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ABSTRACT

This paper treats the Japanese adjective phrase forming derivational suffix -tai from a new point of view: firstly it tries to approach from a semantic standpoint by applying the proposal made in Ikeya (1991). It will be shown that adjective phrases formed by -tai fit nicely with the semantic structure proposed by Ikeya. Secondly, we attempt to 'derive' -tai sentences, by adopting a basic framework of HPSG so that we can 'derive' them without having recourse to transformational operations, that is, in a monostratal way. In tackling the problem we have tried to incorporate many ideas proposed so far on this issue.

1. Introduction

In Japanese as well as in Korean there are such expressions as follows.

(1) watasi wa ringo wo tabetai (Japanese)
I Top. apple Obj. eat-want
I want to eat apples.

(2) na-nun sagwa rul mokkoship ta. (Korean)
It should be noticed that -tai desirative, which is so called by Kuno (1973), is mainly used for the first person singular or plural as a subject. In addition to this expression, there are other expressions which are mainly used for the third person as a subject.

(3) kare wa rongo wo tabe ta gatteiru (Japanese)
he Top. apple Obj. eat want show the sign of
He shows the sign of wanting to eat apples.

(4) ku nun sagwa rul mokkoshi phohagoitta. (Korean)

In the tradition of Japanese linguistics the main interest has been mainly focused on the following issues.

(a) How to derive the type of sentences like (3) from that of (1).
(b) What is a relationship between the sentence (1) and (5) below, where nominative case ga is employed instead of wo ? That is, under what condition wo - ga alternation occurs.

(5) watasi wa ringo ga tabetai
I Top. apple Nom. eat want
I want to eat apples.

(c) How to derive a sentence like (1) from a sentence like (6) below.

(6) watasi wa ringo wo taberu.
I Top. apples Obj. eat
So far no serious attempt has been made except Sugioka (1986) to treat -tai suffix as a complex adjective forming suffix by combining with an intransitive or a transitive verb and to make an inquiry into the semantic structure of such an adjective.

1. The Theoretical Framework
1.1. The Semantic Structure of Adjectives
1.1.1. Three Dimensions

In English, as well as in Japanese or Korean, there is a group of the so called degree adjectives whose semantic meaning is greatly dependent on linguistic or non-linguistic contexts. One such contextual factor is called Thematic Dimension by Bartsch (1986/87). In addition to this dimension, it was proposed in Ikeya (1991, 1992, 1996) that it is necessary to set up two other such dimensions, which are termed Comparative / Contrastive Dimension and Degree Dimension. Only after these three vectors are specified is
it possible to determine the truth condition of a sentence which contains a degree adjective. We also claim that this will provide a general framework applicable not only to English but also to Japanese and Korean.

When we say he is good, the sentence has to be specified in what respect he is good, as compared or contrasted with whom he is good at, and to what degree he is good. For example, in he is very good at basketball for a short Japanese all these dimensions are expressed: at basketball is what we call THEMATIC DIMENSION (TD), for a short Japanese is our so called COMPARATIVE / CONTRASTIVE DIMENSION (CD), and very is our DEGREE DIMENSION. (DD).

1.1.2. TD in English Adjectives
In English TDs have the following varieties.

(7) a. John is good at tennis.
    b. John is fine healthwise.
    c. John is fine in terms of health.
    d. John is fine in regards to health.
    e. John is blind in one eye.

As these examples show, in English TDs are expressed by such expressions as in terms of, as regards, or other prepositional phrases headed by of, in etc. All these expressions give specification to adjectives in what respect John is good or fine. It should be noticed that all these expressions grammatically correspond to an adverbial. It should also be remarked that TD is not obligatory. In such a sentence as the business is very slow no TD is expressed.

1.1.3. CD in English Adjectives
A degree adjective like tall implicitly encodes a comparison dimension like taller than X, with X being specified either by a linguistic or non-linguistic context. Take for example, the following sentences.

(8) a. He is tall.
    b. For a Japanese, he is tall.

In (8)a, size "tallness" is always relative to some implicit measure such as the height of an average person and it is nonsense to talk of tallness except relative to such a comparison class. On the other hand, in (8)b a comparison class is explicitly encoded in the form of for a Japanese. This is the case of a linguistic specification of a comparison dimension, while (8)a is a case of non-linguistic contextual specification of a comparison dimension.

The core part of the sentence (9) below is he is good, which we call a core proposition consisting of a core predicate and a subject, the rest being contextual dimensions: TD, CD, and DD.

(9) He is very good at tennis for his age. In terms of a tree diagram, (9) has the following semant

```
PROPOSITION
   CONTEXTUAL DIMENSION
      TD  CD  DD
        tennis  his age  highest
        group  degree

   CORE PROPOSITION
      PREDICATE  SUBJECT
          good  he
```

On the other hand, the sentence Mary is beautiful there is neither TD nor DD which is explicitly expressed, though there is an implicit CD. Thus the semantic structure of the sentence can be represented as follows:
The contextual dimensions TD and DD are optional but CD is either explicit or implicit. In the sentence above the CD is implicitly encoded. In what follows we will stipulate that the semantic structure above is the basic one and therefore unmarked one and the one corresponding to *He is very good at tennis for his age* is marked whose semantic structure has all the three dimensions.

2. *Tai* as an Adjective Phrase Forming Suffix

According to a dictionary the suffix *-tai* is classified as an auxiliary verb having a declension similar to adjectives but this is only half of the truth. It is pointed in Kuno (1973) that the suffix has [+ stative ] as a semantic feature. This gives us a support for our treatment of *-tai*. As is pointed out in Sugioka (1984), *-tai* is followed by a noun forming suffix *-sa*, which usually occurs after an adjective word, not a phrase to form a noun. (10) *Taroo wa [ tesuto de ii ten o tori-ta]-sz no amari kanningu o sita.*

Top. exam Loc good mark Acc. get-want Gen. excess cunning Acc. did

Taroo cheated in the exam out of the desire to get good marks.

As is clear from this example, the noun forming suffix *-sa* occurs after a phrase *tesuto de ii en o tori-tai*.

Another evidence to show that *-tai* is an adjective phrase forming suffix is evidenced by the following pairs of sentences.

(11) a. *watasi wa totemo ringo wo taberu.*
   I Top. very apples Obj. eat
   I eat very much eat apples.
   b. watasi wa totemo ringo wo tabetai.
   I Top. very apples Obj. eat-want
   I want very much to eat apples.

(12) a. *watasi wa totemo anata ni atte hanasu.*
   I Top. very you to see-and talk
   I want very much to see you and talk
   b. watasi wa totemo anata ni atte hanasitai
   I Top. very you to see-and talk want
   I want very much to see you and talk with you.

In the sentences (11)a and (12)a *totemo* meaning very much makes the sentences ungrammatical, while (11)b and (12)b are acceptable since *totemo* modifies a whole phrase *ringo woabetai ' want to eat apples ' or anata ni atte hanasitai ' want to see you and talk with you'.

So far we have given two pieces of evidence to show that *-tai* is an adjective phrase forming suffix. But the most convincing evidence to support my claim that *-tai* is an adjective phrase forming suffix is the fact that the sentences with *-tai* fit nicely with a semantic structure of adjectives which I propose above in section 1. For example, the semantic structure of the sentence (13) is given below as follows.

(13) *watasi wa totemo ringo wo tabetai.*
   I Top. extremely apples Obj. eat-wan
   I want very much to eat apples.
This sentence has no TD as shown above, which is an unmarked case like the sentence *She is beautiful*. CD is implicit, which is contextually specified, e.g. bananas, oranges or peaches. DD is *totemoe* meaning *to a highest degree*.

(14) *watasi ga ringo wo totemo tabetai.*

*I want very much to eat apples.*

In this case *I* gets a focus and the sentence means that it is *I* and no any other persons which are contextually defined that want very much to eat apples.

The sentence (15) is a case where an objective case is *ga*-marked instead of *o*-marked. About the difference between the sentence (1), where *-o* marked case is used and (15), where *ga*-mark-ed case employed, it is asserted in Morita (1988) that a *ga*-marked sentence is paraphrasable as a following cleft sentence. This shows that a *ga*-marked noun phrase is contrasted or compared with other objects in the discourse in question.

(16) *It is apples that I want very much to eat.*

According to our framework *ga*-marked *ringo* is contrasted with contextually specifiable objects like oranges or peaches. The semantic structure of (15) can be represented as follows.

The problem arises as to what difference there is as to the CD in the sentence (13) and (14) since in both sentences the CD is the one which is contextually specifiable. We claim
that in the case of (14) the existence of contrastive elements are more salient although in both sentences the CD's are implicit. This is marked by a particle ga. 2) It is asserted in Muraki (1975) that when there is a free alternation between -ga and -wo, -wo form is apt to be used if a verb is focused. This can be formalized by our framework in the following way. A predicate adjective, instead of a noun, can become an exponent of CD. Take for example, the following sentence.

(17) watasi wa hon wo uritai (no de atte, kaitai no de wa nai.)

I Top. book Obj. sell (but buy) Nominalizer Top. not

I want to buy books but not sell books.

In this context kaitai, a part of a predicate hon wo kaitai plays a part of CD. This can be easily incorporated into our framework of semantic structure.

3. Predicate-Argument Structure of -tai Adjectives.

In Shibatani (1978) it is asserted that the deep structure of the sentence (18) is (19).

(18) boku ga mizu ga/wo nomitai.

I Nom. water Obj. drink-want

'I want to drink water.'

(19) [ I [ I water drink] tai ]

Subj. Subj. DO Stative Verb.

This means that -tai is a two place stative verb taking a subject and a sentence. Muraki (1990) is of the same opinion when he states that the semantic representation of (20) is (21).

(20) sini-tai. (want die) 'want to die'

(21) tai (w, sin (w)), where w refers to the speaker.

We claim that -tai is an adjective forming derivational suffix combining not with a verb stem but a verb phrase and because of that a resultant phrase is an adjective phrase. The reason is as follows. Firstly, the claim by Shibatani that -tai with a specification of a stative verb takes a subject NP and a sentence is wrong. Stative verbs cannot take two objects by definition. Secondly, adjectives in Japanese and possibly in Korean are a one-place predicate. 3) The seemingly -ga marked NP in such sentence as (22) which seemingly takes a nominative case is a case of our TD in terms of semantics, and syntactically an adjunct.

(22) kare wa tenisu ga tosino wariniwa totemo umai

He Top. tennis Nom. age for very good

He is very good at tennis for his age.

Thirdly, there is a positive reason for taking a phrase, formed by -tai as an adjective. In Japanese there is a noun forming derivational suffix -sa as shown below.

(23) adjective: aoi : 'blue' noun: aosa 'blueness'

Similarly, -sa occurs after -tai phrase forming an adjective phrase not an adjective word as shown below.

(24) kare wa [ turi wo sikiwo toosite sitasa ] no amari yamagoya wo tateta.
he Top. fishing Obj. through four seasons do-want Gen. excess hut  
He built a mountain hut for wanting too much to go fishing through four seasons. 

(25) kare wa [ryoosin ni homeraretas] no amari tesuto de kanningu wo sita. 
He Top. parents by being praised want Gen. excess exam in cheat  
He cheated in an exam for wanting too much to be praised by his parents. 

It should be noted that a string turi wo sikiwo toosite sitas consists of a phrase turi wo sikiwo toosite sitai followed by a noun forming suffix -sa. Because -sa is a derivational suffix which follows not only an adjective word but also an adjective phrase, there is no doubt that -tai phrase is an adjective phrase. Since we stipulate that adjectives are one-place predicate, the predicate-argument structure of the sentence (1) reproduced as (26) below is (27).

(26) watasi wa ringo wo tabetai. 
(27) ringo wo tabetai [watasi ] argue 

4. Syntactic 'Derivation' of -tai Sentences

In what follows we adopt HPSG as a basic framework. Since there is no notion of syntactic derivation in HPSG, we will show how lexical information projects into a sentence.

S [SC{0}]
watasi wa sizukani sake wo nomitai

C
H

NP{(1 pers.)}
watasi 'I'

ADJ. phrase{SC{NP{(1pers.SUBJ)}}}
[+ADJ]
sizukani sake wo nomitai

C
H

VP{SC{NP{(1pers.SUBJ)}}}
ADJ-forming suffix{SC{VP}}
[+ADJ]
-tai 'want'

A
C
H

ADJUNCT
sizukani sake wo nomu
'quietly' 'wine' 'drink'

N.B. A: adjunct;  C: complement ; H: head ; SC: subcategorization; 1 pers.: 1st person

The following points are worthy of note on the representation above.

(a) -tai has a Subcat value VP, neither a sententence nor a lexical verb, having [+ ADJ ] as a head feature. In Japanese there are some bound forms like -yasui, 'easy' and nikui 'difficult' having [+ADJ ] as a syntactic feature which also take a lexical verb, not a VP as a Subcat value. 4)

(b) In Muraki (1991) it is asserted that in the sentence like watasi wa hitoride yukkuri sake wo nomitai (I want to drink wine alone leisurely ) hitoride yukkuri (alone leisurely ) modifies nomu (drink) not nomitai (want to drink), which is a correct observation. Our analysis above can capture this observation correctly, for 'quietly' in the sentence above can only modify sake wo nomu (drink wine), not nomitai (want to drink). There is another piece of evidence to show that our analysis is correct. In the sentence (28) totemo meaning 'very' modifies an adjective phrase ringo ga tabetai 'want to eat apples' as a whole, not
I want very much to eat apples.

In (27) the adjunct sizukani 'quietly' is a verb modifier but in (28) totemo 'very' is an intensifier of the adjective phrase ringo wo tabetai 'want to eat'. This fact is correctly represented in the two representations above.

(c) As mentioned above, Shibatani asserts that the deep structure of (18) boku ga mizu ga/wo nomitai. ('I want to drink water.') is (19) [ I [ I water drink] tai ] . Namely, the subject of an embedded sentence is identical with that of the matrix sentence. In our framework which has no notion of deep structure, an index is employed. The use of an indexed NP means that the referent of a noun phrase, which acts as a subject of taberu 'eat' is referentially the same as a subject of an adjective phrase mizu wo nomitai 'want to drink'.

(d) The syntactic rule used here are the following ones.

Rule 1. [ SUBCAT < > ] →H[ LEX +], C *, A

Rule 2. [ SUBCAT < > ] →H[ LEX −], C , A 5)

The rule 1 will take care of such sentence as watasi wa sake ga/wo nomu 'I drink wine.' The rule 2 will be responsible for such sentence as watasi wa sake ga/wo nomitai 'I want very much to drink wine' since sake ga/wo nomitai 'want to drink wine' is considered as an adjective phrase, that is, [Lex - ] in our framework.

5. Previous Studies

5.1. Kuno (1973), Shibatani (1978)

They are similar in deriving a surface form from a deep structure having an embedded sentence with an identical subject to a matrix sentence. For example, the deep structure of (29) is asserted to be (30), from which (29) is derived by an array of transformations which are no longer available in the current scene of linguistic theory. The transformational operations employed are: subject marking, object marking, equi-NP deletion, aux deletion, verb raising, subject marking, object marking gato deletion.

(29) boku wa hon wo yomitai.

I Top. book Obj. read want

I want to read books.

(30) boku [ boku hon yom-ru ] tai-i.

-tai is claimed by Shibatani to be stative predicate. Their ideas of an equi subject and stative character of -tai are incorporated into our framework as stated above: namely, the idea of an equi subject is represented as a referential identity by the use of an index and the
idea of stativeness is rephrased as an adjective forming derivational suffix of -tai.

5.2. Sugioka (1986)

The main points of Sugioka (1986) can be summarized as follows.

(i) -Tai is a case of phrasal suffix which attaches to a lexical verb or verb phrase forming an A', that is, an adjective phrase.

(ii) The sentence (b) taroo wa eigo o hanasitai 'taroo wants to speak English' is asserted to be the result of Equi NP deletion of the sentence (a) below.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow V' \\
Taroo & V' \\
\text{taroo} & \text{wa} \\
\text{eigo} & \text{o} \\
\text{hanasi-tai} & \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
\end{align*}
\]

(iii) In the sentence (b) quoted above taroo wa eigo ga hanasi tai is reanalyzed as follows:

Taroo ga [eigo ga [hanasi-tai]] Eigo ga is an argument of a lexical adjective of hanasitai and taroo ga is an argument of a newly formed an adjective phrase eigo ga hanasitai.

(iv) When -ga marked is reanalyzed as the argument of V-tai, the NP is brought into focus.

(31) boku wa biiru ga koohii yori nomitai
'I want to drink BEER more than coffee.' = It is beer more than coffee that I want to drink.

(32) boku wa biiru wo koohii yori nomitai.
'I want to drink more than coffee.'

The structure of (31)

The structure of (32)

About the first point, we have adopted the same stand as Sugioka. Secondly, the idea of Equi-predicate is incorporated into our framework as we mentioned above. The third point is that an adjective formed by the suffix -tai is a one-place predicate, not a two-place predicate, with which we can agree. We claim that eigo o / ga hanasitai as a whole constitute a one-place predicate with taroo ga constituting an argument. Sugioka asserts that the NP eigo ga should be treated as an argument of the stative predicate hanasitai as a whole, and hence is assigned the nominative cases marking. But when the NP takes -o as in eigo o hanasitai the o-marked NP is not assigned a status of an argument in her
approach, which complicates the matter. In our framework -tai is given a status of an AP forming suffix, whether it occurs before a lexical or non-lexical verb. Fourthly, we tackle the problem of a focus in a different way. The sentence (31) has the following semantic structure.

The sentence (32) has the following semantic structure.

In (31) a contrastive not comparative dimension is chosen out of CD so that 'beer' is contrasted with 'coffee'. On the other hand, in (32) comparative dimension, not contrastive dimension is chosen so that 'beer' is compared with 'coffee'. Thus the syntactic approach taken by Sugioka can be rephrased by our semantic approach. In a word the difference between the two sentences is attributed to whether a comparative or contrastive dimension is chosen.

FOOTNOTES
(1) Nihongo Kyoiku Jiten (Dictionary of Japanese Language Education), s.v. Jodooshi
(2) This difference between -wo + tai and -ga + tai is only a part of the whole story. According to Iwori (1995), in addition to my assertion, which can be classified as a semantic one, the following factors seem to be involved with respect to the ga-wo alternation of the particle. i) Lexical restriction: (a) verbs of Chinese origin are more 'reluctant' to use -ga than those of Japanese counterpart. (b) Idiomatic verbs taking -wo do not usually alternate with-ga. ii) When an object and a verb are intervened by other constituents, the less easy it becomes for -ga to occur. iii) When a verb has an explicit transitive character, the less easy it becomes to use -ga.
(3) As for the details of a predicate-argument structure of Japanese adjectives cf. Ikeya (1991, 1992) and Ikeya (in preparation).
(4) For details, refer to Ikeya (1996).
(5) These rules are a modified version of the original rules in Pollard and Sag (1987).
REFERENCES

Bartsch, Renata. 1986/87. The Construction of properties under perspective. Journal of Semantics 5:293-320.

Ikeya, Akira. 1991. A contextual approach to Japanese adjectives. The sixth Japanese-Korean joint conference on formal linguistics. ed. by Akira Ikeya, 64-90. Logicoc-linguistic Society of Japan, Tokyo.

Ikeya, Akira. 1992. Japanese Tough Constructions in HPSG Framework. Language Information and Computation. ed. by Chung Lee and Beom-mo Kang. 50-63. Seoul, Thaehasa.

Ikeya, Akira. 1996. Tough constructions of Japanese and English in HPSG framework, In Meaning and Discourse--A Festschrift for Professor Eva Hajicova, ed. by Barbara Partee and Petr Sgall, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Iwori, Isao. 1995. Ga sitai and wo sitai. Nihongo Kyouiku 86: 52-64.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. The Structure of Japanese Language. The MIT Press, Massachusetts.

Morita, Yosiyuki. 1988. Nihongo no ruihyoogen. (Synonymous expressions of Japanese) Tokyo: Sootakusha.

Muraki, Masatake. 1990. Tai and garu: derivational suffixes or predicates. Journal of Japanese Linguistics. 12: 115-126.

Muraki, Sinjiroo. 1975. 'Mizu wo nomitai' no ni 'mizu ga nomitai' to wa? (Though we want to drink water why should we say mizu ga nomitai instead of mizu wo nomitai?) Nihonbunpoo no miete kuruhon. ed. by Tadatosi Ookubo. 111-123. Tokyo: Shoobunsha.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan Sag. 1987. Information-based syntax and semantics. Stanford: CSLI.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. Head-driven phrase structure grammar. Stanford: CSLI.

Sugioka, Yoko. 1986. Nihongo no bunseki. (The analysis of Japanese). Tokyo: Taishukan.

Tamura, Suzuko. 1969. Nihongo no tadoosi no kibookei, kanookei to josi. (Desirative and a verb form expressing ability in Japanese and particles.) Bulletin of Waseda University Language Education and Research Institute. 8: 16-33.

Tamura, Suzuko. 1971. On the word having 'ga' meaning an object. (On the word with a nominative case marker meaning object case) Bulletin of Waseda University Language Education and Research Institute. 10:28-52.