PREFACE

The papers collected in this volume are of considerable linguistic
interest on at least two levels. First, on a general level, the papers
are concerned with the proper formulation of linguistic theory, es-
pecially with regard to the question of the interaction of various modu-
lar components of a grammar. Secondly, on a more language specific level,
the papers are largely concerned with the syntactic analysis of Japanese,
and provide us with new directions in the analysis of a language which
has been among the most important to be studied in the continued develop-
ment of generative linguistics. It is not particularly remarkable that
a volume of papers should be concerned with linguistic theory, or else
with a particular language. What is remarkable about the papers in this
volume is that they combine a fundamental guiding interest in linguistic
theory with detailed empirical analysis of a particular language other
than English, providing us with an example of a new kind of cross-lin-
guistic theoretical study that is now becoming increasingly possible and
desirable.

The development of the Standard Theory in Chomsky's Aspects of the
Theory of Syntax was based largely on the study of English and the lin-
guistic properties which English seemed to represent. However, the
application of the Standard Theory model to the analysis of Japanese was
quick to follow, and landmark works by Kuroda, Kuno, Inoue, Shibatani,
and others, established a surprisingly comprehensive analysis of the
language that became a virtual orthodoxy for some ten years. The Trans-
formational treatment of case marking, word order, "understood" NPs,
causative and passive constructions, and other important grammatical
phenomena, gave rise to a set of inter-woven assumptions that formed a
constraining framework on virtually all important debates on Japanese
grammar during the 70's. Beginning in the early 70's, with the appear-
ance of Chomsky's Conditions on Transformations, the transformational
framework of the Aspects model began to undergo radical changes, and a
new picture of syntactic theory began to emerge. Studies on constraints
on transformations, on the lexicon, morphology and word formation, on
the theory of phrase structure, all contributed to the development of
the Revised Extended Standard Theory, and ultimately to the theory repre-
sented by Chomsky's Lectures on Government and Binding. Despite the
rapid changes in syntactic theory based on the work on English, the
analysis of Japanese continued to be framed with remarkable consistency
within a more or less Standard Theory model, and it is only quite re-
cently that researchers have turned their attention to the analysis of
Japanese within the newer "modular" framework. In particular, important
dissertations by Ann Farmer and Shigeru Miyagawa pointed toward new --
if controversial -- directions in the research on Japanese syntax, and
the way was opened for a re-analysis of case marking, "scrambling", the
causative construction, and other crucial grammatical phenomena in
Japanese.

With a new trend developing in the analysis of Japanese, it seemed
timely and appropriate to hold a conference on Japanese syntax, to pre-
sent and solidify certain results, as well as to stimulate debate on
the problems and prospects of this emerging line of thought. Profs.
Ann Farmer (Department of Linguistics) and Chisato Kitagawa (Department

2

of Oriental Studies) organized, with considerable energy and skill,
an excellent conference, the results of which are presented in this
volume. The conference itself was an exceptionally gratifying exper-
ience: the papers provoked much intelligent discussion, and the debate,
while lively, was always productive and cooperative. It is hoped that
the papers collected here will reflect some of the stimulating atmos-
phere of the conference. More importantly, however, the reader will
find, in the following papers, an exciting new development, both in
general syntactic theory, as well as in the analysis of a language
that will continue to provide an important and difficult challenge to
linguistic theory for many years to come.

2

Adrian Akmajian
Department of Linguistics
University of Arizona