1. Introduction

This paper analyzes the adversity in Japanese adversative passives and in English resultatives. An analysis based on construction grammar can clarify nature of the adversity and finds parallelism between Japanese and English constructions. In chapter 2, introducing the analysis methods of Construction Grammar, syntactic and semantic features of the adversative passive construction in Japanese will be described. This chapter also explains the syntactic flexibility assuming metonymy a clue. Chapter 3 points out parallelism between Japanese adversative passives and English resultatives.

Japanese has direct passives (neutral passives) and indirect passives (adversative passives) that don't have corresponding active sentences other than direct passives (neutral passives). It is said that these indirect adversative passive constructions are unique to Japanese.

(1) Direct passives (neutral passives)

a. Boku wa sensei ni homerareta. (active sentence = sensei ga boku wo hometa)
   'I was praised by a teacher.' (active sentence = A teacher praised me.)

b. Purezento ga minna ni yorokobareta. (active sentence = minna ga purezento wo yorokonda)
   'The present pleased everyone.' (Everyone was pleased with the present.)

(2) Indirect passives (adversative passives)

a. Boku wa kangohu ni kanngo no houtai wo torikaerareta.
   'I was replaced a bandage of an affected part by a nurse.'
   (active sentence = 'Kangohu ha kanbu no houtai wo boku wo torikaeta)
   'A nurse replaced a bandage of an affected part on me.'

b. Boku wa gakusei ni nando mo dotabata to rouka wo hashirare, benkyou dekinakatta.
   'I was noisily run in a corridor by students and I couldn't study.'
   (active sentence = 'Gakusei ha boku ni rouka wo dotabata to hashitta.)

---

[1] This paper is a brief summary of Ouchida (2015). I wish to thank my supervisor, Manabu Hashimoto, and vice supervisors, Shinji Saito and Kunihiro Matsubayashi. My research owes much to their helpful suggestions and comments.
Because students noisily ran in a corridor, I felt unpleasant.

While direct passive sentences in (1a,b) have corresponding active sentences, active sentences corresponding with (2a,b) are unacceptable. Indirect passive sentences like (2) have the meaning of adversity. However, indirect passive sentences don’t always have the connotation of adversity. Let us compare (3) with (4).

(3) a. Hanako wa ame ni hurareta.
‘Hanako was rained on.’

b. Hanako wa Taro ni yoko ni suwarareta.
‘Hanako was sat beside by Taro.’

c. Hanako wa Taro ni koe wo dashite hon wo yomareta.
‘Hanako was read with a loud voice by Taro.’

(4) a. Hanako wa Taro ni nagurareta.
‘Hanako was hit by Taro.’

b. Yamada-san wa goutou ni korosareta.
‘Mr. Yamada was killed by a robber.’

c. Taro wa gakko de ijimerareta.
‘Taro was bullied at school.’

In (3 a-c), verbs themselves don’t have the meaning of adversity to subjects. However, when they occur in passive sentences, the sentences express the meaning of a bad effect on their subjects. The phenomenon observed in (3) should be called the supply of adversative connotation by construction (Shibatani, 1996), and we call these sentences “adversative passive”. In contrast, verbs (4 a-c) themselves have the meaning of adversity to referents of subjects. This meaning of adversity is not supplied by the examples (4 a-c).

The fact that adversative connotation caused by constructions occur in sentences can be applied to the idea of construction in construction grammar. Adversative passives in (3) have the meaning of adversity that can’t be expected from original meanings of their verbs. It is essential to set this definition of adversity for clarifying a whole picture of adversative passives construction.

To clarify syntactic and semantic features of adversative passives, four points are central of this paper.

The first point is the definition of “adversity”. In previous studies of adversative passives, “adversity” was not clearly defined. As we have seen above, examples whose verbs lexically have meaning of adversity are distinguished from adversative passive sentences whose verbs don’t have adversative meaning connotation. In the latter adversative passives, adversative connotation is supplied by this construction.

The second point is the description of adversative passives based on construction grammar. On the basis of definition of adversity, the adversative passive construction has adversity. For the discussion of this construction, we have to describe with the framework of
construction grammar. This approach will summarize syntactic and semantic features of this construction efficiently.

The third point is the explanation that adversative passive is a phenomenon based on metonymy. The discussion on the second point, shows that this construction has various forms. That is, in adversative passives, a noun phrase occurring as a subject is not required by its verb. This syntactic flexibility can be explained metonymical translation of focus points based on frame semantics.

The fourth point is the parallelism between Japanese adversatives and English resultatives. The adversative passive construction ensures acceptability of sentences with the supply of adversative connotation. This phenomenon, the supply of adversative connotation, is also observed in English resultative construction. Comparing resultatives with adversative passives, these constructions have similarity in their syntactic and semantic features. This parallelism leads to a typological hypothesis.


Construction grammar distinguishes verb's lexical meaning and construction's meaning. Verb's meaning is called "participant role" and construction's meaning is called the "argument role". Argument roles are those roles which the construction in question requires. For example, agent, patient, goal etc. can be an argument role. Participant roles are specific examples of general argument roles. Based on these ideas, sentence meaning is constituted by fusion of construction's meaning and verb's meaning.

2.1 The Fusion of Argument Role and Participant Role

The preceding section sets the supply of adversative connotation in Japanese adversative passives as constructional phenomena. Before the semantic analysis of this construction, we have to clarify syntactic characteristics. However, adversative passives have various forms. Therefore, syntactic features of adversative passives have to be analyzed by paying attentions to verbs used in them.

First, let us consider adversative passives of intransitive verbs. Now, we will consider examples of unaccusative verbs.

(5) Adversative passives of unaccusative verb
   a. Kinou, boku wa ame ni hurareta.
      'Yesterday, I was rained on.'
   b. Kare wa tsuma ni shinareta.
      'He was died on by his wife.'

(6) Corresponding active sentences
   a. *Kinou, ame ga boku wo (ni) hutta.
      'Yesterday, rain falls on me.'
b. *Tsuma wa kare wo (ni) shinda.

From the fact that (6) are unacceptable, these examples of adversative passive don’t have their active sentences. This is because their subjects boku (1), kare (he) don’t have participant roles of verbs. Participant roles of verbs in (5) can be described in (7).

(7) a. huru (fall) = <fallen>
   b. shinu (die) = <died>

Subjects of adversative passives don’t have direct relation with the events expressed in embedded sentences. In adversative passive sentences, their subjects are treated as patient to be acceptable. We should call subjects of adversative passive sentences fake patient. This term is based on fake object in Ono (2001)’s analysis of resultative constructions of intransitive verbs. When we describe these subjects on the basis of construction grammar, fake patient is more appropriate as an argument role than fake object, so let us use the term fake patient. Setting this fake patient as an argument role of adversative passives, we can explain the phenomenon that subjects are indirectly related with events.

Based on this discussion, adversative passives of unaccusative verbs can be described as (8).

(8) a. Kinou, boku wa ame ni hurareta.
   b. Sem CAUSE-ADVERSITY < f. pat theme >
     R
     R: instance, HURU (FALL) < fallen >
     means
     Syn V SUBJ OBL

In (8), the construction specifies which roles of the construction are obligatorily fused with roles of the verb; these are indicated by a solid line between the argument roles and the verb’s participant role. Roles which are not obligatorily fused with roles of the verb are indicated by a dashed line. The construction also specifies the way in which the verb is integrated into the construction (what type of relation R can be). V and SUBJ and OBL are syntactic expressions in the sentence. Likewise, unergative verbs can form adversative passive sentences.

(9) Adversative passives of unergative verb
a. Boku wa aru otoko ni kimyou na dansu wo odorareta.
   ‘I was danced a strange dance on by a man.’
b. Hanako wa Taro ni yoko ni suwarareta.
   ‘Hanako was sat beside by Taro.’
(10) Corresponding active sentences

a. *Aru otoko wa boku wo kimyou na dansu wo odotta.
   ‘A man danced a strange dance on me.’

b. *Taro wa hanako wo yoko ni suwatta.
   ‘Taro sat beside Hanako.’

Unergative verbs odoru (dance) and suwaru (sit) occur in adversative passive sentences (9). The subjects aru otoko (a man) and Taro are not given a participant role of the verb. Because (10) are unacceptable, their corresponding active sentences don’t exist. Let us see a participant role of odoru and suwaru in (11).

(11) a. odoru (dance) = <dancer>
    b. suwaru (sit) = <sitter>

Based on discussion above, we can explain adversative passives of unergative verb by setting fake patient as a participant role of this construction like (12).

(12) a. Boku wa aru otoko ni kimyou na dansu wo odorareta.
    b. Sem CAUSE-ADVERSITY < f. pat agent >
       R
       R: instance, ODORU (DANCE) < dancer >
       Syn V UBJ OBL

Next, let us consider examples of transitive verbs. Basically, a transitive verb require an agent and patient as its participant role. In the case of adversative passives of transitive verb, fake patients are directly related with event expressed by embedded sentences.

(13) a. Boku wa Hanako ni jisho wo tsukawareta.
    ‘Because Hanako used my dictionary, I felt unpleasant.’

b. Watashi wa, kanai ni sono ringo wo taberareta. (Takami&Kuno, 2002)
   ‘Because my wife ate the apple, I felt unpleasant.’

(13a) describes the event that its subject Boku felt unpleasant probably because his wife eats his apple without his permission. (13b) evokes us an occasion that its subject Watashi gets angry because probably his wife ate an apple that he was looking forward to eating. These subjects Boku and Watashi don’t have any participant role of verbs.

Simple passive sentences like (13b) and (14b) have their active sentences (14a) and (15a). However, as with examples of unaccusative and unergative verbs, active sentences
of transitive verb passives that have a fake patient can’t be accepted because (16) are not acceptable.

(14) a. Hanako wa jisho wo tsukatta.
   ‘Hanako used a dictionary.’
   b. Jisho wa Hanako ni tsukawareta.
   ‘A dictionary was used by Hanako.’

(15) a. Kanai wa sono ringo wo tabeta.
   ‘My wife ate the apple.’
   b. Sono ringo wa kanai ni taberareta.
   ‘The apple was eaten by his wife.’

(16) a. *Hanako wa jisho wo boku ni tsukatta.
   ‘Hanako used a dictionary on me.’
   b. *Kanai wa, sono ringo wo watashi ni tabeta.
   ‘My wife ate the apple on me.’

As we have seen, this is because these transitive verbs don’t have a participant role for their subject as a fake patient in a sentence. (17) shows participant roles of tsukau and taberu.

(17) a. tsukau (use) =<user used>
   b. taberu (eat) =<eater eaten>

We can formulate adversative passives with transitive verbs based on the observation.

(18) a. Boku wa Hanako ni jisho wo tsukawareta.
   b. Sem CAUSE-ADVERSITY < f. pat agent object >
      R
      R : instance, TSUKAU (USE) < user used >
      means
      Syn V SUBJ OBL OBJ

As discussed above, adversative passives have three types of forms. In composite fused structure of adversative passives (8), (12), and (18), only fake patients are common to all. This syntactic flexibility can be explained with an analysis based on metonymy in the next section. The next section will conduct a cognitive analysis of adversative passives referring to the discussion by Nishimura & Noya (2013).
2.2 Semantic Constraints on Adversative Passives

Shibatani (1997) explains the supply of adversative connotation using his idea ‘relevance’ based on the principle of meaning unification. Two subclassifications are set for the relevance.

(19) a. Proximity
    = Spatial and temporal proximity between subjects and events; for example,
      physical parts, kinships, the space occupied by subjects have proximity.
b. Affectedness
    = Affectedness is the difference of impacts of verbs. Noun phrases that can be
      affected strongly have high relevance, and such noun phrases are easy to compose
      sentences. Little affected noun phrases need adversity supply.

Based on proximity and affectedness, let us observe (20).

(20) Boku wa aru otoko ni kimyo na dansu wo odorareta.

In the example of (20), the event ‘a man dances a strange dance’ doesn’t have proximity or affectedness. Shibatani claims that adversity is added to compensate for the lack of relevance. In this adversative passive sentence, contexts that raise proximity or affectedness occur (for example, ‘while I was studying, a man danced a strange dance.’ or ‘because I followed the dance with my eyes, I felt bad.’).

This fact is observed also in (21).

(21) Boku wa Hanako ni piano wo hikareta.

(21) is acceptable only when ① the piano is his possession or ② the sound of the piano prevents him from sleeping. From these facts, when verbs don’t have proximity and affectedness, the acceptability of sentence is ensured by the supply of adversative connotation. Now, let us consider adversative passives intentionally lowered their proximity or affectedness.

(22) a. *Boku wa Hanako ni Jiro no piano wo hikareta.
    ‘Because Hanako played Jiro’s piano, I felt unpleasant.’
b. *Taro wa hajimete mita dancer ni terebi joude odorareta.
    ‘Because a new dancer danced on TV, Taro felt unpleasant.’

In adversative passives without proximity such as (22a,b), adversity can’t be supplied to compensate for the lack of relevance. In (22a), the event that Hanako played Jiro’s piano can’t be interpreted as adversity on the fake patient Boku. In (22b), the event that a new dancer danced on TV can’t be interpreted as adversity on the fake patient. Similarly, examples without affectedness in (23a,b) are unacceptable.
In (23a), the event that Hanako played the piano beautifully can't be interpreted as a change of its subject's state. In other words, the metonymical transition of frame can't occur. We can't admit this adversative passive sentence. Also in (23b), because the subject Boku can't hear her piano, this fake patient can't be affected by the event.

From this analysis, it can be considered that adversative passives have semantic constraints proximity and affectedness suggested by Shibatani (1997). The next section will observe parallelism between Japanese adversative passives and English resultatives.

2.3 An Analysis of Flexibility of Adversative Passives Based on Metonymy

Metonymy is a metaphorical expression of contiguity. In this expression, a target is expressed with a word deeply relating to it. (19) show typical examples of metonymy.

(24) a. Akazukin (red hood) = a girl who wears a red hood
b. Akashatsu (red shirt) = a person who wears a red shirt

In (24a) and (24b), a speaker intends to indicate not a red hood or a red shirt themselves but a person who wears them. When humans indicate something, we use a thing contiguous to a target. One of the most typical examples of this contiguity is the physical closeness in (24). These expressions are based on our reference point ability.

(25) Reference point ability: the ability to invoke the conception of one entity for purposes of establishing mental contact with one another  (Langacker 1993)

---

Figure 1
In Figure 1, Conceptualizer gives attention to Target focusing on reference point that is salient. Adversative passives can be explained by this cognitive ability.

For example, when someone want a friend to see a cat distant from them, it’s hard to show a cat itself directly. He/she would say, “You see a big tree over there, and can you see a cat under the tree?”. A speaker shows a target by using the big tree as a reference point. (26) shows other examples of metonymy.

(26) a. Nabe ga nieteimasu.
   “The pot is boiling.’
   (Nabe (The pot) =a thing boiling in the pot like soup)
b. Saikin, Murakami Haruki wo yondeimasu.
   ‘These days, I read Murakami Haruki.’
   (Murakami Haruki=the books written by Murakami Haruki)

In (26a), nabe refers soup physically contiguous with it. In (26b), the occasion is a little different from (26a). Books written by Murakami Haruki are not physically contiguous with him. In this example of metonymical expression, there is contiguity that Murakami Haruki has rights of those books. Nishimura & Noya (2013) defines contiguity as shown in (27).

(27) Contiguity:
   Relationship between a reference point and a target that can be accessed with it.

Other language phenomena can be explained by reference point structure.

(28) a. Taro’s car
   b. Hanako’s mother
   c. Tama’s tail
   d. Soseki’s novel

The expressions of possession in (28) are also based on reference point structure. For example, a person who knows Taro can easily find the particular car from cars around the world by regarding Taro as a reference point. These examples (28) show a clue contiguous with a target to help listener identify the particular car, mother, tail, and novel.

On the basis of this discussion, Nishimura & Noya (2013) defined metonymy as (29).

(29) Metonymy (Nishimura & Noya, 2013)
   = A phenomenon that focuses a different phase of a common frame evoked by some expressions

Nishimura & Noya (2013) analyzed tough-constructions using the concept of metonymy shown in (29). Now, let us see some examples of this construction.
Nishimura assumed a metonymical relation in (30a,b). The frame evoked by an adjective *difficult* is ‘an action has a degree of difficulty of accomplishment, and it is decided with its property related with the action (for example an object of the action or a location of the action).’ He claims that (30a) focuses a degree of the action, while (30b) focuses its object of the action *this book*.

Nishimura & Noya (2013) analyzed adversative passives on this basis. Let us observe an example below.

(31) Taro wa Hanako ni nakareta. (Nishimura & Noya, 2013)
‘Taro was cried on by Hanako.’

In (31), an intransitive verb *naku* (cry) acquires transitive meaning (adversity) by being applied to passive construction. (32) shows a part of their discussion.

(32) a. In the sentence “Taro wa Hanako ni nakareta.”, various occasions where ‘crying’ can occur are evoked as a frame. Some of those occasions contain events that someone’s crying makes other people feel troubled and unable to endure being there a moment longer. Adversative passives focus troubled people.
   b. In the sentence "Ame ni hurareta.", various facts around rain falling occur as a frame. Those frames contain an occasion that someone gets wet and feels troubled because he/she forgets to take an umbrella with them. If a speaker focuses the aspect of being troubled, adversative passives will be used.
   (Nishimura & Noya, 2013; pp180)

In other words of their analysis, adversative passives focus on the frame that fake patients got adversity. This explanation corresponds with the fundamental function of adversative passive sentences suggested by Takami & Kuno (2002).

(33) The fundamental function of adversative passive sentences : the function of the adversative passive sentences are to show that the referent of the subject is caused trouble by the event which the embedded sentence implies and that the speaker thinks that such trouble is caused by the referent of the noun phrase of the particle *ni.*
   (Takami & Kuno, 2002)

The syntactic flexibility observed in 3.2 can be explained by this metonymical phenomenon. Adversative passive sentences have three types of ① unaccusative verbs, ② unergative verbs, and ③ transitive verbs. In other words, because the fact that fake patients got adversity is focused, adversative passives are acceptable despite a kind of events described by embedded sentences.
The next section will consider semantic constraints of adversative passives.

3. Parallelism between Japanese Adversative Passives and English Resultatives

This section will discuss parallelism between Japanese adversative passives and English resultatives based on the analysis of fake-object resultatives insisted by Ono (2004). He made an interesting consideration on Japanese indirect passives and English fake-object resultatives on the basis of event structural analysis.

First, Ono (2004) classifies resultatives into three types as (34) ~ (36).

(34) Transitive verb resultatives (object = transitive verb's participant role)
   a. Lancelot had discovered my empty yougurt container and was working hard to lick it clean...
   b. Ma pats the bag smooth...

(35) Intransitive verb resultatives without an object
   a. The pond froze solid.
   b. The garage door rumbles open...

(36) Intransitive verb resultatives with a fake-object (fake-object resultatives)
   a. She winked us past...
   b. the dog barked him awake...

In (34), each verb’s participant roles occur as objects of sentences. Intransitive verb resultatives without (35) describe subjects’ result states. Unlike (34) and (35), intransitive verbs occur in (36) but they have objects. However, these noun phrases are not given participant roles by verbs, so Ono (2004) call such objects fake-objects to distinguish from usual objects. And Ono (2004) defines examples like (36) as fake-object resultatives. He cited Rappaport Horav & Levin (2001) to show that adversative connotation is observed in this construction.

(37) They drunk the pub dry.

(RH&L,2001)

RH&L (2001) claims that the example (37) describes the occasion that the subject’s action adversely affects the pub. The subject of this sentence the pub is not appropriate for an object of the verb drink.

This fact can be explained by metonymy whole frame transition. In this example, a speaker uses fake-object resultative constructions to pay attention to the frame that the pub has been dried up and the proprietor feels unpleasant. This is clear because of the example (38).
They drank pints of beer.

In (38), the sentence has the subject they and the object pints of beer. Each noun phrase has a participant role drinker and drunk given by the verb drink. The frame focused by the sentence is not that all liquor has been dried up but their beer drinking. On the contrary, when a noun phrase without a participant role occurs as an object of resultatives like (37), adversity needs to be added.

Thus, in some examples of the resultative construction, the phenomenon similar with the supply of adversative connotation is observed. In the two constructions, Japanese adversative passives and English resultatives, constructions give an argument role to a noun phrases without a participant role. We can suggest the hypothesis below from this parallelism.

Hypothesis on the supply of adversative connotation:
An operation to link a noun phrase (without participant roles) with event expressed by a verb leads to supply adversity on the sentence.

However, we can't prove this hypothesis from only Japanese and English. To discuss typologically this hypothesis as a whole is beyond the scope of this paper, so following researches are expected.

As shown in this section, there is parallelism between English resultatives and Japanese adversative passives on adversity supply. Now, a question why adversity is added (in other word, why can’t benefit be added?) arises. The next section will argue this question.

4. Conclusion

This paper discussed adversative passives focusing on four points below.

a. Definition of adversity
b. Description of adversative passives based on construction grammar
c. Explanation that adversative passive is a phenomenon based on metonymy
d. Parallelism between Japanese adversatives and English resultatives

Firstly, we clarified that adversity is supplied to sentences whose verbs themselves don't have adversity. This definition shows the problem of research on this construction.

Secondly, we described adversative passives based on construction grammar. Syntactic features can be described as shown in (41) - (43).
This classification shows that adversative passive construction has syntactic flexibility. Also, semantic features, proximity and affectedness, are discussed.

Thirdly, metonymical focus transition explains this flexibility of adversative passives based on Nishimura & Noya (2013). We clarified that focused frame in adversative passive is different from active sentence.

Forthly, we discussed parallelism with English resultatives. As shown in RH&L (2001), adversity can be observed in the example below.

(44) They drunk the pub dry.

Based on this observation, we find the same phenomenon, the supply of adversative connotation, in resultatives as adversative passives. Comparing this construction with adversative passives, we observe the similarity that a noun phrase without a participant role occurs in sentences. We called it fake-patient in this paper. From this observation, we built up a typological hypothesis (45).
Hypothesis on the supply of adversative connotation:
An operation to link a noun phrase (without participant roles) with event expressed by a verb leads to supply adversity on the sentence.

This paper clarifies syntactic and semantic characteristics of Japanese adversative passive construction. Framework of construction grammar is efficient to discuss this linguistic phenomenon. Also, more discussion is necessary for the hypothesis (45). Following researches will argue this hypothesis.
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