

Attitudes without Monsters: A view from Japanese
Toshiyuki Ogihara
University of Washington

I argue that attitude verbs in Japanese can be described and explained without quantification over contexts (i.e. without monsters in the sense of Kaplan (1977)). This proposal disagrees with Schlenker's (1999, 2003) recent work on the semantics of attitude verbs and is essentially in agreement with von Stechow (2002), who claims that monsters are not needed for the semantics of attitudes. My proposal is an extension of Ogihara (1996) in the "tenseless clause" analysis of present tense is extended to (some of) the nominal arguments of verbs, and this enables me to present a proposal that deals with times, worlds and individuals in a parallel fashion. That is, it is arguable that typical Japanese sentences are "personless". For example, (1)

- (1) sukidesu. 'I love you'
like
- (2) $\llbracket \text{sukida} \rrbracket$ 'like' = $\lambda w \lambda t \lambda x \lambda y . y \text{ likes } x \text{ at } t \text{ in } w$
- (3) sukida is true in c iff $\llbracket \text{sukida} \rrbracket$ (the addressee of c)(the speaker of c)(the time of c)(the world of c) = 1

Given this analysis, we can analyze the complement clause of (4) in a similar way.

- (4) Dare-mo ga siawase-da to omo-te ita.
Everyone happy-be that think past
'Everyone thought that s/he was happy (then).'

It is natural to assume that the embedded clause, which is in fact just the predicate, denotes a property as in (5).

- (5) $\llbracket \text{siawase-da} \rrbracket$ 'be happy' = $\lambda w \lambda t \lambda x . y \text{ is happy at } t \text{ in } w$

Given Lewis's (1979) analysis that an attitude denotes a relation between individuals and properties, the computation proceeds straightforwardly.

It is important to point out that this proposal clearly has an advantage over Schlenker's in accounting for relative clause data in Japanese. That is, a relative clause in present tense can be interpreted in relation to the time of the matrix verb (Ogihara 1996). This fact cannot be explained in terms of monsters since no operator is involved here unlike attitudes.

I thus argue that a semantic analysis of attitudes without monsters is not only possible but more desirable.