Deriving Passives with Pragmatic and Semantic Implications

Akemi Matsuya
Takachiho University

This paper will explore how interpretations of passives, neutral meaning, subject NP's and speaker's emotional implications, are produced by Factivity and Widening (Zanuttini and Portner (2003)), syntactic derivation by phase (Chomsky (2001)), checking theta roles (Hornstein (2000)) in syntax-semantics interface and updating the Common Ground in pragmatics (Castroviejo (2008)).

Emotional implications of English passives are speaker-oriented and range from positive emotive to negative emotive, depending on the context, as observed in (1). If *Johnny* is stressed with short pitch, it would more likely sound positive emotive (see (1a')). If the pitch range of *Johnny* is elongated and pronounced with falling stress, it would more likely sound negative emotive (see (1a")). As (1a''') shows, (1a) could have a neutral interpretation without any positive/negative feeling of the speaker. In other words, emphases with pitch and stress enable English passives without any overt degree morphology to have extreme degree interpretations, which is similarly observed in exclamatives (Rett (2008) among others).

(1) a.   Mary was asked for her e-mail address by Johnny.
     a'.   The speaker, who knows that Mary likes Johnny, is delighted with his asking for her e-mail address.
     a".   The speaker, who knows that Johnny is serious and shy, is annoyed by his asking for Mary's e-mail address.
     a'''. The speaker, who knows the fact, attempts to report it to others.

I attempt to account for the wide range interpretations of passives with factive operator, FACT, at the Spec of the lower CP and wh operator for root exclamatives, WH, at the Spec of the higher CP, proposed in Zanuttinni and Portner (2003) as well as checking theta roles (Hornstein (2000)). As the operator for passives is phonologically unrealized, I call it a null operator, OP. The LF representations for the interpretations of (1a'), (1a"), and (1a''') are depicted as follows. In (2a), the PP is generated in the higher vP by syntactic computation. The OP triggers obligatory movement of *Johnny*, agent NP, from PP to the Spec of CP_3. Then Factivity and Widening interact each other, thereby presupposing that a new proposition under the new domain is true at syntax-semantics interface: that Johnny asked for Mary's e-mail address is presupposed. The speakers' emotional attitudes are caused by updating of the Common Ground at the pragmatic level. As (2b) shows, PP is generated within VP dominated by vP and no OP motivates *Johnny* to move to the Spec of CP_3 and no new proposition is produced. In addition, Johnny cannot move to CP_3 once Spell-Out of VP is induced by the higher phase head, v.

(2) a. $[_{CP3}$ Johnny$_j$ $[_{CP2}$ OP $[_{C'}$ t_j" $[_{CP1}$ FACT $[_{C'}$ t_j' $[_{TP}$ Mary$_i$ $[_{vP}$ $[_{vP}$ t_i $[_{VP}$ $t_i...t_j$ $][_{PP}$ t_j']]]]]]]]]$
      $\ \ \ \ $ +θ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ +θ $\qquad\qquad$ +θ $\ $ +θ $\quad$ +θ
      $\ \ \ \ $ +θ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ +θ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ +θ
      (for (1a') and (1a"))

     b. $[_{CP3}$ $[_{CP2}$ ∅ $[_{C'}$ $[_{CP1}$ OP $[_{C'}[_{TP}$ Mary$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t_i' $[_{VP}$ $t_i ... t_j$ $[_{PP}$ Johnny$_j$]] ...]]]$
      $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ +θ $\quad$ +θ $\ $ +θ $\ $ +θ $\qquad$ +θ
      $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ +θ $\qquad$ +θ $\qquad\qquad$ +θ
      (for (1a'''))

The above methodology can be applied to Japanese passives. Japanese *ni* direct and indirect passives can have strong emotional implications for subject NPs (see (3)) while English passives have a neutral meaning (Hoshi (1994), Kuroda (1965), Lasnik and Fiengo (1974)). Tokunaga (1998: 460-461) claims that (4a) can contain three interpretations as seen in (4a'), (4a"), and (4a'''). As (4a''') shows, a neutral interpretation is possible, depending on the context. Notice that once the a particle, *yo*, an auxiliary, *da*, or both of them, is/are added to a Japanese passive (3), it will present the speaker's emotional attitude like English cases, as

observed in (4b') and (4b'').

(3)　　Hanako-ga sensei-ni　home-rare-ta.
　　　　　-Nom teacher-by praise-passive-past
　　　'Hanako was affected by the teacher's praising her.'　Hoshi (1994:35)
(4)　　a.　　Tanaka san-wa Yamada san-ni Ishikawa san-o shookais-are-ta.
　　　　　　　　　-Top　　　　　-by　　　　　-Acc　introduce-Passive-Past
　　a'.　　Tanaka was annoyed by Yamada's introducing Tanaka to Ishikawa.
　　a''.　　Tanaka was moved by Yamada's introducing Tanaka to Ishikawa.
　　a'''.　　Tanaka was introduced to Ishikawa by Yamada.
　　　　　(=The speaker, who knows the fact, attempts to report it to others.)
　　b.　　Hanako-ga sensei-ni home-rare-tan-**da**/-tan-**da-yo**/-ta-**yo**.
　　b''.　　The speaker, who knows that Hanako is quiet and shy in the class,
　　　　　is delighted with her teacher's praising her.
　　b''.　　The speaker, who knows that Hanako is an apple-polisher in the class,
　　　　　is annoyed with her teacher's praising her.
　　b'''.　　The speaker, who knows the fact, attempts to report it to others.

　　　The LF representations for the interpretations of (4b') and (4b'') are drawn in (5a) while (4c''') is represented in (5b). As (5a) shows, the OP makes *Hanako*, affectee NP, move to the Spec of CP$_3$ in order for Factivity and Widening to interact each other, which leads to presuppose that a new proposition under the new domain is true at syntax-semantics interface. The details of speakers' emotional attitudes are decided by updating of the Common Ground at the pragmatic level. (5b) shows that no OP triggers *Hanako* to move to the Spec of CP$_3$ and no new proposition are produced. Moreover, *Hanako* cannot move to CP$_3$ once Spell-Out of TP is induced by the higher phase head, C.

(5)
　　a. [$_{CP3}$Hanako$_i$[$_{CP2}$OP[$_{C'}$[$_{CP1}$FACT[$_{C'}$[$_{TP}$ t_i''　　[$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ t_i'　　[$_{vP}$　t_i … t_j][$_{PP}$ sensei$_j$]]]]]]]]]
　　　　　+θ　　　　　　　　　　　　　　+ θ　　　　+θ　　　　+θ　+θ　　　+θ
　　　　　+affectee θ　　　　　　　+affectee θ　+affectee θ　　　　　　+affecter θ
　　b. [$_{CP3}$ [$_{CP2}$ $^\varnothing$ [$_{C'}$ [$_{CP1}$ FACT [$_{C'}$ [$_{TP}$ Hanako$_i$ [$_{vP}$ t_i　[$_{vP}$ t_i … t_j [$_{PP}$ sensei$_j$]]]]]]]]]]]
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　+θ　　　　+θ　　　　　+θ
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　+affectee θ　+affectee θ　　　+affecter θ

　　　In sum, passives behave similarly to exclamatives. Speaker's emotional attitudes in passives can be accounted for straightforwardly by not only syntactic principles but also semantic and pragmatic conditions.

References
Castroviejo, E. 2008. Deconstructing Exclamations, *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 7, 41-90.
Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase, in M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1-52. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move!: A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
Hoshi, H. 1994. *Passive, Causative, and Light Verbs: A Study on Theta Role Assignment*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
Kuroda, S-Y. 1965. *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
Lasnik, H. and R. Fiengo 1974. Complement Object Deletion, *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 535-571.
Rett, J. 2008. A Degree Account of Exclamatives, *SALT XVIII*, 601-618.
Tokunaga, M. 1998. Nihongo Ukemibun-no Kaishaku: Higai-no Ukemi-wa Sonzaisuru no ka? [Interpretations of Japanese Passives: Are there Any Adversity Passives?], *Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language: Explanation of the Human Faculty for Constructing and Computing Sentence on the Basis of Lexical Conceptual Features*, 447-465.
Zanuttini, R. and P. Portner 2003. Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface, *Language* 79:1, 39-81.