The syntax-semantics interface of the addressee-honorific construction:

the multidimensional in-situ analysis

vs

the copy analysis
1 Introduction

**Topic:** the addressee-honorific construction in contemporary Japanese

(1) Thai

\[ aacaan \quad maa \quad l\acute{e}\acute{e}w \quad n\acute{a} \quad kh\acute{a}. \quad \text{(Iwasaki and Horie 2005)} \]

teacher.3 come ASP PP \text{HON}_A

‘(I’d like to inform you that) the teacher has arrived \textbf{(formal)}.’

(2) Korean

\[ Ecey \quad pi-ka \quad o-ass \quad -\text{supnita} \quad . \quad \text{(Portner et al. manuscript)} \]

yesterday rain-nom come-past- dec.formal

‘It rained yesterday.’

(3) Basque

\[ etorri \quad n-a \quad -iz \quad \text{(Oyharçabal 1993)} \]

come 1.ABS-PRS \text{HON}_A

‘I comes.’
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**Background:** Studies under formal linguistics

Honorific constructions

**Agreement**
  - Miyagawa (2012; 2017): Addressee-honorifics
- (No) Kim and Sells (2007), Thompson (2011)

**Multidimensionality**

**Emphathy Theory**
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Multidimensional Approaches:


2) In a nutshell: Building a different plane for expressive meaning during the semantic composition

3) Explanandum: Honorific meaning cannot be affected by any other operators.
   (4) a. * My respect and an event happened in the past.
      b. An event happened in the past; I respect you at the utterance time.

   (5) The interpretation of a parsetree $T$ is the tuple $\langle A, B \rangle$, where
      i. $A$ is the semantic value of $T$’s root node; and
      ii. $B$ is the set consisting of all and only the interpretations of the type $\varepsilon$ expressions in $T$.

5) Hidden assumption: The addressee-honorific marker is interpreted in-situ.
   This view tacitly (not necessarily though) assumes that morphemes with expressive meaning are interpreted in situ.
   Theoretically, movement analysis is compatible with the multidimensional approach. But if so, the attractiveness of the multidimensionality disappears.
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**Goal:** (i) Syntax: the feature is interpreted *not in-situ but by movement*
(ii) Semantics: *probabilistic update* to the discourse component
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2 Data

(3) a. Present
(i) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-u}] \]
run -PRS
‘(I) run.’ (tutoiement)
(ii) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasit- } \square \text{-ta}] \]
run -PST
‘(I) ran.’ (tutoiement)
(iii) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-anai}] \]
run -NEG
‘(I) do not run.’ (tutoiement)
(iv) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-anak- } \text{-at- } \text{-ta }] \]
run -NEG -COP -PST
‘(I) did not run.’ (tutoiement)

(4) a. Present
(i) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-imas}] \]
run HON\textsubscript{A} -PRS
‘(I) run.’ (vouvoiement)
(ii) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-imas}] \]
run HON\textsubscript{A} -ita
‘(I) run.’ (vouvoiement)
(iii) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-imas- } \text{-en}] \]
run HON\textsubscript{A} -NEG
‘(I) run.’ (vouvoiement)
(iv) \[\text{TP} [\text{Hasir- } \square \text{-imas- } \text{-en- } \text{-des- } \text{-ita }] \]
run NEG COP\textsubscript{A} -PST
‘(I) run.’ (vouvoiement)

\textit{n.b.,}
1) ‘do/be’ support under PAST + NEGATION
2) HON\textsubscript{A} appears at vP-periphery
3) HON\textsubscript{A} affects the form of NEG
4) HON\textsubscript{A} affects the form of ‘do/be’ support
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3 Syntax

(A) Multidimensional Semantics:
(a) HONₐ is interpreted in-situ. Therefore:
(b) Movement is not due to LF-legibility.
(c) Movement is not due to PF-legibility.

(ii)*[TP [Hasir- imas]-des -ita ]
run - HONₐ-COP-PST

(iv)*[TP [Hasir- imas ] -anak-at -ta ]
run - HONₐ-NEG-COP-PST

(B) Alternative analysis:
(a) HONₐ is interpreted in CP (cf. Miyagawa 1987,(2012, 2017); Speas and Tenny 2003; Haegeman and Hill 2013).
(b) Movement is due to LF-legibility (cf. SMT; Chomsky 2001)
(c) Multiple copies: the highest is subject to the interpretation

Based on this syntax
What kind of denotation does this [+HONₐ] have?

n.b., 1) ‘do/be’ support under PAST + NEGATION
2) HONₐ appears at vP-periphery
3) HONₐ affects the form of NEG
4) HONₐ affects the form of ‘do/be’ support

1. Cyclic effects on the c-commanding heads (until it hits T).
2. This may remind us of the “head-movement”.

LF-legibility condition
Discourse-oriented elements should be placed in CP at LF.

saP  sa
TP ....

T [-ta]
PolP [+HONₐ] T
Pol [-des]
HONₐ [-en]
vP v
HONₐ [-mas]

hasir- ‘run’

Affect

No problem in such a low position.

Based on this syntax
What kind of denotation does this [+HONₐ] have?
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4 Semantics and Pragmatics

(A) McCready (2014): Update to the register

(5) Sentence \( \text{HON}_A \)

a. \( \text{HON}_A \) = (Hon = [0.1, 0.2])

b. Appropriateness for honorifics.

\[
\text{Utter}(S) \in C = \begin{cases} 
\sqrt{\text{if } \text{Hon}(S) \cap R \neq \emptyset} \\
\times \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]

c. Dynamic registers. \( C[(S)]_H = C' \), where

\[
C' = \begin{cases} 
C \text{ if } C \subseteq \text{Hon}(S) \\
\frac{\min(C) + \text{Hon}(S)}{4}, \frac{\max(C) + \text{Hon}(S)}{4} \text{ else}
\end{cases}
\]

(B) Alternative

a. \( \text{HON}_A \) = \( \lambda_p \cdot p, 1 > \)

b. Generative models: e.g., \( y|\Theta \sim \text{Bernouilli}(\Theta) \)

\[
p(y | \Theta) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta_1 + \theta_2)}{\Gamma(\theta_1) \Gamma(\theta_2)} h_s^{\theta_1 - 1} (1 - h_s)^{\theta_2 - 1}
\]

c. Prior: \( \theta_1 \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta) \)

d. Dynamic registers. \( \Theta \) \( [(S)]_H = \Theta' \), where

\[
\Theta' = \Theta | y \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha + y, \beta + 1 - y)
\]

(6) A sequence of utterances

Context: \( R = (\min, \max) \)
\( [0.4, 0.66] \)

Context: \( R' = (1, 2) \)

Context: \( R'' = (2, 2) \)

 TOO DISCRETE!
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Main claims of this presentation

( A ) Previous studies:
(a) Multidimensionality during the semantic derivation
(b) Interpretation is in-situ

( B ) Alternative analysis:
(a) Multidimensionality only within the discourse context
(b) Interpretation is at a displaced position

Question 1: What LF object does the addressee-honorific construction have?

Question 2: How does the addressee-honorific meaning contribute to the context?
Update to the parameter (posterior distribution)
Thank you so much!
Possible Discussion (1): Syntax (Feature Inheritance)
Possible Discussion (2): Syntax (Agreement)