

Mapping from DS to SS : a case of Japanese psych-verbs

著者	Hashimoto Manabu, Hoshi Hidehito, Shimada Masaharu, Takano Yuji
journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	10
page range	303-305
year	1991-08-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7605

Mapping from DS to SS: A Case of Japanese Psych-Verbs

Manabu Hashimoto, Hidehito Hoshi,
Masaharu Shimada, Yuji Takano

In this joint research we discussed the following constructions with psych-verbs:

- (1) a. sono aidolu kasyu-ga John-o sitsubousa-se-ta koto
the idol-NOM John-ACC dissapoint-CAUSE-PAST fact
'The idol disappointed John.'
b. sono aidolu kasyu-ga John-o (nihon-no geinokai-ni)
the idol-NOM John-ACC (Japanese-GEN show business-
sitsubousa-se-ta koto
DAT) disappoin-CAUSE-PAST fact
lit.'The idol disappointed John about Japanese show business.'

The main purpose of our research is to shed some light on the syntactic behaviour of psych-constructions in Japanese and to make clear some differences between (1a) and (1b).

First, we claimed that psych-constructions have biclausal structures parallel to causative constructions:

- (2) John-ga Mary-o hataraka-se-ta koto
John-NOM Mary-ACC work-CAUSE-PAST fact
'John made Mary work.'

sase (CAUSE) is involved with both psych-constructions and causative ones. It is plausible to claim that, like causative, Incorporation has to do with psych-constructions, assuming that Japanese psych-constructions are derived through either V-raising or VP-raising, as Inagaki et al. (1990) points out in causative constructions.

Secondly, there are some examples of psych-constructions involving A-movement like passive, as Belletti and Rizzi (1988) observes. Consider the following example:

- (3) *nanika-ga daremo-o sitsubousa-se-ta koto*
 something-NOM everyone-ACC disappoint-CAUSE-PAST fact
 'Something disappointed everyone.'

(cf. Oka (1988))

(3) is ambiguous; the quantified NP *nanika* (something) takes wide scope over the other quantified NP *daremo* (everyone) and vice versa. Following Hoji's (1985) observation that when a quantified NP is preposed over another quantified NP, the scope interpretation is ambiguous, we can say that A-movement like passive is involved with psych-constructions; psych-verbs have nonthematic subjects, like passive, raising, or ergative verbs. However, there are other examples where passivization is available. Consider the following sentence:

- (4) *John-ga sono aidolu kasyu-niyotte sitsubousa-se-rare-*
 John-NOM the idol -by disappoint-CAUSE-PASS-
ta koto
 PAST fact
 'John was disappointed by the idol.'

It is well known that structures with nonthematic subjects cannot undergo passivization. Thus, the above fact appears to be contradictory to the assumption that A-movement is involved with psych-constructions. We must attack the problem of this ambivalent nature of psych-constructions.

In order to account for the above facts we claimed that two types of thematic relations have to do with psych-constructions. Consider the following English data discussed by Pesetsky (1990):

- (5) a. Bill was satisfied with the Chinese dinner.
 b. The Chinese dinner satisfied Bill.

It has long been assumed that *the Chinese dinner* in both (5a) and (5b) has the same θ -role; it bears "Theme" θ -role. However, Pesetsky

(1990) observes that *the Chinese dinner* in both (5a) and (5b) is different; it represents "Subject Matter" (SM) and "Cause" θ -role, respectively. This seems to hold of psych-constructions in Japanese. Let us return to the sentences (1a,b).

In (1a) *sono aidolu kasyu* can represent either SM or cause; the sentence (1a) is ambiguous. If *nihon-no geinoukai*, which is a SM argument, is added to (1a), the sentence is unambiguous. That is, in (1b) *sono aidolu kasyu* is a Cause argument. From the above observation, we can say that (1a) and (1b) differ with respect to the thematic relation and that the fact should be represented in a syntactic configuration. We concluded that while psych-constructions with a Cause argument can be passivized, psych-constructions without a Cause argument involve A-movement of a SM argument and cannot be passivized. In fact, in the passive sentence (4) *sono aidolu kasyu* cannot be a SM argument; it represents Cause.

In this way, we can explain this ambivalent nature of psych-constructions in terms of the thematic relation along the line of Pesetsky's (1990) observation.

References

- Baker, M. (1988) *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi. (1988) "Psych-Verbs and θ -Theory," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 291-352.
- Hoji, H. (1985) *Logical form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Inagaki, D, K. Miyagawa, Y. Takano, and K. Takeda. (1990) "Mapping from DS to SS: A Case of Japanese Causatives," *Tsukuba English Studies* 9, 375-377.
- Oka, T. (1988) "Subject in Japanese," *TLF* 2, 137-152.
- Pesetsky, D. (1990) "Experiencer Predicates and Universal Alignment Principles," Ms., MIT.