

THE STRUCTURE OF HUMBLE CAUSATIVES IN JAPANESE

Fusa Katada
Waseda University, Tokyo

ABSTRACT

The so-called sa-ire 'sa-insertion' refers to a morphological change in progress in Japanese humble causatives, verbal forms with the causative suffix sase connoting the speaker's humbleness addressed toward a hearer. This change has been regarded as incorrect grammar and never received proper attention beyond prescriptive interpretations. This paper brings up issues surrounding sa-insertion and offers a purely descriptive, structural analysis which appears to induce a number of theoretical implications in Japanese grammar. In particular I argue that the humble causative is a double causative in which the humble interpretation is achieved structurally. Other implications drawn from this analysis include abstractness of morphology and possible accommodation of reflexive causatives in Japanese, an accommodation that has never been reported in previous work on the language.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

The form of contemporary Japanese spoken in the Tokyo area is often referred to as *standard* Japanese. In this dialect (hereafter simply Japanese), two types of morphological change are in progress. One type is called *ra-nuki* 'ra-deletion', a morphological shortening (*rare* → *re*) which has emerged in the suffixal system of *rare* with the meaning 'potential'. The other type is called *sa-ire* 'sa-insertion', a morphological lengthening (*ase* → *asase*) which has emerged in the suffixal system of the *sase* causative. Innovations of both types of change, though different in nature (Katada, in preparation), have been regarded as incorrect grammar, which thus should be avoided at least in formal settings (Japan Cultural Agency 1995). Such prescriptive interpretations have been dominant in the

¹ Part of this research was supported by Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects #99A-162. I wish to thank Michiko Onodera and a reviewer of *Linguistica Atlantica* for their interest in and valuable comments on the issues and analyses presented in this paper. All shortcomings are mine. Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: TP=topic, ACC=accusative, CAUS=causative, CMP=complementizer, PRES=present, INCH=inchoative, LC=lexical causative, PRE=prefix, HN=honorific, RSP=respectful, HMB=humble, PR=refined.

Japanese domestic debate, and scientific inquiries of these changes, though potentially enormous, have not received proper attention.² Of the two types of change, this paper takes up *sa*-insertion, the phenomenon that has received less attention. I aim to offer a purely structural, descriptive analysis showing how issues surrounding *sa*-insertion can be interpreted. Far-reaching implications drawn from such structural analyses are also discussed.

This paper is organized as follows. After introductory remarks in section 1, section 2 introduces the *sa*-insertion phenomena and defines linguistic issues dealt with in this paper. Sections 3 and 4 are solely concerned with an honorific use of the causative morpheme *sase*. (These two sections are needed to establish the matrix context for *sa*-insertion; an explanation of *sa*-insertion itself must wait until section 5. Section 3 briefly explains the Japanese honorific system and where in the system the causative *sase* fits. The discussion leads to naming the honorific use of *sase* as the *humble causative*. Section 4 conducts purely structural analyses in which syntactic properties of the humble causative are defined: in particular its subcategorization property and argument structure. It will be argued that the humble *sase* is a double causative, a claim which has direct and crucial effects on the analysis of *sa*-insertion. Based on the double causative analysis of the humble *sase*, section 5 argues that the *sa*-inserted construction is also a double causative. It is claimed that a motivation for *sa*-insertion is to bring up the deep double causative structure to the surface, thereby disambiguating a double causative reading from a single causative reading. Section 6 discusses several major implications of the double causative analysis, including abstractness of morphology and the non-attested *reflexive causative* in Japanese. Finally, concluding remarks are given in section 7.

2. SA-INSERTION PHENOMENA AND ISSUES TO BE EXPLAINED

The so-called *sa* insertion is a morphological lengthening phenomenon, which appeared about a decade ago in the honorific system of *standard* Japanese. Examples are given in (1).

- (1) a. yasum-ase → yasum-asase
 'cause to rest'
 b. owar-ase → owar-asase
 'cause to finish'

² For structural and quantitative analyses, see Katada (1998) and Matsuda (1993) respectively.

The input form 'V-*ase*' is the normative, prescriptive variant, whereas the output form 'V-*asase*' is the new form found especially in the language of younger generations. This phenomenon has been most frequently observed when the causative is used to induce a politeness connotation, followed by an honorific verbal expression of receiving a favor: *te-itadakimasu* 'to receive'. The general context in question is given in (2).

- (2) V-*ase*-te-itadak-imasu → V-*asase*-te-itadak-imasu.

Due to the Japanese syllabification process of forming basic (C)V structures, the change in (1) is realized prosodically as in (3), which appears to involve the insertion of *sa* before the last unit *se*.

- (3) a. ya.su.ma.se → ya.su.ma.sa.se
'cause to rest'
b. o.wa.ra.se → o.wa.ra.sa.se
'cause to finish'

This change thus has been characterized as *sa-ire* 'sa-insertion', which is viewed as incorrect grammar; that is, part of the disorder in the use of honorific language spreading among younger generations (Japan Cultural Agency 1995). Previous analyses and discussion as carried out in Japan are uniformly prescriptive, nonstructural in nature and remain surface-observational, in which such linguistically relevant questions as in (4) have never been addressed.

- (4) a. How does the causative construction induce the politeness reading in the first place?
b. Why should *sa* be the unit chosen for insertion?

Furthermore, *sa*-insertion is a phenomenon that applies to a set of verbs whose stem ends in a consonant (C-final verbs); it never applies otherwise, to those whose stem ends in a vowel (V-final verbs). This contrast is illustrated in (5), which also needs to be explained. (* represents an impossible form.)

- (5) a. yasum-ase → yasum-asase
'cause to rest'
b. tabe-sase → *tabe-sasase
'cause to eat'

Note that the structural approach undertaken in this paper treats *ase* in (5a) as an allomorph of *sase* (cf. Kuroda 1960, McCawley 1968). This is in accordance with the generative conception which posits one underlying form for one morpheme. Removal of the initial consonant *s* of *sase* in (5a) is due to phonological limitations on consonant clusters in Japanese.

Crucial is the prohibition of double consonants occurring in adjacent positions, except those in geminates. In what follows the underlying suffixal form is used throughout with the dropped initial consonant enclosed in parentheses: (s)ase. The underlying representation of *sa*-insertion in (2) is thus as follows:

(6) V-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu → V-(s)asase-te-itadak-imasu

In order to provide as full a description of *sa*-insertion as possible, research beyond the verbal morphology is felt necessary. This paper thus extends analyses from verbal morphology to the syntax of causatives, and offers possible answers to the questions defined in (4), by arguing for the following points in (7).

- (7)
- a. The politeness connotation is a structural meaning borne by the Causer-Causee relationship.
 - b. The structure of the short input form for *sa*-insertion in (6) is in fact a double causative.
 - c. The structure of the *sa*-inserted long output form in (6) is also a double causative; *sa*-insertion is not a correct characterization.
 - d. The motivation for *sa*-insertion is to reveal a double causative structure on the surface.

3. THE HONORIFIC PROPERTY OF JAPANESE CAUSATIVES

In order to define the matrix contexts for *sa*-insertion, I first lay out the basic honorific properties of Japanese. Briefly, Japanese is equipped with three basic ways to express the speaker's politeness, summarized in (8).

- (8) Honorifics (HN) in Japanese
- a. *Sonkei-go*: Respectful (RSP) expressions to elevate the superior relative to the speaker.
 - b. *Kenjo-go*: Humble (HMB) expressions to lower the speaker and his/her in-group members.
 - c. *Teinei-go*: Refined (RF) expressions to make the speech sound more refined.

The most extensively reported honorification in the field is that achieved via lexical items. The word *iku*, for example, is the dictionary (neutral) form for 'go'. This word has three other related forms shown in (9), which vary depending on the type of politeness method used.

- (9) *iku*: dictionary (neutral) form for 'go'
- a. *irassyau*: RSP-form
 - b. *mairu*: HMB-form
 - c. *ikimasu*: RF-form

Besides the lexically achieved honorification, there is still another way to express the speaker's politeness. The causative induces a politeness connotation when combined with the honorific verbal form *itadak* 'receive'. For example, the three expressions in (10) all mean '(I/We) close the door', with the subject of the verb being non-overt but implicitly understood as the 1st person *I* or *we*. (The singular form *I* is used hereafter representing the 1st person speaker with any number.) A difference lies in the politeness connotation; the degree of politeness expressed by the speaker increases as we go from (a) to (b) to (c).

- (10) a. Doa-o sime-ru (dictionary form)
 door-ACC close-PRES
 '(I) close the door'
- b. Doa-o sime-masu (refined form)
 door-ACC close-PRES(RF)
 '(I) close the door'
- c. Doa-o sime-sase-te-itadak-imasu (humble form)
 door-ACC close-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 '(I) close the door'

The politest expression in (10c) with *sase-te-itadak* connotes the speaker's humbleness in particular. This form we thus hereafter call *the humble causative*. The simple, refined expression in (10b) is the form that had been used as an announcement at stations, warning passengers on the platform that the doors of a train will soon be closed. This expression is polite enough. Yet, only about a decade ago or so, the extra-polite expression, the humble causative (10c) came to be spoken and heard in *standard* Japanese and started replacing the simple refined form (10b).³ This general observation was picked up by the mass media, a particular example being NHK Close-Up Gendai broadcast in 1997. The humble causative, with *sase-te-itadak-imasu*, is now quickly gaining its status as the normative

³ The historical novelist Shiba (1984) traces the original use of *sase-te-itadak-i-masu* to the doctrine of the *Jodo-Shinshu* Buddhism sect practiced in *Omi*, close to *Kamigata* (i.e., the present Kyoto-Osaka district). This is the region where *sase-te-itadak-i-masu* has historically been frequently heard. Shiba reports that it was sometime in the *Showa* era (1924-1989) when *sase-te-itadak-i-masu* reached the language of the Tokyo area (i.e., *standard* Japanese). He further goes on to state that, before *Showa*, for example in literature of the *Meiji* period dealing with settings in the Tokyo area, not even a single use of this expression has been found.

honorific.⁴ Examples such as in (11) are commonly heard especially in service businesses such as in hotels and department stores.

- (11) a. O-hey_{ni}-made go-annai-s-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu.
 PRE(HN)-room-to PRE(HN)-lead-do-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 '(I) will lead you to your room.'
- b. Asu-no 3-zi-ni todoke-sase-te-itadak-imasu.
 tomorrow 3-o'clock deliver-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 '(I) will deliver (the goods) to you at 3 o'clock tomorrow.'

Two questions are raised about this change:

- (12) a. What has triggered this change?
 b. How does the predicate structure *sase-te-itadak* induce the humble reading?

A possible explanation for (12a) has been made available socio-linguistically. According to Inoue (NHK Close-Up Gendai broadcast in 1997), there is a general tendency which he characterizes as *Kei Teegen-no Hoosoku* 'Politeness Reduction Law'—that is, as people keep using a certain polite expression, the politeness connotation read from it is felt to reduce or fade. Such politeness reduction, combined with the anxiety increased by uncertain human relationships, particularly conspicuous in present-day societies, would motivate the use of extra-polite expressions, so that faded politeness is compensated for and tension among people can be soothed. This tendency is more along the laws of a universal, and the use of the extra-polite, humble causative (10c) certainly accords with this law.

As for (12b), no linguistic analysis has been offered, to my knowledge. One may possibly claim that the humble reading is due to the lexical meaning of *itadak*, since it is the humble form of 'to receive'. This possibility, however, does not seem to be the case since, if we omit *sase* as in (13), the sentence meaning is altered; the logical subject of 'closing the door' becomes the addressee, the passengers on the platform in this particular context, or the second person 'you' in general.

- (13) Doa-o sime-te-itadak-imasu
 door-ACC close-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 '(You) close the door.'

Furthermore, *sase* alone does not bear the lexical meaning of 'humbleness', at least in contemporary Japanese, since the removal of *te-itadaki* as in (14) cancels the humble reading, turning the sentence into a

⁴ See Narrog (1999) and references cited there for some historical facts on relations between the causative and honorific suffixes.

simple refined expression. Moreover the logical subject of 'closing the door' is altered as well, this time to an implicitly understood 'someone' in the discourse; the speaker here is no longer the subject of 'closing the door' but a Causer subject of the matrix sentence who let 'someone' close the door.

- (14) Doa-o sime-sase-masu
 door-ACC close-CAUS-PRES(RF)
 '(I) let (someone) close the door.'

What we are concerned with is the reading of (10c) which seems to be always achieved cooperatively by *sase* and *itadak*. In other words, the relevant humble reading can be attributed to neither *sase* alone nor *itadak* by itself, but must be due to the combination of both. As mentioned earlier (cf. 2, 6), the 'humble causative' occurring in this context is the input expression to which *sa*-insertion applies. For a full analyses of *sa*-insertion, the structure of the humble causative (i.e., the form before *sa*-insertion) first needs to be clarified.

The humble causative *sase-te-itadak-imasu* is an illogical expression after all, unless its humbleness induction is accounted for in some linguistically logical way. In (15a), for example, the person who will pay the subway fee thereby making it possible for the speaker to go to *Kyoto* is no other person but the speaker himself/herself. Practically then, there should be no one to whom the speaker should address his/her politeness, and the simple refined expression in (15b) without the humble causative should be sufficiently polite to express the same semantics as (15a).

- (15) a. Tikatetu-de Kyoto-made ik-ase-te-itadak-imasu
 subway-by Kyoto-to go-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 '(I) will go to Kyoto by subway.'
- b. Tikatetu-de Kyoto-made ik-imasu
 subway-by Kyoto-to go-PRES(RF)
 '(I) will go to Kyoto by subway.'

4. STRUCTURAL ANALYSES

4.1 Subcategorization for the humble causative

Sase-te-itadak-imasu literally means 'to receive the favor of X's letting Y do something'. This is actually a morpheme-by-morpheme compositional meaning of the humble causative, with referents of X and Y left unspecified. This is not unusual, given that Japanese is a language that allows non-overt NPs, especially when they are the 1st person 'I/we' or the 2nd person 'you'. In humble causatives all subject NPs appear as non-overt on

the surface but their semantic contents are clearly recoverable; they are either the addressee 'you' or the speaker 'I'. Specifically the subject of 'receive' is always the first person 'I'; X is the subject of 'let', and Y the subject of 'do'. Sentence (10c), for example, literally reads as 'I receive the favor of your letting me close the door'. The sentence structure reflecting this compositional meaning is given in (16), in which the implicitly but clearly understood non-overt nominal referents are shown in parentheses.

- (16) [(wata-si-ga) [(anata-ga) [(wata-si-ni) doa-o sime]-sase]-te-itadak-imasu]
 (I) (you: CAUSER) (I: CAUSEE) door-ACC close-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'I receive the favor of your letting me close the door'

The analysis of (17) is displayed to make clear each sentence embedding involved in (16).

- (17) a. [(wata-si-ga) [(anata-ga) [(wata-si-ni) doa-o sime]-sase]-te-itadak-imasu]
 b. [(anata-ga) [(wata-si-ni) doa-o sime]-sase-masu]
 'you let me close the door'
 c. [(wata-si-ga) doa-o sime-masu]
 'I close the door' (LC)
 d. doa-ga simar-(r)u
 'the door closes' (INCH)

The simplex sentence embedded innermost is (17c) with a lexical causative (LC) predicate *sime* 'to close'. (17d) is added to show the presupposed final effect induced by (17a). Now notice that (17c) is the structure for (10b), which, as mentioned above, is already in the refined polite form. In (17c) the speaker 'I' is the only referent effecting the induction of (17d). This connotes that the speaker's role in 'closing the door' is prominent; that is, the speaker is the one who plays a crucial role in 'closing the door'. Such a speaker's prominent role is minimized if the verb for 'close' is causativized. The structure representing such an interpretation is the next higher embedding (17b). In (17b), the speaker 'I' remains a logical subject of 'closing the door', but it appears in the position of the Causee, who is allowed to do so by the addressee 'you' appearing in the Causer's position. In other words, it is the addressee 'you', who plays an active, prominent role for the induction of (17d). By the process of causativization, on the other hand, the prominence of the speaker's role is lowered and made passive here. The reading of speaker's humbleness arises from this Causer-Causee relationship established between the addressee and the

- c. [(watasi-ga) siai-o oe-masu]
'I finish the game' (LC)
- d. siai-ga owar-(r)u
'the game finishes' (INCH)

Note that the canonical verb stem *sime* 'close' in (17a) or *oe* 'finish' in (20a) is the lexical causative (LC) transitive counterpart of the corresponding inchoative intransitive *simar* 'close' in (17d) or *owar* 'finish' in (20d) respectively. Although these lexical causatives do not undergo *sa*-insertion, for reasons to be clarified in section 5, this fact is significant for the analysis of *sa*-insertion in the following sense. The lexical causative followed by the morphological syntactic causative *sase* has the functional equivalent to that of a double causative. Thus we hold (21) as a reasonable assumption, which will be verified in the following section 4.2.

- (21) The humble causative is functionally a double causative.

4.2 Double causative analysis of humble causatives

As mentioned above, the lexical causative, such as *sime* 'close' or *oe* 'finish', does not undergo *sa*-insertion. There is, however, an alternative to (19) which undergoes *sa*-insertion. (22) is the expression which achieves exactly the same semantic function as (19) and thus is used in exactly the same social contexts. (22), whose structure needs to be clarified first, contains the inchoative (Inch) intransitive *owar*, instead of its lexical causative counterpart *oe*.

- (22) Sia-i-o owar-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu.
game-ACC finish(INCH)-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of your letting me finish the game.'

(22) may first posit two possible underlying structures, (23) and (24), which are both single causatives inducing the same effect represented by the most deeply embedded canonical clause: 'the game finishes'.

- (23) * [(watasi-ga) [(watasi-ga) [siai-o owar]-(s)ase]-te-itadakimasu]
(I) (I:CAUSER) game(CAUSEE) finish-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of my letting the game finish.'
- (24) * [(watasi-ga) [(anata-ga) [siai-o owar]-(s)ase]-te-itadakimasu]
(I) (you:CAUSER) game(CAUSEE) finish-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of your letting the game finish.'

However, neither satisfies the subcategorization frame established in (18). First, in (23) the Causer-Causee relationship is between the speaker 'I' and the 'game'. Here not only the speaker's role in finishing the game is

prominent due to its being the subject Causer, but also the addressee's role is not represented at all. This structure does not conform to the subcategorization frame in (18) and thus not to the semantics of (22) in which the Causer-Causee relationship is properly read as between the addressee 'you' and the speaker 'I'.

Second, in the possible alternative (24), the Causer-Causee relationship is established between the addressee 'you' and the 'game', which is likewise inappropriate; first of all the speaker's role of being the subject of 'finishing the game' is not represented at all.

The appropriate underlying structure for (22) should be the one given in (25), which involves a double causative. The outer causative complement has the proper Causer-Causee relationship required by (18), which is between the addressee 'you' and the speaker 'I'. (25) then conforms to the interpretation borne by (22).

- (25) [(watasi-ga) [(anata-ga) [(watasi-ni) [siai-o owar]-(s)ase]-sase]-te-itadakimasu]
 (I) (you:CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE) game finish-CAUS-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'I receive the favor of your letting me let the game finish.'

The inner causative with *owar-(s)ase* 'finish(INCH)-CAUS' in (25) is accommodated in (20a) by the single lexical causative *oe* 'finish(LC)'. (20a) and (25) are otherwise identical in both structure and function.

The single occurrence of *sase* in (22) on the surface should be due to the low-level morphological operation of (26) which reduces phonologically identical multiple morphemes to one (i.e., *sase-sase* → *sase*).

- (26) Phonologically identical multiple morphemes reduce to one.
 (Shibatani 1973, 1976; Marantz 1984; Katada 1997)

The double causative analysis in (25) can be supported by the expression often used in the following situation. A mother calls her son's school in the morning, and tells his teacher that she wants to let him stay home since he does not feel well. Very politely the mother uses the expression in (27).

- (27) Kyoo-wa kodomo-o yasum-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu.
 Today-TP child-ACC rest-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'Today I would like to let my son stay home.'

It is clear that the mother is the person who wishes to let the child stay home, and she is also the person who is asking the teacher for permission to do so. The structure representing this interpretation cannot be a single causative: that is, neither (28) since the teacher's (the addressee's) role in

giving permission to the mother (the speaker) is not represented, nor (29) since the mother's wish to let the child stay home is not represented.

- (28) * [(wata si-ga) [(watasi-ga) [kodomo-o yasum]-(s)ase]-te-itadakuimasu]
 (I) (I:CAUSER) child(CAUSEE) rest-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'I receive the favor of my letting my son stay home'
- (29) * [(wata si-ga) [(anata-ga) [kodomo-o yasum]-(s)ase]-te-itadakuimasu]
 (I) (you:CAUSER) child(CAUSEE) rest-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'I receive the favor of your letting my son stay home'

What is needed is the structure representing the Causer-Causee relationship established between the 'teacher' and the 'mother'. Such underlying structure must be a double causative, as given in (30). Here the mother 'I' is represented as the Causee of the outer causative clause, in the position which receives the permission from the teacher 'you' appearing as the Causer. Simultaneously the mother 'I' is the Causer of the inner causative clause.

- (30) [(wata si-ga) [(anata-ga) [(watasi-ni) [kodomo-o yasum]-(s)ase].sase]-te-itadakuimasu]
 (I) (you:CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE/CAUSER) child:CAUSEE rest-CAUS-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
 'I receive the favor of your letting me let my son stay home'

(30) is then subject to the morphological reduction rule (26), and the double occurrences of *sase* is realized as a single *sase*.

5. EXPLAINING SA-INSERTION

The double causative analysis presented above has a far-reaching implication for an analysis of the *sa-insertion* phenomena whose general context was given in (6), repeated below as (31).

- (31) V-(s)ase-te-itadakuimasu → V-(s)asase-te-itadakuimasu

The input shorter form and the output longer form carry an exactly identical semantic function, and the latter longer form is found as an alternative, for example, to (22) or to (27), illustrated in (32a/b).

- (32) a. owar-(s)ase-te-itadakuimasu (cf. 22)
 → owar-(s)asase-te-itadakuimasu
- b. yasum-(s)ase-te-itadakuimasu (cf. 27)
 → yasum-(s)asase-te-itadakuimasu

As mentioned earlier, the *sa-inserted* output form is viewed as improper use of honorific language which should be avoided in formal settings at least. Linguistically, however, this change in fact makes perfect sense under the double causative analysis. First, we have seen in section 4.2 that the input form with a single *sase* is underlyingly a double causative, as in (33), but undergoes morphological reduction (26).

- (33) a. owar-(s)ase-sase-te-itadak-imasu (cf. 25)
 b. yasum-(s)ase-sase-te-itadak-imasu (cf 30)

This double causative structure is overtly reflected in the longer output form of (32), not with two identical *sases* this time, but with another causative morpheme *sas*⁵ followed by *sase*: i.e., *sas-sase*, as in (34).

- (34) a. owar-(s)as-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu
 b. yasum-(s)as-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu

Here morphological reduction (26) does not take place since the two morphemes are not identical. *Sas-sase* stays as it is accordingly, but due to the prohibition of double consonants occurring in adjacent positions in Japanese (cf. section 2), the initial *s* of each causative morpheme is removed. It is thus realized as *asase* (< (s)as-(s)ase) as if *sa* were inserted.

The combination of *sas-sase* in place of *sase-sase* can be taken as a type of morphophonological modification, so that both morphemes may show up on the surface. Such modification is consistent with a general linguistic phenomenon reported by Kulikov (1993), that causative morphemes are reiterated but often with some morphophonological modifications, as illustrated in (35) drawn from Hanzib, a Daghestan language (see Katada 1997a: 64 for details).

- (35) Hanzib (Isakov 1986 cited in Kulikov 1993: 123)
 ut' 'to sleep'
 ut'-k' 'to make sleep'
 ut'-k'-ek' 'to cause to make sleep'

It is also consistent with such agglutinative languages as Turkish, Tuvan, and Tsez in which causative morphemes actually show up on the surface recursively, as illustrated in (36). This is made possible since these languages have more than two causative morphemes, and thus they may

⁵ I wish to claim that *sas* is the morphophonologically modified form of *sase* (Katada, in preparation). For details of other interpretations of *sas*, as opposed to *sase*, see Kuroda (1981, 1986, 1992) and Shibatani (1973, 1976).

avoid, by alternation, having two identical morphemes appearing in adjacent positions.

- (36) a. Turkish (Lewis 1963, cited in Kulikov 1993: 124)
- | | |
|----------------|--|
| öl | 'to die' |
| öl-dür | 'to kill' |
| öl-dür-t | 'to have someone to kill' |
| öl-dür-t-tür | 'to get someone to get someone to kill' |
| öl-dür-t-tür-t | 'to get someone to get someone to get someone to kill' |
- b. Tuvan (Kulikov 1986, cited in Kulikov 1993: 127)
- Kara-kys ool-ga a-ak-ka Bajyr-ny don-ur-t-kan
 Kara-ky; boy-DAT old man-DAT Bajyr-ACC freeze-CAUS-CAUS-past
 'Kara-ky; caused the boy to make an old man get Bajyr frozen.'
- c. Tsez (Stephen Matthews, personal communication)
- Kid-ba a uzhi-q R'waj-q-or k'et'u xan-re-re-r-si
 girl boy-LOC dog-LOC-towards cat bite-CAUS-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
 'The girl made the boy have the dog bite the cat.'

One may then wonder: if a single occurrence of *sase* achieves the double causative structure (cf. 22 vs. 25, 27 vs. 30), why should the two distinct forms of causative appear on the surface at all? A possible answer may be due to functional, processing reasons. As also mentioned earlier in section 4.1, none of the subject NPs appear overtly. Thus the argument structure, not reflected in the number of the subject NPs, is opaque, which makes it harder to tell whether the causative is single or double. The only transparent source for the structure is the predicate that has a single *sase*. But this predicate alone is ambiguous since a single *sase* accommodates a double (or a multiple, to be accurate) causative. We may conclude therefore that *sa*-insertion is a logical way to bring up the double causative structure to the surface.

The reason that the lexical causative followed by *sase* never undergoes *sa*-insertion: **oe-sas-(s)ase*, **sime-sas-(s)ase* (cf. section 4.1) follows naturally. The lexical causative followed by a single *sase* is already a double causative functionally (cf. 20), thus having no structural space for *sa*-insertion to apply.

6. IMPLICATIONS

Several further implications drawn from the double causative analysis are in order. First, morphology cannot be too abstract. This is supported by the motivation for *sa*-insertion defended in the present paper, that it is to reveal the underlying double causative structure on the surface.

Second, Shibatani (1990: 237) reports that in Japanese, suffixal auxiliaries do not attach directly to the verbal root, always involving an inflectional ending in general, and that *sase* and *rare* are the only examples which attach directly to verbal roots. Assuming this fact as a general property of Japanese, the insertion of *sa* might be to simply mediate between verbal roots and *sase*, thus making the suffix accord with this general property. This possibility, however, poses two questions. First, why should *sa* be the unit? And second, why then should the other suffix *rare* undergo a change in just the opposite direction? As mentioned in the introductory remarks of the present paper, *rare* undergoes a morphological shortening, the so-called *ra-deletion* (*rare* → *re*), which is just the reverse phenomenon from *sa*-insertion. Unless these relevant questions are answered, analyses that stay at the morphological level do not seem to offer sufficient insights into what has been involved in the *sa*-insertion phenomena, as well as the phenomena of *ra-deletion*.

Third, vowel-final verbs do not undergo *sa*-insertion: **tabe-sasase* (< **tabe-sas-(s)ase*), as shown in (5b). In principle, however, nothing prevents it from applying to this set of verbs. The reason could then be due to a low level morphophonological tendency that similar sounds, such as *sasa* of *sasase*, are avoided at least in some part of grammar. This issue is left open for future research.

Fourth and most significantly, the present analysis has an implication for the possibility of the 'reflexive causative' in Japanese, by which the referents of the Causer and the Causee are meant to be identical. While other languages such as English allow such constructions as *I let myself go* and *John let himself rest*, the reflexive causative does not seem to be attested in Japanese, but the reason for this has never been clear. The present analysis offers a theoretically different picture of the Japanese reflexive causative. Consider the humble causative (37) drawn from (15a), a polite form of *ikimasu* 'I will go' (15b).

(37) *ik-(s)ase-te-itadak-imasu* 'I will go'
 go-CAUS-CMP-*receive*(HMB)-PRES(RF)

(37), containing the intransitive verb *ik* 'go' which takes the speaker as its subject, presents challenging analyses. A possible underlying structure may be either (38) with a single causative or (39) with a double causative which is then subject to morphological reduction (26). Both conform to the subcategorization properties of *itadak* formulated in (18), the Causer-Causee relationship in both is between 'you' and 'I', and the same effect: 'I go' is presupposed by both.

- (38) [(watasi-ga) [(anata-ga) [(watasi-ni) ik]-(s)ase]-te-itadak-
imasu]
(I) (you:CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE) go-CAUS-CMP-receive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of your letting me go'
- (39) [(watasi-ga) [(anata-ga) [(watasi-ni) [(watasi-ni) ik]-(s)ase]-
sase]-te-itadak-imasu]
(I) (you:CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE/CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE) go-CAUS-CAUS-CMP-re-
ceive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of your letting me let myself go'

At first sight, nothing seems to prevent us from choosing (38). However (38) cannot be the correct structure for (37), given that the *sa*-inserted longer causative, *ik-asase* (< *ik-(s)as-(s)ase*), exists as an alternative to (37); the *sa-inserted* causative should be a double causative as shown in (40).

- (40) [(watasi-ga) [(anata-ga) [(watasi-ni) [(watasi-ni) ik]-(s)as]-
(s)ase]-te-itadak-imasu]
(I) (you:CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE/CAUSER) (I:CAUSEE) go-CAUS-CAUS-CMP-re-
ceive(HMB)-PRES(RF)
'I receive the favor of your letting me let myself go'

The present analysis then favors (39) over (38), since (39) is the structural parallel to (40).

In short, (39) and (40) are the output of the present structural analysis, in which the CAUSER and the CAUSEE of the inner causative are both read as the speaker 'I'. In other words, the existence of the reflexive causative is revealed by the structural analysis of *sa*-insertion. This would demonstrate a dynamism of structural approaches, although the analysis does not go beyond the conclusion that the reflexive causative manifests itself syntactically only under the construction of the humble causative: *sase-te-itadak*.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that the morphological lengthening characterized as *sa*-insertion brings up to the surface the underlying structure of the double causative expressed by a single occurrence of *sase*. The analysis presented is purely structural, in which several linguistic questions accompanying *sa*-insertion have been resolved. Whenever new linguistic forms emerge, prescriptive interpretations seem to be always easier and first to come by. In this respect, this paper has demonstrated that language change through time offers an area of linguistic research into the structure of the language in question. Ideally what needs to be added to this paper is

a cross-linguistic perspective on honorifics associated with causatives. I wish to leave this part of the inquiry open for further research.

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- JAPAN CULTURAL AGENCY. 1995. On the National Policy for the Coming New Era: A Report on the 20th Discussion on the National Language. (written in Japanese). Tokyo: Japan Cultural Agency.
- KATADA, FUSA. 1997. Agglutinative causatives and morphology. In Francis Corbrin, Daniele Godard & Jean-Marie Marandin (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*. Bern: Peter Lang, 61-77.
- 1997b. The structure of 'ra-deletion' in Japanese. In Monika S. Schmid, Jennifer R. Austin & Dieter Stein (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1997. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 164*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175-190.
- In preparation. Two types of language change in contemporary Japanese.
- KULIKOV, LEONID. 1993. The 'second causative': a typological sketch. In Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 121-154.
- KURODA, SHIGE-YUKI. 1960. *Gengo no Kijyutsu*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
1981. Some recent trends in syntactic theory and the Japanese language. In Anne Farmer & Chisato Kitagawa (eds.) *Coyote papers 2. Proceedings of the Arizona Conference on Japanese Linguistics: The Formal Grammar Sessions*. Tucson: University of Arizona, 103-122.
1986. A case against lexicalism in Japanese syntax and a modest proposal for the reorganization of grammar. Ms. San Diego: University of California.
1992. *Japanese Syntax and Semantics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- MARANTZ ALEC. 1984. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- MATSUDA, KENJIHO. 1993. Dissecting analogical leveling quantitatively: the case of the innovative potential suffix in Tokyo Japanese. *Language Variation and Change* 5, 1-34.
- MCCAWLEY, JAMES. 1968. *The Phonological Component of a Grammar of Japanese*. The Hague: Mouton.
- NARROG, HEIKO. 1999. Causatives as honorifics. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 20, 47-62.
- SHIBA, RYOTARO. 1984. *Kaido-o Yuku 24: Omi Sampo, Nara Sampo*. Tokyo: Asahi-shinbunsha.
- SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI. 1973. Semantics of Japanese causativization. *Foundations of Language* 9, 327-373.
1976. Causativization. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*. New York: Academic Press, 239-294.
1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.