draft

ON CONDITIONS FOR THE DUPLICATION OF THE JAPANESE POLITENESS MARKER -*MAS*-

KEISUKE YOSHIMOTO
Ryukoku University

1 Introduction [1]

This paper investigates conditions for the Japanese politeness marker -*mas*- in embedded clauses. In conversation, the speaker adds -*mas*- to a verb when s/he thinks the relationship with the hearer is not close enough (yet) to talk casually, possibly because they have just met and/or the hearer is older, socially superior to the speaker. (1a) is a base form, and (1b) is a polite form with -*mas*-.

(1) a. Asoko-ni   ginkoo-ga   ar-u   yo.
       Over.there   bank-Nom   be-Pres   Prt
       'There is a bank over there.'
    b. Asoko-ni   ginkoo-ga   ari-*mas*-u   yo.
       Over.there   bank-Nom   be-Pol-Pres   Prt

Miyagawa (2012) argues that -*mas*- is an instance of genuine Main Clause Phenomena (MCP) occurring only in main clauses, and that -*mas*- is licensed through agreement in a Speech Act Phrase in the topmost CP layer of a sentence. However, Miyagawa's (2012) analysis runs counter to previous observations by Harada (1976), Nitta (1991) and Uchibori (2007, 2008) that -*mas*- also occurs in a subset of subordinate clauses. Uchibori (2007, 2008) notes that the embedded -*mas*- is licensed nonlocally with the matrix -*mas*- because the embedded -*mas*- can only occur where there is also a matrix counterpart. In other words, otherwise unacceptable

---

embedded _-mas-_ is salvaged by the presence of the matrix _-mas-_. In this light, let us observe the following contrast in subjunctive clauses; whilst there are two _-mas-_ both in the main clause and the embedded clause in (2a), there is only one in the embedded clause in (2b).

(2) a. Isya-wa   oosama$_i$-ni   [e_i sono   kusuri-o   o nomi ninari-_mas_-u
     doctor-Top   king-Dat   that   medicine-Acc   take (honoric)-Pol-Pres
     yoo(ni)]   motome-_masi_-ta.
     C   ask-Pol-Past
     'The doctor asked the king to take that medicine.'
   b.??Isya-wa   oosama$_i$-ni   [e_i sono   kusuri-o   o nomi ninari-_mas_-u
     doctor-Top   king-Dat   that   medicine-Acc   take (honorific)-Pol-Pres
     yoo(ni)]   motome-ta
     C   ask-Past

(Uchibori 2008: 113-114)

I show that the co-occurrence of _-mas-_, or the _-mas-_ duplication, does not improve the grammaticality of sentences in every context. Specifically, I put forth the insight of Harada (1976) and illustrate that the _-mas-_ duplication is not effective in operator constructions.

    This paper is organized as follows. In subsection 2.1, I investigate the distribution of _-mas-_ in relative clauses, and show that it is allowed only when a relative clause has a nonrestrictive interpretation. The limited distribution of _-mas-_ in relative clauses is then explained in relation to the absence of operator movement with a nonrestrictive interpretation. The relevance of operator movement is further reinforced by looking into other operator constructions such as comparative deletion in subsection 2.2. Section 3 concludes the paper.

2 Operator Constructions

In this section, I show that the following configuration is ruled out.

(3) * V-mas$_i$ ... [$_{CP}$ Op$_j$ V-mas$_i$ ~~Op$_j$~~
         [Mod]   [Mod] [Mod]

In (3), the _-mas-_ duplication has taken place and _-mas-_ has been copied onto the embedded verb. Let us assume that _-mas-_ has a modality feature as it serves to indicate how the speaker views the interpersonal relationship with the hearer. But, the _-mas-_ duplication cannot take place together with operator movement in the same clause. In recent studies of locality in terms of feature-based relativized minimality, it has been argued that a category X blocks movement of another category Y either if X and Y have the identical feature set or if Y's feature set is a proper subset of X's (Starke 2001, Rizzi 2004, Endo 2007, Haegeman 2012). If the operator has the same modality feature, this configuration can be taken as another instance of intervention effects.

2.1 Relative Clauses

Harada (1976: 557-558) notes that _-mas-_ in a relative clause requires specificity of the head NP, and that in such a case, the relative clause is considered to be nonrestrictive. However, he did not

argue why this should be so; and therefore, a question remains as to the relationship between the derivation of restrictive/nonrestrictive relative clauses, and the *-mas-* duplication.

   A puzzling fact concerning Japanese relative clauses is that, as originally pointed out by Kuno (1973), they do not seem to obey the Subjacency Condition (Chomsky 1973).

(4) $[_{NP}[_S[_{NP}[_S e_i \ e_j \ $ kite iru$] \ $ yoohuku$_j]$-ga yogoreteiru$] \ $ sinsi$_i$
                          wearing   suit-Nom   dirty   gentleman
   'Lit: a gentleman who the suite (he) is wearing is dirty.'   (Kuno 1973: 239)

However, Ishii (1991) convincingly tells us by using various diagnostics that Japanese relative clauses involve operator movement, and that an empty resumptive pronoun is employed as a last resort when a movement violates Subjacency. Hence the grammaticality of (4) follows thanks to an empty resumptive pronoun. One piece of evidence he shows for operator movement is reconstruction of local reflexive *kare-zisin* (he-self) / *kanozyo-zisin* (she-self). As shown in (5), *kare-zisin* in the head position of the relative clause is perfectly understood as referring to *John*, indicating that reconstruction of an operator into the the base position notated as *e* is possible.

(5) Mary-wa   [[John$_i$-ga   *e*   taipusi-ta]   kare-zisin$_i$-no ronbun]-o
    Mary-Top   John-Nom   type-Past   he-self-Gen   paper-Acc
    motteki-ta.
    bring-Past
    'Lit. Mary brought himself$_i$'s paper that John$_i$ typed.'   (Ishii 1991: 29)

On the other hand, such reconstruction is not observed in nonrestrictive relative clauses:

(6) ?*Mary-wa [John$_i$-ga   taipusi-ta]   ano kare-zisin$_i$-no   ronbun]-o
    Mary-Top John-Nom   type-Past   that he-self-Gen   paper-Acc
    sutetesimat-ta.
    throw.away-Past   (Ishii 1991: 49)

In (6), it is difficult to interpret *kare-zisin* as referring to *John*; hence the reconstruction effect is not observed. Thus we are led to consider that operator movement is involved in restrictive relative clauses but not in nonrestrictive ones.

   Let us turn to the *-mas-* duplication. Unlike English, the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive readings is not crystal clear in Japanese. Yet, the context such as the following ensures the difference between the two readings. (7) is a restrictive relative clause, and the contrast between (7a) and (7b) shows that the *-mas-* duplication does not salvage the embedded *-mas-*.

(7) Tanaka-sensei-ni-wa musuko-san-ga san-nin i-*mas*-u. Hitori-wa isya-ni, futari-wa
    bengosi-ni nari-*masi*-ta.
    'Mr. Tanaka has three sons. One of them became a medical doctor, and two of them became layers.'

    a. [Isya-ni   nat-ta]   sono musuko-san-ga   kyonen
       Doctor-Dat become-Past   that   son-Mr-Nom   last.year

kekkonsi-*masi*-ta.
get.married-Pol-Past
'The son who became a medical doctor got married last year.'
  b.*[Isya-ni   nari-*masi*-ta]   sono   musuko-san-ga   kyonen
   Doctor-Dat become-Pol-Past that   son-Mr-Nom   last.year
  kekkonsi-*masi*-ta.
  get.married-Pol-Past

In contrast, in nonrestrictive contexts such as in (8), the -*mas*- duplication renders the embedding of -*mas*- possible. [2]

   (8) Tanaka-sensei-ni-wa musuko-san-ga hitori i-*mas*-u.
      'Mr. Tanaka has one son.'

     a. [Tokorode   isya-ni   nat-ta]   sono musuko-san-ga   kyonen
       by.the.way   doctor-Dat become-Past that son-Mr-Nom   last.year
       kekkonsi-*masi*-ta.
       get.married-Pol-Past
       'The son, who became a medical doctor by the way, got married last year.'
     b. [Tokorode   isya-ni   nari-masi-ta]   sono musuko-san-ga   kyonen
       by.the.way   doctor-Dat become-Pol-Past that son-Mr-Nom   last.year
       kekkonsi-masi-ta.
       get.married-Pol-Past

Given that restrictive relative clauses involve operator movement whilst nonrestrictive relative clauses do not, the contrast between (7b) and (8b) tells us that the generalization in (3) holds; that is, -*mas*- and operator movement do not take place in the configuration in which the latter moves past the former.

2.2 Comparative Deletion

Another well-known construction for involving operator movement in Japanese is comparative deletion such as follows:

   (9) Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga *e* yon-da   yori(mo)] takusan-no   hon-o   yon-da.
      Taro-Top   Hanako-Nom read-Past than   many-Gen   book-Acc read-Past
      'Taro read more books than Mary read.'

Kikuchi (1989) argues that Japanese comparative deletion is derived by operator movement by testing with various diagnostics. One of his most important observations is that comparative deletion is sensitive to Subjacency Condition. The following two sentences illustrate this point; (10) is an example of extraction out of a relative clause, (11) an example of extraction out of an adjunct.

---

[2] According to Ishizuka (2008), only the word string, Relative Clause – Demonstrative (this, that) – NP, receives a nonrestrictive interpretation in Japanese relative clauses.

(10) *[[sono tukue-de *e*ᵢ *e*ⱼ yondeita]   hitoᵢ-o   John-ga   nagut-ta   yorimo]
        that table-At   was.reading person-Acc John-Nom hit-Past   than
      Paul-wa   takusan   honⱼ-o   yondeita.
      Paul-Top   many   book-Acc   has.read
      'Lit. Paul read more books than John hit a person who was reading at the table.'
                                                                                    (Kikuchi 1989)

(11) *[[John-ga *e*ᵢ   yondeita   tokini]   zisin-ga   oki-ta   yorimo]
        John-Nom   was.reading when   earthquake-Nom happen-Past   than
      Paul-wa   harukani   takusanno   honᵢ-o   yondeita.
      Paul-Top   far   many   book-Acc has.read
       'Lit. Paul has read more books than an earthquake happened when John was reading.'
                                                                                    (Kikuchi 1989)

As Subjacency Condition is a hallmark of movement, Kikuchi (1989) concludes that the operator coreferential with the head NP has been moved from the base position to the edge of *-yori* 'than' clause.

Turning to the *-mas-* duplication, it cannot operate into the *-yori* 'than' clause as the following sentences illustrate:

(12) a. Mary-wa   [John-ga *e* yonda   yori(mo)] takusanno hon-o   yomi-*masi*-ta.
         Mary-Top John-Nom read-Past than   many   book-Acc   read-Pol-Past
         'Mary read more books than John read.'
     b.*Mary-wa   [Mary-ga *e* yomi-*masi*-ta   yori(mo)]   takusanno   hon-o
         Mary-Top Mary-Nom read-Pol-Past than   many   book-Acc
         yomi-*masi*-ta.
         read-Pol-Past

Thus, it follows that the embedded *-mas-* cannot appear in a clause where it intervenes with operator movement.

3 Conclusion

Summarizing the argument so far, the embedded *-mas-* is allowed to occur in a subset of subordinate clauses with the help of the matrix *-mas-*, a phenomenon I call 'the *-mas-* duplication' here. After a close scrutiny, it has become clear that the *-mas-* duplication does not help the embedded *-mas-* appear in certain clauses, and that these clauses involve operator movement. This indicates that intervention effects are at work between the embedded *-mas-* and an operator, in the same way as topicalization intervenes with operator movement (see Haegeman 2012, Tomioka 2015). I suggested that the intervention effects can best be analyzed by feature-based relativized minimality considering that the politeness marker is a kind of modality classified into the same group as topics (see Nitta 1991).

The findings in this paper have two important implications. Firstly, as noted by Endo (2007), feature-based relativized minimality works irrespective of the levels of projections. Here, *-mas-* is a head, and an operator is a maximal projection. Yet, the former blocks the movement of the latter assuming that both have the same modality features. Secondly, MCP may not always occur

in designated projections in the left periphery. If MCP are licensed through agreement, it comes as no surprise that some of them are licensed nonlocally where long-distance agreement is possible, even if the embedded clauses do not have designated left-peripheral projections for specific MCP.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle,* ed. Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Endo, Yoshio. 2007. *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harada, Shin-ichi. 1976. Honorifics. In *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, 499-561. New York: Academic Press.

Ishii, Yasuo. 1991. *Operators and Empty Categories in Japanese.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Ishizuka, Tomoko. 2008. Restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in Japanese: Antisymmetric approach. Ms., UCLA.

Kikuchi, Akira. 1989. Comparative deletion in Japanese. Ms., Yamagata University.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MA: MIT Press.

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

Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo no Modarityii to Ninsyoo* [Japanese Modality and Person]. Tokyo: Hituji Syoboo.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In *Structures and Beyond: Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, ed. Adriana Belletti, 104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Starke, Michal. 2001. *Move Dissolves into Merge: A Theory of Locality.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.

Tomioka, Satoshi. 2015. Embedded *wa*-phrases, predication, and judgment theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33: 267-305.

Uchibori, Asako. 2007. Modarityii-yosoo niyoru ninka no (hi)hutooomei ryooiki: -koto/-yoo(ni(to)) ga mitibiku meirei/kigan hyoogen o megutte [(Non-)opaque domains for licensing from modal elements: On imperative and optative expressions led by *–koto/-yoo(ni(to))*]. In *Nihongo no Syubun Gensyoo: Toogo Koozoo to Modarityii* [Main Clause Phenomena in Japanese: Syntactic Structures and Modality], ed. Nobuko Hasegawa, 295-330. Tokyo: Hituji Syoboo.

Uchibori, Asako. 2008. A short note on Japanese politeness verb *–des/mas* in embedded contexts. *Scientific Approaches to Language* 7: 103-122.