

THREE KINDS OF *WA*-MARKED PHRASES AND TOPIC-FOCUS ARTICULATION IN JAPANESE*

Koichiro Nakamura (nakamura@gaines.hju.ac.jp)

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most interesting issues that has been extensively discussed in the literature of Japanese syntax since Kuroda (1965) and Kuno (1973) is the behavior of *wa*-marked phrases. *Wa*-marked phrases are commonly considered to be topics, but their behavior are never uniform. Let us begin by looking at some examples.

(1) a. Taro-wa furansugo-wa hanas-eru
T-Top French-Top speak-can
'As for Taro, he can speak French.'
b. Furansugo-wa Taro-wa hanas-eru
French-Top T-Top speak-can
'As for French, Taro can speak it.'

In the sentences in (1a) and (1b), *Taro* and *furansugo* (=French) are marked by *wa*, but their interpretation differs.

The first aim of this paper is to claim that *wa*-marked phrases are divided into three: Thematic Topic (henceforth, TT), Contrastive Topic (henceforth, CT,) and Contrastive Focus (henceforth, CF) with the focal stress on it. The second aim is to propose that Japanese phrase structure has two topic slots: the upper one is for TT, and the lower one is for CT. The third aim is to show that a focussed *wa*-marked phrase (henceforth, CF *wa*) is interpreted as focus, and move into Spec-FocP. The theoretical implication is that we can extend the claim we are making here to the analysis of DP scrambling in Japanese, too. Japanese DP scrambling can be analyzed as focus movement, which targets Spec-FocP.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In section 1, we take up the previous analyses and examine how *wa*-marked phrases were analyzed. In section 2, we divide *wa*-marked phrases into three: that is, Thematic Topic, Contrastive Topic, and Contrastive Focus. Here, we also take up examples from Korean, Hungarian, and Persian to strength our view of separating CT from CF. Section 3 deals with, based on the convincing analysis of Rizzi

* This is a revised version of my paper presented at Swiss Workshop in Generative Grammar (SWIGG 11), which was held at University of Geneva on April 15-16, 2011. I sincerely thank an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments and suggestions. Originally, this paper grew out of my presentation at a workshop held at Kanda University of International Studies on July 1 2010. A portion of this paper was also presented at Fukuoka Linguistic Circle held at Kyushu University on July 16 2011. I would like to thank all the audiences there for valuable questions and comments. This research is supported by the research grant from Hiroshima Joagkuin University, for which I am grateful.

(1997), syntactic investigation of *wa*-marked phrases. We propose two Topic Phrases(TopP)s: the upper one is for TT, and the lower one, for CT. We go on to argue that *wa*-marked phrases move into Spec-Focus Phrase (FocP). Section 4 examines the theoretical implication our claim has, and section 5 concludes the paper.

2. PREVIOUS ANALYSES

Kuno (1973: 38) extensively discusses the behavior of the Japanese particle *wa*. He claims that there are two kinds of *wa*-marked phrases: theme and contrast.

(2) a. John-wa gakusei desu
 John-Top student is
 ‘Speaking of John, he is a student.’
 b. Ame-wa hutte imasu ga...
 rain-Top falling is but
 ‘It is raining, but...’

Wa in (2a) marks theme, and *wa* in (2b) marks contrast. Since Kuroda (1965) and Kuno (1973), it is commonly assumed that *wa*-phrases in the sentence initial position marks theme, and it marks contrast elsewhere. Kuno himself does not suggest whether these *wa*-marked phrases are topic or focus.

Yanagida (1995: 18) claims that when there are two *wa*-marked phrases in a sentence, the second one is considered to be contrastive focus, with the focal stress on it.

(3) John –wa sono hon-wa kat-ta
 J-Top that book-Top buy-Past
 ‘As for John, THAT BOOK he bought.’

However, Yanagida (1995) does not mention the distinction among the other kinds of *wa*-marked phrases. Here, we propose to amalgamate what has been discussed in the literature and argue that *wa*-marked phrases should be divided into three, not two.

3. THREE KINDS OF *WA*-MARKED PHRASES: TT, CT, AND CF

In this section, we put forward data on topic and focus. The point we make is that *wa*-marked phrases in Japanese should be divided into three : TT, CT, and CF with a focal stress on it.

3.1. Japanese data

Let us start with the following examples.

(4) a. Gakusei-tachi-wa nani-o kat-ta no?
 student-PL-TT what-Acc buy-Past Q
 ‘What did the students buy?’
 b. John-wa gengogaku-no hon-wa kat-ta
 J-TT linguistics-Gen book-CT buy-Past

‘As for John, he bought a book on linguistics, but I don’t know whether he bought anything else.’

c. John-wa gengogaku-no hon-wa kat-ta
 J-TT linguistics-Gen book-CF buy-Past
 ‘As for John, he bought a book on linguistics, but didn’t buy anything else.’

(4b) indicates that the speaker knows that *John* bought at least a book on linguistics, and there may be other things John bought. In contrast, when the object is marked by *wa*, as in (4c), it signifies that a book on linguistics is the only thing *John* bought.

We can provide other examples to strengthen our view.

(5) a. Taro-wa Murakami Haruki-wa suki da
 T-TT Haruki Murakami-CT likes Declarative
 ‘As for Taro, he likes at least Haruki Murakami among the writers.’

b. Taro-wa Murakami Haruki-wa suki da
 T-TT Haruki Murakami-CF likes Declarative
 ‘As for Taro, he likes Haruki Murakami, not Ryuu Murakami.’

c. Demo (Taro-wa) Murakami Ryuu mo suki da
 but T-TT Ryuu Murakami also likes Declarative
 ‘But Taro also likes Ryuu Murakami.’

In (5a), the speaker knows, at least, that *Taro* likes *Harumi Murakami* among the writers. On the other hand, in (5b), *Taro* likes *Haruki Murakami*, in contrast to *Ryuu Murakami*, for example. This is confirmed because we can easily continue (5c) to (5a), but we cannot do so to (5b). Let us give further examples.

(6) a. Yooroppa-de boku-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai
 Europe-in- I-TT Geneva-CT go-want to
 ‘In Europe, as for me, I want to go to (at least) Geneva.’

b. Yooroppa-de boku-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai
 Europe-in-TT I-TT Geneva-CF go-want to
 ‘In Europe, as for me, I want to go to Geneva (and not to other places).’

When we utter (6a), we think of a situation where there maybe other places I want to go to. In contrast, in (6b) probably *Geneva* is the only place I want to go to.

Hara (2006) extensively discusses the same point. Here are her examples.

(7) a. Who passed the exam?
 b. Mary-wa ukat-ta
 Mary-CT pass-Past
 ‘At least Mary passed, but I don’t know whether the other(s) passed.’

c. Mary-ga ukat-ta
 Mary-Nom pass-Past
 ‘It is (only) Mary who passed.’

d. Mary-wa ukat-ta

(Hara (2006 :9))

Mary-CF pass-Past
 ‘It is Mary, and not Lisa, who passed.’

In (7b), the speaker only knows about *Mary*’s success, whereas in (7c) *Mary* is the only one who passed. When we put *wa* instead of *wa* in (7b), as in (7d), the similar effect as in (7c) shows up. Here, *wa* in (7b) shows what Tomioka (2007) calls uncertainty. (7d) clearly shows contrastive focus. Let us give further examples by Hara (2006).

(8) a. How many people came to the party?
 b. San-nin-wa ki-ta
 three-CL-CT come-Past
 ‘At least three came. I don’t know whether more than three came.’
 (Hara (2006: 18))
 c. San-nin-**wa** ki-ta
 three-CL-CF come-Past
 ‘Only the three people came among the one who were supposed to come.’

In (8b), where *wa* indicates CT, the sentence tells us only that at least three came. In contrast, in (8c), in which **wa** is used, it signifies that only three among the people who were supposed to come actually made it to the party.

Let us now turn to the exhaustive identificational reading that CF **wa** brings about. Here are examples.

(9) a. Gakusei-tachi-wa (riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-wa yon-da
 student-PL-TT (reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CT read-Past
 ‘As for the students, they read (at least) four books among the reading list.’
 b. Gakussei-tachi-wa (riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-**wa** yon-da
 student-PL-TT (reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CF read-Past
 ‘As for the students, they read four books among the reading list.
 They didn’t read anything else.’
 c. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-wa gakusei-tachi-wa yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-TT students-PL-CT read-Past
 ‘As for the four books among the reading list, the students read them.’
 d. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-**wa** gakusei-tachi-wa yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CF students-PL-CT read-Past
 ‘There are four books (among the reading list) such that the students read them.’

Although the judgement is very subtle, we can detect the differences in interpretation here. In (9a), the speaker knows that there are at least four books such that the students have read them, but he does not know anything except for those. In contrast, in (9b), *hon-yon-satu*(=the four books) is the only ones they read. This indicates exhaustive identificational effect CF has. In (9c), *hon-yon-satu* acts as TT, and it means the designated four books among the reading list. In (9d), we can more easily detect the contrastive focus reading.

Here, we introduce into our discussion the scopal interaction of the quantified elements. Since Rizzi (1997) pointed it out, it is widely known that topic elements do not have scopal interactions, while focus elements do. Let us present the examples below to prove the point.

(10) a. Dono gakusei-mo (riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-wa yon-da
 every student-PL (reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CT read-Past
 ‘Every student read (at least) four books among the reading list.’

 b. Dono gakusei-mo (riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-**wa** yon-da
 student-PL-Nom (reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CF read-Past
 ‘Every student read four books among the reading list.
 They didn’t read anything else.’

 c. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-wa dono gakusei-mo yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-TT every student read-Past
 ‘As for the four books among the reading list, every student read them.’

 d. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-**wa** dono gakusei-mo yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CF every student read-Past
 ‘There are four books among the reading list such that every student read them.’

In (10a), where the object is marked by *wa*, the object acts as CT, and the subject and the object do not have the scopal interaction. On the other hand, in (10b), in which the object is marked by *wa*, we can notice the scopal interaction between the subject and the object. Here, the primary, strong reading is that the subject scopes over the object. In a similar vein, when *wa*-marked object moves into sentence initial position, as in (10c), the object acts as TT, and does not have the scopal interactions with the subject. In contrast, in (10d), where *wa*-marked object moves into sentence initial position, the reading where the moved object has wider scope than the subject is dominant.

Besides, when we insert in a sentence what Jackendoff (1972) and Cinque (1999) call the pragmatic adverb like *shoojiki-itte* (=honestly), we can more easily observe the differences in interpretation.

(11) a. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-wa shoojiki-itte dono gakusei-mo yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-TT honestly every student read-Past
 ‘As for the four books among the reading list, honestly every student read them.’

 b. (Riidingu -risuto-no) hon yon-satu-**wa** shoojiki-itte dono gakusei mo yon-da
 (Reading list-Gen) book-four-CL-CF honestly every student read-Past
 ‘There are four books among the reading list such that honestly, every student read them.’

In (11b), the moved *wa*-marked object is considered to scope over the subject because the object sits in the CP domain. This is because the higher adverb *shoojiki-itte* (=honestly) occurs below the moved object. In (11a), in which *wa*-marked object is also moved into the CP domain, the object acts as TT.

Next, we take up examples where three *wa*-marked phrases appear in one sentence. Our crucial point is that the sequence of TT-CF-CT is much more natural than the other ones.

(12) a. Gakusei-tachi-wa dare-no sakuhin -o yomu no
 student-PL-TT whose works-Acc read Q
 ‘Whose works do the students read?’

 b. Sakka-de-wa Murakami Harumi-**wa** Taro-wa yomu

writers-among-TT Harumi Murakami-CF T-CT read
 ‘Among the writers, it is Haruki Murakami, and not Ryuu Murakami that at least Taro reads.’

c.?? Sakka-de-wa Murakami Haruki-wa Taro-wa yomu
 writers-among-TT Harumi Murakami-CT T-CF read

The judgment is more or less subtle, but the acceptability of (12c) is somewhat degraded. On the other hand, (12b) is perfectly acceptable. Let us consider similar examples.

(13) a. Ano ie-de-wa shigoto-o donoyoo-ni buntan-suru no?
 that house-at-TT job-Acc how-Dat share-does Q
 ‘At the house, how do they share the jobs?’

b. Kaji-wa ryoori-wa Hanako-wa suru
 house chore-TT cooking-CF H-CT does
 ‘As for house chore, it is cooking, and not others, that at least Hanako takes charge of.’

c. ?? Kaji-wa ryoori-wa Hanako-wa suru
 house-chore-TT cooking-CT H-CF does

Here again, the judgment is somehow delicate, but the order of TT-CF-CT is more natural than that of TT-CT-CF.

Up to now, we have examined Japanese data and claimed that there are three kinds of *wa*-marked phrases: TT, CT, and CF with the focal stress on it. In the next subsection let us turn our eyes into data from other languages: namely, Korean, Hungarian and Persian.

3.2 Data from Korean, Hungarian, and Persian

Let us start with Korean data. Gill and Tsoulas (2004) put forward the following Korean data to distinguish between topic and focus.

(14) I chayk-un [Chelswu-nun e sassta]
 this book-Top Chelswu-CF bought
 ‘As for this book, it was Chelswu (not others) who bought it.’
 (Gill and Tsoulas (2004: 129))

When there are two *nun*-marked phrases in a sentence, the second one is interpreted as a contrastive focus. This is exactly what we attest in *wa*-marked phrases in Japanese. Further Korean data are prodived below.

(15) a. Mary-ka ecey John-un manna-ss-ta
 M-Nom yesterday J-CF meet-Past-Dcl
 ‘Mary met John yesterday.’

b. John-un Mary-ka ecey manna-ss-ta
 J-Top M-Nom yesterday meet-Past-Dcl
 ‘As for John, Mary met him yesterday.’

c. Mary-ka ecey Boston-ey-nun ka-ss-ta

M-Nom yesterday Boston-to-CF go-Past-Dcl
 ‘Mary went to Boston yesterday.’

d. Boston-ey-nun Mary-ka ecey ka-ss-ta
 Boston-to-Top Mary-Nom yesterday go-Past-Dcl
 ‘As for Boston, Mary went yesterday.’

(Choi (1997 :549-550))

Choi (1997) claims that *John-un* (=John-Top) in (15a) and *Boston-ey-nun* (=Boston-to-Top) in (15c) are contrastive foci, and those in (15b&d) are contrastive topics. However, *nun*-marked phrases in (15b) and (15d) are actually TT, as the gloss indicates. Choi (1997) also suggests that *nun*-marked phrase in (15b) indicates what the sentence is about. This the rope TT plays in a sentence. In addition, as the Japanese translated versions below clearly show, *nun*-marked phrases in (15a) and (15c) should be treated as CT.

(16) a. Mary-ga kinoo John-(ni)-wa at-ta
 M-Nom yesterday J-(to)-CT meet-Past
 ‘Mary met John yesterday, but I don’t know whether she met anyone else.’

b. Mary-ga kinoo Boston-ni-wa it-ta
 M-Nom yesterday Boston-to-CT go-Past
 ‘Mary went to Boston yesterday, but I don’t know whether she went anywhere else.’

When we put a focal stress on *wa* in (16a) and (16b), as in the following, the CF reading shows up.

(17) a. Mary-ga kinoo John-(ni)-**wa** at-ta
 M-Nom yesterday J-(to)-CF meet-Past
 ‘Mary met John yesterday, and she met no one else.’

b. Mary-ga kinoo Boston-ni-**wa** it-ta
 M-Nom yesterday Boston-to-CF go-Past
 ‘Mary went to Boston yesterday, and she went nowhere other than that.’

The facts shown here evidently signify the distinction between TT, CT, and CF in Japanese (and in Korean).

In Hungarian, too, there is a clear distinction between contrastive topic and contrastive focus. Let us cite examples from Molnár (2006).

(18) a. Ki utazott el Stockholmba
 who went to perf Stockholm-to
 ‘Who left for Stockholm?’

b. [PÉter]F utazott el Stockholmba
 Peter went perf Stockholm-to
 ‘It is Peter who left for Stockholm.’

c. [PÉter]CT [STOCKholmba]F utazott el
 ‘As far as Peter is concerned, he left for Stockholm.’

(Molár (2006: 220))

In (18b), an answer for (18a), *Peter* designates CF. *Peter* is the only one who left for Stockholm. On the other hand, (18c) means that, at least *Peter* went to Stockholm, and it shows CT.

Our next task is to take a look at Persian examples that give rise to the same effect.

(19) a. ketâb-â chi shod ?
 book-PL what became-3sg
 'What happened to the books ?'
 'Kimea gave them to me yesterday.'
 b. Unâ-ro RAHJUE diruz be man dâd
 they-râ R yesterday to me gave-3sg
 'As for them, it was RAHJUE who gave them to me.'

(Karimi (2005: 129-130))

We can answer to a question in (19a) as in (19b), where both TT (Karimi labels this as a background topic) and CF show up. We can give more Persian examples to present the contrastive focus reading a Persian sentence has.

(20) a. halâ barâ KIMEA pro nâme mi-nevis-an
 now for K letter hab-write-3sg
 'Now it is for KIMEA they are writing letters (as opposed to someone else).'
 b. pro barâ Kimea ye KETAB xarid-am
 for K a BOOK bought-1sg
 'It was a book that I bought for Kimea (as opposed to a shirt).'
 Karimi (2005: 132-133))

Here again, *barâ KIMEA* (=for Kimea) in (20a) and *ye KETAB* (=a book) in (20b) designate contrastive focus and *halâ* (=now) in (20a) and *barâ Kimea* (=for Kimea) in (20b) act as TT.

Up to now, we have presented Korean, Hungarian, and Persian data to strengthen our view of making a distinction among TT, CT, and CF. At this point, we have to clarify our position about the notation of focus. Since Kiss (1998), focus is commonly divided into two: information focus and identificational focus. Furthermore, Kiss (2002) convincingly points out that identificational focus denotes exhaustive identification. Let us cite examples from Kiss (2002: 77).

(21) a. [TopP Pétert [Predicate [Focus JANOS] mutatta be Marinak]]
 Peter-Acc John introduced VM Mary-to
 'As for Peter, it was John who introduced him to Mary.'
 b. [TopP Janos [Predicate [Focus PETERT] mutatta be Marinak]]
 'As for John it is Peter that he introduced to Mary.'
 c. [TopP Pétert [Predicate [Focus MARINAK] mutatta be Janos]]
 'As for Peter, it was to Mary that John introduced him.'

(Kiss (2002 :77))

As can be clearly detected by the English glosses, elements in the focus position indicate exhaustive identification. Similar examples are taken from Kiss (1998).

(22) a. Hol jártál a nyáron?
 where went.you the summer. in
 ‘Where did you go in the summer?’
 b. Jártam OLASZORSZÁGBAN
 went.I Italy. to
 ‘I went to Italy [among many other places.]’
 c. **Olaszországban** jártam
 ‘It was **Italy** where I went.’

(Kiss (1998: 249-250))

The question in (22a) can be answered as both in (22b) and (22c), but they differ in meaning. (22c) signifies exhaustive identification: *Italy* is the only place the speaker went to. In contrast, when the speaker answers, as in (22b), where OLASZORSZÁGBAN (=to Italy), without focal stress, designates post-verbal information focus. He maybe went to places other than Italy. This is what exhaustive identification is all about.

López (2009), on the other hand, does not use the notion of exhaustive identificational focus. He instead uses the notion of *contrast*. However, as López himself points out, the notion of contrast he discusses about the Romance languages and exhaustive identificational focus Kiss uses for Hungarian data mean the same, because these two exclude the other possibilities and pick up only the designated one. In this regard, we can safely say that we can extend their analysis to Japanese data. That is, contrastive focus we have discussed so far indicates exhaustive identificational focus in the sense of Kiss. Put differently, if an element is marked by *wa*, this excludes any other possibility, and picks up only the designated one.

In this section, we have put forward Japanese data and have argued that *wa*-marked phrases should be divided into three: TT, CT, and CF with a focal stress on it. We have also given data from Korean, Hungarian, and Persian to prove that we are on the right track. In the next section, let us scrutinize the syntactic structure of the *wa*-marked phrases.

4. SYNTACTIC MECHANISMS OF *WA*-MARKED PHRASES

The purpose of this section is to scrutinize the syntactic structure of *wa*-marked phrases. Here, we base our analysis on Rizzi (1997) and Endo (2007).

4.1. Rizzi’s (1997) elaborated CP structure

Let us begin by presenting Rizzi’s data.

(23) a. Il tuo libro, lo ho letto
 ‘Your book, I have read it.’
 b. IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo)
 ‘Your book, I read (, not his.)’

(Rizzi 1977 :286))

(23a) shows a topic-comment structure, while (23b), a focus-presupposition structure.

(24) a. Il libro, a Gianni, domani, glielo darò senz-altro
 ‘The book, to John, tomorrow, I’ll give it to him for sure.’
 b. * A GIANNI IL LIBRO darò (non a Piero, l’articolo)
 ‘TO JOHN THE BOOK I’ll give, (not to Piero, the article).’

(Rizzi (1997 :290))

As is seen from (24a) and (24b), one sentence can have multiple topics, while there is only one focus in a sentence. Furthermore, as we can see from (25) below, we can detect topic-focus-topic sequence, but this is the only possibility.

(25) A Gianni, QUESTO, domani, gli dovrete dire
 ‘To Gianni THIS tomorrow you should tell him.’

(Rizzi (1997: 291))

The elaborated CP structure is roughly represented as in (26).

(26) Force P TopP* FocP TopP* FinP IP

Taking the structure in (26) as a starting point, let us further investigate the Japanese structure involving *wa*-marked phrases.

4.2 Japanese phrase structure with three kinds of *wa*-marked phrases

Our next task is to scrutinize the syntactic structure involving *wa*-marked phrases. Let us start by considering the examples below.

(27) a. Taro-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai
 T-TT Geneva-CT go-want to
 ‘Taro wants to go to (at least)Geneva.’
 b. Taro-wa Jyuneebu-**wa** iki-tai
 T-TT Geneva-CF go-want to
 ‘Taro wants to go to Geneva, (and not other places).’
 c. Taro-**wa** Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai
 T-CF Geneva-CT go-want to
 ‘It is Taro, and not Hanako who wants to go to Geneva.’

In (27a), *Taro* acts as TT, while *Jyuneebu* (=Geneva) designates CT. There may be other places *Taro* wants to go to. On the other hand, in (27b), *Jyuneebu* is marked by *wa* and plays a part of CF. *Geneva* is the only place *Taro* wants to go to. When *Taro* is marked by *wa*, as in (27c), it signifies CF. The sentence says that, in contrast to *Hanako*, it is *Taro* who wants to go to *Geneva*. Next, let us present the examples where three kinds of *wa*-marked phrases occur in a sentence.

(28) a. Gakusei-tachi-wa dare-no sakuhin -o yomu no (=12a)

student-PL-TT whose works-Acc read Q
 'Whose works do the students read?'

b. Sakka-de-wa Murakami Harumi-wa Taro-wa yomu (=12b)
 writers-among-TT Harumi Murakami-CF T-CT read
 'Among the writers, it is Haruki Murakami, and not Ryu Murakami that Taro reads.'

(29) a. Ano ie-de-wa shigoto-o donoyoo-ni buntan-suru no? (=13a)
 that house-at-TT job-Acc how-Dat share-does Q
 'At the house, how do they share the jobs?'

b. Kaji-wa ryoori-wa Hanako-wa suru (=13b)
 house chore-TT cooking-CF H-CT does
 'As for house chore, it is cooking, and not others that Hanako takes charge of.'

In view of the fact that there are two kinds of *wa*-marked topics, TT, and CT, and furthermore, that *wa*-marked phrase is considered to be focus, which is in between two topics, we propose, based on Rizzi(1997), the following phrase structure for Japanese. Endo (2007) assumes the similar structure, but he does not make a clear distinction among TT, CT, and CF.

(30) [CP [TopP [FocP [TopP [TP [vP [VP V] v] T] Top] F] Top] C]

The upper Topic Phrase (TopP) is for TT, while the lower one, CT. *Wa*-marked phrase occurs in Focus Phrase (FocP). Based on (30), let us schematize the structure for (31a-c) as in (32a-c).

(31) a. Taro-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai (=27a)
 T-TT Geneva-CT go-want to
 'Taro wants to go to (at least) Geneva.'

b. Taro-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai (=27b)
 T-TT Geneva-CF go-want to
 'Taro wants to go to Geneva, (and not other places).'

c. Taro-wa Jyuneebu-wa iki-tai (=27c)
 T-CF Geneva-CT go-want to
 'It is Taro, and not Hanako, who wants to go to Geneva.'

(32) a. [TopP Taro-wa [FocP [TopP Jyuneebu-wa [TP t_{subj} [vP t_{subj} [VP t_{obj} iki]tai]]]]]]
 b. [TopP Taro-wa [FocP Jyuneebu-wa [TopP [TP t_{subj} [vP t_{subj} [VP t_{obj} iki]tai]]]]]]
 c. [TopP [FocP Taro-wa [TopP Jyuneebu-wa [TP t_{subj} [vP t_{subj} [VP t_{obj} iki]tai]]]]]]

Let us next represent the structure (34a-b) for (33a-b), which involve two topics and one focus.

(33) a. Sakka-de-wa Murakami Haruki-wa Taro-wa yomu (=28b)
 b. Kaji-wa ryoori-wa Hanako-wa suru (=29b)

(34) a. [TopP sakka-de-wa [FocP Murakami Haruki-wa [TopP Taro-wa [TP t_{subj} [vP t_{subj} [VP t_{obj} yomu]]]]]]
 b. [TopP kaji-wa [FocP ryoori-wa [TopP Hanako-wa [TP t_{subj} [vP t_{subj} [VP t_{obj} suru]]]]]]

In this section, we have put forward the elaborated phrase structure for Japanese. It includes two TopPs: the upper one is for TT, while the lower one, for CT. On the other hand, *wa*-marked phrases move into Spec-FocP.

5. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE ISSUES

Up to now, we have focussed on the data with two or three *wa*-marked phrases. Here, we would like to consider extending our analysis to data that involve object DP scrambling. Nakamura (2009, 2010) extensively argue that DP scrambling is focus movement that targets Spec-FocP. Examine the data below.

- (35) a. Furansugo-o Taro-ga hanas-eru
french-Acc T-Nom speak-can
'It is French that Taro can speak.'
- b. Furansugo-o Taro-wa hanas-eru
French-Acc T-CT speak-can
'It is French that Taro (,not Hanako,) can speak.'
- c. Taro-wa furansugo-o hanas-eru
T-TT French-Acc speak-can
- d. Demo (Taro-wa) doitugo-mo hanas-eru
but T-TT German-also speak-can
'But he can also speaks German.'

DP scrambling shown in (35a) and (35b) presents exhaustive identificational effect that focus movement has. That is to say, by scrambling the DPs, we can understand that *French* is the only language *Taro* can speak. It is proved by the fact that we cannot easily continue (35d) to (35a-b). In contrast, we can continue (35d) to (35c) without any problem. Let us consider further examples.

- (36) a. Ano ie-de-wa
- (37) shigoto-o donoyoo-ni buntan-suru no? (=13a)
that house-at-TT job-Acc how-Dat share-does Q
'At the house, how do they share the jobs?"
- b. Kaji-wa ryoori-wa Hanako-wa suru (=13b)
house-chore-TT cooking-CF H-CT does
'As for house chore, it is cooking, and not others, that Hanako takes charge of.'
- c. Kaji-wa ryoori-o Hanako-wa suru
house chore-TT cooking-Acc H-CT does
'As for the house chore it is cooking that Hanako(, not Taro,) does.'
- d. ??Kaji-wa ryoori-o Hanako-wa suru
house-chore-TT cooking-Acc H-CF does

In (36b), the sequence of TT-CF-CT is OK, whereas in (36c), with DP scrambling, the sequence of TT-scrambled DP- CT is acceptable. In contrast, in (36d), with DP scrambling,

the sequence of TT-scrambled DP-CF is rather degraded. This indicates that *wa*-marked phrase and DP scrambling occur in the same position and DP scrambling should be seen as a focus movement. For more data and discussion, we refer the reader to Nakamura (2009a,b), (2010). If we are on the right track, we can say that object DP scrambling, which moves the object across the subject, is an operation that targets Spec-FocP. The structures in (37a&b) are for (35a&b).

(37) a. [_{FocP} fransugo-o [_{TopP} [_{TP} Taro-ga [_{vP} _{t_{subj}} [_{VP} _{t_{obj}} hanas]]]esu]]]
 b. [_{FocP} furansugo-o [_{TopP} Taro-wa [_{TP} _{t_{subj}} [_{vP} _{t_{subj}} [_{VP} _{t_{obj}} hanas]]] eru]]]

Likewise, the structures shown in (38a&b) are for (36b&c).

(38) a. [_{TopP} kaji-wa [_{FocP} ryoori-wa [_{TopP} Hanako-wa [_{TP} _{t_{subj}} [_{vP} _{t_{subj}} [_{VP} _{t_{obj}} suru]]]]]]]
 b. [_{TopP} kaji-wa [_{FocP} ryoori-o [_{TopP} Hanako-wa [_{TP} _{t_{subj}} [_{vP} _{t_{subj}} [_{VP} _{t_{obj}} suru]]]]]]]

As the reviewer points out, the structures in (38a&b) could be a problem because two difference kinds of foci targets the same position : Spec-FocP. Here, we simply assume that contrastive focus, namely, *wa*-marked phrase in (38a) and exhaustive identificational focus, that is, scrambled DP in (38b) picks up the only designated one, and therefore they mean the same.

Up to now, we have claimed that we can extend our view to cases with object DP scrambling. Next, let us consider future issues. In this paper, we have concentrated on cases that involve multiple *wa*-marked phrases. However, we will have to examine cases where *wa*-marked phrases remain in-situ, and the subject is marked by the nominative marker *ga*. In addition, we have to examine cases where the subject is marked by *ga*, the object, the accusative marker *o*. Here are some examples.

(39) a. Taro-ga furansugo-wa hanas-eru
 T-Nom French-CT speak-can
 ‘Taro can speak at least French. I don’t know whether he can speak any other language.’
 b. Taro-ga furansugo-wa hanas-eru
 T-Nom French-CF speak-can
 ‘Taro can speak French (, not German).’
 c. Taro-ga furansugo-o hanas-eru
 T-Nom French-Acc speak-can
 ‘Taro can speak French.’

(39c) is a normal sentence, and the object is regarded as information focus in the sense of É Kiss. If the *wa*-marked phrase in (39b) really designates contrastive focus, *furansugo-wa* in (39b) and *furansugo-o* in (39c) should occur in different positions. Here, we maybe entertain the possibility of postulating *vP* internal focus phrase, which is discussed in Belletti (2001). This awaits further research.

6. CONCLUSION AND A FUTURE ISSUE

In this paper, we have claimed that *wa*-marked phrases should be divided into three, not two: Thematic Topic, Contrastive Topic, and Contrastive Focus. Our crucial point is that Japanese phrase structure involves two topic slots: the upper one is for TT, and the lower one, CT. CF is in between them, and occurs in Focus position. The phrase structure we have proposed here nicely matches what has been discussed for Italian, Hungarian, Korean, and Persian data. We have also indicated that object DP scrambling is a focus movement that targets Spec-FocP. This is proved because *wa*-marked focus phrase and scrambled object cannot co-occur.

Here, we have to add one more point. We have assumed that the topmost *wa*-marked phrase is interpreted as TT, while it is read as CT elsewhere. However, as the reviewer points out, there is a possibility that one sentence has multiple TTs. The further investigation about this matter is one of our future issues.

REFERENCES

Belletti, A. (2001) “Inversion as Focalization”, in A. Hulk and J.Y. Pollock (eds.), *Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Grammar*, 60-90. Oxford University Press, New York.

Choi, H.-W. (1997) “Topic and Focus in Korean: The Information Partition by Phrase Structure and Morphology”, *Japanese and Korean Linguistics* 6, 545-561.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross Linguistics Perspective*. Oxford University Press, New York.

É Kiss, K. (1998) “Identificational Focus Versus Information Focus”, *Language* 74, 245-273.

É Kiss, K. (2002) *The Syntax of Hungarian*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Endo, Y. (2007) *Locality and Information Structure*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

Gill, K.-H. and G. Tsoulas (2004) “Peripheral Effects without Peripheral Syntax: The Left Periphery in Korean,” in D. Adger et al. (eds.), *Peripheries: Syntactic Edge and their Effects*, 121-141, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Hara, Y. (2006) *Grammar of Knowledge Representation*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware.

Karimi, S. (2005) *A Minimalist Approach to Scrambling : Evidence from Persian*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

López, Luis (2009) *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Molnár, V. (2006) “On Different Kinds of Contrast,” in V. Molnár and S. Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus*, 197-233, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Nakamura, K. (2009a) “Topic-focus Articulation and DP Scrambling as a Focus Movement in Japanese,” in *Proceedings of 38th Western Conference on Linguistics*, 231-240, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Davis.

Nakamura, K. (2009b) “Japanese Object Scrambling as an Exhaustive Identificational Focus Movement,” in Sun-Woong Kim (ed.), *Visions of the Minimalist Program: Proceedings*

of the 11th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar, 273-290, Hankuk Publishing Co, Seoul.

Nakamura, K. (2010) “*Wa*-marked Topicalization Triggered by Topic Feature and Object Scrambling Triggered by Focus Feature”, in Duk-Ho An and Soo-Yeon Kim (eds.), *Movement in Minimalism: Proceedings of the 12th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar*, 361-372, Hankuk Publishing Co, Seoul.

Rizzi, L. (1997) “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery”, in L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Tomioka, S. (2007) “A scope theory of contrastive topics”, ms., University of Delaware.

Yanagida, Y. (1995) *Focus Projection and Wh-head Movement*, Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.