The syntax-semantics interface of the addressee-honorific construction: the multidimensional in-situ analysis vs the copy analysis

Akitaka Yamada

1. Introduction: Formal studies on honorification have developed in several ways for the last fifteen years. First, syntacticians have pursued the idea that the content-honorific construction is a special type of agreement (Niinuma 2003; Boeckx and Niinuma 2004; Boeckx 2006; Kishimoto 2010). Second, rather independently, semantists have played with the idea that honorification is involved with an expressive meaning, calculated in a different plane separated from the meaning associated with the root clause (Potts and Kawahara 2004; McCready 2014). Honorific constructions are, however, not monolithic. Most studies have examined the CONTENT-HONORIFIC (an honorific construction with which a person referred to by a particular argument of the predicate is respected) and the study of ADDRESSEE-HONORIFICS (an honorific construction with which the addresser shows his/her respect to the addressee in the given context) is less developed. This study, thus, zooms in the syntax-semantic interface of this addressee-honorific construction and it proposes that the expressiveness is calculated at the very last step of the semantic composition, not during the compositional semantics.

2. Multidimensional Analysis: The point of departure of our investigation is with the following data in (2) from Japanese, in which, unlike Korean or Thai but similar to Basque and Burmese, the addressee-honorific marker is in the middle of the sentence, *i.e.*, is c-commanded by the tense marker.

(1) ***Affirmative sentence***

a. Present	b. Past
[$_{TP}$ [*Hasir-imas*]-*u*].	[$_{TP}$ [*Hasir-imas*]-*ita*].
run-HON$_A$-PRS	run-HON$_A$-PST
'(I) run.; I respect you.'	'(I) ran.; I respect you'

If the morphemes are interpreted according to the superficial structure, a standard compositional semantics would face a problem; we have to say that the scope of the addressee-honorific is lower than the scope of other operators (*e.g.*, tense and negation). Multidemensional approaches, on the other hand, seem to overcome this issue, by placing the politeness meaning in a different plane where the meaning of the root sentence is calculated (Potts and Kawahara 2004; McCready 2014).

3. Syntax (Copy analysis): Notice that this multidimensional idea tacitly (not necessarily, though) assumes the following syntax; *i.e.*, the element is interpreted in the position between *v*P and TP (this study calls this proposal to the LF syntax the IN-SITU ANALYSIS). This assumption is not, however, congenial to the data given below in (2)b. First, there are multiple addressee-honorific morphemes present within a single sentence. If the meaning is shipped to a different plane at the very point where the *-imas* is pronounced, we do not have to make it move, contrary to the fact. Second, the negation marker *-anak* sandwiched between *-imas* and *-des* becomes *-en*, as if the addressee-honorific feature cyclically moves through heads and changes the feature bundle of this head. This study, therefore, proposes that a series of cyclic internal merges take place which provides multiple copies pronounced in the tree and the meaning of the addressee-honorific is interpreted at the highest position of the tree (this study calls this the COPY ANALYSIS; Nunes 1995, 2004; Landau 2005).

(2) Negative sentences

a. [$_{PolP}$ [*Hasir-imas*]-*en*].
run-HON$_A$-NEG
'(I) do not run.'

b. [$_{TP}$ [$_{PolP}$ [*Hasir-**imas***]-*en*]-***des***-*ita*].
run-HON$_A$-NEG-**HON$_A$=COP**-PST
'(I) did not run.'

This study hypothesizes that the highest projection where this highest copy is located must not be available to PF; the last phase head, which ships its complement to PF, remains in the narrow syntax because there is no higher phase head available (as a consequence of the Phase Theory). The lower copies are present because of PF-requirements (P-recoverability; Landau 2005).

4. Semantics and Pragmatics: A Bayesian Update to the Discourse

The politeness meaning is involved with the way how the main proposition, the true target of the truth/false judgement, is delivered. To this end, this presentation proposes that the context tuple contains the following discourse components associated with the use of the addressee-honorific in the given way (the decision of the prior and the link function is an arbitrary choice for the simplicity sake).

(3) **Conversation Context** (C)[1]: $\mathrm{C} =< cg, qs, tdl, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{x_i} >$

(4) **Social Context for the *i*-th utterance ($\boldsymbol{x}$)[2]:** $\boldsymbol{x_i} = \left(x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ip}\right), \forall x_j \in \mathbb{R}$

(5) **Parameters for Register Generating Function ($\boldsymbol{\beta}$)**[3]:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \left(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p\right)^T,\ \forall \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$$

a. $\beta_i \sim \mathrm{Uniform}(0,1), \forall \beta_i$

b. $y_i \sim Bernoulli\ (\mathrm{logistic}(\boldsymbol{x_i\beta}))$; $y_i = 1$, if the i-th utterance includes the addressee-honorific marker.

The probability $\mathrm{logistic}(\boldsymbol{x_i\beta})$ represents the acceptability of the sentence with the addressee-honorific marker. Unlike McCready's work, this model does not give a clear-cut dichotomy between *acceptable* and *unexpected*. Rather, every utterance may select one of the forms with a particular probability and each instance then updates the context by finding the posterior value for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Reference

Boeckx, C., and Niinuma, F. (2004). Conditions on agreement in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:453–480. **Boeckx, C.** (2006). Honorification as agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 24(2), 385-398./**Kishimoto, H.** (2010). Honorific agreement in Japanese. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*, 55(03), 405-415./**Landau, I. (2006).** Chain resolution in Hebrew V(P)-fronting. *Syntax*, 9(1), 32-66./**McCready, E.** (2014). A semantics for honorifics with reference to Thai. *PACLIC*, 503-512./**Niinuma, F.** (2003). *The syntax of honorification*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Connecticut./**Nunes, J.** (1995). *The copy theory of movement and linearization of chains in the Minimalist Program*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland./**Nunes, J.** (2004). *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement* (Linguistic inquiry monographs 43). MIT: MIT Press./**Portner, P., Pak, M. and Zanuttini, R**. (manuscript) The addressee at the syntax-semantics interface: Evidence from politeness and speech style./ **Potts, C. and Kawahara, S**. (2004). Japanese honorifics as emotive definite descriptions. *Proceedings of SALT XIV*.

[1] Where *cg* is a set of propositions, *qs* is a set of question-denotations, *tdl* is a set of properties.

[2] Where *p* is the number of predictors

[3] Where each β_i corresponds to the prior parameter for each social predictor (e.g., formality, social distance, and psychological distance, as McCready 2014 proposes).