

On the syntax of causative constructions with the accusative path in Japanese

University of Edinburgh

Kaori Miura

An issue: It is widely known that the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ construction in Japanese takes either a dative or accusative causee ((1a,b)), whereas the $V_{\text{trans}}+sase$ construction never allows an accusative causee ((2b)) but requires a dative one ((2a)). However, an accusative causee is allowed when an accusative path follows it in the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ construction as in (3). One might attribute the ungrammaticality of (2b) to the famous “Double-*o* Constraint” (DoC) ([1]). Recently, [2] argues that (2b) does not have the DoC effect. As evidence, [2] shows that a multiple accusative cleft is disallowed with (2b) as in (4a), which contrasts with DoC-sensitive verbs such as the object possessor raising construction (see (4b)). As shown in (5), a multiple accusative cleft can be formed with (3). Thus we have two puzzles: (i) (3) may involve a double accusative structure and (ii) (3) may pass the DoC filter for some reason. This paper tries to solve these puzzles by proposing that (3) involves two v s and each v heads a strong phase. Thus, the derived structure never violates the phase-bound DoC that bans multiple occurrences of the structural accusative value within a phase ([2]).

The syntax of the path: The accusative of path is not an inherent case but a structural case. First, it licenses an NQF (numeral quantifier floating) ([3]) (see (6)). Second, the accusative path of transitive clauses can be passivized (see (7)). Next, the accusative path is a sister to the lexical V because *soo-su* can take VP [*Noriko climb a ladder*] as an antecedent (see (8)).

The syntax of the causee: It is well-known that the causee of the $V_{\text{trans}}+sase$ construction shows the subjecthood properties, for example controlling PRO in adverbial phrases and binding *zibun* ‘self’ in the same sentence. The same holds true with the causee of the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ with the accusative path (see (9a)). Second, the causee of the same construction can be passivized, which means that it receives the structural case ([3]). The causee of the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ with the accusative path is on a par with this, as in (9b).

The base structure for the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ with the accusative path: [4] proposes that the causee of $V_{\text{trans}}+sase$ causatives merges as the specifier of the lower v of a three-layered v P ($v-v-\sqrt{\text{root}}$) and that each v is a phase head, by reinterpreting the bi-clausal analysis of productive causatives ([5]). The causee is assigned dative case by the higher v . I follow [4] with respect to the base structure for (2a). One might wonder if this structure can be extended to (3), since from the discussion so far (2a) and (3) seem to share the same syntax. However, this causes a problem since the higher v would assign structural dative to the causee of (3). Under this analysis, the difference between (10a) and (10b) would not be expected.

Proposals: I claim that the causee of (3) is valued accusative by the higher v and the path is also valued accusative by the lower v . Thus, (3) involves the combination of two accusative heads as in (11). This allows two types of v to exist in Japanese lexicon: v_{dat} and v_{acc} . I suggest that this is an extension of [3]’s proposal of dative case marking in Japanese. Hence, there are four potential combinations of the v s: (i) $v_{\text{dat}}-v_{\text{acc}}$, (ii) $v_{\text{dat}}-v_{\text{dat}}$, (iii) $v_{\text{acc}}-v_{\text{dat}}$ and (iv) $v_{\text{acc}}-v_{\text{acc}}$. I argue that (i) underlies (2a) and (iv), (3). (iv) cannot be the base for (2b), because (4a) cannot be derived. (ii) and (iii) can be excluded under the assumption of the generally recognized hierarchy of Japanese ditransitive structure ([6]). Now, consider the fact that the passive of the accusative path of the $V_{\text{intrans}}+sase$ construction is banned (see (12)). I propose that this can be explained if we assume that the lower v_{acc} is another strong phase ([4]). The passive morpheme *-rare* cannot absorb the structural case of the lower v P, after Spell-Out has sent it to the interface. This is also supported by (3), where an adjacent realization of the accusative phrase is allowed. This follows the phase-bound DoC that claims its application domain is a phase ([2]).

Conclusions/Implications: I have shown that evidence from causatives with path accusatives support the existence of two distinct accusative-valuing phase heads.

Examples:

- (1) Taro-ga Hanako-{a. ni, b. o} hashigo-e nobor-ase-ta (V_intrans+sase)
 Taro-NOM Hanako-{a. DAT, b. ACC} ladder-toward climb-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Taro made Hanako climb toward a ladder’
- (2) Taro-ga Hanako-{a. ni, b. *o} hashigo-o syuuris-ase-ta (V_trans+sase)
 Taro-NOM Hanako-{a. DAT, b. ACC} ladder-ACC repair-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Taro made Hanako repair a ladder’
- (3) Taro-ga Hanako-o hamabe-o aruk-ase-ta (the path-ACC + [V_intrans+sase])
 Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC beach-ACC walk-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Taro made Hanako walk on a beach’ ([7]: 262, (73))
- (4) a. [Ken-ga t_i sono-hon-o yom-ase-ta no]-wa Naomi-ni/*o_i da
 Ken-NOM that book-ACC read-CAUSE-PAST C-TOP Naomi-DAT/ACC COPULA
 ‘It was Naomi that Ken made read the book’ ([2]: 727, (9b))
 b. [Ken-ga t_i atama-o tatai-ta no]-wa Naomi-o_i da
 Ken-NOM head-ACC hit-PAST C-TOP Naomi-ACC COPULA
 ‘It was Naomi that Ken hit on the head’ ([2]: 738, (43))
- (5) [Taro-ga t_i hashigo-o nobor-ase-ta no]-wa Hanako-o_i da
 Taro-NOM ladder-ACC climb-CAUSE-PAST C-TOP Hanako-ACC COPULA
 ‘It was Hanako that Taro made climb the ladder’
- (6) Taro-wa Kenji-o [hashigo-o fu-tasu] nobor-ase-ta (✓NQF)
 Taro-TOP Kenji-ACC ladder-ACC two-CL climb-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Taro made Kenji climb two ladders’
- (7) Sono takai hashigo-ga Hanako-niyotte nobor-are-ta (koto) (✓Passive: path)
 the high ladder-NOM Hanako-by climb-PASS-PAST (fact)
 ‘(The fact that) the tall ladder was climbed by Hanako’
- (8) Taro-ga Hanako-o hashigo-o nobor-ase, Noriko-mo so-si-ta
 Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC ladder-ACC climb-CAUSE Noriko-also so-do-PAST
 ‘Taro made Hanako climb a ladder, Noriko did so, too’ (✓Soo-su substitution)
- (9) a. Taro-ga_i Kenji-o_j [PRO_{i/j} utai-nagara] hashigo-o nobor-ase-ta
 Taro-NOM Kenji-ACC singing-while ladder-ACC climb-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Taro_i made Kenji_j climb a ladder while singing_{i/j}’ (✓Control PRO)
 b. Hanako-ga Taro-niyotte hashigo-o nobor-ase-rare-ta
 Hanako-NOM Taro-by ladder-ACC climb-CAUSE-PASS-PAST
 ‘Hanako was made to climb the ladder by Taro’ (✓Passive: causee)
- (10) Hanako-to Taro-ga [_{VP} hitori-de kodomo-{a. o / b. *ni}] [_{VP} hashigo-o nobor]-ase]-ta
 Hanako-and Taro-NOM alone child-{a. ACC / b. DAT} ladder-ACC climb-CAUSE-PAST
 ‘Hanako and Taro made a child climb alone the ladder’
- (11) [_{VP} Causer_{CASE: }] [_{VP} Causee_{CASE: ACC}] [_{VP} Path_{CASE: ACC} V] v_{CASE} v_{CASE}-sase]
- (12) *Sono takai hashigo-ga Taro-niyotte Hanako-o nobor-ase-rare-ta (koto) (*Passive: path)
 the high ladder-NOM Taro-by Hanako-ACC climb-CAUSE-PASS-PAST (fact)
 ‘Literally; (The fact that) the tall ladder was made Hanako to climb by Taro’

References: [1] Harada, S-I. (1973) Counter equi NP deletion. In *Annual Bulletin* 7, 113-147. Research institute of logopedics and phoniatrics, Tokyo: University of Tokyo. [2] Hiraiwa, K. (2010) Spelling out the Double-*o* Constraint. *NLLT* 28,723-770. [3] Miyagawa, S. (1989) *Structure and case marking in Japanese*. [4] Harley, H. (2008) On the causative construction. In *Oxford handbook of Japanese linguistics*, 20-53. [5] Marantz, A. (1984) On the nature of grammatical relations. [6] Hoji, H. (2003) Falsifiability and repeatability in generative grammar: a case study of anaphora and scope dependency in Japanese. *Lingua* 113, 377-446. [7] Miyagawa, S. (1999) Causatives. In *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 236-268.