

Control and *Te*-Clauses in Japanese

Kenji Arisaka, Shinsuke Homma, Hidehito Hoshi
Mikinari Matsuoka, Kazue Takeda

In this joint research, we examined the following sentences:

- (1) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kata-o ~~mom~~-de moratta
Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT shoulders-ACC message-TE received
'Taro had his shoulders massaged by Hanako'
b. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kata-o ~~mom~~-de ageta
Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT shoulders-ACC message-TE gave
'Taro massaged her shoulders for Hanako'

We call the sentence in (1a) *te-moraw* construction, and the one in (1b) *te-ager* construction, respectively. There is a difference between (1a) and (1b) with respect to the semantic subject of the verb ~~mom~~. In (1a), the dative NP *Hanako* is taken as the subject of ~~mom~~, while in (1b) the matrix subject *Taroo* is understood as the semantic subject of the internal verb. We claimed this difference can be explained by the Minimal Distance Principle (cf. Larson (1991)), observing the syntactic behavior of NP-ni in both constructions.

First, we argued that both constructions in (1) involve sentence complementation: the VP-*te* sequence is the complement clause of the matrix verbs, *moraw* and *ager*. Next, we pointed out that the NP-ni that appears in each construction is a matrix element. Thus the DS representations of (1a) and (1b) seem to be illustrated in (2a) and (2b), respectively:

- (2) a. Taroo₁-ga Hanako₂-ni [PRO₂ kata-o monde] moratta
b. Taroo₁-ga Hanako₂-ni [PRO₁ kata-o monde] ageta

Here, we claimed that the controller of *PRO* is determined by the Minimal Distance Principle; specifically, the closest NP that c-commands *te*-clauses at DS is chosen as a controller of *PRO*. In (2a), the closest NP which c-commands *PRO* at DS is *Hanako*, and it is correctly chosen as the controller of *PRO*. However, in (2b), if the Minimal Distance Principle is adopted, *Hanako*

would be incorrectly chosen as the controller of *PRO*.

However, there is evidence suggesting that the DS representation of (1a) is not (2b). On the basis of the fact of VP-preposing and *soo-s* replacement, we suggested that the syntactic status of NP-*ni* in (1a) is different from the one in (1b). That is, NP-*ni* in the *te-moraw* construction ((1a)) is an argument, while NP-*ni* in the *te-ager* construction ((1b)) is an adjunct.

According to Chomsky (1986: 67), DS is the representation where only thematically relevant items, namely, predicates and arguments, are projected and others, if any, remain invisible. Taking this assumption strictly, we argued that NP-*ni* in the *te-ager* construction, which is an adjunct, must be invisible at DS. Therefore, the DS representation of each construction in (1) is given as follows:

- (3) a. [_{IP} Taroo₁-ga [_{VP} Hanako₂-ni [_{CP} PRO₂ kata-o monde] moratta]]
 b. [_{IP} Taroo₁-ga [_{VP} [_{CP} PRO₁ kata-o monde] ageta]]

(3a) is identical to (2a), but (3b) is different from (2b) in that *Hanako-ni* is not present. Thus the controller of *PRO* in (3b) as well as that in (3a) is correctly determined by the Minimal Distance Principle. In the *te-ager* construction, *Taroo* is the closest NP c-commanding *PRO* and correctly chosen as the controller of *PRO*.

We also showed that NP-*ni* in the *te-moraw* construction and that in the *te-ager* construction are also different in categorial status. The behavior of the floating quantifier provides the evidence that NP-*ni* in the *te-ager* construction is PP, while NP-*ni* in the *te-moraw* construction is NP.

For detailed discussion and arguments, see Arisaka, Homma, Hoshi, Matsuoka and Takeda (1992) contained in this volume.