19
ICL
19th International
Congress of Linguists
July 21-27 2013
Geneva - Switzerland

Hideki KISHIMOTO

Kobe University, Japan
kishimot@lit.kobe-u.ac.jp

Coordination and Movement of Addressee Honorific Heads in Japanese

poster presentation in session: 5 Theoretical and comparative syntax (Luigi Rizzi)

Coordination and Movement of Addressee Honorific Heads in Japanese

Hideki Kishimoto
Kobe University

1. Introduction

In many languages, heads sometimes appear in a position where they are not base-generated by virtue of head raising. In the literature on Japanese, there is an issue as to whether the language has head raising (see Kishimoto 2008). The issue arises, because the SOV word order of Japanese makes it difficult to provide a yardstick to detect the presence or absence of head raising. In this paper, I suggest that a correlative coordinate construction allows us to find one type of head raising. I argue that in Japanese, addressee-honorific heads (generated below TP(=IP)) undergo head raising to SpAP (Speech Act Phrase; Speas and Tenny 2003, Tenny 2006), and suggest that they are raised for the purpose of sanctioning their discourse-related 'speech act' property, filling the head position of SpAP located above ForceP (i.e. above the CP system; Rizzi 1997, 2004).

2. Two Variants of the Correlative Coordination

Disjunctive coordinate constructions have some structural properties that allow us to discern the presence of one type of head raising, which moves an addressee-honorific head to a higher structural position. Prior to making this point, I need to discuss how the disjunctive coordinate constructions, which are used to diagnose head raising, are constructed (for discussion on the general properties of coordinations, see Williams 1978, Munn 1993, Schwartz 1999, Johannessen 1998, and others).

   In Japanese, the coordinate constructions are constructed by using particles as coordinators. The disjunctive coordinate construction at issue has two variants, where two clauses are connected by the disjunctive *ka* 'or', as shown in (1).

(1) a. [Ken-ga   hasi-ru ka] [Mari-ga   hasi-ru   ka] da.
         Ken-NOM run-PRS OR   Mari-NOM run-PRS   OR COP
         'Either Ken runs or Mari runs.'
    b. [Ken-ga   hasiri ka] [Mari-ga   hasiri ka] su-ru.
         Ken-NOM run   OR Mari-NOM run   OR do-PRS
         'Either Ken runs or Mari runs.'

The coordinate structure in (1a) involves TP-coordination just like what it looks, as (2a) illustrates. The coordinate structure in (1b) also involves TP-coordination, but it additionally instantiates partial gapping, as illustrated in (2b).

(2) a. [[John-ga   hasir-u   ka] [Mary-ga   hasir-u   ka]] da.
         John-NOM run-PRS OR   Mary-NOM run-PRS OR   COP
         'Either John runs or Mary runs.'

b. **[**[John-ga   hasiri ~~TENSE~~ ka]   [Mary-ga   hasiri ka]   su-ru**]**.
       John-NOM   run   OR   Mary-NOM   run   OR   do-PRS
     'Either John runs or Mary runs.'

Note that the correlative coordinate constructions in (1) have two instances of the disjunctive marker *ka*, but the first instance of *ka* serves as a real coordinator. This can be seen by the fact that two clauses can be connected by using only the disjunctive *ka* attached to the first clause, as in (3).

(3) [Ken-ga   hasi-ru ka]   [Mari-ga   hasi-ru].
      Ken-NOM   run-PRS OR   Mari-NOM   run-PRS
     'Ken runs or Mari runs.'

Given this fact, it is reasonable to state that in the correlative coordination constructions in (1), the second instance of *ka* serves an adverbial element (but not a real coordinator) in syntactic terms, behaving in a way analogous to *either* appearing in the English correlative coordinator *either..or*.

The structures of the coordinate structures given in (2) are motivated by the fact that they possess the same structural properties. For example, both coordinate constructions in (1) do not allow discourse- and judgment-related elements inside the coordinate structures, which can be assumed to be licensed in projections above TP (for the discussion of categories projected above TP, see e.g. Endo (2006), Rizzi (1997, 2004)). The examples in (4), which include topicalized phrases, illustrate that these elements need to occur outside the coordinate structure, but not inside.

(4) a.   *[Ken-wa   hasi-ru   ka]   [Mari-wa   hasi-ru   ka]   da.
           Ken-TOP run-PRS   OR   Mari-TOP run-PRS   OR   COP
          'Either Ken runs or Mari runs.'
    b.   *[Ken-wa   hasiri ka]   [Mari-wa   hasiri ka]   su-ru.
           Ken-TOP   run   OR   Mari-TOP   run   OR   do-PRS
          'Either Ken runs or Mari runs.'

As often claimed (see e.g. Minami (1974, 1993), Masuoka (2007)), topics appear in the same structural layer which comprises evaluative modals appearing outside tense. Since the topic phrases are not allowed in the coordinate structures, the fact suggests that the two variants of the coordinate construction do not conjoin projections above TP.

By contrast, elements associated with projections within TP are allowed to appear in the coordinate structures. For instance, temporal adverbs associated with tense can be placed inside the coordinated clauses.

(5) a.   [Ken-ga   <u>kyoo</u>   hasir-u   ka]   [Mari-ga   <u>asu</u>   hasir-u   ka]   da.
           Ken-NOM today   run-PRS   OR   Mari-NOM tomorrow run-PRS   OR   COP
          'Either Ken will run tomorrow or Mari will run tomorrow.'
    b.   [Ken-ga   <u>kyoo</u>   hasiri ka] [Mari-ga   <u>asu</u>   hasiri ka]   su-ru.
           Ken-NOM today   run   OR   Mari-NOM tomorrow run   OR   do-PRS
          'Either Ken will run today or Mari will run tomorrow.'

Given that temporal adverbs are adjoined to TP, a comparison of the data in (4) and (5) shows that both variants of the disjunctive coordinate construction in (1) should involve TP-coordination and that constituents located in a position higher than TP cannot be coordinated.

Turning now to cases involving head elements, heads located outside tense are not allowed to appear inside the coordinate structures. The examples involve modal heads appearing to the right of tense.

(6) a. *[[John-ga   hasir-u   daroo ka] [Mary-ga   hasir-u   daroo ka]] da.
           John-NOM run-PRS will   OR   Mary-NOM run-PRS will   OR   COP
        'Either John runs or Mary runs.'
    b. [[John-ga   hasir-u ka] [Mary-ga   hasir-u   ka]] daroo.
           John-NOM run-PRS OR   Mary-NOM run-PRS OR   will
        'Either John runs or Mary runs.'

The data show that the modal *daroo* 'will' needs to appear outside the coordinate structures. In opposition to *daroo*, auxiliary elements like the passive *(r)are*, which are placed to the left of tense, can occur inside the disjunctive coordination, as in (7a).

(7) a. [Ken-ga   nagur-are-ru   ka] [Mari-ga   nagur-are-ru   ka]   da.
           Ken-NOM hit-PASS-PRS OR   Mari-NOM   hit-PASS-PRS OR   COP
        'Either Ken will be hit or Mari will be hit.'
    b. **[** [Ken-ga   naguri ka] [Mari-ga   naguri ka]   s-are-ru**]**.
           Ken-NOM hit   OR   Mari-NOM   hit   OR   do-PASS-PRS
        'Either Ken will be hit by his father or Mari will be hit.'

In (7b), the passive marker follows the coordinate marker, but since the disjunctive coordinator in the first conjunct is attached to the verb stem, it is understood to be located within the coordinate structure, and hence the clause is acceptable. The patterns in (7) arise when the heads reside in the projections below TP.

Addressee-honorific heads like *masu* and *masen* display puzzling behavior in this regard. As shown in (8), the honorific head *masu* cannot be included in the coordinate structure, even though it occurs between the verb and tense.

(8) a. *[Ken-ga   hasiri-**mas**-u   ka] [Mari-ga   hasiri-**mas**-u   ka] da.
            Ken-NOM   run-AD.HON-PRS OR   Mari-NOM   run-AD.HON-PRS OR   COP
        'Either Ken runs or Mary runs.'
    b.   [John-ga   hasiri ka] [Mary-ga   hasiri   ka]   si-**mas**-u.
            John-NOM   run   OR   Mary-NOM   run   OR   do-AD.HON-PRS
        'Either John runs or Mary runs.'

The addressee-honorific head needs to appear outside the coordinate structure, as shown in (8b). Observe at this point that the addressee-honorific head *mas(u)* combines with tense (i.e. the non-past and past forms are *mas-u* [AD.HON-PRS] and *masi-ta* [AD.HON-PST]), in the same way as ordinary verbs like *sas(u)* 'point' (i.e. the non-past and past forms are *sas-u* [point-PRS] and *sasi-ta* [point-PST]). While the regular verbs are allowed to appear inside the coordinate structure, the addressee-honorific head *masu*

is not. The addressee honorific head patterns with the modal *daroo* generated above TP, as both cannot be embedded under the disjunctive coordinate structures.

The morphological fact of *masu* suggests that this addressee-honorific head is located lower than TP. Nevertheless, this honorific head displays the structural property suggesting that it resides in the projections higher than TP. To account for the puzzling properties of the addressee-honorific head *mas*, I propose that it undergoes LF head raising to a position higher than TP, as illustrated in (9).

(9) [SpAP   *addressee*   [ForceP [TP   [HP   ~~mas-~~] ~~mas~~-T] ~~mas~~-Force] mas-SpA]

More specifically, I suggest that the addressee-honorific head is covertly head-raised to SpAP located above ForceP, and licensed in agreement with an addressee argument located in SpAP (see Speas and Tenny 2003, Tenny 2006, Miyagawa 2012). Since the addressee-honorific head carries speech act information related to the addressee, I claim that the honorific head is raised for the purpose of sanctioning its discourse-related 'speech act' property, in agreement with the invisible addressee. Furthermore, I assume that the addressee-honorific head moves up to SpAP while stopping at the higher heads on the way, and that its movement proceeds invoking excorporation, as in (9) (cf. Miyagawa 1997). This excorporation analysis is reasonable, because the tense should take scope over TP, even after the movement of the addressee-honorific head.

An additional piece of evidence in favor of the view that the addressee-honorific head *mas* should end up in a very high projection in clause structure may be obtained from (10).

(10) Watasi-wa   [Ken-ga   {ki-ta/*ki-masi-ta}   ka] sira-na-i.
      1.sg-TOP   Ken-NOM   {come-PST/come-ADR.HON-PST} Q   know-NEG-PAST
      'I do not know whether Ken came.'

The verb *siru* 'come to know' takes an embedded question, so that we can assume that it selects for ForceP, which determines the quantificational force of the clause (Rizzi 1997, Radford 2009). Given that an interrogative clause with the addressee-honorific head cannot appear in the complement clause, the addressee-honorific head should be located in a projection located above ForceP, i.e. SpAP.

The present proposal taking the disjunctive coordinate constructions in (1) to involve TP-coordination provides a ready account for the fact that coordination fails in (8a); the addressee-honorific head *mas*, which occurs inside TP, cannot be placed inside the coordinate structures, because of its LF head raising to SpAP, located above TP. Since the effect of head raising is not visible in the surface strings, it is reasonable to say that the movement of the addressee-honorific head takes place at LF. In (8a), an island effect is incurred by virtue of LF head raising, owing to the fact that the addressee-honorific head is extracted from the coordinate structure (see Bošković and Franks (2000) for arguments that LF movement is constrained by island constraints, and that ATB movement cannot be instantiated).

There is further evidence suggesting that the addressee-honorific head *mas* base-generated in a position below TP should undergo head raising to SpAP. Further empirical evidence comes from the behavior of another addressee-honorific head *masen*, which is the negative form of the addressee-honorific head *masu* (and this form is

derived by combining *mas-* with the negative form *-en* 'not'). First, let us consider how a plain negative verb interacts with the disjunctive coordinator in the correlative coordinate constructions.

(11) a. [Ken-ga   hasira-nakat-ta ka] [Mari-ga   hasira-naka-ta   ka] da.
         Ken-NOM   run-NEG-PST   OR   Mari-NOM run-NEG-PST   OR   COP
         'Either Ken did not run or Mari did not run.'
    b. [Ken-ga   hasiri ~~NEG TENSE~~ ka] [Mari-ga   hasiri ka] si-nakat-ta.
        Ken-NOM run   OR   Mari-NOM run   OR   do-NEG-PST
        'Either Ken did not run or Mari did not run.'

In both variants in (11), the disjunctive coordinate taking scope over the negator, and thus, the sentences have the scope interpretation ¬A ∨ ¬B, i.e. the sentences carry the meaning that either Ken did not run or Mari did not run. If, as suggested above, the first coordinator is a real coordinator determining the scope interpretation relative to negation, the scope fact of (11a) follows straightforwardly, since the negator resides in a position internal to the disjunctive coordinator. A little complication arises in (11b), due to the fact that it involves partial gapping, but the scope fact of (11b) is accounted for in the same way as (11a). In (11b), Neg, which is elided by gapping, is located below the first disjunctive marker, so that the disjunction is interpreted as taking scope over negation, just like (11a).

   A different scope interpretation obtains when the negator appears to the right of copula *da*, which occurs outside the coordinate structure.

(12) [Ken-ga   hasit-ta ka] [Mari-ga   hasit-ta   ka] de   na-i.
      Ken-NOM   run-PST   OR   Mari-NOM run-PST   OR   COP NEG-PRS
      'It is not the case that either Ken ran or Mari ran.'

Example (12) has the interpretation ¬(A ∨ B), i.e. the proposition is true if either 'Ken ran and Mari ran' or 'Ken did not run and Mari did not run' holds true. This interpretation arises when negation takes scope over the disjunctive coordinator.

   With this fact in mind, let us consider the examples involving the negative addressee-honorific head *masen*.

(13) a. *[Ken-ga hasiri-**masen**   ka] [Mari-ga   hasiri-**masen**   ka] da.
          Ken-NOM run-AD.HON.NEG.PRS OR   Mari-NOM run-AD.HON.NEG.PRS OR COP
          'Either Ken does not run or Mary does not run.'
    b. [John-ga   hasiri ~~NEG TENSE~~ ka] [Mary-ga   hasiri ka] si-**masen**.
        John-NOM run   OR Mary-NOM run   OR   do-ADR.HON.NEG.PRS
        'Either John does not or Mary does not run.'

The examples in (13) show that the negative addressee-honorific head *masen* displays the same behavior as its affirmative counterpart *masu* in the disjunctive coordinate constructions. This being the case, the negative addressee-honorific head must also be located outside TP.

   Interestingly, however, the well-formed sentence in (13b) is interpreted in the same way as the sentences in (11), in that the disjunction takes scope over negation, obtaining

the interpretation ¬A v ¬B. The fact indicates that in (13b), the negator must be located inside the coordinate structure. Since the addressee-honorific head is located to the left of the negative –*en* on the surface, it must be generated in a position internal to TP. It follows from this that (13a) is ruled out in violation of the coordinate structure island constraint, because the negative honorific-addressee is head-raised to SpAP out of the coordinate structure at the LF level, as represented in (14).

(14) [$_{SpAP}$ *addressee* [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{NegP}$ [$_{HP}$ ~~mas-~~] ~~mas-~~Neg] ~~mas-~~T] ~~mas-~~] mas-SpA]

Note that even if the addressee-honorific head containing speech act information is head-raised to a higher position, it does not change the scope relations of the affective elements, i.e. disjunction and negation, which suggests that the head movement at issue does not invoke a change in the structural position of the intervening heads. The scope facts follow if the movement of addressee-honorific heads proceeds by invoking excorporation on the way, as illustrated in (14).

3. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have examined the two types of correlative coordinate structures introduced by the disjunctive coordinate marker *ka*, which can be assumed to involve TP-coordination. The syntactic behavior of addressee-honorific heads in the disjunctive coordinate structures suggests that the addressee-honorific heads should be located in a projection above TP. Nevertheless, the addressee-honorific heads appear to the left of tense on the surface, and the scope facts of the negative addressee-honorific head *masen* also suggest that the addressee-honorific heads should be located within TP. These facts lead to the conclusion that the addressee-honorific heads should undergo LF head raising up to SpAP, which is projected above TP, while invoking excorporation in the intervening head positions.

References
Bošković, Željiko, and Steven Franks (2000). "Across-the-board Movement and LF." *Syntax* 3, 107-128.
Endo, Yoshio (2007). *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Johannessen, Janne Bondi (1998). *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2008). "On verb raising." In Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics,* 107-140. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2013). "Notes on correlative coordination in Japanese." In Daiko Takahashi, Hideki Maki, Masao Ochi, Koji Sugisaki, and Asako Uchibori (eds.) *Deep Insights, Broad Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Mamoru Saito*, 192-217. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
Masuoka, Takashi (2007). *Nihongo Modaritii Tankyuu* (An Investigation of Japanese Modality). Tokyo: Kurosio.
Minami, Fujio (1974). *Gendai Nihongo-no Koozoo* (The Structure of Modern Japanese).Tokyo: Taishukan.

Minami, Fujio (1993). *Gendai Nihongo Bunpoo-no Rinkaku* (Outline of Modern Japanese Grammar). Tokyo: Taishukan.

Miyagawa, Shigeru (1987). "LF Affix Raising in Japanese." *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 362-367.

Miyagawa, Shigeru (2012). "Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause." In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman and Rachel Nye (eds.) *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, 79-112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Munn, Alan (1993). *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Radford, Andrew (2009). *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997). "The fine structure of the left periphery." In Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, Luigi (2004). "On the cartography of syntactic structures." In Luigi Rizzi (ed.) *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures: Volume 2*, pp. 3-15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Speas, Peggy, and Carol Tenny (2003). "Configurational properties of point of view roles." In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.) *Asymmetry in Grammar Volume 1: Syntax and semantics*, 315-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schwarz, Bernhard (1999). "On the syntax of *either …or.*" *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17, 339-370.

Tenny, Carol (2006). "Evidentiality, experiencers, and the syntax of sentience in Japanese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15, 245-288.

Williams, Edwin (1978). "Across-the-Board Rule Application." *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31-43.