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ABSTRACT

Early Middle (Chuuko) Japanese literature reveals that much of the honorific expression system was grammaticalized by the middle of the Heian period (794-1185). This thesis is an attempt to investigate what evolutionary paths honorific expressions followed as they became what they were in the mid-Heian period and how they were actually used in a specific text of the mid-Heian period, Ookagami 'The Great Mirror' (c. 11th c.). The general framework for this study is the field of functional linguistics. While it makes use of much kokugogaku scholarship, it develops an account of honorifics that suggests some of its established assumptions regarding the honorific system should be reconsidered.

In Early Middle Japanese, subject-honorification (sonkei hyogen 'honorable expression') in predication was expressed by the inflectional suffixes -raju and -sajju, honorific verbs such as okasu, honorific auxiliary verbs such as tamahu, and certain combinations of these three, for example, -(sajju)x-tamahu.

While textual evidence for Old Japanese is rather limited in terms of genres, Early Middle Japanese seems to have had more marked honorific expressions that involved a sense of triple honorification in addition to double honorific expressions. When one looks at the diachronic changes of each lexical item for
honorific use, the evidence suggests that creating more honorifically marked lexical
items happens when originally marked items became so conventionalized that they
represent less of a deliberate choice on the part of the speaker, thus becoming
unmarked. In order to preserve the markedness of an expression, conventionalized
lexical items are often augmented anew with less conventionalized, more marked
lexical items, and once again these expressions come to function as marked forms.
This is a natural and widely attested linguistic process in the course of
grammaticalization, and the diachronic changes of honorific expressions from Old
Japanese to Early Middle Japanese do not seem to be an exception to this cross-
linguistic phenomenon. Honorific predication in the text of Ookagami is
straightforward in nature and corresponds to the general description of honorific
expressions in Early Middle Japanese which I present in Chapter One,
notwithstanding the many examples of the more marked “triple honorification”
which occur in Ookagami.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative particle <em>wo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJEC</td>
<td>conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>doubted identity particle <em>ka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEF</td>
<td>externally established fact suffix <em>-keri</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>established fact suffix <em>-ki</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDPF</td>
<td>endoactive perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive particles <em>go, mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>gerundive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2HON</td>
<td>double honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive focus particle <em>mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative <em>ni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>irrelais, <em>mo</em> <em>en</em> form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGI</td>
<td>negative intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RES  resultative
RY   renyoo form (infinitive)

***************************
Inflectional Classes for Verbs:

4D    yodan inflection
NH    na-hen inflection
RH    ra-hen inflection
KH    ka-hen inflection
SH    sa-hen inflection
K1    kami-ichidan inflection
K2    kami-nidan inflection
S1    shimo-ichidan inflection
S2    shimo-nidan inflection
0. INTRODUCTION

For more than 100 years since taking over the philological legacy of kokugaku 'national studies', kokugogaku 'study of nation's language' scholars have made enormous efforts in the study of the Japanese language and, needless to say, their contributions are extremely valuable. However, kokugogaku scholars have often tried to document and substantiate the peculiarity of the Japanese language--how "unique" and "different" "our country's language (kokugo)" is. Therefore, when one desires to understand some particular aspect of the Japanese language in a larger context, the traditional framework of the kokugogaku tradition--which tends to presuppose the progressive "evolution" of the Japanese language rather than its historical change over time--is not inclusive enough to accommodate a cross-linguistic view. For this reason, I seek to incorporate general linguistic theory in my analysis of honorific predication in Early Middle (Chuuko) Japanese.

Whether there was a progressive "evolution" of the grammar or not, Early Middle Japanese literature written in the Heian period (794-1185) reveals that an honorific system was grammaticalized by the mid-Heian
period. Considering that the social stations of the Heian writers represented in the extant works were among the loftiest ranks in the contemporary aristocratic society, we may imagine that the system of honorific expression was fully implicated in maintaining the structure of their courtly society. What I would like to do in this study is to survey honorific predication in Early Middle Japanese from a cross-linguistic and functional perspective, beyond the framework of the 細句式 tradition. We shall find historical change, but will attempt to describe and understand it in ways that differ from the 細句式 idea of evolution. Therefore, I shall examine (a) what evolutionary paths honorific expressions emerged out of, and (b) how they were actually used in a specific text of the mid-Heian period, the 俄路 "The Great Mirror" (c. 11th c.).
CHAPTER 1  HONORIFIC PREDICATION IN EARLY MIDDLE JAPANESE

1.0. Introduction

It has been a long time since scholars of the Japanese language (kokugogakusha) began to question whether or not jodooshi (lit. 'helping verbs') can be classified as an independent 'part of speech' (hinshi). The main focus of my study here, however, is not an attempt to resolve the status of jodooshi in Classical Japanese. In addition to this basic question of grammatical classification, there is another controversy surrounding the status of 'honorific helping verbs' (sonkei no jodooshi in the kokugogaku tradition).

Honorific suffixes -(ra)ru and -(sa)su attach directly to

---

1. In this paper, I use the period terms for linguistic classification as follows: Joodai or Old Japanese for the Nara period including the Nagaoka period (710-794), Chuuko or Early middle Japanese for the Heian period (794-1185), and Chuussai or Middle Japanese for the Middle Ages after Heian.

2. For example, see Kitahara (1981: 3-44). He gives an account of this controversy by dividing prominent scholars into two groups, namely, those who hold the position that jodooshi are not hinshi and those that hold the position that jodooshi are hinshi. Kitahara himself takes the position of acknowledging jodooshi as hinshi and questions the anti-hinshi scholars' theory.

3. For general review of this issue, see Tanjimu (1968: 28-29, 43-44).
the mizen form (mizen-kei 'irrealis form,' abbreviated as MK in this paper) of verbs and do not allow any other jodooshi to be inserted between themselves and the verb form. In other words, inflecting suffixes -(ra)ru and -(sa)su belong to the class of jodooshi which cannot have any other kind of jodooshi between them and the predicate base. For this reason, some scholars classify them as a more inflection-like setsubigo 'suffix.' More recent scholarship has used the terminology "inflecting suffixes" to gloss jodooshi, and I shall follow this convention. Jodooshi, then, are inflecting suffixes, not setsubigo, since they inflect almost in the same paradigms as lexical predicates (yoogeo) inflect. The main contentsions of this paper are not affected by the dispute among the kokugyoakusha as to whether honorific suffixes are jodooshi or setsubigo, and I will therefore refer to keijoo no jodooshi as honorific inflecting suffixes. In

4 The main difference between jodooshi and setsubigo is that jodooshi are somehow more independent than setsubigo, which sometimes are not treated as an independent lexical item. A jodooshi adds a meaning independent of the main verb in a predicate, whereas a setsubigo adds a meaning only to the verb it follows. Since -(ra)ru and -(sa)su directly attach to verbs and add a meaning only to the main verb they follow, some scholars claim that -(ra)ru and -(sa)su are setsubigo, that is, subordinate to the verbs and thus not distinctive hinshi like jodooshi. As pointed out by Minegishi (1968), Hashimoto (1948) emphasizes that this difference between the honorific jodooshi and other jodooshi should not be overlooked.
this study, I will assume that jodooshi are
morphologically distinct suffixes with their own
inflections, focus on the subset of jodooshi that index
honorable meaning, and attempt to trace possible
evolutionary paths they may have followed as they came to
be used as honorifically.

1.1. The Inflecting Suffixes -(ra)ru and -(sa)su

1.1.1. Overview of Honorific Suffixes in Early Middle
Japanese

In Early Middle Japanese, there were four kinds of
' honorific expressions' (sonkei hyogen) that involve the
inflecting honorific suffixes -(ra)ru and -(sa)su. These
express subject-honorification, and attach to the NE form
of the base verb. Each of these is illustrated below.

(a) -(ra)ru

In Early Middle Japanese, -(ra)ru functions as a
inflecting suffix and is interpreted variously as a
passive (ukemi), spontaneous (jihatsu), potential (ranoo),
and honorific (sonkei). In the honorific use, -(ra)ru
indexes subject-honorification.
(1) izure no fune ni ka norä-rü-beki [OK, Ten] 5
which GEN boat LOC DI board-HON-CONJEC
'Which boat is it he should board [HON]?'

(b) -(sa)ru

-(sa)ru functions as a inflecting suffix for the
causative (shiteki) and honorific (sonkei) in Early Middle
Japanese. The main difference between honorific -(sa)ru
and -(ra)ru is that the former cannot be used alone to
convey honorific meaning. It must be used with some other
honorific element that indexes subject-honorification. In
other words, -(sa)ru does not appear to have expressed
honorific meaning by itself; it seems to have been more of
an honorific intensifier.

(2) kohori wo torä-sE-tamashi-te,... [OK, Chi] 6
ice ACC take-HON-HON-GER
'(he) takes [HON] the ice, and...'

(c) Combinations of -(ra)ru and -(sa)ru

Theoretically speaking, -(ra)ru and -(sa)ru can be
used in the same predicate, in which case there are two
possible configurations and interpretations: (1) V +

5 Ootagami, in Yoritada, Ten 'Heaven' (p.162, line 2). The
speaker is Fujiwara no Michinaga and the referent is Fujiwara no
Kintō. In this paper, examples are transcribed in a hybrid
romanization, in a closer approximation of the kana. However,
Japanese terms used in my text are transcribed in a modified
Hepburn (with vowel length represented by double vowels).
6 In Kaneke, Chi 'Earth' (p.244, line 8). The speaker is Yotsugi
and the referent is Sanjō-in.
-(sa)sE + raru (ME of -(sa)su + -(ra)ru), for a causative plus honorific reading, and (2) V + -(ra)sE + nasu (ME of -(ra)ru + -(sa)su), for a spontaneous, passive, or potential plus honorific reading. However, these combinations were not apparently very common before Early Middle Japanese and it has not been explained well why the latter part of the combination (i.e., -(ra)ru in combination (1) and -(sa)su in the combination (2)) is always used for a honorific meaning.

(d) Double Honorifics

The phenomenon known as saikoo-keigo ('highest degree of honorific') will here be referred to as a double honorific, for reasons explained below. The subjects for which saikoo-keigo were used typically included members of the imperial family, such as the emperor, empress, princes and princesses, or aristocrats of the highest rank. Double honorifics commonly involve the honorific auxiliary vero (sonkei no hojodooshi) tamahu in the quadrigrade (yodan) inflection paradigm, in the form /base + -(sa)su + tamahu/. Tamahu 'give(s) [HON]' also functioned independently as an honorific verb that could stand alone, but in double honorifics it serves only as an auxiliary verb for honorification, following the honorific inflectional suffix -(sa)su.
(3) todomê-rarez-sa-z-tosahi-te  [OK, Chi]^7
    stop-PASS-HON-HON-GER
  '(he) was fired [ZHON] from office, and ...'

Note that example (3) also illustrates the occurrence of
-\textit{ra}ru and -\textit{sa}su in the same predicate. As observed,
only one of them functioned honorifically. Now let us
look more closely at the honorific inflectional suffixes
-\textit{ra}ru and -\textit{sa}su respectively in the following section.

1.1.2. -\textit{Ra}ru

1.1.2.1. Background

Phonologically, -\textit{ru} and -\textit{raru} appear to occur in
complementary distribution and the function of the longer
-\textit{raru} is to compensate for the lack of a thematic vowel
\textit{a} in certain verbs. My argument is supported by the
fact that -\textit{ru} attaches to the MZ form of verbs which
belong to the yodan (4D), na-hen (NH) and ra-hen (RH)
inflexional paradigms, and ends in the vowel \textit{a}, whereas
-\textit{raru} attaches to the athetic MZ form of verbs which
belong to the kami-ichidan (K1), kami-nidan (F2), shimo-
ichidan (S1), shimo-nidas (S2), ka-hen (KH), and sa-hen
(SH) paradigms and does not end in the vowel \textit{a}. In

^7 In Kameie, Chi [p.239, line 14]. The speaker is Yostugi and
the referent is Fujiwara no Kameie.
addition to that, there is no difference in meaning between -ru and -raru. Therefore, we shall treat -ru and -raru as one suffix with phonological variation. It is widely believed that use of -(ra)ru became common at some time around the end of the Nara period (710-794) and continued to the beginning of Heian period (794-1155).\(^6\)

Before then, another suffix, -(ra)yu, was the dominant inflecting suffix used for for passive, spontaneous, and possibly potential in the oldest manuscripts of Old (Jooko) Japanese, such as seen in the Man'yōshū (compiled c.159) and it is believed by many scholars to be the older form of -(ra)ru.\(^7\) However, as Hashimoto points out (1969: 266-270), instances in which -(ra)ru was used for the passive and spontaneous meanings can already be seen in the Man'yōshū. This fact suggests that the inflecting suffix -(ra)ru did not start out as an honorific suffix, but that, rather, an honorific use of

---

\(^6\) It is believed that they were paired because of the phonetic compensation of /a/ for verbs belonging to K1, K2, S1, S2, KN, and SH groups. For a detailed analysis of /a/ in the NE form, see Ungar (1975/1993: 69-76) or Oono (1952: 52).

\(^7\) Many scholars, including Oono (1955), believe that the change from -(ra)yu to -(ra)ru was due to a change of [y] to [r], a change that Kindaichi and Okumura (1976) claim is phonetically natural. While such a change may indeed be phonetically natural, this claim is ad hoc unless other instances of the change [y] > [r] can be cited in support of it. Hashimoto (1969) states that it is hard to tell which suffix is older.
-(ra)ru developed later, as a secondary significance, on the way to Early Middle Japanese.

Around the beginning of the Heian period, the use of -(ra)ru came to be limited to idiomatic expressions such as arA-yuru 'that which can exist' (i.e. 'all that exists') and ihA-yuru 'which can be said [to be]' (i.e. 'so-called') and -(ra)ru took over as the productive inflecting suffix signifying passive, spontaneous and potential.\(^{16}\)

1.1.2.2. Origins of the honorific use of -(ra)ru

The main issue of debate on the origins of the honorific use of -(ra)ru is whether or not the use of -(ra)ru for subject-honorification was derived from the spontaneous use or the passive use. Since the Edo period (1600-1867), kokugogaku scholars have been divided into two positions over the hongi ('essential meaning' or 'original/basic meaning') of the inflecting suffix -(ra)ru. Some scholars, including Hashimoto (1969), Tokieda (1941) and Oono (1967), believe that the hongi of -(ra)ru was the spontaneous meaning, which was then

\(^{16}\) As for exactly when -(ra)ru began to be used in potential meaning, there are several opinions. However, scholars do agree that it did not come to have a clear potential meaning until after the time of Taketori monogatari 'Tale of the Bamboo Cutter' (c.901-956).
extended to express passive and potential meanings. Others, such as Yamada (1926), believe that -{ra}ru's basic meaning was passive, which then was extended to express spontaneous and potential senses.

Let me examine their arguments in brief, since determining the origins of the honorific use of -(ra)ru requires that we understand the range of meanings expressed by -(ra)ru. In the major kokugogaku research, there are two hypotheses, represented as I and II below. Hypothesis III is claimed by linguists, not kokugogaku scholars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPO.</th>
<th>hongi</th>
<th>derived meaning(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>&gt; spontaneous &gt; potential &gt; honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II)</td>
<td>spontaneous</td>
<td>&gt; passive-potential-honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III)</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>&gt; honorific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-1. Hypotheses on the origins of honorific -(ra)ru

Hypothesis (I) is supported by many scholars, such as Yamada (1926: 317-319) and Konoshima (1983), in which they presuppose that the hongi of -(ra)ru is passive. They assume that passive meaning extended to spontaneous
meaning and then to potential meaning, from which honorific meaning directly derived. Their argument that the birth of honorific meaning is attributable to the potential, rather than directly to the passive or spontaneous, can be summarized as follows. They claim that noblemen (kijin) were believed to have an innate power or ability, which ordinary people did not have. Whether or not a person had the power or ability to make something happen was considered a dividing line between people to be exalted and those not to be exalted. As a consequence of this distinction, people began to extend the logic: if a person was born into a superior social existence, then s/he must have possessed such natural power. And if -(rs)ru expressed ability in its potential sense, reference to this quality could have also indexed social status, albeit indirectly. This hypothesis, however, accounts for no more than the link between the potential and honorific uses. It motivates the development of an honorific use by assuming that a potential use already existed, which was available for people to use in elevating the status of the acts of or socially superior referents. It is not at all clear why they presuppose that passive is more fundamental notion than spontaneous.
Hashimoto (1948: 266-293), Tokieda (1954: 63-64), Kindaiichi (1957: 189), Oono (1967), and Minegishi (1968: 21-24) support hypothesis (II), that a spontaneous meaning was the main and first semantic property of the suffix -(ra)ru. According to them, the spontaneous use is older than the passive use; the suffix originally meant 'things happen' spontaneously. It is noteworthy that these scholars employ a sociocultural line of reasoning in their account of the extension of the meaning of -(ra)ru to honorific. They argue that in Japan, it has always been more polite to refer to someone’s actions by describing them indirectly, and that framing an action as a ‘natural happening’ (shisan-teki jitsugen), without any causing volition on the part of the agent, is less direct than expressing the volition of the agent explicitly. Their argument reminds us of Shibatani’s main claim (1985) that indirectness is the key to understanding the utilization of passive structure in honorific predicates.

There are also other hypotheses in the linguistic scholarship that argue for a direct development from the spontaneous use to the honorific one. Jacobsen (1992: 154-155) argues that the use of passive for honorific meaning in Modern Japanese is integrally related to the basic function of presenting an event as occurring.
spontaneously, apart from the intentionality of the subject, which undoubtedly can be applied to the case in Classical Japanese. The notion of spontaneity entails a lack of volition, and Quinn (1987) sees this as a feature common to all uses of Classical -(ra)ru, which he treats as an "endoactive valency converter," as opposed to its "exaactive" (i.e. basically volitional) counterpart, -(sa)ru.

Hypothesis (III) is supported by scholars who believe that the honorific use was directly derived from the passive, in parallel with the spontaneous-potential use. These scholars work mainly in the field of linguistics, not the kokugogaku tradition, and thus, they try to explain the issue based on linguistic universals and cross-linguistic considerations (Spencer, 1991: 244-245). Shibatani (1985: 837-838) states that the principal function of the passive is to de-focus the agent. He reasons that since in a passive predicate the agent no longer needs to be explicitly mentioned, it fits the notion of being polite by being implicit; thus, the passive structure conveys a certain psychological

---

11 Although the passive -(r)are has been grammaticalized as a suffix that indexes subject-honorification in Modern Japanese, historically speaking, it is the modern version of -(ra)ru and can be considered to express a semantics closely related to that of -(ra)ru in Classical Japanese.
distance. Shibatani concludes that a universal characteristic of honorific speech lies in its indirectness, and one of the clear manifestations of indirectness is avoidance of expressing an agent.

It seems difficult to attribute the politeness of a passive predicate to its purported failure to mention an agent explicitly. This is clear if we consider that the agent need not be mentioned in an active sentence, either, in Classical or Modern Japanese. Not mentioning the agent does not automatically mean that the sentence indicates politeness nor does mentioning an agent make a polite predicate less polite. Consequently, Shibatani’s theory of the relation between politeness and de-focusing the agent needs to be refined. It will not do simply to equate defocusing the agent with a failure to mention him or her. I would propose that we might think of this function of the passive voice as focusing the patient rather than de-focusing the agent. By passivization, the patient becomes the predicate’s Theme, and the agent is thus de-focused, and this is true whether or not the agent

12 Quinn (1994) also relates affecting agency to some basic social phenomena, arguing that it amounts to respectful act. (Situated Meaning, Chapter 11).
13 Therefore, Shibatani classifies modern Japanese -(r)are- as an agent-defocusing suffix.
14 For example, Kono hon wa Tanabe-san ga okaki ni natte n desu ka. ‘Did you write this book, Mr/Ms. Tanabe?’
is overtly mentioned or not. Such a predicate is indirect in the sense that the speaker avoids making any personal claim about the volition of the agent, whereas an active structure overtly signals that the speaker has knowledge about the agent and his/her intention. This kind of defocusing indirectness the passive structure conveys could indicate the speaker’s psychological distance from the agent.

It is not an easy task for us to determine which semantic property was primary for -(ra)ru in Old Japanese. However, either way, we can see that the common characteristic in all of these hypotheses of the honorific use of -(ra)ru is the overt marking of absence of an agent’s volition. Thus, more generally, we might simply say that the honorific use of -(ra)ru was based on its marking of the absence of an agent’s volition, rather than on another particular exploitation of this lack of volition, such as the passive, spontaneous, or potential use of -(ra)ru. The most important assumption here is that people opted for indirectness in order to show their respect, that is, they introduced a kind of psychological distance by effacing the notion of agency. This may be the most likely reasoning, in that it links sociocultural

15 Quinn (1994: 270) makes this point.
preference with a more widely attested account of de-agentivisation.

It is of course equally important to remember that whatever the hōng of -(ra)ru (or of -(t)are- today), its various functions were and are products of its interaction with different contexts of use and the semantics of the verbs with which it occurs (C. Quinn, p.c., 1997). Even so, however, all the functions share a more or less de-agentized way of expressing an event.

1.1.3. -(Sa)su

1.1.3.1. Background

Just as in the case of -(ra)ru, I shall treat -su and -sasu as one suffix because -su and -sasu also show complementary distribution, but do not show any difference in meaning. Both -su and -sasu occur after the MZ form of the verb, with the longer form -sasu attaching to verbs whose root ended in /a/, while verbs whose root ended in a consonant added /a/ before -su. The suffix -su attaches to the MZ form of verbs with an /a/ ending which belong to 4D, NH and RN, whereas -sasu attaches to the MZ form of the verbs which belong to the other classes, namely K1, K2, S1, S2, KH, and SH which lack a thematic vowel in their MZ form. There is another form -shimu, however,
which was fully developed as a causative suffix in the inventory of devices for Kanbun-kundokubun, 'Chinese writing read as Japanese', from the Nara period. It was rarely used in wabun, 'Classical Japanese writing,' and will not be treated here.

Although there are several theories about the etymology of the inflecting suffix -(sa)su, it is agreed that it shared somewhat the same origin with the ancient transitiviser -su, which attaches to the verb root and creates a transitive verb (see, for example, Iwabuchi [1971] and Yoshida [1973]). Therefore, it is possible to find a function of transitivization in the semantics of the suffix -(sa)su, just as we can identify a function of intranitivization in the semantics of the suffix -(ra)ru. This hypothesis corresponds with the apparent fact that all verbs which end in -su in Old Japanese are transitive verbs.16

It is interesting to note that OD honorific suffix -su, which inflected in the 4J paradigm, can be seen as an integral part of honorific verbs like ohasu ‘is/are’ and 16

---

16 This presupposition can be indirectly supported by Jacobsen (1992, for example) that every verb might be originally intransitive. In other words, events just happen, which is unmarked for intransitive verbs, then agentivity or volition is added at the next level of derivation.

17 For the list of Old Japanese verbs, see Unger (1977: 87-142).
Therefore, there were two suffixes -su attested in Old Japanese, a transitive marker -su and an honorific marker -su. Both of these inflect in the 4D paradigm. The causative suffix -(sa)su settled down into a S2 inflectional paradigm in the beginning of the Heian period and came to be used very commonly in Japanese vernacular writings from then on. Although there are several theories about how they are related to the Heian honorific suffix -(sa)su, the majority of scholars acknowledge that the 4D transitive marker -su became a productive causative suffix in Old Japanese and then in the Heian period acquired honorific meaning: in the process it shifted from the 4D paradigm to the S2 paradigm, and some time later, the allomorph -sasu developed.

1.1.3.2. Meaning Extension to Honorific

As we have seen in 1(b), -(sa)su cannot be used alone to index a subject referent honorifically; it must be used

---

18 Washimoto (1969) says that all the honorific verbs which belong to the 4D paradigm were originally derived from this -su suffix in the 4D type of inflectional pattern (1969: 308). However, Oono (1952) seems to support the idea that all Japanese verbs were originally either 4D or 5B.

19 As Kobayashi (1987: 360) states.

20 However, some scholars such as Yamada (1926) and Kindschiel (1959), for instance, say that the Old Japanese honorific suffix -su with 4D paradigm should not be considered to be related to the Heian honorific suffix mainly because there is no good reason for its paradigm shift from 4D to S2.
with another honorific item, specifically, a lexical one. As suggested above, -\( (sa)su \) did not function by itself honorifically, it is probably best classified as an honorific intensifier, whose main function was to increase the degree of deference. In this sense, the function of -\( (sa)su \) is honorific bolstering to strengthen the sense of honorification.\(^{21}\) Double honorific derivations include not only the combination of -\( (sa)su \) with the common honorific auxiliary verb tamah\( u \), but also its combination with honorific verbs such as notamah\( u \) ‘say[s]’ [\( \text{HON} \)],’ as is the following:

\[
(4) \text{e-iki-yara-ji to notamahA-suru-wo,... } \quad [\text{GM}]^{22} \\
\text{POT-go-let-NEGQ say[+\text{NOM}]-HON-CONJ} \\
\text{‘although (he) says [2HON] he cannot let that happen,...’}
\]

The derived predicative notamah\( A \)-suru\( \) is the \( \text{ME} \) form of 4\( D \) honorific verb notamah\( u \) ‘say[s]’ [\( \text{HON} \)] plus the RT form of -\( su \) [\( \text{HON} \)], and it is a double honorific predicate, which indicates greater deference than the use of a single honorific verb like notamah\( u \) would.

The development of the honorific use of the suffix -\( (sa)su \) from its causative use is much less controversial when compared to the development of -\( (ra)ru \) discussed

\(^{21}\) I have borrowed the term “bolstering” from Quinn (1987), who uses it in reference to evidentiality.

\(^{22}\) In Genji Monogatari, Kiritsubo.
above, mainly because it is clear that the honorific use was directly based on the causative meaning. According to Oono (1967), the basic sense of -(sa)su was "artifice," a human-like intentionality (jin'i or sakui), which contrasts with the basic sense of -(ra)ru as "naturalness" or "unartiﬁciality" (shizen). Regarding the aspects of transitivity or volitionality that I mentioned earlier, -(sa)su is the counterpart of -(ra)ru and scholars such as Quinn (1987) call -(sa)su an exoactive valency converter, as opposed to -(ra)ru, an endoactive valency converter.

The most popular theory about the use of causative suffixes for subject-honorification is that a member of the imperial family, such as the emperor, does not have to perform any action X by himself, but makes or has his subjects or servants perform X for him. Therefore, by employing a causative suffix to describe the emperor's action, it directly indexes a causing agent, even when one is not expressed in the surface structure. The important idea behind causativization as honorificaton is that people of high rank did not have to perform an action for themselves, since they had the power to make somebody else to perform that action for them. In other words, the

---

23 For a discussion of Oono's hongi theory, see Minegishi (1968: 21-26).
agent possessed control over somebody else’s action, insofar as s/he made him/her perform the action, instead of the agent doing the action for him/herself. A causative expression is indirect in the sense that the agent does not directly perform an action with his/her own hand. Thus causativization came to be used for honorific meaning, and just as in the case of passivization, indirectness is a key to the original motivation for its honorific use. This meaning extension is another instance of a larger social practice of indirectness or circumlocution, which is still a very important technique in maintaining good relationships with others in modern Japan and is considered to be an indication of respect and politeness.

It is said that utilizing the difference of the degree of honorification between bare honorific verbals and these cases with -(wa)su (for example, the difference between tamashu and -(sa)s&tamashu) became clear after *Genji monogatari* 'The Tale of Genji' (c.1008) (Toyama, 1985). However, unlike the development of -(ka)ru, the honorific use of which persists into today’s Japanese, the suffix -(wa)su gradually lost its use for honorification, and this use is completely extinct in Modern Japanese.
Let us now review the evolutionary paths each of these suffixes seems to have followed as it developed from its original functions to its honorific usages. Passive/spontaneous and causative are both syntactically and semantically opposite because, ultimately speaking, passive/spontaneous is for intransitivization and causative is for transitivization. If one tries to find a common thread of meaning extensions for both -(ra)ru and -(sa)su in a bigger picture, their shared property might be said to be the kind of indirectness their semantics made possible. The linguistic motivation for -(ra)ru to be used for honorification probably that this suffix signalled the nonvolitional nature of an event, and shifting the focus from any agency. The motivation for the honorific use of -(sa)su would have followed from the idea that causativization indexes the privilege of an agent who does not perform an action him/herself, but rather causes someone else to perform that action on behalf of the agent. Both of these imply a certain distance between the agent and act attributed to him/her, so that it is possible to claim that indirectness of expression is an integral component in both inflecting suffixes, -(ra)ru and -(sa)su. This fact can be explained very well by conceptualizing -(ra)ru as an endoactive
valency converter, which reduces the number of the arguments, and -(sa)su as an exocative valency converter, which adds to the number of arguments. But there is an important sense in which these two opposite valency converters are not really opposite at all, because both of them indicate distance that the agent has from his/her act, although in different ways.\footnote{As for the passive-causative correlation, Shibatani (1985: 840) points out that a causative expression shares a semantic similarity with the middle voice and with the passive sentence. His examples are as follows: 'John had Taro teach him Japanese [causative],' 'John taught himself Japanese [middle voice],' and 'John was taught Japanese (by Taro) [passive].'}

One of the critical issues to look at here is how to interpret the fact that both suffixes attach to the MZ form of verbs. The significance of this morphological characteristic of these suffixes will be treated in a later section.

1.2. Honorific Verbs

Although we do not know how many honorific verbs Old (Jōkyo) Japanese had, we can hypothesize based upon the extant texts that Early Middle (Chūko) Japanese had more honorific verbs than Old Japanese; these verbs had developed over time through the process of grammaticalization and lexicalization, and judging from the texts, there were at least twenty honorific verbs by the mid-
Heian period. Verbs used as normal verbs with no 
honorific meaning in Old Japanese were combined with 
certain types of morphemes, grammaticalized, and then 
lexicalized as honorific verbs at a later stage.

The most common phenomenon is lexicalization of 
compounds derived with two kinds of -su. One is the S2- 
inflected suffix -su, which probably should be categorized 
in its earlier stage as no more than a transitivizes, and 
the other one is a monosyllabic honorific 4D-suffix su, 
which appears only in Old Japanese texts. Let us look at 
some examples of such grammaticalization.

(a) asobasu (4D): asoba- (ME form of asobu, 4D) + 
-su (4D) > asob̄a-su > asobasu 'to(es)[HON]'

In Old Japanese, there was already asowab 'do [HON]' 
(Unger, 1993: 88), so, the lexicalization of /asowab/ + /a/ 
(thematic vowel) + -su (in Unger's transcription, -ce) was 
presumably completed before the Nara period. It is 
believed that the need for the /a/ preceding for -su is 
due to the lack of a thematic vowel (a vowel between the 
root and suffix) in the root of verbs.\(^{23}\) The resulting

\(^{23}\) In the case of Classical Japanese, when the root ends in a 
vowel, the thematic vowel /a/ becomes zero in the formation of ME. 
The phonological changes involved with the formation of ME form 
are as follows: ROOT + /a/ + suffix → ME + suffix, /a/ → 
zero/∅. This assumption indicates that thematic ME forms are 
older than athematic ME forms, which supports Oono’s (1953: 52)
verb asobasu retains the inflections of the older inflecting suffix -su (4D) and remains a 4D verb even after becoming fully established as an honorific verb.  

(b) mesu (4D): mi- ('see') + s + su (4D) > mi-asu  

> mesu 'see(s), call(s), invite(s) [HON]' 

Although there is no way of knowing a definite etymology for unattested words in any old language, at least one can always make a feasible conjecture. In this case of mesu, what probably happened was, after gaining a thematic vowel /a/ following the root form, the monophthongization, "/i/ plus /a/ becomes /e/ (i + a --→ e) occurred.  

Monophthongization is a common sound change behind a number of forms in Old Japanese and Early Middle Japanese, as seen in, for instance, in the derivation of the suffix -keri, which can be broken down into -ki plus -ari (/i/ + /a/ --→ /e/).

---

claim that 4D and NH inflectional paradigms were the oldest among the paradigms in the Japanese language and that a thematic HI form for 4D was established before the 9th century. Although Unno [1993: 61] agrees about the vowel insertion after the root, he hypothesizes that there was -su "cause (object) to do preceding root" in Old Japanese, rather than -asu.  

After Old Japanese, the older inflectional suffix -su (4D) remained only in such insulated "islands" and became extinguished as an independent suffix. 

This sound change must have occurred before the application of the deletion of the thematic vowel; /a/ becomes zero before a vowel.
Next, let us examine ohasu ‘is/are [HON].’

(c) ohasu (SH): oho- (< *oho-*) + masu (4D) > cho-masu
> ohasu (SH) ‘is/are [HON]’

Oho- was originally an uninflecting honorific prefix. Therefore, masu, an honorific substitute for the verbs ari/wari ‘is/are’ was attached to the prefix oho- in order to make it a verb with inflection. As for its etymology, one possibility is that some time after the verb became established as ohomasu (an attested Old Japanese verb), /m/ was deleted (m > zero), and then monophthongization (o + a --> a) occurred, which produced the form ohasu.

Phonological reduction, which sometimes occurs also with voicing or devoicing, is cross-linguistically very common in the process of grammaticalization. Since the verb ohasu belongs to the SH class, the paradigm shift from 4D to SH occurred some time after attaching masu (4D) to the prefix oho-, but it is not known exactly when this happened. Since masu (4D) itself was an honorific verb in Old Japanese and originally contained the notion of honorification, ohasu might be identified as an honorific verb that began as a double honorific. By the mid-Heian period, however, the more honorifically marked version ohasimasu comes to appear very commonly (see next).
(d) ohasimasu (4D): ohasi- (BY of ohasu, SH) + masu
(4D) 'is/are [HON]'

If ohasu had its beginnings in two honorific morphemes, as mentioned under case (c) above, oha-shi-masu was the product of three honorific elements, albeit diachronically. However, since ohasu was already lexicalized at the point when masu was added and ohashimasu derived, synchronically speaking, ohasu counts as only one honorific and ohashimasu was the product of bolstered marking for honorific meaning. Interestingly, the paradigm shift from 4D to SH does not occur this time, as opposed to the case of ohasu; rather, the verb retains the old 4D paradigm of masu.

The next verb is oboisu 'think(s) [HON].'

(e) oboisu (4D): omochA (M of omohu, 4D) + -su (4D)
   > omochosu > oboisu (4D) "think(s) [HON]"

This verb was originally the verb omohu which is simply the unmarked verb for 'think, feel [-honorific].' One possible phonological change is that, attaching the earlier honorific suffix -su (4D) to the M of omohu produced omohasu, which probably in turn, after de-
nalization of [m] before the vowel (m → b/Y), h-deletion between the vowels (h → zero/Y), and monophthongization (o + a → o), settled down as oposu (4D). No shift occurred in the inflectional paradigm.

The next verb oposimusu, was also used for 'think(s), feel(s) [HON]', but was morphologically more marked.

(f) oposimusu (4D): oposI- (RY of oposu, 4D) + mesu(4D) 'think(s) [HON]' 

Since oposimusu can be analyzed as the combination of two honorific verbs, it is fair to infer that the grammaticalization of oposimusu happened later than the emergence of both oposu and mesu as honorific verbs, and oposimusu would have had a stronger honorific sense than oposu used by itself.

This phenomenon of honorific bolstering can be understood as another instance of the principle of markedness as it is observed in morphological replacement and renewal. According to this theory, a word or morpheme is replaced by a different one, or renewed by an additional “mark,” to clarify the intended meaning. This

28 On markedness theory in general, see Mayrthseler (1988) and Battistella (1990).
newer form, through use over time, comes to apply in a broader range of contexts (e.g. social, semantic, and grammatical), and eventually is no longer felt by speakers to be marked. At this point in its evolution, the form may be replaced, or may get renewed again, usually by the addition of morphological material to express the semantic feature that is no longer so clearly associated with original form. This yields a new form that is, diachronically speaking, doubly marked. An example of this in English is a form like irregardless, which arose—perhaps through contamination with irrespective—as a way of insuring that the negative force of -less in regardless was, as it were, not missed. Additional examples may commonly be found in the deictic pronominal forms in many of the world’s languages, where over time the deictic force of demonstratives weakens, resulting in the creation of new, strengthened forms like dialectal English this’here for earlier this.29

Let us examine another such case, in the verb kikosu ‘hear(s)/listen(s) to [HON].’

\[(g) \text{kikosu (4D)}: \text{kik-} + a + su \quad (4D) > \text{kika-su} \]
\[> \text{kikosu ‘hear(s), say(s) [HON]’} \]

---

29 Also it is true in the case of Japanese demonstratives. Kore, sore, and are were originally kō, so, and a, respectively.
Unger (1977/1993) hypothesizes that there was already *kiko-su* in Old Japanese, of which the proto form was *kiko-su* (-ce in his transcription). The base verb *kiku*, which indicates the simple action of 'hear/listen,' gained a thematic ME form with /a/ some time before the Nara period. The attachment of the honorific suffix -su (4D) produced an honorific verb meaning 'hear(s)/listen(s) [HON]' in Old Japanese, which then developed an extended meaning, 'say(s) [HON].' It is possible that there was a semantic link which tied the casing of 'hear/listen to' to 'say,' insofar as 'make (something) heard' is a less direct way to express the notion of 'say.' This link might have been related to the causative structure for honorification. The thematic /o/ vowel may have prevailed in order to distinguish this verb from transitive *kikasu* 'make someone hear/listen to,' which would mean that the lexicalization of the honorific verb *kikosu* happened later than the lexicalization of verb *kikasu* in Old Japanese. The combination remained in the 4D paradigm after lexicalization.

As *kikosu*, the causative-derived, marked honorific verb for hear/listen, over time became so established that its deployment was less striking, the clarity or force
with which it indexed deference seems to have weakened, resulting in a reduction in the form's markedness, and an opening for a more marked way to express an honorific 'hear(s), listen(s)'. Thus was a way opened for the derivation and eventual lexicalization of a new verb, kikosimesu.

(h) kikosimesu (4D): kikosi (RY of kikosu, 4D) + mesu (4D) > kikosimesu ‘hear(s)/listen(s) [HON]’

This verb emphasized the speaker’s respect for the referent, and surpassed the older kikosu in degree. Kikosu remained as an honorific but not so clearly honorific alternative to the innovative kikosimesu.

1.3. Honorific Auxiliaries

Honorific auxiliaries in Classical Japanese are called sankei no hojodooshi ‘supplementary verbs for honorification.’ Etymologically speaking, all of the honorific auxiliaries were originally honorific verbs, and most of them were still used as independent honorific verbs even after their grammaticalization as honorific auxiliaries. Unlike in the case of sankei no jodooshi, kokugogaku scholars unanimously agree that honorific auxiliaries are a distinct hinshi, which comprises a
category just between inflecting suffix and verb. There
is no phonological reduction during the process of its
grammaticalization as a honorific auxiliary verb, whereas
most of the inflecting suffixes underwent some
phonological and paradigmatic reduction during the
grammaticalization before settling down as suffixes. In
other words, honorific auxiliaries are more independent
and verb-like than inflecting suffixes in the sense that
they retain the full inflection paradigms of the
independent verbs they derive from, and always follow the
infinitive (KY) form of verbs. They are less independent
than verbs in the sense that they are used to modulate the
meaning of another verb, but only to add honorific, not
ideational, meaning. By the end of the Heian period there
existed about ten auxiliary verbs (hojodoosshi) for
honorification, but in Early Middle (Chuo ko) Japanese,
only three were common: tamahu, ohasu, and ohashimasu.
Let us review each of these in turn.

(a) tamahu (4D)

The auxiliary verb tamahu for honorification, was an
application of the honorific ditransitive verb tamahu (4D)
'give(s), confer(s) [HON].' As explained in the case of
-(sa)su in 1.1., this auxiliary verb tamashu came to be combined with -(sa)su for double honorification. The honorific auxiliary use of ditransitive tamashu must have started somewhat as follows. Its original lexical meaning as an honorific verb was for someone of higher position to give something to someone in a lower position. When applied to the infinitive (RY) of a verb, this would have specified the social directionality of the act that verb represented. Thus, the combination of /infinitive X + tamashu 'give'/ expressed a situation where the referent did the recipient the favor of some-anything-act X. By the beginning of the Heian period, the double honorification /-(sa)sē-tamashu/ was grammaticalized as the highest honorific form and in the bargain, the honorific verb 4D tamashu was also grammaticalized as an auxiliary, where its original meaning 'give' gave way to a more general deferential meaning, honorification of the subject's action. There are a couple of variants of 4D tamashu, namely tabu and taubu, in the text of the Ōkagami, but they were not commonly used in Early Middle Japanese, apparently. The difference between them is considered to
be purely phonological in traditional kokugogaku scholarship.30  

(5) Kaguyahime ito itaku nashi-tamahU. [TM]31  
N very hard cry-HON  
'Kaguyahime cries [HON] very hard.'

(b) ohasu (SH) and ohashimasu (4D)

As explained in section 1.2, there are honorific verbs ohasu and ohashimasu with the meaning 'do(es) [HON].' The auxiliary verbs ohasu and ohashimasu were simply applications of those honorific verbs.

(6) Itsu sika to mati-ohasuru-ni.... [GM]32  
when-DI QUOT wait-HON-CONJ  
'although (he) is waiting anxiously, (wondering) "when?"'

1.4. Morphological Layering in Predication

In order to interpret the significance of the fact that both of the inflecting suffixes that functioned honorifically, -(ra)su and -(sa)su, are attached to the ME form, it will help to review the layered structure of predication in Classical Japanese. Here is the diagram for laying categories which Quinn (1987) proposes:

30 For example, see Akiba (1960: 167). Kokubo (1976: 144-145) supports the idea that these variants of tamah were already out of date in the Heian period.
31 In Taketori Monogatari, "Kaguyahime no shooten" section.
32 From the Fune no ukihashi chapter.
The lexical base is the core or nucleus (kaku) of the whole, and it is an inflected predicate. Valency converters are -(la)ru and -(sa)su in Classical Japanese and their basic features are de-agentivization, and agentivization, respectively. As Quinn notes, directional verbs were basically used to add a spatial orientation or direction to the action referred to by the lexical base, such as up and down, but some of them came to refer not only to the spatial, but also the social, direction of the action, indexing the speaker’s view of the referent, such as up (= honorific, applied to others) and down (= humble, applied to one’s own person(s)).

Aspectual inflecting suffixes such as perfective -nu and -tsu basically indicate the realization of events, while inflecting suffixes for modality include the likes of optative/suppositional -mu, established fact -ki, and externally established fact -keri. These express the speaker’s intentions, desires and beliefs, but also

---

33 Predicate (juojoen) is a general term for verbs, adjectives, or noun plus copula.
necessity and obligation. The status layer contains further specification of the same two kinds of modality.

Quinn (1987) calls the inflecting suffixes which function inside the ideational realm, such as valency converters -(ra)ru and -(sa)su, Inner Operators. Inflectional suffixes which are outside of the ideational framework, such as the evidential markers -ki and -keri, he classifies as Outer Operators. Note that the valency converters and directionals, such as honorific auxiliary verbs, come right after the lexical core of the predicator: as Quinn suggests, this syntactic closeness corresponds to a semantic closeness and the closer a morpheme is located to the predicator base, the closer the semantic relationship between the two is (cf. Jacobsen (1992), Bybee (1985) and Bybee et al. (1995)). When they are used honorifically, valency converters and directionals index a socially delictic stance within the ideational scope by expressing the speaker's view of the referent in society. Let us look at an example.

(7)  haira-se-tamabi-te-mo,... [GM]  
enter-HON-HON-GER-CONJ  
'although (he) entered [HON] (his palace at night),...'

31 The term "ideational" is introduced by M.A.K. Halliday (1985, inter alia) as one of his three metafunctions of language.
32 From Genji monogatari, Kiritsubo.
In (7), first there is hairu as a lexical base, followed by -ru, RY of a valency converter -su (used here honorifically), and then tamah-., RY of the honorific auxiliary verb tamah as a directional, attaching to -ru, RY of exocentric perceptive -tu as an aspectual marker, all of which are Inner Operators in the layer constructing the ideational framework for the predicate.

When analyzing the semantic relevance of each of the inflecting suffixes based on their relationship (setsuzoku), or interface, it must be noted that there are differences among the suffixes which attach to the MZ. For example, although the negative suffixes -zu/ji also attach to MZ, they are Outer Operators that fill the modality slot of predicates, whereas -(sa)zu and -(sa)su, as Inner Operators, fill positions right after the lexical base (kazu 'nouns'), and index a social relation. The honorific suffixes -(sa)zu and -(sa)su are the only inflecting suffixes that do not allow any other suffix to come in between themselves and the MZ form of the lexical base. Therefore, a simple analysis and classification based on the forms to which the inflecting suffixes attach
(e.g. ME) is not enough to pinpoint the characteristics of any one of them, including -(ra)ru and -(sa)su. Their place in the hierarchy of operators must also be noted.

As we have seen in this chapter, the inflecting suffixes -(ra)ru and -(sa)su, honorific verbs, and honorific auxiliary verbs served the function of honorification in the predication of Early Middle Japanese. However, most of them had non-honorific origins. There were two kinds of historical change. Semantically, their original meanings extended in ways that constrained or treated the subject in a special way. Syntactically, they grammaticalized into the larger layered structure of a complex predicator over time. In most cases, the motivation for the final products of this process was to preserve, by bolstering, the honorific sense of older forms.

I shall now focus on a particular text (or particular texts in a particular period of time) and adduce actual examples in order to have a look beyond the general account presented above. Ookagami (completed by the early 12th century) is a very good source to analyze because there are many examples of honorific predication used in reference to a set of known personages in known social
positions, by a narrating persona, Yotsugi, who is presented as having lived in the same society.
CHAPTER 2   HONORIFIC PREDICATION IN OOKAGAMI

2.0. Ookagami: Historical background and setting

Ookagami 'The Great Mirror' is one of the oldest prose compositions written in the Japanese vernacular language (Wabun). Wabun was written in the kana syllabary, as distinct from kanbun, Chinese writing mainly used for official documents, including history. Although there are many theories about the exact date, all hypotheses agree that the Ookagami was written in the early middle ages, some time between the second half of the eleventh century and the early twelfth century.\(^1\) The author of the work is still unknown, although many candidates have been suggested by scholars, based on certain passages in the text. Judging from the style and other features of the text, it is agreed that the author was a male aristocrat who was very close to the Fujiwara clan.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) The earliest theory suggests 1028 and the latest 1141, a range of almost 120 years. For general information about the date issue, see Matsumura (1966: 11-15).

\(^2\) More than a dozen names have been suggested as candidates mainly because of comparison with their other writings, their knowledge of Chinese historiography, and their relations with the Fujiwara clan.
Traditionally, **Ookagami** is regarded as belonging to the genre of **rekishi monogatari** 'historical tales,' which by definition depict real historical events. As Konishi (1986) reminds us, however, truth and fiction are also matters of the narrative stance of a writer, and the "truth" of **rekishi monogatari** does not necessarily correspond to the historical reality of the content of the tales. Given that no **rekishi monogatari** can be perfectly objective, what matters most is not the correspondence of a narrated event to the world per se, but the willingness of the audience to accept what the narrator says as true. Konishi asserts that history was adopted by a writer of **rekishi monogatari** as a genre framework to indicate to an audience that his/her narrative was not fictitious.³

Regardless of the presence of fictional elements, which raise questions about the factuality of the events depicted in the text, scholars have noted that **Ookagami** contains subtle criticism of certain aspects of the Heian government, directed at specific events and specific individuals. This differentiates **Ookagami** from the more fictitious portrayal of Heian court life presented in **Eiga monogatari** 'A Tale of Flowering Fortunes' (c.1030). **Eiga**

monogatari also belongs to the genre of rekishi monogatari, and its title refers to its admiring account of the life and times of Fujiwara no Michinaga. There are few criticisms of anyone in the narrative, veiled or otherwise. Another difference between Ookagami and Eiga monogatari is the format. Ookagami is a first-person narrative written in a style called kidentai 'anecdotal style' or 'anecdotal format,' a kind of biographical history writing, whereas Eiga monogatari follows a chronological format called henzenzai 'chronological format/style.' Both styles were major ways to structure a history in Chinese history writing, and it is fair to interpret both of these rekishi monogatari as the products of authors who were well grounded in the styles of traditional Chinese historiography. In terms of narrative features, however, a significant difference between Ookagami and Eiga monogatari is technique: Ookagami has a fictional setting aimed at making the events depicted seem factual, whereas Eiga monogatari does not present any special narrative technique such as layered settings for the story in order to make it seem factual. Now let us look at the narrative settings of Ookagami.

In the year 1025, the narrator tells us, he journeyed to a Buddhist temple in Kyoto, the Urin'in, to hear the
yearly enlightenment sermon, or bodai koo. While waiting for the preacher to arrive to deliver the sermon, the narrator comes across two old men, Ooyake no Yotsugi, aged 190, and Natsuyma no Shigeki, aged 180. To entertain those waiting with them for the preacher’s arrival, namely Yotsugi’s wife, Shigeki and his wife, and one young attendant, Yotsugi starts telling stories about the good old days, which for him go back quite some time. The narrative is constituted mainly of Yotsugi’s storytelling, interspersed with occasional comments and objections made by Shigeki and the young attendant in the audience. The primary narrator, who has introduced Yotsugi and his companions to the reader, then fades from the text itself, except for one occasion in the midst of the larger narration (ji no bun), in which s/he expresses a desire to comment on Yotsugi’s story. Yotsugi, then, functions as a secondary narrator who is also a character within the story’s outermost frame, and he delivers most of what the book has to relate. Yotsugi presents an account of events

1 In English literal gloss, Ooyake no Yotsugi means ‘Record of the Royal Succession’ and Natsuyma no Shigeki means ‘Dense Forest in the Summer Mountains.’ According to Yashibana et al. (1996: 433-435), it has been pointed out by some scholars that both names are related to the lives of traditional katasuhi ‘narrative guild performers’ in sarugaku, and celebrate longevity.

2 The part of the primary narrator’s narration (ji no bun) is minimal; except for the introduction of the setting at Urim’in and the arrival of the Buddhist preacher at Urim’in at the end, s/he is virtually absent.
he actually saw and heard throughout his long life, in a kind of personalized "Chronicles of Japan."

The narrative framework of Ookagami thus establishes three layers within the text, as shown below in Figure 1. The innermost layer consists of the historical situations described in the text, such as which emperor did what to whom, or what Fujiwara no Michinaga did, and so on. These situations and events are related as if nonfictional, so the first layer might be called historical ground zero.

![Figure 1. Narrative layers in Ookagami](image-url)

The second layer is the setting where the narration of so much of the text takes place, the gathering peopled by the narrator Yotsugi and his audience at the Urin'in. This setting is doubtless fictional. It is in the third layer
of the text that the outermost narrator/authorial persona interfaces with the reader. Note that the contemporary readers of the Ōkagami see "historical events" not directly, but through the second layer Yotsugi and other characters present in the text of Ōkagami, as a filter. For this reason there is a certain historical fuzziness in the text, which may be a critical flaw if one pursues the historicity of each anecdote. However, by covering the first layer of nonfictional layer with the second, more overtly fictional layer, the outermost narrator/authorial persona mediates the events of the past for his contemporary readers in the early middle ages, by means of the narrative of the 190-year-old Yotsugi, who says he saw or heard them directly. Although it is not clear if there were archaisms in Yotsugi's narration, these readers would have themselves experienced the rise of the Fujiwara clan. At the same time, because the third layer is set in the "present" (the year 1025), the contemporary reader never loses his/her familiarity and link with his contemporary milieu as s/he reads the text. These layers, realized through the application of both fictional and nonfictional monogatari techniques, construct a multi-dimensional and non-linear portrayal of one version of historical reality. The resulting narrative differs markedly from monogatari
that describe "history" in a straightforward, linear manner.

Although many versions of the text of Oukagami still exist, the Konoe-bon 'Konoe manuscript' is considered to be the closest to the original, mainly because of its organization and a general lack of grammatical editing by the transcribers of later periods. While there is historical evidence that the original consisted of three volumes, the Toomatsu-bon 'Toomatsu manuscript,' the oldest known complete version, was copied around the time of the Bun'ei era (1264-1275) and is the only version that consists of six volumes. The Konoe-bon is more recent than the Toomatsu-bon but is said to have been directly copied from the same manuscript as the Toomatsu-bon. Moreover, the Konoe-bon still retains the older form of three volumes. Therefore, I have used the Konoe-bon for this study, but refer to the Toomatsu-bon, paying special attention to any crucial differences. Book One, Ten 'heaven,' begins with the two old men’s introductions (jō 'preface') and continues with the recounting of the reigns

---

6 For example, scholars considered to be Oukagami specialists, such as Kokubu Taka'eki, Akiba Yasutarō, and Hosaka Hiroshi are all in favor of the Konoe-bon, rather than the Toomatsu-bon. However, both of the two available translations in English, by Joseph K. Yamagiwa (1967) and Helen Craig McColough (1980), are based on the Toomatsu-bon, and other scholars disagree over whether the Konoe-bon or the Toomatsu-bon is closer to the original.
of fourteen emperors and retired emperors, from Montoku to Go-Ichijō (850-1025). In the next volume, Chi 'earth,' Yotsugi tells the stories of the ministers belonging to the Fujiwara clan during these fourteen imperial reigns. Finally, in the last volume, Hitō 'the men,' Yotsugi recounts the story of Fujiwara no Michinaga, who plays a central role in the history of the Fujiwara family.

2.1. Inflecting Suffixes

2.1.1. -(Ra)ru

As Kokubo (1968) points out, in Okegami there are many complex predicates in which -(ra)ru attaches to non-honorific verbs in order to make them honorific expressions. In Early Middle Japanese, the combination of a non-honorific verb and -(ra)ru is traditionally interpreted as indexing the lowest degrees of respect among the honorific expression and is not supposed to be used for aristocrats of high rank. However, when one looks at the ninety-one examples of those combinations in the Konno-bon text, it is clear that the range of the status of referent indexed in those predicates is quite broad. The people of highest rank referred to by Yotsugi in -(ra)ru predication are the retired emperors Sanjō-in and Nazan-in, although these two are the only emperors
referred to with -(ra)ru predication. So such examples are limited to two predicates out of a total of ninety-one.

The referents of the next highest rank referred to with -(ra)ru are ministers from the Fujiwara clan or other members of the emperor’s family. These profiles of such high-ranking referents show that the combination of plain (i.e. non-honorific) verb and -(ra)ru, in okagami at least, is not limited solely to referring to aristocrats of the lowest rank. This contrasts with the traditional view of complex predicates with plain verb plus -(ra)ru.

Kokubo interprets this fact as possibly due to the writer’s stylistic preference for men’s writing, which was originally considered to be based on a style of writing in the Japanese language that was influenced by the conventions of reading Chinese texts off as Japanese (asanbun).\(^7\)

Another kind of honorific expression was the suffxing of an honorific verb with -(ra)ru. In Okagami, this combination is seen only with the honorific verb ohosu ‘say(s), speak(s)’ [HUN].\(^8\) Ohosu of course functioned as an honorific predicate by itself, so with

\(^7\) Kokubo (1968: 113).
-(ra)ru attached to it, as obosE-raru, it was expressed doubly honorific. In Ookagami, referents of this verbal combination are limited to emperors, empresses, and the family of the Chancellor, Fujiwara no Michinaga. It therefore seems likely that obosE-raru as a predication indexed the highest degree of respect, saiko keigo.

There are five common honorific expressions in Ookagami with inflecting suffix -(ra)ru, namely, obosimesA-ru, obosA-ru, obosinarA-ru, [plain verb]-rE-tamahu (plain verb plus RY of -ru plus tamahu), and chasimasA-ru. The first three mean 'think(s), feel(s) [HON]' and the last two 'is/are [HON].' Among the complex predicators for 'think/feel,' oboshimesA-ru is the most honorific because of its derivation from two honorific verbs, obosu plus mesu, in addition to the suffix -ru.

ObosA-ru is the next most honorific, and oboshinarA-ru was probably the least honorific among them, although there is only one example in the Ookagami. Regarding [plain verb]-rE-tamahu, Kokubo agrees with the kokugogaku theory that the combination of -(ra)ru and tamahu is not supposed to have been used until the late Heian (Chuusai) and the existence of two examples of -rE-tamahu in the Ookagami.
are worth paying attention to. This assertion of Kokubo's was made probably because it might constitute evidence that -ke-tamahu already existed or was just starting to be used in Early Middle Japanese. Although the significance of these rare examples is not clear, I would suggest the possibility that the transcribers in the later period might have miscopied them accidentally. Kokubo classifies this complex predicator the same as ohashimasu, which he considers saikoo keigo.

Overall, it is not very common in Ookagami to combine -(ra)ru with an honorific verb, and this fact may support the traditional kokugogaku theory that -(ra)ru is the honorific marker for the lowest degree of respect. But we still do find it used of such illustrious referents as Sanjoo-in and Kazan-in.

2.1.2 -(Sa)su

As noted in Chapter 1, the inflecting suffix -(sa)su was not used independently for honorific meaning. Therefore, -(sa)sE-tamahu is acknowledged as the purest double honorific expression, or saikoo keigo. In


6 There is only one example of ohashimasA-ru, which Yotsugi used when he addressed his audience. This is one of the examples that shows Yotsugi conveys very high honorific terms to his audience in Urin'in.
Ookagami, Yotsugi uses -(sa)sE-tamahu for referents who are emperors, members of the imperial family and the family of Fujiwara no Michinaga. Shigeki, the second character/narrator of Ookagami, follows the practice of Yotsugi. Yotsugi and Shigeki do not use tamahu alone as an honorific auxiliary verb in reference to people of whom they use -(sa)sE-tamahu regularly. This fact suggests that both Yotsugi and Shigeki had a clear social distinction in mind when choosing between -(sa)sE-tamahu and tamahu by itself as an honorific auxiliary verb. It seems clear that they considered the combined double honorification of -(sa)sE plus tamahu as fitting referents only of the highest rank.

However, when we take a closer look, we see that Yotsugi occasionally used tamahu by itself of certain emperors. There is an intriguing study by Kokubo (1976) which claims that one can determine a differential indexing of deference towards the referent by Yotsugi. Here is a table for the breakdown of the referents excerpted from Kokubo's study, with some modifications.\(^{10}\)

\[\text{From Kokubo (1968: 137). I included -shinE-tamahu in the category of -(sa)sE-tamahu because in my opinion the difference between them is purely one of style and not of degree of respect.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Succession # and reign</th>
<th>Emperor's name (referent)</th>
<th># of NUX-tamahu</th>
<th># of -(sa)se-tamahu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 (593-628)</td>
<td>Suzo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (645-654)</td>
<td>Kootoku</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 (668-672)</td>
<td>Tenchi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (673-688)</td>
<td>Tenmu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (690-697)</td>
<td>Jitoo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (697-707)</td>
<td>Mormu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 (724-749)</td>
<td>Shoomu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 (749-758)</td>
<td>Kooken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 (764-770)</td>
<td>Shootoku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (781-916)</td>
<td>Kanmu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 (833-856)</td>
<td>Ninmyoo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 (850-858)</td>
<td>Montoku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 (858-876)</td>
<td>Seiwa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 (876-884)</td>
<td>Yozel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (884-897)</td>
<td>Kookoo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 (887-897)</td>
<td>Uda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 (897-930)</td>
<td>Daigo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 (930-946)</td>
<td>Suzaku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 (946-967)</td>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 (967-969)</td>
<td>Reizai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 (969-984)</td>
<td>En'yuu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 (984-989)</td>
<td>Kazan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 (989-1011)</td>
<td>Ichijoo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 (1011-1016)</td>
<td>Sanjoo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (1016-1036)</td>
<td>Go-Ichijoo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Tamahu and -(sa)se-tamahu in ookagami
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This table may indeed show something of Yotsugi's personal attitude towards each of the emperors he depicts in Kokagami. Notice that the ratio of tamahu to -(sa)se-tamahu varies from emperor to emperor. Also, some emperors are not referred to with double honorific expressions as often as other emperors. For example, Yotsugi uses six predicates with an auxiliary verb tamahu for emperor Tenchi as a referent; only two of these six predicates are double honorifics, and the rest, that is, 67% of the total predicates with tamahu used of Tenchi add only tamahu, and are not double honorifics. In the case of emperor Seiwa, only three out of eight predicates were double honorifics. However, it is hard to imagine that Yotsugi is disapproving or otherwise deprecatory of any of these emperors he used a single tamahu for, such as Tenchi or Seiwa, who were regarded as great rulers by his contemporaries. It seems likely that Yotsugi's use of tamahu as an auxiliary verb does not necessarily reflect his degree of respect towards each emperor. It is also unlikely that the length of reign was the key factor of deciding the degree of honorific terms, as is clear in the case of Kazan or Sanjoo.

However, it does seem that in the case of older emperors who reigned longest ago, Yotsugi uses tamahu
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alone more frequently, which may simply indicate Yotsugi's own chronological and, thus, experiential distance from those emperors. Although Kokube does not interpret this differential usage in terms of distance, he does mention that Yotsugi's use of the simple predicate tamahu for earlier emperors might indirectly reveal the significance of these honorific expressions for the author of Oookagami in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. In the text of Oookagami, there are also eight examples of -shimu-tamahu, which I have counted in the category of -(sa)sE-tamahu. The use of ancient causative -shimu, ordinarily associated with the Chinese style of writing in Japanese (kanbun), in Japanese prose composition also suggests that Oookagami was probably written by a person who was familiar with scholarly writing of the mid-Heian period where this causative was used, that is, a male aristocrat.

2.2 Honorific verbs

There are ten honorific verbs used in the text of Oookagami. Let us look at an example of each.

(a) Asobasu 'do(es) [NON]'

One can find two kinds of asobasu in the text. One is lexical, and follows the 4B inflecting paradigm, and the other one is derived from the verb asobu and the inflecting suffix -(sa)su; this therefore inflects as S2.
The reason why there are two kinds of inflections is that the stem asobA- is attached to by two different morphemes.

(a-1) asobA + -su (4D) > asobasu (4D)

(1) Maku mo asobasi-keru ni,... \[Ten\]^11

poem INCL does [+HON] -DEF COP

'that (he) even composes [HON] poetry,...'

As discussed in Chapter 1, (a-1) was derived from the pre-
old Japanese combination of asob- and earlier honorific
suffix -su (4D) 'do(es) [HON]' and was lexicalized as an
honorific verb during the Nara period. The other asobasu
in Ookagami was derived, and not a lexical item.

(a-2) AsobA + -su (S2) > asobA-su (S2)

(2) Sugyoo sI-asobase-tamaH-te,... \[Hito\]^12

austerities do-HON-HON-GER

'(He) goes [HON] to practice religious training,
and...'

Judging from its S2 inflecting paradigm, this combination
should be parsed into a 4D verb asobu plus a inflecting
suffix -(sa)su (S2) for honorific meaning. This layered
predicate asoba-se-tamaH can thus be understood as a
double honorific expression built on a verb that was not
itself honorific, so that the whole complex breaks down as

---

^11 Heavey/Yoshifusa (p.69, line 4). The speaker is Yotsugi and
the referent is Fujiwara no Yoshifusa.

^12 Man/Michihara (p.375, line 6). The speaker is Yotsugi and the
referent is emperor Uda.
asobasu-tamah (plain verb + HON + HON). It is not clear to me if the same kind of expression with lexical asobasu (4D), namely, asobasu-tama, existed in Early Middle Japanese. There is no instance of its use in the text of Ookagami.

(b) ohasu/ohasimasu

In Ookagami, there are also two kinds of ohasu, in terms of inflection, one 4D and the other 5N. There are two meanings for ohasu and ohasimasu. Their primary meaning is ‘is, exists [+animate, HON]’ and the honorific equivalent of the verbs ari ‘be’ and wari ‘be.’ The other meaning, which is less frequently found, is ‘goes or comes [HON]’ and in this sense, ohasu and ohasimasu function as the honorific version of verbs yuku ‘go’ and ku ‘come.’ The example for ohasu is as follows.

(3) Kooji ohasi-ni-tari. [Hitot, 248][13]  
lecturer come+[HON]-ENDPP-RES  
‘The preacher has just come [HON].’

The ideational meaning of ohasimasu is the same as ohasu, that is, it covers ‘be, exist [HON]’ and ‘go, come [HON].’ However, since it seems to have strengthened th

[13] Man/Michinlsa (p.419, line 13). The speaker is someone among the audience at Urin’im and the referent is the Buddhist preacher who just arrived at Urin’im to give the enlightenment sermon, which adumbrates the conclusion of the story of Ookagami.
simple verbs's honorific sense by adding -masu, ohasimasu would have probably indexed a higher degree of respect, at least while it coexisted with ohasu. Therefore, diachronically speaking, ohasimasu represents the accumulation in a single verb of what were at one time three separate honorific elements. Ohasimasu shows only 4D inflection in Ookagami. As for the difference between ohasimasu and ohasu, ohasimasu is used only for those referents who are usually referred to with saikoo keigo, in contrast with ohasu, which is used only for referents of lower rank, such as the Buddhist preacher referred to in example (3) above. Synchronically speaking, therefore, in the time when the Ookagami was written, ohashimasu was a doubly honorific verb, and ohasu, a simple honorific verb.

Ohasu and its strengthened form ohashi-masu also function as a verbal component governing an adverbial component in the same predicate, giving it honorific significance. This component may be of the form /adj + -ku/ as in (4):

(4) TanososikU-ohasimasU. [Ten]\textsuperscript{14}  
\textquoteleft\textquoteleft(He) is\textquoteleft\textquoteleft[HON] trustable.'

\textsuperscript{14} Heaven/Go-Ichijo-in (p.34, line 6). The speaker is yotsugi and the referent is Fujiwara no Michinaga.
When ochasu renders a nominal predicate honorific, it follows the locative particle ni as an honorific substitute for the ari of copula nari, as in (5):

(5) Saiwaibito ni ochasimasU. [Ten]15
    (he) is[HON] a lucky man.'

(c) imasu/masimasu 'is/are, exist(s), come(s)[HON']

Imasu and masimasu are treated together because they are said to index the same degree of honorification.

There are only two examples in which imasu and masimasu are used independently as honorific verbs in Ookagami. These two examples for imasu are inflected in the RY, and the two examples for masimasu are SS. See example (6):

(6) kaku imazE-terU koto,... [Ten]16
    such come[HON]-RES that
    'that you came [HON] like this,...'

(d) notamahu

According to Akiba (1968), notamahu is a contracted form of nori-ramahu, the base of which is nori (RY of 4D noru 'tell,' from which the nori of norito 'Shinto prayers' is derived). This verb refers to emperors or

---

15 Heaven/Introduction (p.21, line 9). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is Go-Ichijo.
16 Heaven/Moromasa (p.144, line 4). The speaker is Fujiwara no Michinaga and the referent is Naritoki's daughter.
gods making pronouncements to their people. After lexicalizing as notamahu (4D), it came to have a broader honorific meaning of 'says, tells' or 'speaks.' See the next example, (7):

(7) ...to zo notamahı́-keru. [Chi]^{17}  
QUAT FOC say[HON]=EEF  
'...is indeed what (they) said [HON].'

In Ookagami, it is very common for notamahu to be used with the inflecting suffix -(sa)su (S2).

(8) ...to notamahasE-keru. [Hito]^{19}  
QUAT say[HON]=EEF  
'...is what (he) said[HON].'

Mainly because of the frequency of this combination of notamahu plus -(sa)su, scholarly opinion has it that people had begun to treat notamahA-su as one word, notamahasu (S2).^{19}

(e) ohosu

Ohosu is also the honorific verb for in 'say(s)' and it is used with the inflecting suffix -(ra)ru as in the following example:

---

^{17} Heaven/Tokihiro (p.84, line 8). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referents are old people in general[fuiki hitobito].

^{18} Man/Michinaga (p.327, line 11). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is Fujiwara no Michtaka.

(9) kaku obozE-raruzU,...

thus say+[HON]-HON

‘That (he) speaks [HON] thus,...’

(g) Mesu

Although it is known that the honorific verb mesu had
multiple meanings, it is used only in two senses in
Ookagami. One is ‘invite(s), call(s) [HON]’ and the other
is ‘eat(s), drink(s) [HON].’

(10) Soo mesE-do,...

priest call-[HON]-CONJ

‘(He) invites [HON] priests, but...’

(11) Kusuri wo mesi-taJi-kerU wo,...

medicine-ACC drink+[HON]-RES-EEF-CONJ

‘although (he) took [HON] medicine,...’

(g) sirasu/sirosimesu

Sirasu is a lexical item which was created by
compounding the verb siru ‘know’ with mesu, for
honorsification. The original meaning of siru is limited
to ‘know, realize, find out.’ It is very likely that some
time during the course of its lexicalization into sirasu,

20 Heaven/Morosama (p.144, line 10). The speaker is Fujiwara no
Haritoki’s daughter and the referent is Fujiwara no Michinaga.
21 Earth/Michitaka (p.266, line 14). The speaker is Yostugi and
the referent is Fujiwara no Korachika.
22 Heaven/Sanjo-in (p.33, line 15). The speaker is Yotsugi and
the referent is emperor Sanjoo.
over two stages of inflecting change, it came to mean ‘reign(s), govern(s)’ in reference to emperors or gods.

(g-1) sira(s) (4D): sira- (ME of siru, 4D) + -su (4D) > sira(s) ‘reign(s), govern(s)’ [KON]

This is a combination of ME form of siru plus the earlier honorific suffix -su (4D). Sirasu was used with this meaning of ‘reign, govern’ in Old Japanese, but in Early Middle Japanese, we find a more marked form, sirosimesu, presumably in order to bolster sirasu’s significance as an honorific verb.

(g-2) sirosimesu (4D): sira(s)-i (RY of sirasu, 4D) + mesu (4D) > sira(s)-mesu > sirosimesu

This more marked honorific verb was presumably created by attaching an honorific auxiliary verb mesu to the RY of sirasu, although it is difficult to explain the vowel alternation (a/o).23

(12) Yo wo sirosimesi-sika-ba,... [Chi]24
world ACC reign+[KON]-EP-CONJ
‘Although (he) ruled the world,...’

23 Sirasu is not attested in Old Japanese, nor is sirosimesu, although sirasu is attested for Old Japanese. So, it is possible that the /o/ form never existed until the Heian period, but it also seems unlikely that the /o/- /a/- alternate apprehend suddenly in the Heian period.
24 Earth/Michitaka (p.261, line 2). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is Fujiwara no Michinaga.
(h) obosu/obosimesu 'think [HON]'

As we have seen in Chapter 1, obosu came from the combination of omohu plus earlier honorific suffix -su (4D). Obosimesu is a strengthened form of obosu, owing to the addition of the honorific auxiliary verb mesu (4D).

(13) Itsa yasukara-zu obose-do mo,... [Chi]25
very pleasant-NEG think[HON]-CONJ FOC
'(He) finds [HON] it very unpleasant, but...'

(i) kikosu/kikosimesu 'hear [HON]'

The etymological relation of kikosu to kikosimesu is similar to the case of sirasu and sirosimesu. There is only one example of kikosu in Ookagami, and it is in combination with the honorific auxiliary verb mesu. Its rarity seems to support the view that kikosu, which was originally a compound of kiku 'hear, listen to' and the ancient honorific suffix -su (4D) became gradually less common after the early Heian period.26 The much greater frequency with which kikosimesu, an honorifically strengthened version of kikosu, is used in Ookagami would appear to confirm this.

25 Heaven/Yoritada (p.108, line 12). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is Fujiwara no Yoritada.
(14) Kane no koc wo kikosimasite... [Ten]
    bell GEN voice ACC hear[HON]-GER
    'He hears [HON] the sound of a bell, and...'

(15) tamahu 'give(s), confer(s) [HON]'

Tamahu (4D) is used as an honorific equivalent of the verb kudasu 'give, confer.' Although there are some phonological variations such as tabu in Otagami, tamahu is most common.

(15) yuzuke bakari tamahu. [Man]
    porridge (of rice) only give[HON]
    'He gives [HON] only a cup of porridge (to the priests).'

2.3. Auxiliary verbs

one finds three auxiliary honorific verbs in Otagami. None of them appears to have functioned as an independent lexical item; their function is rather to mark or intensify the meaning of honorification in the predicate.

---

27 Heaven/Toshihira (p.78, line 3). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is Fujiwara no Michinaga.
28 Man/Michinaga (p.400, line 6). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is the host of hoko 'Buddhist memorial service' at the Hoojooji (Hoojoo Temple) in July, 1022.
(a) asobasu

Matsumura et al. (1981) claim that the use of asobasu as an auxiliary verb started in the Edo period (kinsai). While it may appear that there are examples of asobasu being used as an auxiliary verb in Otokogami, that is, as early as the end of eleventh century, these are probably the honorific complex derived with gorañji-asobu (4D) and the suffix -(sa)ru. And it is always the case that this asobu-su is followed by another honorific auxiliary verb, tamahu (4D), as shown in the following example:

(16) Gorañji-asobu-su-tamañi-da,... [Chi]21
  look[HON]-do-HON-HON-CONJ
  '(he) takes a look [HON], and then...' 

Since the meaning 'do' does not have any semantic function in the sentence, this use of asobasu might be a mistranscription for the 4D lexical asobasu, which I presented in (a-1) in this chapter. This three-layered complex represents the highest degree of honorific in Otokogami.

(b) Tamahu with variation of tabu/taubu (4D)

Tamahu (4D) and its variants are very common auxiliary verbs in Otokogami. The inflecting paradigm of the auxiliary tamahu in honorific meaning is 4D, as distinguished from the auxiliary verb tamahu expressing

21 Earth/Moromasa (p.190, line 2). The speaker is Yostugi and the referent is emperor Go-Ichijoo.
humble meaning, the inflecting paradigm of which is S2. There are three possible forms of honorific predicates that use the honorific auxiliary verb tamahu in combination with other elements.

(1) RY of verb [± honorific] + tamahu
(II) -(ra)E (RY of -(ra)ru) + tamahu
(III) -(sa)E (RY of -(sa)su) + tamahu

Similar to category (I), categories (II) and (III) occasionally have two instantiations, namely, with honorific verbs or non-honorific verbs. A predicate shows a higher degree of respect when there is a -(ra)ru or -(sa)su between the main verb and tamahu. Combinations (II) and (III) are honorific expressions and (III) represents the highest level (saikō koigō), and was limited to referents of the highest rank. As stated earlier, the combination summarized as Type (II) had not yet appeared in the language in the mid-Heian period. According to traditional kokugogaku estimates the degree of respect (keiido), the gap between the degrees of a simple -tamahu and -(sa)E-tamahu in Okagami (c. mid-eleventh or beginning of twelfth century) is about the same as that evident in Makura no sooshi 'The Pillow Book'
(c.1004) and Genji monogatari ‘The Tale of Genji’
(c.1008).\(^{10}\)

(c) ohasu/ohasimasu

These honorific equivalents for *ari, warî ‘be, exist,’ ohasu and ohasimasu are also used as auxiliary verbs to make honorific reference to the subject of the base verb.

(17) Umaru-ohasimasuI-taru oohon-îka no motihi [Ten]\(^{11}\)
Be born HOR-RES 50th day GEN rice cake
‘The rice cakes for the 50th day celebration since (he) was born (HON),’

In this case, umaru, a plain verb, is marked for honorific meaning by an honorific auxiliary verb ohasimasu (a lexical double honorific), and the expression umaru-ohasimasu as a whole expresses an emperor’s birth, with the highest level of respect.\(^{12}\)

2.4 Conclusion

Over all, honorific predication in the text of Ookagami corresponds to the general description and aspects of honorific expressions described for Early

\(^{10}\) Cf. Kôubô (1976: 127-146).
\(^{11}\) Heaven/Daigo (p.36, line 11). The speaker is Yotsugi and the referent is emperor Daigo.
\(^{12}\) For a detailed discussion on the degree of respect for auxiliary verbs, tamadu, ohasu and ohasimasu, see Kôubô (1977: 88-97).
Middle (Chuuko) Japanese presented in Chapter 1. Nevertheless, there are still a couple of cases which seem odd for an Early Middle Japanese text, such as the use of 
\( -(ra)ru + tamahu \) or the apparent use of derived S2 (not lexical 4D) \( asoba-su \) as an auxiliary verb. One can always surmise that the passages containing these forms might have been mistranscribed in later periods. However, it is also possible that they in fact existed at the time when the original text of \( Otokamishima \) was written. Unless further sources of documentation, including older versions, are unearthed, these and other questions will remain unsolved.
CHAPTER 3  CONCLUSION

In this study, I have discussed some specific aspects of honorific predication in Classical Japanese by concentrating on examples from the text of the Kokagami. The data I have presented lead us to two significant interpretations which are overlooked in the kokugogaku tradition. The first observation is that it is not possible to prove that the Japanese language indeed experienced a shift from an absolute honorific system to a relational honorific system, as has been claimed by kokugogaku scholars. The second observation is that the honorific expressions of higher degree can be understood in terms of the ebb and flow of markedness, which is an issue completely overlooked in kokugogaku scholarship. Now let us look at each issue in this concluding chapter.

The first of these two issues is the transformation of the nature of the honorific system (keigo) from an absolute honorific system (zettai keigo) to a relational honorific system (sootai keigo). Kindaichi (1942, 1959) proposes that there are three stages in the development of the Japanese honorific system: (1) a stage of taboo; (2) a
stage of absolute honorific; and (3) a stage of relational honorific.1 Stage One is that in which people use certain kinds of expressions in order to avoid using taboo words (Kindaichi, 1959: 25-30). According to Kindaichi, these taboo expressions most often dealt with the social concept of the "impurity" of women. The indirectness of such taboo expressions became the origin of honorific expressions.2 In Stage Two, people invariably used fixed honorific expressions to refer to the same type of referent, whether s/he is inside (uchi) or outside (soto) of the group which the speaker belongs to. In this system, the situational context does not matter and the same honorific expressions are used for the same class of referents on every occasion, regardless of the context.3 Finally, in Stage Three, people use different honorific expressions depending on the referent and/or the

1 This theory is usually referred to as Kindaichi's theory of the evolutionary stages of honorific expressions (keigo kettendainai-setsu).
2 Kindaichi's examples are from the Ainu language, in which it is believed that what women say causes disasters. For example, wives cannot call husbands by their names because it is believed that it brings bad luck to their husbands. Kindaichi assumes that women's roundaboutness to express about their husbands became the origin of indirectness of honorific expressions.
3 It is known that modern Korean language shows an aspect which belongs to this type of honorific system. For instance, when one talks about his/her grandparents to the people outside of the family, s/he refers to his/her grandparents with honorific expressions, not with humble expressions, because older people are supposed to be referred to deferentially in any context, whether
situation, as in today's Japanese. In this system, gauging the context is crucial for choosing the right honorific expressions. Kindaichi explains the historical change in the honorific system as a gradual shift from absolute honorification to relational honorification, or the system of honorification of Modern Japanese.

Kindaichi and his followers' support their theory of a shift in the honorific system based on the phenomenon of self-honorification, called jikai hyoogen, in Classical Japanese. Self-honorification refers to those honorific expressions which the speaker uses to exalt himself and his own actions.¹ Such speakers were usually emperors and kokugogaku tradition has considered it as a legacy of an old fixed-referent system (i.e. absolute honorification) in which, for example, emperors were supposed to be honored in any context, even when they were the speakers (i.e. self-honorification). It is possible to interpret self-honorification as the speaker's honoring himself in reference to his own acts, and also as his exaltation of the position he occupies. Since such

---

¹ There are many proponents of Kindaichi's theory, among whom Ishizaka Shozo and Tsuchimura Toshiaki are the most enthusiastic. For a study on self-honorification Jikai hyoogen to support Kindaichi's theory, see Ishizaka (1969) and Tsuchimura (1992). For the general study on Jikai hyoogen, see Nishida Naotoshi (1987, 1995).
speakers are limited to emperors or deities in the myths, self-honorification is sometime called tenno-go 'the language of emperors' or sōdai-go 'the language of arrogance'. Some kokugogaku scholars, such as Fujitani Mitsue in the Edo period, Mitsuya Shigematsu in the Meiji period, and Ozaki Tonomitsu, do not believe that self-honorific expressions existed. Instead they argue that it was the writer/transcriber of the texts who decided occasionally to exalt the speaker's actions while writing about him in the text they were composing or copying.

As a possible social or pragmatic motivation for self-honorification, which is anything but absolute, Quinn (1995) refers to the notion of social deixis (cf. Levinson 1983) and suggests that self-honorification may have started out as an empathetic deixis whereby the speaker shifts to someone else's point of view. This sort of reference from a shifted point of view is also called "deictic projection" or "other-centered deixis" (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987 and Levinson 1983). In any case, the existence of self-honorific expressions in certain texts has led the majority of kokugogaku scholars to believe that the Japanese language originally had an absolute

honorific system, as Kindaichi has proposed. One problem with this idea is that JO includes uses of honorifics that are understandable as relative honorifics.

Furthermore, most of their examples of self-honorific expressions are drawn from lyrical and/or mythical compositions such as Manyooshuu (completed ca.759) or Nihonshoki (720), which purport to record the language of a good many deities and/or sovereigns. There are no prose compositions from any period prior to the beginning of the Heian period which they can cite in support of their theory. Therefore, their claims are hindered by a lack of evidence in a variety of genres; it may be the case that the phenomenon of self-honorification seems more present than it actually was, owing to the nature of the evidence: lyrical and other genres that report what gods and emperors said quite a bit more often than what other beings said. The kind of evidence that would allow generalizations about the language at large--extant texts of other genres, particularly narratives--just does not exist for Old Japanese. If, as some of the kokugogaku scholars believe, it is true that the absolute honorific system already had begun to break down and was being gradually replaced by a relational honorific system, then they must prove that the appearance of self-honorification
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in Old (Jōraku) Japanese was not due to such problems as genre constraints. The fact that self-honorification in Old Japanese is limited to lyrical/mythical compositions may be interpreted simply as evidence that self-honorification functioned outside of the framework of the honorific system to defer to those in positions of absolute power such as emperors and deities, as part of traditional Shinto belief. It does not necessarily mean that self-honorification was part of or the basis of the honorific system. In that case, we might say that part of Old Japanese had an absolute honorific system, but this is quite a different matter.

There seems to be little or no evidence in Early Middle Japanese of an absolute system. In Makura no sooshi 'The Pillow Book,' the author Sei Shônagon complains about the tendency of retainers and servants to refer to their own masters honorifically when they address an interlocutor who belongs to another household. Murasaki Shikibu, too, in Genji monogatari 'The Tale of Genji,' describes a scene in which the ladies in waiting find it very amusing that a little prince uses honorific expressions when referring to his own actions. Both

6 From Funi kotoha nareki hito koso. 27-dan in the Nagan-bon, 243-dan in the Yōsokibuko-bon.
7 From the Yosokibuko chapter.
examples show that people in the Heian period already had
a notion of relational honorifics, but neither of them
provides any evidence for the lingering presence of an
absolute honorific system.

As with any other ancient language for which we have
only limited written evidence, there is no way either to
prove or disprove what kokugogaku scholars say about the
shift from an absolute honorific system to a relational
honorific system in the history of the Japanese language.
However, I suggest the possibility that the Japanese
language was naturally prone to a relational honorific
system with the occasional, exceptional use of self-
honorification such as evidenced in the appearance of
tenno-o-go in lyrical/mythical texts. As mentioned
earlier, even the phenomenon of self-honorification could
have co-existed with a relational honorific system,
particularly if it is interpreted as an "other-centered
deixis" by which the emperor speaks of himself as "the
throne."

My second observation has to do with the
interpretation of the honorific system seen in the text of
Ookagami. Some kokugogaku scholars suggest that the
linguistic characteristics of the text of Ookagami,
including the emergence of the expressions I describe as
triple honorifics, were due to the fact that the text was a product of the cloistered government (Inseiiki no shosan). However, the birth of multiply honorific expressions is quite understandable without any reference to the “increased power” concentrated in the cloistered government around the time when Ookagami was supposedly written.

If one looks at the phenomenon of multiply honorific predications linguistically, or semiotically, rather than just historically and politically, one can see them as the very common cross-linguistic process of lexical renewal through additional marking. More marked lexical items tend to emerge when originally marked items have become so conventional that they begin to seem more symbolic than indexical, semiotically speaking. In this sense, they can be said to become unmarked. The idea is that to preserve marked reference to the original category, lexical items are often augmented with less conventionalized, more "marked" lexical items, and thereby

---

10 See, for example, Kokubo (1977:61).
11 Shirakawa (1053-1129, r. 1072-1086), a powerful emperor, abdicated the throne and entered holy orders in order to start the cloistered government system. He actually strengthened the cloistered emperor’s influence and continued to govern, exercising actual political power over the emperors, and ruling for forty-four years (1086-1129) as a cloistered emperor.

12 This interpretation of loss of honorific markedness is due to Charles Quinn.
come once again to function as marked forms. These are then slowly incorporated into the linguistic system. This is one of the core arguments of markedness theory, as I have mentioned in previous chapters, and this seems to have been exactly what was going on with doubly and triply marked honorific predicates of the mid-Heian period. The process is a natural and widely attested one, and there is no need to invoke a political reason for the "heavier" honorific expressions of the time. The birth of strengthened honorific expressions need not have anything to do with the power-concentrating of the cloistered system and does not necessarily reflect a transitional period of politics in Heian government.

The position of honorific elements in a layered predicator in Classical Japanese reminds us that honorific predication is not just a post-ideational overlay, but an indexing of the orientation of the speaker to the referent, expressed at the heart of the predicator, by inner operators, based in some way on the symbolic value of their original semantics. It is hoped that some of the material that I have presented and reanalyzed might suggest further re-interpretations of politeness phenomenon in Early Middle Japanese, from a cross-linguistic perspective.
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