3-1994

Predicate union and the syntax of Japanese causatives

Stanley Dubinsky

University of South Carolina - Columbia, dubinsky@sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ling_facpub

Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Publication Info

Published in *Journal of Linguistics*, Volume 30, Issue 1, 1994, pages 43-79.

Dubinsky, S. (1994). Predicate union and the syntax of Japanese causatives. *Journal of Linguistics*, 30(1), 43-79.

Copyright © 1994 Cambridge University Press. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=LIN>

This Article is brought to you by the Linguistics, Program of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

Predicate union and the syntax of Japanese causatives¹

STANLEY DUBINSKY

University of South Carolina

(Received 10 October 1993; revised 29 March 1994)

This paper presents a monoclausal, multipredicate analysis of Japanese causatives, adopting the fundamental assumptions of Relational Grammar. Evidence is provided for the existence of two distinct classes of causatives, distinguished on the basis of the agentivity of the matrix subject. It is also demonstrated that the surface case marking of the causee is constrained by its relative status to the matrix subject with respect to a set of Proto-Agent entailments (as proposed in Dowty 1991).

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper adopts an approach to multipredicate structures first proposed in Davies & Rosen (1988), and demonstrates its applicability to Japanese causative constructions. It will show that a relational analysis can account in an insightful way for the grammatical properties exhibited by the dependents of the causative construction; properties only hinted at by an examination of surface case marking and thematic roles, and often obscured by them. It will also demonstrate that a proper account of case marking must recognize the existence of two distinct classes of causatives, Agentive and Non-agentive, and applies insights into argument structure proposed in Dowty (1991). Other particular claims made in this analysis are: (i) Japanese has (regardless of surface case alternation) only a single syntactic rule of causative formation, (ii) all causees (regardless of their surface case marking) are direct objects at an abstract level of representation, and (iii) causees and passive Agents can be distinguished syntactically despite the apparent identity of their case

[1] The overall shape of this analysis is drawn from my dissertation (Dubinsky 1985a), and I am indebted to Carol Rosen, my dissertation director, for her advice, inspiration and encouragement then and since, to Bill Davies for his input into that process and continued involvement, and to Masayoshi Shibatani for introducing me to many aspects of Japanese syntax. In the course of revising this document several times, I received invaluable comments and suggestions from Judith Aissen, Sam Bayer, Matthew Dryer, Shoko Hamano, Bill Ladusaw, Susumu Kuno, Shige-Yuki Kuroda, Yasunori Morishima, Keiko Muromatsu, Paul Postal and two anonymous reviewers for *Journal of Linguistics*. My gratitude to the above individuals is not meant to attribute to them any responsibility for the ideas expressed here, for which I alone am accountable. Here at the University of South Carolina, Eijun Senaha has provided enormous help in clarifying some of the thornier data issues. Finally, I acknowledge the assistance of Ho Han and the support of the University of South Carolina Linguistics Program in the preparation of this revision.

marking. Section 2 introduces the relational approach to multipredicate clauses, based on Davies & Rosen (1988). Sections 3–5 present an analysis of Japanese causatives and show how the thematic property of [protagonist control] figures crucially into the correct analysis. Section 6 argues for a semantically distinct Agentless causative, and shows how seemingly aberrant case-marking patterns can be explained by reference to Proto-Agent properties of the sort proposed in Dowty (1991). Finally, section 7 demonstrates the inadequacy of case marking and/or thematic roles alone in accounting for the various grammatical properties of the causee in this construction.

2. INTRODUCTION TO CLAUSE UNION

This section presents a brief survey of unions in general, discussing the type of construction to which the label is applied, the universal parameters within which these structures occur, and the formal representation adopted for them here.

2.1 *The nature of union*

The term UNION as it is used in Relational Grammar (RG) is most often the label for the structure of syntactic causatives of various languages. This term refers to the fact that such constructions behave in some ways as biclausal structures, and in other ways as though they were a single clause. Thus, a Japanese causative sentence, such as (1), seems to be halfway between a monoclausal construction and an embedded one.

- (1) Sensei wa gakusei o hayaku kaer-aseta.
 teacher TOP student ACC early go.home-made
 'The teacher made the students go home early.'

In (1), the nominals *gakusei* 'student' and *sensei* 'teacher' behave in some ways as the arguments of distinct predicates. In other respects, they appear to be the dependents of a single clause. Thus, the causee *gakusei* is both the subject of the predicate *kaer-* 'go.home' and the direct object of the entire clause.

2.2 *Representation of union*

Work in the RG framework over the previous decade (Rosen 1983; Gibson & Raposo 1986; Davies & Rosen 1988) has identified universal parameters which apply to all union constructions. Gibson & Raposo (1986) ascertained that the embedded subject (hereafter, 1) is the only embedded argument of a union clause which can be REVALUED (assigned a new grammatical relation (GR)). They also determined that this revaluation can be either to direct object (2) or to indirect object (3), and that the choice of GR is fixed on a language and/or construction specific basis. Rosen (1983) extends this

typology to include the possibility that the embedded 1 of a union not be revalued at all. In such a case, this nominal is put *en chômage* by the matrix 1 (if there is one).² The universal parameters of union constructions are stated in (2).

- (2) (a) The embedded 1 may be revalued or not.
 (b) If the embedded 1 is revalued, it is revalued as a 2 or a 3.

Other embedded nominals either retain their embedded GR into the final stratum of the clause or acquire the *Chômeur* (Cho) relation (in case their embedded GR is assumed by revaluation of the embedded 1). For example, an embedded final 2 will be a union stratum 2 unless the embedded 1 is revalued to 2, in which case it will be a Cho.

In most of the RG literature prior to Davies & Rosen (1988), unions are represented as structures having two clauses initially which collapse into one clause finally. However, the biclausal formalization of union suffers from several drawbacks. For example, there is no direct evidence that the embedded clause actually bears a GR, nor evidence as to what that GR might be, if it existed. Also, the GR borne by the embedded clause (whatever it might be) DISAPPEARS in the union stratum under the biclausal analysis, and this too must be stipulated. Davies & Rosen (1988) give several additional reasons for treating unions as single-clause structures, rather than embeddings of multiple clauses, i.e. all the predicates and nominals are dependents of the same clause node. The embedded predicate heads a P(predicate) arc in the first (hereafter, c1) stratum. The causative predicate does not head any arc in the c1 stratum; the first stratum in which the causative predicate bears a GR is, by definition, the union stratum. In addition to the causative predicate itself, the 1 subcategorized for by that predicate heads no arc in any pre-union stratum. The first stratum in which a predicate heads a P arc is defined as its P-INITIAL stratum. Correspondingly, the last stratum in which a predicate heads a P arc is its P-FINAL stratum. Note that in a multipredicate construction, the P-initial or P-final strata of a given predicate are not necessarily the initial or final strata of the clause. The RELATIONAL NETWORK (RN) of (1) is as follows:

(3)		I	P
P	I	2	Cho
-sase	sensei	gakusei	kaer-

Sensei and *gakusei* both head P-initial 1 arcs. The strata in which a given

[2] *CHÔMEUR* (Cho) is the grammatical relation that arises when the GR borne by a clausal dependent is assumed by another dependent of the same clause. The Cho relation is MOTIVATED where retention of a GR would result in a violation of STRATAL UNIQUENESS (i.e., only one dependent can bear a given GR in a given stratum). Acquiring the Cho relation is technically a DEMOTION; i.e., Chos are classed with Obliques with regard to accessibility to syntactic phenomena (e.g. relativization, clefting).

predicate heads a P arc from its P-SECTOR. The c1 stratum in which *kaer-* in (3) heads a P arc is the INNER P-sector; the c2 stratum in which the causative predicate *-sase* heads a P arc is, in addition to being the union stratum, the FINAL or OUTER P-sector. In the union (c2) stratum of (3), the predicate of the inner P-sector, *kaer-*, is put *en chômage*, and the inner P-final 1, *gakusei*, revalues to 2.

Union is characterized then by the introduction of a predicate into a non-initial stratum of a clause, and it is not available for every predicate. For example, the Spanish verb *querer* 'want' is a union trigger, while *parecer* 'seem' is not, as evidenced by the clitic-climbing facts in (4b) and (5b) (see Aissen & Perlmutter 1976/1983).

- (4) (a) Luis quiere comer-las.
 want to.eat-them
 (b) Luis las quiere comer.
 them want to.eat
 'Luis wants to eat them.'
- (5) (a) Luis parece haber-las comido.
 seems to.have-them eaten
 (b) *Luis las parece haber comido.
 them seem to.have eaten
 'Luis appears to have eaten them.'

The ability of *querer* to trigger union in (4b) is a lexical property of the verb.

The mechanism by which a verb is specified (or not specified) as a union predicate in the lexicon needs not be very complex, and can be folded into the subcategorization requirements that all verbs generally impose on their RNs. In principle, a P arc might originate in ANY stratum, and it is the capacity to originate in a non-initial stratum which characterizes union predicates. Of course, the vast majority of verbs in any language (like *parecer* in (5)) are required to head a P arc beginning in the first stratum of a clause. Verbs which are OPTIONAL union predicates, such as *querer* 'want' in (4), have the first coordinate of their P arc left unspecified. Finally, affixal predicates such as the Japanese causative *-sase*, which can ONLY appear as union predicates, have their P arcs specified to begin in a post-initial stratum.

3. JAPANESE CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Almost any basic Japanese verb can be causativized by attaching the inflection *-(s)ase* to the verb stem.³ However, the facts are more complex than (1) suggests. Causatives of transitive verbs differ from those of intransitives,

[3] The initial consonant of *-sase* drops when affixed to a verb stem ending in a consonant. The addition of *-sase* to *tabe* 'eat' and *kaer* 'go home' yields the following: *tabe + sase = tabesase*; *kaer + sase = kaerase*

and three classes of intransitive verbs can be distinguished with respect to the case marking of a causee. In causatives formed from transitive verbs, the causee is marked with dative *ni* and the direct object of the embedded verb has accusative *o*.

- (6) (a) Seito ga eigo o hanasita.
pupil NOM English ACC spoke
'The pupils spoke English.'
(b) Sensei ga seito ni eigo o hanasasetta.
teacher NOM pupil DAT English ACC speak.made/let
'The teacher made/let the pupils speak English.'

Causativized intransitive verbs divide into three classes with respect to case marking of the causee. For some, the causee can only be marked with *ni*:

- (7) (a) Tanaka ga denwa-sita.
NOM telephone-did
'Tanaka telephoned.'
(b) Katyoo wa Tanaka ni/*o denwa-sasetta.
boss TOP DAT/ACC telephone-do.made/let
'The department chief made/let Tanaka telephone.'

For some, it is marked with *o*:

- (8) (a) Mariko wa yorokondeita.
TOP was.happy
'Mariko was happy.'
(b) Taroo ga Mariko o/*ni yorokobasetta.
NOM ACC/DAT happy.made
'Taro made Mariko happy.'

And for others, it may be marked with either *ni* or *o*:

- (9) (a) Tanaka no hisyo wa hayaku kaetta.
GEN secretary TOP early went.home
'Tanaka's secretary has gone home early.'
(b) Tanaka wa hisyo o hayaku kaerasetta.
TOP secretary ACC early go.home.made
'Tanaka made his secretary go home early.'
(c) Tanaka wa hisyo ni hayaku kaerasetta.
TOP secretary DAT early go.home.let
'Tanaka let his secretary go home early.'

Several observations can be made about the causative data. Transitive verbs only exhibit a single pattern of causative formation, while in causatives formed from intransitive verbs, the causee is marked with *ni*, with *o*, or

optionally with *ni* or *o*. With intransitives allowing either *ni* or *o* marking of a causee, case marker choice correlates with the selection of a certain modality: the *o* causatives typically express a stronger type of causation than *ni* causatives. In (9), the *o* causative is translated as 'make', while the *ni* causative is roughly translated as 'let' or 'permit'. The late 1960s and early 1970s saw a spirited debate in the literature as to the precise semantic characterization of the two causatives. Kuroda (1965) argued for a 'non-coercive' versus 'coercive' interpretation; Kuno (1973) argued that it translates into a 'let' versus 'make' distinction, while Shibatani (1973) claimed that the distinction is non-discrete. Without going into the details of the various proposals, suffice it to say that there is a real semantic difference between *ni* and *o* causatives, and that this difference needs to be reflected in any analysis of the construction. For clarity, I will adopt Kuno's terminology and refer to them as 'let' and 'make' causatives, respectively. For causatives formed from transitive verbs, the causee is normally marked with *ni*, and the interpretation is ambiguous between 'make' and 'let'.

Alongside the syntactic patterning of causatives in connection with their case marking, one can also distinguish three semantic types of causatives, each with its own distribution. There is the most familiar 'make' causative, which involves a sentient, volitional subject. This is well illustrated by the (b) sentences in (8) and (9) and by the 'make' interpretations of the (b) sentences in (6) and (7). The second semantic type is the 'let' causative just alluded to. It also takes as its subject a sentient, volitional agent (i.e. the one who grants permission or does the persuading). This causative is illustrated in the 'let' interpretations of (6b) and (7b) and in (9c). The third semantic type, which has not been identified as such in the literature, is one which takes a non-agentive subject. This subject, if non-sentient, can be interpreted as the 'cause' (rather than the 'causer') of the event. On the other hand, if the subject of this non-agentive or 'agentless' causative is human, then it is interpreted as 'allowing' the event, or 'not preventing' the event from happening. Observe (10) and (11):

(10) (= Kuno 1978: (22))

Meirii no kotoba wa kare ni mukasi no koibito
 Mary GEN words TOP him DAT past GEN sweetheart
 no koto o omoidasaseto.
 GEN thing ACC recall.caused
 'Mary's words caused him to recall his old sweetheart.'

(11) (a) Watasi wa kodomo o sinaseta.

I TOP child ACC die.caused

'I allowed my child to die.' [was unable to prevent it]

(b) Taroo wa Ziroo ni hiru made nemuraseta.

TOP DAT noon until sleep.caused

'Taro left Ziro to sleep until noon.'

Example (10) contains an agentless causative having a non-sentient subject. While *Meirii no kotoba* 'Mary's words' are the direct 'cause' of his recalling his old sweetheart, they are certainly not the volitional 'causer' of such. Mary cannot, strictly speaking, be deemed the causer of the event either. While she may have in fact said something with the specific intent of causing the event in question, (10) would still be true even if she had no idea whatsoever that her words would have such an effect. In agentless causatives having a sentient subject, such as (11), the subject is interpreted as having no control over the event: either by default, (11a), or by design, (11b).

Insofar as *-sase* might be translated in (10) as 'make' (i.e. 'Mary's words made him recall...') and in (11b) as 'let' (i.e. 'Taro let Ziro sleep till noon'), one might seek to assimilate these examples to the 'make' and 'let' causative classes, respectively. While this approach has in fact been taken (see Kuno 1978), there are good reasons for not doing so. First of all, many agentless causatives cannot be assimilated to either the 'make' or the 'let' category. Although *sinasetu* is, morphologically speaking, 'cause to die', it certainly does not mean that. Neither does (11a) mean that 'I (volitionally) permitted my child to die'. Rather, it means something akin to 'I was unable to prevent my child from dying'. It is thus necessary to recognize a third semantic class of causatives, and it seems reasonable to suppose that this class is distinguished on the basis of the semantic role assigned to the subject. A second reason for distinguishing agentless causatives is that they are consistently 'extrametrical' to any account of case marking in causatives. Generalizations applying to all cases of agentive 'make' and 'let' causatives find their exceptions among agentless causatives. For this reason, I will first develop an account of the agentive variety, and return to the agentless causative subsequently.

In characterizing the 'let' and 'make' causatives, the following well-known observation can be made: in all 'let' causatives, the causee is marked with *ni*; in 'make' causatives, the causee is marked with *o*, unless the embedded verb is transitive in which case the causee is marked with *ni*.⁴ Thus, while all *o* marked causees are of the 'make' variety, the reverse is not true. This asymmetry results in a transitive causative being potentially ambiguous where an intransitive causative is not. This fact can be made salient by adding the verb *kureru* 'give' to the gerundive (*-te*) form of a causativized predicate; attached in this fashion *kureru* expresses the meaning, roughly, of 'give the favor of...'. The recipient associated with this added predicate varies depending upon whether the causative receives a 'make' or 'let' interpretation. In the case of a 'let' causative, the recipient is understood to be the causee; while in the 'make' causative, the recipient is taken to be someone other than the causer or the causee.

[4] Intransitive verbs (e.g. *denwa-suru* 'telephone') that mark both 'make' and 'let' causees with *ni* are taken up in section 4, where they are shown to be transitive.

- (12) Ziroo ga Taroo ni hayaku kaerasete-kureta.
 NOM DAT early go.home.let-gave
 ‘Ziro gave Taro the favor of letting him go home early.’
- (13) Ziroo ga Taroo o hayaku kaerasete-kureta.
 NOM ACC early go.home.make-gave
 ‘Ziro gave (me) the favor of making Taro go home early.’

In (12), the causee *Taroo* is the understood recipient. In (13), the recipient is someone other than *Ziroo* or *Taroo*. A transitive *ni*-marked causative is predictably ambiguous.

- (14) Ziroo ga Taroo ni mesi o takasete-kureta.
 NOM DAT rice ACC cook.make/let-gave
 ‘Ziro gave Taro the favor of letting him cook the rice.’
 ‘Ziro gave (me) the favor of making Taroo cook the rice.’

In (14), recipient role is assigned most naturally to *Taroo* if the interpretation is ‘let’, and necessarily to someone other than *Ziroo* or *Taroo* if the interpretation is ‘make’.

This treatment of Japanese causatives involves the following proposals: (i) causative union uniformly involves 1-2 revaluation of the embedded subject,⁵ (ii) all *ni* marked causees result from 2-3 retreat, and (iii) 2-3 retreat itself is triggered either by the semantics of the causative construction (i.e. by its having a ‘let’ interpretation) or by the grammar (i.e. by a constraint on two direct objects in the same clause). Finally, 2-3 retreat of a causee is conditioned by the semantic role assigned to it by the inner predicate: only subjects of self-controllable verbs may undergo 2-3 retreat.

Causativized intransitive verbs have two available RNs. An *o* marked causee indicates that the pre-union 1 is revalued to 2 and is a final 2 in the clause, as in (15).

(15) (= 9b))		1	P
	P	1	2
	-sase	Tanaka	hisyo
			Cho
			kaer-

On the other hand, a *ni* marked causee signals the presence of 2-3 retreat, as in (16).

[5] Revaluation of an inner 1 in union constructions is subject to the Union Revaluation Law (Davies & Rosen 1988) which allows an inner 1 to be ‘something else’ (e.g. 2, 3, or Cho) in the union stratum, only if the union predicate initializes its own 1. Choice of revaluation is language (and sometimes construction) particular. Uniform 1-2 revaluation is also attested in Portuguese and Chamorro (Gibson & Raposo 1986).

(16) (= (9c))

		I	P
P	I	2	Cho
P	I	3	Cho
-sase	Tanaka	hisyo	kaer-

To account for the difference in meaning between (9b) and (9c), I propose the following linkage between 2-3 retreat and the permissive semantics of (9c).

(17) 2-3 *Retreat-'Let' Linkage*: If causative *-sase* has the 'let' interpretation, then the 1-2 revaluee demotes to 3.

The analysis thus separates causative union (uniformly 1-2 revaluation) from the *ni* marking of the causee (2-3 retreat), and ties the semantics of 'let' to the latter.

Notice that (17) provides a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for the 'let' interpretation. This is because not all *ni*-marked causees appear in causatives with a 'let' interpretation. Specifically, the causee is marked with *ni* in both the 'let' and 'make' causatives of transitive predicates (recall (6)). Now there are two ways that the mismatch between semantic interpretations and surface case marking could be accounted for. One could propose that the 'let' reading triggers 2-3 retreat, but 2-3 retreat is not necessarily accompanied by the 'let' reading (as in (17)). This allows 2-3 retreat to be induced by other factors (to be discussed shortly). Alternatively, one could posit a biconditional relation between the 'let' interpretation and 2-3 retreat, and introduce a special mechanism for assigning *ni* marking to the causees of transitive causatives which fail to have the 'let' reading. There are a couple of reasons for preferring (17) over the alternative: (i) there is no evidence that the *ni* marked causee of a 'let' causative and that of a 'make' causative are syntactically distinct and plenty of evidence (given in section 7) that they are not distinguishable, and (ii) there are cases in which a causee has *ni* marking without either a 'let' interpretation or an embedded transitive verb to motivate it (these will be taken up in a discussion of 'non-agentive' causatives in section 6). For these reasons, I claim that causative structures having the 'let' interpretation are a subset of causative structures containing 2-3 retreat, and that transitive causatives have one possible RN, in which the embedded subject is revalued to 2 and demotes to 3 (independent of whether the causative morpheme receives the 'make' or 'let' reading). The characterization of a *ni* marked causee as a 1 in the inner P-sector is relatively uncontroversial and is reflected in analyses such as Kuroda (1965), Harada (1973) and Shibatani (1973). The final 3-hood of the nominal is more open to question. Shibatani (1973) and Kuroda (1978) group together all *ni* marked agentive nominals (i.e. transitive causees and passive agents). However, *ni* marked causees and *ni* marked 1-Chos (passive agents) are readily distinguishable by diagnostics such as accessibility to topic marking and cleft formation (see sections 7.1 and 7.2). More controversial yet is the

proposed intermediate 2 relation of the *ni* marked causee, upon which the 2-3 retreat analysis depends. This will be taken up in section 7.5. Before doing so, I show how 2-3 retreat is conditioned by the semantic features of the causee.

4. PROTAGONIST CONTROL, DOUBLE OBJECT CLAUSES, AND *NI* MARKING

Harada's (1973) proposal that a *ni* causative requires its verb to express a self-controllable action is, according to Tonoike (1978), one of the few claims made about causatives which has not thus far encountered any counter-examples. Although this is not strictly true if one includes agentless causatives in the discussion, it does hold for the two causative types being discussed here. The semantic feature [protagonist control] has been shown to play a syntactic role in a number of languages (see Rosen 1984: 62–64; Perlmutter & Postal 1984a: 100–103), and it would appear that Harada's observation about Japanese causatives refers to this feature. Let us assume then that [protagonist control] licenses 2-3 retreat in Japanese 'let' causatives:⁶

- (18) *2-3 Retreat Authorization*: If the subject of the inner predicate of a causative has the feature [+protagonist control], then that nominal may undergo 2-3 retreat.

While (18) AUTHORIZES 2-3 retreat under the appropriate conditions, it does not mandate it. 2-3 retreat is available for all self-controllable intransitive verb causees and can be invoked by the special meaning 'let', in accordance with (17). For example, the subject of a [+protagonist control] verb such as *asobu* 'play' may have a 'let' interpretation, in which case 2-3 retreat is triggered, resulting in *ni* marking of the causee.

- (19) *Keiko wa ototoo ni uti no mae de asobaseta.*
 TOP brother DAT home GEN front LOC play.let
 'Keiko let her little brother play in front of the house.'

If the causative has a 'make' interpretation, then the causee is marked with *o*, there being nothing else in the structure to motivate 2-3 retreat.

- (20) *Keiko wa ototoo o uti no mae de asobaseta.*
 TOP brother ACC home GEN front LOC play.made
 'Keiko made her little brother play in front of the house.'

[6] Although (18) is a stipulation, it is a rather natural one, based on correspondences between thematic properties and syntactic selection laid out in Dowty 1991. Dowty presents 'volitionality' (here, [protagonist control]) as a Proto-Agent entailment that naturally aligns with subjecthood. Accordingly (extending Dowty's account), if [–protagonist control] is a Proto-Patient property that aligns with direct objecthood, we might expect a [–protagonist control] nominal to remain a 2, once demoted to that GR.

On the other hand, the subject of a [–protagonist control] verb such as *odoroku* ‘be surprised’ may not form a ‘let’ causative, since the 2-3 retreat triggered by the interpretation is not licensed for the [–protagonist control] causee.⁷

- (21) Taroo ga Ziroo o/*ni odorokaseta.
 NOM ACC/DAT surprised.made
 ‘Taro made Ziro be surprised.’
 (# ‘Taro let Ziro be surprised.’)

Since most transitive predicates have [+protagonist control] subjects, we find that 2-3 retreat is generally authorized for the causee of a transitive causative.⁸ Transitive causatives would thus, in principle, have the following RN available to them:

(22)		1	2	P
P	I	2	Cho	Cho
P	I	3	Cho	Cho
-sase	sensei	seito	eigo	hanas-

According to (17), a transitive causative sentence with a ‘let’ interpretation, such as (23) below, is predicted to trigger 2-3 retreat and have RN (22).

- (23) Sensei ga seito ni eigo o hanasaseto.
 teacher NOM student DAT English ACC speak.let
 ‘The teacher LET the students speak English.’

Data such as (24) suggest that (17) should not be stated as a biconditional. Save that the causative predicate has a ‘make’ interpretation, (24) is identical to (23).

- (24) Sensei ga seito ni/*o eigo o hanasaseto.
 teacher NOM student DAT/ACC English ACC speak.made
 ‘The teacher MADE the students speak English.’

An account of the ambiguity of (23/24) and the ill-formedness of the double *o*-marked variant of (24), leads to a discussion of well-known constraints on double-accusative structures in Japanese. Some earlier analyses of causatives (e.g. Tonoike 1978) explained (23/24) by means of a surface case marking constraint (the Double *o* Constraint; see Shibatani 1973) that precludes any single clause from having two NPs marked with *o*.

[7] Some normally [–protagonist control] verbs have a [+protagonist control] alternate. For example, the verb *naku* ‘cry’ normally permits only an *o* causative. However, if the subject were an actor who was instructed to cry in a particular scene, then it could be marked with either *o* or *ni* as a causee.

[8] For the few transitive predicates that do NOT assign [+protagonist control] to their subject. This analysis predicts that they cannot form ANY causatives.

However, this constraint cannot account for all the relevant data. Although Japanese tends to avoid double *o* marking, it is not strictly precluded, especially when the two constituents are non-adjacent. Thus, for lexical causatives that are subcategorized for both an initial 2 and an extent locative (e.g. *toosu* 'pass'), the locative advances to 2 and both it and the 2-Cho can be marked with *o*. Examine (25) and its RN (26).⁹

- (25) ? Kono mon o Taroo wa muriyari kono kuruma o toosita.
 this gate ACC TOP forcibly this cart ACC passed
 'Taro forcibly passed this cart through this gate.'
- (26) 1 2 Loc P
 1 Cho 2 P
 Taroo kuruma mon toosu

(25) is stylistically marginal, since it does not avoid double-*o* marking, but is not ungrammatical per se. A modification of the Double *o* Constraint is given in (27).

- (27) *Avoid Double-o Filter*: Avoid *o* marking of two distinct dependents of a single clause.

(27) is similar to Shibatani's (1973) Double-*o* Constraint. However, rather than rule out double-*o* structures absolutely, (27) only says that a non-double-*o* structure will be selected wherever there is a choice.

Alongside (27), it is also necessary to posit the Direct Object Constraint (28) (similar to a proposal in Kuroda 1978). (28) is sensitive to grammatical relations and obligatory (see Poser 1983).

- (28) *Direct Object Constraint*:¹⁰ If nominals *a* and *d* in clause *b* are both P-initial 2s and acting 2s, then *b* is ill-formed.

It is (28) which is most directly responsible for the infelicity of the *o*-marked variant of (24). (28) says that, if a 2 is INITIALIZED in each of two (or more) P-sectors in the same clause (as with transitive causatives), and if neither the causee nor the embedded 2 acquire another term relation (i.e. 1 or 3), then the clause is ungrammatical.¹¹

(28) is needed because a Double *o* Constraint fails to predict the fact that a transitive causee must be *ni* marked, regardless of whether *o* appears on the embedded direct object. This normally occurs when the inner P-final 2 is

[9] In Kuroda 1978, the locative of extent is admitted as a second *o* marked nominal on the basis of its being an 'adverbial'. However, there is good evidence that the locative is a 2 at some level. For arguments supporting the advancement to 2 analysis of the locative of extent, see Dubinsky (1985b).

[10] (28) references the notion ACTING GRx. An acting 2 is a dependent that heads a 2 arc in some stratum and does not head a distinct term arc in a subsequent stratum (i.e. a final 2 or a final 2-Cho: Perlmutter & Postal (1984b) provide a precise definition).

[11] To say that a GRx is INITIALIZED in a P-sector means that the predicate has selected a nominal bearing the GRx relation in the first stratum of that P-sector.

clefted or topicalized. Kuroda (1978) has shown that the causee in a transitive causative cannot be *o* marked, even when the object is clefted ((29) and (30) are adapted from Kuroda (1978: 39)).

- (29) Taroo ga Hanako ni/*o takaseta no wa mesi da.
 NOM DAT/ACC cook.let/made thing TOP rice is
 'The thing Taro let/made Hanako cook is rice.'

The *o* marked variant of (29) is ill-formed even though the embedded object *mesi* is clefted, and the sentence only has one *o* marked nominal. A surface case marking constraint cannot account for this. However, the Direct Object Constraint (28) does predict the unacceptability of *o* marking in (29). If *Hanako* and *mesi* each head P-initial 2 arcs and *Hanako* is a final 2, then they are both acting 2s and (29) with *o* is ill-formed by (28). Therefore, *Hanako* may not be *o* marked in (29). In contrast, if the Direct Object Constraint is not violated, the causee of a transitive causative CAN be marked with *o*, as is seen in (30).

- (30) (a) Taroo ga Hanako ni arukaseta no wa hamabe da.
 NOM DAT walk.made place TOP beach is
 'The place Taro let Hanako walk is on the beach.'
 (b) Taroo ga Hanako o arukaseta no wa hamabe da.
 NOM ACC walk.made place TOP beach is
 'The place Taro made Hanako walk is on the beach.'

Recall, from (25) and (26), that an *o* marked locative of extent is an initial oblique that advances to 2. While *Hanako* and *hamabe* are both acting 2s and *Hanako* heads a P-initial 2 arc in the Union stratum, *hamabe* is not a P-initial 2. Therefore, the Direct Object Constraint has nothing to say about (30b), and the sentence is well-formed. That (30b) does not violate the Direct Object Constraint is readily observable from the RN that represents the clause preceding the pronominal element *no* 'place'.

(31)		I	Loc	P
		I	2	P
<hr/>				
P	I	2	Cho	Cho
-sase	Taroo	Hanako	[hamabe]	aruk-

The Direct Object Constraint can also explain why some apparent intransitive verbs only occur in *ni* causatives.

- (32) Tanaka wa Hanako ni/*o denwa-saseta.
 TOP DAT/ACC telephone-do.made/let
 'Tanaka made/let Hanako telephone.'

These *ni* causative intransitive verbs (including *sutoraiki-suru* 'strike' and *zesutyaa-suru* 'gesture') superficially resemble combinations of θ -assigning

VERBAL NOUNS (VNs) and the 'light verb' *suru* 'do' (e.g. *benkyoo-suru* 'study-do', see Grimshaw & Mester 1988).¹² Like genuine VNs (e.g. *benkyoo*), they regularly allow their nominal to be marked by *o*.

- (33) Tanaka wa denwa (o) sita.
 TOP telephone (ACC) did
 'Tanaka telephoned.'

However, (33) is felt to be more natural when the *o* marker is PRESENT. This contrasts with true VN-*suru* verbs, such as *benkyoo-suru* 'study', for which the form with the VN NOT *o* marked is more natural. Suppose that these are not intransitive VNs combined with the 'light verb' *suru*. Rather, assume they are simply combinations of the verb *suru* 'do, make' and a direct object. On this view, the element *denwa*, in (32) and (33), is really an initial 2 in a clause whose predicate is the transitive verb *suru*.

Reinforcing the view of *denwa* in *denwa-suru* as a covert direct object is that it is far more readily topicalizable than VNs (i.e. those that form true compounds with *suru*). Compare (34a and b).

- (34) (a) (Sono) denwa wa Taroo ga sita.
 that phone TOP NOM did
 'As for (that) phone.call, Taro made it.'
 (b) *(Sono) benkyoo wa Taroo ga sita.¹³
 that study TOP NOM did
 'As for (that) study, Taro made it.'

Example (33) thus has the same RN whether or not the *o* marker is overtly present.

- (35) (= (33)) I 2 P
 Tanaka denwa suru

[12] The term VERBAL NOUN is a coinage of Samuel Martin (1975).

[13] If *benkyoo* can be *wa* marked at all (i.e. if (34b) is ever acceptable), it is only when it receives a contrastive reading. As a reviewer points out, both (34a and b) have a grammatical source in which *sono denwa* or *sono benkyoo* appear to head 2-arcs.

- (i) Taroo ga sono denwa o sita.
 NOM that phone.call ACC made.
 'Taro made that phone-call.'
 (ii) Taroo ga sono benkyoo o sita.
 NOM that study ACC made
 'Taro made that study.'

(ii) suggests that *benkyoo* and some other VNs can in fact appear in a structure identical to that given in (35) for *denwa*. Otherwise, *benkyoo* could not be fronted at all or occur with the determiner *sono*. However, *denwa* can ONLY appear as an object, while *benkyoo* is normally a θ -assigning VN in construction with the light verb *suru*. The VN *benkyoo* only appears in a construction like (34b), when pragmatic factors induce a rather marked construction. Hence, the contrastive interpretation noted above.

If (33) is underlyingly transitive, then the behavior of causatives is completely predictable. The causee in (32), like that of any other transitive causative, must undergo 2-3 retreat (regardless of the 'make/let' interpretation) and is marked with *ni*. (32) has RN (36).

(36)		1	2	P
P	1	2	Cho	Cho
P	1	3	Cho	Cho
-sase	Tanaka	Hanako	denwa	s(u ru)

In RN (36), *Hanako* and *denwa* are both P-initial 2s and if *Hanako* remains a 2 after union, the structure is ruled out by the Direct Object Constraint. However, the subject of *denwa-suru* is [+protagonist control], and *Hanako* can demote to 3. Obviously, a surface constraint cannot account for these facts, since *denwa* appears without *o*.¹⁴

5. PROTAGONIST CONTROL AND THE DIRECT OBJECT CONSTRAINT

This section presents additional arguments for two of the claims advanced so far: (i) *ni* causatives are dependent on the [+protagonist control] licensing of 2-3 retreat, and (ii) the Direct Object Constraint as stated is responsible for ruling out *ni* causatives which might otherwise be permitted by the 2-3 retreat licensing. Supporting the first claim, both unergative and unaccusative predicates fail to have *ni* causatives, if the causee is [–protagonist control]. This precludes accounting for the distribution of *o* causatives on the basis of

[14] *Denwa-suru* can have an *o* marked nominal (S. Kuno, personal communication).

- (i) Kimi saki uresisoo-ni nani o denwa-siteita no?
 you before happily what ACC phone-were. doing CMP
 'What were you phoning about happily a minute ago?'

If the nominal *nani* in (i) were an initial 2, then *denwa* could not be, as two initial 2s violate Stratal Uniqueness. However, this nominal is plausibly an Obl-2 advancee. First, *nani o* in (i) is most nearly glossed as 'ABOUT what', and the *o* can be replaced with *ni-tuite* 'about' without any change in meaning. Secondly, as pointed out by a reviewer, the use of *o* in these constrictions is restricted to expressions which denote 'information' (e.g. *siken no kekka* 'exam results' but not *siken* 'exam'). Thus, as an answer to (i), (ii) is possible only with the oblique marker *ni-tuite*, while (iii) can have either *ni-tuite* or *o*.

- (ii) Asita no siken ni-tuite/*o denwa-siteita.
 tomorrow GEN exam about/ACC phone-were. doing
 'I was phoning about tomorrow's exam.'
 (iii) Siken no kekka ni-tuite/o denwa-siteita.
 exam GEN result about/ACC phone-were. doing
 'I was phoning about the exam results.'

This is consistent with the assumption that *nani o* in (i) is an Obl-2 advancee which has put *denwa*, the initial 2, *en chômage*. The avoidance of adjacent *o* marked nominals precludes the *o* marking of *denwa* in (i), when the oblique *nani* is advanced to 2.

the initial GR of the causee. For the second claim, it is shown that initially transitive clauses can indeed form *o* causatives if the Direct Object Constraint is not violated. Finally, the [+protagonist control] condition on 2-3 retreat and Direct Object Constraint rule out causatives altogether for some underlying transitive predicates.

Dubinsky (1985a) presents evidence for two classes of intransitive predicates: unergatives (whose single argument is an initial 1) and unaccusatives (whose single argument is an initial 2). There, it is observed that unergative predicates can appear in the 'adversative passive' construction, while unaccusatives cannot (see Miyagawa (1989) for similar observations). Examples of each class are the unergative *huru* 'precipitate' which yields a grammatical adversative construction, (38a), and the unaccusative *bakuhatu-suru* 'explode' whose adversative is ungrammatical (38b).

- (37) (a) Ame ga hutteiru.
rain NOM is.falling
'It's raining.'
- (b) Bakudan ga bakuhatu-sita.
bomb NOM explode-did
'A bomb exploded.'
- (38) (a) Wareware ga ame ni hurareta.
we NOM rain DAT was.fallen
'It rained on us.' [Lit: 'We were fallen by rain.']
- (b) *Wareware ga bakudan ni bakuhatu-sareta.
we NOM bomb DAT explode-was.done
'A bomb exploded on us.' [Lit: 'We were exploded by a bomb.']

The RNs of (37a and b) are, respectively:

- (39) 1 P
ame huru
- (40) 2 P
1 P
bakudan bakuhatu-suru

Both verbs only form *o* causatives, despite their distinct initial strata. (41) and (42) are from Kuno (1973: 342).

- (41) John ga bakudan o/*ni bakuhatu-saseta.
NOM bomb ACC/DAT explode-do.made
'John made the bomb explode.'
- (42) John wa ame o/*ni huraseru koto ga dekiru.
TOP rain ACC/DAT fall.make thing NOM can
'John can make it rain.'

Both *bakudan* in (41) and *ame* in (42) head P-final 1 arcs in the first P-sector. *Ame* is a 1 initially and *bakudan* advances from 2 to 1 by unaccusative advancement. Both of these causees are revalued to 2 in the union stratum, as are the inner P-final 1s in any Japanese causative. They remain 2s due to the fact that neither *bakuhatu-suru* nor *huru* have the feature [+protagonist control], leaving 2-3 retreat unauthorized for both constructions. (41) and (42) have the following RNs:

(43)			2	P
			I	P
<hr/>				
(44)	P	I	2	Cho
	-sase	John	bakudan	bakuhatu-suru
			I	P
	<hr/>			
	P	I	2	Cho
	-sase	John	ame	huru

Since unaccusative verbs typically have non-volitional subjects, we expect them to form only *o* causatives, in accord with protagonist control licensing of 2-3 retreat. However, while all unaccusative verbs are [–protagonist control], it is not the case that all [–protagonist control] verbs are unaccusative. If (37a) is indeed an unergative clause, then obligatory *o* marking of a causee cannot be attributed to the causee's initial GR. Protagonist control authorization of 2-3 retreat makes the correct predictions, namely that ALL [–protagonist control] verbs will fail to form 'let' causatives (including, of course, the unaccusatives).

Evidence against linking *o* causation with initial intransitivity comes from causatives formed with 2-3 retreat predicates. When the Direct Object Constraint is otherwise satisfied (e.g. via lexical 2-3 retreat), initially transitive verbs can form *o* or *ni* causatives with the concomitant semantic properties observed in (19) and (20). A small class of two-place predicates, typified by *au* 'meet', select a transitive initial stratum and further require that their initial 2 demote to 3 (see Dubinsky 1990). When causativized, 2-3 retreat occurs independently of causativization (in the inner P-sector, controlled by the 2-3 retreat predicate itself). Since the initial 2 of the inner P-sector demotes to 3, the predicate can form a 'make' causative with an *o* marked causee without violating the Direct Object Constraint. This is illustrated in (45) in which *Mitiko* and *John* each head a P-initial 2-arc. *John* demotes to 3 in the inner P-sector, and the Direct Object Constraint is satisfied without the 2-3 retreat of the causee.

- (45) (a) Taroo wa Mitiko o John ni awasetu.
TOP ACC DAT meet.made
'Taro made Mitiko meet John.'

(b)		I	2	P
		I	3	P
<hr/>				
	P	I	2	3
	-sase	Taroo	Mitiko	John
				Cho
				aw-

At the same time, the causee *Mitiko* is [+protagonist control] and can undergo 2-3 retreat. In (46), the 'let' interpretation triggers 2-3 retreat and *Mitiko* is *ni* marked.

- (46) (a) Taroo wa Mitiko ni John ni awaseta.
 TOP DAT DAT meet.led
 'Taro let Mitiko meet John.'

(b)		I	2	P
		I	3	P
<hr/>				
	P	I	2	3
	P	I	3	Cho
	-sase	Taroo	Mitiko	John
				Cho
				aw-

Due to the lexical 2-3 retreat in the inner P-sector, the semantic interpretations 'make' and 'let' are available respectively for *o* and *ni* causatives formed with *au*. We thus see that the Direct Object Constraint, rather than the initial transitivity, determines when the *o* marking of the causee is possible.

The crucial role of [protagonist control] in licensing the *ni* marking of causees is clearly seen through an examination of OPTIONALLY transitive predicates whose subjects are [–protagonist control]. The licensing condition on 2-3 retreat combined with the Direct Object Condition predicts, pace Kuno 1978,¹⁵ that *ni*-marking of transitive 'make' causatives is not available to all transitive causees, but only to those which are [+protagonist control], and that [–protagonist control] verbs should not be able to form transitive causatives at all. Proposals which capture only the fact that *ni*-marked causees must be [+protagonist control] are insufficient.

The evidence comes from emotive verbs such as *yorokobu* 'rejoice', which form either transitive or intransitive constructions:

- (47) (a) Hanako wa yorokonda.
 TOP rejoiced
 'Hanako rejoiced/was happy.'

[15] Kuno provides for these nominals to be *ni* marked on the basis of their being in indirect object position. This approach is mirrored in some recent GB analyses of causee case marking in which dative case is optionally assigned to the causee by the causative predicate itself (see Goodall 1987). While both analyses posit reasonable accounts for getting case onto an extra internal argument, neither is restrictive enough, since dative case does not appear on just any causee that needs it.

- (b) (= Tonoike (1978: (15b))
 Hanako wa Ziroo no si o yorokonda.
 TOP GEN death ACC rejoiced
 'Hanako rejoiced over Ziro's death.'

When intransitive, as in (47a), they can only form *o* marked 'make' causatives:

- (48) (= Tonoike (1978: (21b/19b))
 Taroo wa Hanako o/*ni yorokobaseta.
 TOP ACC/DAT rejoice.made
 'Taro made Hanako glad.'

The *ni* marked variant of (48) is predictably ill-formed, since these emotional state verbs are [–protagonist control] verbs and do not authorize 2-3 retreat of the causee. Crucially, transitive clauses with such verbs CANNOT form causatives at all:

- (49) (= Tonoike (1978: (16b/25b))
 *Taroo wa Hanako o/ni Ziroo no si o yorokobaseta.
 TOP ACC/DAT GEN death ACC rejoice.made/let
 'Taro made/let Hanako rejoice over Ziro's death.'

The ill-formedness of (49) is predicted. Once again, the *ni* marked causative is ruled out because these predicates do not authorize 2-3 retreat of the causee. If the causee *Hanako* does not retreat to 3 and is a final 2, the Direct Object Constraint will be violated. Consequently, no (agentive) causative is possible for these transitive verbs.

Summarizing, we have the following picture of 'agentive' causative constructions:

1. All causative constructions involve a revaluation to 2 of an inner P-final 1.
2. If a causee has the feature [+protagonist control], it may undergo 2-3 retreat.
3. In order for the agentive causative predicate to receive a 'let' interpretation, its 'initial' (or union stratum) 2 must retreat to 3.
4. If two distinct nominals head initial 2-arcs and are both acting 2s, then the construction that contains them is ill-formed.

6. AGENTLESS CAUSATIVES

This discussion has thus far provided a systematic account for the distribution of *ni* and *o* marking on causees. Turning to 'agentless' causatives, we find some generalizations observed earlier to be counter-exemplified. For example, we observed that [–protagonist control] emotive verbs, such as *yorokobu* 'be happy' and *kanasimu* 'grieve', cannot form

transitive causatives because: (i) the causee, being [–protagonist control], cannot undergo 2-3 retreat, (ii) if the causee remains a 2, the Direct Object Constraint is violated. Yet, these verbs can in fact form AGENTLESS transitive causatives (Kuno 1978).

- (50) Taroo wa Hanako ni Ziroo no si
 TOP DAT GEN death
 o kanasimasete-oita.
 ACC grieve.make-left
 ‘Taro left Hanako to grieve over Ziro’s death.’

- (51) (= Morishima 1989: (28))¹⁶
 % Haha no syasin ga Taroo ni kanozyo
 mother GEN photo NOM DAT her
 no si o kanasimaseta.
 GEN death ACC grieve.made
 ‘Mother’s photo made Taro grieve over her death.’

In both (50) and (51), the subject of *-sase* is a non-agent. In (50), Taro neither intentionally caused, nor permitted (or otherwise intended for) Hanako to grieve. Rather, Taro simply did nothing to prevent her from grieving. The subject of (50) is clearly a non-agent, and as far from a ‘causer’ as one might imagine. In (51), while ‘mother’s photo’ may have directly caused Taro’s grief, the photo is not an agent in the volitional sense. The difference between a volitional agent and a cause is made clear from the fact that the latter cannot occur with instrumental phrases.

- (52) (a) Taroo wa (zyooku de) Ziroo o yorokobaseta.
 TOP joke INS ACC be.happy.made
 ‘Taro made Ziro happy (with a joke).’
 (b) Taroo no kotoba wa (*zyooku de) Ziroo
 GEN words TOP joke INS
 o yorokobaseta.
 ACC be.happy.made
 ‘Taro’s words made Ziro happy (*with a joke).’

Another claim made in the discussion of agentive causatives is that the causee is marked with *ni* in all ‘let’ causatives. (53) is an apparent counterexample to this claim, since the causee is marked with *o* and one might translate *-sase* in this case as ‘let’.

- (53) Taroo wa yasai o kusaraseta.
 TOP vegetables ACC rot.let
 ‘Taro let the vegetables rot.’

[16] Sentences such as (51), with an inanimate subject, are found to be unacceptable to some speakers, while others find them to be fairly grammatical. I rely on the judgements of Morishima and his informants in this regard.

However, again it is clear that sentences such as (53) cannot be assimilated to the weak, or permissive, causatives. In (53), Taro did nothing to cause the vegetables to rot, nor did he permit, coerce, or suggest they do so. Taro is NOT a 'causer' in the sense that Taro brought about an event of 'vegetable rotting'. Rather, the event in question occurred through Taro's inaction. Thus, while Taro is a participant in the event in question, he does not play any active role and (53) is best analyzed as an AGENTLESS causative.

We observed that 'let' causatives of intransitive verbs entail *ni* marking (i.e. 2-3 retreat). 2-3 retreat is licensed by [+protagonist control] and intransitive verbs which have [−protagonist control] subjects cannot form *ni* causatives. *Sinpai-suru* 'worry' is such a verb. It can form an *o* marked 'make' causative, but not a *ni* marked 'let' causative.

- (54) (a) Taroo *o* sinpai-saseta.
 ACC worry-do.made
 'I made Taro worry.'
 (b) *Taroo *ni* sinpai-saseta.
 DAT worry-do.let
 ('I permitted Taro to worry.')

However, if *sinpai-suru* is embedded in an agentless causative construction, then *ni* marking of the causee is suddenly possible.

- (55) Taroo *ni* sinpai-sasete-oita.
 DAT worry-do.make-left
 'I left Taro to worry [did nothing to keep him from worrying].'

Data such as (55) render a biconditional link between 2-3 retreat and the 'let' reading impossible.

The existence of two types of causative constructions is further supported by the fact that some verbs can form either agentive or agentless causative constructions, and other verbs can only form one variety or the other. *Omoidasu* 'recall' forms a causative with either a [+sentient] or a [−sentient] subject. (56a) is agentive, while (56b) is not.

- (56) (a) Meirii *wa* kare *ni* mukasi *no* koibito
 Mary TOP him DAT past GEN sweetheart
 no koto *o* omoidasaseta.
 GEN thing ACC recall.made
 'Mary made him recall his old sweetheart.'
 (b) (= Kuno 1978: (22))
 Meirii *no* kotoba *wa* kare *ni* mukasi
 Mary GEN words TOP him DAT past
 no koibito *no* koto *o* omoidasaseta.
 GEN sweetheart GEN thing ACC recall.made
 'Mary's words caused him to recall his old sweetheart.'

On the other hand, *sinu* 'die' only forms an agentless causative. Thus, while 'making someone die' is plausible pragmatically, (57) does not mean that.

- (57) *Watasi wa kodomo o sinaseta.*
 I TOP child ACC die.let
 'I allowed my child to die.' [was unable to prevent it]

The intransitive verb *hikaru* 'shine' only allows an agentive causative construction.

- (58) (a) *Tanaka wa hikooki no biyoku o migaite hikarasetta.*
 Tanaka plane GEN tail ACC polish shine.made
 'Tanaka polished the plane's tail and made it shine.'
 (b) **Taiyoo no hikari wa hikooki no biyoku o hikarasetta.*
 sun GEN light TOP plane GEN tail ACC shine.made
 'The sunlight made the plane's tail shine.'

The subject of (58b), *taiyoo no hikari*, is [−sentient], and is for this reason ill-formed. It is therefore a property of the predicate *hikaru* that it does not form an agentless causative.

We have several good reasons for treating agentive and agentless causatives as separate classes: (i) agentless causatives are not readily interpretable as either 'make' or 'let' clauses, (ii) causatives having non-volitional and/or non-sentient subjects counterexemplify generalizations holding for agentive causatives, and (iii) some predicates are restricted to forming causatives of the agentless variety and others can only form causatives of the agentive variety. These facts are all in accord with the following position: there are two related, but lexically distinct, causative predicates. The two causative predicates, both pronounced *-sase*, are both union predicates, both have the general meaning 'cause', and both introduce an argument which heads a P-initial 1 arc. They are distinct in that one selects a [+protagonist control] subject and the other does not. This is represented in (59).

- (59) (a) agentive *-sase*: selects a [+protagonist control] subject.
 (b) agentless *-sase*: selects a [−protagonist control] subject.

The distinction of two lexical entries for *-sase* necessitates some revision of (18) 2-3 Retreat Authorization. While it is obvious, based on (55) and (56b), that this condition on 2-3 retreat cannot be maintained in its current form, 2-3 retreat is in fact constrained in agentless causatives as well and we need to account for it. For agentless causatives, the following contrast obtains: (i) emotive verbs (e.g. *yorokobu* 'be happy') can form *o* marked agentive causatives or *ni* marked agentless causatives, and (ii) verbs which take a [−sentient] subject (e.g. *kusaru* 'rot') only allow *o* marked causatives (both in agentive and agentless). Note that (i) [protagonist control] only licenses 2-3 retreat when the matrix subject (of *-sase*) is itself marked [+protagonist

control], and (ii) another prototypical subject property, [sentience], is invoked in the nonagentive cases.

Suppose, following Dowty 1991, that there is a set of prototypical subject properties (Proto-Agent properties), and that [protagonist control] and [sentience] are in this set. Suppose further, that 2-3 retreat is constrained by the semantic salience (in terms of these properties) of the causee relative to the subject of *-sase*. Under this view, 2-3 retreat is licensed only when the causee is equal to or greater than the subject of *-sase* with respect to these particular Proto-Agent entailments. Thus, when the subject of *-sase* is [+protagonist control], the causee must also possess this feature in order to undergo 2-3 retreat; when the subject of *-sase* is [–protagonist control], the causee need only be [+sentient]. We might restate the condition on 2-3 retreat in the following way:

- (60) *2-3 Retreat Authorization (revised)*: A 2 in the P-initial stratum of *-sase* may retreat to 3, only if the nominal heading the 2-arc meets or exceeds the subject (i.e. proto-Agent) entailments of the P-initial 1.

In causatives formed from emotive predicates, which have [+sentient] but [–protagonist control] subjects, (60) straightforwardly and correctly predicts the causee to be able to undergo 2-3 retreat only when the subject of *-sase* is specified as [–protagonist control]. This revision also has the fortunate consequence of tying the authorization of 2-3 retreat in causatives to conditions holding in the initial stratum of the causative predicate itself. The ‘let’ interpretation for agentive *-sase* is still tied to 2-3 retreat in the predicted way.

- (61) *2-3 Retreat-‘Let’ Linkage (revised)*: If AGENTIVE causative *-sase* has the ‘let’ interpretation, then the 1-2 revaluee demotes to 3.

All other facts about causative constructions and their case marking are held to be attributable to general properties of Union and the constraints and filters outlined previously. Causative union is still claimed to involve revaluation of the inner subject to 2, and the Direct Object Constraint is held to be a property of Japanese grammar, and not linked to any particular lexical entry.

7. DIAGNOSTICS AND PREDICTIONS

In this section, I argue that the present analysis of causatives predicts the proper interaction of causatives with several syntactic phenomena. The final 3-hood of *ni* marked ‘let’ causees is affirmed by their interaction with cleft formation and topic marking. The behaviour of causees with respect to *-nagara* equi and Honorification facts is shown to be evidence for their heading final 1 arcs in the inner P-sector (and thereby, evidence against a lexical analysis of causatives). Finally, the claim that all *ni* marked causees

are 2s is supported by the ability of certain nominals to advance to 1 to the exclusion of others.

7.1 Working 1-hood of the causee: *wa* marking

Sentence initial nominals marked with *wa* can have either topic or contrastive readings, with topic reading being more restricted. Any *wa* marked nominal that can receive a topic reading can also receive a contrastive reading. The reverse is not true. The ability of a particular *wa* marked nominal to be well-formed in a discourse initial question is taken to be an indication that it may receive the topic reading (see Dubinsky 1990).

Monostratal 1s and 2s, otherwise marked with *ga* and *o*, are freely *wa* marked in discourse initial questions, and are well-formed topics. In contrast, *ni* marked nominals behave rather distinctly. While they all can receive a topic reading if they retain *ni* before *wa*, differences show up when marked with *wa* alone. Monostratal 3s marked with *wa* alone can only be contrastive. 1-Chos of simple passives nominals are judged less acceptable with bare *wa* on either reading. The following table summarizes the facts:

(62)	Contrastive w/ bare <i>wa</i>	Topic w/ bare <i>wa</i>
Monostratal 1 (<i>ga</i>)	Yes	Yes
Monostratal 2 (<i>o</i>)	Yes	Yes
Monostratal 3 (<i>ni</i>)	Yes	??
Locative (<i>ni</i>)	Yes	??
1-Cho (<i>ni</i>)	??	??

O marked causees, which head 2 arcs finally, are expected to behave like monostratal 1s and 2s. This prediction is, not surprisingly, born out in (63) in which *Hanako* may receive the topic interpretation (i).

- (63) *Hanako wa dare ga odorokaseta?*
 TOP who NOM surprise.made
 (i) 'As for Hanako, who surprised her?'
 (ii) 'Hanako (as opposed to s.o. else), who surprised her?'

The case of *ni* marked causees is more complex. Observe (64):

- (64) (a) *Ziroo (ni) wa dare ga tegami o kakaseta?*
 DAT TOP who NOM letter ACC write.made
 (i) 'As for Ziro, who made him write the letter?'
 (ii) 'Ziro (as opposed to s.o. else), who made him write the letter?'
 (b) *Ziroo (ni) wa dare ga tegami o kakasete-kureta?*
 DAT TOP who NOM letter ACC write.let-gave
 (i) 'As for Ziro, who let him write the letter?'
 (ii) 'Ziro (as opposed to s.o. else), who let him write the letter?'

As they can appear marked with *ni wa* or *wa* alone, they contrast with 1-Chos (passive agents).¹⁷ Also, the topic interpretation is available to them with bare *wa*, so they are distinguished from monostratal 3s and Locatives. Thus, in contrast with the predicted behavior of other *ni* marked nominals, *ni* marked causees behave like final 1s and 2s, namely: they may be *wa* marked without *ni* and receive a topic reading. Given these facts, what governs the behavior of *ni* marked causees? Under the present analysis, they head 1 arcs initially and 3 arcs finally. They can thus be grouped with monostratal 1s in the class of WORKING 1s (i.e. 1s which head a final term (1, 2, 3) arc; Perlmutter (1984)). The conditions given in (62) can be revised as follows: a WORKING 1 can be marked by *wa* alone and receive a topic reading. There is independent evidence suggesting this to be true. The *ni* marked subjects of 1-3 inversion predicates behave the same as *ni* marked causees (*wakaru* 'understand' and other predicates have been so analyzed in Perlmutter 1984). They are marked with *ni wa* or *wa* alone, and have a topic reading in both cases.¹⁸

- (65) Taroo (ni) wa dono gengo ga wakaru?
 (DAT) TOP which language NOM understand
 (i) 'As for Taro, which language does he understand?'
 (ii) 'Taro (opposed to s.o. else), which language does he understand?'

[17] (64) is evidence against treating all *ni* marked embedded subjects the same, as done in analyses such as Shibatani (1973; agent *ni* marking) and Kuroda (1978; subject *ni* marking). There are even stronger reasons for distinguishing between *ni* marked causees and passive chômeurs. For some speakers, a topicalized *ni* causee is deemed LESS acceptable when it retains *ni* before *wa*, and the embedded verb is intransitive.

- (i) Hanako (?? ni) wa dare ga hayaku kaeraseta?
 DAT TOP who NOM early made.go.home
 'As for Hanako, who let her go home early?'

This contrasts with passive chômeurs, which almost always retain *ni* before *wa*.

- (ii) Kyojin ??(ni) wa dare ga makasareta?
 Giants DAT TOP who NOM was.beaten
 'As for the Giants, who was beaten by them?'

While preference for bare *wa* marking in (i) is not directly accounted for by this analysis, it does firmly establish the distinction between *ni* marked chômeurs and *ni* marked causees upon which an account could be based.

[18] (65) would be stronger evidence for the working 1 proposal were it not for the fact that the variant of (65) in which *Taroo* is not *ni* marked has another potential source.

- (i) Taroo ga eigo ga yoku wakaru.
 NOM English NOM well understand
 'It is Taro who understands English quite well.'

However, a *ga* marked source can only have a FOCUS reading. Hence, bare *wa* in (65) with a topic reading should come from the *ni* marked source. It is nonetheless difficult to argue conclusively for this point based solely on evidence from 1-3 inversion predicates.

While this evidence is suggestive, it is not by itself conclusive (see note 17). However, data from ‘adversative passive’ constructions (Dubinsky 1993) show that P-FINAL IS which are final Chômeurs (and also marked with the postposition *ni*) CANNOT appear without their *ni* marker, indicating that the facts presented in (64) are indeed best accounted for by appeal to the notion ‘working 1’ (i.e. that the causee is an initial 1 and a final 3).

7.2 Final relation of the causee: Cleft formation

In this analysis, *o* marked causees are claimed to be final 2s, and their behavior with respect to cleft formation confirms this, i.e., they drop their case marker when clefted.

- (66) Taroo ga yorokobaseta no wa Hanako (*o) desu.
 NOM be.happy.made one TOP ACC is
 ‘The one who Taro made happy is Hanako.’

3s and Locatives are freely clefted and always drop their *ni* marking. Clefted *ni* marked causees exhibit this same behavior confirming that they are final 3s. Observe (67).¹⁹

- (67) Sensei ga eigo o hanasasetta no wa Mitiko (*ni)
 teacher NOM English ACC speak.made/let one TOP DAT
 desu.
 is
 ‘The one whom the teacher made/let speak English is Mitiko.’

The behavior of *ni* marked causees contrasts with that of passive 1-Chos. Passive 1-Chos are less able to form clefts and always retain their *ni* marker when they do. In (68a), the clefted 1-Cho *ano doroboo* is *ni* marked, and the sentence is still not particularly felicitous. In (68b), it lacks a postposition and the sentence is completely ungrammatical.

- (68) (a) ?Tanaka ga korosareta no wa ano doroboo ni deatta.
 NOM was.killed one TOP that thief DAT was
 ‘The one who Tanaka was killed by was that thief.’
 (b) *Tanaka ga korosareta no wa ano doroboo deatta.
 NOM was.killed one TOP that thief was
 ‘The one who Tanaka was killed by was that thief.’

The contrast between the passive clefts in (68) and the causative cleft in (67) argues against assimilating the *ni* marking of passive chômeurs and causees. The clefted passive chômeur in (68) and the clefted causee in (67) are both initial subjects and agents. Their distinct syntactic behavior in cleft constructions must therefore be due to other factors.

[19] Obviously, (67) is consistent with the claim that the causee is a Locative. However, since Oblique relations can only arise in initial strata and since a *ni* marked causee is an embedded 1, it could only be a final 3 or a 1-Cho.

7.3 *P-final 1-hood: Control of subject equi*

In Dubinsky (1985a), it is established that the subject-controller of a subordinate-*nagara* 'while' clause must be a final 1.²⁰ Applying this diagnostic to causative constructions, we can determine whether only CLAUSE-final IS control equi, or whether ANY P-sector final 1 can do so. (69) and (70) demonstrate that either the matrix subject or the causee may control the subject position of a -*nagara* adverbial clause.

- (69) Tanaka wa Yamada o ryoori o si-nagara utawaseta.
 TOP ACC cooking ACC do-while sing.made
 'Tanaka_i made Yamada_j sing while he_{i,j} cooked.'

- (70) Tanaka wa kodomotati ni arukimawari-nagara uta o
 TOP children DAT walk.around-while song ACC
 utawaseta.
 sing.made/let
 'Tanaka made/let the kids sing a song while he/they walked
 around.'

(69) and (70) are ambiguous in precisely the way that indicates that both the matrix subject, *Tanaka*, and the causees, *Yamada* and *kodomotati*, are each final IS AT SOME LEVEL, i.e. the causees are P-final IS.²¹

Evidence that the control capabilities of the causee are due to syntactic factors comes from the behavior of lexical causatives. The intransitive verbs *kaeru* 'go.home' and *tooru* 'pass (through)' have transitive, lexically causative counterparts: *kaesu* 'send someone home' and *toosu* 'pass someone through'. This is shown in (71) and (72).

- (71) (a) Hanako wa kaetta.
 TOP went.home
 'Hanako went home.'
 (b) Tanaka wa Hanako o kaesita.
 TOP ACC went.home
 'Tanaka sent Hanako home.'
- (72) (a) Ziroo wa kooen o tootta.
 TOP park ACC passed
 'Ziro passed through the park.'
 (b) Ziroo no tomodati wa yakuma ni toosita.
 GEN friend TOP parlor DAT passed
 'Ziro's friends passed him into the sitting room.'

While the subject of (71a) or (72a) can readily control equi, as in (73), the object of a lexical causative cannot, as in (74).

[20] This discussion only considers subordinate clauses where -*nagara* means 'while/during' (and not 'while/although'). See Dubinsky (1985a) for a comparison.

[21] Not every such sentence is ambiguous. Pragmatic factors will, usually, determine one of the nominals to be the controller to the exclusion of the other.

- (73) (a) Hanako wa uta o utai-nagara kaetta.
 TOP song ACC sing-while went.home
 'Hanako returned home, singing a song.'
- (b) Ziroo wa uta o utai-nagara kooen o tootta.
 TOP song ACC sing-while park ACC passed
 'Singing a song, Ziro passed through the park.'
- (74) (a) ??Tanaka wa Hanako o uta o utai-nagara
 TOP ACC song ACC sing-while
 kaesita.²²
 went.home
 'Tanaka_i sent Hanako_j home, singing a song_{i,*,j}.'
- (b) Ziroo no tomodati wa kare o uta o utai-nagara
 GEN friend TOP he ACC book ACC read-while
 kyakuma ni toosita.
 parlor DAT passed
 'Singing a song_{i,*,j}, Ziro's friends_i passed him_j into the parlor.'

This contrasts markedly with syntactic causatives. When the *kaeru* and *tooru* are syntactically causativized, the *o*-marked causees can control equi in the *nagara* clause.

- (75) (a) Tanaka wa Hanako o uta o utai-nagara
 TOP ACC song ACC sing-while
 kaeraseta.
 go.home.made
 'Tanaka made Hanako_j go home, singing a song_j.'
- (b) Ziroo no tomodati wa kare o uta o utai-nagara
 GEN friend TOP he ACC book ACC read-while
 kyakuma ni tooraseta.
 parlor DAT pass.made
 'Singing a song_{i,j}, Ziro's friends_i passed him_j into the parlor.'

These facts suggest that: (i) equi control is at least partly determined by syntactic factors, (ii) a P-sector final *i* can control subject equi in a *-nagara* clause, and (iii) causees in syntactic causatives are P-final *Is*.²³

This diagnostic presents an opportunity to answer a question concerning causatives formed from unaccusative verbs. Since the single argument of an unaccusative verb is always [–protagonist control], it will always form an agentive *o*-causative, as in (76).

[22] (74a) is judged semantically odd because *-nagara* clause equi is only controlled by *Tanaka*, and there is an aspectual mismatch between the durative activity of his singing a song and the punctual action of his telling Hanako to go home.

[23] It is correctly suggested by a reviewer that the contrast between (74) and (75) might be due to semantic differences between *toosita* and *kaesita* on the one hand, and *tooraseta* and *kaeraseta* on the other. Such an explanation would likely rely upon reference to a layered argument structure representation which is in some way isomorphic with the relational analysis presented here.

- (76) Mazyo wa Ziroo o hiru made nemuraseta.
 magician TOP ACC noon until sleep.made
 'The magician made Ziro sleep until noon.'

Since *nemuru* is an unaccusative predicate, the causee *Ziroo* is an initial 2 of the embedded predicate and a final 2 of the clause. The RN of (76) could be either (77) or (78), depending on whether unaccusative (2-1) advancement occurs in the inner P-sector.

(77)	2	P	
	1	2	Cho P
	mazyo	Ziroo	nemur- -sase
(78)	2	P	
	1	P	
	1	2	Cho P
	mazyo	Ziroo	nemur- -sase

Control facts show that (78) is the correct RN for (76). Given the appropriate *-nagara* clause, one finds that either the matrix subject or the causee may control equi.

- (79) Hanako wa Ziroo o hosi o kazoe-nagara nemuraseta.
 TOP ACC star ACC count-while sleep.made
 'Hanako made Ziro sleep while she/he counted the stars.'

The fact that *Ziroo* can control the adverbial *-nagara* clause in (79) is evidence that it heads a P-final 1 arc in the clause. This indicates that the Final 1 Law applies in the inner P-sector of causatives, and that all causatives involve the revaluation of an inner 1.

7.4 P-final 1-hood: Honorification

Subject honorification (SH) involves adding the affix *o* to left of a verbal infinitive, and *ni naru* to its right, as in (80).

- (80) *o*-V (infinitive) *ni naru*

Harada (1976) noted the cyclic nature of SH in multipredicate clauses, such as (81b).

- (81) (a) Yamada -sensei wa sono hon o yonda.
 -teacher TOP that book ACC read
 'Prof. Yamada read that book.'
 (b) Yamada -sensei wa sono hon o yomi-hazimeta.
 -teacher TOP that book ACC read-began
 'Prof. Yamada started reading that book.'

SH in (81a) is rather straightforward, there being only one verb on which to build SH morphology. (81b), on the other hand, presents two possibilities.

- (82) (a) Yamada -sensei wa sono hon o o-yomi ni
 -teacher TOP that book ACC HON-read DAT
 nari-hazimeta.
 become-began
 ‘Prof. Yamada [+HON] started reading that book.’
 (b) %Yamada -sensei wa sono hon o o-yomi-hazime ni
 -teacher TOP that book ACC HON-read-begin DAT
 natta.
 became
 ‘Prof. Yamada [+HON] started reading that book.’

In (82), *Yamada-sensei* is a subject of both *yomu* ‘read’ and *hazimeru* ‘begin’. As such, it may trigger SH on either (but not both) of these predicates.²⁴

Based on Harada’s observations, we might expect placement of SH morphology in causative constructions to be significant. There are two possible ways of combining SH and causative morphology. Taking *yomu* ‘read’ as an example, SH morphology can precede causativization as in (83). Alternatively, SH morphology might apply to the causativized form, as in (84).

- (83) (a) *o-yomi-ni naru* Subject Honorification
 (b) *oyomi ni nar-aseru* Causativization
 (84) (a) *yom-aseru* Causativization
 (b) *o-yomase-ni naru* Subject Honorification

Examining causatives, we find that SH morphology must apply after causativization when the SH trigger is the matrix subject.

- (85) (a) Sensei wa gakusei ni tegami o o-kakase ni
 teacher TOP student DAT letter ACC HON-write.make DAT
 natta.
 became
 ‘The teacher[+HON] made the students write letters.’
 (b) *Sensei wa gakusei ni tegami o o-kaki ni
 teacher TOP student DAT letter ACC HON-write DAT
 narasetta.
 become.made
 ‘The teacher[+HON] made the students write letters.’

[24] The ‘%’ (dialectal) judgement on (82b) reflects judgements of speakers who only apply SH on the ‘lowest cycle’ in which it can appear. SH can only apply once in a structure, e.g. it cannot apply again to the verb *hazime* in (82a), having already applied to the verb *yomi*; **o-[o-yomi-ni narihazime]-ni natta*. Whether this is due to pragmatic or morphosyntactic considerations, or some combination thereof, is not entirely clear.

In (85a), *sensei* triggers SH on the causative verb *kakase* since it is a subject of the causative predicate *-sase*, but cannot trigger the morphology on the verb *kaki* in (85b) since it bears no GR in the inner P-sector governed by *kaku*. This, together with Harada's evidence, leads to the following formulation of the SH condition.

- (86) *Subject Honorification Condition*: In order to trigger subject honorification, a nominal must be a final I IN THE P-SECTOR OF THE PREDICATE ON WHICH THE MORPHOLOGY IS REALIZED.

This SH Condition predicts that a causee should only be able to induce SH morphology on an uncausativized verb, as in (83). This is because the causee is a final I in the inner P-sector (satisfying (86)), but heads only object arcs in the P-sector governed by the causative predicate *-sase*. However, this prediction is difficult to test, since pragmatic factors make it nearly impossible for a nominal to be both a causee and an SH trigger. The causee is an individual under the command, influence, or control of the causer. SH indicates an acknowledgement of an individual's social superiority or elevated status. It is anomalous, then, for an individual to be simultaneously marked as elevated and subservient.

There are, however, some causative constructions in which the causee can readily trigger SH (see Kuno 1983). In agentless causatives, there is no causer for the causee to be subservient to. If it is further made contextually apparent that the action undertaken by the causee is in accord with his/her wishes, then all of the pragmatic factors blocking SH disappear and sentences such as (87a) and (88a) are possible.²⁵

- (87) (a) Watasi wa, kootyoosensei o, o-mati ni naritai
 I TOP principal ACC HON-wait DAT want.to.become
 dake, o-mati ni narasete o-oki moosiageru
 just HON-wait DAT become.make HON-leave do[HUMBLE]
 kotonisita.
 decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to wait as long as he wanted.'
- (b) *Watasi wa, kootyoosensei o, o-mati ni
 I TOP principal ACC HON-wait DAT
 naritai dake, o-matase
 want.to.become just HON-wait.make
 ni natte o-oki moosiageru kotonisita.
 DAT become HON-leave do[HUMBLE] decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to wait as long as he wanted.'

[25] The general form of (87/88) is due to S. Kuno (personal communication).

- (88) (a) Watasi wa, kootyoosensei ni, tegami o o-kaki
 I TOP principal ACC letter ACC HON-write
 ni naritai dake, **o-kaki** **ni narasete**
 DAT want.to.become just HON-write DAT become.make
 o-oki moosiageru kotonisita.
 HON-leave do[HUMBLE] decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to write
 letters as much as he wanted.'
- (b) *Watasi wa, kootyoosensei ni, tegami o o-kaki
 I TOP principal ACC letter ACC HON-write
 ni naritai dake, **o-kakase** **ni natte**
 DAT want.to.become just HON-write.make DAT become
 o-oki moosiageru kotonisita.
 HON-leave do[HUMBLE] decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to write
 letters as much as he wanted.'

In (87b) and (88b), SH is applied to the causativized forms *matase* and *kakase*, and both are decidedly impossible, indicating that the SH Condition given in (86) is indeed correct. It is clear from these data that the cause is an embedded P-final 1.

While it is even more difficult to find relevant examples with unaccusative predicates, SH evidence does confirm the claim (see section 7.3) that unaccusative (2-1) advancement occurs in the inner P-sector. For example, an agentless causative sentence with the verb *nemuru* 'sleep' exhibits the same SH possibilities as *matu* 'wait' and *kaku* 'write'.

- (89) (a) Watasi wa, kootyoosensei o, o-suki na dake,
 I TOP principal ACC HON-like COP just
o-nemuri ni narasete o-oki moosiageru
 HON-sleep DAT become.make HON-leave do[HUMBLE]
 kotonisita.
 decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to sleep as
 much as he wanted.'
- (b) *Watasi wa, kootyoosensei o, o-suki na dake,
 I TOP principal ACC HON-like COP just
o-nemurase ni natte o-oki moosiageru
 HON-sleep.make DAT become HON-leave do[HUMBLE]
 kotonisita.
 decided
 'I[+HUMBLE] decided to leave the Principal[+HON] to sleep as
 much as he wanted.'

In (89a), *kootyoosensei* triggers SH on the inner verb *nemuru*. This could only be possible if that nominal advances to 1 in the inner P-sector. (89) is thus further evidence that the initial 2 of an unaccusative verb advances to 1 in the inner P-sector before being revalued to 2 in the causative union.

7.5 2-hood of a *ni* causee

Having shown how a 2-3 retreat analysis of causatives conspires with the Direct Object Constraint to predict the case marking variations in causative constructions, it remains to motivate the 2-relation posited for *ni* marked causees. We have seen that a *ni* marked causee is a P-final 1 in the inner predicate sector and a final 3 in the clause, but one might wonder what precludes an analysis whereby the embedded 1 revalues directly to 3, rather than to 2, obviating the need for 2-3 retreat. This alternative is compared with the proposed analysis in (90).

(90) (a)	I	2	P	
	I	3	2	Cho P
	Taroo-ga	Hanako-ni	hon-o	yom- -sase
			book	read make
(b)	I	2	P	
	I	2	Cho	Cho P
	I	3	Cho	Cho P
	Taroo-ga	Hanako-ni	hon-o	yom- -sase

Direct evidence for the 2-hood of *ni* marked causees is hard to come by, since syntactic phenomena which are restricted to nominals heading 2-arcs are also accessible to nominals heading P-final 1-arcs. The strongest arguments for the analysis in (90b) come from the interaction of causation with passivization. If *ni* causatives were derived as in (90a), we should expect the embedded direct object to be able to passivize, since final 2s are normally permitted to advance to 1 and passives of causatives are grammatical. (91) illustrates the latter claim, i.e. that transitive causees can freely passivize.

- (91) (a) Taroo ga Hanako ni Biru o butaseta.
 NOM DAT ACC hit.made
 'Taro made/let Hanako hit Bill.'
- (b) Hanako ga Taroo ni(-yotte) Biru o butaserareta.
 NOM DAT(-rely) ACC hit.was.made
 'Hanako was made to hit Bill by Taro.'

Under analysis (90a), the inner 1 of a *ni* causative revalues from 1 to 3, and the inner 2 remains a 2 in the union stratum. If this analysis were correct then *Biru* in (91a) should be able to advance to 1. However, (92) shows that this nominal cannot passivize.

- (92) *Biru ga Taroo ni(-yotte) Hanako ni butaserareta.
 NOM DAT(-rely) DAT hit.was.made/let
 ‘Bill was by Taroo made/let Hanako hit.’

The ungrammaticality of (92) is predicted under the analysis in which ALL causees head a pre-final 2 arc and *ni* marked causees undergo 2-3 retreat. If the causee *Hanako* in (91a) heads a union stratum 2 arc, then *Biru* must be a 2-Cho and its inability to advance to 1 is in accordance with the Chômeur Advancement Ban, which says that if a dependent heads a Cho arc, it cannot be a final Term (1, 2 or 3) (see Perlmutter & Postal 1983).

Another set of facts supporting intermediate 2-hood of *ni* marked causees concerns the semantic interpretation of passivized causatives. Recall that *o* and *ni* marking of causees in intransitive causatives correlates with a semantic distinction glossed as ‘let’ and ‘make’. Harada (1973), among others, correctly observed that ‘only *o* causatives are passivizable’. Notice that the passive of (93a) only has a ‘make’ interpretation.

- (93) (a) Tanaka wa hisyo o/ni hayaku kaeraseta.
 TOP secretary ACC/DAT early go.home.made/let
 ‘Tanaka made/let the secretary go home early.’
 (b) Hisyo wa Tanaka ni hayaku kaeraserareta.
 secretary TOP DAT early go.home.was.made
 ‘The secretary was made/*allowed to go home early by Tanaka.’

Transitive verbs only form *ni* causatives, which are ambiguous between ‘make’ and ‘let’.

- (94) Ziroo wa Saburoo ni sara o arawaseta.
 TOP DAT dish ACC wash.made/let
 ‘Ziro made/let Saburo wash the dishes.’

While these causatives do freely passivize (superficially counterexemplifying Harada’s assertion), the passive unambiguously possesses the ‘make’ interpretation.

- (95) Saburo wa Ziroo ni sara o arawaserareta.
 TOP DAT dish ACC wash.was.made
 ‘Saburo was made/*allowed to wash the dishes by Ziro.’

The facts in (94) and (95) pose a serious dilemma for a 1-3 revaluation analysis of *ni* causatives, since we know that (i) causees can passivize, and (ii) 3s (as well as 2s) can undergo passive. Observe (96).

- (96) (a) Sooridaizin ga Ueda -hakusi ni bunka-kunsyoo o
 prime.minister NOM -doctor DAT culture-medal ACC
 zyuyo-sita.
 award-did
 ‘The Prime Minister awarded Dr. Ueda a cultural medal.’

- (b) Ueda -hakusi ga sooridaizin ni bunka-kunsyoo o
 -doctor NOM pr.minister DAT culture-medal ACC
 zyuyo-sareta.
 award-was.done
 'Dr. Ueda was awarded a cultural medal by the Prime Minister.'

Given the grammaticality of (96b), there is no reason to suppose that a *ni* marked causee should not passivize, and one might take this as evidence for the correctness of the 1-3 revaluation analysis of causatives. However, if one adopts that approach there is no way to predict that passives of such causatives could not also have the 'let' interpretation.

Under the 2-3 retreat analysis of *ni* marked causatives, 2-3 retreat is motivated for transitive embedded verbs by the Direct Object Constraint (which prohibits two initial 2s in the same clause from being 'acting 2s' in the final stratum). Now, there is nothing in this constraint which specifically calls for the causee in (90b) to retreat to 3. Rather, it just prohibits it from surfacing as a final 2. If the causee were to advance to 1 instead of retreating to 3, the Direct Object Constraint would be no less satisfied. Accordingly, we might assume that (95) has the RN given in (97).

(97)	I	2	P	
	I	2	Cho	Cho P
	Cho	I	Cho	Cho P
	Taroo	Saburo	sara	araw- -sase

Having shown that (97) is a possible RN for (95), we need to understand why (98) is not.

(98)	I	2	P	
	I	2	Cho	Cho P
	I	3	Cho	Cho P
	Cho	I	Cho	Cho P
	Taroo	Saburo	sara	araw- -sase

In other words, what is it that PREVENTS the causee in (95) from undergoing 2-3 retreat and then advancing to 1? The answer to this question is provided by the lexical 2-3 retreat analysis proposed in Dubinsky 1990. There, it was demonstrated that lexically governed 2-3 retreat nominals cannot passivize. Accordingly, the object of *au* 'meet' in (99) cannot passivize, in contrast with the indirect object of *zyuyo-suru* 'award' in (96).

- (99) *Taroo wa Mitiko ni awareta.
 TOP DAT was.met
 'Taro was met by Mitiko.'

The verb *au* imposes the requirement on its clause that some nominal head both an initial 2 arc and a later 3 arc. Given this, the only way that the initial 2 of *au* could wind up as a final 1 would be via 2-3 retreat followed by 3-1 advancement.

(100) (= (99))	1	2	P
	1	3	P
	Cho	1	P
	Mitiko Taroo au		

Suppose, that this derivation is prohibited in Japanese (and possibly universally). The RN given in (98) would then be ruled out for the same reason as is (100). Having determined that (97) is an allowable derivation and that (98) is not, we now have a way to explain the fact that there are no passives of 'let' causatives. Recalling that 2-3 retreat is a necessary condition for the 'let' interpretation in causatives, we simply need to note that the only way for (95) to have the unattested 'let' interpretation would be for it to have the illicit structure given in (98). Thus, while Harada's (1973) observation is superficially counterexemplified and it is not literally true that 'only *o*-causatives are passivizable', the generalization does in fact hold at a more abstract level of syntactic structure, since the stratum feeding passive always contains a 2 causee.

REFERENCES

- Aissen, J. & Perlmutter, D. (1976). Clause reduction in Spanish. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 2. 1-30. Revised version (1983). In Perlmutter, D. (ed.) *Studies in relational grammar* 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 360-403.
- Davies, W. & Rosen, C. (1988). Unions as multi-predicate clauses. *Language* 64. 52-88.
- Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67. 547-619.
- Dubinsky, S. (1985a). Japanese union constructions: a unified analysis of *-sase* and *-rare*. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.
- Dubinsky, S. (1985b). Oblique to direct object advancement in Japanese. *Linguistic Analysis* 15. 57-75.
- Dubinsky, S. (1990). Japanese direct object to indirect object demotion. In Joseph, B. & Postal, P. (eds.) *Studies in relational grammar* 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 49-86.
- Dubinsky, S. (1993). A union analysis for Japanese 'adversative passives'. Ms., University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Gibson, J. & Raposo, E. (1986). Clause union, the stratal uniqueness law, and the chômeur relation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4. 295-332.
- Goodall, G. (1987). *Parallel structures in syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimshaw, J. & Mester, A. (1988). Light verbs and θ -marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 205-232.
- Harada, S. I. (1973). Counter equi-NP deletion. *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 7. 113-148. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Harada, S. I. (1976). Honorifics. In Shibatani, S. (ed.) *Syntax and semantics* 5: *Japanese generative grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kuno, S. (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuno, S. (1978). Theoretical perspectives on Japanese linguistics. In Hinds, J. & Howard, I. (eds.) *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Kuno, S. (1983). *Shin-nihonbunpoo kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Taisyukan.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1965). Causative forms in Japanese. *Foundations of Language* 1. 1-30.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1978). Case marking, canonical sentence patterns, and counter equi in Japanese: a preliminary survey. In Hinds, J. & Howard, I. (eds.) *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

JAPANESE CAUSATIVES

- Martin, S. (1975). *A reference grammar of Japanese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989). *Syntax and semantics 22: structure and case marking in Japanese*. New York: Academic Press.
- Morishima, Y. (1989). An analysis of Japanese causative constructions. Ms., University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Perlmutter, D. (1984). Working 1s and inversion in Italian, Japanese, and Quechua. In Perlmutter, D. & Rosen, C. (eds.) *Studies in relational grammar 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 292–330.
- Perlmutter, D. & Postal, P. (1983). Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. In Perlmutter, D. (ed.) *Studies in relational grammar 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 81–128.
- Perlmutter, D. & Postal, P. (1984a) The 1-advancement exclusiveness law. In Perlmutter, D. & Rosen, C. (eds.) *Studies in relational grammar 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 81–125.
- Perlmutter, D. & Postal, P. (1984b). Impersonal passives and some relational laws. In Perlmutter, D. & Rosen, C. (eds.) *Studies in relation grammar 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 126–170.
- Poser, W. (1983). What is the double-*o* constraint a constraint on? Ms., Stanford University.
- Rosen, C. (1983). Universals of causitive union: a co-proposal to the Gibson-Raposo typology. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 19. 338–352. Revised (1983). Chômeur causees and the universals of causative union. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 5. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. 179–198.
- Rosen, C. (1984). The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations. In Perlmutter, D. & Rosen, C. (eds.) *Studies in relational grammar 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 38–77.
- Shibatani, M. (1973). Semantics of Japanese causativization. *Foundations of Language* 9. 327–373.
- Shibatani, M. (1977). Grammatical relations and surface cases. *Language* 53. 789–809.
- Tonoike, S. (1978). On the causative constructions in Japanese. In Hinds, J. & Howard, I. (eds.). *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

*Author's address: Linguistics Program,
The University of South Carolina,
Columbia Campus,
Columbia,
South Carolina 29208,
USA.
E-mail: dubinsk@univscvm.csd.scarolina.edu*