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Abstract

This thesis is a study of the distribution of honorifics in dependent clauses in Japanese and Korean. It aims to determine whether honorifics occur in subordinate environments and to discuss their limitations. It is the first study to collect data from both Japanese and Korean and actively compare the distribution and usage of honorifics in subordinate environments in both languages. The result of the survey study shows an interesting divide between addressee honorification and subject honorification and some curious differences between the two languages. Addressee honorification and subject honorification behave differently and abide by different limitations in both languages. The study brings forth evidence for a syntactic limitation on addressee honorification that limits its occurrence in dependent clauses in both languages, with Korean addressee honorifics being completely blocked for any subordinate environment, and Japanese being very limited in distribution. The results show that even though honorifics most often are considered more pragmatic in nature they are still constrained by their syntactic qualities, opening up the field to further discussion on how pragmatic information can be syntactically represented.
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Abbreviations

1E - first person singular ergative
1SING – first person singular
2SING - second person singular
3A - third person singular absolutive
3D - third person singular dative
3E - third person singular ergative
3SING - third person singular
ADV – adverbial
AH – addressee honorific
ALLO.FEM - feminine allocutive marker
AUX - auxiliary
BA - -ba conditional clause marking (Japanese)
COMP - complementizer
COND - conditionalizer
CP - complement phrase
DAT - dative
DC.PLN - declarative plain speech style (Korean)
FRM - formal speech style (Korean)
FUT - future tense
HON. - indicated honorific version of plain lexical item
INST - instrumental
KARA - kara reason clause (Japanese)
MAS - addressee honorific -mas (Japanese)
NEG - negative
NEG AUX - negative auxiliary
NOM - nominative
OBJ – object
OH – object honorifics
PLN - plain speech style addressee honorific (Korean)
PLT - polite speech style addressee honorific (Korean)
PLU - plural
POS - possessive
POT - potential
PRES - present tense
PROG - progressive tense
PST - past tense
Q - question
REL - relative marker
SE - -se reason clause (Korean)
SH – subject honorific
TARA - -tara conditional clause (Japanese)
TOP - topic
TP - tense phrase
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1 Introduction

The act of representing discourse information through syntactic and morphological devices is particularly well developed in Japanese and Korean. Both Japanese and Korean convey pragmatic information relating to the addressee and/or the referent of the subject or object through a process called honorification. This practice of honorification allows the speaker to show his or her deference or politeness towards an addressee or referent by marking the social relationship between both parts. The incorporation of discourse and social information such as the relative social relationship between speakers shows that we as humans place a tremendous importance and weight on these relationships and studying the nature of honorifics and honorification gives important clues to how humans structure their social relationships.

Honorification in Korean and Japanese have long since been considered an agreement feature and various approaches to this have been made. It has been claimed to be a purely syntactic agreement feature by Boeckx & Niimura (2004) and Hasegawa (2006) while others have favoured a more pragmatic approach (Park 1992, Pollard & Sag 1994). The case remains that there is a discord regarding if honorifics should be considered a more syntactic or more pragmatic phenomenon.

An area of particular interest in this research is honorifics in dependent clauses. In both Korean and Japanese honorific distribution in dependent clauses is very different from the distribution in the main clause. Addressee honorification is blocked in dependent clauses in Korean and limited in Japanese, while subject honorification is allowed in subordinate environments in both languages. In both Japanese and Korean, it seems that honorification does not oblige by as strict rules of agreement in subordinate environments as when it appears in the main clause. In Japanese as long as honorification is present in the main clause it can be omitted from the subordinate clause without changing the politeness of the sentence at whole.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the distribution of honorification in subordinate clauses in Japanese and Korean. It will look at various honorifics in several different subordinate clauses and try to determine what it is that makes them behave differently from in the main clause. The main goal is to investigate whether the distribution of honorifics in a sentence is determined by its syntactic qualities or pragmatic function. The following questions will be asked:

1. Do honorifics occur in subordinate environments?
2. Are there differences between addressee honorifics and subject honorifics?
3. Are honorifics less accepted in subordinate clauses with a greater pragmatic distance to the discourse?
4. Are there similarities between Japanese and Korean?

2 Background

Honorifics are defined in linguistics as a morphosyntactic or otherwise grammatical form that encodes the social relationship between the participants of a conversation and/or referents in an utterance. Honorifics convey politeness in a way that is structured and often governed by many rules, both of correct construction and of what situation demands their usage.

Honorifics are said to operate on three separate axes, speaker-addressee, speaker-referent and speaker-bystander. A speaker can therefore show respect towards an addressee, a referent or a bystander by using these honorific expressions. Several languages possessing these features have been documented, Japanese, Korean, Javanese, Samoan, Dyirbal and Thai to name a few. The norm seems for languages to possess at most two of these features, out of which speaker-addressee and speaker-referent appear to be more common.

2.1 Honorification in Japanese

Japanese, like many other honorific languages, operates on two axes of distinction, the axis of reference and the axis of address. The axis of reference governs the degree of politeness extended to the referent of the utterance, the axis of address governs the degree of politeness extended to the addressee, the hearer in a conversation. Social structure demands that a speaker use honorifics when speaking to or referencing a person of higher social status. This process of honorification is realised through several methods. Important to note is that while the subject most often coincides with the addressee, the addressee-axis and referent-axis are independent from each other.

2.1.1 Addressee Honorifics

Addressee honorification operates on the axis of address and shows reference toward the addressee in a conversation. In Japanese it is shown by the verbal suffix -mas (present tense) and -masi-ta (past tense) that attaches to the adverbial form of the verb.

(1) a. taroo ga ki-ta
    Taro NOM come-PST
b. Taroo ga ki-masi-ta  
Taro NOM come-MAS-PST  
(Shibatani 1990. pp.375)

A small set of addressee targeted honorifics verbs such as itasu (to do. Non-honorific form suru), mairu (to come, visit. Non-honorific form kuru), mousu (to say. Non-honorific form iu), itadaku (to eat, to receive. Non-honorific form kureru), menikakaru (to meet. Non-honorific form au) also exist.

2.1.2 Referent Honorifics

Referent honorification in Japanese encompasses both subject honorification and object honorification. Subject honorification is shown through two morphological processes. The first process makes use of the verb’s nominalised form with the honorific prefix -o by attaching it to the verb naru ‘to become’. The other process is made by the verbal suffix -rare, homophonous with the passive, potential and spontaneous suffix. Object honorification makes use of the same nominalised verb form with prefix -o as the subject honorific but substitutes naru for suru ‘to do’.

(2) a. Sensei ga o-warai ni nat-ta  
teacher NOM SH-laugh ADV become-PST

b. Sensei ga waraw-are-ta  
teacher NOM laugh-SH-PST

c. Sensei ga wara-tta\(^1\)  
teacher NOM laugh-PST  
The teacher laughed.

d. Taroo ga sensei o o-tasuke si-ta  
Taro NOM teacher OBJ HON-help-OH-PST  
Taro assisted the teacher. (OBJ,HON)

e. Taroo ga sensei o tasuke-ta\(^1\)  
Taro NOM teacher OBJ help-PST  
Taro assisted the teacher. (PLAIN)  
(Shibatani 1990. pp.375)

Terms of address are also a form of referent honorification. The Japanese language disfavours the use of second person pronouns over the use of titles or terms of address. A fellow discourse participant or honourable referent are normally referred to by their last name and a

\(^1\) Sentences displaying the plain form without honorifics have been added by me for contrast.
work title or by honorific suffixes \textit{san} or \textit{sama} if they are sufficiently socially distant from the speaker to warrant honorific usage. Keito Takayama who works as a teacher is therefore referred to as Takayama-\textit{sensei} (teacher) or Takayama-\textit{san} by his students and co-workers. Titles can also be used on their own without a name, thus the president of a company might simply be referred and addressed as \textit{syatyoo} ‘company president’

2.2 Honorifics in Korean

Korean operates on the same two scales of honorification as Japanese, namely the axis of reference and the axis of address. The two languages are in many ways similar, they both express honorification by the use of suffixes, humble pronouns, addressee terms and honorific words. Still there are certain differences. Korean addressee honorifics are more numerous than Japanese. Where Japanese has the single honorific suffix \textit{-mas} and a small number of lexical items Korean has 7 speech levels varying from very intimate to super formal, out of the speech levels in common use today 2 are considered honorific levels. Object honorification is much less developed in Korean where it is limited to a small set of lexical items. Hereby follows a further description of addressee and referent honorifics in Korean.

2.2.1 Addressee Honorifics

The two addressee honorific speech levels in common use today are the \textit{hasipsio-chay}, known in English as the formal speech level, and \textit{hayyo-chey}, known as the polite level. The formal level is used in public or formal communication settings, for example broadcasts, public speeches, business settings, and settings that are considered to be more formal in nature. The polite speech level is the most common speech level and is used in any situation that requires polite speech. It lacks the formal qualities of the \textit{hasipsio-chay} and is therefore used freely in everyday life.

(3) a. Jengwu ga o-ass-\textit{eyo}
   Jeongwoo NOM come-PST-PLT

b. Jengwu ga o-ass-\textit{supnita}
   Jeongwoo NOM come-PST-FRM

c. Jengwu ga o-ass-e
   Jeongwoo NOM come-PST-PLN
   ’Jeongwoo came’
2.2.2 Referent Honorifics

In Korean referent honorifics come in both the form of subject honorifics and object honorifics, although the object honorifics are not as developed as Japanese and are limited to a small set of separate lexical items. Korean subject honorification, much like Japanese, can be done through the use of suffixes or usage of separate honorific words. The subject honorific suffix –si is added to the stem of any word to create an honorific version. Certain common words have separate honorific forms such as capsusita, dusita ‘to eat, drink’ (plain form mektta), cumusita ‘to sleep’ (plain form cata), gyeysita ‘to be, exist’ (plain form issta). A certain number of honorific nouns also exist, including yensay ‘age’ (plain form nai, sey), malssum ‘speech’ (plain form mal), cinci ‘meal’ (plain form pap), pun ‘person’ (plain form salam), sengham ‘name’ (plain form irum), tayk ‘house’ (plain form cip). Korean also have honorific particles, kkeyse expressing subject honorification and kkey expressing object honorification. Besides the object honorific particle kkey object honorification in Korean is limited to a small set of lexical items: durita ‘to give’ (plain form cwuta), yeccupta ‘to ask’ (plain form mwulta), boypta ‘to see’ (plain form bota), mosita ‘to accompany’ (plain form teylita), malssumdurita ‘to speak’ (plain form malhata).

Terms of address in Korean function much the same way as Japanese. Use of direct second person pronouns are generally limited to the lower speech levels, in polite and honorific speech titles are instead preferred. Honourable suffix -nim attaches to titles or names to pay respect to the referent, it does not carry any further grammatical properties.

2.3 Honorifics and Agreement

Agreement is broadly defined by Pollard & Sag (1994) as “systematic covariation of linguistic forms” and entails that two parts of the clause agree in certain terms of what information they convey. This process of agreement is defined differently according to derivational-based or constraint-based theories. Derivational theory assuming a more directional process from one object to another and constraint-based theory assuming a more systematic process where parts of the agreement feature is possessed by both objects. In terms of the agreement of honorifics, most modern scholars seem to have employed a more constraint-based approach. Within constraint-based analyses of agreement Pollard & Sag (1994) expresses the need to keep different kinds of agreement distinct and identifies three kinds of agreement based on the context in which the agreement appears, index agreement, syntactic agreement, and pragmatic agreement, out of which the final two are of relevance when analysing honorifics.
Syntactic agreement entails agreement between two parts of the clause while pragmatic agreement entails agreement between the clause and discourse. Whether to consider honorifics in Korean and Japanese as purely syntactic agreement or pragmatic agreement is largely disagreed upon. Scholars such as Hasegawa (2006), Boeckx & Niimura (2004) and Pak (2015) have chosen to regard it as a purely syntactic feature while others (Park 1992, Pollard & Sag 1994) deem the syntactic agreement theory to be lacking since it disregards the fact that honorific agreement is indeed triggered by pragmatic parameters. I will start now by explaining the theory of syntactic agreement then following with description of the pragmatic approach.

Syntactic agreement is motivated in Korean by the co-occurrence of -nim or -kkeyse on the nominal and -si on the predicate in subject honorification. This co-occurrence and syntactic agreement between subject and predicate have oftentimes been claimed to be a feature of agreement similar to the feature agreement of Indo-European languages. While both Korean and Japanese lack the features of person, number and gender, it is argued that there is a politeness feature that explains this co-occurrence of marking on both subject and predicate. See the following examples from Pak (2015. pp.134):

(4)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Kim-kyoswu-nim-kkeyse} wuli cip-ul
  
  Kim-professor-SH-SH.NOM our house-OBJ
  
  pangmwunha-si-ess-ta.
  
  visit-SH-PST-DC.PLN
  
  ‘Prof. Kim visited my house.’
\item \textbf{Kim-kyoswu-ka} wuli cip-ul pangmwunha-ess-ta.
  
  Kim-professor-NOM our house-OBJ visit-PST-DC.PLN
  
  ‘Prof. Kim visited my house.’
\end{enumerate}

In example sentence 1a the predicate, by the occurrence of -si, agrees with the honorific nominal particle -kkeyse. In Japanese the relationship is less visible since there is no distinction between general and honorific particles. Instead politeness features are said to be possessed by particular types of subjects, generally titles or professions worthy of respect such as teacher, doctor and president, or added by the addition of honorific suffixes -san or -sama on the subject nominal. The predicate would take its referent honorific form when referring to a person socially superior to the speaker. (Hasegawa 2006)
(5) Sensei-ga o-warai-ni nat-ta.
    teacher-NOM HON-laugh-SH-PST
    ‘The teacher laughed.’ (Hasegawa 2006. pp. 499)

But not all agree with this purely syntactic approach. Pak (2015) suggests that Honorifics should be distinguished from formal feature agreement. The Korean language is claimed to at least possess some sort of person features that agree with the subject in imperative clauses that behave strikingly different from honorifics\(^2\), suggesting that politeness features expressed by honorifics might belong to a different class than feature agreement (Pak, 2015). Subject honorifics have also been subject to much questioning regarding the nature of honorifics because of their optionality. Not including SH in a sentence where it is traditionally needed does not produce an ungrammatical sentence, just one unfitting for the occasion. There are claims that SH cannot be explained by syntactic agreement, this on the basis that SH are in a large extent optional, and inclusion will be determined by purely pragmatic factors in certain situations. The following examples in (6) from Park (1992. Pp. 291) demonstrates the optionality as well as possible mismatch that can occur in SH in Korean.

    Kim president-NOM come-PST-DC.PLN

    Kim president-NOM come-SH-PST-DC.PLN

    Kim president-SH-NOM come-PST-DC.PLN

    Kim president-SH-NOM come-SH-PST-DC.PLN
    ‘President Kim came.’

None of these sentences are in essence ungrammatical, although Park notes that (6b) and (6c) may sound odd if not proper context is given. This is inconsistent with the feature agreement of Indo-European where no mixing is allowed, as illustrated by French in (7).

---

\(^2\) Korean jussive clauses are claimed to agree with person in a way more regulated than honorific agreement. Korean imperative -la, promissive -ma and exhortative -ca are said to agree with second person, first person and first person inclusive respectively. When the person features of the subject do not agree they are ruled out. The possible mismatch observed for honorifics do not apply for these clauses. For further discussion see Pak 2015.
The Korean sentences 6b and 6c, if viewed as feature agreement, should be ungrammatical, but in fact they can be used in a variety of circumstances. Park theorizes that maybe the speaker considers *Kim sacang* to be an honorific term, enough to warrant an honorific verb form, or does not consider *-si* to be honorific enough to warrant the honorific particle. Perhaps the speaker does regard *sacang-nim* simply as a non-honorific working title and chooses not to use the honorific verb form, or they use *-nim* out of convention but does not respect President Kim enough to use honorific verb forms. He summarises by saying:

> The point is that honorific agreement is motivated by pragmatic factors, and therefore its violations do not result in ungrammatical sentences, unlike French or German where such violations bring about ungrammatical sentences. It seems that violations of honorific agreement can be exploited for certain pragmatic effects. In other words, inconsistent distribution of honorific signals should be understood as a way of expressing certain feelings or attitudes, not simply as violations of grammatical rules.” (pp.292)

This pragmatic view of honorification is shared by both Park (1992) and Pollard & Sag (1994)

### 2.4 Honorifics in embedded contexts

Still, there seems to be some syntactic constraints on honorification especially in embedded clauses. Addressee honorifics cannot occur in embedded environments in Korean, while subject and object honorifics can occur and are equally acceptable in embedded environments.

---

3 Gloss have been added by me for clarification.
as in the main clause. Subject honorifics can even occur in embedded imperatives in Korean. The difference seems to suggest that there are certain restrictions on the occurrence of honorifics in embedded clauses, specifically the embedded CP domain. (Pak 2015).

In embedded clauses in Korean using the complementizer -ko only plain speech style particles can be used. Any other speech style particles, notably the honorific forms, cannot occur. Pak (2015) claims this to be because the plain style speech particles does not specify an addressee while all the others do. Plain speech style particles are the ones used in exclamatives, monologues, academic text where no specific addressee is specified. Miyagawa (2012) likens the Japanese addressee honorific suffix -mas (and its nominal counterpart des) to the allocutive agreement in Basque saying that addressee honorifics in Japanese are triggered by the hearer in the same way as the Basque allocutive. The allocative case and -mas require the speaker to be aware of their relationship with the addressee and hence includes information regarding the addressee and cannot be embedded. Both the allocutive in Basque (8a, b) and -mas (9) cannot occur in embedded complements.

(8) a. Ez dinat nahi [gerta dakion]
   NEG AUX.1E.ALLOfem want happen 3A.AUX.3D.COMP
   ‘I don’t want it to happen to him.’ (said to a woman)

   b. *Ez dinat nahi [gerta diakionan]
   NEG AUX.1E.ALLOfem want happen 3A.AUX.3D.ALLOfem.COMP

   (Miyagawa 2012. pp.83)

(9) Hanako-wa [dare-ga kuru/#ki-mas-u ka] sitte i-mas-u.
   Hanako-TOP who-NOM come/come-MAS-PRES Q know MAS-PRES
   ‘Hanako knows who is coming.’

   (Miyagawa 2012. pp. 89)

Important to note is that while the allocutive is prohibited from occurring in relative clauses, -mas is not.

(10) Watasi-wa mizu-tama-moyoo-no ari-mas-u kami-ga hos-i
    1SING-TOP polka dots exist-MAS-PRES paper-NOM want
    to omoi-mas-u.
    COMP think-MAS-PRES
    ‘I want the paper with polka dots.’

    (Miyagawa 2012. pp. 89)
Given that the Korean speech style particles, Japanese -*mas and Basque allocutive all seem to be restricted from occurring in embedded clauses by syntactic restriction, Pak states the following generalisation: A politeness feature expressing discourse related information cannot occur in embedded contexts. This brings up the problem of subject honorification. Subject honorifics express discourse related information just the same way as addressee honorifics and are syntactically represented the same way through both inflections and lexical items. Still, while addressee honorifics are prohibited subject honorifics can be freely embedded. Pak explains this by claiming that addressee honorification is located high in the CP domain while subject honorification is located further down, in the TP. Since there is nothing hindering honorifics from occurring in the TP, subject honorifics can be freely embedded. Miyagawa (2012) states that the allocutive is not only prohibited in embedded clauses but in matrix interrogative clauses as well.

(11) a. Lan egiten duia hire lagunak?
    work AUX.3E.Q your friend.ERG
    ‘Does your friend work?’ (said to a woman)

    b. *Lan egiten dina hire lagunak?
       work AUX.3E.ALLOFEM.Q your friend.ERG
       (Miyagawa 2012. pp. 89)

This suggests that the allocutive cannot occur along with a lexical complementizer, suggesting that allocutive agreement and complementizers are in complementary distribution with each other. Following Miyagawa’s arguments that Japanese -*mas is a form of allocutive agreement Pak suggests the following modification:

Politeness information relating to the discourse participants, i.e., the speaker and addressee as well as the referent of the of the subject and their relationship, cannot occur in the embedded CP domain. (pp.148)

This generalisation very well describes the syntactic constraints on honorifics in embedded complement clauses but does not try to describe or explain the occurrence of addressee honorifics in other subordinate environments. Further it doesn’t explain why politeness features cannot be encoded in the CP domain.
2.5 Hypotheses

Based on the previous research described, two hypotheses can be drawn regarding the distribution of honorifics in dependent clauses.

(12) Hypothesis 1

Honorifics are limited by their syntactic qualities. Honorific distribution in dependent clauses is governed by the specific syntactic nature of each honorific. Honorifics are in complementary distribution with complementizers and subordinators as they compete for the same syntactic slot in the clause. The distribution differs not based on addressee or referent honorifics but between lexical items and affixation.

(13) Hypothesis 2

Honorifics are governed by their pragmatic function. Dependent clauses are pragmatically further distanced from the conversation in which the honorifics are triggered. Distribution differs between addressee and referent honorification and is not affected by their morphosyntactic qualities.

3 Method

For this study a questionnaire was used to investigate the distribution of honorifics in dependent clauses. Two separate versions of the questionnaire were made for Japanese and Korean respectively. The questionnaire was constructed using Google Forms and was posted on Facebook in groups targeted at native Japanese and Korean speakers. It was also spread by friends and family through other online messaging services. Participants were not required to have a Google login to complete the form.

3.1 Participants

A total of 7 Japanese participants and 5 Korean participants filled in the complete form. Unfortunately, 1 of the Japanese participants answers were not complete and they had to be excluded from the study.

All participants were required to be native speakers of Korean or Japanese and to have been raised in Korea or Japan. The participant’s ages ranged from 20-57 for the Japanese participants and from 26-30 for the Korean participants. Participants were required to give
their age, education, sex, and city of birth. This was to see if the perception of honorifics would differ between people of different background. Because of the small number of participants, no real generalisations can be drawn from the sociolinguistic data collected but it will still be interesting and important to have when analysing the answers.

3.2 Structure

Prior to participation all participants read through a page of informed consent and were required to agree to the stated terms of participation before continuing with the survey. This included that their contribution was used for research purposes and that it might be published on the Lund university website for the public. Participants were made known that all contributions were anonymous and that they could exit and quit the survey at any point in time.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The initial part included reading a short text and filling in the gaps with the appropriate word, particle or nothing at all. The purpose of this task was to test if participants used honorifics in dependent and subordinate clauses when given the option to choose the form for themselves. It was hypothesised that while honorifics might be accepted in dependent clauses they are not used to any significant extent and this section was constructed to test this hypothesis. The blanks included opportunities for both addressee honorifics and subject honorifics to be filled in.

The second section included acceptability judgement of 55 sentences for the Japanese questionnaire and 35 sentences for the Korean questionnaire. Participants read a sentence and were asked the following questions about it:

1. How grammatically correct is this sentence? Please rate if from 1-5 with 1 being grammatically incorrect and 5 being perfectly correct. If you rate it 3 or less, please write the reason.

2. What kind of person would use this sentence?

The first question addressed whether the construction was acceptable and possible. From the results of question one an analysis of in which dependent clauses honorifics are permitted can be made. Question 2 was included to get the participants view of the usability of the sentence. If participants can imagine a person using the sentence than it is very likely that this construction is more common and more natural than if they had trouble imagining the speaker. The result of this question will not be presented separately, it was instead used to better understand the scores and comments on question 1.
3.3 Content

For the first task, a few dependent clauses were chosen and two short narratives for each language was written in collaboration with a native speaker of each respective language. The first narrative written for the Japanese survey included one relative clause, one reason clause with *kara*, one reason clause with *tame*, and two conditional clauses, adding up to a total of 5 blanks. The second text included two relative clauses, two complement clauses with the complementizer *-to* explicitly written, one reason clause with *kara* and one conditional clause, in total of 6 blanks. For the Korean survey, the first text included four nominal particle blanks, one *-se* reason clause, one relative clause, one complement clause, and one *-myen* conditional clause, in total 8 blanks. The second text included three relative clauses, three nominal particle blanks, one *-myen* conditional clause, one *-se* reason clause, and one complement clause, in total 9 blanks. In addition to this there were one blank in a main clause in text one and two blanks in two different main clauses in text two as distraction.

Both narratives were set in a cooperative environment, the first one being a receptionist speaking to a guest at a company, the other a conversation between a CEO and their secretary. They were styled similarly to a manuscript with both characters’ lines being clearly marked in the beginning showing who was speaking. This was to create an environment where participants were encouraged to use both subject honorifics and addressee honorifics.

For the study, a wide collection of addressee and subject honorifics were selected and inserted into different dependent clauses. For the Korean questionnaire the two addressee honorific speech levels in common usage were chosen, namely the polite and formal speech levels mentioned in section 2.2. Subject honorific suffix *–si* as well as subject honorific verb *gyeysita* (to be) were chosen to see if the distribution is affected by morphosyntactic qualities rather than honorific categories. In sentences containing *–si* both a version containing the honorifics particle *kkeyse* and plain nominal particle *ka* were chosen to test the supposed agreement between these. *Kkeyse* was also tested without *–si* to test the reverse conditions.

For Japanese the honorific suffix *-mas* along with lexical item *itasu* represented addressee honorification. For subject honorification *o-verb stem-ni naru*, honorific suffix *-rare*, and honorific verb *irrasyaru* were chosen. Object honorifics were excluded from the study in both languages to decrease the number of questions in the survey. Since object honorifics are limited in Korean, I argued that they would not provide sufficient data to compare the two languages.
The dependent clauses tested included relative clauses, adverbial reason clauses, complement clauses and conditional clauses. For Japanese two different conditional clauses were chosen to see if the syntactic structure of the clause affects the applicability of honorifics. The conditional clauses in question were -tara clauses and -ba clauses. -tara clauses bear a morphological similarity to the past tense inflection -ta that could affect the applicability of honorifics in this specific clause. -ba was chosen as a control clause to test this theory.

4 Result Japanese

Considering the low number of participants, showcasing the result via statistical representation would be unfitting. When compiling the result, it also quickly became clear that the participants took context to play a big role in their judgement of the sentences. The participants’ comments often gave better clues towards the acceptability of the of honorification occurring in subordinate environments rather than their scores on the numbered scale. Hence, the result of the second task is presented first in a table showcasing whether participants judged the occurrence of a particular honorific in the different dependent clauses to be accepted or not based on combined data from their scores and comments. This is followed by a more detailed description of their scoring and comments. Since the first task, filling in blanks, consists of evidence supporting the result of task two it will be presented after task two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Adressee honorific -mas, itasu</th>
<th>Subject honorific o- stem ni naru, -rare</th>
<th>Subject honorific irassyaru</th>
<th>No honorific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional -tara</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional -ba</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason clause</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement clause</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.1. Summary of the result of the Japanese survey.
The table describes the relations between different honorifics and the different dependent clauses tested. The majority of participants judged occurrences of subject honorification to be acceptable to certain degrees. However, whether the honorific form or the non-honorific was preferred is largely dependent on context. Participants noted that they had trouble understanding the context of the sentences and could not judge whether the honorification was appropriate or fitting in some cases. This study does not aim to further this point, since it is mainly concerned with if honorification is allowed to occur or not. Any details concerning the question whether the occurrence of an honorific in the dependent clause affects the formality or politeness of the utterance is left for future research.

Hereby follows an explanation for the different combinations.

4.1 Relative clauses

The relative clauses tested for addressee honorification are presented below. Addressee honorific -mas will henceforth be represented in the gloss by MAS, other addressee honorifics by AH. Subject honorification is represented by SH, and honorification that falls outside of these categories by HON. A few cases of object honorification also appear and they have been glossed OH.

Firstly, I will explain the structure of a relative clause in Japanese. Relative clauses in Japanese are not marked by any overt subordinators. Instead they are expressed through word order where the relative clause is placed directly to the left of the head noun.

(14) a. Kotira-wa wagasya-ga hatubai si-mas-u sinseihin this-TOP our.company-NOM sale do-MAS-PRES new.product des-u AH.COP-PRES

b. kotira-wa wagasya-ga hatubai itas-u sinseihin this-TOP our.company-NOM sale AH.do-PRES new.product des-u AH.COP-PRES

c. kotira-wa wagasya-ga hatubai itasi-mas-u sinseihin this-TOP our.company-NOM sale AH.do-MAS-PRES new.product des-u AH.COP-PRES
d. kotira-wa wagasya-ga hatbain sur-u sinseihin des-u
   this-TOP our.company-NOM sale do-PRES new.product AH.COP.PRES
   ‘This is the new product that our company will release’

Sentences (14a) and (14c) containing two different kinds of addressee honorification, morphological -mas- and lexical itas-, were both ranked 4 or above by the majority of the participants. Two participants, one for (14a) and one for (14c) ranked the sentence lower and commented that they preferred the plain form suru. Two other participants, one for each sentence, ranked it 3 without an explanation. This is likely to be for the same reason as the other lower ranking participants. Sentence (14b) received a 3 from most participants with comments that they preferred the form itasimasu. The two participants that ranked it lower than 3 said they preferred the form suru. This can be explained by the fact that itasu is a verb and any verb will naturally trigger -mas conjugation when respect is paid to the addressee, regardless if the verb already has inherent honorific qualities or not. The control sentence (14d) received a rank of 4 or above by all participants and can therefore be considered the standard form.

Subject honorifics in relative clauses behave in similar ways to addressee honorifics.

(15) a. butyoo-ga raisyuu o-kaeri-ni nar-u yotei des-u
    manager-NOM next.week HON-return-SH-PRES schedule AH.COP-PRES
b. butyoo-ga raisyuu kaer-u yotei des-u
    manager-NOM next.week return-PRES schedule AH.COP-PRES
   ‘The manager is scheduled to return next week’

(16) a. kore-wa totemo yuumeina sakka-ga kaka-rare-ta hon des-u
    this-TOP very famous author-NOM write-SH-PST book AH.COP-PRES
b. kore-wa totemo yuumeina sakka-ga kai-ta hon
    this-TOP very famous author-NOM write-PST book des-u
    AH.COP-PRES
   ‘This is a book written by a very famous author’

(17) a. kaisy-a irassya-r-i o-kyaku-sama-he-no o-sirase
    office-at SH.come/be/go-PRES HON.guest-SH-to HON.notice des-u
    AH.COP-PRES
b. kaisya-ni kur-u o-kyaku-sama\textsuperscript{4}-he-no o-sirase des-u
   office-at come-PRES HON-guest-SH-to HON-notice AH.COP-PRES
   ‘This is a notice for guests coming to the office’

Sentences (15a), (16a) and (17a) all received high scores by all participants. The control sentence (15b) received slightly lower rankings compared to (15a), giving reason to assume (15a) might be a more appropriate form. This is similarly reflected in sentences (17a) and (17b), where (17a) received higher scores than (17b). See footnote for further comments on sentence (17b). None of the participants judged the presence of referent honorification in relative clauses to be ungrammatical but for sentence (16a) one participant commented that they would have preferred to use the forms sakka-san or sakka-sama and subsequently rated the sentence 3. The control sentence (16b) received scores above 4 from all participants. Sentences (16a) and (16b) therefore seem to be equally common, and that its presence of -san or -sama that affects whether the honorific form is preferred or not.

This shows that in an honorific context, both non-honorific and addressee honorifics are generally acceptable in a relative clause, regardless of whether this is lexically or morphologically realized, the only exception being a mismatch between the choice of the lexical honorific itasu and the plain form of the verb. The agreement between subject and subject honorification appears to be similar to the main clause, evident by participants ranking (15a) and (17a) higher than the control sentences.

4.2 Conditional clauses

The survey examined two different kinds of conditional clauses in Japanese, -tara clauses and -ba clauses. The -tara subordinator appears on the surface to incorporate the past tense morpheme -ta. -tara clauses cover the entire conditional spectrum and could be considered the most general conditional clause in Japanese. -ba clauses are limited to describing instances of natural correlation between events and hypothetical situations.

(18) a. kaisya-ni renraku si-masi-tara jikan no yakusoku-o
   office-to contact do-MAS-TARA time POS promise-OBJ
   kime-rare-mas-u
decide-POT-MAS-PRES

\textsuperscript{4} The word kyaku, guest/customer, is seldom used without the honorific construction o-kyaku-sama. To avoid participants rating the sentence lower because of the usage of a non-standard form I chose to use the standard honorific form even in the control sentence. The inherent honorific connotations of using o-kyaku-sama is a likely reason for participants preferring the sentence with honorific marking on the relative verb as well.
b. kaisy-a renraku itasi-tara jikan no yakusoku-o
   office-to contact AH.do-TARA time POS promise-OBJ
   kime-rare.mas-u
decide-POT-MAS-PRES

c. kaisy-a renraku itasi-masi-tara jikan no yakusoku-o
   office-to contact AH.do-MAS-TARA time POS promise-OBJ
   kime-rare.mas-u
decide-POT-MAS-PRES

d. kaisy-a renraku si-tara jikan no yakusoku-o kime-rare-mas-u
   office-to contact do-TARA time-POS promise-OBJ decide-POT-MAS-PRES

‘If you contact the office you can book a meeting’

Addressee honorific -mas seems to be perfectly acceptable in -tara clauses. Participants did
not give either (18a),(18b), (18c) or (18d) any high scores, but from their comments it can be
concluded that this was because they had trouble understanding the context of the sentence
rather than that the presence of the addressee honorification. One participant for sentence
(18b) commented that they would have preferred the form si-masi-tara from sentence (18a).
Another participant for (18b) wanted to use itasi-masi-tara from sentence (18c). For sentence
(18c) one participant corrected the sentence with the word itadake-masi-tara ‘to receive’, the
object honorific potential form of the verb ‘to receive’. From the comments we can clearly see
that there is nothing prohibiting addressee honorification from occurring in -tara clauses.

When we instead look at -ba clauses the result looks very different. Most participants
agreed that any instance of -mas plus -ba was ungrammatical in modern speech, both
simaseba and itasimaseba were rated 2 or less by the majority of the participants. Two
participants noted that simaseba and itasimaseba sounded like ancient speech, one participant
saying it was no longer in use and another saying it sounded like it belonged in a samurai
movie. Interestingly enough, itaseba, although very syntactically equal to a plain form verb,
received the same low scores. One participant commented specifically on itaseba saying it
‘feels weird’. It can therefore be concluded that -maseba and itaseba are not considered
grammatical in modern standard Japanese.

    manager-to contact do-MAS-BA approval-OBJ receive-POT-MAS-PRES
b. *butyoo-ni renraku itase-ba syoonin-o uke-rare-mas-u manager-to contact AH.do-BA approval-OBJ receive-POT-MAS-PRES
d. butyoo-ni renraku sure-ba syoonin-o uke-rare-mas-u manager-to contact do-BA approval-OBJ receive-POT-MAS-PRES
‘If you contact the manager you can get approval’

Subject honorifics in *-tara clauses were ranked the same as the control sentences, consistently ranking 4 or above with occasional comments from the participants on matters not related to honorification.

(20) a. butyoo-ga o-dekake-ni nat-tara watsi-tati doo si-mas-u ka manager-NOM HON-go.outside-SH-TARA we how do-MAS-PRES Q
b. butyoo-ga dekaket-tara watsi-tati doo si-mas-u ka manager-NOM go.outside-TARA 3PLU how do-MAS-PRES Q
‘What will we do if the manager leaves?’
(21) a. butyoo-ga syuttyoo-ni ika-re-tara watsi-tati doo si-mas-u ka manager-NOM business.trip-to go-SH-TARA 3PLU how do-MAS-PRES Q
b. butyoo-ga syuttyoo-ni it-tara watsi-tati doo si-mas-u ka manager-NOM business.trip-to go-TARA 3PLU how do-MAS-PRES Q
‘What will we do if the manager goes on a business trip?’
(22) a. butyoo-ga kaisya-ni irassyat-tara watsi-tati sinpai sinakute mo manager-NOM office-at SH.come-TARA 3PLU worry do-NEG even ii des-u good AH.COP-PRES
b. butyoo-ga kaisya-ni ki-tara watsi-tati sinpai sinakute mo manager-NOM office-at come-TARA 3PLU worry do-NEG even ii des-u good AH.COP-PRES
‘If the manager comes to the office we don’t have to worry’
Once again o-kyaku-sama seemed to trigger a stricter honorific agreement where all participants preferred the sentence with irassyaru over the one with kuru.

(23) a. o-kyaku-sama-ga tyokusetu kaisya-ni irassyat-tara kotira5-de HON-guest-SH-NOM directly office-to SH.come-TARA here-INST o-tetudai-si-mas-u HON-help-OH-MAS-PRES

b. o-kyaku-sama-ga tyokusetu kaisya-ni ki-tara kotira-de HON-guest-SH-NOM directly office-to come-TARA we-INST o-tetudai-si-mas-u HON-help-OH-MAS-PRES

‘If you come directly to the office, we will help you here’

Subject honorifics in -ba conditional clauses behave the same way as in -tara clauses. The discord previously observed with addressee honorifics is completely lacking and subject honorifics are allowed in both conditional clauses. Sentences (24a) and (24b) are ranked similarly to control sentence 24c, although there seems to be a slight preference for (24a) and (24c) over (24b). (24b) was ranked 3 by one participant with the comment that they prefer sentence (24a).


b. butyoo-ga modo-rarere-ba sigoto-ga raku-ni nari-mas-u manager-NOM return-SH-BA job-NOM easy-DAT become-MAS-PRES

c. butyoo-ga modore-ba sigoto-ga raku-ni nari-mas-u manager-NOM return-BA job-NOM easy-DAT become-MAS-PRES

‘If the manager returns [our] work will become easier’

Sentence (25a) was ranked slightly higher than 25b, likely because the double honorification of o-ai dekimasu in the main clause triggers a stricter honorific agreement.

(25) a. butyoo-ga irassyare-ba o-ai deki-mas-u ka manager-NOM SH.be/come-BA HON-meeting do.POT-MAS-PRES Q

5 ‘kotira is a deictic expression meaning ‘here’ but it is also used as a pronoun referring to oneself or one’s group.'
‘If the manager is in, could [I] see them?’ or
‘If the manager comes, could [I] meet them?’

b. butyoo-ga kore-ba o-ai deki-mas-u ka
   manager-NOM come-B A HON-meeting do.POT-MAS-PRES Q
   ‘If the manager comes, could [I] see them?’

The result shows that there is a clear divide between -tara clauses and -ba clauses and between addressee honorifics and subject honorifics. Subject honorifics is accepted in both -tara and -ba clauses while addressee honorification in -tara clauses is acceptable, but not in -ba clauses regardless of their lexical or morphological realization. Addressee honorification in -tara clauses appear to be very context dependent, as participants commented that they had trouble ranking the sentence because they did not have a clear grasp on the context. From participants comments of (19a) and (19c) it can be observed that addressee honorification used to be acceptable in -ba clauses in historical Japanese but has dropped out of use in modern Japanese.

4.3 Adverbial ‘reason’ clauses

The reason clause tested by the survey were ‘kara’ clauses. These are clauses headed by the subordinator particle kara. There seems to be an overall strong acceptance for honorification in this clause. Sentence (26a) was ranked high by half of the participants, receiving scores above 4, and ranked low by the other half with comments that simasu kara was not an appropriate way to address a guest. They did not comment saying that simasu kara was unacceptable, just unfitting for the very honourable subject o-kyaku-sama. One participant commented that they wanted to use the construction itasimasu node instead. no is a nominalizer that in combination with particle de forms an adverbial subordinator also describing reason. It is considered slightly more formal than kara. All participants subsequently preferred and ranked (26c) high. As observed in previous clauses types sentence (26b) where itasu appears without -mas was ranked low by all participants with comments that they wanted to say itasimasu.

(26) a. kotira-kara renraku si-mas-u kara o-kyaku-sama-wa
     HUM.here-from contact do-MAS-PRES KARA HON-guest-AH-TOP
     koko-de o-matī kudasai
     here HON-wait please
b. kotira-kara renraku itas-u kara o-kyaku-sama-wa
   HUM. here-from contact AH. do-PRES KARA HON-guest-SH-TOP here
   koko-de o-mati kudasai
   here HON-wait please

c. kotira-kara renraku itasi-mas-u kara o-kyaku-sama-wa
   HUM. here-from contact AH. do-MAS-PRES KARA HON-guest-SH-TOP
   koko-de o-mati kudasai
   here HON-wait please

d. kotira-kara renraku sur-u kara o-kyaku-sama-wa
   HUM. here-from contact do-PRES KARA HON-guest-SH-TOP
   koko-de o-mati kudasai
   here HON-wait please

Control sentence (26d) was ranked low by half of the participants with comments that they wanted to use a more honorific form. This was likely triggered by the honourable qualities of the word *o-kyaku-sama*.

Subject honorifics were accepted by all participants in the tested reason clauses.

Sentence (27a) was ranked above 4 by all participants except one who commented that they preferred an alternative construction, *naru-tame*, rather than *naru-kara*. The *-tame* construction is an alternative ‘reason’ construction with few differences from the *-kara* clause.

Overall there were no comments on the occurrence of referent honorific forms in any of the sentences tested.

(27) a. butyoo-ga kyoo-kara o-yasumi-ni nar-u kara sigoto-ga
    managers-NOM today-from HON-rest-SH-PRES KARA job-NOM
    taihen-ni nari-mas-u
    hard-DAT become-MAS-PRES

b. butyoo-ga kyoo-kara yasum-u kara sigoto-ga taihen-ni
    managers-NOM today-from rest-PRES KARA job-NOM hard-DAT
    nari-mas-u
    become-MAS-PRES

   ‘Because the manager will go on vacation from today [our] work will become challenging’

Sentence (28a) was ranked 4 by three participants and 3 by the rest. One of the participants who ranked the sentence lower commented that they preferred the construction *omotte*
orareru, the progressive case construction of omou. Important to note is that even in their correction they used the honorific -rare suffix, omotte orareru, and as such the low scores seems not to be because of the presence of honorification, but rather the sentence at whole. Other participants did not offer explanations for their scores.

(28) a. butyoo-ga soo omow-are-ru kara watsi-tati-ga soo sur-u manager-NOM that think-SH-PRES KARA 3PLU-NOM that do-PRES koto sika deki-mas-en thing except do.POT-MAS-NEG
b. butyoo-ga soo omo-u kara watsi-tati-ga soo sur-u manager-NOM that think-PRES KARA 3PLU-NOM that do-PRES koto sika deki-mas-en thing except do.POT-MAS-NEG

‘Because the manager thinks so we have no choice but to do so was well’

Once again two participants commented that sentence (29b) was not of appropriately polite and ranked the sentence 3. All participants except one ranked sentence (29a) 4 or above. The single participant who ranked sentence (29a) 2 did not offer any explanation for the low score.

(29) a. butyoo-ga irassyar-u kara watasi-wa ika-nakute-mo ii manager-NOM SH.go-PRES KARA 1SING-TOP go-NEG good des-u AH.COP-PRES
b. butyoo-ga ik-u kara watasi-wa ika-nakute-mo ii manager-NOM go-PRE KARA 1SING-TOP go-NEG good des-u AH.COP-PRES

‘Because the manager will go it’s okay if I don’t go’

From the result it is evident that both addressee honorific and subject honorifics are accepted in kara clauses, with no differences between lexical items, affixes or morphological constructions. The honorific agreement apparent in the main clause also applies to honorifics in kara clauses, as visible in participants judgement of sentences (29a), and (26d), but as the majority of participants also accepted utterances without honorifics it appears more less strict.
4.4 Complement clauses

Complement clauses in Japanese are headed by the complementizer to. Since direct quotations also use to the verb omou ‘to think’ was chosen to stand in the main clause to separate the sentences from a direct quotation.

Addressee honorification in complement clauses was considered ungrammatical by all participants. This restriction seems to not only prohibit -mas, but lexical itasu as well. Participants ranked sentence (30b) with scores of 2 or lower. One participant explained that itasu was wrong in this context while another added the correction that suru to was the correct construction. Participants all ranked control sentence (30d) a score of 4 or above.

The same restrictions that apply to addressee honorifics seem to not apply to subject honorifics. Sentences (31a), (32a) and (33a) were all ranked high with minimal differences to the control sentences. One participant seemed to prefer sentence (33b) over (33a) ranking them with a one point difference.

(30) a. *tyokusetu kaisya-ni renraku si-mas-u to omoi-mas-u
directly office-to contact do-MAS-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
b. *tyokusetu kaisya-ni renraku itas-u to omoi-mas-u
directly office-to contact AH.do-MAS-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
c. *tyokusetu kaisya-ni renraku itasi-mas-u to omoi-mas-u
directly office-to contact AH.do-MAS-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
d. tyokusetu kaisya-ni renraku sur-u to omoi-mas-u
‘I think I’ll contact the office directly’

(31) a. butyoo-ga asita o-kaeri-ni nar-u to omoi-mas-u
manager-NOM tomorrow HON-return-SH-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
b. butyoo-ga asita kaer-u to omoi-mas-u
manager-NOM tomorrow return-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
‘I think the manager will return tommorow’

(32) a. butyoo-mo soo omowa-rer-u to omoi-mas-u
manager-too so think-SH-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
b. butyoo-mo soo omo-u to omoi-mas-u
manager-too so think-PRES COMP think-MAS-PRES
I believe the manager thinks the same way’

(33) a. syatoyo-ga genzai tyuugoku-ni irasshar-u to company-president-NOM currently china-in SH-be-PRES COMP
    omoi-mas-u
    think-MAS-PRES

b. syatoyo-ga genzai tyuugoku-ni ir-u to company-president-NOM currently china-in be-PRES COMP
    omoi-mas-u
    think-MAS-PRES

‘I think that the company president is currently in China’

Here, the same discord between addressee honorification and subject honorification as observed in conditional -ba clauses is once again evident; addressee honorification is blocked in complement clauses. Both morphological -mas and lexical item itasu are treated as unacceptable by the participants. This is likely to be the result of the honorific qualities of itasu requiring -mas to sound natural. This strong agreement between itasu and -mas can be viewed throughout all sentences.

4.5 Result task 1

In the two short texts of task 1, the first text had a total of 4 blank spaces for the participants to fill in. These included one relative clause, one reason clause with kara, one reason clause with tame, and one complement clause. The second text included two relative clauses, two complement clauses with the complementizer -to explicitly written, one reason clause with kara and one conditional clause, adding up to a total of 6 blanks.

Only 5 out of the 6 participants completed this task. The result is judged on whether a participant used some kind of honorification, addressee honorifics or subject honorifics in subordinate environments when asked to supply words on their own. Out of the five that answered three used some kind of honorification in the kara clause in the first text. Object honorific mairu ‘to go, visit’ was used once, humble oru ‘to be [at a location], exist’ once, and addressee honorific imasu once. Three participants also used honorification in the similar tame clause where object honorific o-ai suru was used thrice, and object honorific ukagau ‘to ask’ was used once. Notably only two participants used honorification in both the kara clause and the tame clause simultaneously despite their similarity. All participants used some kind of
honorification in the conditional clause, but only two used conditional subordinators, the other reinterpreting the sentences completely. Those who chose conditional -ba used object honorific itadakere-ba ‘to recive’. One participant reinterpreted the sentence with itasi-masita-node, making it an adverbial clause but still using addressee honorific itasu, and two participants used subject honorific kudasai ‘please [give to me]’, instead choosing to break the utterance into two. In the relative clause no one used honorification.

In the second text, four participants used honorifics in the first relative clause, but only one participant used honorification in the second relative clause. No participants used honorifics in the first complement clause, but two used subject honorific verbs in the second one, choosing irassyara-nai ‘to not be [at a location]’. Four participants used honorification in the kara clause, irassayaru occurring twice and imasu twice as well, and four participants used honorifics in the conditional clause, including both variants of subject honorific o-modori-ni naru and modo-rare-ru ‘to return’.

The result shows that subject honorific, object honorific and addressee honorifics are all used in subordinate environments, as the majority of participants used honorifics. Notably, only one participant used honorifics in all blanks, all others mixed honorific and non-honorific forms. That declining use of honorifics in the second relative clause compared to the first in text two could indicate that honorification is less necessary closer to the main clause, but since this is falsified by the reverse result in the two complement clauses it is likely to be based on context rather than syntax.

5 Result Korean

The Korean result is here presented the same way as the Japanese result. The Korean participants did not comment on the context to the same extent that the Japanese participants did. Still, their comments played a valuable role in determining whether their score was based on the honorification or on other factors.

The full result of the Korean survey is summarised in the following table. Below follows an explanation of the result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific Clause type</th>
<th>Addresser honorific -yo</th>
<th>Addressee honorific -supnita</th>
<th>Subject honorific -kkeyse, -(u)si, kyeysita</th>
<th>No honorific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td>* (OK in utterance final position)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional clause</td>
<td>* (OK in utterance final position)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason clause</td>
<td>* (OK in utterance final position)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement clause</td>
<td>* (OK in utterance final position)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Summary of the result of the Korean Survey.

Korean addressee honorification is completely blocked in any dependent clause tested in this study. All sentences containing the addressee honorific -supnita in a dependent clause were ranked 1 or 2 by all participants. Polite speech style addressee honorific -yo also received the same low scores in all but one instance.


‘Professor, did you read the thesis I’m writing?’

(35) a. *kyoswu-nim, swukcey-lul ihay mos ha-myen-yo professor-SH, homework-OBJ understanding NEG.POT do-COND-PLT yenlak hay-to tway-yo?

   contact do-even okay-PLT?

   b. *kyoswu-nim, swukcey-lul ihay mos professor-SH, homework-OBJ understanding NEG.POT ha-pnita-myen-yo yenlak hay-to tway-yo?

   do-FRM-COND-PLT contact do-even okay-PLT?
‘Professor, is it okay to contact you if I can’t understand the homework?’

    Minjeong-SH-NOM that problem-OBJ good solve-PST-DC.PLN-COMP-PLT
    seyngkakhay-yo.
    think-PLT

b. * mincing-ssi-ga    ku mwuncey-lul cal
    Minjeong-SH-NOM that problem-OBJ
    haygyelhey-ss-supnita-ko-    sayngkakhay-yo
    solve-SH-PST-FRM-COMP-    think-PLT
    ‘[I] think Minjeong solved the problem really nicely.’

Addressee honorific -yo were ranked high in one instance, namely in the reason clause. Even though it is generally known and accepted that addressee honorification cannot occur in dependent clauses in Korean only two participants found sentence (37) to be incorrect. There seems to be something that allows polite suffix -yo to co-occur with adverbial marker -se.

(37) kyo swu-nim cey-ka swukey-lul cal ihay mos
    professor-SH 1SING.NOM homework-OBJ good understanding NEG.POT
    hay-se-yo haykyel-to mos hay-ss-eyo
    do-SE-PLT solving-also NEG.POT do-PST-PLT
    ‘Professor, I couldn’t do the homework because I couldn’t understand it.’

My own experiences with the Korean language had led me to believe that polite suffix -yo is allowed to co-occur with dependent marking as long as it occurs in the end of the utterance. Therefore, I included such sentences in this survey. In (38) I have extracted the reason clause and placed it in the end in a separate utterance.

(38) kyo swu-nim, cey-ka swukey-lul haykyel mos hay-ss-eyo.
    professor-SH 1SING-NOM homework-OBJ solving NEG.POT do-PST-PLT.
    cal ihay mos hay-se-yo.
    good understanding NEG.POT do-SE-PLT
    ‘Professor, I couldn’t solve the homework. [It was] because I couldn’t understand it.’

This sentence was ranked 4 or above by all but one participant proving that -yo can co-occur with dependent marking as long as it upholds its place as utterance final. The same pattern is visible in complement clauses and conditional clauses as well. All participants except one ranked (39) and (40) a score of 4 or above.
Minjeong-SH-NOM that problem-OBJ good solve-PST-DC.PLN-COMP-PLT
‘[I think/I heard] that Minjeong solved the problem really well.’

(40) kyoswu-nim, yenlakhay-to tway-yo? Swukcey-lul ihay
professor-SH, contact-even okay-PLT? homework-OBJ understanding
mos ha-myen-yo.
NEG.POT do-COND-PLT
‘Professor, is it okay to contact you? If I can’t understand the homework’

Even though (39) and (40) were ranked high the same sentences with the dependent clause placed at its standard place in the utterance were considered incorrect, as visible in (35a) and (36a). Since (39) and (40) were considered acceptable but not (35a) and (36a) the likely reason for participants ranking (37) high is that they perceived the sentence to be two separate utterances⁶.

5.1 Relative clauses

Korean relative clauses are headed by relativizers incorporating tense and aspect qualities, -n for past tense, -nun for present tense, -l for future tense and -ten for past tense habitual aspect.

Subject honorification in relative clauses were accepted by all participants. Sentence (41a) received a score of 5 by all participants except one who ranked it 4. Control sentence (41b) received the exact same scoring. No participants commented on the use of the plain non-honorific nominal particle -i instead of honorific nominal particle -kkeyse, nor on the lack of subject honorification in the main clause of sentence 40a.

(41) a. ku yumyenganh chayk-ul ssu-si-n cakka-nim-i seyrowun
that famous book-OBJ write-SH-REL author-SH-NOM new
chayk-ul ssuko-iss-eyo
book-OBJ write-PROG-PLT

⁶ In Korean online writing there is a tendency to drop punctuation and spacing between words, it is not rare to come across complete texts without punctuation. Readers then have to parse between utterances on their own. It is therefore not unlikely that the participants perceived (35) as two utterances despite my intention for it to be a single utterance.
b. ku yumyenghan chayk-ul ssu-n cakka-nim-i seyrowun chayk-ul that famous book-OBJ write-REL author-SH-NOM new book-OBJ ssuko-iss-eyo write-PROG-PLT
‘The author who wrote that famous book is writing a new book.’

Sentence (42a) was scored 2 by one participant who preferred sentence (42b) but received scores above 4 from the other participants. For sentence (42a) one participants commented on the lack of subject honorifics in the main clause, adding their own corrected version (42b), but did not comment on the use of -i. For control sentence (42c) all participants ranked the sentence high but two commented on the lack of honorifics in the main clause.

c. haywoy-ey sal-ko-iss-ten buchang-nim-i nayil torao-keyey-yo abroad-at live-PROG-REL manager-SH-NOM tomorrow return-FUT-PLT
‘The manager who lived abroad is returning tomorrow.’

The result shows that subject honorification is acceptable in relative clauses regardless if it is realized lexically or morphologically. The lack of comments on the use of -i over -keye shows that the honorific agreement between the elements in the relative clause and the elements in the main clause is not as strong as between different elements in the main clause.

5.2 Conditional clauses

Conditional clauses in Korean are headed by subordinator -myen placed after tense inflection on the verb.
(43) a. ku cakka-nim-i seyrowun cheyk-ul ssu-si-myen te that author-SH-NOM new book-OBJ write-SH-COND more yumyenghaycil-keyey-yo become.famous-FUT-PLT


c. ku cakka-nim-i seyrowun cheyk-ul ssu-myen te that author-SH-NOM new book-OBJ write-COND more yumyenghaycil-keyey-yo become.famous-FUT-PLT

‘If that author writes another book, they will become even more famous.’

(44) a. sacang-nim-i samwusil-ey kyeysi-myen paro ceki-ey company-president-SH-NOM office-at SH.be-COND right.away there-to ka-keyss-supnita go-FUT-FRM

b. sacang-nim-kkeyse samwusil-ey kyeysi-myen paro company président-SH-SH.NOM office-at SH.be-COND right.away ceki-ey ka-keyss-supnita there-to go-FUT-FRM

c. sacang-nim-i samwusil-ey issu-myen paro ceki-ey company president-SH-NOM office-at be-COND right.away there-to ka-keyss-supnita go-FUT-FRM

‘If the company president is at the office [I] will go there right away.’

All participants accepted both (43a) and (44a), giving them scores of 4 or above. One participant commented on the use of -i in both (43a) and (44a) and explained that they wanted to use -kkeyse, preferring sentences (43b) and (44b). Control sentence (43c) received the same scores as sentence (43a). Two participants commented on the lack of honorification in control sentence (44c), preferring sentences (44a) and (44b).

This shows that subject honorification is allowed in conditional clauses with no regard to whether it is lexical or morphological. Compared to relative clauses one participant
commented on the use of -i over -kkeyse, this might suggest a stronger agreement between main clause and subordinate elements in conditional clauses. The comments on lacking honorification in the control sentence (44c), as well as (42c), shows that the honorific agreement between main clause elements is existent, but not strictly upheld.

5.3 Adverbial ‘reason’ clauses

Reason clauses in Korean are headed by the subordinator -se. This subordinator eliminates all tense inflection.

(45) a. cakka-nim-i acwu yeyppun mal-ul ssu-sye-se
   author-SH-NOM very beautiful words-OBJ write-SH-SE
   salam-tul-i motwu chayk-ul coahay-yo
   people-PLU-NOM everyone book-OBJ like-PLT

b. cakka-nim-i acwu yeyppun mal-ul ssu-se salam-tul-i
   author-SH-NOM very beautiful words-OBJ write-SE people-PL-NOM
   motwu chayk-ul coahay-yo
   everyone book-OBJ like-PLT
   ‘Because that author writes very beautifully everyone loves their book/s.’

Sentence (45a) received a score of 5 from two participants. One participant ranked it 4, commenting on the use of -i instead of -kkeyse and one ranked it 3 explaining that they did not understand the context. The final participant did not rank the sentence at all. Control sentence (45b) received two scores of 5 and two scores of 3, with one participant not answering. One of the participants ranking it 3 explained this was because of the lack of honorification in the adverbial clause specifically.

(46) a. bucang-nim-i cikum haywoy-ey kyeysye-se tasi torao-myen
   manager-SH-NOM now abroad-at SH.be-SE again return-when
   yenlakha-keyss-supnida contact-FUT-FRM

b. bucang-nim-kkeyse cikum haywoy-ey kyeysye-se tasi
   manager-SH-SH.NOM now abroad-at SH.be-SE again
   torao-si-myen yenlakha-keyss-supnida return-when contact-FUT-FRM
c. bucang-nim-i cikum haywoy-ey isse-se tasi toro-si-myen
    manager-SH-NOM now abroad-at be-SE again return-SH-when
    yenlakha-keyss-supnida
    contact-FUT-FRM

    ‘Because the manager is currently abroad [I] will contact you when they return.’

Three participants commented on the mismatch in honorification in sentence (46a), all of them explaining that the mismatch felt wrong and that they prefer a sentence such as (46b). No comments were made that indicated that the presence of the honorification itself felt out of place. Control sentence (46c) was ranked high by all participants. One participant, although giving (46c) a score of 5 seemed to imply that it felt off. Likely because of the complete lack of honorification outside of the title *bucang-nim*.

The participants’ comments show that subject honorifics in adverbial *-se* clauses exhibit some main clause behaviour. The two comments on mismatched honorifics in (45a) and lack of honorification in (45b), as well as multiple comments on sentence (46a) suggest that honorific agreement stretches between the subordinate and main clause but is not held in strict regard. From the preference of (46b) over (46a) compared to the very similar scores of (45a) and (45b) it is evident that honorific lexical items trigger slightly stronger agreement.

5.4 Complement clauses

Korean complement clauses are headed by the complementizer *-ko*. The complementizer is placed after tense inflection on the verb and can include embedded speech style particles not targeted at a specific addressee, such as the case with the declarative speech style particle *-ta*. Any other addressee targeted speech style particles such as the addressee honorific *-eyo* and *-supnita* cannot be embedded.

(47) a. sacang-nim-i ku mwuncey-lul cal
    company.president-SH-NOM that problem-OBJ good
    haygyelha-sye-ss-ta-ko sayngkakhay-yo
    solve-SH-PST-DCL.PLN-COMP think-PLT

b. sacang-nim-i ku mwuncey-lul cal
    company.president-SH-NOM that problem-OBJ good
    haygyelhay-ss-ta-ko sayngkakhay-yo
    solve-PST-DCL.PLN-COMP think-PLT
‘[I] think the president solved the problem very nicely.’

Both sentences (47a) and (47b) were ranked the same high score by all participates. One participant commented that the honorific context of control sentence (47b) did not match and preferred sentence (47a).

Similar results appeared for sentences (48a) and (48b). No participants commented on the occurrence of honorifics in the complement clause. One participant commented on the use of -i instead of -keyse in both sentences.

(48) a. kyoswu-nim-i tarun tayhakkyo-eyse
   professor-SH-NOM another university-at
   karuchiko-kyeysye-ss-ta-ko tule-ss-eyo
   teach-SH.PROG-PST-DC.PLN-COMP hear-PST-PLT

b. kyoswu-nim-i tarun tayhakkyo-eyse
   professor-SH-NOM another university-at
   karuchiko-isse-ss-ta-ko tule-ss-eyo
   teach-PROG-PST-DC.PLN-COMP hear-PST-PLT

‘I heard that the Professor used to teach at another university.’

The same acceptance for subject honorification observed in relative clauses, conditional clauses and adverbal clauses is visible in complement clauses. Subject honorification is accepted regardless of it’s lexical or morphological nature. A few comments on the honorific mismatch in (47b), (48a) and (48b) suggests traces of lingering honorific agreement but does not offer any clear evidence.

5.5 Result task 1

In the first task where participants were asked to fill in blanks in two short texts. The first text included four nominal particle blanks, one -se reason clause, one relative clause, one complement clause, and one -myen conditional clause. The second text included three relative clauses, three nominal particle blanks, one -myen conditional clause, one -se reason clause, and one complement clause.

In the first text two participants used the honourable nominal particle -keyse in all instances of them being asked to fill in a nominal particle. The other participants used a mixture of -keyse and the topic particle -un. Only one participant used the non-honourable nominal particle -i at one instance. All participants used subject honorification in the -se
reason clause and the -myen conditional clause. Two participants used subject honorification in the complement clause and one did not provide an answer. Three participants used subject honorific -si in the relative clause, one answered that no word was needed, and one used the plain form verb.

The results are similar in the second text. One participant used kkeyse in all instances of them being asked to provide a nominal particle, three participants used it in the first instance when the subject was teuppyo-nim ‘CEO’ but not in the second instance when talking about a person using the honourable noun bun ‘person’ where they used -i. In the third instance, two participants preferred the topic particle -un and two answered that no particle was needed. Four participants used subject honorific -si or kyeysita in all relative clauses, with one participant only using it in one of the three relative blanks. Four participants used subject honorific -si in the -myeon conditional clause, two used it in the -se reason clause, and all participants used subject honorifics it in the complement clause, four using kyeysita and one using -si.

There is a clear pattern of Korean participants preferring honorifics even in subordinate environments, and as expected from the results of task two no addressee honorification was used. -si, kkeyse and kyeysita were all preferred in the majority of instances, the only one where a plain form being preferred by the majority being the sentence with bun as subject. This can be explained by bun not being considered honorific enough to trigger agreement on its own. This shows that the relationship between the honorific elements of the main clause are strongly tied to the subordinate elements.

6 Discussion

In the results of this study it is clearly visible that there are certain limitations on honorification outside of the main clause. From the summarised result visible in fig. 1 we can observe that there is a clear discord between how addressee honorification and subject honorification behave in embedded environments in Japanese. This has before been observed by both Miyagawa (2012) and Pak (2015). Addressee honorification is allowed in a limited set of dependent clauses, namely relative clauses, reason clauses and -tara conditional clauses. In the light of this Pak’s (2015) claims that politeness information regarding the discourse participants cannot occur in the embedded CP appears to be falsified. We have seen clear examples of addressee honorification occurring in the CP domain in Japanese. Even considering her claim that the difference between addressee honorification and subject
honorification lies in their location in the utterance, with addressee honorification belonging to the CP and subject honorifics in the TP, we have no reason to believe that the addressee honorifics occurring in Japanese relative clauses, reason clauses or -tara conditional clauses should be any different from other instances of addressee honorification. There is no evidence for them being located anywhere below the CP domain. It could be argued that the surface similarities between -tara and past tense morpheme -ta creates a situation wherein the -tara conjugation mimics a TP even when belonging to the CP and therefore triggers a false acceptance for addressee honorification. Still, this does not provide any explanation for addressee honorification in relative clauses and reason clauses, both of which clearly belong to the CP domain.

Another more favourable approach might be that addressee honorific -mas is limited by its syntactic placement in that it cannot co-occur with any overt complementizers. This provides an explanation for the complete lack of addressee honorification in Korean where all clause types tested feature morphological subordinate marking. It also explains why addressee honorification can occur in relative clauses in Japanese since they lack overt marking. Assuming -tara is allowed because it appears to incorporate the past tense marker, this leaves the problem of kara reason clauses. Addressee honorification is allowed in kara clauses even with the overt subordinate marking. It is also allowed in the similar node and tame adverbial clause. This appears contractionary, if addressee honorifics were truly hindered by overt subordinate marking, as is the case in -ba and complement clauses, it would be blocked in kara, node and tame clauses as well. There appears to be something in this adverbial clause that separates it from other subordinate clauses. The answer to this problem lies beyond the scope of this paper and will as such be left for future research.

A curious fact is that addressee honorification is allowed in relative clauses in Japanese but not in complement clauses. This is strikingly different from Swedish where another traditional main clause phenomenon, verb second word order, is acceptable in complement clauses but never in relative clauses. Since the complement clause is considered the most main clause like of subordinate structures it could be expected that the complement clause would allow for more main clause like behaviour, such as the case in Swedish. Still, Japanese does not allow addressee honorifics in complement clauses outside of direct quotations but does allow it in several other dependent clauses. This adds further evidence for honorification being syntactically and morphologically governed rather than pragmatically. It remains the fact that had honorifics been governed by purely pragmatic rules those rules would have been more likely to hinder the occurrence of honorifics in relative clauses over complement
clauses. Therefore, it seems that honorifics are limited by their syntactic qualities, in certain parts agreeing with hypothesis 1 (12) suggested in chapter 2.5.

On the other hand, honorific agreement appears from the result of this study to be largely optional in subordinate environments. The agreement is slightly stricter in Korean, where more participants commented on honorific mismatches, but in Japanese only honorific words triggered agreement strong enough for the sentences with honorific in both dependent clause and main clause to be rated higher than the control sentences with honorifics in the main clause. This evidence favours the more pragmatic approaches made by Park (1992). A dependent clause sits in relation to the main clause, not to the direct discourse. If honorifics then indeed are pragmatically triggered there would be nothing triggering them in the dependent clause since it is not in direct contact with the discourse. Partial evidence for this is observed in the less strict agreement in dependent clauses in both languages. The slacker rules governing dependent clauses implies that agreement is not as important in dependent clauses as in the main clause and that it is largely up to the speaker’s discretion to choose whether to include it.

6.1 Method discussion

There are many things to think about when deciding the method for a study. For this study I chose to do an online questionnaire in hopes of reaching a wider audience than my acquaintances in Lund. This was proven to be both benefactory and lacking in a few ways. Participants seemed to have trouble understanding the context of the sentences and focused more on this rather than the sentences themselves in certain cases. Some participants failed to offer explanations for their answers making analysing the result more difficult. If there had been more time and funds to search for participants available for interviewing in Lund this might have given more accurate information regarding the nature of the honorifics themselves. An interview would allow the interviewer to ask questions regarding the participants and to better clear up any possible misunderstanding.

7 Conclusion

This paper has investigated the distribution of honorifics in dependent clauses in Japanese and Korean and found that even though they do occur they behave slightly different from in the main clause. It has also found that there is a clear difference between addressee honorification
and subject honorification that is not purely motivated by the differences in pragmatic nature but also by their syntactic representation. Subject honorification occur freely in all tested dependent clauses, no differences in behaviour from the main clause. Addressee honorification behaves significantly different from in the main clause in both languages. Any instance of addressee honorifics in an embedded subordinate environment in Korean is blocked. Seemingly because they share the same syntactic slot as complementizers. However, addressee honorific suffix -yo can co-occur with complementizers as long as it maintains an utterance final position. In Japanese addressee honorifics are allowed in relative clauses, -tara conditional clauses and reason clauses, but blocked in complement clauses and -ba conditional clauses. This suggests that there is no correlation between the pragmatic distance from the discourse of the clause, but instead a syntactic limitation caused by the illegal co-occurrence of addressee honorifics and overt subordinate marking.

Still, evidence for pragmatic agreement can be seen. The honorific agreement in dependent clauses is considerably less strict than in the main clause. As such evidence for both hypothesis 1 (12) and 2 (13) have been found.

The result of this study has proven that honorification in both languages is limited by the syntactic and morphologic qualities of the different honorific structures. Hence, favouring parts of hypothesis 1 (12). The limitation of honorification in dependent clauses can to a large extent be explained as honorification and subordinate marking competing for the same syntactic slot. The same syntactic explanation functions to some degree describe the difference between addressee honorifics and subject honorifics in Korean. Korean addressee honorific suffixes -yo, is proven to be limited by its location in the utterance, it cannot occur outside of an utterance final position. A conclusion can be drawn that honorifics are limited by their syntactic qualities and their distribution is governed by syntactic and morphological principles, but the agreement between the discourse and honorification is more pragmatic.

Still, this does not explain the disparity between addressee honorification and subject honorification in Japanese where addressee honorific -mas and subject honorific -rare largely share the same syntactic features. Neither does it address the case of adverbial reason clauses in Japanese allowing honorification. To determine if addressee honorification is truly limited by pragmatic functions more research needs to be done.

To properly determine the nature of addressee honorification further research needs to be done on addressee honorification outside of the predicate. One such area of particular interest is honorific personal pronouns. These pronouns are addressee honorific forms of plain the first-person pronoun and does to my knowledge not behave differently in subordinate
environments. Investigating these properly and comparing them to other addressee honorifics might be insightful in uncovering the true nature of honorifics. More research also needs to be done on addressee honorification in Japanese dependent clauses specifically. This to determine as to why it is limited in certain clauses and not in others. Finally, it might of interest to see if the inclusion of honorification in dependent clauses affects the overall politeness or formality of the utterance.
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