

**A Contrastive Study of Empathy
in Japanese and English
(Part 2)**

Reiko TANAKA

A Contrastive Study of Empathy in Japanese and English (Part 2) ---

Although we Japanese hardly have any trouble in the choice of verbs between *mottekuru* and *motteiku* in Japanese, Japanese EFL students often make a wrong choice between *bring* and *take* in English. Even the reactions of the native speakers of English to various examples suggest that the distinction of *bring* and *take* is less clear than in *mottekuru* and *motteiku*.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate if the difference in the distribution of Japanese verbs *mottekuru* and *motteiku* vs. the English verbs *bring* and *take* follows the same pattern as *kuru* and *iku* vs. *come* and *go* as studied in part 1. Furthermore, the possibilities of co-occurrence, both in English and Japanese, of these four verbs are examined. There the English verbs seem to show more flexibility with regard to empathy relations.

0. Introduction

In my previous paper¹⁾ the distinction between the two English verbs *come* and *go* in their usage has been explored through a comparison with the rules of usage of the Japanese verbs *kuru*(来る) and *iku*(行く) using Kuno's (1978) concept of Empathy. There the observation was made that the English verb *come* has a wider range of use than the Japanese *kuru*. When the speaker is the agent and the place of utterance is the starting point and the hearer is at the arrival point, *iku* is used in Japanese but *come* is used in English. When a third person is the agent, *iku* is used in Japanese if the hearer is not at the arrival point, but in English *come* is preferred to *go*. If the utterance is about an event in the past, *go* is preferred even if the hearer was at the arrival point when the event took place or when the utterance was made. When the action in the past implies repetition or some duration in the result, *come* can also be used in the past.

In this paper I would like to investigate whether the same pattern of behavior is seen with the pairs of verbs *bring/take* and *mottekuru*(持って来る)/*motteiku*(持って行く). Since the Japanese verbs *mottekuru* (or *tsuretekuru*) and *motteiku* (or *tsureteiku*) can be divided into two parts, the latter half being *kuru* or *iku*, it can be assumed that they behave like the verbs *kuru* and *iku*. In fact they do behave in the same way as seen in the following examples:

- (1) a. *うちの息子は今日学校へ来ませんでした。

uchi-no musuko-wa kyou gakkou-e kima-sen deshita
 we-Gen son-Top today school-Goal come-Neg be-Past²⁾
 'Our son did not come to school today.'

- b. うちの息子は今日学校へ行きませんでした。

uchi-no musuko-wa kyou gakkou-e ikima-sen deshita
 we-Gen son-Top today school-Goal go-Neg be-Past

- 'Our son did not go to school today.'
- (2) a. *うちの娘は今日学校にお弁当を持って来ませんでした。
 uchi-no musume-wa kyou gakkou-ni obentou-o
 we-Gen daughter-Top today school-Goal lunch-Acc
 mottekima-sen deshita
 bring-Neg be-Past
 'Our daughter did not bring her lunch to school today.'
- b. うちの娘は今日学校にお弁当を持って行きませんでした。
 uchi-no musume-wa kyou gakkou-ni obentou-o
 we-Gen daughter-Top today school-Goal lunch-Acc
 motteikima-sen deshita
 take-Neg be-past
 'Our daughter did not take her lunch to school today.'
- (3) a. ジョンはきのう私の所に来ました。
 John-wa kinou watakushi-no tokoro-ni kimashita
 John-Top yesterday I-Gen place-Goal came
 'John came to my place yesterday.'
- b. *ジョンはきのう私の所に行きました。
 John-wa kinou watakushi-no tokoro-ni ikimashita
 John-Top yesterday I-Gen place-Goal went
 'John went to my place yesterday.'
- (4) a. ジョンはきのう私にこの箱を持って来ました。
 John-wa kinou watakushi-ni kono hako-o
 John-Top yesterday I-Dat this box-Acc
 motte-kimashita
 brought
 'John brought me this box yesterday.'
- b. *ジョンはきのう私にこの箱を持って行きました。
 John-wa kinou watakushi-ni kono hako-o
 John-Top yesterday I-Dat this box-Acc
 motte-ikimashita
 took
 'John took me this box yesterday.'

In the context where (1a) is unacceptable, i.e. the parent of the son is not at the same school, (2a) is also unacceptable. Similarly, if (3a) is acceptable and (3b) is unacceptable, (4a) is acceptable and (4b) is not acceptable in the same context.

1. *Bring and take vs. mottekuru*(持ってくる) and *motteiku*(持って行く)

The acceptability/unacceptability contrast seen in the sentences in (5) shows that when the speaker is the agent and the place of utterance is the starting point and the hearer is at the arrival point, *motteiku* is used in Japanese but *bring* is used in English. This contrastive behavior is the same as the *come/go* and *kuru/iku* case.

- (5) a. *はい、今すぐ持ってきます。
 hai, imasugu mottekimasu
 yes, right-away bring
 b. はい、今すぐ持って行きます。
 hai, imasugu motteikimasu
 yes, right-away take
 a'. Yes, I'll bring it right away.
 b'. *Yes, I'll take it right away.

In the following examples Japanese and English behave in a parallel way, viz., *mottekuru* is acceptable in Japanese, and *bring* is acceptable in English, while *motteiku* and *take* are not.

- (6) a. あら私今日カメラを持って来るのを忘れちゃった。
 ara watakushi kyou kamera-o mottekuru-no-o
 oh I today camera-Acc bring-Nominalizer-Acc
 wasurechatta
 forgot
 b. *あら私今日カメラを持って行くのを忘れちゃった。
 ara watakushi kyou kamera-o motteiku-no-o
 oh I today camera-Acc take-Nominalizer-Acc

wasurechatta

forgot

a'. Oh, I forgot to bring my camera with me today.

b'. *Oh, I forgot to take my camera with me today.

If the sentence reports an event or situation in the past, *mottekuru* is not acceptable in Japanese but in English both *bring* and *take* seem to be acceptable although *take* is preferred by some informants.

(7) a. *きのうのハイキングにカメラを持って来るのを忘れた。

Kinou-no haikinguni kamera-o
yesterday-Gen on-the-hike camera-Acc
mottekuru-no-o wasureta
bring-Nominalizer-Acc forgot

b. きんのうのハイキングにカメラを持って行くのを忘れた。

Kinou-no haikinguni kamera-o
yesterday-Gen on-the-hike camera-Acc
motteiku-no-o wasureta
take-Nominalizer-Acc forgot

a'. I forgot to bring my camera on the hike yesterday.

b'. I forgot to take my camera on the hike yesterday.

The positive versions, obviously, are also acceptable.

(8) a. I brought my camera on the hike yesterday.

b. I took my camera on the hike yesterday.

One informant has insisted that if the utterance is about an event that took place "yesterday", *take* should be preferred and if the event is taking place "now", *bring* should be used. This reaction is consistent with the observation made with *come* and *go* as summarized in the introduction.³⁾

The following sentences have a third person as agent and the place of the hearer at the time of utterance is not the destination of the action.

(9) a. *今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で君の事務所に会費を持って来ると言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen

jimusho-ni kaihi-o mottekuru-to itteita

office-Goal fee-Acc bring-Comp was-saying

- b. 今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で君の事務所に会費を持って行くと言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no

just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen

jimusho-ni kaihi-o motteiku-to itteita

office-Goal fee-Acc take-Comp was-saying

- a'. I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd bring his membership fee to your office later.
b'. ?I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd take his membership fee to your office later.

The native speakers' reactions to (9) were the same as to the sentences with *come* and *go* in (10).

- (10) a. *今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で君の事務所に来ると言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no

just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen

jimusho-ni kuru-to itteita

office-Goal come-Comp was-saying

- b. 今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で君の事務所に行くと言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no

just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen

jimusho-ni iku-to itteita

office-Goal go-Comp was-saying

- a'. I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd come to your office later.
b'. ?I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd go to your office later. (= (20) of Part I)

Look at the next examples in which the destination of the action of a third person agent is identified with the location of another third person.

- (11) a. *今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で先生の所へレポートを持って来ると言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later
sensei-no tokoro-e repooto-o mottekuru-to
professor-Gen place-Goal report-Acc bring-Comp
itteita

was-saying

- b. 今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で先生の所へレポートを持って行くと言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later
sensei-no tokoro-e repooto-o motteiku-to
professor-Gen place-Goal report-Acc take-Comp
itteita

was-saying

- a'. *I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd bring his paper to the professor later.

- b'. I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd take his paper to the professor later.

Again the native speakers' reactions were the same as in the *come/go* version discussed in the previous paper which will be repeated here as (12).

- (12) a. *今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で先生の所へ来ると言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later
sensei-no tokoro-e kuru-to itteita
professor-Gen place-Goal come-Comp was-saying

- b. 今さっき入り口でジョンに会ったら、後で先生の所へ行くと言っていた。

imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later

sensei-no tokoro-e iku-to itteita
 professor-Gen place-Goal go-Comp was-saying

a'. *I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd come to see the professor later.

b'. I've just met John at the entrance. He said he'd go to see the professor later. (= (21) in Part 1)

When the action is in the past and repetitive like (13), *tsureteiku* is preferred in Japanese but *bring* is preferred in English.

(13) a. *この一週間、先生はメアリーに会うたびに小言を言いました、なぜなら彼女は、学校に猫を連れて来ていたからです。

kono isshuukan sensei-wa Mary-ni au-tabi-ni
 this one-week teacher-Top Mary-Dat meet-every-Time
 kogoto-o iimashita, nazenara kanojo-wa gakkou-ni
 scolding-Acc said because she-Top school-Goal
 neko-o tsuretekiteita-kara desu
 cat-Acc had-brought-for be-Present

b. この一週間、先生はメアリーに会うたびに小言を言いました、なぜなら彼女は、学校に猫を連れて行っていたからです。

kono isshuukan sensei-wa Mary-ni au-tabi-ni
 this one-week teacher-Top Mary-Dat meet-every-Time
 kogoto-o iimashita, nazenara kanojo-wa gakkou-ni
 scolding-Acc said because she-Top school-Goal
 neko-o tsureteitteita-kara desu
 cat-Acc had-taken-for be-Present

a'. The teacher scolded Mary every time he saw her during the week because she had been bringing her cat to school.

b'. *The teacher scolded Mary every time he saw her during the week because she had been taking her cat to school.

There was, however, a reaction to b' above as permissible in a certain case; for example, in the context where Mary's mother is telling somebody about Mary. Perhaps because of the mother's empathy with the daughter who is the agent of carrying the cat, this sentence becomes acceptable.

If the subject of the sentence is the first person and the agent of bringing or taking is the third person, the acceptability/unacceptability changes whether or not the action is repetitive and/or is in the past as seen in the examples below.

- (14) a. *毎月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って来るのを見かける。

mai getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
every Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni mottekuru-no-o mikakeru
paper-Acc professor-Dat bring-Nominalizer-Acc see

- b. 毎月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って行くのを見かける。

mai getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
every Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni motteiku-no-o mikakeru
paper-Acc professor-Dat take-Nominalizer-Acc see

- a'. ??Every Monday I see John on his way to bringing his paper to the professor.

- b'. Every Monday I see John on his way to taking his paper to the professor.

- (15) a. ??先週の月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って来るのを見かけた。

senshuu-no getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
last Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni mottekuru-no-o mikaketa
paper-Acc professor-Dat bring-Nominalizer-Acc saw

- b. 先週の月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って行くのを見かけた。

senshuu-no getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
last Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni motteiku-no-o mikaketa
paper-Acc professor-Dat take-Nominalizer-Acc saw

- a'. ??Last Monday I saw John on his way to bringing his paper

to the professor.

- b'. Last Monday I saw John on his way to taking his paper to the professor.

- (16) a. ??毎月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って来るのを見かけたものだった。

mai getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
every Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni mottekuru-no-o
paper-Acc professor-Dat bring-Nominalizer-Acc
mikaketa-monodatta
used-to-see

- b. 毎月曜日私はジョンが彼の論文を先生に持って行くのを見かけたものだった。

mai getsuyoubi watakushi-wa John-ga kare-no
every Monday I-Top John-Nom he-Gen
ronbun-o sensei-ni motteiku-no-o
paper-Acc professor-Dat take-Nominalizer-Acc
mikaketa-monodatta
used-to-see

- a'. *Every Monday I used to see John on his way to bringing his paper to the professor.
b'. Every Monday I used to see John on his way to taking his paper to the professor.

The above reactions suggest that a first person speaker can easily move his/her viewpoint either to the starting point or to the arrival point and adjust it so as to make the sentence natural. However, if the subject is the third person as in (9), that is not possible. (17), (18) and (19) are examples without the repetitive and stative elements.

- (17) a. *きのううちの息子は、学校に勉強道具をなにも持って来ないで先生に叱られました。

kinou uchi-no musuko-wa, gakkou-ni
yesterday we-Gen son-Top school-Goal
benkyoudougu-o nanimo motteko-nai-de sensei-ni

study-things-Acc any bring-Neg-for teacher-Agent
shikarare-mashita
be-scolded-Past

- b. きのううちの息子は、学校に勉強道具をなにも持って行かないで先生に叱られました。

kinou uchi-no musuko-wa, gakkou-ni
yesterday we-Gen son-Top school-Goal
benkyoudougu-o nanimo motteika-nai-de sensei-ni
study-things-Acc any take-Neg-for teacher-Agent
shikarare-mashita
be-scolded-Past

- a'. Yesterday our son was scolded by his teacher because he did not bring any of his study things to school.
b'. Yesterday our son was scolded by his teacher because he did not take any of his study things to school.

- (18) a. *きのうジョンは先生に叱られました。なぜなら彼は学校に勉強道具を何も持って来なかったからです。

kinou John-wa sensei-ni shikararemashita
yesterday John-Top teacher-Agent was-scolded
nazenara kare-wa gakkou-ni benkyoudougu-o nanimo
because he-Top school-Goal study-things-Acc any
motteko-nakatta-kara desu
bring-Neg-Past-for be

- b. きのうジョンは先生に叱られました。なぜなら彼は学校に勉強道具を何も持って行かなかったからです。

kinou John-wa sensei-ni shikararemashita
yesterday John-Top teacher-Agent was-scolded
nazenara kare-wa gakkou-ni benkyoudougu-o nanimo
because he-Top school-Goal study-things-Acc any
motteika-nakatta-kara desu
take-Neg-Past-for be

- a'. ??Yesterday John was scolded by his teacher because he did not bring any of his study things to school.

b'. Yesterday John was scolded by his teacher because he did not take any of his study things to school.

- (19) a. きのう学校へ漫画の本を持って来たので、先生は太郎を叱りました。

kinou gakkou-e manga-no-hon-o
yesterday school-Goal comic-Gen-book-Acc
mottekita-node, sensei-wa Taro-o shikarimashita
brought-as, teacher-Top Taro-Acc scolded

- b. ??きのう学校へ漫画の本を持って行ったので、先生は太郎を叱りました。

kinou gakkou-e manga-no-hon-o
yesterday school-Goal comic-Gen-book-Acc
motteitta-node, sensei-wa Taro-o shikarimashita
take-as, teacher-Top Taro-Acc scolded

- a'. Yesterday, because Taro brought a comic book to school, the teacher scolded him.

- b'. Yesterday, because Taro took a comic book to school, the teacher scolded him.

(17a) is unacceptable in Japanese in the normal context, whereas in English both a' and b' seem to be acceptable although b' is preferred. (18a) is more acceptable than (17a) and in the English version b' is more acceptable than a' in both (17) and (18). When *teacher* becomes the subject as in (19), the a version is more acceptable in Japanese but in the English version two native speakers said they preferred b', while two other informants preferred a'.

So far the pattern of behavior shown by *mottekuru/motteiku* and *bring/take* does not seem to have a distinct difference from the pattern shown by *kuru/iku* and *come/go*. In the next section let us see the pattern of co-occurrence of the two sets.

2. Empathy relations in complex sentences

- (20) a. 花子は年末に実家に来た時に、

Hanako-wa nenmatsu-ni jikka-ni
 Hanako-Top end-of-the-year-Time parents'-home-Goal
 kita-tokini
 came-when

- b. 花子は年末に実家に行った時に,
 Hanako-wa nenmatsu-ni jikka-ni
 Hanako-Top end-of-the-year-Time parents'-home-Goal
 itta-tokini
 went-when

- c. 子供たちを連れて来なかった。
 kodomotachi-o tsureteko-nakatta
 children-Acc bring-Neg-Past

- d. 子供たちを連れて行かなかった。
 kodomotachi-o tsureteika-nakatta
 children take-Neg-Past

- a'. When Hanako came for a home visit at the end of the year,
 b'. When Hanako went for a home visit at the end of the year,
 c'. she did not bring her children.
 d'. she did not take her children.

For the Japanese version in (20) only the combinations a+c and b+d are possible, but for English, besides the a'+c' and b'+d' combinations, the b'+c' combination is also acceptable.

In case the phrase "at the end of the year" (年末に) gives the connotation of the action being repetitive or customary, sentences in which the event times are clearly limited and non-repetitive have been tested.

- (21) a. ジョンとメアリーは休暇に来た時に,
 John-to-Mary-wa kyuuka-ni kita-tokini
 John-and-Mary-Top vacation-for came-when
 b. ジョンとメアリーは休暇に行った時に,
 John-to-Mary-wa kyuuka-ni itta-tokini
 John-and-Mary-Top vacation-for went-when
 c. 子供たちを皆連れて来た。
 kodomotachi-o mina tsuretekita

children-Acc all brought

- d. 子供たちを皆連れて行った。

kodomotachi-o mina tsureteitta

children-Acc all took

- a'. When John and Mary came for vacation,

- b'. When John and Mary went for vacation,

- c'. they brought all their children with them.

- d'. they took all their children with them.

- (22) a. 花子が20年前にヨーロッパに来た時は,

Hanako-ga 20-nen-maeni youroppa-ni kita-toki-wa

Hanako-Nom 20-year-ago Europe-Goal came-when-Top

- b. 花子が20年前にヨーロッパに行った時は,

Hanako-ga 20-nen-maeni youroppa-ni itta-toki-wa

Hanako-Nom 20-year-ago Europe-Goal went-when-Top

- c. 電気釜を持って来た。

denkigama-o

mottekita

electric-rice-cooker-Acc brought

- d. 電気釜を持って行った。

denkigama-o

motteitta

electric-rice-cooker-Acc took

- a'. When Hanako came to Europe twenty years ago,

- b'. When Hanako went to Europe twenty years ago,

- c'. she brought an electric rice cooker with her.

- d'. she took an electric rice cooker with her.

- (23) a. 花子は先週図書館に来たが,

Hanako-wa senshuu toshokan-ni kita-ga

Hanako-Top last-week library-Goal came-but

- b. 花子は先週図書館に行ったが,

Hanako-wa senshuu toshokan-ni itta-ga

Hanako-Top last-week library-Goal went-but

- c. 返す筈の本を, 持って来なかった。

kaesu-hazuno

hon-o

motteko-nakatta

return-supposed-to book-Acc bring-Neg-Past

- d. 返す筈の本を、持って行かなかった。
 kaesu-hazuno hon-o motteika-nakatta
 return-supposed-to book-Acc take-Neg-Past
- a'. Although Hanako came to the library last week,
 b'. Although Hanako went to the library last week,
 c'. she did not bring the book she was supposed to return.
 d'. she did not take the book she was supposed to return.

The native speakers' reactions to (21), (22) and (23) were not different from the one to sentence (20). The only acceptable combinations in Japanese were $a+c$ and $b+d$, whereas in English $b'+c'$ is also permissible although $a'+c'$ or $b'+d'$ is preferred. Why is $b'+c'$ possible and $a'+d'$ impossible?

In Kuno (1978 and 1987) there is an extended discussion of the empathy relationship in complex sentences. In the following section, his hypotheses will be examined to see if they can explain the acceptability of $b'+c'$ and the unacceptability of $a'+d'$.

First of all, Kuno (1978) says that the Ban of Conflicting Empathy Foci which forbids a single sentence from containing logical conflicts in empathy relationship applies to complex sentences in both English and Japanese (1978:157-159). He explains as follows:

- (24) a. When Mary criticized John, he slapped her on the face.
 b. メアリーがジョンを批判した時、彼は彼女の顔を平手打ちした。
 Mary-ga John-o hihanshita-toki, kare-wa
 Mary-Nom John-Gen criticized-when, he-Top
 kanojo-no kao-o hirateuchishita
 she-Gen face-Acc slapped
- (25) a. When Mary criticized John, she was slapped by him on the face.
 b. メアリーがジョンを批判した時、彼女は彼に顔を平手打ちされた。
 Mary-ga John-o hihanshita-toki, kanojo-wa
 Mary-Nom John-Gen criticized-when, she-Top

- kare-ni kao-o hirateuchisareta
he-Agent face-Acc was-slapped
- (26) a. When John was criticized by Mary, he slapped her on the face.
- b. ジョンがメアリーに批判された時、彼は彼女の顔を平手打ちした。
John-ga Mary-ni hihansareta-toki, kare-wa
John-Nom Mary-Agent was-criticized-when, he-Top
kanojo-no kao-o hirateuchishita
she-Gen face-Acc slapped
- (27) a. *When John was criticized by Mary, she was slapped by him on the face.
- b. *ジョンがメアリーに批判された時、彼女は彼に顔を平手打ちされた。
John-ga Mary-ni hihansareta-toki, kanojo-wa
John-Nom Mary-Agent was-criticized-when, she-Top
kare-ni kao-o hirateuchisareta
he-Agent face-Acc was-slapped

In the above sentences, the active voice clauses "Mary criticized John" and "he slapped her on the face" can be interpreted as having empathy with either the subject or the object or as being neutral. The passive clauses "John was criticized by Mary" and "she was slapped by him on the face", on the other hand, can be interpreted only as statements from the viewpoint of the subject. Among the four pairs of sentences above, only the sentences in (27) have a discrepancy of viewpoint between the adverbial clause and the main clause. Therefore the acceptability of (24) to (26) and the unacceptability of (27) can be accounted for only if we apply the Ban on Conflicting Empathy Foci also to complex sentences regarding subordinate clause plus main clause as one sentence. Although this argument is convincing in itself, it does not help shed light on the $b'+c'$ acceptability vs. $a'+d'$ unacceptability.

Secondly, Kuno (1978) points out that in a sentence whose embedded sentence takes the form of direct speech in the D-structure level, viola-

tion of the empathy rules on that level is more critical than that in the S-structure level, and the balance of power between the violation in the direct speech level and the non-violation of the rule in the S-structure level depends on each empathy verb, e.g., *kuru/iku* and *kureru/yaru* (the two informal giving verbs). He gives the following sentences to illustrate the difference in these two pairs of verbs:

- (28) a. ??太郎が僕にお金を貸してやりたいと、電話をかけて来た。

Taro-ga boku-ni okane-o kashite-yari-tai-to
Taro-Nom I-Dat money-Acc lend-give-want-Comp
denwa-o kake-te-kita
telephone-Acc called

'Taro called me to say that he wanted to lend me money.'

- b. * 太郎が、僕にお金を貸してくれたいと、電話をかけて来た。

Taro-ga boku-ni okane-o kashite-kure-tai-to
Taro-Nom I-Dat money-Acc lend-give-want-Comp
denwa-o kake-te-kita
telephone-Acc called

'Taro called me to say that he wanted to lend me money.'

- (29) a. * 太郎が、僕に会いに行きたいと、電話をかけて来た。

Taro-ga boku-ni aini-iki-tai-to denwa-o
Taro-Nom I-Dat to-see-go-want-Comp telephone-Acc
kake-te-kita
called

'Taro called me to say that he wanted to go and see me.'

- b. (?) 太郎が僕に会いに来たいと電話をかけて来た。

Taro-ga boku-ni aini-ki-tai-to denwa-o
Taro-Nom I-Dat to-see-come-want-Comp telephone-Acc
kake-te-kita
called

'Taro called me to say that he wanted to come and see me.'

(28b) is unacceptable because *tai* which can be used only for a first person subject forces us to interpret the subordinate clause as direct speech whereas *kure* forces an indirect speech interpretation. The sentences in

(28) show that when *kureru* or *yaru* appears in a *tai*-clause, violation of the empathy constraint results in unacceptable sentences. On the other hand, the unacceptability of (29a) and the near acceptability of (29b) show that with *kuru* and *iku* the judgment of acceptability can be mostly made on the surface level (277-280).

Thirdly, Kuno (1987) examines Empathy relationships in complex sentences using the combination of the verbs *tell* and *hear from*. According to Kuno *tell* is an unmarked verb which takes an agent in the subject position whereas *hear from* is a marked verb which takes an agent in the oblique case and a non-agent in the subject position; only when the empathy relationship in both main clause and embedded clause are marked does the sentence become unacceptable or marginal (220-222).⁴⁾

Neither of the above arguments is applicable to the $b' + c'$ combination in (16) to (19) since they do not contain the form of direct speech in D-structure level, nor is there an inherent distinction of marked and unmarked between the verbs *come/go* or *bring/take*.

Fourthly, Kuno (1987) gives the hypothesis that a "test for inconsistency in empathy relationships applies from left to right, and the first empathy relationship established in a given sentence sets the tone for the rest of the sentence" (223). If that is so $b' + c'$ should be unacceptable, so this hypothesis is also inapplicable.

Fifthly, Kuno (1987) mentions that when the agent is moved from the subject position by passivization, it is downgraded in the Surface Structure Empathy Hierarchy and cannot receive the speaker's empathy (229). In order to see if there is any connection between this and the acceptability of $b' + c'$, the passive sentences made with this combination from (20), (22) and (23) will be examined.

- (30) When Hanako went for a home visit at the end of the year,
 - a. * the children were not taken with her.
 - b. * the children were not brought with her.
- (31) When Hanako went to Europe twenty years ago,
 - a. * an electric rice cooker was taken with her.
 - b. * an electric rice cooker was brought with her.

- (32) Although Hanako went to the library last week,
 a. * the book she was supposed to return was not taken with
 her.
 b. * the book she was supposed to return was not brought with
 her.

In the above examples both a and b are quite awkward and there seems to be no difference in the degree of unacceptability between the *take* version and the *bring* version. One of the native speakers commented that the passivized matrix in these examples gives the impression that the bringing was done by somebody other than the subject of the adverbial clause. See the following examples:

- (33) When the Smiths went to Hawaii to live,
 a. their grand piano was not taken with their furniture.
 b. their grand piano was not brought with their furniture.

In (33) both a and b are equally acceptable depending on the context. Sentences like (30), which when given independently receive reactions as being awkward, will become acceptable when a preceding sentence gives an appropriate context, as in (34). The awkwardness of (30) seems to lie in the structure of the sentence, i.e. the subjects of the adverbial clause and the main clause are different and the agent is not in subject position. When these are solved in (34), both *bring* and *take* become acceptable.

- (34) When the children were small, Hanako used to take them
 all with her when she went for a home visit, but this year
 when she went home in August, they were not taken/
 brought with her.

(30), (31) and (32) can be interpreted as having marked verbs in the main clauses because of the passive structure, but Kuno's argument on marked/unmarked verbs in the complex sentence cannot be applied because the when-clauses have the agent as subject. In other words, it does not fulfill Kuno's condition cited above that only when the empathy relationship in both main clause and embedded clause are marked does the sentence become unacceptable or marginal.

If we interpret the verbs *bring* and *take* in sentences (30) to (32) as

marked because they are in the passive and because the agent being moved from the subject position is downgraded in the Surface Structure Empathy Hierarchy and therefore cannot receive the speaker's empathy, as expressed in the fifth argument above, their unacceptability may be explained but it does not help solve the $b'+c'$ issue.

3. Concluding remarks

This paper has investigated whether the difference in usage between the English verbal pairs *bring* and *take* and the Japanese verbal pairs *motte-kuru* and *motteiku* follow the same pattern as the one between *come* and *go* vs. *kuru* and *iku*. The overall result has been that the contrastive behavior is equal to the *come/go* and *kuru/iku* set.

Further, empathy relations in complex sentences have been studied. It has been noticed that in Japanese when the verb *kuru* is used in the subordinate clause, only *mottekuru* (or *tsuretekuru*) is acceptable and with *iku* only *motteiku* (or *tsureteiku*) can co-occur, whereas in English not only the *come+bring* and *go+take* combinations but also the *go+bring* combination is possible although the *come+take* combination is unacceptable. In order to find out why *go* and *bring* can co-occur but not *come* and *take*, Kuno's (1978 and 1987) hypotheses on empathy relations in complex sentences have been examined. None of them, however, could give a satisfactory explanation.

Perhaps it may be wiser at this point to leave the theoretical argument for a while and investigate the problem from a different angle, for example, the use and misuse by Japanese learners of English of these verbs. The area in which their mistakes converge might suggest a more conclusive explanation of the problem.

NOTES

- 1) "A Contrastive Study of Empathy in Japanese and English" in *Seishin Studies*, vol. #81, July 1993. In the above paper I inadvertently omitted the Romanized transcriptions and the glosses for the Japanese sentences. They are given in the appendix to this paper.
- 2) The abbreviations used in this paper are as follows:

Nom: nominative	Loc: location
Gen: genitive	Comp: complementizer
Dat: dative	Conj: conjunction
Acc: accusative	Neg: negative
Top: topic	Q: question
- 3) Another native speaker has said that the choice between *bring* and *take* has nothing to do with tense, but rather with the place one imagines oneself to be, and that, to him, *take* seems more objective. I take the side that tense has some relation to the choice of the verbs, and if *take* is more objective than *bring* the two opinions do not contradict each other but rather strengthen each other in the following sense: In general, a sentence in the past tense seems more objective than the one in the present in that it has more distance in time from the occurrence of the event stated. In other words, it is easier to empathize with the speaker in a sentence in the present tense than in the past tense. Therefore the intuition that says *take* is more objective than *bring* fortifies the appropriateness of the intuition that prefers *take* in the past tense.
- 4) The word "marked" is used by Kuno in the sense of intentional and "unmarked" as unintentional; in other words if the agent is the subject and the goal is the object, the sentence is unmarked.

REFERENCES

- Haegeman, Liliane. 1991. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kamio, Akio. 1990. *Joho no Nawabari Riron* [Territory of Information]. Tokyo: Taishukan. (神尾昭雄「情報のなわ張り理論」)
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. "Pronominalization, Reflexivization and Direct Discourse." *Linguistic Inquiry* 3. 16-195.
- . 1978. *Danwa no Bunpo* [Discourse Grammar]. Tokyo: Taishukan. (久野暉「談話の文法」)
- . 1987. *Functional Syntax*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Kuno, Susumu, and Etsuko Kaburaki. 1977. "Empathy and Syntax." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 627-672.
- Pinker, Steven. 1984. *Language Learnability and Language Development*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Tanaka, Reiko. 1993. "A Contrastive Study of Empathy in Japanese and English." *Seishin Studies* 81. 19-32.

APPENDIX

In my previous paper "A Contrastive Study of Empathy in Japanese and English", which is Part 1 of the present paper, the Romanized transcriptions of the Japanese sentences were not given. Here I will provide them with the minimum gloss.

- (1) a'. *moshimoshi ima Shibuya-ni irundakedo ima-kara kitemo
 hello now Shibuya-Loc be-but now-from come
 iidesuka
 all-right-Q-marker
 b'. moshimoshi ima Shibuya-ni irundakedo ima-kara ittemo
 hello now Shibuya-Loc be-but now-from go
 iidesuka
 all-right-Q-marker
- (2) a'. *hai, ima kimasu
 yes, now come
 b'. hai, ima ikimasu
 yes, now go
- (3) a'. *haitte-kite iidesu-ka
 enter-come all-right-Q-marker
 b'. haitte-itte iidesu-ka
 enter-go all-right-Q-marker
- (6) a. Taro-ga kinou koko-ni kita
 Taro-Nom yesterday here-Goal came
 b. *Taro-ga kinou koko-ni itta
 Taro-Nom yesterday here-Goal went
- (7) a. *Taro-wa kinou koko-kara shikenjou-ni kita
 Taro-Nom yesterday here-Source examination-hall-Goal came
 b. Taro-wa kinou koko-kara shikenjou-ni itta
 Taro-Nom yesterday here-Source examination-hall-Goal went
- (8) gakkou-ni iku-to, Hanako-ga kite-ita
 school-Goal go-when Hanako-Nom come-was-there
- (9) ima-kara sugu boku-no ie-ni itte-kudasai
 now-from right-away I-Gen house-Goal go-please
- (10) ima-kara sugu boku-no ie-ni kite-kudasai
 now-from right-away I-Gen house-Goal come-please
- (11) a. kimi raigetsu-mo Fukuoka-ni kuru-no-kai
 you next-month-too Fukuoka-Goal come-Nominalizer-Q-marker
 b. kimi raigetsu-mo Fukuoka-ni iku-no-kai
 you next-month-too Fukuoka-Goal go-Nominalizer-Q-marker
- (12) a. nanda kimi, Fukuoka-ni itte-ita-no-ka
 oh you, Fukuoka-Goal go-was-Nominalizer-Q-marker

- b. kimi,itsu-kara Fukuoka-ni itte-iru-n-dai
you, when-since Fukuoka-Goal go-be-Nominalizer-Q-marker
- c. kimi, maitzuki Fukuoka-ni iku-koto-ni
you, every-month Fukuoka-Goal go-Comp-as
natteiru-no-kai
arranged-Nominalizer-Q-marker
- (13) a. kimi ashita nanji-ni kaisha-ni kimasu-ka
you tomorrow what-time-Time office-Goal come-Q-marker
- (14) a. uchi-no mususme-ga otaku-ni itte-imasu-ka
we-Gen daughter-Nom your-house-Goal go-be-Q-marker
b. *uchi-no musume-ga otaku-ni kite-imasu-ka
we-Gen daughter-Nom your-house-Goal come-be-Q-marker
- (15) a. *dare-ga tazuneteittemo, ie-ni irete-wa damedesuyo
who-Nom go-and-visit, house-Goal take-in-Top do-not
b. dare-ga tazunetekitemo, ie-ni irete-wa damedesuyo
who-Nom come-and-visit, house-Goal take-in-Top do-not
- (16) a. *Taro-ga kita-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni inakatta
Taro-Nom came-when, you-Top house-Loc be-Neg-Past
b. Taro-ga itta-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni inakatta
Taro-Nom went-when, you-Top house-Loc be-Neg-Past
- (17) a. Taro-ga kita-toki, kimi-wa boku-ni sugu denwa-suru
Taro-Nom came-when, you-Top I-Dat at-once telephone-do
beki-datta
should-be-Past
b. Taro-ga itta-toki, kimi-wa boku-ni sugu denwa-suru
Taro-Nom went-when, you-Top I-Dat at-once telephone-do
beki-datta
should-be-Past
- (18) a. Taro-ga Hanako-ni aini kita
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat to-see came
b. Taro-ga Hanako-ni aini itta
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat to-see went
- (19) a. *Taro-ga Hanako-no ie-o tazunetekita hi-wa, choudo
Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen house-Acc came-to-visit day-Top, just
Hanako-ga Taro-no ie-ni kita hi deatta
Hanako-Nom Taro-Gen house-Goal came day was
b. Taro-ga Hanako-no ie-o tazuneteitta hi-wa, choudo
Taro-Nom Hanako-Gen house-Acc went-to-visit day-Top, just
Hanako-ga Taro-no ie-ni itta hi deatta
Hanako-Nom Taro-Gen house-Goal went day was
- (16) c. *Taro-ga kita-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni ita-noni
Taro-Nom came-when, you-Top house-Loc be-Past-although

- irusuotsukatta
pretended-to-be-out
- d. Taro-ga itta-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni ita-noni
Taro-Nom went-when, you-Top house-Loc be-Past-although
irusuotsukatta
pretended-to-be-out
- (17) c. *Taro-ga kita-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni iru-beki-datta
Taro-Nom came-when, you-Top house-Loc be-should-Past
- d. Taro-ga itta-toki, kimi-wa ie-ni iru-beki-datta
Taro-Nom went-when, you-Top house-Loc be-should-Past
- (20) a. *imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no jimusho-ni
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen office-Goal
kuru-to itteita
come-Comp was-saying
- b. imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode kimi-no jimusho-ni
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later you-Gen office-Goal
iku-to itteita
go-Comp was-saying
- (21) a. *imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode sensei-no
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later professor-Gen
tokoro-e kuru-to itteita
place-Goal come-Comp was-saying
- b. imasakki iriguchi-de John-ni attara, atode sensei-no
just-now entrance-Loc John-Dat met, later professor-Gen
tokoro-e iku-to itteita
place-Goal go-Comp was-saying
- (22) a. *kyonenno kurisumasu-ni anata-no otaku-ni kita-toki-ni
last-year's Christmas-Time you-Gen house-Goal came-when-Time
itadaita wain-no aji-ga wasureraremasen
had wine-Gen taste-Nom cannot-forget
- b. kyonenno kurisumasu-ni anata-no otaku-ni itta-toki-ni
last-year's Christmas-Time you-Gen house-Goal went-when-Time
itadaita wain-no aji-ga wasureraremasen
had wine-Gen taste-Nom cannot-forget
- (23) a. *nikagetsu-mae-ni anata-no nouen-ni kita-toki-ni itadaita
two-months-ago-Time you-Gen farm-Goal came-when-Time received
shikuramen-no hachi-wa mada mankai-desu
cyclamen-Gen pot-Top still full-bloom-be
- b. nikagetsu-mae-ni anata-no nouen-ni itta-toki-ni itadaita
two-months-ago-Time you-Gen farm-Goal went-when-Time received
shikuramen-no hachi-wa mada mankai-desu
cyclamen-Gen pot-Top still full-bloom-be

- (24) a. *juunen-mae-ni furansu-de anata-ni oaishini kita toki-no,
 ten-years-ago France-Loc you-Dat to-see came at-the-time
 anata-no ohanashi-ni kanmei-o-ukemashita
 you-Gen talk-by was-impressed
- b. juunen-mae-ni furansu-de anata-ni oaishini itta toki-no
 ten-years-ago France-Loc you-Dat to-see went at-the-time
 anata-no ohanashi-ni kanmei-o-ukemashita
 you-Gen talk-by was-impressed
- (26) a. *sensei-wa senshuu John-ni taishite okotte-imashita, nazenara
 teacher-Top last-week John-Dat at was-angry, because
 kare-wa maniauyouni gakkou-ni kite-inakatta-kara desu
 he-Top on-time school-Goal come-be-Neg-Past-for be
- b. sensei-wa senshuu John-ni taishite okotte-imashita, nazenara
 teacher-Top last-week John-Dat at was-angry, because
 kare-wa maniauyouni gakkou-ni itte-inakatta-kara desu
 he-Top on-time school-Goal go-be-Neg-Past-for be
- (27) a. *John-wa senshuu gakkou-ni maniauyouni kite-inakatta-to
 John-Top last-week school-Goal on-time come-be-Neg-Past-Comp
 sensei-ni shikarareta
 teacher-Agent was-scolded
- b. John-wa senshuu gakkou-ni maniauyouni itte-inakatta-to
 John-Top last-week school-Goal on-time go-be-Neg-Past-Comp
 sensei-ni shikarareta
 teacher-Agent was-scolded