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Abstract

Hoshi 2013 claims that Japanese indirect passive sentence, which characteristically retains the embedded clause subject in the form of NP-ni, can also appear with a PP headed by ni yotte ‘by,’ in place of NP-ni. What allows this PP is said to be “spontaneous subject demotion” (Comrie 1977), which demotes NP-ni (subject) to NP-ni yotte (adjunct) without suppressing the accusative case assignment by the verb in the embedded clause.

However, the present paper demonstrates that NP-ni yotte is an independent adjunct structurally unrelated to NP-ni and that it therefore can co-occur with NP-ni in a single indirect passive sentence. The paper also points out theoretical difficulties in maintaining the analysis of NP-ni yotte by way of spontaneous subject demotion. It then shows that ni-indirect passive and ni yotte-indirect passive are actually one and the same, denying the existence of the latter as passive sentence distinct from the former.

1. Introduction

It is well known that Japanese indirect passive sentence may appear with a phrase headed by ni or ni yotte, both of which are said to form a phrase (roughly) equivalent to the by-phrase in English passive sentences:

\[(1) = \text{(Hoshi's (2013) (1a) and (2a))} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Zirō-ga} \quad \text{dorobō-ni} \quad \text{saihū-o} \quad \text{nusum-are-ta.} \\
   & \quad \text{-NOM thief-DAT wallet-ACC steal-PASS-PAST} \\
   & \quad '\text{Jiro was affected by a thief's stealing his wallet.'} \\
b. & \quad \text{Zirō-ga} \quad \text{dorobō-ni yotte saihū-o nusum-are-ta.} \\
   & \quad \text{by}
\end{align*}
\]

* I would like to thank all the members of my advanced seminar in the falls of 2015 and 2016. This paper is an extension of the ideas that I first introduced in those classes. Kaoru Katata, Minami Mizushima, and Narumi Suzuki deserve special mention, since they went on to write their graduation theses on this particular topic as well. Also, I would like to extend my thanks to Michiko Fukasawa for her useful comments.
However, it is also well known that *ni yotte* is not allowed if the verb is an intransitive verb:\(^1\)

\[(2) \left(= \text{Hoshi’s (26a)} \right)\]

\[
\text{Zirō-ga kodomo-ni/*ni yotte nak-are-ta.} \\
\text{-NOM child-DAT/by cry-PASS-PAST}
\]

‘Jiro was affected by a child’s crying.’

Hiroto Hoshi (1999) argues that the reason for this is because *ni yotte* can only be used in direct passives, in which both (i) absorption of the external \(\theta\)-role and (ii) the verb’s loss of the ability to assign the accusative case are observed, in accordance with Burzio’s generalization (Burzio 1986). Because of (i), subject gets demoted to a PP adjunct (subject demotion), and because of (ii), object moves to subject position to get case (object promotion). Since intransitive verbs do not take an accusative object in the first place, this mechanism of direct passive formation simply doesn’t come into play in cases like (2).

If so, however, how can the grammaticality of (1b) be explained? Notice that the accusative case on the direct object *saihu-o* is clearly visible, hence not absorbed in this sentence. In that sense, (1b) is similar to (2), for it doesn’t involve object promotion. Following Kuroda 1979, Hiroto Hoshi (1999) offers a clever explanation for sentences like this as well, but Hoshi (2013) dismisses it and claims instead that (1b) actually constitutes evidence for the existence of indirect passive sentences with *ni yotte*. More specifically, he writes as follows (2013:349).

> [T]he above “transitive-intransitive asymmetry” can be ascribed to the properties of the event interpretation denoted by passive verbs. On the assumption that the event interpretation is expressed by eventuality predicates that occur as light verbs (= \(v\)) (Hale and Keyser 1991, Huang 1997), I claim that two different types of indirect passives (*ni indirect passives and *ni yotte* indirect passives) exist in Japanese, demonstrating that the postpositional phrase NP-*ni yotte* is adjoined only to vP denoting a causing event.

In this paper, I will scrutinize the arguments made for this claim and show that they all fail to establish the existence of *ni yotte* indirect passive that is different from *ni* indirect passive. I will then proceed to show that these two types of indirect passive sentence are actually one and the same by demonstrating that NP-*ni yotte* is a base-generated adjunct, not a demoted subject.

### 2. Claims

In what follows, the gist of the major claims of Hoshi 2013 is presented. Section 2.1 explains the internal structure of *ni* indirect passive, and section 2.2 that of *ni yotte* indirect passive. Section
2.3 then describes how the notion of “spontaneous demotion” (Comrie 1977) is used to explain the derivation of ni yotte indirect passive.

2.1 Ni indirect passive

(3) below (= Hoshi’s (18)) is an example of ni indirect passive, whose structural analysis is given in (4) (= Hoshi’s (20)).

(3) Zirō-ga Hanako-ni musuko-o homer-are-ta.
   -NOM    -DAT son-ACC praise-PASS-PAST
   ‘Jiro was affected by Hanako’s praising his son.’

(4)

Following Washio 1993, Hoshi assumes that there are two events involved in this complex sentence, namely, (i) Hanako’s praising of Jiro’s son, and (ii) Jiro’s getting affected by event (i). He further assumes that an eventuality predicate occurs as v (Huang 1997), so “HAVE appears as the matrix v (= v_{HAVE}) in indirect passives and the amalgam of the matrix V (i.e., -(r)are) and v_{HAVE} assigns an affected (or experience [sic]) 0-role to the subject in [Spec,v_{1}P] denoting an affecting (or experiencing) event” (2013:353). This is how Hoshi captures the fact that the matrix subject of an indirect passive sentence always receives the interpretation of getting affected by the event expressed by the embedded clause.

In contrast, the verb in the embedded clause can be of various event types, as the embedded v (= v_{2} in (4)) may be realized as v_{CAUSE} (= cause), v_{DO} (= action), v_{BE} (= state), and v_{BECOME} (= change of state), as shown in (5a-d) (= Hoshi’s (19a-d)), respectively.
Aside from the lack of objective criteria in determining the predicate type of any given verb (to which we turn in section 3.2), what is strikingly peculiar about the analysis in (4) is the movement of NP, which receives the external θ-role of the embedded verb in Spec,\(v_2\)P. Regarding this movement to the specifier position of the abstract nonfinite T, Hoshi specifically writes that “the dative NP escapes out of the embedded \([v_2]P\) and raises to the embedded Spec,TP for Case assignment. Therefore, the dative NP can syntactically behave as a subject” (2013:354). As for the dative case assignor, Hoshi, citing his own previous work in 2007, further stipulates that “the dative Case marker \(ni\) is licensed by \(v_{\text{HAVE}}\) in the matrix clause” (ibid.). In other words, he is arguing for an instance of ECM (exceptional case marking) here, assuming that the dative case is a structural case.

2.2 \(Ni\ yotte\) passive

Hoshi’s analysis of \(ni\ yotte\) passive crucially relies on the etymological history of \(yotte\), which is derived from the verb \(yoru\ ‘cause’\) (Kinsui 1997), and together with \(ni\), it is said to form a complex postposition. The “causal” meaning of \(yoru\ is obvious in (6) below (= Hoshi’s (24)), “where dative NP \(\text{insyu unten \(\text{drunken driving}\) \’indicates a causer, and the nominative NP \(\text{kōtūziko \’traffic accident}\), an effect brought about by the causer” (Hoshi 2013:355).

(6) Keisatsu-wa [sono kōtūziko-ga kare-no insyu unten-ni yoru to] police-TOP that traffic.accident-NOM he-GEN drunken driving-DAT cause COMP syutyōsi-ta. claim-PAST

‘The police claimed that his drunken driving caused the traffic accident.’
This observation then leads Hoshi to propose that “the structure of ni yotte indirect passives is represented as in [(7)], where [NP₂-ni yotte] is adjoined to \( v₂P_{\text{CAUSE}} \)” (2013:356).

(7)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{\_} \\
\text{-} \\
\text{v₁P} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{-} \\
\text{v₁ P} \\
\text{v₁ HAV} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{-} \\
\text{v₂P} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{(r)are} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{v₂P} \\
\text{NP₂-ni yotte} \\
\text{NP-o} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

What this structural analysis implies is that PPs headed by ni yotte are adjuncts that are semantically compatible only with verbs that are intrinsically associated with \( v_{\text{CAUSE}} \). As empirical evidence, Hoshi presents the following example sentences:

(8) (= Hoshi’s (26))

a. Zirō-ga kodomo-ni/*ni yotte nak-are-ta.
   \[\text{-NOM child-DAT/by cry-PASS-PAST}\]
   ‘Jiro was affected by a child’s crying.’

b. Boku-wa ame-ni/*ni yotte hur-are-ta.
   \[\text{I-TOP rain-DAT/by fall-PASS-PAST}\]
   ‘I was affected by raining.’

c. Zirō-ga hahaoya-ni/*ni yotte sin-are-ta.
   \[\text{-NOM mother-DAT/by die-PASS-PAST}\]
   ‘Jiro was affected by his mother’s dying.’

(9) (= Hoshi’s (27))

a. Zirō-ga siranai hito-ni/*ni yotte tegami-o yom-are-ta.
   \[\text{-NOM not.know person-DAT/by letter-ACC read-PASS-PAST}\]
   ‘Jiro was affected by a stranger’s reading his letter.’

b. Zirō-ga Hanako-ni/*ni yotte toire-no naka-ni ir-are-ta.
   \[\text{-NOM -DAT/by restroom-GEN inside-in be-PASS-PAST}\]
'Jiro was affected by Hanako’s being in the restroom.'

The intransitive verbs in (8a-c), namely nak 'cry,' hur 'fall,' and sin 'die,' are not verbs of the CAUSE type; the first two are of the DO type, and the last of the BECOME type. Therefore, the ni yotte phrases in these sentences lack their licenser, $v_{\text{CAUSE}}$, so the sentences all become ungrammatical if ni yotte is chosen over ni. Likewise, the transitive verbs yom 'read' in (9a) and ir 'be' in (9b) are of the DO type and of the BECOME type, respectively; therefore, ni yotte cannot be used in these sentences, either.

Then, we predict that the ni passive in (5a), which contains a verb of the CAUSE type koros 'kill,' should be convertible into a legitimate ni yotte passive; indeed, this prediction is borne out, as is clear from the grammaticality of (10) (= Hoshi’s (7)). (This suggests that the verb nusum 'steal' too must be of the CAUSE type, since it accepts ni yotte as well, as shown in (1b).)

(10) Zirō-ga nanimonoka-ni yotte hahaoya-o koros-are-ta.
   -NOM someone-by mother-ACC kill-PASS-PAST

'Jiro was affected by someone’s killing his mother.'

But there is a problem now. Notice that koros clearly assigns accusative case to its object hahaoya-o ‘mother-ACC’ in this sentence and therefore we expect the verb to assign its external $\theta$-role to its subject as well, in accordance with Burzio’s generalization. However, there is no subject to assign this $\theta$-role to; notice that nanimonoka-ni yotte ‘by someone’ is only an adjunct PP adjoined to $v_2$P, as is illustrated in (7), which lacks Spec,$v_2$P, a $\theta$-position. Hoshi notices this and explains it by introducing the notion of "spontaneous demotion" (Comrie 1977), which we go over in the next section.

### 2.3 Spontaneous demotion

The process of passivization (e.g. Jaeggli 1986) is generally explained as follows. Attaching the passive morpheme to a transitive verb results in absorption of the external $\theta$-role of the verb, which simultaneously loses the ability to assign the accusative case. As a result, the direct object of the verb moves to Spec,TP in order to receive the nominative case from the finite T head (object promotion). As for the absorbed external (i.e. subject) $\theta$-role, it may be reassigned to a $by$-phrase, which now has the status of an adjunct (subject demotion). Thus, object promotion and subject demotion go hand in hand.

However, there are languages in which passivization is said to involve subject demotion without object promotion. Welsh, a VSO language, is reported to be one such language (Comrie 1977). Look at (11) (= Hoshi’s (28)).
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(11) a. Lladdodd draig ddyn. b. Lladdwyd dyn (gan ddraig).
   ‘A dragon killed a man.’
   ‘A man was killed (by a dragon).’

(11b), an instance of impersonal passive sentence, is said to have undergone subject demotion, as
shown in (12) below. But notice that the object stays in the same position as in (11a); this means
that the subject position is empty. This analysis is supported by the fact that there is no agreement
between the passivized verb *lladdwyd* and the object *dyn*. If *dyn* were in the empty subject
position, it would trigger agreement on the verb, which is not the case in (11b).

Moreover, the cliticization of *i ‘him’* to the sentence initial particle *fe* in the active sentence
in (13a) (= Hoshi’s (29b)) is assumed to be possible only from object position. Hence, (13a) is
regarded as having derived as in (13b).

And this cliticization is observed in the impersonal passive sentence in (14a) (= Hoshi’s (29a)) as
well, so this sentence must have derived as in (14b), where there is a gap in the subject position, as
a consequence of subject demotion.

Thus, UG seems to allow subject demotion that doesn’t accompany object promotion, which is
known as “spontaneous subject demotion” (Comrie 1977), and Hoshi’s contention is that this UG
option must be available to passivization in Japanese as well. That is, (10) above, whose embedded
subject is now a demoted PP adjunct, is an instance of spontaneous demotion, which takes place
without suppressing the accusative case assignment to the object.

But what triggers this special demotion operation? Regarding this matter, Hoshi first points
out that “-(r)are” can play no role in subject demotion because the syntactic relation between
-\(r\)are and \(v\) (or \(V\)) is not local: the nonfinite \(T\) intervenes between them” (2013:359). Therefore, stipulating that \(V\)-to-\(v\) movement in Japanese is optional in overt syntax, Hoshi proposes that the option of not overtly applying this movement, as illustrated in (15b) in contrast to (15a), triggers subject demotion.

![Diagram](image)

According to Hoshi, “[s]ince an eventuality predicate in \(v\) is an abstract entity, the substantial element, namely, \(V\) must be associated with it for \(\theta\)-role assignment” (2013:359). Therefore, the \(V\)-to-\(v\) movement in (15a) qualifies \(v\) as a \(\theta\)-role assignor, and as such, \(v\) now assigns the external \(\theta\)-role to the subject NP suffixed by \(ni\). However, if the \(V\)-to-\(v\) movement doesn’t take place before LF, \(v\) fails to be a \(\theta\)-assignor, triggering spontaneous subject demotion. That is, without a \(\theta\)-role, the subject in Spec,\(vP\) gets demoted to a PP-adjunct in a \(vP\)-adjoined position.

However, if this optional \(V\)-to-\(v\) movement is the reason for spontaneous subject demotion, it will overgenerate ungrammatical sentences, such as (16b) below.

(16) (= Hoshi’s (30))

a. Keikenhōhuna gekai-ga mōtyō-o zyokyosi-ta.
   experienced surgeon-NOM appendix-ACC remove-PAST
   ‘An experienced surgeon removed the appendix.’

b. *Keikenhōhuna gekai-ni yotte mōtyō-o zyokyosi-ta.
   by

\(Zyokyos\) ‘remove’ is an ordinary transitive verb that comes with two \(\theta\)-roles to assign. In an active sentence in (16a), the two \(\theta\)-roles are each assigned to the subject and the object, on condition that the \(V\)-to-\(v\) movement in question does take place in overt syntax. However, if it doesn’t, spontaneous subject demotion will be triggered, giving rise to (16b), an ill-formed sentence.

In order to avoid this problem, Hoshi further proposes that the EPP is relevant only in finite clauses in Japanese. In this way, (16b), which is an independent finite sentence, is correctly eliminated as a violation of the EPP, for it lacks a subject in its Spec,\(TP\). On the other hand, (10) is fine, because its embedded clause, which also lacks a subject, is nonfinite and therefore the requirement of satisfying the EPP doesn’t even arise for this sentence.
And this is the gist of the main claims of Hoshi 2013.

3. Problems

Let us now turn to problems. Section 3.1 concerns itself with the position of NP-ni in ni indirect passive, which is assumed to be Spec,TP. However, it will be shown that there is no evidence for the existence of this abstract TP in the embedded clause of an indirect passive sentence with NP-ni. Section 3.2 reveals problems with analyzing NP-ni yotte as a demoted subject that comes to have the status of an adjunct. It will also reveal that the semantic type of the eventuality predicate v doesn’t have anything to do with the use of NP-ni yotte in indirect passive sentences.

3.1 The position of ni-phrase

In ni indirect passive, the embedded subject is assumed to move from Spec,vP to Spec,TP, where it is stipulated to receive the dative case from the matrix v. “Therefore, the dative NP can syntactically behave as a subject. This is empirically true” (2013:354), writes Hoshi, who proceeds to give (17) – (19) (= his (21) – (23)) as evidence.

(17) a. Zirō₁-ga Hanako₂-ni zibun₁/₂-no heya-de hahaoya-o satugais-are-ta.
    -NOM -DAT self-GEN room-in mother-ACC murder-PASS-PAST
    ‘Jiro was affected by Hanako’s murdering his mother in his/her room.’
    b. Zirō₁-ga Hanako₂-ni yotte zibun₁/₂-no heya-de hahaoya-o satugais-are-ta.
       by

(18) a. Zirō₁-ga Hanako₂-ni [NP-pro₁/₂ kaminoke]-o kir-are-ta.
    -NOM -DAT hair-ACC cut-PASS-PAST
    ‘Jiro was affected by Hanako’s cutting his/her hair.’
    b. Zirō₁-ga Hanako₂-ni yotte [NP-pro₁/₂ kaminoke]-o kir-are-ta.
       by

(19) a. Zirō-ga san-nin-no sensei-ni/ni yotte ronbun-o kyakkas-are-ta.
    -NOM three-CL-GEN teacher-DAT/by paper-ACC reject-PASS-PAST
    ‘Jiro was affected by three teachers’ rejecting his paper.’
    b. Zirō-ga sensei-ni*/ni yotte san-nin ronbun-o kyakkas-are-ta.

(17a) shows that Hanako-ni must be in an A-position, since it binds zibun ’self,’ a subject-oriented anaphor. This contrasts with Hanako-ni yotte in (17b), which is a PP adjunct, and as such, it fails to c-command – hence, cannot bind – the anaphor. Regarding (18a-b), Hoshi writes that “pro must
be c-commanded by its appropriate antecedent” (2013:355). Since (18a) allows the pro = Hanako reading, it must be the case that Hanako-ni in this sentence c-commands pro, which must be in the possessive form. On the other hand, (18b) doesn’t allow this reading, so we can’t assume the same structural relation holding between Hanako-ni yotte and pro in this sentence. As for (19b), which, unlike (19a), contains san-nin ‘3-cl.’ as a floating numeral quantifier (NQ), only sensei-ni, but not the PP sensei-ni yotte, can be understood as the antecedent of san-nin. According to Hoshi, “[t]his is because the antecedent NP within PP cannot c-command the NQ (Miyagawa 1989)” (ibid.).

However, these facts do not seem to constitute evidence for the claimed A-movement of NP-ni from Spec,vP to Spec,TP. First of all, given the fact that Spec,vP may reasonably be regarded as a subject position (which is arguably the reason why Kitagawa and Kuroda (1992) as well as Washio (1989-1990) analyze -(r)are in indirect passives as taking vP, as opposed to TP, as its complement; see Hoshi’s footnote 3), so the binding facts observed in (17a-b) only show the NP status of Hanako-ni and the PP status of Hanako-ni yotte. Notice that Hanako-ni can indeed c-command the anaphor zibun from Spec,vP, an A-position, as shown in (20).

\[(20)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
NP \\
\text{Hanako-ni} \\
\text{zibun-no heya-de} \\
\text{hahaoya-o}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
vP \\
\text{v' P} \\
\text{v'} \\
v
\end{array}\]

As for Hanako-ni yotte, we already know from sections 2.2 and 2.3 that it is assumed to appear in an adjoined position as a PP adjunct, but even if it appeared in the same position as Hanako-ni in (20), the said binding wouldn’t be possible, since the NP within the PP couldn’t c-command zibun.

As for (18), what Hoshi seems to be saying is that the pro within the NP object is a bound variable pronoun; otherwise, c-command by its antecedent wouldn’t be a licensing condition for it. Assuming so, we again notice that (18a-b) only show the categorial difference between the NP Hanako-ni and the PP Hanako-ni yotte. That is, whereas the former c-commands the pro, the NP within the latter doesn’t. Obviously, this doesn’t provide evidence for the claimed A-movement of Hanako-ni to Spec,TP.

Let’s now turn to (19b). The following derivation must have been intended for the embedded clause of this sentence with sensei-ni:

\[(21)\] ... [\(\text{TP sensei-ni} [\text{vP} \text{san-nin } \_\text{ ronbun-o kyakkas}]\)] ...
This is what we surmise, since (19b) is compared with (19a), in which the relevant NP has the form of $[\text{NP san-nin-no sensei]}-ni$. However, the sequence of sensei-ni san-nin has long been regarded as a single constituent (e.g. Kamio 1983) (but see endnote 4). Then, (21) can equally be analyzed as in (22), which does not contain a floating NQ, much less a TP projection.

(22) $[\text{NP sensei-ni san-nin} \text{ ronbun-o kyakkas}]$ ...

Therefore, (17) – (19) do not seem to present themselves as solid empirical evidence for the claimed A-movement of the embedded subject suffixed by *ni in indirect passive sentences.

Furthermore, this A-movement is dubious from a theoretical perspective as well. But first, let me note one legitimate point Hoshi makes in explaining the implausibility of positing an expletive pro in the active sentence in (16b), in which spontaneous subject demotion is assumed to have taken place. (16b) is repeated as (23).

(23) *Keikenhōhuna gekai-ni yotte mōtyō-o zyokyosi-ta.

experienced surgeon-by appendix-ACC remove-PAST

'(Intended) An experienced surgeon removed the appendix.'

If the optional V-to-\(v\) movement does not take place here, the subject *keikenhōhuna gekai* ‘experienced surgeon’ fails to be assigned a $\theta$-role, so it becomes an adjunct PP (i.e. spontaneous subject demotion). Then, nothing fills Spec,TP, violating the EPP. Notice that the EPP is very much relevant in (23), because this sentence contains a finite T, as was explained in section 2.3. And this is how the ungrammaticality of (23) is explained in Hoshi 2013.

However, what if expletive pro occupies the Spec,TP of (23)? Then, the EPP will immediately be satisfied, giving rise to the following reasonable structure:

(24) 

---
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But Hoshi (2013:360) denies this possibility by stating that “expletive pro has neither PF nor LF property, so that its existence can never be justified externally (Roberts 2005),” and I agree. Therefore, (23) can still be regarded as a case of EPP violation. With this much in mind, let’s now reexamine the claimed existence of embedded T in indirect passive sentences.

Unlike the finite T in (24), this abstract T never manifests itself morphologically, still less phonologically. Nor does it semantically contribute to any given indirect passive sentence, in which it is stipulated to occur. Moreover, being a nonfinite element, this T is assumed to be exempt from the requirement of the EPP, thus not hosting the EPP-feature, either. Therefore, there seems to be absolutely no raison d’être for this abstract category.

And yet, Hoshi claims that the embedded subject NP in ni indirect passive moves to the specifier position of this T for dative case assignment by the matrix v_{HAVE}; see section 2.1. But this is problematic. Look at (25), which shows the relevant part of the claimed derivation of an indirect passive sentence with NP-ni.

Notice that the matrix V -(r)are is closer to NP-ni than the matrix v_{HAVE} is — even after the alleged subject raising. In that sense, the syntactic relation between v_{HAVE} and NP-ni is not local; the matrix V still intervenes between them, even if we assume that the maximal projection of the abstract nonfinite T is somehow “transparent” for the purpose of case assignment. Moreover, in the absence of the EPP-feature on this nonfinite T, there seems to be no movement-inducing feature or mechanism that guides NP-ni to Spec,TP in the first place.

In this connection, it will be instructive to see how accusative case assignment is carried out, since there is no good reason to think that it is qualitatively any different from dative case assignment; in fact, both accusative and dative are considered structural cases (see section 2.1). Regarding accusative case assignment, Hoshi writes in his footnote 8 that “[it] is not affected by V-to-v movement on the assumption that unlike θ-role assignment, Case is licensed by feature valuation through Agree (Chomsky 2001).” That is to say, case assignment structurally requires
only c-command by a case licensor (i.e. case assignor), provided that there are no potential
Case assignor, provided that there are no potential
case assignors that are closer to the case assignee. In (25), in which there aren’t any potential
case assignors competing with the embedded V (= accusative case assignor), the embedded V
does c-command the object NP even after V-to-v movement has taken place. Therefore, it can
successfully assign accusative case to it (i.e. valuing accusative the unvalued case feature on the
NP) without having the NP move at all.

Returning to the main issue of dative case assignment, notice that \( v \text{\textsc{have}} \) c-commands NP-
\( ni \) in Spec,\( v \text{\textsc{p}} \) in (25). The matrix V -(r)are and the abstract nonfinite T are irrelevant here, since
they are not case assignors. Therefore, \( v \text{\textsc{have}} \) should be able to license the dative case on NP-\( ni \) in
Spec,\( v \text{\textsc{p}} \). Hence, movement on the part of the NP is not necessary.\(^7\)

Thus, it seems clear that there is no evidence for the claimed existence of abstract nonfinite
T in indirect passive sentences in Japanese, precluding the possibility of subject raising on the part
of NP-\( ni \).

\[ \text{3.2 Adjunct status of NP-\( ni \) yotte and arbitrary classification of eventuality predicates} \]

It is standard to assume that the by-phrase in a direct passive sentence in English is an adjunct,
whose appearance is entirely optional (e.g. Jaeggli 1986). This assumption is reasonable, since
a passive sentence like (26) is indeed grammatical without a by-phrase, to which the absorbed
external \( \theta \)-role may be reassigned when the by-phrase does appear in the sentence. But this
reassignment of the absorbed \( \theta \)-role doesn’t make the optional by-phrase an argument again.

(26) English is spoken (by them) in America.

In this respect, look at (27), an indirect passive sentence obtained by removing dorobō-\( ni 
\) yotte ‘by a thief’ from (1b). The grammaticality of this sentence indicates the adjunct status of the
\( ni \) yotte phrase as well.

(27) Zirō-ga sai-hu-o nusum-are-ta.
\( \text{\textsc{nori}} \text{-NOM wallet-ACC steal-PASS-PAST} \)
‘Jiro had his wallet stolen.’

But we have to assume that (27) would be ungrammatical if it were derived from (1a) by removing
dorobō-\( ni \) ‘a thief-DAT,’ since this \( ni \)-phrase is a \( \theta \)-role-bearing subject in Hoshi’s analysis; in other
words, it is an obligatory element that needs to be expressed without fail in terms of the Projection
Principle.

To see this more clearly, let’s review the analysis of external \( \theta \)-role assignment in (15). If
V-to-v movement takes place in overt syntax, the external \( \theta \)-role of the verb is assigned to NP-\( ni \) in
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Spec, vP, as illustrated in (15a); if it doesn’t, no external θ-role is assigned, so NP-ni gets demoted to a PP adjunct, as shown in (15b). However, Hoshi assumes “that V-to-v movement can take place in LF on the assumption that θ-role must be somehow discharged to NP-ni yotte adjoined to vP_{CAUSE} in LF” (his footnote 9). Granted that this assumption is correct, this late θ-assignment still doesn’t repromote the NP to an argument; otherwise, the grammaticality of (27) wouldn’t be explained. In that sense, the LF θ-assignment must be on a par with the reassignment of external θ-role to the optional by-/phrase in English passive sentences.

Now observe the ungrammaticality of the following sentences, which are all derived by removing the ni yotte phrase from the three sentences in (8a-c):

   -NOM cry-PASS-PAST
   `Jiro was affected by crying.'

b. *Boku-wa hur-are-ta.
   I-TOP fall-PASS-PAST
   `I was affected by falling.'

c. *Zirō-ga sin-are-ta.
   -NOM die-PASS-PAST
   `Jiro was affected by dying.'

Unlike (27), these sentences all give the impression that the subject of the nonfinite embedded clause is missing, although the EPP is not supposed to be relevant here. This is mysterious, since there should be a valid option of not applying V-to-v movement within the vP of the embedded clause, which should trigger spontaneous subject demotion without a problem. The demoted subject in the form of NP-ni yotte may be incompatible with the eventuality type of the embedded verb (see the explanation about (8a-c) above), but being an adjunct, it doesn’t have to be added to the sentence at all. The ungrammaticality of (28a-c) thus poses a difficulty on empirical grounds to the proposed analysis of ni yotte indirect passive with the strategy of spontaneous demotion.

Moreover, the classification of eventuality predicates seems arbitrary and capricious as well. For example, (9a) with ni yotte is deemed ungrammatical precisely because yom ‘read’ “denotes an action” (Hoshi 2013:356) when ni yotte is compatible only with the eventuality predicate v_{CAUSE} (9a) is repeated as (29) below.

(29) Zirō-ga siranai hito-ni/*ni yotte tegami-o yom-are-ta.
   -NOM not.know person-DAT/by letter-ACC read-PASS-PAST
   `Jiro was affected by a stranger’s reading his letter.'
The question is, why, then, isn’t *koros ‘kill’* in (5a) be regarded as denoting an action as well? For that matter, isn’t *nusum ‘steal’* in (1) also an action verb that is selected by the light verb $v_{DO}$? As we saw in (10) and (1b) above, however, these verbs can appear with *ni yotte*. Now, is that the reason why they are considered of the CAUSE type? If yes, we would fall into a circular argument. Why are these verbs considered of the CAUSE type, not of the DO type? — Because they can appear with *ni yotte*. Why can they appear with *ni yotte*? — Because they are CAUSE-type verbs. Incidentally, all my informants disagreed with the judgment given to (29) with *ni yotte*; they unanimously accepted that sentence as a totally grammatical sentence. Does that mean that *yom* should then be a CAUSE-type verb, too?

In reality, there doesn’t seem to be anything intrinsically causal about the verbs we saw above that can appear with *ni yotte*. Actually, the usability of *ni yotte* in an indirect passive sentence doesn’t seem to be related to the semantic type of any given verb. In fact, even the verbs in (8a-c) and that in (9b) (none of which are considered to be of the CAUSE type) can indeed appear with a PP headed by *ni yotte*, as shown in (30).

   child-NOM empty.stomach-by cry-PAST
   'The child cried from hunger.'

   b. nanganteikiatu-ni yotte hut-ta yuki
   south.coast.low.pressure-by fall-PAST snow
   'the snow that fell owing to a low atmospheric pressure off the south coast'

   c. Hirosima-no genbakutôka-ni yotte sinda titioya
   Hiroshima-GEN atomic.bomb.dropping-by died father
   'Father, who died from the dropping of an atomic bomb on Hiroshima'

   d. Gakusei-ga sizi-ni yotte (sanzi-made) kyôsitu-ni ita.
   student-NOM instruction-by 3.o’clock-until classroom-in be-PAST
   'Students were in the classroom (until 3 o’clock) on instructions.'

Notice that the *ni yotte* PPs here all express a cause/reason, just as the verb phrase *kare-no insyu unten-ni yoru ‘be caused by his drunk driving’* in (6) does. Hence, the ungrammaticality of (8a-c) and (9b) with *ni yotte* cannot be due to semantic incompatibility between *ni yotte* and the eventuality predicate $v$ associated with each of the verbs in those sentences.

4. An alternative analysis

I would like to offer an alternative analysis now. Compare the following sentences with (1a-b), which are said to share the same meaning.
Unlike (1b), (31b) sounds degraded. This is surprising if "dorobō-ni yotte" in (1b), which is assumed to receive in LF the same θ-role as the one that "dorobō-ni" in (31a) does, is really functioning as a semantic subject of the embedded verb. In this regard, the fully acceptable sentences in (32a-b) below seem to reveal the true structure of (31b) as well as that of (1b).

(32) a. Watasi-wa wazato inemurisuru koto-ni yotte saihu-o nusum-are-ta.

deliberately doze.off thing-by

‘By dozing off, I deliberately had my wallet stolen.’

b. Watasi-wa inemurisuru koto-ni yotte wazato saihu-o nusum-are-ta.

In these sentences, the PP "inemurisuru koto-ni yotte" modifies the matrix verb -(r)are. As for the subject-oriented adverb "wazato ‘deliberately,’" it can modify either the verb "inemurisuru ‘doze off’ within the ni yotte phrase or the matrix verb -(r)are in (32a), but we are only after the latter modification relation here, which is unambiguously obtained in (32b). Notice that the two adverbial elements "wazato and inemurisuru koto-ni yotte" are semantically/pragmatically compatible with each other. But this is not the case with the combination of "wazato and dorobō-ni yotte" in (31b), for thieves typically aren’t predictable or controllable at one’s will. And this seems to be the reason for the oddity of (31b), which will not improve even if the order of "wazato and dorobō-ni yotte" is reversed:

(33) "Watasi-wa dorobō-ni yotte wazato saihu-o nusum-are-ta.

‘(Lit.) By way of a thief, I deliberately had my wallet stolen.’

Therefore, I am led to propose for the relevant part of the structure of ni yotte passive the structural analysis in (34), which is represented in an old framework without the light verb v. In accordance with the discussion in section 3.1, it doesn’t include the abstract embedded T, either.
(34) contrasts with (7) in that it has the PP adjunct headed by ni yotte as an element of the matrix VP. This immediately explains why the semantic/pragmatic compatibility matters between it and the subject-oriented adverb wazato, which is also an element of the matrix clause.\(^{10}\)

Moreover, (34) has NP-ni along with NP-ni yotte, another difference from (7). Indeed, I am suggesting that even in (32a-b), there is NP-ni and that this NP is realized as a pro, which in fact is replaceable by a lexical phrase, such as dorobō-ni, as in (35).

(35) Watasi-wa inemurisuru koto-ni yotte wazato pro/dorobō-ni saihu-o nusum-are-ta.

'thief-DAT

By dozing off, I deliberately had my wallet stolen by a thief.'

This means that even (1b) must contain a pro independently of dorobō-ni yotte, as in (36a).

(36) a. Zirō-ga dorobō-ni yotte pro1 saihu-o nusum-are-ta.


As (36b) shows, however, if this pro is actually replaced by dorobō-ni, it immediately results in semantic awkwardness (i.e. redundancy), although (36b) does represent the logical meaning of (36a). But this kind of redundancy is naturally expected in a pro-drop language like Japanese. In fact, it is also felt in a structurally well-formed sentence such as (37b), in which the choice of the overt pronominal kare-ga over a pro in the embedded clause feels excessively redundant; nevertheless, it is a fact that (37b) faithfully represents the meaning of (37a).

(37) a. Johni-wa kyō pro1 benkyōsi-yoo to omot-ta.

'Tohn thought that pro1 would study today.'

b. *Johni-wa kyō kare-ga benkyōsi-yoo to omot-ta.

he
There is more direct empirical evidence for the analysis in (34). First, look at (38), which would be analyzed as a sentence with spontaneous subject demotion by Hoshi; that is, when V-to-v movement optionally fails to take place within the embedded vP in overt syntax, Hanako gets demoted to an adjunct PP Hanako-ni yotte and is adjoined to vP, receiving the external θ-role of yabur ‘break’ in LF.

(38) Tarō-ga Hanako-ni yotte kiroku-o yabur-are-ta.
\[\text{by record-ACC break-PASS-PAST}\]
\[\text{‘Taro had his record broken by Hanako.’}\]

Now, observe (39), which contains NP-ni in addition to the PP Hanako-ni yotte.

(39) Tarō-ga Hanako-ni yotte onna-ni(-mo) kiroku-o yabur-are-ta.
\[\text{woman-DAT-even}\]
\[\text{‘(Lit.) By Hanako, Taro had his record broken even by a woman. [By being broken by Hanako, Taro’s record has been broken even by a woman.]’}\]

This sentence, which directly supports the analysis in (34), isn’t derivable by the spontaneous demotion analysis, which cannot have Hanako-ni yotte and onna-ni simultaneously.

Let us now discuss case assignment. To do that, we first need to review some facts about the so-called NPI (negative polarity item) sika, which will be relevant very shortly. (40a-b) are from Tsujimura 1993. ((40a-b) are Tsujimura’s (3) and (4), respectively).

(40) a. Tarō-ga sakana-sika tabe-nai.
\[\text{fish-SIKA eat-NEG}\]
\[\text{‘Taro eats only fish.’}\]

\[\text{fish-SIKA eat-NONPAST COMP say-NEG-PAST}\]
\[\text{‘(Intended) Hanako said that Taro eats only fish.’}\]

Sika must be licensed by a negative morpheme such as nai, and both sika and nai must be in the same clause in order for that licensing to take effect. In (40a), these two conditions are met, so the sentence is grammatical. But sika and the negative morpheme are not clausemates in (40b), and the resulting sentence is ungrammatical.

Now consider (41), which is obtained from (1a) by adding sika to its object saihu-o.
(41) Zirō-ga dorobō-ni saihu-sika nusum-are-nak-atta.

\[\text{SIKA \quad \text{NEG}}\]

‘Jiro had only his wallet stolen by a thief.’

The grammaticality of this sentence reveals the sentence’s mono-clausal status. This must be due to restructuring of nusum and -(r)are; see Tsujimura 1993 for the same reasoning for her analysis of restructuring involving purpose/gerundive clauses.

Now to the main point. Since “pure Merge in $\theta$-position is required of (and restricted to) arguments” (Chomsky 2000:103), the derivation of (1a) must start with the following structure:

In this base configuration, nusum, which is a two-place predicate, assigns its internal $\theta$-role (THEME) to saihu and external $\theta$-role (AGENT) to dorobō. Likewise, -(r)are, which too is a two-place predicate, assigns its internal $\theta$-role (PROPOSITION) to the lower VP and external $\theta$-role (EXPERIENCER) to Zirō. Case assignment hasn’t taken place yet in (42).

Subsequently, nusum and -(r)are are combined, giving rise to a restructured single VP, as shown in (43). This tree diagram indicates that the newly created verb nusum-are syntactically takes dorobō(-ni) and saihu(-o) as its complements, and Zirō(-ga) as its subject. Case assignment is now ready to be carried out.

As a regular transitive verb, nusum has the ability to assign the accusative case. Under the assumption that -(r)are is a dative case assignor (which is similar to Hoshi’s idea that the $v$ associated with -(r)are licenses the dative case on NP-ni), the restructured verb nusum-are comes
to have the ability to assign the dative case as well. Thus, it proceeds to assign the dative and accusative case to its two complements, in much the same way as ditransive verbs, such as *ager* ‘give,’ *okur* ‘send,’ *syōkais* ‘introduce,’ etc., do. As for the subject *Zirō(-ga)*, it receives the nominative case in the usual way as it moves up to satisfy the EPP. And it is at this stage of the derivation where NP-*ni yotte*, an adjunct PP, is added to the sentence, giving rise to a structural representation along the lines of (44).

(44)

```
  VP
   \   / \\
  V' /   \ V'
 /     \    
\PP/               \NP-ni(yotte) \NP-ni V''
   \   / \\
    \NP-o
```

This analysis can easily accommodate indirect passive involving an intransitive verb as well. Take, for example, (8c) with NP-*ni*, repeated as (45).

(45) *Zirō-ga*  hahaoya-ni  sin-are-ta.
\-NOM \mother-\DAT \die-PASS-PAST

‘Jiro was affected by his mother’s dying.’

Being an intransitive verb, *sin* ‘die’ doesn’t have the ability to assign the accusative case. Therefore, the restructured verb *sin-are* comes to have the ability to assign only the dative case.

And this is the syntax of Japanese indirect passive that I infer from all the evidence presented above.

5. Conclusion

As is clear from the analysis in (44), Japanese indirect passive does not involve object promotion or subject demotion. This analysis also indicates that the distinction between *ni* passive and *ni yotte* passive is merely an illusion, since they are, after all, one and the same. We get the impression that a sentence like (1a) is a *ni* indirect passive only because no adjunct PP headed by *ni yotte* is used in the sentence. Likewise, (1b) appears to be a *ni yotte* indirect passive, but it in fact contains a 0-role-bearing NP-*ni*, which just happens to be realized as a pro. In this regard, the existence of a sentence like (39) is crucial, since it constitutes empirical evidence for this analysis, by having non-pro NP-*ni* and NP-*ni yotte* concurrently.

As for the nature of the passive verb -(r)are, it is a restructuring verb that doesn’t affect
the case and θ-role assigning properties of the head of the VP it takes as its complement. Hence, Japanese indirect passive indirectly observes Burzio’s generalization, rendering unnecessary the adoption of spontaneous subject demotion, which is reported to occur in languages like Welsh.

Since the proposed analysis in section 4 doesn’t involve absorption of any θ-role, I need to make two rather minor, nonetheless important, points before closing this paper. First, the grammaticality of (27), repeated below as (46b), cannot be due to subject demotion. Actually, it is due to the existence of a pro, which appears in place of NP-ni, as shown in (46b). And this pro receives the external θ-role from nusum.

   -NOM wallet-ACC steal-PASS-PAST
   'Jiro had his wallet stolen.'

b. Zirō-ga pro saihu-o nusum-are-ta.

Second, in section 2.3, the sentences involving intransitive verbs in (28a-c) were all presented as ungrammatical sentences, but that judgment was due only to the assumption that NP-ni, as well as its demoted (hence adjunct) variant NP-ni yotte, was entirely missing in those sentences. As (47a-c) indicate, however, they are structurally fine with a pro, which does receive a θ-role from the embedded verb in each of the sentences.

(47) a. Zirō-ga pro nak-are-ta.
   -NOM cry-PASS-PAST
   'Jiro was affected by pro’s crying.'

b. Boku-wa pro hur-are-ta.
   I-TOP fall-PASS-PAST
   'I was affected by pro’s falling.'

c. Zirō-ga pro sin-are-ta.
   -NOM die-PASS-PAST
   'Jiro was affected by pro’s dying.'

The full grammatical status of (47a-c) parallels that given to the active sentences in (48a-c), which too would be deemed ungrammatical without a pro.

(48) a. pro nai-ta. b. pro hut-ta c. pro sin-da.
   cry-PAST fall-PAST die-PAST
   ‘pro cried.’ ‘pro fell.’ ‘pro died.’
Moreover, it is not difficult to find in actual conversations utterances that have the structures of (47a-c):

(49) Ore, pro mata nak-are-ta/sin-are-ta.
'I was affected by pro’s crying/dying again.'

(50) A: Kyō-mo pro₁ pro₂ hur-are-ta no? (pro₁ = you, pro₂ = ame-ni ‘rain-DAT’)
'Were you rained on today, too?'
B: Un, pro₁ pro₂ hur-are-ta. (pro₁ = I, pro₂ = ame-ni ‘rain-DAT’)
'Yes, I was.'

Therefore, it seems safe to conclude that the analysis in (44) receives ample empirical support.
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Endnotes

1 Under the usual assumption that NP-ni yotte is a PP-adjunct resulting from subject demotion, that is. See section 4 for a different view.
2 Although I believe ir ‘be, stay’ is an unaccusative verb, I assume that it is a regular transitive verb at this time just for the sake of the present discussion.
3 Hoshi (2013:357) states that Welsh is a VOS language, but this must be a careless mistake on his part.
4 I do not get the reported difference in grammaticality between ni and ni yotte in (19b). To me, both are equally bad, meaning that san-nin cannot be associated with sensei-ni, either. This observation goes against the widely-held view that a sequence like sensei-ni san-nin forms a constituent (e.g. Kamio 1983). However, pursuing this matter is beyond the scope of this paper, so I must leave it for another occasion.
5 This movement in (21) seems like a movement of a non-constituent, given the fact that the dative case is assigned to the whole of the NP san-nin-no sensei. In order to circumvent this inconvenient situation, one might consider moving san-nin(-no) out of the NP first and then apply remnant-movement to [np t sensei]-ni. This strategy looks clever (although it appears to violate the Proper Binding Condition (Fiengo 1977)), but it requires independent non-ad hoc motivation, which seems difficult to come by.
6 In order to show that the subject of a ni yotte indirect passive sentence originates in the matrix clause, Hoshi gives the sentences in (ia-b) (= his (15a-b)).

(i) a. San-nin-no gakusei-ga gatkōtōkyoku-ni yotte Suzuki-kyōzyu-no
   3-CL-GEN students-NOM school.authorities-by professor-GEN
   meiyo-o kizutuker-are-ta.
   honor-ACC sully-PASS-PAST
'Three students were affected by the school authorities’ sullying Prof. Suzuki’s honor.’


Notice that san-nin(-no), which directly attaches gakusei-ga in (ia), appears as a floating NQ in (ib). The claimed ungrammaticality of (ib) is said to be expected if gakusei-ga is base-generated in the subject position of the matrix clause, not undergoing object promotion. This is so, because object promotion typically allows an NQ to float, as shown in the direct passive sentence in (ii) (= Hoshi’s (16b)).

(ii) Gakusei-ga nanimonoka-ni yotte t₁ san-nin, satugais-are-ta.

‘Three students were murdered by someone.’

The point is well taken, but the oddity of (ib) cannot be syntactic ill-formedness, since it’s easy to come up with sentences with the same structure that sound just fine. (iii) below is one such example.

(iii) Zyukensei-ga gakubutyō-ni yotte san-nin, gōkaku-o torikes-are-ta.

‘Three students had their acceptances cancelled by the dean.’

7 If we follow the reason for V-to-ν movement in section 2.3, -(r)are in (25) has to move to VHAVE for external θ-assignment as well. This is so, because the abstract VHAVE needs the help of V, a substantial element, for this purpose.

8 Unless there is NP-ni realized as pro in the relevant Spec,TP, that is. We will come back to this point in section 4.

9 (30b) is from Timu Morita-no “Tenki-de kiru” [Team Morita’s “Cut by the weather”], February 27, 2008, https://blogs.yahoo.co.jp/wh_map/52061572.html?s%253Ddart_cmnt%2526pftarget1%2523D%2526target%2523D3, and (30c) from Real Sound, December 17, 2015, http://realsound.jp/movie/2015/12/post-615.html.

10 Hoshi too uses a subject-oriented adverb in his argument to support his structural analysis of ni yotte indirect passive. Look at (ia-b), which are his (17a-b) (where there are clear errors, such as his translation of keisatu-ni yotte taihos-are-ta as ‘punished by the school authorities’ in (ib); I have taken the liberty of fixing these errors in (ia-b)).

(i) a. Gakusei-ga orokanimo keisatu-ni yotte Suzuki-kyōzyu-no

    student-NOM stupidly police-by professor-GEN

    migara-o kōsokus-are-ta.

    person-ACC detain-PASS-PAST

    ’It was stupid of students to have Prof. Suzuki detained by the police.’

b. ’”Gakusei-ga orokanimo keisatu-ni yotte t₁ taihos-are-ta.

    student-NOM stupidly police-by arrest-PASS-PASS

    ’It was stupid of students to be arrested by the police.’
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Regarding these sentences, Hoshi writes, “[(ia)] is in sharp contrast with [(ib)], where the surface subject in the *ni yotte* direct passive cannot be modified by the subject-oriented adverb. This is because the surface subject is assigned a patient θ-role by the passive verb in the original position” (2013:352). What he wants to say is that *gakusei-ga* in (ia) receives external (i.e. subject) θ-role in the matrix clause, and this θ-role is semantically compatible with the subject-oriented adverb *orokanimo*, whereas *gakusei-ga* in (ib) cannot appear with the adverb, since it is an object as far as its θ-role is concerned.

However, I am not sure if I detect the claimed difference in grammaticality between these two sentences, so let me just say the following two things. First, *orokanimo* isn’t a subject-oriented adverb; it is an adverb that expresses the speaker’s attitude toward the individual/party that is responsible for what is expressed by the sentence to which it is added. This is clear in an example like (ii), where *orokanimo* does not describe the stupidity of the subject of the sentence, namely, *syokuryō-ga ‘food-NOM’*; see the Appendix.

(ii) Orokanimo, ōku-no syokuryō-ga suter-are-te iru.

stupidly many-GEN food-NOM dump-PASS-PROG be

‘Stupidly, a lot of food is being dumped.’

Second, the claimed ungrammaticality of (ib) cannot be due to the fact that *gakusei-ga* is an underlying object, since if we remove *keisatu-ni yotte*, this direct passive sentence becomes totally grammatical, as in (iii).

(iii) Gakusei-ga orokanimo taihos-are-ta.

‘Stupidly, the students were arrested.’

Removing the PP adjunct doesn’t affect the θ-role of *gakusei-ga* in (iii), so the compatibility between this subject and *orokanimo* is obvious, which directly argues against Hoshi’s explanation of the degraded status of (ib). If (ib) sounds funny at all, it must be due to the combination of *orokanimo* and *keisatu-ni yotte*.

**Appendix**

The following is a list of actual examples of *orokanimo* ‘stupidly’ that show that this adverb is not syntactically subject-oriented.

(A) ところが愚かにも、いまだに核兵器の強力化と配備の拡大が続けられている。
   (三日健二郎「平和憲法・9条を守る岩手の会ニュース No. 36」2008年8月6日)

(B) 愚かにもこうした商品は救済されているため、...
   (ロイター「コラム: 中国信託商品の恐るべきリスク」2014年2月20日)

(C) ジャケットもあったのね、そんなことが人を愚かにもうれしくしてくれる。
   (西村玲子「西村玲子の裴い張：捨てられないコート」毎日新聞2016年12月18日朝刊)
(D) 今人がやっているお茶事というのは、驚くべき無力平凡の結果として、まったく意識なしに、おろかにも人間の自由を束縛するものである。

（北大路魯山人「茶美生活」）

（N.B. Here, orokanimo describes people who do tea ceremonies, not tea ceremonies themselves.）