

## INTRODUCTION

It seems that the field of Japanese linguistics as defined in generative terms is at present going through an important paradigm shift; this follows some fifteen years of relative -- and remarkable -- tranquility, a period largely dominated by the theoretical orientation of the Standard Theory. The source for the current turbulence apparently comes from two directions, one external and one internal.

The Standard Theory itself has, of course, gone through some radical changes. Linguistic analyses developed within the generative school have been primarily formal characterizations of constructions found in English. The hope underlying the work of transformational grammarians was that by studying a single language in great depth one would be able to postulate rules and principles which "have explanatory force but are underdetermined by evidence to the language learner" (Chomsky 1981:6). Hence, these rules and principles are attributed to Universal Grammar. To a large extent this has proven to be fruitful. An examination of the history of accounts of the passive construction reveals a trend away from a single, very idiosyncratic transformational rule (cf. Syntactic Structures) towards developing subsystems of interacting principles which characterize not only passive in English but potentially Japanese and Romance languages as well (cf. Chomsky 1981; Jaeggli, this volume). This trend has involved changes in the Revised Extended Standard Theory which now enable the encompassing of languages like Japanese under a more general theory. This then is a significant "external" factor that, potentially, affects the general climate of research in Japanese generative grammar as well.

The other possible source that can affect such a climactic change comes from "internal" pressures having to do with certain impasses found in the language internal accounts of constructions in Japanese. Quite representative of this, perhaps, is the case of Japanese causatives, particularly as it pertains to the well-known distinction between the ni- and o- causatives. Indeed, it is worth reviewing here at length some salient features involved in the "controversy" concerning this distinction, because it is illustrative of a symptomatic stalemate, constituting one of the catalysts for initiating a look towards new theoretical directions.

Japanese causatives with the suffix sase 'cause' is one of the most intensely examined constructions in the history of Japanese generative grammar. As with many other issues in Japanese linguistics, it was Kuroda's monumental studies (1965a, 1965b) which, with decisive clarity, set the course of the investigation thereafter, particularly in the following two crucial respects. First, he placed the focus of semantic investigation of sase-causatives on the nature of polarity exhibited by the two sub-types, i.e., the ni-causative as exemplified in (1) below, and the o-causative as in (2). (We follow here a generally adopted practice of associating the ni-causative with the let-causative in English, and the o-causative with the make-causative.) Second, he distinguished the two types of causatives by postulating different underlying structures as in (3a) and (3b), or, to put it in more general schemata, as in (4a) and (4b) corresponding to (3a) and (3b) respectively.

- (1) Ken-wa Naomi-ni hatarak-ase-ta.  
       top      dat work-cause-past  
 'Ken let Naomi work.'
- (2) Ken-wa Naomi-o hatarak-ase-ta.  
       top      acc work-cause-past  
 'Ken made Naomi work.'
- (3) a. Ken [<sub>S</sub>Naomi hatarak] sase-ta  
       b. Ken Naomi<sub>i</sub> [<sub>S</sub>Naomi<sub>i</sub> hatarak] sase-ta
- (4) a. [NP [<sub>S</sub> ... V] sase]  
       b. [NP NP [<sub>S</sub> ...V] sase]

In terms of historical perspective, perhaps most significant is the fact that subsequent controversies on the sase-causative analysis can be characterized essentially as a case of the "changing of fine print" within this general scheme in both syntax and semantics.

With respect to syntactic representation, Kuroda himself has always identified the ni-causative with the form given in (4a), and the o-causative with (4b). This is what Tonoike (1978) calls the "O-Extra NP Analysis," and is adopted by many including Harada (1973), Kuno (1973, 1978), and Shibatani (1973). Others, including Smith (1970), Nakau (1973), and Tonoike (1978), have argued for the opposite, i.e., for the "Ni-Extra NP Analysis," in which the ni-causative is associated with (4b) and the o-causative, with (4a). It may be noted that, aside from some logistic demands caused by a particular choice of case marking mechanism, there is no obvious reason here why one analysis should necessarily be chosen over the other. Some attempts have been made by proponents of the O-Extra NP Analysis to justify their approach. But, as Tonoike (1978) shows, none of them can be considered conclusive. And Tonoike's own bid to justify the Ni-Extra NP Analysis appears to be countered effectively by Kuno (1978).

As for the semantic characterization of sase-causatives, discussions so far have essentially revolved around Kuroda's following suggestion (1965a:35): "when the o-causative is used, it can be said that the subject of the causative is indifferent as to willingness or consent of the subject of the constituent sentence to do the particular act mentioned or that the former's will to make the latter do it even against the latter's will is implied," whereas it is just this sense of willingness of the causee that characterizes the sense of the ni-causative. Harada (1973), Kuno (1973), and Shibatani (1973) follow the same line -- in Kuno, the causee of the o-causative is said to be "forced" to perform the act, and in Shibatani the same causee is characterized as being "coerced" to do it. In fact, it is his adherence to this specification of o-causatives that led Shibatani (1973) to identify a sentence like the following as an instance of the "ni-causative" (i.e., non-coercion), in spite of the o marking of the "object" NP.

- (5) Ken-wa yasai-o kusar-ase-ta.  
       top vegetable-acc rot-cause-past  
 'Ken caused the vegetable to rot.'

As summarized in Tonoike (1978), however, it is now clear that such a demarcation cannot be drawn between the semantics of the ni- and the o- causatives. Tonoike (1978:9) observes correctly: "all the characterizations of the two causatives proposed so far have counterexamples, except for Harada's (1973) generalization that the complement verb in the ni-causative always denotes a self-controllable action."

It is on the basis of this observation -- namely, that Harada's generalization is the only correct one -- that Tonoike (1978) advances a claim that it is the Ni-Extra NP Analysis, couched in his Case Ordering Hypothesis originally presented in Tonoike (1976), which will provide the correct syntactic representation of causative constructions in Japanese. His argument is based crucially on the unacceptability of sentences like (6) below in contrast to (7) with o.

- (6) \*Taroo-wa Hanako-ni Ziroo no si-o yorokob-ase-ta. (T's (16b))  
           top          dat          's death-acc rejoice-cause-past  
 'Taro made Hanako rejoice over Jiro's death.'
- (7) Taroo-wa Hanako-o/\*ni yorokob-ase-ta. (cf. T's (19b) & (21b))  
           top          acc/dat rejoice-cause-past  
 'Taro made Hanako rejoice.'

We will list a summary of Tonoike's arguments below.

- (8) a. The ni-causative, but not the o-causative, imposes the [+Self-controllable] constraint on its complement predicate, as evidenced by (7);
- b. The ill-formedness of (6), as well as (7) with ni, is due to the [-Self-controllable] property of the complement verb yorokob 'rejoice';
- c. If, therefore, a given grammar guarantees that sase-causatives with an embedded transitive construction, e.g. (6), must always be ni-causatives, the ill-formedness of a sentence like (6) receives a principled explanation; and
- d. Tonoike's Ni-Extra NP Analysis provides just such a guarantee.

Tonoike's claim, if correct, would indeed be significant. But it does not hold. As Kuno points out (cf. 1978:226), there are well-formed causative sentences with an embedded transitive construction, with a [-Self-controllable] verb as its complement predicate, like the one below (cf. Kuno's (18)).

- (9) Ore-wa yatu-ni hito no hukoo-o yorokob-ase-te oku  
 I-top him-dat person 's misfortune-acc rejoice-cause-ing leave  
 wake-ni-wa-ik-ana-i.  
 cannot-indulge-present  
 'I cannot let him rejoice over other people's misfortune.'

Note that Kuno shares (cf. 1978:225) Tonoike's premise that the correct semantic characterization of the o- and ni- causatives is one referred to in (8a) above (thus departing from his earlier stand; cf. Kuno 1978:227). Where he disagrees with Tonoike is on the point (8c). What

Kuno is claiming, following in fact the same strategy employed by Tonoike, is that a sase-causative with an embedded transitive construction may indeed be an instance of the o-causative, because it permits as in (9) the occurrence of a [-Self-controllable] verb as its complement predicate. Kuno thus successfully refutes Tonoike's claim. But there is more to the problem than so far indicated.

It turns out that the real issue is not so much with (8c) nor with (8d) but with (8a), the premise which is shared by both Kuno and Tonoike. Consider the following ni-causative examples, which are well-formed even without a "pretense" interpretation for the (underlined) [-Self-controllable] verbs used therein as the complement predicate.

- (10) Ano toki Naomi-ni kizetu s-ase-te oi-te, imagoro nani-o  
 that time dat faint do-cause-ing leav-ing now what-acc  
 i-u ka.  
 say-present or

'How dare you say such a thing, having already caused Naomi to faint at that time.'

- (11) Siken-ni ukat-ta to-i-u ansinkan-ga Ken-ni sono ban zyukusui  
 exam-dat pass-past such relief-nom dat that night deep-sleep  
s-ase-ta.  
 fall-cause-past

'The feeling of relief that he had passed the exam enabled (lit. caused) Ken to fall into a deep sleep that night.'

These underlined predicates are prima facie examples of [-Self-controllable] verbs (in the sense, certainly, the term is normally understood; see Kitagawa 1976 for a discussion on issues of self-controllability and volitivity). The proof that they are well-formed in the context of ni-causatives thus refutes the premise given in (8a), demonstrating that, under yet to be specified conditions, not only o- but ni-causatives also do accommodate a [-Self-controllable] verb as their complement predicate. But this is a striking fact. For, (8a) constitutes, to both Kuno and Tonoike, the only valid semantic characterization left that can still be ascribed to sase-causatives. Since Tonoike's conclusion -- that all the other semantic characterizations thus far proposed are untenable -- appears to be justifiable otherwise, we now find ourselves without any viable semantic characterization available for sase-causatives. Thus, the following remark by Kuno (1978:213-14) on the current state of Japanese linguistics in general is only too apt in the case of the semantics of sase-causatives: "the intensive examination that Japanese has received from numerous scholars in the past fifteen to twenty years, especially in the framework of transformational generative grammar, has produced a paradoxical situation in which we know more about Japanese than before and yet, at the same time, we know less about it."

Kuno's own assessment of the controversies over the O-Extra and the Ni-Extra NP Analysis is that there is no convincing evidence to choose between the two, and that the problem "will remain unsolved for many years to come, and we will see many papers published which attempt to present new and convincing evidence for one analysis or another, with hidden

drawbacks of their own" (Kuno 1978:231). The situation, however, might well be symptomatic of a deeper problem reminiscent of Kuhn's oft quoted description (Kuhn 1962:152) of a "paradigm in trouble" -- "trouble has repeatedly been explored, and attempts to remove it have again and again proved vain." It may well be advantageous, therefore, to try and approach these "old" problems from new angles, to probe the box with a different stick, so to speak.

Some of the papers in this volume are indeed attempts to such exploration. The passive construction is thus revisited in Japanese and Romance, crucially focusing on theoretical issues relating to Universal Grammar. The Japanese causative constructions are examined in depth from perspectives seldom discussed in the published literature before. New approaches to the scrambling phenomenon are advanced. The status of zibun 'self' and kare 'he' is reassessed. And the issues of the lexicon are investigated with insights which, while not always expressed in uniform terms, are bound to inspire many future works on the subject.

It is our conviction then that the papers in this volume will collectively contribute to the new understanding of some of the crucial issues that confront the field of Japanese linguistics today.

Ann K. Farmer  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Arizona

Chisato Kitagawa  
Department of Oriental Studies  
University of Arizona