

THE BIAUTONOMY OF SYNTAX

S.-Y. Kuroda

In conformity with the lexicalist hypothesis, a lexical analysis of the Japanese causatives has recently been proposed as an alternative to the traditional transformational analysis. I contend that the lexical analysis is untenable. I claim that syntax is autonomous from morphology, so that no general constraint may be imposed on it in terms of morphological notions.

There are two trends in generative transformational grammar that have been gaining force in the past ten years which are incompatible with some basic assumptions and claims of the works in "classical" Japanese transformational syntax, including my own. Let me call them lexicalism and interpretivism. By these terms I only refer vaguely to general tendencies, rather than particular theories. Besides, these two trends may not be considered unrelated; they might as well be taken as subcurrents of a general drift, which might be called interpretivism, in a broad sense, or perhaps, anti-transformationalism. Be that as it may, it would seem convenient for the purpose of this paper to identify these two subcurrents separately.

For, I would also like to throw in another term to refer to a theoretical position underlying, or presupposed by, most of the classical transformational syntax of Japanese, but this position is not so much an antithesis of interpretivism as of lexicalism. I refer to this position by biautonomous syntax. Again, biautonomous syntax, like autonomous syntax, of which it is a namesake, is meant to be a very general, and, perhaps, as yet vague term used on a historico-ideological level.

The autonomy of syntax, or autonomous syntax, of course, is now a familiar term among generative linguists, and it means the autonomy of syntax vis-à-vis meaning, the independence of syntax from semantics. Then, what do I intend to mean by biautonomy? One can no doubt guess, correctly, that one side of the "bi" refers to semantics; biautonomous syntax is *eo ipso* autonomous syntax. But what is the other side of the "bi"? Syntax relates sound to meaning. The other side must be sound.

Then, I should say the biautonomy thesis means the independence of syntax from semantics and phonology. This must ultimately be the right characterization of biautonomy. But this may not be a particularly felicitous way of putting the matter at the moment. I would rather like to formulate the biautonomy of syntax as the autonomy of syntax from semantics and morphology.

If the autonomy thesis was conceived as an antithesis to generative semantics, the biautonomy thesis is an antithesis to a strict form of lexicalism. It seems generally understood that Chomsky's 1970 paper "Remarks on nominalization" is the beginning of lexicalism. But we have to distinguish various positions among lexicalism. As Newmeyer notes, "'lexicalism' in its narrow sense refers to a particular position on the derivation of derived nominals," as promoted in this paper of Chomsky's. To quote from Chomsky, "to summarize [his paper], three types of nominalizations [were] considered...: the gerundive nominals such as (60), the derived nominals such as (61), and the "mixed" forms (62),....

(60) John's refusing the offer

(61) John's refusal of the offer

(62) John's refusing of the offer

...it seems that the transformational hypothesis is correct for the gerundive nominals and the lexicalist hypothesis for the derived nominals and perhaps, though much less clearly so, for the mixed forms." (p.215) Note that in this usage, the lexical hypothesis does not refer to a type of linguistic theory, but a hypothesis on a particular construction in grammar. But as Newmeyer further notes, "in its broad sense [lexicalism refers] to the position that no transformation changes category labels." (p.137) In this sense, lexicalism refers to a theoretical position of linguistic theory. According to Newmeyer, Chomsky (1970) "strongly implies" this position.

A small clarification may be in order here for the condition that "no transformation changes category labels." If the gerundive nominals such as (60) and derived nominals such as (61) in the above quote are both derived transformationally, a transformation might be said to change the category label S to NP, and hence it might be wrongly thought that the above condition prohibits transformational derivation of both gerundive and derived nominals. That is not the intended meaning of the condition. In the derived nominal (61) the word refusal would have to be reassigned the category label Noun, while refusing in the gerundive nominal (60) remains a Verb. This is the difference intended to be captured by the condition in question. What is relevant is changing labels of lexical categories. But this formulation of a lexicalist position leaves room for quite arbitrary liberty. So, for example, it leaves room to derive unhappy and nonsense from not happy and no sense, transformationally, because no change of lexical categories would be involved in these cases.

Perhaps for this reason it might be felt that the intended lexicalist condition should be formulated with the help of more traditional

terms such as "derivational morphology", as Jackendoff (1972) did. To quote: "Chomsky [1970] proposes the Lexicalist Hypothesis, roughly, that transformations do not perform derivational morphology." (p.12) (Jackendoff's own lexicalist position, Extended Lexicalist Hypothesis, is stronger (more stringent) than this, which is out of the scope of the present paper.) Aronoff expounded on this theme in his influential monograph Word formation in generative grammar (1976), but he took a step further and went beyond the lexicalism apparently implied in Chomsky (1970), and formulated a position, which, according to him, "seems to be the position of Chomsky (1973): "...Chomsky [1970] noted that much of derivational morphology is semantically irregular and should not be handled in the syntax.... Out of this remark there developed two hypotheses. The strong lexicalist hypotheses of Jackendoff (1972) excludes all morphological phenomena from syntax. This means that the syntax cannot relate some and any, or ever and never, and that inflection, if it is referred to in the syntax, must be handled by some sort of filter.... The version of the lexicalist hypothesis... which is more widely accepted than this one, but which to my knowledge has never been explicitly formulated in print, is that derivational morphology is never dealt with in the syntax, although inflection is, along with other such 'grammatical' matters as Do Support, affix hopping, Clitic Rules, i.e. all of 'grammatical morphology'. This seems to be the position of, for example Chomsky (1973). This latter hypothesis, which I will assume, does not say that derivational processes are always irregular and that their semantics is always noncompositional. Nor does it exclude from the domain of the syntax only irregular derivational phenomena as Chomsky (1970) says one might do. It says rather that derivational phenomena are always separate from the syntax, regardless of their regularity." (p.8) To sum up, "derivational morphology is never dealt with in the syntax, and this does not mean to exclude from the domain of the syntax only irregular derivational phenomena."

The last sentence of this quote is especially important to note. It implies that irrespective of any generalizations that might obtain in other components of grammar, derivational phenomena are to be excluded from the domain of syntax. An apparent rationale of this position would be that this hypothesis put a general constraint on syntactic theory.

The thesis of biautonomous syntax is in conflict with this lexicalist hypothesis. It implies that no general constraint may be imposed on syntactic theory in terms of strictly morphological notions.

As Sadock (1980) notes, "the arguments in favor of this very influential 'lexicalist position'...have been based largely on data from English...." He investigated "one sort of derivational process from a typologically remote language, Greenlandic Eskimo," a polysynthetic language, and concluded that it falsifies the lexicalist hypothesis. In contrast, Miyagawa (1980) applies "the lexicalist hypothesis to Japanese, a non-Indo-European agglutinative language" and "attempts to provide an alternative framework to the transformational analysis that has dominated Japanese linguistics for the past fifteen years." In what follows I would like to show that Miyagawa's lexicalist analysis is untenable.

Morphologically, complex verbs of Japanese provide the stock examples of agglutination. From the simple verb stem susum ('advance'), for example, we can form a multiply expanded verbs such as susum-ase-rare-taku-nai ('advance'-causative-passive-desiderative-negative). In the rest of this paper I will mainly be concerned only with the formation of causatives, simply-expanded complex verbs.

Before I start my discussion of causatives, however, one caution must be made here. What I mean by causative here is, unless otherwise qualified, what is traditionally called causative, or by "productive causative" in the sense of Shibatani (1976), in contradistinction with "lexical causative" in Shibatani's sense, or "derived transitive" in the sense of Bloch (1946).

One can say, as Miyagawa does, that the transformational analysis of causatives has dominated Japanese linguistics in the past, if only one understands, properly, "causative" in the traditional sense of "productive" causative. A transformational analysis, if there has been any, of "lexical" causatives is not at issue here.

In order to illustrate the difference between the productive causative and the lexical causative, consider the pair of verbs susumu ("advance" intr.) and susumeru ("advance" tr.). We have:

- (1) hei-ga susumu.
 soldier-NOM advance
 "soldiers advance."
- (2) syoogun-ga hei-o susumeru.
 general-NOM soldier-ACC advance
 "a general advances soldiers."

The verb susumeru may be called the lexical causative derived from, or, better, related to, susumu. Morphologically, the correspondence between intransitive verbs and related lexical causatives is not uniform; we can set up a dozen or so of categories for this morphological correspondence such as:

- (3) susum-u susum-e-ru "advance"
- tob-u tob-as-u "fly, jump"
- sas-ar-u sas-u "stick"
- ni-e-ru ni-ru "boil in liquid"
- ok-i-ru ok-os-u "wake"
- sam-e-ru sam-as-u "cool"

In contrast, the productive causative (or, simply, causative) is morphologically regular, and furthermore, may be derived either from

intransitive or transitive verbs. The causative is derived from a verb stem by a suffix -sase, if the verb stem ends in a vowel, or -ase, if the verb stem ends in a consonant:

- (4) susum-u susum-ase-ru
 susume-ru susume-sase-ru

The suffix -sase/-ase has a variant form: -sas/-as:

- (5) susum-u susum-as-u.
 susume-ru susume-sas-u.

The grammatical distinction between the lexical and the productive causatives is basically clear, but at the phenomenal level some confusion can arise, mainly, but not solely, because one of the suffixes of the lexical causatives has the same phonological form as this variant form of the productive causative suffix -sas/-as. Take, for example, the stem tob-. The variant form of the productive causative would be tob-as. But I have entered tob-as-u in (3) as a lexical causative. These details, then, require justification. In other respects, too, there are some other phenomena that blur the distinction between the two types of causatives we are concerned with, but such details, important though they are in other contexts, should not deter us at present.

The basic facts about the Japanese causative are well-known. Corresponding to the simple sentence:

- (6) Taroo-ga biiru-o nomu.
 beer-ACC

"Taroo drinks beer."

We have causative sentences such as:

- (7) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni biiru-o nomaseru.

"Hanako causes Taroo to drink beer."

The causative sentence (7) has the same surface configuration as simple sentence such as:

- (8) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni biiru-o watasu.

"Hanako hands beer to Taroo."

Any adequate description of the causative must then account for these two points: (a) the relatedness (or, more specifically, in a very general sense, the inclusion) of (6) to (7); (b) (7) has the structure of the simple sentence at the surface level. The transformational analysis of Japanese causatives assumes that (7) is derived from the underlying form which is something like:

(9) Hanako (Taroo biiru nom) saseru.

The main points of the transformational analysis are that (i) the (surface) sentence (7) is underlyingly a complex sentence, but (ii) in the course of the syntactic derivation, the embedded predicate nom is fused with the main predicate saseru, to yield a complex predicate nomaseru at the surface level.² The transformational analysis, thus, assumes that the word (or the word-stem) nomase is not a lexical entry, or anything formed and stored in the lexicon, in the sense of generative syntax (i.e., not an input to the lexical insertion rule). The lexicon contains nom and sase, but not nomase.

In contrast, the lexicalist analysis of causatives assumes that (i) (7) is syntactically a simple sentence, both surfacewise and underlyingly (if there is any difference), and (ii) a word formation rule of some sort relates the simple verb(-stem) nom to derived verb(-stem) nomase in the lexicon.

The transformational analysis of Japanese causatives has obvious similarity to the transformational analysis of the English causative like

(7') Hanako causes Taroo to drink beer.

which is a possible translation of (7). The underlying form of (7') would be something like:

(9') Hanako caused (Taroo drink beer).

In English, in contradistinction with Japanese, nothing particularly significant happens transformationally,³ so far as the aspects relevant to our immediate interest are concerned.

The transformational analysis of Japanese might appear to be just superficial adjustment of Japanese grammar to the model provided by English grammar at the expense of introducing an ad hoc device of raising, by now an outlaw in the transformational orthodoxy.

In contrast, the lexical analysis of Japanese causatives has obvious affinity to the traditional analysis, both in the Japanese (kokugokaku) and in the American (structuralist) linguistic scholarship. The morpheme saseru, which is contained in the surface causative verb such as nomaseru, has effectively been considered to be a bound morpheme, a suffix, by all grammatical traditions. Nomaseru is, paraphrasing Bloch (1946), a post-derived secondary word, derived by adding the causative suffix -sase/-ase to the base of the underlying verb nom. The formation of the complex verb nomase is entirely a matter of derivational morphology.⁴

The transformational grammarians of Japanese may not have called the causative verb sase in the underlying form (9) a suffix, but it is not because they challenged this traditional view that sase is a suffix at the level of observational adequacy. They also assumed, albeit perhaps implicitly, that this morpheme appears at the surface level as a

bound constituent of a complex surface verb, which is formed by a transformation, Predicate Raising, with the further help of morphologico-phonological rules. They simply were not particularly interested in the documentation of the surface characterization of this morpheme as a suffix.

Thus, it came to me as something of a surprise to find, if my analysis is correct, that there are sentences, i.e., surface forms, in which the causative saseru appears as a free word. Consider the following sentence:

(10) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni biiru-o nomanaku saseru.

The word nomanaku consists of the verb stem nom, the negative (adjective) suffix stem na, the inflectional suffix ku, and takes the inflectional form of the adjective called renyoo-kei ("pre-predicative") in the terminology of Japanese school grammar, or infinitive, in the American structuralist terminology. Crucially, saseru materializes as a word in the surface sentence form (10), it is not a suffix in (10).

The meaning of this sentence is roughly:

(10') Hanako causes Taroo not to drink beer.

The base form of (7) would be:

(11) (Hanako (Taroo biiru nom na)_Ssaseru)_S

In the derivation of (10) saseru must be inserted by the lexical rule in the syntactic component of the grammar.

One might wonder, if one is not familiar with Japanese, why such a simple example like (10) has not drawn transformationalists attention before. There is a good reason. (10) is not a good sentence, in an ordinary, normatively relevant, but theoretically irrelevant sense. A better way of putting the same sentence would be:

(12) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni biiru-o nomanai yoo-ni saseru.

For whatever reason that there might be (12) sounds much more natural than (10) with practically the same semantic function. The native speaker may even reject (10) as unacceptable. It can easily be overshadowed by (12) in his/her acceptability judgment.

Note that (12) also contains the word form saseru. But this is not evidence for the free occurrence of the causative "suffix" saseru. (12) is a causative derived from:

(13) Taroo-ga biiru-o nomanai yoo-ni suru.

This means something like:

(13') Taroo refrains from drinking beer.

The last word suru is the "non-past indicative" form (Bloch's term) of the irregular verb whose stem is s-/su- and whose semantic and other functions are much like English "do". The form saseru in (12) is the causative form derived from this verb: s-sase-ru.

So, here is another trap, perhaps not obvious to those unfamiliar with the structure of Japanese. The surface word form saseru is not an unfamiliar word; the causative form of suru (a post-extended secondary verb derived from suru) is saseru. It requires some conscious attention to identify an occurrence of the word form saseru as a "free" occurrence of (what has hitherto been taken as) the causative "suffix" saseru.

The other side of this same trap, this time for me, is that one may attempt to overturn my claim that saseru in (10) is a free occurrence of the causative saseru by demonstrating that it is somehow derived from the underlying suru. This possibility, remote though I feel it is, exists nonetheless. My analysis of (10) is a null hypothesis, and as such would require, at this moment, no specific support, and would not have any, if it remains to be a null hypothesis. Be that as it may, it should be noted that (10) is not so innocent a piece of data as not to have the potential of generating future controversies.

As another example of the free occurrence of the causative saseru, let us consider:

(14) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni biiru-sika nomanaku saseru.

Here we have sika instead of o in (10). The particle sika is a negative polarity word, much like the French negative polarity que, meaning not other than, or only. For example, we have

(15) Taroo-ga biiru-sika nomanai.

which means

(15') Taroo drinks only beer.

In contrast,

(16) *Taroo-ga biiru-sika nomu.

is ungrammatical, just as

(16') *Taroo boit que bière.

would be in French. The meaning of (14) is:

(14') Hanako causes Taroo to drink only beer.

The negative form nomanaku provides a proper environment for the negative polarity sika, indicating the scope of the meaning of only adequately. The underlying form of (14) is:

(17) Hanako (Taroo biiru sika nom na) saseru.

honorification, triggered by the subject of the sentence, prefixes o to the verb stem and inserts the verb nar after it. The original verb (in this case, yasumu) then, takes the infinitive form followed by ni. To illustrate, the simple sentence

- (21) sensei-ga yasumu.
teacher rest

"the teacher rests."

has the subject-honorified form:

- (22) sensei ga o-yasumi-ni naru.

Subject honorification contrasts with nonsubject honorification. The direct object can trigger nonsubject honorification, which prefixes o to the verb and inserts the verb suru after it. From

- (23) Hanako-ga sensei-o yasum-ase-te oku.

we get

- (24) Hanako-ga sensei-o yasumasete o-oki suru.

Stripped of honorifications (20) has the following form:

- (25) Hanako-ga sensei-o yasumi-tai dake yasumasete oku.

"Hanako lets the teacher rest as much as he wants."

(20) is essentially obtained by combining (22) and (23). In (23), as in (22), from which it is derived, the causative saseru is attached to the verb stem yasum. But in (22), yasum is followed by the honorific nar. Then, in (20), the causative saseru is attached to nar, or put another way, to the sequence o-yasumi-ni nar.

The transformational analysis of causatives assumes that (24) involves sentence embedding; its base form is:

- (24') Hanako (seisei yasum) sasete oku.

(20) can be accounted for by assuming that subject honorification takes place in the first cycle and nonsubject honorification in the second cycle, after the predicate raising agglutinates saseru to nar.

Now, let us try to see how the lexical analysis of causative would deal with (20). According to the lexical analysis, the causative complex verbs are formed by a word formation rule in the lexicon. Miyagawa formulates the following word formation (cf. Miyagawa's formula (40), p.94):

(25) Sase W[ord] F[ormation] R[ule]

$$\begin{bmatrix} [x] \\ +V \\ -ergative \\ [(NP)^n \text{---}] \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} [[x]] \text{ sase} \\ +V \\ -ergative \\ [(NP)^{n+1} \text{---}] \end{bmatrix}$$

This word formation rule is assumed to interact with the following Nonergative Case Redundancy Rule:

$$\begin{aligned} (26) \quad [NP \text{---}] &\longrightarrow [NP_{ga} \text{---}] \\ [NP \ NP \text{---}] &\longrightarrow [NP_{ga} \ NP_o \text{---}] \\ [NP \ NP \ NP \text{---}] &\longrightarrow [NP_{ga} \ NP_{ni} \ NP_o \text{---}] \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider first how (23) is derived by the lexical analysis. The sase word formation rule derives the causative complex verb yasumase from the verb yasum, which is intransitive, i.e., has the feature NP^1 . Hence, the extended verb yasumas has the feature NP^2 . Then, the case redundancy rule derives the following lexical entry:

$$(27) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{yasumas} \\ +V \\ -ergative \\ [NP_{ga} \ NP_o \text{---}] \end{bmatrix}$$

On the other hand, the syntactic component derives the sentence frame:

$$(28) \quad NP \ ga \ NP \ o \ V.$$

The lexical insertion rule, then inserts (27) to (28) (as well as Hanako and sensei) and derives (23).

But we encounter an obvious difficulty with (20), if we try to extend this analysis. The derived verb naraser must be formed by a word formation rule. But the honorific auxiliary nar does not have a case frame. It is not likely that the author of the rule (25) anticipated that it may apply to the situation where $n = 0$. But assume he did. Then, (25) applies to nar with $n = 0$ and we obtain the following lexical entry after the application of the case redundancy rule (26):

$$(29) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{narase} \\ +V \\ -ergative \\ [NP_{ga} \text{---}] \end{bmatrix}$$

Another word formation rule would derive o-yasum from yasum, but the honorific prefixation will not change the case frame, so we have the lexical entry:

- (30)
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{o-yasumi} \\ +V \\ \text{-ergative} \\ [\text{NP}_{\text{ga}} \text{---}] \end{array} \right]$$

The syntactic component might generate a form something like:

- (31) Hanako ga sensei o V ni V
[+Aux]

But both (29) and (30) have wrong subcategorization features for them to be inserted in (31). The cause of the trouble is evident. The fact of the matter is that the syntactic process of causativization changes o-yasumi-ni-naru to o-yasumi-ni-naraseru, not nar to naraseru. The case frame change incorporated in the Word Formation Rule (25) would have to apply to the word sequence o-yasumi-ni nar not to a word nar. Put differently the case frame change is not a matter dealt with at the word level. The lexical analysis of causatives in terms of word formation rules fails.

I have discussed two sets of examples that are incompatible with the lexical analysis of Japanese causatives. Let us now consider their significance for the bi autonomy thesis. Consider first (20). The lexicalist commits himself/herself to deriving the form naraseru lexically, i.e., by means of a word formation rule, because it is a word. But the analysis of (20) demonstrates that the fact that naraseru is a unit is syntactically an artifact. If the unit nomaseru in (7) may be said to be derived from the unit nom by causativization, then, so far as syntax is concerned we have to say the sequence o-yasumi ni narase te is derived by causativization from the sequence o-yasumi ni nar-, not narasete from nar-. The significance of this fact is similar to that which follows from Sadock's study of Greenlandic Eskimo: morphology may not dictate syntax to stay away from phenomena supposedly consigned to derivational morphology.

Examples (10) and (14) further calls into question the legitimacy of such a constraint on syntax that is formulated in terms of derivational morphology. Derivational morphology is a descriptive category set up in structural linguistics. The lexicalist wishes to impose a constraint on syntax by postulating that syntax may not deal with derivational morphology, thereby presupposing that this structuralist category retains an autonomous theoretical status in generative grammar. This may well be an illusion, and indeed our examples (10) and (14) suggest it is. The causative verb sase is a morpheme which is at the same time a suffix and the stem of a free word. From the structuralist perspective, this discovery, unexpected though it might be, would not damage its foundations. Structuralist grammar, engaging itself in taxonomy, may enter sase in the list of "primary base" (cf. Block p.91), and at the same time retain intact the description of sase/ase as a suffix in derivational morphology. In contrast, in the perspective of generative grammar, (10) and (14) as data do not simply concern the question as to which classificatory box the particular occurrences of sase in these examples should be put in. They raise the question as to what the optimal grammar that generates them as well as well known instances of

causative sentences, which contain sase as a suffix. They call into question the lexicalist hypothesis that the suffixal materialization of sase must be derived in the lexicon, because it is a matter of derivational morphology.

I started this paper by implying that the standard work in transformational syntax of Japanese is in conflict with the strict lexicalist hypothesis. The traditional transformational syntax of Japanese took it for granted that generative syntax is autonomous from morphology. In fact, in my opinion, it was exactly for this characteristic that transformational grammar has gained most insights into the syntax of Japanese. In the perspective of the study of the Japanese language, the historical role of transformational grammar was most remarkable in this respect.

Looking back the past twenty years personally, the development of the transformational orthodoxy in these years is quite ironical. I was liberated from morphology in the formation of my conception of syntax before I was initiated into transformational orthodoxy, though under the influence of Chomsky's Syntactic Structures. My pre-MIT works in the late 50's were not particularly transformational, but syntax was definitely autonomous from morphology. This feature was transplanted into my works in transformational syntax of Japanese in the 60's and they were accepted in transformational orthodoxy as a matter of course.

But this autonomy of syntax from morphology was not an inherent feature of transformational generative grammar, and in fact transformational orthodoxy has apparently rejected it, in espousing the strong form of the lexicalist hypothesis. I would not have imagined twenty years ago that one day I would have to formulate anew what I took (or mistook) as a fundamental assumption of transformational generative grammar.

It is also ironical to recall that the effective denial of the autonomy of syntax from morphology came about during the course of the counteroffensive of transformational orthodoxy against generative semantics. To regain the autonomy thesis, i.e., the autonomy of syntax from semantics, the autonomy from morphology was sacrificed. A manifesto such as that syntax does not deal with derivational morphology was introduced for the purpose of restricting the possible forms of syntactic components in order to fend off the intrusion of semantics and its loosening effects on the form of syntax. The biautonomy thesis implies instead that general principles that restrict the forms of syntax are to be formulated in terms of syntactic primitives, and not imposed from outside by semantics or morphology.

I have just said that "to restore the autonomy thesis" the autonomy from morphology was sacrificed. The significance of the notion of autonomous syntax in the historical perspective, however, is not quite straightforward, and a more careful treatment of this topic would be necessary. I have to refer the reader to Newmeyer (1980) for details, but it is quite interesting to read that "Chomsky has offered the opinion that the history of transformational grammar would have been more rational if generative semantics had been the original position, with

interpretivism a subsequent development,...."(Newmeyer p.151) It appears then that so far as the "real" history is concerned, whatever that appears to be supportive of the "autonomy thesis" (from semantics) in Syntactic Structures was accidental, in the perspective of the originator of the theory. It would have been historically more rational if such features would not have existed. Whatever that appears to be supportive of the autonomy from morphology in Syntactic Structures was also not inherent features of transformational theory, inasmuch as it was subsequently to be outcast for the sake of the "autonomy thesis". Thus, neither side of the biautonomy thesis was characteristic features of the Chomskian revolution in 1957, in the subjective understanding of it by its initiator.

NOTES

1. The content of the present paper partially overlaps that of Kuroda (to appear), to which the reader is referred for more detailed factual information. Aside from the refutation of the lexical analysis of Japanese causatives, however, the theoretical aspects of the two papers are complementary. For transformationalist analyses of Japanese causatives, see Kuno (1973), Kuroda (1965a), (1965b), (1978), Shibatani (1976).
2. Traditional generative grammarians of Japanese disagree with each other about the details of the underlying form of the causatives. The problem of distinguishing the ni- and the o- causatives is relevant to the issue of how to determine their underlying forms. I abstract away from all details not directly relevant to my immediate concern which, however, are important in other contexts of discussion about Japanese causatives or related issues.
3. That is, I am now disregarding the involvement of the Equi phenomenon in the causative constructions; my choice of cause, rather than make, to illustrate the English causatives is intentional.
4. The Japanese school grammar calls saseru a zyodoosi; the same term is used to translate "auxiliary verb" in English grammar. But a hasty identification of zyodoosi and "auxiliary verb" is misleading. The intended sense of zyodoosi might be expressed by something like "suffixal verb".
5. This example, somewhat adapted, is due to Susumu Kuno, who argues with such examples as this that the process of honorification is cyclic.
6. The essential point of this account remains valid, even if we assume a lexical, not transformational, analysis of honorification, so long as we retain the transformational analysis of causatives. Let us note, in passing, that the transformational account of honorification violates the constraint, entertained by some linguists, that the transformations may not insert lexical items, while the transformational analysis of causatives does not.

7. Cf. Kuroda (1960a), (1960b), where morphology is characterized as a byproduct of syntax and (what might in modern terms be a prototype of autosegmental) phonology.

References

- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. Word formation in generative grammar. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Bloch, Bernard. 1946. Studies in colloquial Japanese III. Derivation of inflected words. Journal of the American Oriental Society 66.304-315. (Page reference to Roy Andrew Miller, Bernard Bloch on Japanese. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1970)
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press
- _____. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. Readings in English transformational grammar. ed. by Roderick Jacobs and Peter Rosenbaum, 184-221. Waltham, Massachusetts: Ginn and Co.
- _____. 1973. Conditions on transformations. A festschrift for Morris Halle, ed. by Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-285. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- _____. 1975. Questions of form and interpretation. Linguistic Analysis, 1.75-109.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1972. Semantic interpretation in generative grammar. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. The structure of the Japanese language. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1960a. Gengo no kizyutu. Tokyo: Kenkyuusha.
- _____. 1960b. Linguistic system, Gengo kenkyuu, 34.1-24.
- _____. 1965a. Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese Language. MIT Dissertation. Reprinted 1979, New York: Garland Press.
- _____. 1965b. Causative forms in Japanese. Foundations of Language 1.30-50.
- _____. 1978. Case-marking, canonical sentence patterns, and counter equi in Japanese. Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics, ed. by John Hinds and Irwin Howard, 30-51. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- _____. To appear. Some recent trends in syntactic theory and the Japanese language. Coyote Papers. University of Arizona.
- Miyajawa, Shigeru. 1980. Complex verbs and the lexicon. University of Arizona dissertation.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1980. Linguistic theory in America: the first quarter century of transformational generative grammar. New York: Academic Press.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1980. Noun incorporation in Greenlandic. Language 56.300-319.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. Causativization. Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 239-294. New York: Academic Press.