

# Mapping from DS to SS: A Case of Japanese Causatives

Daisuke Inagaki, Keiko Miyagawa,

Yuji Takano, Kazue Takeda

In this joint research, we have proposed that Japanese causative constructions are derived through either of the two kinds of syntactic movement: VP-raising and V-raising. Though our approach is based on Baker's (1988) analysis on Japanese causatives, the difference between them is that in the latter, it is claimed that Japanese causative constructions are derived only through V-raising, and in the former, it is argued that VP-raising is also possible. Thus, the main purpose of our study is to present evidence supporting this argument.

There have been two types of approach to Japanese causative constructions; one is a "lexical" approach, where it is assumed that a complex predicate is generated in the lexicon (cf. Farmer (1984), Miyagawa (1980), Kitagawa (1986) and others), and the other is a "Verb-raising" approach, where a complex predicate is generated through some kind of syntactic process (cf. Kuroda (1965), Baker (1988), Inoue (1988) and others). Baker (1988) claims that in languages that have complex causative predicates, a complex causative predicate is generated through the syntactic process of incorporation. If this is the case, the null hypothesis is that the same process is involved in the causative formation in Japanese. In this sense, it seems that the second approach is on the right track.

The reason why Baker concludes that there is no VP-raising process in Japanese is that an embedded object cannot be moved to the subject position in the main clause. But in fact, there are examples indicating that his conclusion is not correct. Consider the following sentence:

- (1) Sono-hon-ga kyooju-niyotte {?gakusei-ni/\*-o}  
That book-Nom the professor-by the students-Dat  
kawa-sa-re-ta (koto)  
buy-cause-pass-Past (the fact)  
'That book was made to be bought by the students by the professor.'

On the basis of these examples, we have concluded that there must be VP-raising

in Japanese, contrary to the claim made by Baker.

The example in (1) shows another aspect of Japanese causatives; that is, differences between *Ni*-causatives and *O*-causatives. Although (1) is grammatical when the embedded subject is assigned *Ni*-Case, if it is assigned *O*-Case, the sentence is ungrammatical. To account for this fact, we have proposed that *Ni*-Case is inherent Case assigned by causative predicates, and *O*-Case is structural Case which is exceptionally assigned by causative predicates. Then the ungrammaticality of (1) with *O* assigned to the causee follows from the following condition on Case-marking in Japanese:

(2) Condition on Structural Case-marking (CSC):

A verb can assign at most one structural Case.

There is another difference between the two types of causatives related to the scope of quantifiers, which suggests that the position of *Ni*-phrases is different from that of *O*-phrases; that is, *Ni*-phrases are complement to causative predicate *sase* and *O*-phrases are in the embedded subject positions.

Under the assumption that VP-raising is possible in Japanese, we can explain another related phenomenon. In Japanese causative constructions, the subject in the main clause can be an antecedent of a reflexive in the embedded object position, as seen in the following example:

- (3) John<sub>i</sub>-ga Mary<sub>j</sub>-ni jibunjisin<sub>i,j</sub>-o hihan-sase-ta (koto)  
 John-Nom Mary-Dat himself/herself-Acc criticize-cause-Past (the fact)  
 'John made Mary criticize \*himself/herself.'

The possibility of coreference as seen in (3) follows from the existence of VP-raising. Since the reflexive is raised over the embedded clause by VP-raising, its governing category is the higher clause, that is, the higher IP. Thus, the reflexive can be bound to the matrix subject.

A syntactic approach to Japanese causatives in general presupposes that a causative construction is biclausal. This point is an important difference between a syntactic approach and a lexical approach. Although it has been pointed out in the literature that there are some phenomena that seem to indicate the validity of the latter approach, they can be explained in our syntactic approach. One of them is concerned with facts about the adverbial

scope. Consider the following contrast:

- (4) a. John-ga [Mary-ga kinoo kekkonsi-ta]to it-ta (koto)  
 John-Nom Mary-Nom yesterday get married-Past that say-Past  
 'John said that Mary got married yesterday.'  
 b. John-ga Mary-o/ni damatte heya-ni hair-ase-ta (koto)  
 John-Nom Mary-Acc/Dat silently the room-into enter-cause-Past  
 'John made Mary enter the room silently.'

In (4a), where the embedded clause is finite, the adverb *kinoo* 'yesterday' in the embedded clause cannot modify the higher predicate, but in the causative construction in (4b), the adverb *damatte* 'silently' can modify the predicate in the main clause. In our approach, such a difference as this is not due to the monoclausality of causatives but due to the raising of the lower predicate to the higher one. Interpretation of adverbs must be subject to such a condition as the one Kitagawa (1986) proposed; that is, if a modifier is governed by a modifiee, it is licensed. Since in (4b), *damatte* is governed by the complex predicate, given the Government Transparency Corollary presented in Baker (1988), the intended interpretation naturally follows.

Finally, we have discussed some other related issues. One of our claims is that there is also a type of causative constructions generated in the lexicon: those including psych-verbs (for example, *yorokoba-seru* 'make pleased'). And another is related to the so-called "Light Verbs" (*suru* in such complex predicates as *sampo-suru* 'take a walk'). We have claimed that some instances of Light Verb *suru* in the sense of Grimshaw and Mester (1988) involve N-incorporation, and that their occurrences in *O*-causatives, though rather surprising, are correctly predicted by the CSC in (2).

As we have seen briefly above, the incorporation approach in this study explains the facts which might otherwise require ad hoc stipulations, including the existence of passivization of the embedded object, differences between *O*-causative and *Ni*-causative, and facts concerning Binding Theory and LF scope; it also has interesting implications for the analysis of Light Verbs and that of psych-predicates.