An Event-Based Interpretation of Japanese Honorific Constructions Using RRG Operators

Akira Ishikawa
Sophia University, Dept. of English and Studies
7 Kioi-cho, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 102, Japan
ishikawa@sophia.ac.jp

Abstract

The contemporary Japanese verbal honorific constructions can be motivated in view of the RRG clausal organization and its operator hierarchy. I will present an analysis of the subject honorific construction based on a functional analysis of existential and copulative verbs, and relate it to adjectival verbs. I will also sketch a possible origin of the non-subject honorific construction.

1 Introduction

The contemporary subject and non-subject honorific constructions involving the combination of the prefix *o* or *go* and the *ren'you* form of verbs (called the gerundive by Martin), which came to be widely used only in the late 19th century, are relatively latecomers in the history of honorific expressions in Japanese (Tuzimura 1968). The predicates of the two constructions have the following forms:

(1) a. The subject honorific predicate
o/go-V ni naru

b. The non-subject honorific predicate
o/go-V suru

V in both predicates is the *ren'you* form of a verb, and *o* and *go* are prefixes of honorification of presumably Chinese descent. *Ni* in (1a) is the dative case marker, and *naru* is a verb which I will argue is a grammaticalized version of the verb *naru* meaning 'to happen'. *Suru* in (1b) is a verb which I will also claim to be a grammaticalized version of the verb *suru* 'to do'.

In this paper, I will approach this problem from the viewpoint of the universal operator hierarchy of RRG. I will present an analysis of the subject honorific construction based on a functional analysis of existential and copulative verbs, and relate it to adjectival verbs. I will also sketch a possible origin of the non-subject honorific construction.

According to RRG, a clause has a tripartite structure.

(2) (((Nucleus)Core) Periphery)

The innermost layer, the nucleus, is composed of the predicate of the clause, while the next layer, the core, is composed of the predicate and its core arguments. The outermost layer, the periphery, is made up of all other constituents of the clause. Each layer is associated with a distinct set of operators, which have the layer as their scope. Traditional grammatical categories such as tense, aspect and mood are among these operators. For example, RRG holds that these three operators belong to different layers, which is seen in the different ordering possibilities of these operators. The following is the universal layered structure of the clause as proposed in RRG.

(3) Illocutionary force $\prec$ Evidential $\prec$ Tense $\prec$ Status $\prec$ (*Periphery* $\prec$ Modal $\prec$ (*Core* $\prec$ Directional $\prec$ Aspect $\prec$ (*Nucleus*)))

It is also pointed out that voice is a nuclear modification and "there is a complex interaction between voice and aspect."(Foley & van Valin, p. 225) The above clausal structure with operators can be functionally interpreted as follows. Suppose we have a report of an event. The type of the event is essentially determined by the nucleus, which is the predicate of the clause. Aspect modifies the event as perfective or imperfective. The event can be further modified by a directional, which indicates the direction of the action involved in the event. When the core arguments are added to this innermost construct, the type of the event is firmly established. Then, modality "characterizes the speaker's estimate of the relationship of the actor of the event to its accomplishment" in terms of obligation, intention, ability, etc. (p. 213) After the core layer, we have status and tense as two kinds of operators which locates the event temporally and in terms of realis-irrealis scale, respectively. Since the determination of the reality status of an event involves a judgment, the status operator can introduce another level of clausal structure corresponding to the judgmental event. In other words, the status operator can modify a tensed clausal unit, and can itself be modified by the tense operator. [1] Evidentials are concerned with specifying in whose authority the report is made, i.e. whether and to what degree the speaker is responsible for the report, and operators of illocutionary force with indicating what kind of interaction with the hearer is intended by the speaker. As we proceed from the innermost to the outermost, operators become less concerned with the description of the event and more with the expression of the speaker's attitude toward the locutionary event, e.g. the reporting. More precisely, the outermost operator, illocutionary force, represents the speaker's act such as assertion and questioning within the locutionary event. Thus, we may well say that the clause is so structured that its successive layers and their operators represent a cline from the specification of an event to that of the speaker's direct involvement in the speech event. Honorification shows up at the innermost end of the above clause structure. It is also relative to the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

(4) a. Tanaka- sensei- ga sou ossyat-ta
Tanaka-Prof-NOM so say-PAST
'Prof. Tanaka said so.'

b. Tanaka- kun- ga sou it-ta
Tanaka-Mr-NOM so say-PAST
'Mr Tanaka said so.'

(4a) uses the honorific verb *ossyaru* instead of the plain verb *iu* used in (4b). When Prof. Saitou is talking to his student Tarou, (4a) is a proper way of reporting on Prof. Tanaka. Prof. Tanaka is superior to the hearer Tarou, so the honorific form of the verb say is chosen. [2] On the other hand, when Prof. Saitou is talking with his close friend Prof. Watanabe, (4b) is the proper locution. Prof. Tanaka is socially equal to Prof. Watanabe, so the plain form is employed. The plain form also requires the relationship between Prof. Saitou and Prof. Watanabe to be fairly close. However, when Tarou is talking with one of his teachers, he would use (5a) The verb form ossyaimasita is analyzed as in (5b).

(5) a. Tanaka- sensei- ga sou ossyai-masi-ta
Tanaka-Prof-NOMso say-POL-PAST
'Prof. Tanaka said so.'

[1] This point is not explicitly stated in Foley & van Valin

[2] It is also possible to use *Tanaka sensei ga sou itta* instead of (4a). In this case, the choice of the verb form is based on the equal relationship between Prof. Saitou and Prof. Tanaka.

b. (($_{peripheral}$ossyai) masi-ta)

This verb form contains an auxiliary verb of politeness masu. Since a politeness marker is required when the relationship between the speaker and the hearer is not equal (i.e., the hearer is superior to the speaker) or is not intimate enough (i.e., lack of familiarity requires formality even among equals), Tarou has to use the politeness marker masu here. The choice of ossyaru is also mandatory because unlike the case of sentence a, the socially inferior speaker does not have the option of using the hearer's social status relative to the referent's in choosing the honorific form. Let us summarize the rules for choosing honorific forms we have been working with (S=speaker, H=hearer, and R=referent).

(6) 1. When S is superior to H, S can use either S or H as the pivot for locating R.
2. When S is inferior to H, S must use S as the pivot.
3. When R is superior to the pivot, the honorific form is used.
4. When S is superior to H, the use of a politeness marker is optional.
5. When S is inferior to H, the use of a politeness marker is obligatory.

2 The position of politeness markers

In this section, I will argue that the politeness marker is associated with the major illocutionary act of the clause. By major illocutionary acts are meant such acts as asserting, questioning, ordering, inviting, encouraging, etc. In the case of asserting and questioning, the politeness marker appears with the tense operator.

(7) a. Tarou- ga sore- o kaki-masi-ta
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-POL-PAST
'Taro wrote it. '

b. Tarou- ga sore- o kai-ta hazu-des-u
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-PASTnatural=expectation-COP-PRES
'Taro should have written it. '

c. Tarou- ga sore- o kai-ta you-des-u
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-PASTappearance-COP-PRES
'Taro seems to have written it. '

(7a) contains only one tense operator because there is only one assertion. On the other hand, (7b) and (7c) contain two tense operators because the embedded constituent also represents a secondary assertion in which the temporal location of the asserted event needs to be specified relative to the tense of the main assertion. In (7b) and (7c), the politeness marker resides in the copulative element *des*, which provides the support for the main tense operator. The same analysis explains positive questions.

(8) a. Tarou- ga sore- o kaki-masi-ta-ka
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-POL-PAST-QUES
'Did Taro write it? '

b. Tarou- ga sore- o kai-ta hazu-des-u-ka
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-PASTnatural=expectation-COP-PRES-QUES
'Should Taro have written it?'

c. Tarou- ga sore- o kai-ta you-des-u-ka
Taro-NOM it-ACCwrite-PASTappearance-COP-PRES-QUES
'Does Taro seem to have written it? '

However, negative clauses exhibit a more complicated picture.

(9) a. Tarou- wa sore- o kaki-mase-n-desi-ta
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-POL-NEG=TENSE-COP-PAST
'Taro did not write it. '

b. Tarou- wa sore- o kaka-nakat-ta-des-u
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-NEG-PAST-COP-PRES
'Taro did not write it. '

c. Tarou- wa sore- o kaka-nakat-ta hazu-des-u
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-NEG-PASTnatural=expectation-COP-PRES
'Taro should not have written it. '

d. Tarou- wa sore- o kaka-nakat-ta you-des-u
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-NEG-PASTappearance-COP-PRES
'Taro seems not to have written it. '

e. Tarou- wa sore- o kai-ta hazu-ga-ari-mase-n
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-PASTnatural=expectation-NOM-exist-POL-PRES
'Taro cannot have written it.'

f. Tarou- wa sore- o kai-ta hazu-ga-nai-des-u
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-PASTnatural=expectation-NOM-not=exist-COP-PRES
'Taro cannot have written it.'

g. Tarou- wa sore- o kai-ta you-de=wa-nai-des-u
Taro-TOP it-ACCwrite-PASTappearance-COP-not=exist-COP-PRES
'Taro does not seem to have written it.'

Without going into detailed discussion, let us assume the following rules, which should suffice for the present purposes.

(10) 1. A politeness marker can provide the support for negation.
2. When negation is supported by a politeness marker, it can only take the unmarked tense.
3. When negation is not supported by a politeness marker, it has to take the copulative support with the unmarked tense.

In the case of ordering, inviting, and encouraging, the politeness marker appears with the illocutionary operator.

(11)

hayaku ossyai-mas-e
right awaysay-POL-IMPER
'Tell us at once.'

glhayakuright away iki-mas-you
go-POL-HORT
'Let us go at once.'

glhayakuright away goran-nasai-mas-e
see-DO-POL-IMPER
'Take a look at once.'

In this case, the negative counterparts are formed with the morpheme na, which is derived from *nak-ar-e*. Thus, the politeness marker supports both negation and the major illocutionary force.

(12)

hayaku ossyai-masu-na
right awaysay-POL-NEG=IMPER
'Don't tell us at once.'

glhayakuright away goran-nasai-masu-na
see-DO-POL-NEG=IMPER
'Don't take a look at once.'

3 Adjectival verbs as the model for the subject honorific construction

In this section, I will argue that SHC (the subject honorific construction) uses the inflection of adjectival verbs (keiyoudousi) as its model.

3.1 Adjectival verbs and the copulative verb

Adjectival verbs are a class of stative predicates which have distinct inflections from adjectives.

(13) a. Tarou- wa genki- da
Taro-TOP healthy-COP
'Taro is healthy.'

b. Tarou- wa genki- dat-ta
Taro-TOP healthy-COP-PAST
'Taro was healthy.'

c. genki-na otokono-ko
healthy-COP=LINK(adj) man-child
'healty boy'

d. Tarou- wa genki-ni nat-ta
Taro-TOP healthy-COP=LINK(adv)become-PAST
'Taro became healthy.'

e. Tarou- wa genki-de-nai
Taro-TOP healthy-COP-NEG=PRES
'Taro is not healthy.'

Compare these with the corresponding adjectival forms.

(14) a. Hanako- wa utukusi-i
Hanako-TOP beautiful-PRES
'Hanako is beautiful.'

b. Hanako- wa utukusikat-ta
Hanako-TOP beautiful-PAST
'Hanako was beautiful.'

c. utukusi-i musume
beautiful-PRES=LINK(adj) maiden
'beautiful maiden'

d. Hanako- wa utukusiku nat-ta
Hanako-TOP beautiful=LINK(adv)become-PAST
'Hanako became beautiful.'

e. Hanako- wa utukusiku-nai
Hanako-TOP beautiful-NEG=PRES
'Hanako is not beautiful.'

Adjectival verbs are mostly borrowings from Chinese. When Chinese words are adopted as predicates in Japanese, dynamic predicates take *suru* (*benkyou-suru*'to study', *kenkyuu-suru*'to research', *kaiwa-suru*'to converse'), whereas stative predicates take the copulative verb *da* (*sinsetu-da*'to be kind', *meihaku-da*'to be clear', *kibin-da*'to be agile'). The choice of the respective endings is natural in view of their intrinsic dynamicity and stativity. It is widely acknowledged that the copulative verb *da* and its variants are all based on the verb of existence *aru*. The following etymologies of the three copulative verbs are cited from the famous Syougakukan Dictionary of Japanese.

(15) a. ni-te-ari (NI-TE-exist=PRES) ⇒ de-aru ⇒ de-a ⇒ da (plain)

b. de-gozar-u (DE-exist-PRES)⇒ de-goansu ⇒ de-ansu ⇒ desu (polite)

c. de-gozari-mas-u (DE-exist-POL-PRES) ⇒ degozaimasu (very polite)

3.2 The verbs of existence *aru* and *iru* as component verbs

In Japanese, the verb of existence comes in two varieties *aru* and *iru*. *Aru* takes an inanimate subject, whereas *iru* an animate one.

(16) a. sokoni ie-ga ar-u
there house-NOM exist-PRES
'There is a house there. '

b. sokoni wani-ga ir-u
there crocodile-NOM exist-PRES
'There is a crocodile there. '

The difference in existential verb forms can be attributed to the conception of mode of existence on the part of the referent of the subject argument. An animate subject can be taken to be aware of its existence at the current location, while inanimate subjects cannot. Etymologically speaking, *iru* is derived from *wiru*, which means that a potentially mobile object is at a standstill. In other words, the state of existence at a location is just temporary in the case of *iru*. In Ishikawa (2003), this conceptual difference is used to account for the distinct behaviour seen in the complex verb constructions formed by *aru* and *iru*.

Both verbs can form a stative complex verb of the form *V-te aru/iru*, where *te* is considered to act as a temorally-neutral tense operator in terms of RRG.

(17) a. ame-ga hut-te ir-u
rain-NOM fall-TE exist-PRES
' It is raining.'

b. ha-ga nui-te ar-u
tooth-NOM pull=out-TE exist-PRES
' (It) has its teeth pulled out.'

The *V-te iru* construction denotes both progressive and resultative aspects, depending on the type of event associated with the V (Kobayashi (2003)). By contrast, the *V-te aru* construction can only express resultative aspect. Moreover, the V in this construction must be a transitive verb whose subject is an agent.

(18) a. *ame-ga hut-te ar-u
rain-NOM fall-TE exist-PRES
' It is raining.'

b. kono bussitu-wa tanso-o hukum-u
this matter-TOPcarbon-ACCcontain-PRES
'This matter contains carbon. '

c. *kono bussitu-ni-wa tanso-ga hukun-de ar-u
this matter-LOC-TOPcarbon-NOMcontain-TEexist-PRES
'Carbon is contained in this matter. '

The element of temporariness in *iru* and its absence in *aru* explains the availability of progressive aspect only for the former. In terms of the RRG theory of the clause structure, we can account for the constructions in question as follows. To be usable as regular predicates, complex predicates must be formed at a level as close to the nucleus as possible. Otherwise, the resultant complex predicate cannot take a full range of operators to be serviceable for normal communicative purposes. This requirement imposes a natural boundary on the outermost possible layer for the formation of complex predicates at the point of the core constituent. (3) is reproduced below for the ease of reference.

(19) Illocutionary force $\prec$ Evidential $\prec$ Tense $\prec$ Status $\prec$ (*Periphery* $\prec$ Modal $\prec$ (*Core* $\prec$ Directional $\prec$ Aspect $\prec$ (*Nucleus*)))

According to (19), aspect and directional are the only operators which can constitute part of a complex predicate.[3] For example, various benefactive complex predicates based on *V-te* in Japanese presumably use the verbs of giving and receiving as directionals.

(20) a. Tanaka-Si-ga hisyo-ni tegami-o kai-te morat-ta
Tanaka-Mr-NOM secretary-DATletter-ACCwrite-TEget-PAST
'Mr Tanaka had his secretary write a letter. '

b. Tanaka-Si-ga kodomo-tati-nitegami-o yon-de age-ta
Tanaka-Mr-NOM child-PL-DAT letter-ACCread-TEgive-PAST
'Mr Tanaka read the letter to the children. '

According to Kuno (1978), these benefactive constructions directly reflect the speaker's empathy, which corresponds to the point of view from which he/she conceptualizes the benefactive event. Thus, it is apparent that these constructions are based on the directional operator. The verbs of giving and receiving used as the directional component of the constructions have different argument structures from those of the original full verbs. Most notably, such verbs are no longer subcategorized for the argument indicating the object given or received. Instead, they subcategorize for the benefactive event involved. As a consequence, what is transferred from the benefactor to the beneficiary is a benefit or favour instead of a physical object.[4]

[3]Or voice, which is not regarded as one of the universal operators in RRG.

[4]For an analysis along these lines based on Generative Lexicon Theory, see Kim (2003).

In the case of *aru* and *iru*, the full verbs predicates the property of existence of relevant objects. The following Generative Lexicon representations capture this commonality and their differences.[5]

(21) the full verb *iru*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} & = \left[E_i \quad = e_i\text{:temporary state} \right] \\ \text{ARGSTR} & = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:animate object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = \text{y:location} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} & = \left[\text{FORMAL} \quad = \text{at}(e_i,x,y) \right] \end{bmatrix}$$

(22) the full verb *aru*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} & = \left[E_i \quad = e_i\text{:state} \right] \\ \text{ARGSTR} & = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:inanimate object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = \text{y:location} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} & = \left[\text{FORMAL} \quad = \text{at}(e_i,x,y) \right] \end{bmatrix}$$

When they are used as component verb in the *V-te aru/iru* constructions, they also subcategorize for the event denoted by the V. This argument corresponds to ARG2 of their full verb counterparts. In other words, instead of locations, the component verbs *aru* and *iru* subcategorize for events. Unlike verbs of giving and receiving, these verbs do not contain any element of direction in their meaning. Therefore, their semantic contribution must be either aspect or voice. The aspectual lacuna, the progressive aspect, is better filled up by *iru* than *aru* because temporariness is the essential element in it. So *iru* takes on the role.

By contrast, the resultative meaning for both *aru* and *iru* seems to reflect the contribution of the temporally-unspecified tense operator *te* more directly. In the progressive interpretation of *V-te iru*, the event denoted by *V-te* is temporally overlapping with the state denoted by *iru*. In the resultative interpretation of *V-te iru*, the event must precede the state.

(23) a. Tarou-wa nido nankyoku-ni it-te ir-u
Taro-TOP twice the=Antarctic=Pole-DAT go-TE exist-PRES
'Taro has been to the South Pole twice. '

b. Tarou-wa nido nankyoku-ni it-ta
Taro-TOP twice the=Antarctic=Pole-DAT go-PAST
'Taro has been to the South Pole twice. '

The state in which the subject finds himself/herself is the one which results from the completion of the event in question. In other words, the resultative meaning can come for free without using this construction as shown in (23b). (23a) only serves to emphasize that the subject is still alive. Thus, the resultative meaning should not be part of the semantic contribution of *aru* and *iru*. Then, what is the semantic contribution of the component verb *aru*? The obvious answer is that it is a voice operator reducing the number of obligatory arguments. We adopt the following pragmatic principle to motivate this process.

[5]Some people may object to the specification of 'temporary state' for *iru*, citing sentences such as *watasi-ni-wa hutari no ane ga iru*'I have two sisters.' It is to be noted that *aru* and *nai* can always replace *iru* and *inai* in these contexts. It is as if the two specifications 'animate objct' and 'temporary state' are vying for the primary constraint for the verb.

(24) Omission of Linguistic Expressions (Masuko (forthcoming))
Linguistic expressions, even arguments of a predicate, can be omitted as long as the resultant utterance is *sufficiently informative* and *newsworthy*.

By this principle, we can conclude that the agent argument can be omitted when its identity is not important or already taken for granted. In the *V-te aru* construction, the successful completion of the relevant event and the retention of the resultant state are denoted, which should be sufficiently informative and newsworthy. Thus, we have identified a potential lacuna in the organization of a clause in terms of pertinent arguments.[6] We formulate the lexical representations of the component *iru* and *aru* as follows (I(e) and R(e) denote the initial segment of e and the result of e, respectively.).

(25) the component verb *iru* (adapted from Kobayashi (2003))

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} E_i & = e_i\text{:temporary state} \\ E_j & = e_j\text{:dynamic event} \\ \text{RESTR} & = \leq (I(e_j),e_i) \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{ARGSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = e_j \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{FORMAL} & = at(e_i,x,e_j) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

(26) the component verb *aru*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} E_i & = e_i\text{:state} \\ E_j & = e_j\text{:dynamic event} \\ \text{RESTR} & = \leq (e_j,e_i) \\ \text{HEAD} & = e_i \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{ARGSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = e_j \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{FORMAL} & = at(e_i,x,R(e_j)) \\ \text{AGENTIVE} & = e_j\text{\_act}(e_j,y,x) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

3.3 The copulative honorific construction

The copulative honorific construction, *o-V + copula*, is known to have existed long before the subject and non-subject honorific construction came into use. It is also known that the construction was in use in the Kantou region, where honorific expressions were far less conspicuous than in the Kansai region, but the modern honorific expressions must have originated in this region. The copulative honorific construction is still widely used in contemporary Japanese. Let us look at some examples.

(27) a. o-tukare-daro-u-to omot-te mukae-ni ki-masi-ta
O-tire-COP-INFER-TO think-TE meet-NI come-POL-PAST
'Thiking that you must be tired, I've come to meet you. !?

b. sonnani arui-ta-no-nara kitto o-tukare-desyo-u
so much walk-PAST-ASSERT-COND surely O-tire-COP-INFER
'If you've walked so much, you must surely be tired.'

[6]Indeed, we already have the passive voice, but the passive voice cannot be used to emphasize the retention of the resultant state of an event.

c. o-tukare-degozaimasyo-u-kara watakusi-ga nimotu-o o-moti-si-masyo-u
O-tire-COP-INFER-CAUSE I-GA baggage-O o-carry-SURU-POL-HORTATIVE
'As you must be tired, I will carry the baggage for you.'

As was mentioned above, the copulative verb *da* and its variants are derived from the existential verb *aru*. The functions of predication and identification of the copula can be captured by taking ARG2 of *aru* to denote abstract locations and *ni-te* to be a marker of the membership relation (cf. (15a)).

(28) the full verb *da*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} & = \left[\text{E}_i \;\; = \text{e}_i\text{:state}\right] \\ \text{ARGSTR} & = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = \text{y:abstract location} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} & = \left[\text{FORMAL} \;\; = \text{at}(\text{e}_i,\text{x,y})\right] \end{bmatrix}$$

In the case of adjectival verbs, the copula supplies Chinese stative predicates with the support for the tense operator, which we have already seen as directly relating to the major illocutionary act of the clause. Since a stative predicate denotes a property, the semantic contribution of the copula (assertion of the membership relation) is compatible with the predication of the property or the assertion of the property about the subject.

This interpretation is directly applicable to the copulative honorific construction. The verbal component *o-V* is dissociated from tense just as the Chinese stem of an adjectival verb. The honorific prefix *o* cannot attach to any finite form of a verb. The *V* in *o-V* takes an infinite form called *ren'you* form. It is also interesting to note that *o* cannot attach to the *te* form, either, because *te* can be considered to be a tense operator as we have already seen. As with adjectival verbs, the predicative nature of *o-V* should be accessible to the speaker. By combining with the copula, *o-V* obtains the support for tense and an assertion of membership.

(29) a. Tanaka-sensei-wa kono-setu-o o-utagai-da
Tanaka-Prof-TOP this-theory-ACC o-doubt-COP
' Prof. Tanaka doubts this theory.'

b. *Tanaka sensei wa* *kono setu o o utagai* *da*
abstract location membership assertion

Since the copulative support is mainly concerned with the membership assertion, the full predicative force of the original V is not realizable by this construction. This is seen in the opposition as in (30).

(30) a. asita o-modori-desi-tara o-denwa-kudasa-i
tomorrow o-return-COP-COND o-telephone-give-IMPER
'If you are to return tomorrow, please give me a call (before you arrive)'

b. asita o-modori-ni-nat-tara o-denwa-kudasa-i
tomorrow o-return-NARU-COND o-telephone-give-IMPER
'When you've returned tomorrow, please give me a call.'

We have seen that the resultative meaning of the *V-te aru/iru* constructions can be traced to the temporally-unspecified tense marker *te*. Since the copulative honorific construction lacks this marker in the *o-V* part, the resultative reading can only result from the tense of the clause.

(31) a. Tanaka-Si-wa sakuzitu o-modori-da
Tanaka-Mr-TOP yesterday o-return-COP-PRES
'Mr Tanaka returned yesterday. '

b. Tanaka-Si-wa asu o-modori-da
Tanaka-Mr-TOP tomorrow o-return-COP-PRES
'Mr Tanaka will return tomorrow. '

By pragmatic inference, (31a) but not (31b) can have a resultative reading. It is this lack of the meaning of transition into the resultative state which necessitates the use of *naru* 'to become' as the support for tense both for adjectival verbs and the copulative honorific construction (cf. (13d) and (30b)). This point is captured by the following GL lexical entries of *naru* for both types of constructions. The major difference is that unlike naru for adjectival verbs, naru for the copulative honorific construction

(32) *naru* for adjectival verbs

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} E_i & = e_i\text{:state} \\ E_j & = e_j\text{:dynamic event} \\ \text{RESTR} & = \leq (e_j, e_i) \\ \text{HEAD} & = e_i \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{ARGSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:object} \\ \text{ARG2} & = \text{y:abstract location} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{FORMAL} & = \text{at}(e_i,\text{x,y}) \\ \text{AGENTIVE} & = \text{become\_act}(e_j,\text{x,y}) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

(33) the component verb *naru*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{EVENTSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} E_i & = e_i\text{:state} \\ E_j & = e_j\text{:dynamic event} \\ \text{RESTR} & = \leq \circ_\alpha (e_j, e_i) \\ \text{HEAD} & = e_i \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{ARGSTR} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG1} & = \text{x:respected person} \\ \text{ARG2} & = \text{ef1} = (\text{x},(e_j,\text{t}))\text{:honorific infinitive} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{QUALIA} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{FORMAL} & = \text{at}(e_i,\text{x},R(e_j)) \\ \text{AGENTIVE} & = e_j\text{\_act}(e_j,\text{x,ef1}) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

4 The non-subject honorific construction

Let us briefly look at the peculiarity of the *o-V + suru* construction and its possible explanation. In this construction, the respected person is denoted not by ARG1 but by some other argument.

(34) Tarou-wa sono-koto-o Tanaka-sensei-kara o-kiki-si-ta
Taro-TOP the-matter-ACCTanaka-Prof-ABL o-hear-SURU-PAST
'Taro heard about the matter from Prof. Tanaka. '

Suru is neither a directional nor an aspectual operator. If the subject of *suru* were identified with the respected person, there would be a semantic clash between the register of *suru*, which is not honorific and that of *o-V*, which is honorific. There is an old-fashioned construction *o-V nasaru*, which avoids the clash by using the honorific form of *suru*.

(35) Tanaka-sensei-wa sono-koto-o Tarou-kara o-kiki-nasat-ta
Tanaka-Prof-TOP the-matter-ACC Taro-ABL o-hear-NASARU-PAST
'Prof. Tanaka heard about the matter from Taro. '

So the function of *suru* must be to cause this semantic clash due to the register inconguity, moving the locus of the respected person to a non-subject argument.

5 Conclusion

I have shown that the subject and non-subject honorific constructions can be analysed in terms of the RRG operators and their universal hierarchy. I have presented an analysis of the subject honorific construction based on its relation to adjectival verbs, and a sketch of a possible origin of the non-subject honorific construction along the same lines.

Acknowledgments

This research is partly funded by the 2003 research funds from Sophia University Linguistic Institute for International Communication and Sophia University Open Research Center.

References

Bresnan, Joan, 2001. *Lexical-functional syntax.* Blackwell.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

Hasegawa, Yoko. 1996. *A Study of Japanese Clause Linkage.* Stanford: CSLI.

Kim, Kyung-Ah. 2003. *Seisei Goi Ron kara Mita Nihongo to Kankokugo no Zyuyo Hyoogen.* MA diss. Sophia Univ.

Kobayasi, Noriko. 2003. *On Interpreting the semantic ambiguity of the V-te iru construction in Japanese using Generative Lexicon Theory.* MA diss. Sophia Univ.

Kuno, Susumu. 1978. *Danwa no Bunpou.* Taisyukan.

Masuko, Mayumi. 1999. *Conditions for Argument Suppression.* ESLLI

Masuko, Mayumi. forthcoming. *Valence Change and the Function of Intransitive Verbs in English and Japanese.*

Martin, Samuel. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese.* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press

Pustejovsky, James. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Tobin, Yishai. 1993. *Aspect in the English Verb.* Longman.

Tuzimura, Tosiki. 1968. *Keigo no Siteki Kenkyuu.* Tokyo: Tokyoodoo Syuppan.