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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

There are two Japanese equivalents to the adverb of emphasis *even* in English, *sae* and *made*, as the following examples show.¹

(1) John sae soo itta.
    even so say-past
    'Even John said so.'

(2) John made soo itta. (= (1))

Both constructions have approximately the same meaning. In this thesis, I will focus on *sae*, examining its syntactic and semantic characteristics. In previous descriptive studies on Japanese grammar, Matsumura (1971), for instance, offers a detailed list of possible sequences with *sae*.

(3) i) It can attach to a noun or *'-ne'*.  

    ii) It can attach to a particle including *'-te' in the *te* forms (verbal gerundives).

    iii) It can attach to a verb in *sae'-yoo* form (the *-i-form,  
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verbal infinitives).

This list only captures in part the distribution of sae. Ogawa (1982) provides the meanings of sae.

(4) i) sae suggests that the same situation would hold for other cases of a similar kind by emphasizing one extreme example.

a. Byooki de mizu sae nodo-o toor-anai.
   sickness because of water even throat-ACC go through-NEG
   'Because of the illness, (I) cannot drink even water.'

ii) It indicates that something more unpleasant or intolerable is added to a present situation that is already not so good.

b. Samui dake de naku, yuki sae hutte kita.
   cold only be NEG snow even pour come-past
   'It is cold, and in addition to that, it started snowing.'

iii) Followed by a verb in its provisional form, it exclusively takes up one condition that is needed for the situation under discussion to be realized.

c. Hima sae areba hon-o yonde iru.
   free time exist book-ACC read-ing
   '(He) is reading a book whenever he has time.'

Of these three, sae in (4a) and (4b) can be translated as even in English. However, sae in (4c) does not mean even. This sae appears in conditionals.
Martin (1975: 73) summarizes the meanings of *see* into three groups as follows.

(5) a. Additionally, in addition, what's more, on top of everything else.
    b. By mentioning this all others follow or all else follows as analogous entailment.
    c. Narrowing the focus, meaning 'if just'.

Again, (5c) is the peculiar use of *see* which cannot be found in the use of *even* in English. Excluding the use of *see* in (4c) and (5c), I will discuss the syntactic and semantic characteristics of *see* in this thesis. In the syntactic analyses, I adopt the theoretical framework of Government and Binding (e.g., Chomsky 1981) throughout the thesis.

In the following section, the study on English *even* by Epstein (1975) is reviewed. In section 1.2., I examine Kato's (1985) proposal. These two works are on the semantics of *even* and *see*, respectively. The syntax of *see* is discussed in section 1.3. Section 1.4. is a summary of chapter I. In Chapter II, I investigate the syntactic distribution of *see* at the phrasal level and its meaning. In Chapter III I examine its distribution at the sentential level. By doing so, I evaluate some previous syntactic analyses of constructions such as passives, potentials, causatives, desideratives, and resultatives. Finally, Chapter IV provides the concluding remarks.
1.1. English Even

Epstein (1975) provides five presuppositions to interpret sentences that contain *even*. Sentences like (6) have five presuppositions listed in (7).

(6) Even John kissed Mary.

(7) a. There is someone other than John who might possibly have kissed Mary.

b. There is someone other than John who kissed Mary.

c. A reasonably large fraction of the people who might have kissed Mary did in fact kiss Mary.

d. Of the people who kissed Mary, John is the least expected to have done so.

e. It is surprising that John kissed Mary.

These presuppositions can be obtained by first setting SCOPE and CLAUSE(SCOPE), then applying the formulas. Definitions of these terms are as follows (Epstein 1975: 50).

(8) SCOPE: a. If *even*’s mother is not S, that constituent except *even* is SCOPE.

b. If *even*’s mother is S, any constituent dominated by S may be SCOPE.

CLAUSE(SCOPE): The lowest S dominating *even*.

In the case of (6), John is the SCOPE and the lowest S John
**Kissed Mary is the CLAUSE(SCOPE).** For example, we get (7a) and (7e) by applying these SCOPE and CLAUSE(SCOPE) to the formula 1 and 5, respectively:

(9) Even presupposition 1: (\(\exists x\))(x = SCOPE) & (CLAUSE(x) is possible)

Even presupposition 5: CLAUSE(SCOPE) is surprising (unexpected)

### 1.2. Kato’s Analysis

Kato (1985) provides two presuppositions, not five like Epstein, to interpret sentences containing *sae*. According to Kato, sentence (10) has the presuppositions in (11).

(10) John *sae* soo itta.
    even so say-past
    ‘Even John said so.’

(11) a. Focus:       John
    b. Presupposition: (i) \(\exists x = John \ x \ L_x\alpha(x)\)

(ii) LEAST EXPECTED (John \(\ L_x\alpha(x)\))

(11b) can be paraphrased as (i) there are people other than John who said so, and (ii) of all the people who said so, for John to do so was the least expected. Epstein’s (1975) presuppositions (a)-(c) are combined to (i), and (d) and (e) are to (ii).

(11) is the interpretation of the sentence where *sae* attaches to a noun. Let us next consider the case where it attaches to a
verb.

(12) John-ga hon-o kai sae sira.
     -NOM book-ACC buy even do-past
     'John even bought a book.'

Kato (1985) claims that when sae attaches to a verbal stem as in (12), the sentence becomes ambiguous. That is, the focus may be set on the object NP *hon*, the verbal stem *sira*, or the VP *hon-o sira*. Therefore, there are three different sets of presuppositions as the following.

(13) a. Focus: hon
    b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than books that John bought.
       (ii) Of all the things that John bought, books are the least expected for him to buy.

(14) a. Focus: kai
    b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than buying that John did with the books.
       (ii) Of all the things he did with the books, buying was the least expected for him to do.

(15) a. Focus: hon-o kai
    b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than buying books that John did.
As seen above, the sentence yields different presuppositions according to the focus we set. Although Kato does not mention it, this can be explained by the c-command relationship.² That is, *see* takes scope over the elements it c-commands. Observe the following structure to see this indeed is the case.

(16)  

```
(16)    IP(S)
    /     \    
   NP   I'    
  /      \  
 John XP I
   /    \  
  VP see tense
  /    \    
 NP  V      
 /     \  
 hon kai
```

(16) is the structure that I adopt in this thesis.

Since *see* c-commands the VP, the NP, V, and VP are all within the scope of *see*. Thus, the ambiguity arises. (The structure of the sentence containing *see* will be discussed in Chapter II.)

It seems, then, that Epstein’s (1975) presuppositions can be narrowed down to the two proposed by Kato (1985). Epstein (1975: 8) himself says that even presuppositions (7a)-(7c) might be combined as one in that it is presupposed that there are a lot of x other than the SCOPE. And, apparently, “least expected” entails
"surprising". Therefore, I will adopt Kato’s interpretation throughout this thesis.

1.3. The Syntax of _sae_

_Sae_ does not occur by itself in a sentence. It is a dependent constituent and it always follows a maximal projection. This can be seen in the following examples.

    -NOM student notebook even buy-past
    ‘John even bought the student’s handbook.’

b. [Gakusei] sae tetyoo-o katta.
    student even notebook-ACC buy-past
    ‘Even students bought the notebook.’


_Gakusei tetyoo_ in (17a) has the structure in (18).

(18)    NF
    |   N
    / \ N
   |   |
   gakusei tetyoo

_Gakusei_ in (18) is an N, as (19) shows.

(19) *Wakai gakusei tetyoo
    young student notebook
Only an N’ (or NP) can be modified by an adjective. The fact that _gakusei_ cannot be modified by the adjective _wakari_ suggests that _gakusei_ in (19) (and also in (17a)) is not an N’ (or NP).

(17b), on the surface, looks like _sae_ is attached to the N, _gakusei_, but the only possible reading is the one given in English. That is, _gakusei_ is the subject of the verb, thus it is an NP in this case, not an N. The ungrammatical example (17c) supports this view. There cannot be another subject NP _John_ in the sentence.

Next, consider the case of verb compounds.

(20) a. John-ga kagi-o sagasimawatta.

     -NOM key-ACC look around-past

     'John looked around for the key.'

   b. John-ga kagi-o sagasimawari sae sita.

   c. *John-ga kagi-o sagasi sae mawatta.

The verb compound _sagasimawar_ has the following structure since both _sagas_ and _mawar_ are verbs.

(21)

     V
     \   \  
      V  V 
     sagasi mawar

As (20b) and (20c) show, _sae_ cannot appear between _sagas_ and _mawar_. This suggests that _sae_ may not adjoin to a V. Then, it can only attach to the whole VP, not just to the V. It is clear
that *sae* in (20b) does not attach to the compound V if we examine the meaning. Since the verb has an object, the structure of the VP is the one in (22).

(22) 

```
NP     V
     / \
    kagi V V
     / \
    sagasi mawar
```

If *sae* attaches to the higher V, then the NP *kagi* cannot be the focused element since it is not c-commanded by *sae* as discussed in 1.2. However, it is possible to get a reading where the focus is on the NP, in that there are other things than the key that John looked for in (20b). Thus, *sae* should be attached to the VP. These pieces of evidence suggest that *sae* adjoins only to maximal projections.

1.4. Summary

In this chapter, we have seen the semantics and syntax of *sae*. We have found that in the traditional grammar, the emphasis is on the meaning of *sae*, and the occurrence is only descriptively offered without any explanations. By reviewing the works by Epstein (1975) and Kato (1985), it has become clear that *sae* can take scope over the elements that it c-commands. Thus, when it follows a verbal stem, actually it is the VP to which *sae* attaches, and it takes scope over the object NP, the verb, and the VP as a whole. As a result, the sentence becomes ambiguous.
It was also revealed that *see* can only attach to a maximal projection. In the following two chapters, I examine the distribution of *see*, basing my analysis on these two properties.
Notes to Chapter I

1 In this thesis the following abbreviations are used in the gloss.

NOM: Nominative Case marker; ACC: Accusative Case marker; DAT: Dative Case marker; TOP: Topic Marker; past: past tense; pres: present tense; pass: passive morpheme; pot: potential morpheme; cause: causative morpheme; NEG: negative.

2 The following is the definition of c-command by Reinhart (1979).

A c-commands B if neither A, B dominates the other and the first branching node dominates A also dominates B.
CHAPTER II
DISTRIBUTION OF SAE AT THE PHRASAL LEVEL

2.0. Introduction

Saë ‘even’ can appear in various places in a sentence. For instance, we can find it after a noun as in (1), after a postposition as in (2), or after a verb as in (3).

(1) John saë hon-o katta.
    even book-ACC buy-past
    ‘Even John bought a book.’

(2) John-to saë hanasita.
    with even speak-past
    ‘(I) spoke even with John.’

(3) John-ga paatii-ni ki saë sita.
    -NOM party-to come even do-past
    ‘John even came to the party.’

There are other places where saë can appear, such as after a complementizer or adjective as in (4) and (5), respectively.

(4) John-ga youoroppa ni itta to saë itta.
    -NOM Europe to go-past Comp even say-past
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'John even said that he went to Europe.'

(5) Mary-wa utukusiku sō atta.
   -TOP beautiful even be-past
   'Mary was even beautiful.'

In the following sections, I will examine more closely when and where we can find *sae*.

In section 2.1., NP + *sae* is discussed, and in section 2.2., postpositional phrases with *sae* is treated. In section 2.3., I focus on the topic construction. Verb phrases are discussed in section 2.4., and Complementizer phrases in 2.5. In section 2.6., AP + *sae* is illustrated and in 2.7., IP + *sae* is treated. In section 2.8., I summarize the discussion of Chapter II.

2.1. Noun Phrase + *sae*

This section focuses on the cases where *sae* occurs after an NP. I will examine the NP with three different Case markers, namely with the Nominative Case marker *go*, the Accusative Case marker *o*, and the Dative Case marker *ni*.

2.1.1. Nominative Case

Let us begin this subsection by looking at subject NPs that are normally marked by the Nominative Case marker *go* as in (6a).

   -NOM to go-past
   'John went to Tokyo.'
b. John sae Tokyo-e itta.
   even to go-past
   'Even John went to Tokyo.'
c. John sae-ga Tokyo-e itta.

In (6a), John is the subject of the sentence and thus marked with
* ga. As we can see in (6b) and (6c), the appearance of ga is
optional. We can explain this by hypothesizing that, as a
particle, *sae (and other words of a similar type such as take
'only' or made 'even') lies somewhere in between the Topic marker
*wa and ga. It can optionally assign Case to the NP it attaches
to. So, (6b) is the case where sae assigns Case, and in (6c), it
does not. In the latter case, the Nominative Case marker has to
be present to satisfy the Case filter (Chomsky 1981) in (7).

(7) Case filter
   *NP if NP has phonetic content and has no Case

As (6d) shows, it is impossible for the Nominative Case marker to
appear between an NP and sae. Why is (6d) ill-formed? Let us
consider it here. In this course of discussion, I adopt the Case
theory developed by Takezawa (1987).

The following tree diagrams (8) and (9) are both possible
S-structure representations for sentence (6b). In (8) and (9), V-
raising, which raises the verb under VP to Infl, occurs in order
to have Tense inflected on the verb.

\[
(8) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{sae} \quad \text{I'} \\
\text{John} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{I} \\
\text{PP} \quad t_i \quad V_i \quad \text{Tense} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{ta} \\
\text{Tokyo} \quad \text{e}
\end{array}
\]

\[
(9) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{I'} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{sae} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{I} \\
\text{John} \quad \text{PP} \quad t_i \quad V_i \quad \text{Tense} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{ta} \\
\text{Tokyo} \quad \text{e}
\end{array}
\]

In structure (8), \text{sae} is immediately dominated by the IP while in (9) it forms a constituent with the NP dominated by the maximal projection, which is temporarily called XP. Assuming the structure is uniform in (6a–c), I conclude that (9) is the correct structure for (6b). This is because the Case marker \text{gs} appears following \text{sae} as seen in (6c). If (8) is correct, (6d) should be possible, where \text{gs} appears between \text{John} and \text{sae}.

Another piece of evidence which supports the idea that the NP and \text{sae} comprise a constituent is the fact that nothing can
intervene between them.

    even to go-past
    'Even John went to Tokyo.'


(10b) is ill-formed since the moved element breaks the constituency of the NP and sae.

Ergative verbs, too, support this idea. As discussed in Miyagawa (1989), the NP in the subject position in the ergative construction involves NP movement. That is, the NP originates in the object position of the verb, and is forced to move to the subject position where it can receive Case because ergative verbs lack Case assigning ability.

    Students even inn to arrive-past
    'Even the students arrived at the inn.'

b. *Gakusei ti ryokan-ni ti sae tui.

(11b) is unacceptable since gakusei sae is a constituent and only a part of it moves.

In the case of English, too, even + NP is a constituent as Rooth (1985) proposes. He argues that adverbs that intervene between a V and an NP, especially when the NP is a pronoun, are marginal, as shown in (12). On the other hand, there are some
cases where *\textit{even} can occur in this position, as (13) shows. The sentences and the judgments below are Rooth’s.

(12)*John likes very much himself.
(13) John’s mother despises even him.

Another piece of evidence provided by Rooth in support of constituency is the restrictions on what *\textit{even} can be associated with. He refers to Jackendoff (1972) and says that *\textit{even} can only associate with an element that it c–commands, as the sentences in (14) show. The sentences in (14) suggest the constituency of *\textit{even} and the NP.

(14) a. *John GAVE even his daughter a new bicycle.
b. John gave even HIS daughter a new bicycle.
c. John gave even his DAUGHTER a new bicycle.
d. *John gave even his daughter a NEW bicycle.

(Rooth, 1985: 92)

The capitalized elements are focused in (14). If *\textit{even} is dominated by the VP and is a sister of the V as in (15), then it c–commands \textit{gave} and (14a) should be possible.

(15) \[
\text{VP} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm}} / / \backslash \backslash \\
\text{\hspace{1cm}} V \text{ even NP NP} \\
/ \hspace{1cm} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm}} \text{gave}
\]
The ungrammaticality of (14a) suggests that the verb is not o-
commanded by *even*. (14b) through (14d) show that the NP *his
daughter* is o-commanded by *even*, but not a *new bicycle*. This fact
suggests that [even NP] is a constituent and the VP in (14b) and
(14c) have the structure in (16) (Rooth 1985).

(16) \[ \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{V} \text{ NP NP} \\
  \text{even NP} \\
\]

There are two possible analyses to determine the category of
this constituent with *sae*. One is to hypothesize that NP + *sae* is
an NP as Rooth does, and the other is to hypothesize it is an XP,
some kind of maximal projection whose head is *even*. It does
exhibit the characteristics of NP. However, there is a problem
with treating it as an NP. That is, *sae*, which is not a noun,
becomes the head of the NP because Japanese is a head final
language. Since we would not want to call *sae* the head of the NP,
I will treat the constituent as an XP, which receives the features
Selkirk's proposal is summarized as follows (from Nishigauchi
(1986)).

(17) The feature of a nonhead of the phrase is percolated, just
in case the head is unmarked with respect to that feature.

(Nishigauchi 1986: 105)
This NP, then, receives the features [+N, -Y] from its complement NP and thus behaves as NP. Also, in this analysis sae appears head final, which is one of the characteristics of Japanese.

Assuming that even adjuncts are licensed by the head, sae is not an adjunct since it appears on the right of the NP. Adjuncts appear to the left of their heads.

As we have seen, John sae in (6c) occupies the subject position. Thus, as the highest NP, it is assigned the Nominative Case marker by Inf1 (Takezawa 1987). Also, by taking the structure in (9), the scope relationship can be made clear. As discussed in Chapter I, sae takes scope over the elements it cocommands. In (6b), sae takes scope only over John and has the following presuppositions, according to Kato (1985), which captures our intuition.

(6) b. John sae Tokyo-e itta.

(16) a. Focus: John

b. Presupposition: (i) There are people other than John who went to Tokyo.

(ii) Of all the people who went to Tokyo, John is the least expected to do so.

If the structure (8) is correct, then sae can take scope over every element in the sentence. Obviously, this is not a desired result.

There is another place where we can find the Nominative Case marker sae. It is well known that in a stative sentence, a noun in
the object position is marked with газ (cf. Kuno 1973).

   -NOM English-NOM can understand
   'John can understand English.'
   c. John-газ eigo ژae ژa wakaru.2

In (19a), eigo in the object position is marked by the Nomitive Case marker газ. We can see that this is the same газ as the one that marks the subject, John, since it can appear after ژae as seen in (19c).

This is not the case for the exhaustive-listing ژa (cf. Kuno 1973).

   -NOM teacher be-pros
   'John (and only John) is a teacher (among us).'
   b. ژJohn ژae GA sensei da.

Note that it is possible to interpret (20b) as 'even John is a teacher'. The reason why ژae cannot occur with the exhaustive-listing ژa appears to be due to semantics. ژae implies that there are other people who are teachers, while ژa suggests that only John is a teacher. Therefore, it is impossible to have them both.
2.1.2. Accusative Case

Let us next examine the case of Accusative Case marked object NPs.

     -NOM    -ACC hit-past
     'Mary hit John.'
 b. Mary-ga John sae nagutta.
     -NOM    even hit-past
     'Mary hit even John.'
 c. Mary-ga John sae-o nagutta.
 d. ?Mary-ga John-o sae nagutta. 3

Like the example of the Nominative Case marker, the Accusative Case marker o, too, can be dropped as seen in (21b).

Saito (1985) argues that the Accusative Case marker can be dropped when an object NP is adjacent to the verb since the NP can be assigned abstract Case as in (22a). But if the NP is not adjacent to the verb, the Case marker cannot be dropped as (22b) shows. However, as discussed in 2.1.1., sae can optionally assign Case, therefore, even when the object NP is not adjacent to a verb, the Case marker o can be dropped as in (22c).

(22) a. John-ga hon katta.
     -NOM book buy-past
     'John bought books.'
c. Hon sae John-ga katta.

book even -NOM buy-past
‘John even bought books.’

(21d) shows that o cannot intervene between the NP and sae. Since the Accusative Case marker cannot occur here, therefore I will consider (21c) to have the structure in (23), where the object NP and sae form a constituent.

(23)

IP
|   \\
NP-ga I
|   \\
Mary VP I
|   \\
XP-o t_i V_i Tense
|   \\
NP sae naguta
|   \\
John

This constituency is further supported by the fact that no adverbials can intervene between Jobs and sae as in (24), and also that scrambling of Jobs cannot occur as in (25).

(24) *Mary-ga John tuyoku sae nagutta.
	hard
-NOM even hit-past
‘Mary hit even John.’
b. John sae Mary-ga t_i nagutta.
c. *John Mary-ga t ane nagutta.

(24) is ill-formed because an adverbial tYOUKO breaks the constituency. In the case of (25), as (b) and (c) suggest, the whole constituent has to move, otherwise the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

As structure (23) shows, *SANE c-commands the object NP only. Therefore its scope does not extend to other elements in the sentence. The meaning of the sentence is represented in (26).

(26) a. Focus: John

b. Presupposition: (i) There are people other than John who Mary hit.

(ii) Of all the people Mary hit, John was the least expected.

Since the verb cannot be the focused element, the idea that *SANE does not branch from the VP as a sister of the NP and the V is further supported.

2.1.3. Dative Case

Miyagawa (1989) states that in Japanese there are two kinds of tani, one is tani as the Dative Case marker and the other as a postposition. Here, we are interested in the former, which marks the object of a sentence.

(27) John-ga gakusei-ni atta.
-NOM student-DAT meet-past
'John met the students.'

Gakusei-ni in this sentence is not a PP but an NP with Dative Case as the test with a floating numeral quantifier (NO) in (28) shows.

(28) John-ça gakusei-ni 3-min atta.
  -NOM student-DAT 3-CL meet-past
  'John met three students.'

If ni in (28) is a postposition, then the NP gakusei is inside the PP, so it fails to satisfy the Mutual C-Command Requirement proposed in Miyagawa (1989). Thus it should be unacceptable as the example in (30) shows.

(29) Mutual C-Command Requirement: For a predicate to predicate of a NP, the NP or its trace and the predicate or its trace must c-command each other.

  (Miyagawa, 1989: 30)

(30) *Gakusei-ça gakkoo kara 2-tu kita.
    students-NOM school from 2-CL come-past
    'Students came from two schools.'

Gakkoo kara in (30) is a PP, and therefore the NP gakkoo inside of it fails to c-command the NO.
The fact that the NP and the NO can be construed suggests that *gakusei-ni* in (28) is an NP and thus the Mutual C-Command Requirement is satisfied.

Now, let us see if *sae* can appear with the Dative Case marker.

   -NOM student-DAT even meet-past
   'John met even the students.'
   b. ?John-ga gakusei sae ni atta.

Note that unlike the other two Case markers we have discussed, the Dative Case marker *ni* cannot be dropped as shown in (31c), and allows *sae* to occur either before or after *ni*, although the former case is marginal as in (31b). This characteristic is rather close to that of postpositions discussed in the next section. Here, let us examine other cases where postposition *ni* appears in locatives.

   -NOM concert to go-past
   'John went to the concert.'
   -NOM concert to 3-CL go-past
   'John went to three concerts.'

(33) a. Mizuumi ni hune-ga ukandeiru.
lake in boat-NOM float-pres
'There is a boat floating on the lake.'
b. *Mizuumi ni 3-tsu bune-ga ukanderu.
lake in 3-CL boat-NOM float-pres
'There is a boat in each of these three lakes.'

In both cases, the ni-phrase should be a postpositional phrase because they are locatives. However, in (32b) the NP in the PP can be construed with the NO while the NP in the PP in (33b) cannot. Therefore the distinction between ni as the Dative Case marker and as the postposition does not seem very clear. I will come back to discuss this particle in the following section.

2.2. Postpositional Phrase + sae

A PP that consists of an NP and a postposition looks, on the surface, similar to an NP and a Case marker, but they show different characteristics. First, observe the following:

many-GEN people-NOM from ever come-past
'Even from Tokyo many people came.'
b. *Takusan-no hito-ga Tokyo sae kara kita.
c. *Takusan-no hito-ga Tokyo sae kita.

Sae can only attach to a PP as (34a) shows and it cannot intervene between the NP and a postposition as seen in (34b).
Further, the postposition *kara* cannot be dropped as in (34c).

A major difference between Case markers and postpositions is that the latter assign Case to the preceding NP while the former are realizations of structurally assigned Case. As we have seen in section 2.1., Case can be assigned to [tp NP+*sae*]. Therefore, just as *kara* assigns Case to *Tokyo* in (34a), it should be able to assign Case to *Tokyo* *sae* in (34b). If this is the case, then the ungrammaticality of sentence (34b) is not due to a violation of the Case filter.

Why, then, is (34b) unacceptable? To see this, let us consider the structure of PP.

(35)(=34b)

```
        PP
         / \  \
        /   \ 
       NP *kara*  
          /   \
         NP *sae*
            |
          *Tokyo*
```

As the tree diagram suggests, *sae* o-commands the NP *Tokyo* but not the PP. That is, it fails to take scope over the PP. However, it is the PP *Tokyo* *kara*, not just the NP *Tokyo*, that has to be focused. Therefore *sae* should be attached to the PP, and should o-command it. In (34a), *Tokyo* *kara* *sae* forms a constituent and allows *sae* to successfully take scope over its sister PP, *Tokyo* *kara*.

Let us next consider why (34c) is unacceptable. Unlike NPs that have overt Case markers, it is not clear what functional/
grammatical role the NP in (34c) has since the postposition is dropped. *Kara, like other postpositions, is a lexical item that indicates source and therefore cannot be dropped. Radford (1981: 266), referring to Chomsky and Lasnik(1977), states the Recoverability Condition as follows (originally from Postal and Katz (1964)):

(36) Recoverability Condition
Only elements which do not have semantic content can be deleted.

Deleting *kara violates this condition, thus the ungrammaticality of (34c) results.

Now, let us see if these points hold in other cases of PP.

(37) a. [pp Naifu de] sae kitta.
    Knife with even cut-past
    'I cut (it) even with a knife.'
    b. *Naifu sae de kitta.
    c. *Naifu sae kitta.

    -NOM school at even cry-past
    'John cried even at school.'
    b. *John-ga gakkoo sae de naita.

(39) a. [pp John to] sae hanasita.
    with even speak-past
‘I spoke even with John.’
b. ‘John saw to hanasita.
c. ‘John saw hanasita.

As the sentences in (37) through (39) show, a PP with other
postpositions exhibits the same characteristics as a PP with で. It
However, it seems different in the case of に. Consider the
sentences in (40) to (44).

(40) a. [ppHeya ni] sae ki-o oita.
   room in even tree-ACC put-past
   ‘(I) put trees even in the room.’
b. ‘Heya sae ni ki-o oita.
c. ‘Heya sae ki-o oita.

(41) a. [ppIke ni] sae hune-ga ukandeiru.
   pond in even boat-ACC float-pres
   ‘Even in the pond there is a boat.’
b. ‘Ike sae ni hune-ga ukandeiru.
c. ‘Ike sae hune-ga ukandeiru.

   -NOM for even present-ACC buy-past
   ‘John bought a present even for Mary.’
b. ‘John-ga Mary sae ni puresento-o katta.
c. ‘John-ga Mary sae puresento-o katta.

   -NOM to even go-past
   ‘John went even to Tokyo.’

    -NOM to even go-past
    'John even went to Tokyo.'
c. John-ga Tokyo saw itta.4

Argument PP (45) and adjunct PP (41) show the same characteristics as PP with saw. This is also true for the benefactive PP in (43). However, notice that when a PP receives the Goal theta role, the P can be deleted (see (43) and (44)). This seems to be a general property of saw in PPs which represent the theta role, Goal, but it is not. Consider the following examples.

(45) a. Nisuto-ga uti ni saw todoita.
    -NOM home to even reach-past
    'A package reached even to my house.'
b. *Nisuto-ga uti saw todoita.

Therefore, the verb saw 'go' is the only exception in which the postposition saw can be dropped (especially in colloquial speech).

As shown in (28) in the previous section, some saw-phrases can be construed with an NO, therefore there is a possibility that saw in those cases is not a postposition. Thus, except for the case with saw 'go', it can be concluded that saw cannot intervene
between an NP and a postposition, i.e., it has to be attached to PP having the structure below.

(46)                     XP
                         / \      \\
                        PP  sae
                         /  \       \\
                        NP  P

Just as the case with an NP, I hypothesize that PP + sae comprises an XP and receives the features from its complement, the PP.

Let us next examine the meaning of the sentence (34a) which is repeated below.

(34) a. Takusan no hito-ga Tokyo kara sae kita.
      'Many people came even from Tokyo.'

This sentence has the following presuppositions.

(47) a. Focus: Tokyo

b. Presupposition: (i) Many people came from places other than Tokyo.
   (ii) Of all the places people came from, Tokyo was the least expected.

Since sae c-commands the PP, it should be possible to get two other sets of presuppositions besides (47) where the P and the PP are the focused elements. However, it is not possible. Since a
postpositional phrase is closely related to a verb, changing the postposition also changes the meaning of the verb. For instance, if we replace * sees * with * s*, the direction people move becomes opposite. For this reason we cannot get the reading in which the postposition is included.

2.3. Topic Construction

In the previous two sections, we have examined * seen * with an NP and with a PP. In this section, topic construction, which involves these two phrases will be discussed.

There are two types of topicalization in Japanese: NP topicalization and PP topicalization. Let us begin by observing the NP topic construction.

As Kuno (1973) points out, the topic marker * s * has two different functions. One is thematic * s * and the other is contrastive * s * . Saito (1985) argues that a thematic topic phrase is base generated in the sentence initial position as Kuno (1973) originally states, and that the contrastive * s * phrase is a result of move * s * , following Kuroda (1966). Thus, the * s * marked phrase in (48a) should be base generated since it has only one reading, whereas (48b) has two possible derivations since there are two possible readings.

(48) a. Sakana-* wa tei-* ga oishii. (*S (5a) in Saito (1985))
    fish-TOP red snapper-NOM tasty
    'Speaking of fish, red snapper is tasty.'
b. Ano hon-wa John-ga e+ katta. ( = (67) in Saito)
that book-TOP -NOM buy-past
'Speaking of that book, John bought it./John bought that
book (but not this one).'  

When the empty category is base generated as in (48b), it is
interpreted as a pro, while, if there is movement, it is
interpreted as a trace left behind.

However, as the sentences in (49) show, regardless of the
meaning of wa, or the status of the empty category, *sae cannot
occur with an NP topic.

(49) a. *sakana-wa sae tai-ga oishii.
b. *sakana sae-wa tai-ga oishii.
c. *Ano hon-wa sae John-ga katta.
d. *Ano hon sae-wa John-ga katta.

This appears to be due to semantics rather than syntax. As
discussed in Chapter I, Kato (1985: 93) says that "the focused
element with *sae is on the endpoint of a certain scale of
expectation". Thus the sentence containing *sae always has
presuppositions. On the other hand, wa marks the topic about
which the rest of the sentence is about (Saito 1985), and there is
no presupposition associated with the wa-marked element.
Therefore, the topic marker wa is not compatible with the
extremeness that *sae gives to the focused element.
Let us go on to the PP topic construction next. As Saito (1985) argues, it involves movement.

(50) a. John to i wa watasi-ga t i hanasita.
     with TOP I-NOM speak-past
     'With John, I spoke.'
 b. *John to sae wa watasi-ga hanasita.
 c. *John to wa sae watasi-ga hanasita.

(51) a. Tokyo de i wa sakana-ga t i yasui.
     in TOP fish-NOM inexpensive
     'In Tokyo, fish are inexpensive.'
 b. *Tokyo de sae wa sakana-ga yasui.
 c. *Tokyo de wa sae sakana-ga yasui.

Just as the case with the NP topic, the PP topic does not allow *sae to occur either. If the reason is semantic, then it is natural that even the PP topic does not allow *sae to occur.

2.4. Verb Phrase + sae

So far, I have discussed that sae can attach to noun phrases with (or without, in the case of Nominative and Accusative Case) Case markers and also to postpositional phrases. In this section, verb phrases are examined. First, consider the following:

(52) John-ga hon-o kai sae sita.
     -NOM book-ACC buy even do-past
     'John even bought a book.'
(53) is the tree diagram representing the structure of (52).

```
(53)      IP
         / \  
        NP   I'
        /   /  
   John XP   I
        /   /  
   VP  see si past
         / \  
        NP V'   ta
        |   |  
   hon V  
        |  
   kai
```

The V cannot be raised to I to have tense inflected because `see` is the head of another category. Thus the head movement is blocked. Therefore, as a result, Do (su) Insertion occurs to put the dummy verb to inflect with stranded tense. Hence, `sita` appears in (52). (Kuroda (1965) refers to this mechanism as `si`-insertion.) Here again VP + `see` is treated as an XP, having the features of the complement VP. Since `see` c-commands the VP, its scope is over the VP and does not extend to the NP John, as discussed in section 1.2., and this accords with our intuition.

Let us next consider another type of VP, progressives, where we see the `to-form` (or gerund) of a verb.


   -NOM letter-ACC write be-prog

   'John is writing a letter.'

b. John-ga tegami-o kaite see iru.
even

'John is even writing a letter.'

(c) John-ga tegami-o kaitte i sae suru.
d. John-ga tegami-o kaki sae site iru.

(54b) suggests that *kaitte iru* is not a single word since *sae* can intervene between them. Tokashiki (1989) argues that the *te*-form of a verb is an IP, therefore (54a) has the following structure.

(55)

```
      IP
       /\    /\   /
      NP  \  I'  \  I
       /   /  /  /
  John_i VP  \  V_j tense
      /     /
      NP  \   \  u
             /     /
     [e]_i VP  I
             /          /
      NP-o  \   \    \  kai_k te
             /     /
      tegami
```

In the case of (54b), *sae* attaches to the lower IP, where the focus is on the action and not its progression. In (54c), it attaches to the higher VP emphasizing the progression of the action. Since *sae* blocks the raising of the verb, as we can see, do-insertion takes place. (54d) is evidence for V-raising. When *sae* attaches to the lower VP, it blocks V-raising of the embedded verb, *kak*, and triggers do-insertion. In other examples, V-raising occurs and *kak + te* is pronounced as *kaite*. 
2.5. Complementizer Phrase + *sae*

We have seen that *sae* can be attached to an NP, a PP, and a VP. Now, let us turn our focus on the CP. Two different types of CP will be treated in this section, namely the CP that has the overt complementizer *to*, and relative clauses.

2.5.1. Complementizer Phrase with an Overt Complementizer

Like English *that*, *to* in Japanese works as a complementizer. Observe the following:

(56) John-ga [CP asita kuru to] itta.
      -NOM tomorrow come Comp say-past
      'John said that he's coming tomorrow.'

When adding *sae* to (56), the only possible site for it is after the CP.

(58) represents the tree diagram of (57a). *Sae* o-commands the CP and takes scope over it. Therefore the CP as a whole (*asita kuru to*), the IP (*asita kuru*), and the elements in the IP (*asita* and *kuru*) can the focused elements.

There are two possible reasons why (57b) is unacceptable. One is the scope *sae* takes. As discussed in the section 1.3., *sae* has to o-command a constituent to take scope over it. In this case, it is the IP, not the CP within it that must be o-commanded, therefore *sae* cannot appear between the lower IP and the complementizer.

The other possible reason is that *sae* cannot occur immediately after a tensed element. The following are some examples:

(59) *Takakatta* sae hon.

was expensive even book

'The book that was expensive.'
In (57b), *see appears after a tensed IP, therefore it is ungrammatical. The re-form we have discussed in the previous section is also an IP, but it does not have tense. More on this matter is to be discussed in section 2.7.

2.5.2. Relative Clause

The other CP to be discussed is the relative clause construction. Unlike the CP with the overt complementizer, it is not possible for *see to appear after a CP that is a relative clause.

(62) [NP [CP watashi-ga katta] hon]-ga nusumareta.
    I-NOM buy-past book-NOM was stolen
    'The book that I bought was stolen.'

(63) [NP [CP watashi-ga katta] see hon]-ga nusumareta.

If *see can attach to a CP as seen in the previous section, it must also be possible in this case. However, as (62) shows, it cannot intervene between the CP and its head NP. (63) is the tree diagram representing the structure of the NP in (62).
A possible explanation for the ungrammaticality of (62) is to consider the XP having *see as its head as the barrier that blocks coindexing the head NP and the relative clause operator under the CP since it breaks the adjacency of the two. As the examples in (64) show, no element can intervene between the operator and the relative head, i.e., they have to be adjacent.

(64) a. *Watasi-ga katta kinoo hon-ga nusumareta.
   I-NOM buy-past yesterday book-NOM was stolen

b. *Watasi-ga katta dake hon-ga nusumareta
   only

Let us next examine another type of relative clause where there is no gap.

(65) a. Kore-ga yaseru kusuri da.
this-NOM get thin medicine be-pres
‘This is the medicine that reduces your weight’
b. *Yaseru sae kusuri.

There is no movement involved in (65a), but still it is not possible for *sae to intervene between the relative clause and its head. Thus it can be concluded that the relative head and its complement CP have to be adjacent to each other. Or, alternatively, the relative clause in Japanese is not CP but IP which does not allow *sae, as will be discussed in 2.7.

2.6. Adjectival Phrase + *sae

Makayama (1989) claims that predicate adjectival phrases occur within a VP having the copula aru. When the copula aru occurs with the present tense, it is unpronounced, but when it is with the past tense, it is realized as -atta following adjectives (e.g., akah-atta ‘was red’ or takah-atta ‘was expensive’). This analysis is supported by the fact that when *sae attaches to an AP, the copula appears as in (66a).

(66) a. Kanoryo-wa (atama-ga ii de naku) utukusiku *sae atta.
    she-TOP smart only NEG beautiful even be-past
    ‘She was not only smart but also beautiful.’
cf. b. Kanoryo-wa *utukusii.
    she-TOP beautiful-present
If there is no *sae*, the adjective *utukusik* is incorporated with V, an empty copula. Then the incorporated VP raises to Infl and gets inflected with tense as in (66b). Since *sae* blocks this incorporation, the copula *saru* appears to realize tense. In the case of the simple VP we saw in section 2.4, when *sae* blocks incorporation, do-insertion occurs in order for tense to be phonologically realized. We do not see it here since there is a copula that raises into Infl. (66a) and (66b) have the following structures, respectively:

(67) a. \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} / \backslash \\
\text{kanoryo} \text{VP} / \text{I} \\
\text{AP} V V \text{past} \\
\text{AP} \text{sae} t_1 \text{ar}_1 \text{ta} \\
\text{utukusiku} \\
\end{array} \]

b. \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} / \backslash \\
\text{kanoryo} \text{VP} / \text{I} \\
\text{AP} t_1 V_1 \text{tense} \\
\text{t}_1 \text{A}_i V \text{present} \\
\text{utukusik} [e] \text{A} \\
\end{array} \]
(67b) is the D-structure of (66b). The adjective is incorporated into the V since nothing blocks it, then the incorporated V moves up to INFL to get present tense.

It seems possible to analyze that *sae* attaches to the VP in (66a), as the following tree diagram represents where the copula *ari* is inserted.

```
(68)                      IP
  /                     /
 /     I               |
 /      /               |
kanozyo XP      I     /  /
 /   /     VP see at past /
 /     |      |        |
AP V ta     |        |        |
|      |        |        |
|      |        |        |
utukusiku [e]
```

However, if *sae* were attached to the VP, then it would block the incorporation and do-support would be needed to have something inflected with tense. We would get the sentence in (69), which is also possible, rather than (66a).

(69) Kanōzyo-wa [VP utukushiku ari] sae sita.

But in the case of (66a), the matrix verb *ari* is inflected with tense, so it is obvious that nothing blocks the incorporation of the V into Inf1. Thus we can conclude that *sae* here attaches to the AP, not the VP.

As the sentences in (66) show, *sae* can attach to an AP as well as the other maximal projections we have seen. *Sae c-
commands the AP, and the following is the reading we get.

(70) a. Focus: utukusik
   b. Presupposition: (i) There are (good) characters other than
      being beautiful that she has.
      (ii) Of all the good characters, being
      beautiful is the least expected.

There is another category of words in Japanese that can
modify nouns just as adjectives can. This category is called
adjectival nouns (also ma-type adjectives, ma-nominals, etc.), and
words like kirei or suruka are included. As the name suggests, an
adjectival noun has characteristics of both adjectives and nouns.
When followed by the copula da (or datta), it functions the way
nouns do, and with ma attached, it can modify an NP.

The tree diagram in (72), which represents the structure of
(71), is based on Nakayama (1989)'s analysis of adjectival nouns.

(71) Kanoozyo-wa (atama-ga ii dake de naku) kirei de sae aru.
    she-TOP smart only NEG pretty even be-present
    'She is not only smart but also pretty.'
Note that Nakayama treats de as a postposition. However, this PP having de as the head does not show a typical characteristic of PPs, namely, topicalization.

(73) "Kirei de wa kanōzyo-ga aru."

A possible alternative analysis is to treat kirei de as the infinitival form of this adjectival noun, and to say that sae is attached to the ANP (adjectival noun phrase) analogous to the AP. In that case, the sentence has the following structure.

(74) 

```
  IP
     / \  
    NP  I
       / \  
  kanōzyo VP  I
       / \  \  
  IP  ti vi tense
       / \  \  
  ANP  sae  ar  u
        \  \  
  kireidē
```
I believe that adjectival nouns do not consist of a noun + copula since they do show different characteristics from ordinary nouns. For instance, ordinary nouns do not take na to modify another noun like adjectival nouns do.

(75) a. Kirei na hon.
    beautiful book
    'It is a beautiful book.'

b. Gakusei na hon.
    student

Also, the fact that they cannot be coordinated with NP suggests that they are different categories.  

(76) a. Kanozyo-wa kirei de gakusei da.
    she-TOP beautiful student be-pres
    'She is beautiful and is a student.'

b. Kanozyo-wa kirei de sizukada.
    she-TOP beautiful quiet-pres
    'She is beautiful and quiet.'

c. Kanozyo-wa gakusei de shuhu da.
    she-TOP student housewife be-pres
    'She is a student and housewife.'

In (76b) and (76c), the same categories are coordinated. On the other hand, in (76a), two different categories are
coordinated, hence the sentence is ungrammatical.

Thus, our view that adjectival nouns are different from ordinary noun + copula is supported by the evidence discussed above. I conclude that sentence (71) has the structure of (74), with \textit{sae} taking scope over the ANP. The structure is analogous to that of APs, and so is the reading we get from the sentence.

We have seen that \textit{sae} can attach to APs and ANPs. However, there are exceptions. Observe the following.

(77) a. *[Kawaiii sae gakusei]-ga kita.
pretty even student-NOM come-past
child-NOM quiet even park in play-past

As we can see in (77a) and (77b), \textit{sae} cannot occur after an AP or ANP when it modifies an NP. It is possibly because a modifier and a modificie hold a predication relationship which cannot be blocked by \textit{sae}. Or, alternatively, an AP and an ANP form a relative clause when it modifies an NP. As discussed in section 2.5.2., \textit{sae} cannot intervene between a relative clause and its head, therefore, (77a) and (77b) are unacceptable.

2.7. Inflectional Phrase + \textit{sae}

The last maximal projection I would like to discuss is an IP. As the examples (78) and (79) show, it is not possible to attach \textit{sae} to an IP that has tense.
    -NOM go-past even

(79) *[Ip asita kuru] sae to itta.
    tomorrow come-pres even say-past

What makes (78) and (79) different from the other grammatical sentences that contain *sae we have seen in other sections, is that there is tense before *sae. If this is the case, the reason why these sentences are not acceptable appears to be that *sae must be governed by tense. 7,8

*sae cannot attach to an IP that has tense, but as we have seen in section 2.4., it is possible when there is no tense, i.e., the te-form.

2.8. Summary

This chapter has presented a close examination on the distribution of *sae at the phrasal level. It can attach to all the maximal projections except for an IP with a tensed element, a CP in a relative clause, and an NP within a PP. I presume that *sae is the head of an IP, which receives features from its complement phrase since *sae itself does not have the lexical features [\#N, \#V].

It was also found that *sae blocks V-raising, therefore it forces do-support to take place to realize tense. When do-insertion is not possible, attaching *sae yields ungrammatical sentences.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. An alternative analysis is to assume that *sae* can optionally transfer Case which is assigned to TP to NP. When it transfers Case, *ga* can be dropped since the NP has abstract Case and does not violate the Case Filter.

2. The sentence might sound a little awkward, however, its negative counterpart is significantly better.

   (i) John-*ga* eigo *sae* ga wakaranai
   -NOM English even NOM can understand-NEG
   'John even cannot understand English.'

3. In some cases the *o* *sae* sequence is acceptable. The following is from Martin (1975).

   (i) Iyarasi-*sa o* sae kanziru koto *ga* aru
   'I sometimes even feel a disgust.'

4. However, as pointed out by Miyagawa (p.o.), it is hard to tell if the dropped postposition is *ni* or *o*, both mean 'to'.

5. The ungrammaticality of the sentence might not be due to *de*. It seems that topicalization is not possible from a VP with *aru*. Observe the following:

   (i) *Gakusei de wa John-*ga* aru
   student TOP -NOM be-pres

   (ii) Utukusiku-*wa kanziryo-*ga* aru
   beautiful-TOP she-NOM be-pres

6. Miyagawa (1987) argues that adjectival nouns have the features [+V, +N] while nouns are [-V, -N] and adjectives are [+V]. The examples in (76) confirm this.


   Government: *a* governs *b* in
\[ \beta \ldots \gamma \ldots \alpha \ldots \gamma \ldots \] where

(i) \( \alpha \equiv X^0 \)

(ii) where \( \phi \) is a maximal projection, if

\( \phi \) dominates \( \gamma \) then \( \phi \) dominates \( \alpha \).

(iii) \( \alpha \) \( \omega \)-commands \( \gamma \)

The reason why \( \omega e \) has to be governed by tense seems to be that \( \omega e \) cannot take scope over tense. As pointed out by Nakayama (p.c.), tense is another element that takes scope over the entire sentence, possibly from Comp by moving there at LF. Suppose \( \omega e \) cannot take scope over tense, it cannot appear above tense unless \( \omega e \) is dominated by (or within the scope of) another tense. If this is correct, this tense to Comp movement, that is presumably head movement, is blocked by \( \omega e \). Thus, the sentence is not good.
CHAPTER III
DISTRIBUTION OF "SPE" AT THE SENTENTIAL LEVEL

3.0. Introduction

The previous chapter provided an examination of the distribution of "spe" at the phrasal level in simple active sentences. In this chapter, its distribution at the sentential level is discussed to evaluate analyses of various sentence structures such as passives. In the course of examination, previous studies on each construction will be reviewed and I will investigate which approach is favorable based on the results we obtained in Chapters I and II.

In section 1, I will examine both the biclausal and the monoclausal approaches to the passive construction. Section 2 deals with the potential construction, proposing different structures for P/A (potential of ability) sentences and P/P (potential of possibility) sentences following the proposals by Okada (1989). In section 3, the causative construction is discussed. I will discuss the desiderative construction in section 4, and the resultative construction in section 5. A summary of this chapter is provided in section 6.
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3.1. Passive Construction

As Kuno (1973) points out, there are two types of passive constructions in Japanese, namely the pure passive and the adversity passive. The pure passive, or more commonly called the direct passive, is similar to the English passive in which the passive morpheme is attached to a transitive verb. Also, the surface subject is a logical object of the verb. On the other hand, both transitive and intransitive verbs are involved in the case of the adversity passive, or the indirect passive. Observe the following examples:

(1) a. John-ga Mary-o butta.
   -NOM -ACC hit-past
   'John hit Mary.'

b. Mary-ga John-ni butareta.
   -NOM by hit-pass-past
   'Mary was hit by John.'

c. Mary-ga John-ni kodomo-o butareta.
   -NOM by child-ACC hit-pass-past
   '(Lit.) Mary was hit her child by John.'

(2) a. John-no oya-ga sinda.
   -GEN parent-NOM die-past
   'John’s parents died.'

   -NOM parent by die-pass-past
   '(lit.) John was died by his parents.'
The verb *but* 'hit' in (1) is transitive whereas *sin* 'die' in (2) is intransitive. As we can see, a transitive verb has both direct (1b) and indirect (1c) passive counterparts while an intransitive verb has only the indirect passive.

There is an extra NP in the indirect passive sentence that receives the Experiencer theta role. In (1c), it is *Mary*; and in (2b), it is *John* that is the Experiencer NP which is the subject of the verb and is adversely affected by the verb (Miyagawa 1989).

There are two possible analyses for each of the two types of passives: syntactic (movement) or lexical. Some have suggested a uniform account for both the direct and the indirect passives, and others, a non-uniform account. Let us first examine the direct passive.

3.1.1. Direct Passive

Miyagawa (1989) argues that the direct passive in Japanese is similar to the English passive in which the object NP of the verb moves to the surface subject position. There is another analysis in which no movement is involved (lexical approach).

Before discussing the Japanese direct passive, let us study the mechanism of the English passive.

(3) a. John broke a vase.

b. A vase was broken by John.

(3b) is the passive counterpart of (3a), where the object NP moves to the subject position and the passive morpheme -ed is
attached to the verb. (3b) has the following D-structure.

(4)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IP} & \quad / \quad \backslash \\
\text{NP} & \quad I' \\
\text{I} & \quad / \quad \backslash \\
\text{VP} & \quad / \quad \backslash \\
\text{tense} & \quad \text{pass} \\
\text{V'} & \quad \text{PP} \\
\text{past} & \quad \text{been} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{NP} & \quad \text{P} \\
\text{hit} & \quad \text{N} \\
\text{by} & \quad \text{John} \\
\text{Mary} &
\end{align*}
\]

Chomsky (1981) argues that the passive morpheme -en absorbs accusative Case of the verb, and also it suppresses the external theta role that the verb has to assign. John receives the Agent theta role since the absorbed external theta role is transmitted to the argument of by (Jaeggli 1986). If Mary stays in the position where it is in (4), nothing can assign Case to it. Therefore, to avoid violating the Case Filter, it has to move to the empty subject position where it can get Case from Infl. Its theta role, Theme, is assigned by the verb before the movement and the position it is moved to does not receive any other theta role because the external theta role of the verb is suppressed by the passive morpheme. Thus the Theta Criterion (5) is not violated.

(5) Theta Criterion (Chomsky, 1981)

Each argument bears one and only one theta role, and each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument.
Now, let us turn to the case of Japanese.

(6) Mary-ga John-ni nagurarreta.
    -NOM by hit-pass-past
    'Mary was hit by John.'

Nakayama and Tawa (1999b) suggest the following D-structure for (6), in which the passive morpheme is generated under Infl.

(7)

```
IP
  / \  
NP / I \ 
   / \ 
VP / I 
  / \ 
PP V  pass-tense
  / \ / \ (zare-past)
NP P NP V
   |   |   
John ni Mary nagur
```

The verb *nagur* has two theta roles, the external theta role Agent and the internal theta role Theme. The absorption of Accusative Case takes place after the suppression of the external theta role assignment and forces *Mary* to move to the subject position. The external theta role remains at the theta grid as an implicit argument or is assigned to the NP in the by-phrase (Nakayama and Tawa 1999b). Therefore *Mary* does not receive two theta roles. In the subject position, the NP receives the nominative Case from Infl (Takezawa 1987).
Miyagawa (1989) takes the lexical approach in forming the passive verb, i.e., it is a morphological process. Thus in his analysis, the passive morpheme is not in I as the following S-structure shows.

(8)

```
(8)     IP
        /   \    
       NP   I'
       /  \   \ 
    Johni  VP   I
       /  \   \   
     PP   V' tense
    /    / \   \ 
  Mary ni NP   V ta
     /
    t_i nagurate
```

In his approach, the external theta role of the verb is suppressed by the passive morpheme, just like in English passives.

Both analyses discussed above are monoclusal, in which the passive morpheme /is/ is not treated as an independent verb.

Another syntactic approach is a bioclusal analysis in which the passive morpheme is treated as a matrix verb and the transitive verb as a verb in the embedded clause (cf. Kuroda 1965). The following tree diagram represents the bioclusal analysis.
The lexical approach (e.g., Miyagawa 1980), on the other hand, assumes that everything is base-generated and there is no movement. Thus the structure should be something like the one in (10).

However, as Miyagawa (1989) points out, the lexical approach should be ruled out. Observe the following:

If there is no movement involved, we cannot explain why it is possible to construe the numeral quantifier with the NP in the subject position. The NG in both (11a) and (11b) are in the VP on the surface, as the structures (12a) and (12b) show, respectively, so it cannot c-command the noun in the subject position.

(12) a. 

```
  IP
    / \ 
   NP  I'
    |   \ 
   koppu  VP  I
    |     \ 
   PP  NO  V  past
    \   \  |  |
    NP  P  V  ta
    |   |   |
    John ni  warare
```

b. 

```
  IP
    /  
   NP  I'
    |  
   gakusei  VP  I
    |     \ 
   NP  NO  V  past
    |     |  |
    koppu  wat  ta
```

However, only (11b) is ungrammatical. That is because the NP in
the subject position in (11a) originated in the object position of
the verb and moved, leaving its trace behind. Thus the VP in
(12a) actually has the structure (13).

(13)    
     /      
    VP    PP
     /     / \ 
  \   v   v
   \    \   
    t      NO V

In (13), the quantifier and the trace of NP c-command each other,
satisfying the Mutual C-Command Requirement (Miyagawa 1989).

Now, let us examine where *sae* can occur in passive
sentences.

     -NOM by hit-pass even do-past
     'Mary was even hit by John.'


In (14a), *sae* blocks the raising of the verb into Infl;
therefore do-insertion takes place. This is exactly what we saw
when *sae* attached to a VP in section 4 of the previous chapter.

If the passive morpheme is an independent verb as suggested
in the biclausal analysis, (14b) has to be acceptable. There are
a few other serious problems with the biclausal analysis, even
without *sae*. First of all, it cannot explain why the NP has to
move in (9). The passive morpheme is not attached to the verb,
therefore case absorption cannot take place. If Accusative Case
is assigned to Mary, nothing forces the movement. Even if we say
that there is no movement involved and that there is a pro instead
of the trace in (10), the biclausal account still has another
undesirable consequence. That is, the passive morpheme \textit{(t)are}
assigns different theta roles to the NP in the matrix subject
position depending on the verb. In (15a), the NP John receives
the Theme/Experiencer theta role from the passive morpheme,
whereas it receives the Goal theta role in (15b).

\hspace{1cm} -NOM by kick-pass-past
\hspace{1cm} 'John was kicked by Mary.'

b. John-ga Mary-ni hon-o okurareta.
\hspace{1cm} -NOM by book-ACC send-pass-past
\hspace{1cm} 'John was sent a book by Mary.'

Thus the biclausal analysis is excluded.

There are two possible analyses left here. One is to treat
\textit{butare} in (14a) as a lexically integrated single verb, since \textit{see}
cannot attach to the "first" verb as we can see in (14b). The
other possibility is that the passive morpheme is the head of
another VP, which takes a VP as its complement as in (16).

(16) \hspace{1cm} \textbf{IP}
\hspace{1cm} / \hspace{1cm} \textbf{NP}
\hspace{1cm} / \hspace{1cm} I
\hspace{1cm} / \hspace{1cm} \textbf{VP}
\hspace{1cm} / \hspace{1cm} I
\hspace{1cm} / \hspace{1cm} \textbf{VP} \hspace{1cm} rare
Assuming that the verb in the lower VP and the passive morpheme have to be incorporated, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (14b) can be explained since the incorporation is blocked by \textit{sae}. This analysis can also solve the problem with the other monoclausal approach, such as (7), in which \textit{sae} intervenes between the passive morpheme and tense, which are both generated under Inf1.

So, we have discussed two possible analyses: a lexical analysis and a VP analysis. The second analysis is more preferable since there is a dialect which accepts (17). If a verb and the passive morpheme form a single verb, this cannot be explained.

(17) Mary-ga John-ni naguri sae sareta.\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{-NOM by hit even do-past}

'Mary was even hit by John.'

For those people who speak this dialect, incorporation of the two verbs is optional. Since \textit{sare} is a bound morpheme, do-insertion occurs when \textit{sae} blocks incorporation. On the other hand, for those who only accept (14a), incorporation is obligatory so that \textit{sae} cannot intervene between the two verbs.

Now that we have determined the structure, let us see which element is focused by \textit{sae} and what sort of presuppositions we get from the sentence. Consider the sentence and its structure below.
(18) a. John-ga Mary ni nagurare sae sita.
   -NOM by hit-pass even do-past
   'John was even hit by Mary.'

b.  IP
    / \  
    NP I'
    | /  \ 
   John_i XP I
    / \ /  \ 
   VP sae do past
    / \ |  |
   VP V si ta
    / \ |  |
   PP V nagur-j-are
    / \ |  |
   NP P NP V
    | /  |  |
   Mary ni t_i t_j

Sae c-commands the VP Mary ni nagurare as seen in (18b). Thus, as pointed out by Kato (1985), there is an ambiguity in the interpretation of the sentence. Not only the VP as a whole, but also the V, the PP, and the trace of John can be the focused element. Thus the sentence has the following four sets of presuppositions.

(19) a. Focus: John

b. Presupposition: (i) There was someone other than John who was hit.
   (ii) John was the least expected person to be hit.

(20) a. Focus: Mary ni
b. Presupposition: (i) John was hit by someone other than Mary
   (ii) Mary was the least expected person to hit John.

(21) a. Focus: nagurare
b. Presupposition: (i) There were other things than being hit that John was done by Mary.
   (ii) Being hit was the least expected among the things John was done by Mary.

(22) a. Focus: Mary ni John ga nagurare.
b. Presupposition: (i) There were people other than John who were done something other than hitting by someone other than Mary.
   (ii) John's being hit by Mary was the least expected to have happened.

It is not possible to have *nagur* itself (i.e., without the passive morpheme) as the focused element. That is because *see* attaches to the incorporated verb. For those who accept sentence (17), then *nagur* can be the focused element in (17).

3.1.2. Indirect Passive

Let us now turn to the indirect passive. Kuno (1973) analyzes the indirect passive as having an internal clause, i.e., as being bi-clausal. He treats the passive morpheme as a matrix verb, therefore the sentence in (2) has the following D-structure.
Miyagawa (1989), on the other hand, proposes a unified account for passives. That is, in his analysis, indirect passive verbs are also formed by a morphological process and are treated as a single verb as in structure (24), unlike what Kuno hypothesizes.

In Miyagawa (1989)'s account, the passive morpheme, when attaching to an intransitive verb, does not absorb Case (since there is no Case to absorb), but it internalizes the external theta role of the verb and provides a new external theta role, Experiencer. When the passive morpheme attaches to a transitive verb, it absorbs the Case of the verb and reassigns the Case to the object NP. Thus the object NP *kodomo* in (25) receives its Case from the passive morpheme.

(25) Mary-ga sensei-ni kodomo-o sikarareta.
    -NOM teacher by child-ACC scold-past-past
'Mary had the child scolded by the teacher.'

It is also possible to analyze the structure of *V* rare as we did for the direct passive.

(26)  
/ \  
VP  rare  
/ \  
NP  V

Since the passive morpheme is adjacent to the verb, we can assume that the mechanism that Miyagawa (1989) proposes, which is discussed above, takes place.

Now, let us examine the indirect passive with *sae*.

    -NOM parent by die-pass even do-past
    '(lit.) John was even died by his parents.'

(28) a. Mary-ga sensei ni kodomo-o sikarare sae sita.
    -NOM teacher by child-ACC scold-pass even do-past
    'Mary was adversely affected by the teacher scolding her child.'
b. *Mary-ga sensei ni kodomo-o sikari sae rareta.
c. *Mary-ga sensei ni kodomo-o sikari sae rareta.

We get the same distribution as we did in the direct
passive. The indirect passive is analogous to the direct passive, in which two dialects exist. One dialect requires incorporation of the verb and the passive morpheme; the other does not and accepts the (c) sentences. Therefore, I will adopt the structure in (26) for the indirect passive. 4

Let us next determine the meaning of the sentence. (27a) has the following structure.

(29)  
    IP
    / \  
   NP  I'
   / \  / \ 
John IR  I
    \ / \ 
    VP sae si ta 
    / \ \ 
    VP sim1-are
    / \ 
    NP V
    / \ 
    oya ni t1

As we can see above, the VP (also the NP and the V within it) is in sae's c-command domain. Thus we get the following three sets of presuppositions.

(30) a. Focus: oya ni

b. Presupposition: (i) There was someone other than his parents who died (and John was adversely affected by the death).

(ii) Of all the people who died on John, his parents were the least expected.
(31) a. Focus: sinare
   b. Presupposition: (i) There were other things than dying
      that John was done by his parents.
      (ii) Of all the things that John was done
           by his parents, died by them was the
           least expected to have happened.

(32) a. Focus: oyani sinare
   b. Presupposition: (i) There were other things than died by
      by his parents that have happened to
      John.
      (ii) Death of his parents was the least
           expected event to have happened.

We cannot get the reading where there were people other than John
who were affected by their parents' death, thus John is not in the
scope domain of sam, suggesting that there is no movement.

3.2. Potential Construction

Like the passive construction, the potential also has two
different types: potential of ability (henceforth P/A) and
potential of possibility (P/P) according to Nakayama and Tawa
(1998). First, observe the following:

(33) John-ga nihongo-o ga hanaseru.
    -NOM Japanese-ACC/NOM speak-pot-pres
    "John can speak Japanese."

(34) Kono sakana-ga taberareru.
this fish-NOM eat-pot-pres
'This fish is edible.'

(33) is an example of P/A, while (34) is of P/P. In P/A sentences, it is the ability or capability of someone to do something that is discussed. So in (33), it is John's ability to speak Japanese that is expressed by the verb. On the other hand, P/P sentences express the possibility of something. In (34) it is this fish's property of being edible that is stated by the verb. Actually, (34) can be read as a P/A sentence, too, and in that case, there is someone understood in the discourse who can eat the fish, as in (35).

(35) [pro [kono sakana-ga taberareru]]
    this fish-NOM eat-pot-pres
    '(I/he/she/they) can eat this fish.'

In the next two subsections, P/A and P/P constructions are discussed separately.

3.2.1. Potential of Ability

Okada (1989) argues that the formation of the P/A construction takes place in the lexicon and that there is no movement involved. The following is the structure she gives for the P/A construction.
(36) IP
NP-ga I'
    / \    /
John  VP I
    / \   /
NP-o V tense
|   / \|
nihongo hanas e ru

In Okada (1989), the verb *hanas* and the potential morpheme *(rar)e ru* are treated as a single verb, similar to the case in the passive verb in Miyagawa's (1989) analysis.

Takezawa (1987), as well as Kuno (1973), treats the potential morpheme as the matrix verb. (37) is the structure that he provides.

(37) IP
NP-ga I'
    / \    /
John  VP I
    / \   /
NP I' *(rar)e ru*
    / \      /
PRO VP I
    / \   /
NP V *(tense)*
|   / \|
nihongo hanae

Takezawa also proposes Reanalysis, following Haegeman and van Riemen (1985), to account for Case alternation. We will not go into his Case assignment mechanism here, but simply mention that, after Reanalysis, the structure looks exactly like the one
Okada proposes. That is, the verb and the potential morpheme become a single verb, changing the sentence from being bioclusal to monoclausal.

Sugioka (1984), too, claims that Reanalysis takes place in potential sentences. However, in her proposal, the structure is monoclausal throughout the process as shown in (38).

(38)a. $V'$ \reanalysis\ $V'$
    \ /                       \ / \ NP $V$
    $V'$ (rar)eru \longrightarrow NP $V$
    / \                         / \ Y-eru
    NP $V$

The NP receives Accusative Case in the structure before Reanalysis, and Nominative Case after, as the argument of the [+stative] predicate in the structure on the right.

Now, let us examine the case when the P/A construction contains see. As the following examples show, the occurrence of see seems to favor Sugioka's (1984) account.

(39) a. John-ga nihongo-o ga hanasi see suru.
    -NOM Japanese-ACC/NOM speak-pot even do-pres
    'John can even speak English.'

b. *John-ga nihongo-o hanasi see rareru.

c. *John-ga nihongo-o hanasi see sareru.

d. ?John-ga nihongo-o hanasi see dekiru.

Takezawa's (1987) bioclusal approach cannot account for the ungrammaticality of (39b) since see attaches to a tenseless IP,
which should be possible as discussed in the previous chapter. 5

As (39d) suggests, there are two dialects. I find this sentence awkward, but many people accept it. Sugioka’s (1984) analysis cannot account for this phenomena since (39d) should always be possible when the object NP is marked with a. However, if we take the same analysis as used for passives, we do not have to change the structures just to account for Case alternation, and we can explain both (39b) and (39d). Observe the following.

(40)

```
( VP / \ VP (rar) e / \ NP V
```

Incorporation of the V and the potential morpheme is optional to some people, but when *see* blocks it, there has to be do-insertion, since *(rar)*e is a bound morpheme. Therefore (39d), but not (39b), is acceptable. For those who speak the dialect in which incorporation is obligatory, *see* cannot block it. Thus both (39b) and (39d) are unacceptable. (39c) is ungrammatical since the potential form *suru* is not *sareto* but *deshiu*.

The structure in (40) can also account for Case alternation. The verb *hane* has the feature [+stative] whereas the potential morpheme has [-stative] (cf. Kuno, 1973). If we assume that the incorporated verb can take either feature, it can be explained why there are two Case patterns (see the discussion in Takezawa, 1987).
Let us next examine the meaning of the sentence. (39a) has the structure in (41) where *sae o*-commands the NP, the V and the VP.

(41)

```
IP
  / \  
NP-ga I'
  | /  \   
John XP I
  / \ /  \  
VP sae su ru
  / \  
VP hanasi-e
  / \   
NP V
  |  |
nihongo ti
```

The following are the three sets of presuppositions we can obtain.

(42) a. Focus: nihongo

b. Presupposition: (i) There are languages other than Japanese that John can speak.

(ii) Of all the languages that John can speak, Japanese is the least expected.

(43) a. Focus: hanasi

b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than speaking that John can do with Japanese.

(ii) Of all the things that John can do with Japanese, speaking is the least expected for him to be able.

(44) a. Focus: nihongo-o hanasi
b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than speaking Japanese that John can do with a foreign language.
   (ii) Of all the things that he can do with a foreign language, speaking Japanese is the least expected.

Since John is outside of the VP, it cannot be a focused element.

3.2.2. Potential of Possibility

Unlike the P/A construction, the P/P sentences involve NP movement (Nakayama and Tawa (1988); but cf. Okada (1989), Nakayama and Tawa (1989a)). Nakayama and Tawa (1988) consider that the P/P sentences are formed in a similar fashion to passives. However, Okada (1989) considers that P/P sentences involve focus movement (IP-adjunct \). In her analysis, the attached potential morpheme absorbs the Case-assigning ability of the verb and forces the NP in the object position to move. (45) is the structure given in Nakayama and Tawa (1988) and (46) is that given by Okada (1989).

(45) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad I' \\
\text{kono} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{sakana}_1 \quad / \\
\text{NP} \quad V \quad \text{tabe}_j\text{-kare-ru} \\
\text{t}_1 \\
\end{array}
\]

(46) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad I' \\
\text{kono} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{sakana}_1 \quad / \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
[\text{e}] \\
\text{NP} \quad V \\
\text{ru} \\
\text{t}_1 \text{taberare}
\]

In (45), the NP *kono sakana* moves to the subject position, whereas in (46), it is the focus movement in which the NP adjoins to IP, creating another IP. Nakayama and Tawa (1999a) note that the NP is base-generated in the IP-joined position. Another difference between them is that Okada (1989) interprets the pro (the empty subject in (46)) as an expletive while Nakayama and Tawa (1999a) interpret the pro as arbitrary. Although their interpretations of pro differ, both analyses generate the potential morpheme /rar/e under Infl in D-structure, like passives.

Now let us turn our focus on P/P sentences containing *sae*. It appears to be impossible to get the P/P reading, hence only the P/A reading is possible.

(47) Kono sakana-ga taberare sae suru.
    this +h-NOM eat-pot even do-pres
    'This fish is even edible.'
    '(I/he/she/they) can even eat this fish.'

This holds in other examples:

(48) a. Kono konpyuuta-ga tukaeru.
    this computer-NOM use-pot-pres
    'This computer is usable.' (P/P)
    '(I/he/she/they) can use this computer.' (P/A)

b. Kono konpyuuta-ga tukae sae suru.
    even
"This computer is even usable." (P/P)

"(I/he/she/they) can even use this computer." (P/A)

Since syntactically these sentences are acceptable, it must be at
some other level that the sentences above are ruled out. I would
hypothesize it to be at the semantic level. When people expect
only one thing to be done, it is awkward to use sae since there is
no reason to emphasize that single activity. Consider the
examples in (49).

(49) a. Kono kamera de syasin-o toru.
   This camera with picture-ACC take-pres
   "(I/he/she/they) take(s) pictures with this camera."
   b. *Kono kamera de syasin sae toru.
   even
   "* (I/he/she/they) take(s) even pictures with this camera."
   c. Kono kamera de sae syasin-o toru.
   "(I/he/she/they) take(s) pictures even with this camera."

(49b) is unacceptable since taking pictures is (under normal
circumstances) the only thing that people do with a camera. On
the other hand, in (49c), it is implied that there are other
cameras in the discourse, thus the appearance of sae is
acceptable. Since we would not expect fish to be used for
purposes other than eating, (47) cannot have the P/P reading.
When there is more than one thing that something can be used for,
then the P/P reading is possible as in (50).
(50) Kono mizu-ga (ryoori ni tukaeru dake de naku) nome sae suru.
this water-NOM cooking to use-pot only not drink-pot
even do-pres
'(Not only it can be used for cooking) this water is drinkable.'

If the potential morpheme is generated under Infl as stated by Nakayama and Tawa (1988, 1989a) and Okada (1989), then it cannot be explained why *sae* appears between the potential morpheme and the tense. Therefore, if we take the position that the potential verb is not formed in the lexicon, it is necessary to hypothesize that the potential morpheme becomes the head of another VP dominating the lower VP, as in the following.

(51) VP
     / \  
    VP  rare
       / \  
      NP V
      | pro

This seems correct since, similar to the P/A construction, there are people who accept (52).

(52) *Kono mizu-ga nomi sae dekiru
this water-NOM drink even can-pres
'This water can even be drunk.'
Let us consider the meaning of P/P sentences next. Take the sentence in (50) for example. It is possible to take な水 as the focused element as the following demonstrates.

(53) a. Focus: な水
   b. Presupposition: (i) This water has some other possibilities than being drinkable.
      (ii) Of all the possibilities, being drinkable is the least expected.

Note that it is not possible to get the reading where the focus is on な水. This supports Okada's (1989) proposal, in which the NP undergoes focus movement. Since な水 is already marked as a focus by the particle が, す is cannot take scope over it, as we discussed in 2.1.1., i.e. the exhaustive listing す.

Okada's (1989) analysis can also explain why we do not see any Case alternation in the P/P construction.

3.3. Causative Construction

Causative sentences are formed in a similar fashion to passives and potentials, in that a morpheme is attached to a verb. The causative morpheme is /す/す, and it can attach to both transitive and intransitive verbs.

(54) John-が Mary-に 本-を かわせた。

'John made Mary buy the book.'
(55) John-ga Mary-ni/o iiaseta.
    -NOM    DAT/ACC go-cause-past
    'John made Mary go.'

In (54), the causative morpheme is attached to a transitive verb, whereas in (55), it is attached to an intransitive verb. As shown in the example, when the verb is intransitive, the lower NP can be marked with either ni or o. They are referred to as the ni-causative and the o-causative, respectively. Kuno (1973) proposes different structures for these two causatives.

(56) (o-causative)

```
    S
      /   \                /
     NP   VP
    /     \      /
  John NP S  V
    /     \  |
  Mary NP VP saseru
      /   |
  Mary iku
```

(57) (ni-causative)

```
    S
      /   \                /
     NP   VP
    /     \      /
  John S  V
    /     \  |
  NP    VP saseru
      /   |
  Mary iku
```
In Kuno (1973)'s analysis, the verb and the causative morpheme are treated as two separate verbs in the D-structure in both types of causatives, and they become a single verb in the syntax by the rule called Verb Raising. So, Mary in (56) is the subject of the embedded verb *take* while John is that of the matrix verb *(s)see*.

Takezawa (1987) provides the following structure and accounts for the Case marking alternation by an optional *S'-deletion.*

(58)  
```
  IP 
  / \  
 NP I' 
 / \ 
 S' V 
 / \ 
 IP *see* 
 / \ 
 NP I' 
 / \ 
 VP I 
 / \ 
 (tense)  
```

The two analyses reviewed above are both biolausal. An alternative analysis is the lexical approach, in which the verb and the causative morpheme are formed into one complex verb in the lexicon. Therefore, the structure of the causative is monolausal throughout the derivation. Miyagawa (1989) argues that the causative morpheme is analogous to the passive morpheme. They both provide a new external theta role, the causative morpheme *(s)see* provides an Agent role whereas the passive morpheme *(s)are* provides an Experiencer role, and this allows for an extra NP to
appear. (59) is the structure of the sentence (54).

(59)         IP
            /   ,
           /   /
      NP    'I'
       |    /  \ 
  John   VP  I
      /   \  
     NP  V  tense
    |    /     
  Mary NP  V  ta
     |    /     
     hon  kawase

Now, let us examine where *sae* appears.

(60) a. John-ga Mary-ni hon-o kawase sae sita.
     -NOM  -DAT book-ACC buy-cause even do-past
     'John even made Mary buy the book.'
   b. ?John-ga Mary-ni hon-o kai sae sasetta.

(61) a. Jo-ga Mary-ni ikase sae sita.
     -NOM  -DAT go-cause even do-past
     'John even let Mary go.'
   b. ?John-ga Mary-ni iki sae sasetta.

     -NOM  -ACC go-cause even do-past
     'John made Mary go.'
   b. ?John-ga Mary-o iki sae sasetta.

In the (b) sentences, although it looks as if the causative morpheme behaves as an independent verb, do-insertion takes place (Sugioka 1984). As in the case of the passive construction, there
is a dialect which accepts the (b) sentences. Therefore, a causative verb should have the following structure, rather than (59).

(63)  \   \  
     \  \   \   \  
       \  \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \   \  
VP      (s)ase      NP  V

Just like passives, in one dialect, incorporation is obligatory and in the other it is optional. Since the causative morpheme has the feature [-stative], the object NP cannot have the Nominative Case marker, unlike the P/A sentences.

Now, let us examine the meaning of a causative sentence. The sentence in (61a) has three sets of presuppositions.

(64) a. Focus: Mary
    b. Presupposition: (i) There were people other than Mary who were caused by John to go.
       (ii) Of all the people who were caused by John to go, Mary was the least expected.

(65) a. Focus: ikase
    b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than going that John made Mary do.
       (ii) Of all the things John made Mary do, having made her go was the least expected.
(66) a. Focus: Mary-o ikase
   b. Preposition: (i) There were things other than having made Mary go that John made someone other than her do.
      (ii) Of all the things John made people do, having made Mary go was the least expected.

For those who speak the dialect in which incorporation is optional, one can also attach to the lower VP. In that case, the causative morpheme is not among the focused elements, so the focus is on the action that Mary took.

3.4. Desiderative Construction

The last construction we would like to discuss is the desiderative construction. To show a first person's desire, the morpheme - tai is used as in (67a), whereas for a third person, - tager (tai + gar) is more commonly used, as in (67b).

(67) a. Watasi-ga ano kuruma-o/ga kaitai.
   I-NOM that car-ACC/NOM buy-want-pres
   'I want to buy that car.'

b. John-ga ano kuruma-o kaitagatteiru.
   -NOM that car-ACC buy-want-ING
   'John wants to buy that car.'
Let us begin with 

Just like passives or potentials, this morpheme, too, attaches to a verb. The only difference is that the verb having 

which is lexically an adjective (Sugioka 1984), shows characteristics of an adjective. This can be seen in the form of the past tense that it takes. The past tense of 

is 

different. Here we can see the same past tense morpheme 

that occurs with adjectives, such as 

's was white' or 

'was expensive'.

Kuno (1973) provides an account in which 

is treated as a matrix verb. The following is the D-structure of (67a) in his analysis.

(68)

```
                S
            /    \             
           NP    VP              
       /     \   \      \          
      watasi  S    V             
            /     \            \ 
            NP    VP    tai       
       /     \   \      \          
      watasi NP   V             
            /     \            | 
            |     ano   kaw      | 
             |      kuruma  |
```

By the transformational rule called Verb Raising, 

and 

become one verb. The subject of the embedded clause is deleted by another transformational rule called Equi-NP Deletion (for more detail, see Kuno 1973).

It should also be possible to analyze verb + 

as a lexically integrated verb having the structure (69), or as a VP with 

as the head as shown in (70).
Sugioha (1984) proposes Reanalysis, like the case with potentials, which essentially changes the structure in (70) to the one in (69). By this process, the Case alternation seen in (71) can be accounted for.

(71) a. Boku-ga (kuruma-o kai) tai.
I-NOM car-ACC buy want
'I want to buy a car.'

b. Boku-ga (kuruma-ga [keitai]).

(71a) has the structure in (70), where the verb assigns Accusative Case to the NP. (69) is the structure of (71b), in which V + tai is a single verb and has the feature [+ static], and the NP receives Nominative Case.

Let us next examine the sentences containing see and determine the structure.

(72) a. Watasi-wa ano kuruma-ga/o [mitai dake de naku]
I-TOP that car-NOM/ACC look only not
kaitaku sae atta.
buy-wast even be-past
'(Not only I wanted to see it), I even wanted to buy that
car.'

b. 'Watasi-wa ano kuruma-o kai sae takatta.

Watasi-wa ano kuruma-o kai sae sitakatta.

(71a) is analogous to adjectives in that an empty copula is
phonologically realized when sae blocks incorporation as we
discussed in section 2.6. (72b) suggests that -tak cannot behave
as an independent verb as Kuno analyzes in (68). Note that (72c)
suggests that, in this construction, too, there are two dialects.
It sounds awkward to me, but many people accept it. Therefore, it
is incorporation, rather than Reanalysis, that takes place here.
Reanalysis is not allowed in my dialect, in which incorporation is
obligatory.

However, if we take (70) as the structure for desideratives
analogous to the three other constructions we have seen, we cannot
explain why the copula aru appears in (72a). Therefore, I propose
the following structure instead.
The desiderative morpheme has the feature [+stative] like the potential morpheme; therefore it also allows two different Case markings by the same mechanism discussed in section 2.

Now, since *sa* attaches to the AP in (73), there are three possible readings.

(74) a. Focus: ano kuruma

b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than that car that I wanted to buy.

   (ii) Of all the things I wanted to buy, that car was the least expected.

(75) a. Focus: kaitak

b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than buying that I wanted to do with that car.

   (ii) Of all the things I wanted to do with that car, buying was the least expected.
(76) a. Focus: ano kuruma-o kaitak

b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than buying that car that I wanted to do.
(ii) Of all the things I wanted to do, buying that car was the least expected.

Let us next consider (67b) in which another morpheme -gar is attached. According to Sugioka (1984), gar is a verbalizer that attaches to an adjective, and gives the [-stative] feature to the whole predicate. In Kuno's (1973) study, V + ta + gar is treated as having two embedded sentences, and John is the subject in both. However, as the following examples reveal, -gar cannot be used as an independent verb.

(77) a. John-ga ano kuruma-o kaitagari sae sita.
     NOM that car-ACC buy-want- even do-past
     'It seems that John even wanted to buy that car.'


c. ?John-ga ano kuruma-o kai sae sitagatta.

In (77a), sase attaches to the whole verb kaitagari. (77b) and (77c) show that incorporation of the verb kai with the morpheme ta/i/j is optional (for some people), but that of ta/i/j and gar is obligatory.

Based on the observation above, (77a) has the following structure.
See attaches to the VP, and takes scope over the NP *ano kuruma* and the V *kaitagar*. Therefore the sentence has the following two readings.

(79) a. Focus: *ano kuruma*
    
    b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than that car that John wanted to buy.
       (ii) Of all the things John wanted to buy, that car was the least expected.

(80) a. Focus: *kaitagar*
    
    b. Presupposition: (i) There were things other than buying that John wanted to do with that car.
       (ii) Of all the things that John wanted to do with that car, buying was the least expected.

As we have seen, both *V + ta(i)* and *V + ta + gar* involve
incorporation. There is a dialect in which incorporation of the V + ta/i/ is optional, but as sae shows, ta + yar must always be incorporated.

3.5. Resultative Construction

Let us next examine the resultative construction where the te-form, which was discussed in section 2.2., appears.

Nakayama and Tawa (1999a) suggest three possible structures (82a), (82b), and (82c), for resultative sentences like (81).

(81) John-ga ringo-o katte aru.
     -NOM apple-ACC buy resultative
     'John has bought apples.'

(82) a. [IP John-ga [yp ringo-o t₁] katte aru₁]
    b. [IP pro [yp IP John-ga [yp ringo-o t₁] [kat]₁-te t₁] aru₁]
    c. [IP John₁-ga [yp IP t₁ [yp ringo-o t₂] [kat]₁-te t₂] aru₁]

In (82a), katte aru is treated as a single verb which is formed in the lexicon, whereas it is treated as a compound verb in (82b) and (82c). Nakayama and Tawa (1999a) exclude the former possibility by the subject honorification test, but sae can also be used to show that the resultative form is not a single verb. To see this, observe the following tree diagrams:
If (83a) is the correct structure, then *sae* has to intervene between a single verb as seen in (84).

(84) John-ga anna ring-o k atte sae aru.
    -NOM such apple-ACC buy even resultative
    'John has even bought such apples.'

As we discussed in Chapter II, this is not possible, since *sae* attaches to maximal projections. This can also be seen in the following cases of compound verbs.
(85) a. "moti sae agaru (motiagaru 'to lift')

b. "hai sae mawaru (haimawaru 'crawl about')

In (85a), for example, the verb consists of two verbs motu 'hold' and agaru 'lift'. Since sae cannot appear in the examples in (85), if (83a) is indeed correct, then (84) should be unacceptable. However, since (84) is well-formed, it suggests that (83b) is correct instead. Notice that sae is attached to the lower IP in (83b). It is not the VP that sae attaches to, since the verb does raise to the Infl to get inflected with tense.

In the re-form, te is in Infl, therefore sae and Infl appear next to each other. But since te is not a tensed element, sae can attach to the IP. Since sae is dominated by the only tense in the sentence that is realized, it is different from the case of relative clauses, where sae appears after tensed elements, i.e., a tensed IP. (See the discussion in 2.7.)

The presuppositions that sentence (84) has are the following.

(86) a. Focus: ringo

b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than apples that John bought.

(ii) Of all the things John bought, apples are the least expected.

(87) a. Focus: kaw

b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than buying that John did with the apples.
(ii) Of all the things that John did with the apples, buying is the least expected.

(88) a. Focus: ringo o kaw
     b. Presupposition: (i) There are things other than buying apples that John did.
     (ii) Of all the things John did, buying apples are the least expected.

Both (82b) and (82c) allow these readings, so it is not possible to select one structure over the other.

3.6. Summary

In this chapter, we have examined the distribution of saw at the sentential level based on the observations we made in Chapters I and II. From section 1 though section 4, the structure of sentences that contain a [V + morpheme] was discussed.

In passives, potentials, and causatives, the V + morpheme has the following structure.

```
(88)       VP
       / \  
      VP  morpheme
     / \  
    NP  V
```

In desideratives, the morpheme is lexically an adjective as Sugioka (1984) points out, therefore having the following structure instead
In all four cases, there are two dialects. In one of them, incorporation of the verb and the morpheme is obligatory, and in the other it is optional. **Sae** can attach to the lower VP in the latter, but not in the former.

The potential and desiderative morphemes have the feature [+stative], therefore the incorporated verb can either receive this feature or keep the [-stative] feature of the verb. As a result, these two constructions allow Case alternation.

In section 5, the resultative construction has been discussed. This construction shares the characteristics of the **ce**-form observed in Chapter II.

In all five cases, we have seen that adding **sae** to a sentence helped determine the structure, and examining the scope of **sae** provided confirmation of the structure.
Notes to Chapter III

1 Unless we assume V incorporation, and the passive morpheme is a dependent morpheme. Under the bicalausal analysis, (14b) is out because see blocks V incorporation, leaving /NJ are stranded.

2 This judgement might be due to the fact the the i-form of a verb is the basic nominal form (Sugioka, 1984). Compare (17) with the following.

(i) ??Mary-ga John-ni buti see saretara.
   -NOM by hit even do-past

(ii) sounds worse possibly because the form buti is not used as a noun as often as neguri is. The following pair in potentials supports this idea.

(ii) a. John-ga eigo-o hanasi sae dekiru.
    -NOM English-ACC speak even can
    'John can even speak English.'

b. ??John-ga anna mono-o tabe sas dekiru.
   -NOM such thing-ACC eat even can
   'John can even eat such a thing.'

(iii) might sound better since anna is more often used as a noun than tabe.

3 Miyagawa (p.c.) points out that ergative verbs too involve NP movement, and, hence, we get the reading where the NP in the subject position can be focused.

(i) Doar1-ga [tA aki see sita].
    door-NOM open even do-past
    'The door even opened.'

Although ane is outside the VP, it is possible for see to focus it. This suggests that there is a trace under the VP, which is within the scope of see. So the following reading is possible.

(ii) a. There are other things than the door that opened.

b. Of all the things that opened, the door was the least expected.

Uneargative verbs do not force NP movement, unlike ergative verbs, therefore the NP in the subject position is not in the scope of see.
(iii) John-ga warai sae sita.
  -NOM laugh even do-past
  "John even laughed."

In (iii), it is hard to get the reading where John is the focused element, i.e., there are people other than John who laughed. This contrast between (i) and (iii) supports the idea that ergative verbs involve NP movement.

4 There is a counterargument for the monoclausal analysis. Consider the following examples.

(i) John1-ga oya3-ni zibun2/j no uti de sinaretara.
    -NOM parent by self
    GEN house in die-pass-past
    (Lit.) John was died by his parents in self's house.

It is well known that zibun is a subject-oriented anaphor. In (i), the fact that zibun can be coindexed with either John or oya supports the biclausal analysis of Kuno (1973) in which oya is the subject of the embedded clause. However, it seems that the referent of zibun cannot be determined solely by syntax.

(ii) John3-ga Mary1-ni zibun1/j no uti de kodomo-o
    -NOM by self
    GEN house in child-ACC
    scold-pass-past
    'John had his child scolded by Mary at self's house.'

In (ii), zibun can be coindexed only with John. Therefore, it is not clear if one can reject the monoclausal analysis by referring solely to counterexamples like (i).

5 Unless we assume that the potential morpheme is a dependent morpheme, and V incorporation is required.

6 Psych-verbs are exceptions to this generalization. They only allow c- causatives (Keichi Ikezako, p.o.).

(i) John-ga Mary-o/ni yamasetara
    -NOM -ACC/DAT annoy-cause-past
    'John annoyed Mary.'

7 Nakayama and Tawa (1989a: 28) give the following example.

(i) Tanaka sensei-ga ringo-o okatte atini naru
    prof-NOM apple-ACC hono-buy res-hono-pres
"Prof. Tanaka has bought apples."

Referring to Kageyama (1982), they explain that the ungrammaticality of this sentence is due to the fact that the morpheme attaches to the verbs that have a phrasal boundary.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this thesis, I have examined the distribution of *see* at both the phrasal and sentential level.

In the first chapter, the semantics and syntax of *see* was discussed. *See* is a bound morpheme, and in that respect is different from English *even*. They are similar with respect to scope; they both take scope over the elements they c-command. Thus, when *see* attaches to a verbal stem as in (1), it can take scope over the elements in the VP that it c-commands, such as the object NP, the verb, and the VP as a whole. As a result, the sentence becomes ambiguous.

(1)

```
  IP
 / \       
 NP  I
  / \     
  VP  I
   / \   
  VP  see
   / \ 
 NP  V
```

It was also revealed in the first chapter that *see* can only attach to a maximal projection. These facts are crucial for the discussions in Chapters II and III.
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The second chapter has presented a close examination of the distribution of *see* at the phrasal level. We have seen that *see* can attach to all the maximal projections except for an IP with a tensed element, a CP in a relative clause, and an NP within a PP. When attaching to maximal projections, I presume that *see* is the head of an IP which receives features from its complement phrase by Feature Percolation (Selkirk 1982) since *see* does not have the lexical features [+N, ±V]. Thus, when it attaches to an NP, for instance, the IP receives [+N, −V] from the nonhead NP, so that it can behave as an NP.

(2)  

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{[+N, −V]} \\
\end{array} \]

It was also found that *see* blocks incorporation, therefore it forces do-support to take place, as we saw in the cases with a VP and an AP. When do-support is not possible, attaching *see* yields ungrammatical sentences.

In the third chapter, we have examined the distribution of *see* at the sentential level based on the observations we made in Chapters I and II. The passive, potential, causative, and desiderative constructions have the same structures in which the morpheme is the head of a VP dominating a lower VP as in (3).

(3)  

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP morpheme} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array} \]
Incorporation is optional in one dialect, and is obligatory in the other. In the former dialect, *see* can attach to the lower VP, and in that case do-insertion must occur. In the latter, the only possible site for *see* is the upper VP.

Desideratives, too, have a similar structure. However, since the morpheme is an adjective, as Sugioka (1984) points out, the upper node is an AP, not a VP.

When the morpheme has the feature [+stative], i.e., potential and desiderative, there is Case alternation. This is explained as the [V + morpheme] having an option of receiving the [+stative] feature from the morpheme or retaining the [-stative] feature of the V in the lower VP. When it receives [+stative], the NP in the object position is assigned the Nominative Case marker. When it chooses [-stative], the NP gets the Accusative Case.

The resultatives are different from the other four. In this construction, *see* attaches to a tenseless IP, but not a VP, as discussed in section 2.4.

In conclusion, the scopal phenomenon by *see* can be explained syntactically by appealing to the notion of c-command. Furthermore, as we have seen in Chapter III, the occurrence of *see* can help us determine the correct analyses of the structures.
LIST OF REFERENCES


Kato, Yasuhiko. (1985) 'Negative Structures on Japanese,' *Sophia Linguistics* XIII.


