is stated in the lexicon or elsewhere in Japanese about *-niyotte* (which is a *renyookei* (adverbial form) of *-niyoru* 'to depend upon'), and its use does not necessarily signal a passive with the argument-reducing *-rare* (e.g., *A-ga B-niyotte C-ni naru* 'A becomes C {by/with/because of} B' (as in some chemical reaction)).

[13] *NP-ni* is considered a *marked NP*.   I assume in this paper that the case-marking in question applies before the PF movement takes place.   I also assume that the *-ni* marking on the embedded subject *NP1* in (23b), which has been extremely productive and stable throughout the history of the Japanese language, is achieved by a mechanism independent of the marking of *-ga* and *-o*; cf. Kuroda's (1965, 1978/1992:222) *Subject ni-raising*.

orders' corresponding to them can be understood as instances of 'scrambled' sentences. We could thus make predictions in regard to the possibility of bound variable anaphora once we adopt a specific analysis of the 'scrambled' sentences, and I will discuss several predictions adopting Ueyama's (1998) analysis introduced in Section 3.

5. Predictions

Consider the schematic structures in (26), with *A*, *B*, *C* and *V* being constant.[14]

(26) a. A-ga B-ni C-o V
   b. D-ga [$_{VP}$ A-ni B-ni C-o V]-rare (with the argument-taking *-rare*)
   c. B-ni C-ga V-rare   (with the argument-reducing *-rare*)

If *C* is an empty category and anaphorically related to *D* in (26), we get *D-ga [$_{VP}$ A-ni B-ni pro V]-rare*. Since *D* is anaphorically related to, and presumably has the same value as, *pro* in such cases, let us represent it as *C-ga [$_{VP}$ A-ni B-ni pro V]-rare*. We can then have (27a) and (27b) as corresponding to (26a).

(27) a. *C*-ga [$_{VP}$ A-ni B-ni *pro* V]-rare (with the argument-taking *-rare*)
   b. B-ni C-ga V-rare   (with the argument-reducing *-rare*)

Recall that *A-ni* is the agentive phrase and *B-ni* is the indirect object of the ditransitive construction in question.

Given that (27a) and (27b) represent the 'base orders', we see that *C* c-commands *B* in (27a) while *B* c-commands *C* in (27b) in their 'base orders'. The other word orders are then instances of 'scrambled orders', which may be either Surface OS or Deep OS. Consider (28), for example.

(28) a. C-ga A-ni B-ni V-rare   (with the argument-taking *-rare*)
   b. C-ga B-ni V-rare   (with the argument-reducing *-rare*)

In both (28a) and (28b) *C-ga* precedes *B-ni*. According to the proposed analysis, however, (28b) is an instance of the OS construction while (28a) represents the 'base order'. Given the possibility that (28b) is an instance of the Surface OS type, it should be possible for its LF representation to be identical to its SO counterpart, i.e., (27b), where *B* c-commands *C*. Since (28a) is claimed to be the 'base order', there cannot be an LF representation for (28a) where *B* c-commands *C*. We thus predict that BVA(B, β) is not possible in (29a) but that it is not impossible in (29b).[15]

---

[14] I assume that *NP-ni NP-o* is the 'base order'; see Hayashishita 2000 for empirical paradigms and arguments in support of this which are significantly more compelling than those given in Hoji 1985.

[15] While the judgments on the availability of the BVA(B, β) in (29b) may not be stable or uniform, we can facilitate its availability by adding the adjunct *NP-niyotte*, as in (29b), since it seems to help the speaker to associate the phonetic string in question with a structural description in which the argument-reducing *-rare* is used instead of the argument-taking *-rare*. Note

(29) a. [… β …]-ga A-ni B-ni V-rare   *BVA(B, β)
    b. [… β …]-ga (A-niyotte) B-ni V-rare   BVA(B, β)

Recall from Section 2 that a given OS construction cannot be both Deep OS and Surface OS simultaneously, that reconstruction effects obtain only in Surface OS, and that resumption forces a given OS to be an instance of Deep OS. We thus predict that, with resumption, BVA reconstruction becomes unavailable in (29b), resulting in the unavailability of the BVA(B, β). The paradigms given in (19)-(21) above confirm these predictions.

Let us now consider (30), where *A-ni(yotte)* is the agentive phrase and *B-ni* is the indirect object.

(30) a. B-ni C-ga A-ni V-rare   (with the argument-taking *-rare*)
    b. B-ni C-ga A-niyotte V-rare   (with the argument-reducing *-rare*)

Given our analysis, (30a) must be an instance of the OS type while (30b) represents the 'base order' of the argument NPs; see (27). Hence we expect that the BVA(C, β) is not possible in (31b) insofar as the *-rare* in (31b) is taken to be the argument-reducing *-rare*,[16] but that BVA(C, β) is not impossible in (31a), which can be an instance of Surface OS.[17]

(31) a. [… β …]-ni C-ga A-ni V-rare
    b. [… β …]-ni C-ga A-niyotte V-rare

It is further predicted that even those speakers who accept BVA(C, β) in (31a) will find the BVA to be unavailable if the 'base position' of the 'dislocated phrase' is occupied by resumption.

I will briefly illustrate how the predictions regarding (31a) are borne out. (32) is an instance of (31a), and BVA(*55% izyoo-no gakusei, so-itu*) seems possible.

(32)   [*so-itu*-ga hairitakunakatta kaisya]-ni   *55% izyoo-no gakusei*-ga
        that-guy-NOM did:not:want:to:join company-DAT   55% more-GEN student-NOM
        (a-no)   Yamada kyoozyu-ni *ec* syookais-areta (koto)
        that-GEN Yamada professor-by   was:introduced
        'to a company *he* did not want to join, *each of the 55% or more of the students* was introduced *ec* by (that notorious) Prof. Yamada'

If the *ec* in (32) is replaced by *so-itu-ni* 'that guy-DAT', however, the BVA becomes unavailable, much as in (17) and (21).[18, 19]

in this connection that the use of the agentive *NP-ni* clearly signals the use of the argument-taking *-rare*, according to the hypothesis pursued here; see footnote 12.

[16] This should be the case at least to the extent that BVA(C, β) is not possible for *[… β …]-ni C-o V*; see footnote 14.

[17] It is noted in Hoji 1985: Chapter 4, footnote 37 that the judgments on the WCO and reconstruction paradigms involving the direct and the indirect objects of a ditransitive verb is not as clear as examples involving the subject and the object NPs; see also footnote 14.

[18] The availability of BVA(*55% izyoo-no gakusei, so-itu*) in (i), an instance of Deep OS under the account adopted here, indicates that the unavailability of the BVA in (32) with resumption

6. Concluding remarks

In the preceding sections, I have argued that the nature of the word order variations in the Japanese passive is identical to that in non-passive sentences. I have further argued that A-movement is not involved in the derivation of any instance of the OS construction in Japanese, now including the OS versions of passive sentences. The empirical argument for this comes from the fact that those OS constructions in which the 'dislocated phrase' exhibits A-properties are precisely those in which resumption is allowed in the theta-position related to the 'dislocated phrase'. Once we adopt the assumption that A-movement is forced for Case reasons and if the relevant part of the Case theory states that overt categories must have Case, it is not possible to maintain that the movement in question is due to Case reasons since an overt category can indeed appear in what would be the launching site of the A-movement.

It has been argued in Belletti & Rizzi 1988 and Barss 2001, among others, that A-movement exhibits reconstruction effects. The availability of BVA(*every boy*, *his*) in examples like (33) is among the bases for such a claim.

(33)   ?[His$_1$ first girl friend]$_2$ seems to every boy$_1$ t$_2$ to be the most un-
             forgettable.   (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992: (35c))

The availability of BVA in such examples seems to be more analogous to that in (34a) than to that in (34b).

(34) a.   It seems to every boy$_1$ that [his$_1$ first girl friend] is the most un-
             forgettable.   (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992: (35a))
       b.   *[His$_1$ (own) daughter]$_2$ promised every father$_1$ [PRO$_2$ to take
             good care of her little brother]. (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992: (38b))

---

cannot be attributed to (some processing difficulty associated with) the sequence of *NP-ni NP-ga NP-ni NP-ni*.

(i)   [55% izyoo-no kaisya]-ni   [*so-ko*-ni   hairitakunakatta   gakusei]-ga
             55% more-GEN company-DAT that-place-DAT did:not:want:to:join   student-NOM
             (ano)   Yamada kyoozyu-ni   so-ko-ni   syookaisareta   (koto)
             that-GEN   Yamada professor-by   that-place-DAT   was:introduced
             'to *each of the 55% or more companies*, a student who did not want to join *it* was
             introduced to *it* by Prof. Yamada'

Furthermore, the unavailability of the BVA with resumption in an example corresponding to (32) cannot be attributed to the use of *so-itu* 'that-guy' as the dependent term; see footnote 9. The choice of the particular example in (32) is to make it minimally different from (i) above in terms of their 'semantico-functional' aspects.

[19] So far, we have been concerned with the availability of BVA in the Surface OS (see (11b)). Ueyama (1998: Chapter 2, 2002) also discusses empirical generalizations in regard to Deep OS and specifies conditions on when a given 'dislocated phrase' can exhibit A-properties, making reference to 'long-distance scrambling', 'multiple scrambling', and the clause types. Ueyama's generalizations and analysis of Deep OS thus yield a number of predictions beyond what has been discussed above, but the relevant discussion will have to be presented on a different occasion.

A closer inspection, however, leads us to conclude that A-movement (in English) does not exhibit BVA reconstruction. It is argued in Ueyama 1998, Hayashishita forthcoming, and Hoji 2003 that certain QPs need to be used in syntactic experiments intended to probe into syntactic structures at LF. With such QPs (e.g., *at least one NP*), reconstruction effects are not observed in the raising construction in English (while they are in A'-movement such as *wh*-movement). In (35), due to J.-R. Hayashishita, for example, BVA(*at least one professor*, *his*) seems unavailable.

(35) *his_1 *student* seems to [at least one professor]$_1$ *t* to be worth promoting

If *his student* were indeed in its theta-position (i.e., the embedded subject position) at the point where the grammatical basis for the BVA is checked, the intended binding in (35) would be expected to be as readily available as in (36).

(36) it seems to [at least one professor]$_1$ that his$_1$ student is quite promising

It is perhaps worth noting that Ueyama's (1998) generalizations discussed in Section 2 have been arrived at by focusing on paradigms without resumption that involve a certain type of binder-bindee pairs and concentrating on the distribution of BVA that is crucially based on a c-command relation at LF. If we considered BVA that can arise independently of LF c-command, we would no longer be able to maintain the generalizations in question, and a different set of generalizations emerges, as discussed in Ueyama 1998 in some depth. In the preceding discussion, I have used such QPs without providing a detailed background discussion.[20] As pointed out in Ueyama 1998: Section 3.1 and Hoji 2003: Section 2.2, if we use QPs like *everyone*, *every teacher*, etc., the speakers' judgments on BVA paradigms are not as robust as when we use certain other QPs, including *at least one NP*. I thus conclude that A-movement (in English) does not exhibit reconstruction effects, at least in the way the OS constructions in Japanese do.[21]

---

[20] Hoji 2003 provides a summary of the relevant empirical materials.

[21] Recall that the Japanese passive with agentive *NP-ni* does not exhibit reconstruction effects; see (20). One might thus suggest that it is in fact the Japanese passive with agentive *NP-ni* that involves A-movement. Such a position, however, does not seem tenable at least for the following reason. If the so-called *ni*-passiv*e* were derived via A-movement, the animacy requirement on the subject of such passive sentences would be mysterious.

(i)   a.   (Inoue 1976: 83, (40b))
              Kaikai ga gityoo ni yotte sengen sareta
              opening chairman   was:announced
              'The opening of the meeting was announced by the chairman'
     b.   (Kuroda 1979: (18))
              *Kaikai ga gityoo ni sengen sareta
(ii)   (Kuroda 1979: (19) and (20))
     a.   Siroi booru ga Oo ni yotte takadakato utiage-rareta
              white ball   high   hit-up

The essentials of the analysis outlined above are made in Kuroda 1979, where two types of passives are recognized in Japanese, the *ni* passive and the *niyotte* passive, and the former is explicitly argued in Kuroda 1979 to involve the argument-taking *-rare*. It is also clear that for Kuroda 1979 the agentive *NP-ni* is an argument in the sense relevant here and *NP-niyotte* is an adjunct. This work can thus be understood as an attempt to substantiate the essentials of Kuroda's proposal.[22] Unlike Kuroda 1979, however, we maintain that the dichotomy is not between *-ni* and *-niyotte* passives, but it is between the argument-taking *-rare* and the argument-reducing *-rare*. While this new dichotomy makes it less straightforward to test two distinct types of passives in Japanese, the reconstruction effects of BVA have provided an effective testing ground for the hypothesis about the passives in Japanese, and the empirical considerations in Sections 2-5 point to a conclusion that is consistent with (10), repeated here.

(10)   No items in Japanese bear a feature that is responsible for agreement/checking, and hence agreement/checking plays no role in Japanese, unlike in English and other languages.

References

Barss, A., 2001. Syntactic Reconstruction Effects. In M. Baltin, and C. Collins, eds., *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 670-696, Blackwell Publishers.

Belletti, A. & Luigi R., 1988. "Psych-Verbs and Theta-Theory," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6-3, 291-352.

Borer, H. 1984. *Parametric Syntax*, Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Reidel, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, N. 1976. "Conditions on Rules of Grammar," in *Essays on Form and Interpretation*, North-Holland, New York, pp.163-210.

Fukui, N., 1986. *A Theory of Category Projection and Its Applications*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Fukui, N., 1993. Parameters and Optionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24-3, 399-420.

Fukui, N. and H. Sakai, 2003. The Visibility Guidelines for Functional Categories: Verb Raising in Japanese and Related Issues. *Lingua* 113/4-6, 321-375.

Hayashishita, J.-R., 2000. "Scope Ambiguity and 'Scrambling'," *WCCFL* 19, pp. 204-217, Cascadilla Press Somerville, MA.

Hayashishita, J.-R., forthcoming. *Syntactic and Non-Syntactic Scope*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California.

Hoji, H. 1985. *Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japa-*

'A white ball was hit high in the air by Oo'
   b.   *Siroi booru ga Oo ni takadakato utiage-rareta
Given the analysis of the passive with the argument-taking *-rare* adopted here, this is not unexpected; see Section 4.

[22] Space limitation prevents me from discussing many important works on Japanese passives in the literature, including Miyagawa 1989, and Hoshi 1994, 1999.

nese, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Hoji, H., 1998. "Formal Dependency, Organization of Grammar, and Japanese Demonstratives," *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol.7, pp.649-677, CSLI Publications.

Hoji, H., 2003. Falsifiability and Repeatability in Generative Grammar: A Case Study of Anaphora and Scope Dependency in Japanese. *Lingua* 113/4-6, 377-446.

Hoshi, H., 1994. *Passive, Causative and Light Verbs: A Study on Theta Role Assignment*, Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Hoshi, H., 1999. Passives, in Natsuko Tsujimura, ed., *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 191-235, Blackwell Publishers.

Inoue, K., 1976. *Henkeibunpoo to nihongo: Joo, toogoron o tyuusin-ni (Transformational Grammar and Japanese: (I) On Syntactic Structures)*, Taishuukan, Tokyo.

Jaeggli, O., 1986. "Passive," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, pp.587-622.

Kitagawa, Y., and S.-Y. Kuroda, 1992. Passive in Japanese. Ms., University of Rochester and University of California, San Diego.

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1965. *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1978. Case-marking, Canonical Sentence Patterns, and Counter Equi in Japanese (A Preliminary Survey), in Hinds ed., *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*. 30-51, Kaitakusha, Tokyo. (Reprinted in Kuroda,1992, 222-239).

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1979. On Japanese Passives, in Bedell et al., eds., *Explorations in Linguistics: Paper in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*, 305-347, Kenkyuusya, Tokyo. (Reproduced as Kuroda, 1992: Chapter 5. (183-221). The page reference is to Kuroda 1992.))

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1988. "Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese," *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12, pp.1-47, also in Kuroda (1992) pp.315-357.

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1992. *Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston and London.

Miyagawa, S., 1989. *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese*, Syntax and Semantics 22, Academic Press, San Diego.

Miyagawa, S., 1997. "Against Optional Scrambling," *Linguistic Inquiry* 28-1, pp.1-25.

Miyagawa, S. and K. Arikawa., 2003. Locality in syntax and floated numeral quantifiers. A talk given at UCLA.

Saito, M., 1992. "Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 1-1, pp.69-118.

Saito, M., 2003. A Derivational Approach to the Interpretation of Scrambling Chains. *Lingua* 113/4-6, 481-518.

Ueyama, A., 1998. *Two Types of Dependency*. Doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California. (Distributed by GSIL publications. Los Angeles: University of Southern California).

Ueyama, A., 2002. Two Types of Scrambling Constructions in Japanese. In: A. Barss (ed.), *Anaphora: A Reference Guide*, 23-71. Blackwell, Cambridge.