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Logical structures and case marking systems in Japanese are investigated in the framework of Role and Reference Grammar. Section one summarizes theoretical backgrounds. In section two, transitive, ditransitive, inversion, possessor-raising, causative, direct passive, and indirect passive constructions are discussed. Based on the observations of those structures and syntactic behaviors, it is concluded that case marking systems in Japanese are accounted for by referring to logical structures and the notion of pragmatic peak. Instead of grammatical relations, the combination of semantic argument status in logical structures, syntactic argument/adjunct status, and pragmatics are appropriate to describe case marking systems and syntactic behaviors in Japanese.

-pragmatically anomalous
AAJ argument adjunct
ACC accusative
ACH achievement
ACM accomplishment
ACT activity
ACT-ACH active-achievement
ACT-ACM active-accomplishment
ASP aspect
AUX-V auxiliary-verb
CAUS causative
COMP complementizer
CONJ conjunction
DCA direct core argument
DEC declarative
DO direct object
H honorific
IND indicative
INF infinitive
int. intended
IO indirect object
L linker
LOC locative
Glosses, morpheme-boundaries, and translations in cited examples may be modified for the sake of consistency.

Grammatical relations, especially the notion of subject, have been one of the central notions in many theories in syntax. In the following examples of inversion constructions, it is not easy to determine which argument is the subject. The example (1) is from Japanese, the example (2) is from Italian, and the example (3) is from Korean.

(1) Japanese
Sensei-ni furansugo-ga o-wakari ni nar-u.
teacher-DAT French-NOM H-understand become-NPST
□ The teacher understands French. □

(2) Italian
Gli piacciono le sinfonie di Beethoven
him.DAT like.3PL the symphonies of Beethoven.
□ He likes Beethoven's symphonies. □(Perlmutter 1984:293)
The teacher remembered his own childhood days. (Gerdt 1987:194)

Japanese, an accusative language, usually encodes a subject by a nominative case, however in (1), instead of the subject, the theme NP furansugo which is encoded by the nominative ga. The so called logical subject sensei teacher which is the subject from the semantic point of view, is encoded by the dative case ni. This case encoding suggests that the theme NP is the syntactic subject. On the other hand, the dative coded NP triggers o...ni naru honorification. As we will see later in details, it has been pointed out (Harada 1976, Shibatani 1978) that the NP which triggers o...ni naru honorification is the subject. The example (1) shows mismatch of the logical subject and the syntactic subject in semantics, case coding, and syntactic behaviors such as the so-called subject honorification. Examples from other languages show the same contradiction. In (2), the logical and semantic subject is dative, while the theme NP is nominative, and the verb agrees with the nominative NP. Perlmutter (1984) provides five syntactic phenomena indicating indirect object-hood and four phenomena indicating subject-hood of the same dative NP Gli. In Korean, the controller of a reflexive is either subject or direct object (Kozinsky and Polinsky 1993:187). The reflexive controller in (3) suggests the dative NP sensaengnim-eykey teacher-dative is the subject, while the dative case suggests it is not the subject. It is evident from these examples that a single term subject is not sufficient to refer to a NP whose subject-hood is not consistent in terms of semantics, morphology, and syntax. Subject-hood also varies between constructions as we will see elsewhere in this paper.

The framework I use to tackle these problems is Role and Reference Grammar (henceforth RRG) of Van Valin and Lapolla 1997 (henceforth VV & LP). RRG claims semantic structures (i.e. logical structures) but not grammatical relations are primitives. In this theory, the trigger (i.e. controller) of the honorification in the Japanese example, the controller of the verb agreement in the Italian example, and the controller of the reflexive in the Korean example are structure-specific. In other words, a controller is not necessarily the same among different structures within a language, nor does RRG claim that a nominative case is a subject marker. In this paper, I will discuss how these claims can shed new light on some case marking patterns in Japanese.

In RRG, semantic decomposition of predicates and their semantic argument structures are represented as logical structures (henceforth LS). A similar notion called argument structure or semantic structure is found in other literature.
(1) (a) The mouse died. 
   BECOME dead (mouse) [accomplishment]

(b) The cat killed the mouse. 
   [do (cat, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME dead (mouse)] [causative accomplishment]

(c) John made the cat kill the mouse. 
   [do (John, Ø)] CAUSE [do (cat, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME dead (mouse)]
   [causative accomplishment]

(d) John ran.
   do (John, [run (John)]) [activity]

(e) John is at the store.
   be-at (store, John) [state]

(f) John ran to the store.
   [do (John, [run (John)])] & [BECOME be-at (store, John)] [active accomplishment]

(g) The window shattered.
   INGR shattered (window) [achievement]

(h) John gave the book to Mary.
   [do (John, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have (Mary, book)] [causative accomplishment]

In RRG, there are four basic classes of predicates: states, activities, accomplishments, achievements (cf. Dowty 1979, Vendler 1957). In addition, accomplishment with activity, i.e. active accomplishments, is recognized. As we will see later, there are also active achievement predicates in Japanese. The classes are determined by Aktionsart tests such as whether the predicate may occur with for one hour, in one hour, and slowly; and whether the predicate occurs in the progressive or not (see VV & LP for details). The characteristics of the basic four classes are summarized in terms of three features, [static], [punctual] and [telic]. The last feature [telic] refers to the presence of an inherent temporal terminal point.

(2) State [+static] [-telic] [-punctual]
   Activity [-static] [-telic] [-punctual]
   Accomplishment [-static] [-telic] [-punctual]
   Achievement [-static] [+telic] [+punctual]

The notation do denotes an activity predicate as in (1d). The example (1e) without do denotes a stative predicate. The notation BECOME in example (1a) denotes an accomplishment predicate. The notation INGR in (1g) denotes an achievement predicate. It is interesting to note that in English, die is an accomplishment since it can be used in the progressive e.g. he is dying. On the other hand, sinu die in Japanese is an achievement. (cf. VV & LP 106.)

(3) Kare-wa sin-de-i-ru.
   he- TOP die-L-RESL-be.
   He is in the state of being dead. = He is dead.
   INGR dead (he)
The notation \( \emptyset \) in (1b, c, h) denotes unspecified activity. All clauses may have causative counterparts indicated by the notation CAUSE as in (1b, c, h). The notation \& in (1f) denotes temporarily sequenced state of affairs without causation.

RRG posits two macroroles, actor and undergoer. The actor subsumes agent-like thematic roles (e.g. an agent, an experiencer) while the undergoer subsumes patient-like thematic roles (e.g. a theme, a patient). In (4) below, the argument at the left end of the actor-undergoer hierarchy is the most typical actor, namely an animate agent that acts upon and affects an undergoer argument. The argument at the right end is the most typical undergoer, namely an inanimate patient that is acted upon and affected by an actor argument. Moving toward the center of the scale, actor-hood and undergoer-hood become less typical. An agent is the x argument preceded by the notation \( \text{DO} \) for example, as in the verb *murder* as represented by \( \text{DO} \{x, [\text{do} \{x, [\text{kill} \{x, y\}]\} \text{CAUSE} \text{BECOME} \text{be-dead} \{y\}] \}. \) Usually, the notation \( \text{DO} \) is usually omitted in the representation, because agentivity is an implicature for most verbs. (Holisky 1987, Van Valin and Wilkins 1996; but see Hasegawa (1996: 60) who argues that many Japanese verbs, unlike English, are lexically agentive.)

(4) Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{arg} )</td>
<td>1st arg of ( \text{pred} {x, y} )</td>
<td>2nd arg of ( \text{pred} {x} )</td>
<td>( \text{arg of state} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{DO} )</td>
<td>( \text{do} {x, \ldots } )</td>
<td>( \text{pred} {x, y} )</td>
<td>( \text{pred} {x} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{agent} )</td>
<td>( \text{effector} )</td>
<td>( \text{experiencer} )</td>
<td>( \text{locative} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{source} ) ( \text{path} ) ( \text{goal} ) ( \text{recipient} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The arrow indicates the increasing markedness of realizations of argument as actor or undergoer]

When a \( \text{pred} \) is preceded by \( \text{do} \) it denotes an activity predicate; the \( \text{pred} \) which is not preceded by \( \text{do} \) denotes a stative predicate. This diagram is a combination of the one in Van Valin (1993) and the one in VV & LP. Thematic roles in RRG are primarily determined in terms of the Aktionsart of a predicate and the position of arguments within a LS. RRG has no commitment to their labels.

Using the hierarchy, John in (1h) repeated below is the actor, while between *Mary* and *book*, the lower ranking argument, *book*, is chosen as the undergoer. The remaining argument, namely *Mary*, is called a non-macrorole core argument.

(1h) *[do \{John, \( \emptyset \}\}] \text{CAUSE} \text{BECOME} \text{have} \{\text{Mary, book}\}]

The term \( \text{argument} \) is used in two senses. In one sense, it refers to semantic argument(s) that a predicate requires semantically. *Kill*, for example, takes two semantic arguments and *give* takes three semantic arguments. The other sense of argument refers to syntactic argument(s). We can see these two senses in the following example:

(5) The mouse was killed by the cat.
Here, mouse is a semantic argument as well as a syntactic core argument while cat is a semantic argument but not a syntactic core argument (core refers to a syntactic but not a semantic property). Cat is syntactically an adjunct, i.e., peripheral element in RRG terminology. At six in (6), a modifier of the phrase John got up, is also an adjunct.

(6) John got up at six.

To the station in (7) and on the desk in (8),

(7) John ran to the station
(8) John put the book on the desk
are called an semantic/syntactic argument-adjunct. An argument-adjunct is like an adjunct since neither of them is completely predictable from their LS. Note that John ran and John put the book down without an argument-adjunct are complete sentences. On the other hand, if they appear in sentences, they are construed as semantic/syntactic arguments of predicates rather than adjuncts.

**Vv & LP propose case assignment rules for German and Icelandic as follows.** I added core in the definition as they note that these rules apply within the core direct arguments only. (VV & LP:359)

(9) Case assignment rules for German and Icelandic
   a. Assign nominative case to the highest-ranking macrorole core argument.
   b. Assign accusative case to the other macrorole core argument.
   c. Assign dative case to non-macrorole core argument (default).

The rules are a semantics-based formulation with syntactic constraints incorporated. Interaction between semantics and syntax is most evident in a passive construction.

(10) He was hit by Mary.

   LS: do ∥ Mary [hit ∥ Mary, 3sg.m)]

Mary would be the actor and a syntactic argument if the sentence were active, but in the passive sentence, Mary is an adjunct syntactically (i.e. actor-adjunct). Consequently, the other macrorole, namely the undergoer is the highest macrorole argument syntactically and receives nominative case. I will use the above formulation as a starting point to formulate the case assignment rules of Japanese.

**In RRG, syntactic structures are represented as layered structures by using two notions, juncture and nexus. Juncture refers to the three levels of syntactic units, viz. clause, core, and nucleus. Each level is determined in terms of operators that modify different levels. For example, aspect is a nuclear operator, which modifies a nuclear level unit. Deontic/root modality is a core operator; tense is a clause operator. Nexus indicates how these units are combined. There are three kinds of nexus, viz. subordination, cosubordination, and coordination. If one unit is embedded within another unit, it is subordination. If one of two units is not embedded under the other, but obligatorily share the same operator at the level in question, it is cosubordination. If two units are coordinated and each unit may have its own operator at the level, it is coordination. My main concern in this paper is nuclear junctions.**
The sentence (11) is an example of nuclear cosubordination and the sentence (12) is an example of core coordination in French from VV & LP (p.443-444).

(11) Je ferai manger les gâteaux à Jean

I will make eat the cakes to Jean

I will make Jean eat cakes.

(12) Je laisserai Jean manger les gâteaux.

I will let Jean eat the cakes.

I will let Jean eat the cakes.

(11) Nuclear cosubordination

SENTENCE

CLAUSE

CORE

ARG  NUC  ARG  ARG

NUC NUC

PRED PRED

NP  V  V  NP  PP

Je  ferai  manger  les  gâteaux  à  Jean

(12) Core coordination

SENTENCE

CLAUSE

CORE

CORE

ARG  NUC  ARG  NUC  ARG

PRED PRED

NP  V  NP  V  NP

Je  laisserai  Jean  manger  les  gâteaux
Nuclei must be adjacent to each other in linear order in nuclear juncture as in (11), while nuclei may be separated by an argument in core juncture as in (12). This is a characteristic to distinguish nuclear juncture from core juncture in French. Hasegawa (1996) argues that, in Japanese, nuclear predicates in nuclear junctures cannot be separated by an element except by some particles such as a topic marker or nuclear-level operators. (See Hasegawa 1996: 67-70 for diagnostic tests of nuclear juncture in Japanese.)

(13a) Tegami-ga das-anai-de ar-u. (Hasegawa 1996: 88)
   letter-NOM send -NEG-L be-NPST
   □ There is a letter which hasn’t been sent out. □

(13b) Tegami-ga mada das-anai-de ar-u. (modified from Hasegawa 1996: 88)
   letter-NOM still send -NEG-L be-NPST
   □ There is still a letter which hasn’t been sent out. □

(13c) *Tegami-ga das-anai de mada ar-u.
   letter-NOM send -NEG-L still be-NPST
   □ (int.) There is still a letter which hasn’t been sent out. □

The sentence (13) is an example of nuclear coordination and (14) is an example of nuclear subordination in Japanese. (Hasegawa 1996: 87-88).

(14) John-ga soto ni kuruma-o tome-te ar-u
   John-NOM outside LOC car-ACC stop-L be-NPST
   □ John has parked the car outside. □

(13a) Nuclear coordination

```
SENTENCE
   ▼
  CLAUSE
     ▼
    CORE
       ▼
      ARG
        ▼
       NUC
         ▼
        NUC
          ▼
         NP
          ▼
         PRED
           ▼
          NUC
            ▼
           NEG
            ▼
          NUC
            ▼
           CORE
             ▼
            TNS
```
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Nuclear subordination

SENTENCE

CLAUSE

CORE

ARG  ARG  ARG  NUC ← NUC

NP  NP  NP  PRED

John-ga  soto ni  kuruma-o tome-te ar -u

NUC ← ASP

CORE

CLAUSE ← TNS

(14) is an example of nuclear subordination because the valence of the complex nucleus V-te ar- is identical with that of the TE-predicate (i.e. tome-te) itself...ar- makes no contribution to the argument structure (Hasegawa 1996: 87). The representation of the layered structure is modified in accordance with VV & LP. By contrast, nuclear coordination and nuclear cosubordination may change the valence of the (first) predicate, which is the case in (13a). Das-u send is a transitive verb, but when it is followed by te-ar- as in das-i-te-ar-, the valence is reduced by one and das-i-te-ar-u as a whole becomes an intransitive predicate. Ar- in (14) is an aspectual operator, while ar- in (13a) is a nuclear predicate. Note that ar- in (13a) is not an operator. If it were, das-ı send would remain as transitive and tegami letter would be marked by accusative. Thus, (13a) is either nuclear coordination or nuclear cosubordination but not subordination. In order to determine the nexus between the two possibilities, we look at nuclear operator sharing. Since the first predicate das-ı send takes its own nuclear operator in (13a), it is coordination.

Typical examples with transitive verbs are (1) in the active voice and (2) in the passive voice.

(1) Hanako-ga Taro-o tatai-ta.
   Hanako-NOM Taro-ACC hit-PAST
   □ Hanako hit Taro. □

(2) Taro-ga (Hanako ni) tatak-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (Hanako by) hit-PASS-PAST

Δ Taro was hit by Hanako. Δ

do (Hanako [hit (Hanako, Taro)])

ACT→adjunct UND

Hanako-ni is an actor-adjunct. The presence of the passive morpheme -(r)are- reduces the number of core arguments, since an argument is demoted to the periphery or may be totally deleted from the clause. The passive morpheme -(r)are- is within a nucleus, but it is not predicative by itself since it does not have its own meaning besides reducing the number of arguments in direct passives. It is labeled as an auxiliary verb since it becomes inflected by tense like verbs. The layered structure, the logical structure, and their linking for (2) are as follows:

(2)

VV & LP's case assignment rules for Icelandic and German account for these Japanese examples as well. The rules are repeated below.

(3) Case assignment rules for German and Icelandic (VV & LP: 359)

   (a) Assign nominative case to the highest-ranking macrorole core argument.
   (b) Assign accusative case to the other macrorole core argument
   (c) Assign dative case to non-macrorole core argument (default)

For example, in (2), the higher macrorole, which is the undergoer since the actor is demoted to an adjunct, receives nominative case. Strictly speaking, the actor is not demoted as Relational Grammar.
puts it. Non-derivational RRG regards the superficial demotion as an alternative linking between the LS and syntax. The actor is linked to an adjunct whereas the undergoer is linked to the subject. The former was called backgrounding, the latter was called foregrounding in Foley and Van Valin (1984). In order to avoid the confusion with terminology referring to pragmatic saliency in cognitive linguistics, VV&LP: (P. 294) refer to them as Privileged Syntactic Argument Modulation and Argument Modulation respectively. I simply adopt demotion and promotion without a commitment to the derivational view of Relational Grammar.

An example of ditransitive sentence is:

(4) Taro-ga kodomo-ni hon-o atae-ta.

Taro-NOM child-DAT book-ACC give-PAST

Taro gave a book to the child.

The layered structure of (4) is:

The identically represented semantic arguments in the LS (the first and the second Taro; the first and the second kodomo in the LS respectively) receive the same syntactic-semantic value.

Case marking of ditransitive sentences in the active voice follows the case assignment rule introduced above. The actor Taro, the higher macrorole, takes nominative according to the rule (3a). The undergoer hon, the other macrorole, takes accusative according to (3b). By the rule (3c), the remaining core argument, the recipient, takes dative by default.

However, the rules fail to account for case marking of passive sentences with a ditransitive in Japanese. In Japanese, not only the theme, as in (5), but also the recipient may be passivized as in (6). Note that the recipient is a non-macrorole core argument and there is no dative shift in Japanese.
(5) Hon-ga Kodomo-ni (Taro ni-yotte) atae-rare-ta
   book-NOM child-DAT (Taro by give-PASS-PAST
   □ The book was given to the child (by Taro). □

(6) Kodomo-ga (Taro ni) hon-o atae-rare-ta.
   child-NOM (Taro by) book-ACC give-PASS-PAST
   □ The child was given the book (by Taro). □

The actor-adjunct is coded by ni-yotte rather than ni in (5) in order to avoid the ambiguity of homophones (i.e. the recipient and actor-adjunct).

For the sake of comparison, let us examine related English constructions. In English, verbs such as present and give alternate undergoer assignment between the theme and the recipient. (VV & LP: 338-360)

(7a) He presented them to Mary
       [do [[he [present [he, Mary]]]] CAUSE [BECOME have [[Mary, them]]]
       ACT OCA UND

(7b) They were presented to Mary (by him).
       UND OCA (actor-adjunct)

(8a) He presented her with the books.
       [do [[he [present [he, her]]]] CAUSE [BECOME have [[her, the books]]]
       ACT UND OCA

(8b) She was presented with the books (by him).
       UND OCA (actor-adjunct)

Case assignment rules introduced above apply to these English examples. In passive sentences (7b) and (8b), the highest macrorole core argument, receiving nominative case, is the undergoer since the actor is an adjunct. The remaining syntactic core argument, which is called an oblique core argument receives dative case as default in (7b). It is marked by the with preposition in (8b). Alternation of the undergoer with the verb give is known as a dative shift.

(9a) John gave them to her.

(9b) John gave her the books.

(9c) *John gave her them.

In (9a), them is the undergoer, whereas in (9b), her is the undergoer. The case of the books in (9b) is not overtly marked. Both her and the books in (9b) must be accusative, given that they are not nominative. (9a) and (9b) can be passivized. Many American English speakers (but not British English speakers) find passivization of the theme in (9b) ungrammatical. It indicates American English has the constraint that only an undergoer may be passivized.

(9a) □ They were given to her by John.

(9b) □ She was given the books by John.

(9b) *?The books were given her by John.

Acceptability of passivization in the dative shift sentences is controlled by the interaction of foregrounding versus backgrounding (in the sense of a cognitive operation), topicality, and speaker's
perspective. (9b) indicates her is relatively foregrounded compared to the books. Topicalization of the foregrounded her as in (9b) is pragmatically natural, however topicalization of the book is odd because the dative shift in (9b) is the operation of backgrounding the books, while topicalization of the books in (9c) is foregrounding the books. Two operations contradict each other in terms of pragmatics, which leads to the oddity.

Load/spray verbs also show undergoer assignment alternation.

(10a) John loaded the hay on the wagon.

\[ \text{do [John [load [John, wagon]]] CAUSE [be-on [wagon, hay]]} \]

\[ \text{ACT OCA UND} \]

(10b) John loaded the wagon with the hay.

\[ \text{do [John [load [John, wagon]]] CAUSE [be-on [wagon, hay]]} \]

\[ \text{ACT OCA UND} \]

(11a) They loaded a box onto the truck. (Yasui 1987: 147)

(11b) *They loaded the truck with a box. (Yasui 1987: 147)

(11c) They loaded the truck with a single, enormous box.

(10a) is considered to be the unmarked undergoer assignment, whereas (10b) is considered to be the marked undergoer assignment in RRG. Marked assignment of macroroles is motivated by pragmatics and/or semantics. In (10a), the undergoer the hay receives a holistic interpretation, whereas the wagon receives a partitive interpretation. This holistic-partitive relation reverses in (10b) in accordance with undergoer assignment alternation. (11b) is ungrammatical because the holistic interpretation of the truck is not possible with a single box. However, Van Valin (p.c.) pointed out that (11c) is grammatical since a holistic interpretation is possible, even with a single box.

Not all verbs taking a goal allow the undergoer shift. Put, for instance, taking a typical goal, does not.

(12a) John put the hay on the wagon.

\[ \text{do [John [put [John, wagon]]] CAUSE [be-on [wagon, hay]]} \]

\[ \text{ACT AAJ UND} \]

(12b) *John put the wagon with the hay.

Japanese lacks the undergoer assignment alternation. How then can we account for a sentence like (6) repeated below, which assigns nominative case to a non-macrorole core argument?

(6) Kodomo-ga (Taro ni) hon-o atae-rare-ta .

child-NOM (Taro by) book-ACC give-PASS-PAST

The child was given the book (by Taro).

I propose that pragmatic peak is another motivation to assign nominative case in Japanese.

Pragmatic peak refers to the most salient argument in a simple clause. The terminology is adopted from early RRG. Van Valin and Foley (1980:338-339) say:

Pragmatic salience is established by two interacting factors, discourse prominence (i.e. definiteness, specificity, and givenness), on the one hand, and what Zubin (1979) calls the speaker’s focus of interest, on the other, that is, that participant which the speaker treats as most salient in the situation.
under consideration. The pragmatically most salient NP in a clause is called PRAGMATIC PEAK....According to Zubin (1979), the speaker's focus of interest plays the primary role in German in determining which NP will occur as the pragmatic peak in the nominative case....These two sets of pragmatic factors can be characterized as speaker related and hearer related. The speaker-related factors are those discussed by Zubin and reflect the speaker's judgment about the relative importance of the participants in a situation.... The hearer-related factors, on the other hand, are those of definiteness, specificity, and givenness, which are tied up with speaker's assumption about hearer's ability to identify the referents of NPs and about what has been established in the discourse context.

What I refer to as pragmatic peak is similar to Zubin's focus of interest. Both are speaker-related factors. Hearer-related factors are usually called topic. The pragmatic peak and discourse topic are distinct notions, therefore the pragmatic peak may actually be manifested as either a discourse focus (coded by the nominative ga) as in (13a), a discourse topic (the nominative ga is replaced by a topic particle wa) as in (13b), or a deleted topic (i.e. zero anaphor) as in (13c). If the pragmatic peak takes a surface case, it is nominative.

(13a) Taro-ga daigaku e it-ta.
    Taro-NOM college to go-past
    □ Taro went to college.

(13b) Taro-ga daigaku e it-ta. Taro-wa keizaigaku -o benkyoo-si-ta.
    Taro-NOM college to go-past. Taro-TOP economics-ACC study-do-past.
    □ Taro went to college. Taro studied economics.

(13c) Taro-ga daigaku e it-ta. Sosite, Ø keizaigaku-o benkyoo-si-ta.
    Taro-NOM college to go-past. and economics-ACC study-do-past.
    □ Taro went to college. And (he) studied economics.

Discourse focus is subsumed under the pragmatic peak, thus exhaustive ga (Kuno 1973) is one manifestation of a pragmatic peak (cf. see section 2.3 for examples). The pragmatic peak may be best defined as a sum of various factors. The following are candidates to determine the pragmatic peak. They are not meant to be exhaustive or hierarchically ordered.

(14) (a) A figure is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than the ground --- [Figure-ground hierarchy].
    (b) Discourse focus is more likely to be the pragmatic peak.
    (c) An animate nominal is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than an inanimate nominal----- [Animacy hierarchy].
    (d) A higher argument is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than a lower argument in the LS --- [Argument hierarchy]. (An argument that appears toward the left in the LS is higher than an argument that appears toward the right. For instance, in a schematic LS [pred (x, y) CAUSE pred (y, z)], x is higher than y, in turn, y is higher than z.)
    (e1) The actor is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than the undergoer.
    (e2) A macrorole is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than a non-macrorole core argument --- [Macrorole hierarchy].
    (f) The pragmatic peak must be a core argument.
The pragmatic peak is manifested as nominative in Japanese (the same is true of German, as stated by Zubin) but the reverse is not necessarily true. There are nominative NPs which are not pragmatic peaks as we will see later. A pragmatic peak may interact with syntax but not necessarily determine a controller, a pivot, or a subject. Case and postposition assignment rules for Japanese, with the notion of pragmatic peak incorporated, are formulated as follows:

(15) Case/postposition assignment rules (Japanese)

(P) Assign nominative case to the pragmatic peak.
(A) Assign nominative case to the higher-ranking macrorole core argument.
(B) Assign accusative case to the other macrorole core argument.
(C) Assign dative case to the other core argument as default (Direct Core Argument)
(C') The other core argument may take a postposition (Oblique Core Argument)

(16) Nature of macrorole ranking

A demoted macrorole is respected in terms of macrorole ranking even if it is not assigned case. The rules apply in the order listed above. The rule (15P) is added to the former rules. In many instances, addition of (15P) is trivial because the higher-ranking macrorole core argument and the pragmatic peak are expressed by the same NP. I will discuss the nature of macrorole ranking, shortly.

Let us examine how the new rules handle the ditransitive sentences repeated below.

(17) Taro-ga Kodomo-ni hon-o atae-ta
Taro-NOM child-DAT book-ACC give-PAST
[Taro gave a book to the child.]
[do [Taro [give [Taro, child]]] & [have [child, book]]]
ACT=peak DCA UND

(18) Hon-ga kodomo-ni (Taro ni-yotte) atae-rare-ta
book-NOM child-DAT (Taro by) give-PASS-PAST
[The book was given to the child (by Taro).]
[do [Taro [give [Taro, child]]] & [have [child, book]]]
ACT-->adjunct DCA UND=Peak

(19) Kodomo-ga Taro ni hon-o atae-rare-ta
child-NOM Taro by book-ACC give-PASS-PAST
[The child was given the book by Taro.]
[do [Taro [give [Taro, child]]] & [have [child, book]]]
ACT-->adjunct DCA=peak UND

Case marking in (17) is straightforward and requires no explanation. Between (18) and (19), the choice of the pragmatic peak alternates. In (18), hon book is chosen as the pragmatic peak because the undergoer outranks a non-macrorole for the choice of pragmatic peak. In (19), on the other hand, different criteria apply. The animate kodomo child outranks the inanimate hon book furthermore, the higher argument kodomo child outranks the lower argument hon book. Note that, in neither sentence, the actor-adjunct Taro cannot be the pragmatic peak. In (18), hon book takes nominative by
the rule (15P); *kodomo* [child] takes dative by the rule (15C). In (19), *kodomo* [child] takes nominative by (15P). *Hon* [book] [lin] (19) would be the highest macrorole receiving nominative if the actor-adjunct were not counted which would be true in Icelandic and German but not in Japanese. In order to account for the fact that the undergoer takes accusative but not nominative, I proposed the nature of macrorole ranking [lin] (16). The actor-adjunct or the implicit actor after ellipsis at syntax level is still counted as the higher macrorole at semantics. Thus, the undergoer *hon* [book] is counted as the lower (i.e. the other) macrorole. The rule (15A) fails to apply to the actor-adjunct or the implicit actor since they are not syntactic core arguments. The rule (15B) applies to *hon* [book] and assigns it accusative. Thus, both (18) and (19) are potential passive counterparts of (17). One of the two forms is chosen based on the context. (18) is used when the context requires *hon* [book] to be the focus, while (19) indicates *kodomo* [child] is the focus, such as an answer to wh-question sentences. (18) is used when there is a presupposition that something was given to the child, whereas (19) is used when there is a presupposition that somebody was given the book.

An example of an oblique core argument is the goal of the verb *okuru* [to send]. *Okuru* is ambiguous in the meaning between [to send] and [to present, give]. They are homophones but orthography differentiates them by different characters. *Okuru* [to send] in (20) takes a goal nominal, whereas *okuru* [to present] in (21) takes a recipient.

(20) Taro-ga afurika kara Hanako ni kozutumi-o okut-ta.

Taro-NOM Africa from Hanako to parcel-ACC send-PAST

[do [Taro, [send [(Taro, Hanako)]]] CAUSE [[NOT be-at [Africa, parcel]] & [be-at [Hanako, parcel]]]

ACT AAJ OCA UND

(21) aro-ga Hanako-ni yubiwa-o okut-ta.

Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT letter-ACC present-PAST

[do [Taro, [present [(Taro, Hanako)]]] CAUSE [have [Hanako, ring]]

ACT DCA UND

Although Hanako is a human in (20), it is construed as a goal, but not a recipient. We can argue for this view based on the facts that 1) *Hanako* is paired with the source of geographic location *afurika* [Africa]. 2) *Hanako* may be replaced by an explicitly localized [NP *Hanako no tokoro*] Hanako's place or *Hanako no moto* the place where Hanako stays at. 3) *Hanako* may be replaced by a goal of geographic location such as *Tokyo*. None of these three applies to the recipient of (21). The recipient may be replaced by *Tokyo*, but only if *Tokyo* is interpreted as an organization. It is noteworthy that the passivization of a recipient is perfectly fine while the passivization of a goal is anomalous. The interpretation I get from (20) is an adversative passive reading, where Taro sent a parcel to somebody else from Africa, and Hanako was affected.

(20)?? Hanako-ga afurika kara Taro ni kozutumi-o okur-are-ta.

Hanako-NOM Africa from Taro by parcel-ACC send-PASS-PAST

[do [Taro, [send [(Taro, Hanako)]]] CAUSE [[NOT be-at [Africa, parcel]] & [be-at [Hanako, parcel]]]

ACT AAJ OCA UND
(21) Hanako-ga Taro ni yubiwa-o okur-are-ta.
    Hanako-NOM Taro by ring-ACC present-PASS-PAST
  □ Hanako was presented a ring by Taro. □

Inversion is the construction in which the so-called subject is coded by dative and the so-called object is
coded by nominative.

(22) Taro-ni sono imi-ga wakat-ta.
    Taro-DAT that meaning-NOM understand-PAST
  □ Taro understood the meaning. □

(23) Taro-ni Hanako-ga mie-ta.
    Taro-DAT Hanako-NOM visible-PAST
  □ Taro saw Hanako. (lit.) Hanako was visible to Taro. □

The pragmatic peak Hanako in (23) receives nominative case by the case assignment rule (15P). The
higher macrorole argument is the undergoer because there is no actor. The rule (15A) says to assign
nominative to the higher macrorole, namely Hanako. However it has been already assigned nominative
case by the rule (15P), therefore the rule (15A) does not apply. The remaining non-macrorole core
argument is assigned dative by the rule (15C). In Japanese, a single macrorole is the default for
predicates containing no [+activity] (i.e. state, achievement, and accomplishment without do □..
predicate). I propose the principle of M(acrorole)-transitivity for Japanese (and other languages with many inversion verbs) as follows:

(24) M-Transitivity Principle for Japanese
    If a predicate has no activity predicate in its LS, the predicate is M-intransitive as default
    (i.e. it takes a single macrorole).

Van Valin (1993:47)'s Default Macrorole Assignment Principles state that for verbs which take one macrorole, ...[and if] the verb has no activity predicate in the LS, the macrorole is undergoer. The principle (24) with the Default Macrorole Assignment Principles predict that a stative predicate has an undergoer but not an actor.

Other examples of inversion verbs are:

(25) kikoe-ru
    □ to be audible □ audible (x, y)
deki-ru
    □ can do □ able (x, y)
i-ru/hituyoo-da
    □ to need □ need (x, y)
ar-u
    □ to have □ have (x, y)
nai
    □ not have □ NOT have (x, y)
kowai
    □ be afraid of □ afraid (x, y)

(26) Ningen-ni wa 50 herutsu ika-no oto-ga kikoe-nai.
    human.beings-DAT TOP 50 Hz under-GEN sound-NOM audible-not
    □ Human beings can not hear the sound under 50 Hz. □

Potential verbs derived by adding -(ar)e-r- to a verb stem are productive.

(27) kak-e-ru
    □ can write □ write.able (x, y) cf. kak-u □ to write □
yom-e-ru
    □ can read □ read.able (x, y) cf. yom-u □ to read □
tsuka-e-ru
    □ can use □ use.able (x, y) cf. tsuka-u □ to use □
taber-are-ru
    □ can eat □ eat.able (x, y) cf. taber-u □ to eat □
kir-are-ru
    □ can wear □ wear.able (x, y) cf. kir-u □ to wear □

(28) Kumon kaado de benkyoo sure-ba, 3 sai-no kodomo-ni mo kanji-ga
    Kumon cards by study do-if, 3 years.old-GEN child-DAT also kanji-NOM
    yomeru-yoo ni naru.
    read.able-nominalizer to become
    □ If he/she studies by using Kumon cards, even a three-year-old child becomes to be able to read kanji (chinese characters). □

The majority of inversion verbs have an alternative case marking pattern. Both arguments may be coded by nominative.

(29a) Taro-ni okane-ga hituyooda
    Taro-DAT money-NOM need
    □ Taro needs money. □
    need (Taro, money)
    DCA UND=peak
The two arguments in the inversion construction are equally good candidates for the pragmatic peak. On the one hand, Taro, a human nominal, is more likely the pragmatic peak than the inanimate okane, money according the animacy hierarchy. In addition, Taro, the higher argument is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than the lower argument okane, money according to the argument hierarchy. On the other hand, a macrorole argument, namely the undergoer okane, money is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than non-macrorole Taro. In (29b), the case marking rule (15P) assigns the pragmatic peak Taro nominative. The undergoer is the higher macrorole because there is no actor even in the periphery. The rule (15A) assigns nominative to the undergoer. The result is a double nominative construction. When a speaker pays more attention to the non-macrorole direct core argument than the undergoer, the pragmatic peak shifts to the non-macrorole argument. It is the context that helps choose one of the two alternatives. In (29b), Taro is the focus, i.e. pragmatic peak, since Taro is compared with others. Example (29b) is more natural than (29a) since Taro is coded by nominative in (29b). As the result, the sentence becomes a double nominative construction. In (29a), okane, money is the focus, i.e. pragmatic peak, since okane is compared with others. Example (29a) is more natural than (29b) since not Taro but okane is marked by nominative in (29a).

Voice morphology affects the number and linking of macroroles as we saw in the transitive and ditransitive constructions in Japanese. The inversion construction, however, is not coded morphologically on the verb. Therefore we can safely say that the macrorole value is intact in inversion sentences, which consequently guarantees the occurrence of double nominatives by following the case assignment rules. There are a handful of predicates whose x argument as well as y argument must take nominative case.

(30)  
\[\text{zyoozu-da} \quad \text{be good at} \quad \text{skillful} \] (x, y)  
\[\text{heta-da} \quad \text{be poor at} \quad \text{bad} \] (x, y)
hosii  □ want □  want [x, y]
suki-da  □ like □  fond [x, y]
kirai-da  □ dislike □  hateful [x, y]

E.g. Taro-ga/*ni Hanako-ga sukida.
Taro-NOM/*DAT Hanako-NOM like □ Taro likes Hanako. □

Tentative explanations for the contrast between (30) versus (25),(27) are as follows. Predicates of (25), (27) but not (30) allow the undergoer to be construed as being the pragmatic peak. Ability, possession, and necessity in (25),(27) are construed as being located at animate nominals. Locatives are cognitively the ground, rather than the figure. In perception predicates, such as mieru□ can see, be visible □ and kikoeru□ can hear, or be audible □ the percept figuratively moves from its origin to the perceiver (cf. fictive motion in Talmy 1995). The percept is the figure, and the end point or the perceiver, is the ground. The former is construed as the pragmatic peak. Such interpretation is not available for (30). The animate nominal x, rather than the locative y, is more likely to become the pragmatic peak according to the animacy hierarchy.

Wakaru□ understand □ may take an adverbial 5-fun-de□ in five minutes □ indicating [+telic].

(31) Taro-ni/-ga sono kotae-ga 5-fun de wakat-ta
Taro-DAT/-NOM that answer-NOM 5-minutes in understand-PAST □ Taro understood the answer in five minutes. □

It shows that wakaru□ understand □ in this sentence is an accomplishment and the LS for (31) is:

(31 □ BECOME know □[Taro, answer])

DCA UND

Wakaru□ understand □ in the next sentence is a state as it is evident from simple present. The non-past form, i.e. -u ending verbs, denotes simple present if the predicate is state. Other verbs in non-past denote future in Japanese, e.g. taberu□ to eat or will eat □

(32) Taro-ga/ni Furansugo-ga wakar-u.
Taro-NOM/DAT French-NOM understand-NPST □ Taro understands French. □

know □[Taro, French]

When wakaru□ is embedded in a causative phrase, the theme must be coded by accusative.

(33) Boku-wa Mary-ni kore-o /*-ga wakara-se-ru. (Kuno 1973: 139)
I-TOP Mary-DAT this-ACC/*-NOM understand-CAUSE -NPST
□ I will make Mary understand this. □

Kuno argues as follows:

□ /Wjakar□ to understand □ is [+stative] and thus takes ga for making its object. When it is followed by the causative -(s)ase, however, the whole form wakar-(s)ase□ to make (someone) understand □ becomes [-stative] because of the [-stative] feature of -(s)ase. Thus ga cannot be used to mark the object or this derived form. (1973: 139)

In our account, case marking of (33) falls out naturally from its LS.
(33) [do [I, Ø]]CAUSE [BECOME know [Mary, this]]

Koren  this  the undergoer, takes accusative, whereas Mary, the non-macrorole core argument, takes dative as default.

Kuno cites another example which does not alter case marking even though the right most element is [-stative].

(34) John-wa nihongo-ga wakari hazime-ta. (ibid.143)

John- TOP Japanese-NOM understand begin-PAST

John began to understand Japanese.

He argues that:

Affixes seem to influence the case marking of the object of the derived forms only when they are bound forms (such as the causative -(s)ase)....Hazime-ru is an independent verb that means to begin ...Since hazime-ru in itself implies an action, derived compound verbs are also [-stative]. However, it does not influence the case marking of the object of the verbs to which it is added.

(35c) is a new form gaining popularity among new generations.

1) Note that BECOME is due to wakaru (to become to) understand in the same vein as in (31) but not due to hajimeru to begin or to start. It is also worthy to point out that hajimeru to begin is a transitive verb if it is used as a full verb, whereas it does not affect case marking when it is used as an aspectual operator.

a) Taro-ga benkyoo-o hajime-ta. (hajimeru as a transitive verb)

Taro-NOM study-ACC begin-PAST

Taro started his study.

b) Akanboo-ga naki-hajime-ta. (hajimeru as an aspectual operator)

baby-NOM cry-begin-PAST

The baby started crying.
Potential predicates in (35a) and (35b) are [+static]. However, case marking of (35c) indicates the predicate is [+activity]. The potential morpheme -e- is affecting the meaning of the whole sentence, namely making the whole sentence [+static]. Nevertheless, the morpheme does not affect case marking in (35c). Furthermore, even though the predicate in sentence (35c) must be an activity in terms of case marking, it is not compatible with a volitional or a progressive form which we expect to be compatible with activity predicates.

It suggests that there is an on-going transition from a stative to an activity.
The highest argument and the lowest argument in the LS are identical, namely *Taro*, thus, there are two possibilities to assign a macrorole to this argument, either actor or undergoer. In such a case, the higher macrorole on the actor-undergoer hierarchy is chosen. Therefore, *Taro* is an actor and receives nominative case by the rule (15P) and by the rule (15A). The remaining *heya* room is the oblique core argument in the same vein as a goal of ditransitive verbs. It is followed by a directional postposition *ni* which should be distinguished from dative *ni*. The layered structure is:

(36a) 
```
CLAUSE
   CORE
      ARG  ARG  NUC
         NP   NP   PRED

Taro-ga  heya-ni/e  hait-ta
```

The verbs in this class have an alternative LS, for example, the verb *hairu* enter when it is followed by *te-iru* form, manifests another LS as in (38a):

(38a) Taro-ga heya ni/e hait-te i-ru.

* Taro has entered the room.
* Taro is in the room.
* Taro is entering the room.

The morpheme *-i*, otherwise glossed as progressive, is glossed as RSLT (resultative) in (38a). It denotes resulting state of an event but not the continuation of motion. When a verb is used in a sense of resultative meaning, it lacks internal temporal continuity. They are construed as perfective (i.e. achievement) and perfect. (cf. definition by Comrie 1976.) Thus (36b) allows the co-occurrence of a pace adverb but (38b) does not. The grammaticality of (36b) is attributed to an activity LS component. The sentence is an active-achievement. The ungrammaticality of (38b) is due to the lack of an activity component

(36b) Taro-ga yuukuri heya ni/e hait-ta

* Taro entered the room slowly.

(38b) *Taro-ga yuukuri heya ni hait-te i-ru.

* Taro has slowly entered the room.
(38b) becomes acceptable when a speaker is reporting the activity on the spot. The speaker pays more attention to the internal structure of the event rather than taking the event as a single whole (cf. Comrie 1976). In such an imperfective reading, the LS gains the activity component as in (36). Motion verbs in this section are traditionally categorized as punctual verbs. (cf. shunkan-dooshi i.e. punctual verb in Kindaichi 1954). The claim is based on the fact that those verbs in te-iru linker-be form denote the result state but not progression. This interpretation, however, should not be taken as an indication of punctuality, perfective or achievement of a verb per se. The interpretation of the result of an event becomes salient only when the te-iru form is used. In this case, the LS is constituted by a single achievement component. As long as a verb contains an achievement component, its te-iru form may denote the resulting state regardless of whether the verb is inherently an achievement (e.g. verbs of arriving in the next section). The verb may alternate between an achievement and an active-achievement as in motion verbs. To sum up, co-occurrence with a pace verb observed in (36b) on the one hand, is attributed to the activity component of the LS. The perfective interpretation of (38b) or indication of telicity, on the other hand, is attributed to the achievement component of the LS.

Tsuku arrive tassuru reach and todoku reach do not denote motion, at least syntactically. Such verbs are inherently perfective or achievement because they do not allow a durational expression as in (39b), a pace adverb as in (39c), nor mean progression or continuation of an action in the te-iru linker-be form as in (39d). -Te-iru form denotes the result state of a telic event.

(39a) Taro-ga mise ni/e tsui-ta.
Taro-NOM store to/to arrive-PAST

<- INGR be-at [store, Taro]
OCA UND

(39b) *Taro-ga mise ni iti-jikan tsui-ta.

<- Taro arrived at the store for one hour.

(39c) *Taro ga mise ni yakkuri tsui-ta.

<- Taro arrived at the store slowly.

(39d) Taro ga mise ni u -te -i -ru.

<- Taro has arrived at the store. Taro is arriving at the store (now).

The macrorole NP receives nominative case. The goal is marked by the postposition ni to but not dative ni, as indicated by the fact that it is interchangeable with a directional postposition e to

Possessive is coded by the genitive.
(40a) Mary-no me-ga aoi
Mary-GEN eye-NOM blue
Mary's EYES are blue. (Speaker's attention is on eyes as parts of Mary.)
If the possessor is raised the sentence becomes a double nominative construction.
(40b) Mary-ga me-ga aoi
Mary-NOM eye-NOM blue
MARY's eyes are blue. (Speaker's attention is on Mary as a whole.)
The adjective aoi (be) blue is a one-place predicate, however, the sentence has two nominative nominals. This construction was called multi-subject construction by Kuno (1973). The syntactic status of two subjects has been a challenge to many syntactic theories. Kuno (1973:68-71) and Tateishi (1994:179-207) from the perspective of Generative Grammar allow multiple subject assignments. Other theories, such as Lexical Functional Grammar, Relational Grammar and RRG, do not allow multiple subjects. Relational Grammar has analyzed multiple objects construction in Korean as follows. Two constructions (i.e. double-subject construction and double-object construction) are parallel because both involve possessor raising.

dog-NOM student-GEN leg-ACC bite-PAST-IND
The dog bit the student's leg. □
(41b) Kay-ka haksyang-ul tali-lul mwul-ess-ta. (O Grady 1991: 71)
dog-NOM student-ACC leg-ACC bite-PAST-IND
2 chômeur
The dog bit the student on the leg. □
In Relational Grammar, the ascended possessor is an argument and the remaining possessee nominal is a chômeur. (cf. Gerdts 1987, Chun 1986, Perlmutter and Postal 1983). This analysis was supported by the facts that only the raised possessor but not the remaining possessee nominal may undergo hi-passivization (Korean has another passive which does not work for this construction), plain topicalization, and clefting in Korean. This approach, however, does not provide an explanation for the case marking. The fact that the remaining possessee is still marked by accusative is an open question.
Nakamura (1997) posits that both the raised possessor and the remaining possessee share the same macrorole value. He extends this notion of sharing to non-macrorole arguments to account for instances such as case spreading among adjuncts. He argues that the same case is shared by the raised possessor and the remaining possessee because they share the same semantic value. His claim is based on the observation that a possessee as well as a possessor may launch QF. He assumes this fact indicates two nominals are identical in terms of macrorole value. This approach, however, ignores all other syntactic asymmetries between the raised possessor and the remaining possessee investigated in Relational Grammar. Another problem seems to be the notion of entailment which he supposes to be true of all the instances of whole-part relation. For example, in (41), the fact that a dog bit the student's leg entails that the dog bit the student. In his theory, this entailment guarantees the sharing of the same semantic value.
However, whole-part relation does not necessarily evoke entailment. In (40), the fact that Mary's eyes are blue does not entail Mary is blue.

I propose an analysis of possessor raising construction as follows:

(40a) CLAUSE
   | CORE
   | ARG NUC
   | NP PRED
   | NPPIP COREN
   | NPGEN NUCN
   | REF
   | N N ADJ
   Mary-no me-ga aoi
   be' (have.as.part' (Mary, eyes), [blue])
   UND=peak

(40b) CLAUSE
   | CORE
   | ARG ARG NUC
   | NP NP PRED
   | ADJ
   | NPGEN NUCN
   | REF
   | N N ADJ
   Mary-ga me-ga aoi
   be' (have.as.part' (Mary, eyes), [blue])
   DCA=peak UND

In (40a), the underlined part of the LS indicates a head. The modifier Mary is linked to NP initial position in the layered structure and appears in the genitive (cf. VV & LP: 61). The undergoer is assigned to the lowest core argument in the LS by default, namely me eyes [Mary no me] Mary's eyes is a single NP. Nominative case is assigned to [Mary no me]. In (40b), both Mary and me eyes are NP arguments as the result of possessor-raising, in spite of the fact that aoi blue is a one-place predicate. An element, for instance, an adverb modifying the predicate, may be inserted between the two arguments in (40b), while it is not the case in (40a).

(40a) *Mary-no totemo me-ga aoi
    Mary-GEN really eye-NOM blue
Mary's eyes are really blue. 

The undergoer is assigned to the lowest semantic argument me. Mary is the pragmatic peak. Mary receives nominative case by the case assignment rule (15P). The undergoer Mary receives nominative case by the rule (15A). The shift of the pragmatic peak reflects foregrounding of Mary. The speaker’s attention changes from the body part mel eyes to Mary as a whole. Figuratively, the sight of the speaker zooms in on Mary’s eyes in (40a), while the sight zooms out and now is on Mary as a whole in (40b). In the Korean examples, I hypothesize that possessor raising is the foregrounding of the possessor, whereas the passivization and clefting of the possessed is the foregrounding of the possessed. The two operations on the same clause are not valid together since they contradict each other.

A constraint called double-o constraint blocks possessor raising from the accusative host in Japanese. The double-o constraint says that a clause may not have more than one nominal coded by accusative (Harada 1973). This constraint may be evaded if accusative is replaced by other particles. (cf. Kuno 1983:218)

(42a) John-ga Tom-no kao-o nagut-ta
John-NOM Tom-GEN face-ACC hit-PAST
John hit Tom’s face.

(42b) *John-ga Tom-o kao-o nagut-ta
John-NOM Tom-ACC face-ACC hit-PAST
John hit Tom on his face.

(43) John-ga Tom-o atama-mo kao-mo nagut-ta. (modified from Kuno:1983: 218)
John-NOM Tom-ACC head-too face-too hit-PAST
John hit Tom both on the head and on the face.

In the rest of this section, I investigate causative and indirect passive constructions, whose LSs are complex, and the possessor raising passive construction which is often confused with the indirect passive. I will point out that the construction is actually a kind of direct passive in terms of LSs and case marking.

The causative suffix -(s)ase- has been called jodoosi auxiliary verb in traditional Japanese grammar.

(44) Hanako-ga Taro-ni hon-o yon-de-simaw -ase -ta
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT book-ACC read-L-complete- CAUS-PAST
Hanako made/let Taro finish reading the book.

\[do,[Hanako, Ø]) CAUSE [do,[Taro, [(read, [Taro, book]]])\]

ACT DCA UND

(45a) Hanako-ga Taro-o utaw-ase -ta.
Hanako-NOM Taro -ACC sing-CAUS-PAST
Hanako made Taro sing.
The layered structure of (44) is:

(44) Nuclear coordination

\[ \text{Nuclear coordination} \]

\[ \text{CLAUSE} \]

\[ \text{CORE} \]

\[ \text{ARG} \]

\[ \text{ARG} \]

\[ \text{ARG} \]

\[ \text{NUC} \]

\[ \text{NUC} \]

\[ \text{NUC} \]

\[ \text{PRED} \]

\[ \text{PRED} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{V} \]

\[ \text{Aux-V} \]

\[ \text{Hanako-ga Taro-ni hon-o yon-de simau -ase - ta} \]

\[ \text{NUC} \leftarrow \text{ASP} \]

\[ \text{NUC} \]

\[ \text{CORE} \]

\[ \text{CLAUSB} \leftarrow \text{TNS} \]

\(-(s)ase-\) is a nucleus which must be cliticized to the stem (with an aspect marker subordinated to it). It affects the LS of the verb stem by increasing the number of arguments by one. It indicates that the nexus between the causative morpheme and the verb is either coordination or cosubordination. The example (44) shows that the stem and -(s)ase- may be separated by an aspectual element simau modifying only the verb stem independently. Therefore, the nexus is coordination. The level of juncture is nuclear because no syntactic argument may intervene between the two nuclei. Simau\(\) to complete \(\)which follows the te linker is a verb but it does not determine nor affect the number of arguments, therefore the nexus type between yomu\(\) read \(\)and simau\(\) to complete \(\)is subordination. Simau\(\) to complete \(\)functions as an operator at the same time, thus it is double duty. (See Hasegawa (1996) for an RRG analysis of te-simau construction.)

In (44) with a transitive verb, the actor is assigned nominative case by the rule (15A), and also by (15P) as an actor is the default choice for the pragmatic peak. The undergoer receives accusative by the rule (15B). The remaining non-macrorole core argument receives dative. In the coercive causative (45a), Taro is the undergoer receiving accusative by the rule (15B), whereas in the permissive causative (45b), Taro is the non-macrorole core argument receiving dative by the rule (15C). (45b) shows a marked
linking between semantics and syntax. The lowest semantic argument is not assigned undergoer. An undergoer argument is a more patient-like argument than a non-macrorole core argument. Choosing a non-macrorole argument over an undergoer argument denotes the argument in question as less patient-like. The similar semantic difference is observed in Korean. (Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993:202), Choi (1983) (cited in Gerdts (1990:221), and Yang(1994).) In Korean, a causee may be coded by either nominative, dative, or accusative case. It is claimed that the nominative-coded causee has the most control, a dative-coded causee has less control, and the accusative-coded causee has no control over the situation. The alternative case assignment in the causative constructions in other languages are summarized in VV & LP section 9.2.2.

Alternative assignment of undergoer in causative constructions is available only when the verb is intransitive in Japanese. The double-o constraint blocks accusative coding of the causee in a sentence of a transitive verb.

(47) Hahaoya-ga kodomo-ni/*-o hon-o yom-ase-ta.

mother-NOM child-DAT/*-ACC book-ACC read-CAUS-PAST

☐ The mother made/had/let the child read the book. ☐

In such a sentence, the semantic difference between coercive causation and permission is neutralized.

Passive constructions are divided into two types, direct passive and indirect passive. The indirect passive construction, which is rare cross-linguistically, has case making and syntactic properties which require special considerations.

We have already seen direct passive constructions. The examples are repeated as (48a) and (49a) below.

(48a) Taro-ga Hanako ni tatak-are-ta.

Taro-NOM Hanako by hit-PASS-PAST

☐ Taro was hit by Hanako. ☐

(49a) Kodomo-ga Taro ni hon-o atae-rare-ta.

child-NOM Taro by book-ACC give-PASS-PAST

☐ The child was given the book by Taro. ☐

Direct passive sentences have active counterparts. The examples (48b) and (49b) are the active counterparts of (48a) and (49a) respectively.

(48b) Hanako-ga Taro-o tatai-ta.

Hanako-NOM Taro-ACC hit-PAST

☐ Hanako hit Taro. ☐

(49b) Taro-ga kodomo-ni hon-o atae-ta

Taro-NOM child-DAT book-ACC give-PAST

☐ Taro gave a book to the child. ☐

Indirect passives may be formed from an intransitive verb as in (50a), from a transitive verb as in (51a),
or from a ditransitive verb as in (52a). Contrary to direct passives, indirect passives lack active counterparts.

(50a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni sin-are-ta.
   Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT die-PASS-PAST
   □ (lit.) Hanako was died by Taro. ◄or ◄Taro died on Hanako. □

(50b) *Taro-ga Hanako-o sin-da.
   Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC die-past

(51a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni uta-o utaw-are-ta.
   Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT song-ACC sing-PASS-PAST
   □ Hanako was affected by Taro's singing a song. □

(51b) *Taro-ga Hanako-o uta-o utat-ta.
   Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC song-ACC sing-past

(52a) Hanako-ga kodomo-ni tomodachi-o takusan paatii-ni/e shootai-s-are-ta.
   Hanako-NOM child-DAT friends-ACC many party-to/to invite-do-PASS-PAST
   □ Hanako was affected by her child inviting many of her friends to the party. □

(52b) *Kodomo-ga Hanako-o tomodachi-o takusan paatii-ni/e shootai-si-ta.
   child-NOM Hanako-ACC friends-ACC many party-to/to invite-do-PAST

The indirect passive construction is also called the adversative passive (Howard 1968), the adversity passive (Kuno 1973), or the affective passive (N. McCawley 1972) because of the semantics. The sentences denote that the subject is adversely affected. A construction with on, with limited verbs in English, may express the similar adversity as in the translation of (50a). In such a sentence, the affected experiencer appears as an argument-adjunct, in an on prepositional phrase.

(53) The horse died on John.

AAJ

Some researchers have argued that some indirect passives do not denote adversity. (Wierzbicka 1979, Kuno 1983.) However, a closer look reveals that all the examples of non-adversative reading, except one example, that is (57a), which we will see shortly, are what I call possessor-raising passives. Such sentences have active counterparts, therefore they are actually direct passives. (54a), (55a), (56a) are examples of possessor-raising passive and (54b), (55b), and (56b) are their active counterparts.

(54a) Hanako-ga (Taro ni) kata-o dak-are-ta.
   Hanako-NOM (Taro by) shoulder-ACC hold-PASS-PAST
   □ Hanako had Taro's arm around her shoulders. □

(54b) Taro-ga Hanako-no kata-o dai-ta.
   Taro-NOM Hanako-GEN shoulder-ACC hold-PAST
   □ Taro put his arm around Hanako's shoulders. □

(55a) Taro-ga (Hanako ni) asi-o fum-are-ta.
   Taro-NOM (Hanako by) foot-ACC step.on PASS-PAST
   □ Taro had (his) foot stepped on (by Hanako). □
(55b) Hanako-ga Taro-no asi-o fum-da.
Hanako-NOM Taro-GEN foot-ACC step.on PAST
Hanako stepped on Taro’s foot.

(56a) Seito-ga (sensei ni) sakubun-o home -rare-ta.
student-NOM (teacher by) composition-ACC compliment-PASS-PAST
The student was complimented on his composition (by his teacher).

(56b) Sensei-ga seito-no sakubun-o home -ta.
teacher-NOM student GEN composition-ACC compliment-PAST
The teacher complimented the student on his composition.

Shibatani (1990) claimed that passive sentences with a body-part like object such as (54a) and (55a) are not indirect passives against other authors. I agree with him and will argue later that not only passive sentences with a body-part object, but all possessor raising passive sentences including sentences such as (56a), are direct passives. He also claims that the only one remaining problematic example with the verb *huku* blow as in (57a) is actually a direct passive sentence, even though there is no active counterpart.

(57a) Konoha-ga kaze ni huk-are -te tit-ta.
tree.leaf-NOM wind by blow-PASS-CONJ scatter-PAST
Leaves scattered, being blow (away) by the wind.

(57b) *Kaze-ga konoha-o huk-u.
wind-NOM tree.leaf-acc blow-NPST
The wind blows (away) a leaf.

The problem of *huku* blow is due to the accidental lack of an overt transitive counterpart, which has mislead many to claim that there is an intransitive, and hence, indirect passive that lacks the adversative reading. ... certain (direct) passives lack corresponding well formed active sentences, though the positing of the corresponding active forms or of a basic argument structure underlying them must be recognized. The casef huku is exactly of this kind, and together these cases require us to think deeply the nature of argument structures associated with individual verbs. (Shibatani 1990: 332. emphases are added)

Accordingly, passive sentences with neutral (i.e. non-adversative) reading are direct passives. Of course, it does not deny that direct passives may denote adversity. If a direct passive denotes adversity (e.g. (55a)), it is because of the semantics of the predicate, whereas adversity is structurally coded in indirect passives.

With the revised case assignment rules (15), direct passive sentences of transitive verbs are accounted for as follows (We have already seen ditransitive passive sentences in terms of rules (15) in section 2.2.):

An example is (2) (repeated as (58) below).

(58) Taro-ga Hanako ni tatak-are-ta.
Taro-NOM Hanako by hit-PASS-PAST
Taro was hit by Hanako.
do [Hanako, [hit [Hanako, Taro])]

ACT->Adjunct UND=peak

The undergoer Taro must be the pragmatic peak since there is no other core argument in the sentence. According to the rules (15) with the notion of pragmatic peak, Taro takes nominative by the rule (15P). The rule (15A) fails to apply to Hanako since it is not a core argument.

As we saw above, the adversative meaning is inherent in true indirect passive sentences. I indicate it as feel-affected in the LS. The sign \[feel-affected\] in the LSs indicates simultaneous states of affairs.

(59a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni sin-are-ta.
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT die-PASS-PAST
\[\text{[INGR be-dead [Taro])]} \text{[feel-affected [Hanako]}\]

(60a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni uta-o utaw-are-ta.
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT song-ACC sing-PASS-PAST
\[\text{Hanako was affected by Taro's singing a song.}\]

Both direct passives and indirect passives demote an argument. Shibatani (1990) argues that indirect passives do not share the universal agent-defocusing property of passivization. Agent-defocusing refers to the property that passivization demotes the agent to an adjunct or syntactically deletes it from a clause. It is true that indirect passivization does not demote the agent to an adjunct status, however, it does not demote the subject to the dative coded non-subject (as we see presently). In this broad sense, the indirect passive construction deserves to be called passive.

Indirect passives differ from direct passives regarding a demoted argument in very important respects. First, what is demoted is restricted to the actor in direct passive, whereas, the undergoer as well as the agent may be demoted in indirect passives. Second, in direct passives, the actor is demoted to an adjunct status, and consequently it can be deleted, whereas, in indirect passives, the demoted highest macrorole must be kept in a clause (unless it is understood as a pro whose identity is provided contextually. (Shibatani 1990:325-326)

(61) John-ga tatak-are-ta.
John-NOM hit-PASS-PAST
\[\text{John was hit.}\]

(62) *John-ga sin-are-ta.
John-NOM die-PASS-PAST
\[\text{Someone died on John.}\]

Accordingly, the highest macrorole is demoted to a direct core argument status coded by dative but not to an adjunct status. Thus, it may be stated as follows:

(63) The highest macrorole of the basic sentence is demoted to non-macrorole direct core argument
The indirect passive construction is parallel to the causative construction in some respects. The causer is added to the corresponding non-causative sentence. Analogously, the affected experiencer is added to the corresponding non-passive sentence in indirect passives.

(59b) Taro-ga sin-da.
Taro-NOM die-PAST
\[\text{INGR be-dead [Taro]}\]
\[\text{UND=peak}\]

(59c) Hanako-ga Taro-o sin-ase-ta. (Causative)
Hanako-NOM Taro-ACC-CAUS-PAST
\[\text{do [Hanako, } \emptyset \text{ CAUSE [INGR be-dead [Taro]]]}\]
\[\text{ACT=peak UND}\]

(59a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni sin-are-ta. (Indirect Passive)
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT die-PASS-PAST
\[\text{[INGR be-dead [Taro]]] [\text{feel-affected [Hanako]}]\]
\[\text{DCA DCA=peak}\]

(60b) Taro-ga uta-o utat-ta.
Taro-NOM song-ACC sing-PAST
\[\text{[do [Taro, [sing [Taro, song]]]}\]
\[\text{ACT=peak UND}\]

(60c) Hanako-ga Taro-ni uta-o utaw-ase-ta. (Causative)
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT song-ACC sing-CAUS-PAST
\[\text{do [Hanako, } \emptyset \text{ CAUSE [do [Taro, [sing [Taro, song]]]]]}\]
\[\text{ACT ACT-->DCA UND}\]

(60a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni uta-o utaw-are-ta. (Indirect Passive)
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT song-ACC sing-PASS-PAST
\[\text{do [Taro, [sing [Taro, song]]]}\] [\text{feel-affected [Hanako]}]
\[\text{ACT-->DCA UND DCA=peak}\]

In both causative and indirect constructions, the number of arguments increases by one. The number of macroroles, on the other hand, is reduced by one in indirect passives. Note that corresponding sentences for causative and indirect passive sentences are not counterparts which share the same LS as in active sentences and their direct passive versions. The indirect passive construction is different from the causative construction in the sense that what is added is assigned a macrorole in causatives but it is a
non-macrorole direct core argument in indirect passives. The following proposal regarding the added argument is required in indirect passive constructions.

(64) Non-macrorole status assignment in indirect passives.

The lowest semantic argument in the LS (i.e. the affected participant) is assigned a non-macrorole direct core argument status.

This has an important consequence for accusative case marking in sentences with a transitive verb such as in (60a). Taro, the demoted argument can not be the pragmatic peak, since demotion is the operation used to make an argument pragmatically less salient. Instead, the added experiencer is more likely to be the pragmatic peak. The animate Hanako is more likely to be the pragmatic peak than inanimate uta song is. The pragmatic peak Hanako gets nominative case from the rule (15P). (63) says that Taro is demoted from actor status. Therefore by (16) repeated below, the undergoer uta song is considered to be the lower macrorole.

(16) Nature of macrorole ranking

A demoted macrorole is respected in terms of macrorole ranking (even if it is not assigned case). The lower macrorole uta song receives accusative by the rule (15B). The remaining non-macrorole direct core argument receives dative by the rule (15C). If we did not have (64) and assigned the undergoer to the lowest argument Hanako, then uta song would be assigned DCA. In that case, we cannot account for the fact that uta song is marked by accusative rather than dative.

Case assignment for sentences with an intransitive verb is exemplified with (59a) repeated below.

(59a) Hanako-ga Taro-ni sin-are-ta.

Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT die-PASS-PAST

[] (lit.) Hanako was died by Taro. [] Taro died on Hanako. []

[INGR be-dead [Taro]] [feel-affected [Hanako]]

UND --> DCA DCA = peak

The pragmatic peak takes nominative case by the rule (15P). The non-macrorole direct core argument takes dative by the rule (15C).

Sugioka (1984 via Miyagawa 1989: 186) observes that te-i-, an aspect marker, may intervene between a verb and a passive morpheme in the indirect passive construction as in (65), whereas it is not the case in the direct passive construction as in (66a).

(65) Taro-ga Hanako-ni (yodoosi) oki-te-i-rare-ta.

Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT (all.night) stay.up L-PROG-PASS-PAST

[] Taro was affected by Hanako's staying up (all night). []

(modified from Sugioka 1984 via Miyagawa 1989: 181)

[do [Hanako,[stay-up [Hanako]]] [feel-affected [Taro]]]

ACT --> DCA DCA = peak

(66a) *Taro-ga Hanako ni tatai-te-i-rare-ta.

Taro-NOM Hanako by hit-L-PROG-PASS-PAST

[] (int.) Taro was being beaten by Hanako. []
The layered structure of (65) is:

(65) Nuclear coordination

Note that the aspect maker -i-, which is a state verb in origin, is subordinated to the verb stem oki- stay up (cf. Hasegawa (1996) example cited as (14) in section one). Since the passive morpheme -(r)are- can be separated from the verb stem by an aspectual element and the aspectual element can modify only the verb stem, the nexus of the verb stem and -(r)are- is coordination. This is again shared with causatives but not with direct passives. -(r)are- affects the number of semantic arguments. Therefore, I consider -(r)are- itself to be an independent nucleus.

If a possessor is raised from (67a), the sentence would be like (67b) in principle. However, the sentence is ungrammatical because of the double-o constraint. (It is well known that Korean and some other languages allow double accusative constructions. One of the Japanese dialects, spoken in the Hachijoojima island, also has double accusative constructions. (Kaneda 1993.)

(67a) Hanako-ga Taro-no asi-o fum-da.

Hanako-NOM Taro-GEN foot-ACC step.on PAST

Hanako stepped on Taro’s foot. □

(67b) *Hanako-ga Taro-o asi-o fum-da.

Hanako-NOM Taro-ACC foot-ACC step.on PAST

Hanako stepped on Taro’s foot. □

The constraint is evaded in the passive version.

(67c) Taro-ga (Hanako ni) asi-o fum-are-ta.

Taro-NOM (Hanako by) foot-ACC step.on PASS-PAST
Taro had (his) foot stepped on (by Hanako).

The possessor-raising passive construction is one of the direct passive constructions for the following reasons.

Firstly, the passive morpheme does not affect the number of semantic arguments of the LS, in other words, the passive morpheme does not increase the number of semantic arguments of the clause.

Secondly, there exists an active counterpart sentence linked to the same LS (which is not the case for indirect passive). For instance, both active (67a) and its passive counterpart (67c) share the same LS (67 ᘊ, except that asի foot ڣis the head in (67a), while both Taro and asі foot ڣare arguments in (67c). (67 ᘊdo ԎHanako [step-on ԬHanako, [have.as.part ӖTaro, foot]])

Another example of possessor-raising passives is (68c), which shares its LS with the active counterpart (68a) and another passive form (68b).

(68a) Sensei-ga Taro-no ronbun-o hihan-si-ta.
teacher-NOM Taro-GEN thesis-ACC criticism-do-PAST

The teacher criticized Taro's thesis. □

**do ӊ[teacher [criticize ߜteacher, [have ڧ[Taro, thesis]]]]

ACT=peak UND

(68b) Taro-no ronbun-ga (sensei ni) hihan-s-are-ta.
Taro-GEN thesis-NOM (teacher by) criticism-do-PASS-PAST

Taro's thesis was criticized by the teacher. □

**do ӊ[teacher [criticize ߜteacher, [have ڧ[Taro, thesis]]]]

ACT --->adjunct UND=peak

(68c) Taro-ga (sensei ni) ronbun-o hihan-s-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (teacher by) thesis-ACC criticism-do-PASS-PAST

Taro was criticized on his thesis (by the teacher). □

**do ӊ[teacher [criticize ߜteacher [have ڧ[Taro, thesis]]]]

ACT --->adjunct DCA=peak UND

The difference among these sentences lies in the linking of macroroles, syntactic argument status, and the pragmatic peak. In terms of syntactic arguments, direct passives reduce their number by one as the actor is ฆdemoted แto an adjunct status or unspecified. A possessor-raising passive sentence reduces a syntactic argument through passivization. However, a possessor-raising passive sentence increases its syntactic argument through possessor-raising, by assigning argument status to both the possessor and the possessed. Note that as far as semantic arguments are concerned, there is no change among LSs of (68a), (68b), and (68c). The difference among those is the status of syntactic arguments.

In non-possessor-raising (68b), Taro cannot be the pragmatic peak since it is not a core argument. In possessor-raising (68c), both Taro and ronbun�� thesis แare arguments, therefore Taro is a core argument. Taro is most likely to be the pragmatic peak since it is higher than ronbunכ thesis ฆin terms of argument hierarchy and in terms of the animacy hierarchy. In (68c), the case assignment rule (15P) assigns nominative case to the pragmatic peak Taro, the undergoer ronbunכ thesis แreceives accusative by the rule (15B). Note that the undergoer is lower than the actor-adjunct in terms of the macrorole ranking
since the actor-adjunct is respected by the nature defined in (16).

Thirdly, NP-ni is demoted to an adjunct status (i.e. to the periphery). It does not receive dative case as it does in the indirect passive construction as seen in the previous section.

Fourthly, Miyagawa (1989: 187) observes that aspectual elements cannot intervene between a verb stem and a passive morpheme in this construction. (67a,b) are adapted from Miyagawa. (In his analysis, sensei-ni is dative contrary to the present analysis)

(67a) Taro-ga sensei ni ronbun-o hihan -s -are -te -i -ru.
Taro-NOM teacher by thesis-ACC criticism-do-PASS-L-PROG-NPST

(67b) *Taro-ga sensei ni ronbun-o hihan -si-te -i -rare-ru.
Taro-NOM teacher by thesis-ACC criticism-do-L-PROG-PASS-NPST

□ Taro is being criticized on his thesis by the teacher. □

Indirect passives allow an aspectual element to intervene between a verb stem and a passive morpheme, whereas possessor-raising passives do not. The ungrammaticality of (67b) is parallel to that of a typical direct passive (68b).

(68a) Kodomo-wa Hanako ni sikar-are -te-i -ta.
child -TOP Hanako by scold-PASS -L-PROG -PAST

(68b) *Kodomo-wa Hanako ni sikat-te-i -rare -ta.
scold-L-PROG -PASS -PAST

□ The child was being scolded by Hanako. □

The layered structure of (68c) (repeated below) is (68c □).

(68c) Taro-ga sensei ni ronbun-o hihan -s -are -ta.
Taro-NOM teacher by thesis-ACC criticism-do-PASS-PAST

□ Taro was criticized on his thesis by the teacher. □

do [teacher [criticize [teacher [have [Taro, thesis]]]]]

ACT --->adjunct DCA=peak UND

(68c □)

CLAUSE

ARG Periphery ARG NUC

PRED

NP PP NP V Aux-V

Taro-ga sensei ni ronbun-o hihan-s -are -ta

NUC

CORE

CLAUSE ← TNS
The following rules for case assignment in Japanese were proposed and then applied to several constructions.

(P) Assign nominative case to the pragmatic peak.
(A) Assign nominative case to the higher ranking macrorole core argument.
(B) Assign accusative case to the other macrorole core argument.
(C) Assign dative case to the other core argument as default (Direct Core Argument)
(Ĉ) The other core argument may take a postposition (Oblique Core Argument)

A demoted macrorole is respected in terms of macrorole ranking even if it is not assigned a case.

The rules correctly accounted for all constructions including inversions, dative-postposition, double nominative, possessor-raising double nominative, causative, direct passive, possessor-raising passive, and indirect passive constructions.
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