Summaries of the Papers Read at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society

On the Passivisability of Periphrastic Causative Sentences
Mai Osawa, Masaru Kanetani, and Nobukatsu Yoshida

This joint research deals with the passivisability of periphrastic causative sentences with the verb *make* (henceforth, *make* causatives).   Some *make* causatives can be passivised as shown in (1a), and others cannot as shown in (1b):

(1)   a.   Tom was made to work (by Mary).

   b.   ? The mushrooms were made to come out (by the rain).

In (1a), the passive sentence of *make* causatives is grammatical, whereas in (1b) the acceptability of the passive sentence is degraded.   This contrast suggests that there are two types of *make* causatives: one that can be passivised, and the other that cannot.

In relation to the passivisability of causative sentences, it is interesting to compare *force* causatives with *cause* causatives.   Consider the following:

(2)   a.   He was forced to resign by Russia's conservative parliament.

   b.   * Body temperature is caused to drop by aspirin.

The examples in (2) show that *force* causatives can be passivised (e.g. (2a)), whereas *cause* causatives cannot (e.g. (2b)).   This contrasting behaviour is parallel to the contrast in *make* causatives in (1).   In addition, dictionaries define that the causative verb *make* has the meaning of *force* and *cause*.   For convenience, we refer to the *make* causative of the *force* causative meaning as *make*$_F$ causatives, and the *make* causative of the *cause* causative meaning as *make*$_C$ causatives.   *Make*$_F$ causatives can be passivised and *make*$_C$ causatives cannot.

Following Fujimoto (1995), we assume that *make*$_F$ and *make*$_C$ causatives have complement structures as follows:

(3)   a.   Mary made [Tom$_i$][PRO$_i$ work].   [*make*$_F$ causative]

   b.   The rain made [the mushrooms come out].   [*make*$_C$ causative]

The structure in (3a) indicates that the object NP and the bare infinitival VP following it independently form a syntactic unit.   In (3b), the bracketed phrase, the complement of *make*$_C$ causatives, forms a unit as a whole.

Since the meaning of *make*$_F$ causatives and that of *force* causatives are similar, it is predictable that the semantic similarity is reflected in their grammatical behaviours. Likewise, from their semantic similarity, we can predict that *make*$_C$ and *cause* causatives show some similar behaviour.   These predictions are supported by the following facts. First, the passivisability of *make* causatives and that of *force/cause* causatives are parallel, as seen in (1) and (2).

Second, *make*$_F$ and *force* causatives cannot express unintentional causations, while *make*$_C$ and *cause* causatives can.   A brief look at the following examples:

(4)   a.   John {deliberately/*accidentally} made Mary do the dishes.

         b.   John {deliberately/*accidentally} forced Mary to break the vase.

(5)   a.   George {deliberately/accidentally} made the elephant die by shooting the gun at it.

         b.   John {*deliberately/accidentally} caused Mary to pick up her books and run.

The examples in (4) show that in *make*$_F$ and *force* causative sentences, *deliberately*, an adverb that denotes the intentionality of the subject, can be inserted whereas *accidentally*, an adverb that expresses the unintentionality of the subject, cannot. Meanwhile, as the sentences in (5) show, *accidentally* can be compatible with *make*$_C$ and *cause* causatives. That is, *make*$_F$ and *force* causatives cannot express unintentional causations, while *make*$_C$ and *cause* causatives can. Thus, the compatibility of these adverbs with causative sentences corresponds.

Finally, we have already seen that in *make*$_F$ causatives the object NP and the VP following it do not form a unit, as in (3a). Similarly, the object NP and the *to*-infinitive in the complement of *force* causatives do not form a unit as shown in (6):

(6)   Mary will force [John][to leave], but I don't think she'll force Rex (*to).

The example in (6) indicates that the infinitival *to* cannot be stranded in the *but* clause. Thus, in *force* causatives, the object NP forms a unit independently of the *to*-infinitive. This behaviour is the same as that of *make*$_F$ causatives. On the other hand, the complement of *cause* causatives forms a unit as a whole. Consider the following:

(7)   What a sense of guilt caused is [John to withdraw from Mary].

In (7), the bracketed phrase, the complement of *cause* causatives, appears in the focus position of the pseudo-cleft sentence. Thus, it forms a unit as a whole. If the object NP is extracted from the unit, the sentence is ungrammatical as in (8):

(8)   * What a sense of guilt caused John is [to withdraw from Mary].

From these parallel behaviours of *make* causatives and *force*/*cause* causatives, we conclude that *make*$_F$ and *force* causative have the same complement structure, and the complement structure of *make*$_C$ and *cause* causatives are the same. In (1a), the object of the verb is moved to the subject position, which is typical passivisation. Hence it is grammatical. In contrast, in (1b), the object NP, part of a unit, is extracted from a unit to passivise and hence ungrammatical.

SELECTED REFERENCE

Fujimoto, Shigeyuki (1995) "Shieki Kobun," *Eibunpo eno Izana*i, ed. by Takeo Saito, Shosuke Haraguchi, and Hidekazu Suzuki, 167-181, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.