Historical developments/variations of Japanese addressee-honorific markers and economy principles

Akitaka Yamada, Georgetown University (ay314@georgetown.edu)

Introduction. The left-periphery area in CP has been convincingly claimed to be a site for discourse-oriented elements (Rizzi 1997, inter alia). Some addressee-honorific (AH) markers, however, do not seem to obey this generalization. Certainly, Thai *kháp* and Korean *supnita/eyo* are used as sentence-final particles and are above CP (hereafter, POSITION C). But Contemporary Japanese (NJ) *-mas*, Middle Japanese (MJ) *-soorow* and Burmese *-pa/ba* occupy a position at least lower than Pol(arity)P (hereafter, POSITION A). Furthermore, as in (1) and (2), MJ and NJ display multiple AH-constructions, in which an additional AH-marker appears in T (hereafter, POSITION B). Schematically, we have three possible positions for AH-markers, as shown in (3).

(1) [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$[$_{PolP}$ *hitobito* *motii-**sooraw**-azu*] [$_{T}$ ***soora(w)**-iki*]]]. Middle Japanese (MJ)
people use-HON$_A$-NEG HON$_A$-PST

(2) [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$[$_{PolP}$ *minna* *motii-**mas**-en*] [$_{T}$ ***des**-ita*]]]. Contemporary Japanese (NJ)
people use-HON$_A$-NEG HON$_A$-PST
'People did not use (it) [polite register].'

(3) [[$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{PolP}$ [**?P** [$_{vP}$ …. v] POSITION A] $_{Pol}$] [$_{T}$ POSITION B T]] $_{C}$] POSITION C]

Goal. Previous analyses on AH-markers cannot predict such low positions for AH-markers (Miyagawa 1987, 2012, 2017, Slocum 2016). The aim of this study is to reconcile the data with the literature, which in most part convincingly argues that the interface between syntax and pragmatics is situated above CP. Why can *-mas* and *-soorow* appear in POSITION A (QUESTION A) and why must multiple phonological exponents appear in (1)/(2) (QUESTION B)? I propose that (A) discourse-oriented features in Position A/B are sanctioned in syntax via upward agree and (B) these phonological exponents result from a head movement and economy principles.

Answer to QUESTION A. First, I claim that Position A is the Head, High-ApplicativeP. Historically, *-mas* was a low applicative, object-honorific (OH) marker *-ma(w)iras* 'give.HON$_O$,' which honorifies the recipient of the giving event; *e.g.*, in the structure [$_{vP}$ IO DO *ma(w)iras*-], the indirect object (IO) is respected. This verb also developed an auxiliary use, which honorifies IO of the verb; *e.g.*, in the configuration, [… [$_{vP}$ IO DO teach (verb)]-*ma(w)iras*-], the IO of the verb *teach* is honorified. Similarly, *-soorow* developed out of a lexical verb meaning 'to serve for,' which honorifies the IO and also developed the auxiliary use. Since (i) they both originated as a low applicative and (ii) function as a head which combines with the *v*P by Event Identification (*i.e.*, it adds another piece of information of a participant in the event described by the verb), it is reasonable to assume that the auxiliary use of the OH-marker occupies the Head, High-ApplP, as envisioned by Pylkkänen (2008: 16). As a historical reminiscent property, the AH-marker *-mas* continues to appear in the Head, High-ApplP, just like *-ma(w)iras*. This is why *-mas* appears in Position A. Second, discourse-participants (speaker SP and hearer HR) are assumed to have representations in syntax, as in (4) (Speas and Tenny 2003; Miyagawa 2012, 2017). The Head, High-ApplP is equipped with an unvalued, uninterpretable feature $_u$[HON: _] which gets its value from the interpretable HON feature in HR in saP. That is, $_u$[HON: _] in High-ApplP is a probe which upward-agrees with HR (Bjorkman & Zeijlstra 2014; Wurmbrand 2014). This is how elements in Position A are sanctioned in syntax.

(4) [$_{SAP}$ SP [$_{saP}$ HR $_{i}$[HON: +] [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{PolP}$ [**High-ApplP** [$_{vP}$ …. v] A $_u$[HON: _]] $_{Pol}$] B T]]]]

Answer to QUESTION B. Why must the sentence in (1)/(2) have a phonological exponent in Position B, as well as Position A? Historical developments also give us a clue. Although *-mas* and *-soorow* both developed out of an OH-construction, Position B elements appear *only after* they became a full-fledged AH-marker; *i.e.*, OH-constructions do not have Position B elements. Especially, the multiple AH-pattern in (2) is known to have developed around 19th century when it competed with a variant in (5), in which there is no morphological change in Position B (it just has a plain do/be-support, *i.e.*, *(k)ar-* in T, instead of *-des*). The correlation between Position A and Position B was optional in 19th century, but it became obligatory in the 20th century.

(5) [CP [TP [PolP [**HighApplP** [*v*P …. *v*] [-mas] -en] *kat* -ita]]

To analyze this variation, I propose the following two economy principles given in (6) and (7). Suppose that the derivation proceeds to the point in (8). Now, we have two problems to solve; (i) to value the $_u$[HON:_] and (ii) to rescue the stranded affix in T. There are two options. First, we can value $_u$[HON:_] from $_i$[HON:+] of HR and make a *do/be*-support independently, as in (9). Second, $_u$[HON:_] head-moves to the Head, TP to serve as a host for the past morpheme, and gets its value from HR at T. Of all the two options, the latter option is *more economical*, because of (7). The head-movement (a) alleviates the violation of long-distance agreement and (b) solve the problem of stranded affix *at the same time*, whereas the derivation in (9) uses different solutions to fix these two problems. When we have two different derivations, a language prefers the more economical derivation. Hence, NJ shows a multiple AH-construction (derivation in (10)). If it involves a head-movement, it is predicted that there can exist another morphological change in the Head, PolP (*cf*. cyclicity). Comparison between (11) and (2) corroborates this prediction; *-nak* changes to *-en*, with an AH-marker in Position A.

(6) **Preference for an agreement within short-*er* distance**: when one has a valuation of the unvalued feature, the shorter the Probe-Goal distance, the better.

(7) **Multitasking**: when there are more than two problems to solve during the derivation, the most economical solution is to fix all the problems at once, rather than solving these problems one by one using different solutions (*cf.* Van Urk and Richards 2015).

(8) [SAP SP [saP HR $_i$[HON: +] [CP [TP [PolP [**High-ApplP** … [Position A $_u$[HON: _]] Pol] [T -(i)ta]]]]]

(9) [SAP SP [saP HR $_i$[HON: +] [CP [TP [PolP [**High-ApplP** … [$_u$[HON: +]] Pol] [T kat-ta]]]]]

(10) [SAP SP [saP HR $_i$[HON: +] [CP [TP [PolP [**High-ApplP** … [$_u$[HON: _]]$_u$[HON: _]+Pol] [T $_u$[HON: _]+-ita]]]]]

(11) [CP [TP[PolP[**High-ApplP** *minna* *motii-* [*φ*] ***-nak***] [T***at-ta***]]]. Contemporary Japanese
people use-φ-NEG be-PST
'People did not use (it) [non-polite register].'

Why, then, did the 19th-century Japanese have a variation? The sentence in (5) is a reminiscent of the earlier stage of grammaticalization, where there is no morphological change in Position B. Note that the derivation in (9) *does* conform to the grammar and is licit (though less economical). This is why such a less economical construction appeared in the transition stage from OH to AH in the 19th century but, being less economical, it became obsolete. Children in later generations acquired the grammar with more preferred derivation; *reanalysis* results from preference for the more economical derivation (*cf*. Lightfoot 2006; Roberts 2007).

Contribution to the workshop. Apparently, Japanese AH-constructions were a challenge to our understanding that discourse-oriented elements should appear at CP. This presentation, however, proposes that (A) Position A is a morphological realization of an appropriately-valued *un*interpretable feature and (B) Position B results from the head-movement and economy principles in derivation. Thus, the only interpretable feature HON is the one in HR, in the Spec, saP. There is no PF-requirement on the distribution on AH-markers or discourse-oriented markers in general. It is the LF-requirement, as in (12), that makes the relevant interpretable feature appear in CP, which indeed supports/reinforces the CP-as-the-syntax/discourse-interface-view, pursued in previous syntax literature.

(12) LF-requirement: all the *interpretable* discourse-related features must be in the CP-region (including SAP/saP) at LF.

Bjorkman, B., & Zeijlstra, H. (2014). *Upward agree is superior*. **Miyagawa, S.** (1987). LF affix raising in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18(2), 362-367. **Miyagawa, S.** (2012). Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. **Miyagawa, S.** (2017). *Agreement beyond phi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **Pylkkänen, L.** (2008). *Introducing arguments*. MIT press. **Slocum, P.** (2016). *The Syntax of Address*. **Van Urk, C., & Richards, N.** (2015). Two components of long-distance extraction: Successive cyclicity in Dinka. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 46(1), 113-155. **Wurmbrand, S.** (2014). The Merge Condition: A syntactic approach to selection.