The Distributional Property of the Japanese Sentence-Final Particle *Ka*[*]
Keita Ikarashi

1. Introduction

The Japanese sentence-final particle *ka* is widely considered to be a question-marker (cf. Kuno (1980), Onoe (1983), Miyagawa (1987), Moriyama (1989a), Masuoka (1992); see also Uyeno (1971), Tsuchihashi (1983), Kuwabara (2013) for discussions about the relationship between *ka* and the illocutionary force of question); it appears in both yes/no-questions and *wh*-questions, as shown in (1), and plays a role in marking the sentences as questions.[1,2]

(1) a. Ano hon-o   kai masita   ka↗
         that book-ACC buy POL.PAST SFP
         'Did you buy that book?'
     b. Nani-o   kai masita   ka↗
         what-ACC buy POL.PAST SFP
         'What did you buy?'

Notice that the use of *ka* is not obligatory in questions because a sentence is marked as a question by rising intonation. We can thus omit *ka* from the sentences in (1) without rendering them unacceptable (i.e. *Ano hon-o kai masita?* and *Nani-o kai masita?*).

The idea that *ka* is a question-marker, however, raises a problem of its distribution. Let us consider the following examples, cited from Noda (1995:215):

(2) a. Itta↗   b. Itta ka↗
         went   went SFP
         'Did you go?'   'Did you go?'
     c. Iki masita↗   d. Iki masita   ka↗
         go   POL.PAST   go   POL.PAST SFP
         'Did you go?'   'Did you go?'
(3) a. Itu itta↗   b. *Itu   itta ka↗
         when went   when went SFP
         'When did you go?'   'When did you go?'

[1] The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of examples in this paper: ACC = accusative, ASP = aspect, COMP = complementizer, COP = copula, GEN = genitive, DAT = dative, IMP = imperative, NOM = nominative, POL = polite, SFP = sentence-final particle, TOP = topic.

[2] "↗" denotes rising intonation and "." non-rising intonation.

c.	Itu iki masita↗	d. Itu iki masita ka↗
	when go POL.PAST	when go POL.PAST SFP
	'When did you go?'	'When did you go?'

The yes/no-questions in (2) are all acceptable regardless of whether they are in polite form ((2c) and (2d)) or plain form ((2a) and (2b)) and whether a sentence has *ka* ((2b) and (2d)) or not ((2a) and (2c)). The *wh*-questions in (3), on the other hand, are not all acceptable; as illustrated in (3b), the *wh*-question is unacceptable when *ka* follows a plain form. Such unacceptability is not observed in the other three types of *wh*-questions. If *ka* were a question-marker as postulated in a number of previous studies, it might be predicted that *ka* could be licensed in any *wh*-question independently of the environment it appears because it marks sentences as questions. These studies thus are forced to provide additional arguments to exclude sentences like (3b) (see section 2.1).

This paper will account for the idiosyncratic distribution of *ka* shown in (2) and (3). I propose that *ka* makes the expression in question what Hirose (1995) calls a private expression, which is specialized in expressing a thought per se on the part of the speaker and does not require the presence of a hearer. It then follows from this proposal that as opposed to the traditional view, *ka* is not a question-marker (cf. Takiura (2008)); it indirectly contributes to the interrogative interpretation by semantically indicating the preparatory condition of the illocutionary act of question (see section 5.1). Furthermore, the proposal has the consequence that there are two types of private expressions in Japanese.[3]

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 overviews previous studies which investigate the idiosyncratic behavior of *ka* and points out several problems with their analyses. Section 3 proposes a generalization that can account for the facts given above and explains them in turn. Section 4 provides supporting evidence for the generalization given in section 3. Section 5 discusses the consequences resulting from the proposal. Section 6 is a conclusion.

2. Previous Studies
2.1. Explanation in Terms of Politeness

The sentence in (3b), repeated as (4), differs from the other examples in (2) and (3) in acceptability.

---

[3] This paper deals with *ka* used in conversation and not with that used in other discourse modes such as soliloquy because the grammatical and lexical system of conversation is different from those in other discourse modes and thus *ka* in conversation has the different value in the system from that in other discourse environments (cf. Coseriu (1988)).

(4) *Itu   itta   ka ↗
    when   went   SFP
    'When did you go?'   (= (3b))

This unacceptability is generally explained in terms of politeness (Moriyama (1988), Noda (1995), Morikawa (2009)).[4] Noda (1995), for example, assumes that *ka* signals the speaker's demand for the hearer's response to a question; in addition, *wh*-words like *itu* 'when' generally play a role in indicating that the sentences including them are questions. Sentences containing both a *wh*-word and *ka* like (4) thus strongly require answers from the hearer, so that they sound rude; hence the unacceptability of (4). Note that the rudeness assumed to be involved in (4) disappears if the plain form *itta* is replaced with the polite form *iki masita*, as shown in (3d), repeated below:

(5) Itu   iki   masita   ka ↗
    when   go   POL.PAST SFP
    'When did you go?'   (= (3d))

According to Moriyama (1988) and Morikawa (2009), the sentence in (5) is fully acceptable because the polite form compensates for the rudeness caused by the co-occurrence of the *wh*-word and *ka*.[5]

---

[4] Miyagawa (1987) attempts to explain the unacceptability in syntactic terms. He speculates that at LF, a *wh*-phrase moves to the Comp where *ka* appears and such complement must be governed (see Miyagawa (1987) for details). The *wh*-question in (4) has the LF representation as in (i).

(i)   [$_{S'}$ [$_S$ t_i itta] itu$_i$ ka]   (cf. (4))

The complement including *ka* and *itu* is not governed, and thus the sentence is ungrammatical. In short, they should occur in the embedding environment. This speculation, however, cannot immediately account for the following example (Akazawa (2005)):

(ii)   Dare-ga   sonna mono taberu ka.   (No one eats it.)
     who-NOM   that   thing eat   SFP
     'Who eats that thing.'

The sentence is interpreted as a rhetorical question. In this case, although *ka* follows non-honorific verbs like (4), the sentence is fully acceptable (I will explain example (ii) in section 4.2). Miyagawa would need additional devices so as to explain this fact. Unlike Miyagawa, I assume that examples like (4) are syntactically appropriate, but pragmatically degraded. See the following discussion.

[5] Masuoka (1992) gives a different explanation of the fact depicted in (4) from that of the previous studies just mentioned. He presumes that *ka* in *wh*-questions is not a modal element. He then goes on to postulate that if a sentence does not include a modal element, it cannot stand as an independent sentence. Based on these assumptions, he concludes that sentences like (4)

66

2.2. Problems

If politeness is a crucial factor which causes the unacceptability of *wh*-questions like (4), we can predict that the sentence in (4) becomes acceptable when politeness is not taken into consideration. This prediction, however, is incorrect.   Let us consider the following example:

(6)   [A president is talking to an employee.]
        *Itu   itta   ka↗
        when   went   SFP
        'When did you go?'

A president is in a socially much higher position than his employees, and so he is socially allowed not to behave politely towards them (at least in Japanese society) (cf. Culpeppar (1996)).   Although the president is not expected to choose polite expressions, the *wh*-question in (6) remains unacceptable.   The following is a similar example:

(7)   [The hearer hasn't answered a question which the speaker has repeatedly
        asked him.   Finally, the speaker got very angry and uttered the following
        sentence in an emphatic way:]
        *Itu   itta   ka↗

The speaker in (7) is speaking with an angry tone.   In such a case, politeness is sometimes ignored (cf. Ikarashi (2013)).   Nevertheless, the *wh*-question is still unacceptable.

Moreover, the definition of *ka* given in the previous studies does not systematically capture *ka* in other situations than typical questions provided so far. For instance, *ka* is used in a rhetorical question as follows (cf. Itani (1993)):

(8)   Konna   tokoro-ni dare-ga   ki   masu ka.   (No one will come.)
        such   place-DAT who-NOM   come POL   SFP

---

contain no modal element and thus they sound unnatural.   His explanation, however, immediately faces difficulties in accounting for examples like (3a), repeated as (i).

(i)   Itu   itta↗
        when   went
        'When did you go?'   (= (3a))

The sentence includes no modal element.   Nevertheless, contrary to Masuoka's analysis, it is fully acceptable.

'Who will come here?'

According to Quirk et al. (1985:825), the rhetorical question is structurally interrogative, but has the force of a strong assertion; it does not require an answer. *Ka* as used in a rhetorical question thus does not function to express the speaker's demand for a response from the hearer. If we adopt the definition of *ka* in the previous studies, we need to postulate two types of *ka* in functional terms; the *ka* used in a typical question is different from that used in a rhetorical question. The use of *ka*, in addition, is not limited to interrogative sentences. For example:

(9) A: Itizikan   kakari masu   yo.
       one hour take   POL   SFP (I tell you)
       'It will take an hour [to get there].'
    B: *Itizikan   desu   ka*. Jaa, moo dekake nakya.
       one hour COP.POL SFP then now leave   have to
       'One hour?   Then I have to leave now.'

                                      (Mizutani and Mizutani (1987:137))

The italicized sentence with non-rising intonation expresses speaker B's understanding of what speaker A said (Mizutani and Mizutani (1987)), and thus, in opposition to the definition provided in the previous studies, *ka* in (9) does not indicate speaker B's attitude of requesting speaker A to provide information. We would then need an ad-hoc characterization of *ka* to account for examples like (9).

Considering the examples given here, it would be necessary to redefine the function of *ka* in order to explain the idiosyncratic distribution of *ka* as well as to provide a unified account of its use.

3.   The Characteristic of *Ka*
3.1.   *Proposal*
In order to explain the distributional characteristic of *ka*, I propose the following generalization:[6]

(10)   The sentence final-particle *ka* turns the expression within its scope into a
       private expression.

The generalization can be schematized as in (11).

---

[6] There appear to be other expressions exclusively indicating a private expression in Japanese. See Konno (2012) for such expressions.

(11) [_{<PRIV>} *expression*] ka

The square brackets [ ] represent the scope of *ka*, and the subscript notation <PRIV> indicates that the expression within the scope of *ka* is a private expression.

Private expression, which is introduced by Hirose (1995) together with *public expression*, is crucial in the generalization. Hirose (1995:226) defines private expression as "the level of linguistic expression corresponding to the non-communicative, thought-expressing function of language" and public expression as "the level of linguistic expression corresponding to the communicative function of language." Public expression presupposes the presence of a hearer, while private expression does not. According to the generalization in (10), the expression within the scope of *ka* exclusively expresses the speaker's thought and does not presuppose the presence of a hearer. This analysis is based on the observation that *ka* signals the speaker's uncertainty (cf. Moriyama (1989a), Hirose (1995), Takiura (2008)). For example, when saying "*Itta ka?* (Did you go?)," the speaker is uncertain about whether the hearer went to the place in question or not. The function of *ka* thus consists in expressing the speaker's thought.

In addition, I suppose that the expression within the scope of *ka* takes on the characteristic of a public expression when it includes expressions which semantically presuppose the existence of a hearer and have the force to change private expression into public expression (see Hirose (1995) for details). Hirose (1995) calls these expression *addressee-oriented expressions*. Among typical addressee-oriented expressions in Japanese are polite verbs (*desu*, *masu*, *gozaimasu*) (for details, see Hirose (1995:226-227)). If we use *ka* together with, say, *desu*, we can get the schema in (12b), in which <PUB> denotes public expression.

(12) a.   [_{<PRIV>} *expression*] ka   (= (11))

             ⇓

    b.   [_{<PUB>} *expression*-desu] ka

The expression within the scope of *ka* is marked as a private expression in (12a). However, the addressee-oriented expression *desu*, which is embedded in the scope of *ka*, cancels the interpretation of the private expression indicated by *ka* and turns the expression within the scope of *ka* into a public expression. The expression in question is no longer a private expression and presupposes the existence of a hearer.

Note in passing that, as noted in section 2, previous studies generally consider *ka* as an expression signaling the speaker's demand for a response from the hearer. This means that *ka* makes the expression within its scope a public expression, as

schematized in (13), even if there is no addressee-oriented expression in the sentence.

(13)   [$_{<\text{PUB}>}$ *expression*   ] ka   (cf. (11))

In this sense, we can say that the previous studies consider *ka* as an addressee-oriented expression.   The basic assumption given in (10) thus should be differentiated from that given in the previous studies.

3.2.   Explanation

Based on the proposal given in section 3.1, I will explain the distributional property of *ka*.   Let us first consider the unacceptable *wh*-question in which *ka* co-occurs with a plain form:

(14)   a.   *Itu   itta   ka ↗
            when went   SFP
            'When did you go?'   (= (3b))
       b.   [$_{<\text{PRIV}>}$ Itu itta] ka

The unacceptability in (14a) can be attributed to the conflict between a *wh*-word and a private expression.   As schematized in (14b), *ka* turns the expression *itu itta* into a private expression.   Note that the *wh*-word *itu* is a constitutive part of the private expression, which does not presuppose the existence of a hearer.   The *wh*-word itself does not, by nature, take on the addressee-orientedness; it merely functions as a variable.   However, the sentence in (14a) has rising intonation, which signals the speaker's attitude to request the hearer to provide information (cf. Moriyama (1989b)) (in this case, the value of the *wh*-word), and hence, the speaker in (14a) intends to make the hearer specify the value of the *wh*-word; in other words, the *wh*-word presupposes the existence of a hearer.   Thus, the *wh*-word *itu* resists being a part of the private expression.   The unacceptability in (14a) is caused by the incompatibility between the *wh*-word and the private expression.[7]   Note that if *ka* in (14a) is omitted as in (15), *itu itta* no longer needs to be a private expression, and then the incompatibility observed in (14a) disappears.   The sentence in (15) is thus acceptable.[8]

---

[7] Unlike polite verbs, *wh*-words are not, by nature, addressee-oriented expressions because they can be used without presupposing the existence of a hearer.   Thus, they do not have the force with which the private expression indicated by *ka* turns into a public expression.

[8] I will discuss the theoretical implication of the analysis here to Hirose's framework in section 5.2.

(15) Itu   itta↗
      when   went
      'When did you go?'   (= (3a))

The *wh*-question in (14a) also becomes acceptable if the plain form *itta* is replaced with the polite form *iki masita*, as shown in (16a).

(16) a.   Itu   iki masita   ka↗
            when go POL.PASTSFP
            'When did you go?'   (= (3d))
      b.   [_{<PUB>} Itu iki masita] ka

Although the sentence includes *ka*, it is interpreted as a public expression because of the existence of the addressee-oriented expression *masita*.   The schema in (16b) shows that the *wh*-word *itu* is a part of the public expression.   Since the *wh*-word here and public expression presuppose the existence of a hearer, the *wh*-question in (16a) does not give rise to any conflict between the *wh*-word and the environment where it appears; hence the acceptable sentence.   Notice that if *ka* is omitted from the sentence in (16a), the expression *itu iki* is no longer characterized as a private expression and becomes a public expression, as schematized in (17b).

(17) a.   Itu   iki masita↗
            when go POL.PAST
            'When did you go?'   (= (3c))
      b.   [_{<PUB>} Itu iki masita]

Since the *wh*-word is in the public expression, the *wh*-question in (17a) is acceptable.

      Unlike a *wh*-question, a yes/no-question contains no *wh*-word; the kind of conflict observed in (14) never arises in yes/no-questions.   Thus, all four types of yes/no-questions given below are acceptable:

(18) Itta↗
      went
      'Did you go?'   (= (2a))

(19) a. Itta   ka↗[9]
          went   SFP
          'Did you go?'   (= (2b))

     b. [_{<PRIV>} Itta] ka

(20) a. Iki   masita ↗
          go   POL.PAST
          'Did you go?'   (= (2c))

     b. [_{<PUB>} Iki masita]

(21) a. Iki   masita   ka ↗
          go   POL.PAST SFP
          'Did you go?'   (= (2d))

     b. [_{<PUB>} Iki masita] ka

As the above analyses show, the proposal in (10) correctly captures the distribution of *ka* observed in section 1.   Moreover, we do not need to postulate several types of *ka* when accounting for its distribution in environments other than a normal question:

(22) Dare-ga   ki   masu   ka.   (No one will come.)
      who-NOM   come   POL   SFP
      'Who will come?'   (= (8))

(23) A: Itizikan   kakari masu   yo.
           one hour   take   POL   SFP
           'It will take an hour [to get there].'

      B: *Itizikan   desu   ka*. Jaa,   moo   dekake   nakya.
           one hour   COP.POL SFP then   now   leave   have to
           'One hour?   Then I have to leave now.'   (= (9))

The *wh*-question in (22) is a rhetorical question.   As noted in section 2.2, the speaker does not request the hearer to provide information in a rhetorical question. The italicized sentence in (23) similarly does not express the speaker's demand for a response from the hearer because it expresses speaker B's understating of what speaker A said.   These facts are problematic for previous studies, in particular, in providing a unified account of the distribution of *ka* since they claim that *ka* serves to express the speaker's demand for an answer (see section 2.1).   In order to

---

[9] *Ka* semantically indicates the preparatory condition of the illocutionary act of question proposed by Searle (1969) (i.e., the speaker does not know if the proposition is true) (see section 5.1).   The sentence in (19a) is thus more strongly associated with the illocutionary force of question than that in (18).

explain *ka* in these examples, they need to postulate a different type of *ka* from that used in a normal question. On the other hand, the examples in (22) and (23) pose no problem for the present proposal; the primary function of *ka* is to make the expression within its scope a private expression (i.e. [$_{<PRIV>}$ Dare-ga ki] in (22) and [$_{<PRIV>}$ Itizikan (da)] in (23)) (although the private expressions indicated by *ka* in both examples are canceled by *masu*) and indicate the speaker's uncertainty about the content within its scope; thus it is, by nature, not associated with the speaker's demand for an answer.[10] The proposal does not hinder a unified account of the distribution of *ka* and makes it possible to capture *ka* in (22) and (23) in a similar fashion to that in (14)-(21). The next section provides supporting evidence of the generalization in (10) from three different perspectives.

4. Supporting Evidence

4.1. *Environments Where* Wh-*Words Does Not Presuppose the Existence of a Hearer*

I have so far explained that the conflict between a *wh*-word and a private expression observed in (14) is caused by the characteristic of a *wh*-word. In a *wh*-question, the *wh*-word presupposes the existence of a hearer because the speaker uses it with the intention of getting the hearer to specify its value. Thus, the *wh*-word may not occur in the private expression indicated by *ka*. We predict, however, that the sentence in which *ka* follows a non-honorific verb is acceptable if the speaker has no intention of asking the hearer to specify the value of a *wh*-word; such a *wh*-word does not presuppose the presence of a hearer, and thus it does not resist being a part of the private expression marked by *ka*. This prediction is supported by the following rhetorical *wh*-question:

(24) a. Dare-ga   sonna mono taberu   ka.   (No one eats it.)
          who-NOM   that   thing   eat   SFP
          'Who eats that thing?'
      b. [$_{<PRIV>}$ Dare-ga sonna mono taberu] ka

A rhetorical question allows *ka* to co-occur with a non-honorific verb (cf. Akazawa (2005), Akazawa and Watanabe (2007), Morikawa (2009)). As noted, since the illocutionary force of the rhetorical question is not question but assertion, the speaker does not demand an answer from the hearer in a rhetorical question; unlike the *wh*-word in a normal *wh*-question, that in a rhetorical question does not

---

[10] I will not investigate reasons why *ka* is used in these examples. For the function of *ka* used in (23), see Akatsuka (1998).

presuppose the existence of a hearer.   Thus, as shown in (24b), it can be contained within the scope of *ka* without adding any addressee-oriented expressions like (16) (i.e., *Itu iki masita ka* ↗ 'When did you go?').   The following example, cited from Morikawa (2009:12), lend support to the analysis developed here:

(25) a. Nani-o   tabe   yoo   ka.[11]
          what-ACC eat   shall SFP
          'What shall we eat?'
      b. [<PRIV> Nani-o tabe yoo] ka

The phrase '(verb +) *yoo*' used in questions indicates that the speaker is in the process of making a decision (Miyazaki et al. (2002)).   In (25), the speaker is thinking about what he will eat with the hearer.   To put it differently, although the sentence is superficially directed to the hearer, the speaker does not intend to ask the hearer to specify the value of the *wh*-word and is trying to decide the thing they eat by himself.[12]   Because the *wh*-word *nani-o* in (25) does not presuppose the existence of a hearer, it is permitted to be a part of the private expression marked by *ka*, as shown in (25b).   The following example can also be accounted for in a similar fashion:

(26) a. Nee, kyoo-wa   dare-ga   kuru ka   na(a).
          hey today-TOP who-NOM   come SFP   SFP
          'Hey, I'm wondering who will come today.'
                              (Akazawa and Watanabe (2007:16), with modifications)
      b. [<PRIV> Kyoo-wa dare-ga kuru] ka na(a)

According to Moriyama (1989b), the sentence-final particle *na(a)* 'I wonder' used in conversations turns the sentence in question into a soliloquy-like expression.   This means that the sentence does not have the illocutionary force of question.   The speaker thus does not intend to require the hearer to provide the value of the *wh*-word; he is merely wondering who will come on that day; hence the compatibility between the *wh*-word and the private expression marked by *ka*.

     Finally, I would like to observe examples in which *wh*-words appear in the embedded environments:[13]

---

[11]   The honorific counterpart to the sentence in (25a) is *Nani-o tabe masyoo ka*.

[12]   Non-rising intonation in (25a) also indicates that the speaker does not intend to request the hearer to provide information (cf. Moriyama (1989b)).

[13]   Although *ka* does not appear at the sentence final position, I do not distinguish between the *ka* appearing in an embedded clause and that appearing at the sentence final position (cf.

(27) Kare-ga   nani-o   katta   ka siri   tai.
     he-NOM   what-ACC bought SFP know want
     'I want to know what he bought.'

(28) Kare-ga   nani-o   katta   ka siri   tai   ka ↗
     he-NOM   what-ACC bought SFP know want SFP
     'Do you want to know what he bought?'

(29) [$_{<PRIV>}$ Kare-ga nani-o katta] ka siri tai (ka)   (cf. (27) and (28))

The *wh*-words can co-occur with the *ka* immediately following the non-honorific verbs in the embedded clauses (cf. Miyagawa (1987)). As the English translations show, both sentences are not *wh*-questions: (27) is a declarative sentence and (28) a yes/no-question.   In these sentences, the speaker does not require the hearer to specify the values of the *wh*-words in the embedded clauses, and so the *wh*-words do not presuppose the existence of a hearer.   That is why they are allowed to be a part of private expression.

4.2. Echo Questions

According to Hirose (2012, 2013), echoic expressions indicate that the speaker conveys the private expression of the original speaker.   For example, let us consider the following echo question:

(30) A: Alfred-wa mikon   kamosirenai yo.
        Alfred-TOP unmarried may   SFP
        'Alfred may be unmarried.'
     B: *Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai tte* ↗ Sonna wake   nai   yo.
                             COMP that   reason not SFP
        'Alfred may be unmarried?   That can't be it.'

The repeated expression *Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai* is speaker A's private expression; the mental attitude expressed by the auxiliary *kamosirenai* in the echo question is attributed to the original speaker, or speaker A, but not to speaker B. The quotation marker *tte*, which is a public expression (Hirose (1995)), signals that speaker B quotes speaker A's private expression.   The italicized expression is thus schematized as in (31).   The difference between the subject of the private expression and that of the public expression is depicted by using the different indices *i* and *j*.

Miyagawa (1987), Yoshida (2012)).

(31)　[_{<PUBj>} [_{<PRIVi>} Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai] tte]

$(i = \text{speaker A}, j = \text{speaker B})$

In echo questions like (30), *ka* can appear immediately after *tte*, expressing the reporter's doubt about the quoted part, as shown in (32).

(32)　A:　Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai yo.
　　　　B:　*Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai tte ka* ↗　Sonna wake nai yo.

By using *ka*, speaker B shows his doubt about, or expresses his disbelief of, the fact that speaker A uttered, namely that Alfred is unmarried.

　　　Notice that *tte* does not necessarily appear in echo questions.　Thus, *tte* in (33) can be omitted as follows:

(33)　A:　Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai yo.
　　　　B:　*Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai* ↗　　Sonna wake nai yo.　　　(cf. (30))

Yamaguchi (2009) points out that echo questions without *tte* function to express, as it were, bare private expressions of the original speaker.　That is, the speaker as a reporter of the original speaker's private expression is backgrounded and, as schematized in (34), the expression serves exclusively to indicate the original speaker's private expression.

(34)　[_{<PRIVi>} Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai]　$(i = \text{speaker A})$
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(= the italicized sentence in (33))

　　　We predict here that *ka* may not be attached to the italicized sentence in (33). This is because although that sentence should be presented as speaker A's private expression due to the lack of *tte*, *ka* makes it speaker B's private expression.　The following sentence proves that this prediction is correct:

(35)　A:　Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai yo.
　　　　B:　**Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai ka* ↗　Sonna wake nai yo.
(36)　[_{<PRIVj>} [_{<PRIVi>} Alfred-wa mikon kamosirenai]] ka

$(i = \text{speaker A}, j = \text{speaker B})$

As schematized in (36), the sentence is marked as speaker B's private expression even though it should exclusively express speaker A's.　Thus, the italicized

sentence in (35) is unacceptable (cf. Itani (1993)).

Furthermore, because the echo question indicates the original speaker's private expression, it does not function as a *wh*-question even if it includes a *wh*-word; in such a case, the speaker merely echoes the original speaker's *wh*-question and thus he does not intend to ask the hearer to specify the value of the *wh*-word. We can thus predict that the echo question including a *wh*-word allows *ka* to immediately follow a non-honorific verb. This prediction is borne out by the following example:

(37) A: Nani-o taberu?
          what-ACC eat
          'What will you eat?'

     B: *Nani-o taberu ka (tte)↗* Nani-mo tabe nai yo.
          what-ACC eat   SFP COMP anything eat not SFP
          'What will I eat?   I will eat nothing.'

(38) [<PRIV*i*> Nani-o taberu] ka (tte)   (*i* = Speaker A)

Although speaker A does not use *ka*, speaker B is adding it in echoing speaker A's *wh*-question. As shown in (38), the *ka* in the italicized echo question thus serves to indicate that *Nani-o taberu* is speaker A's private expression (i.e., speaker A is wondering what speaker B will eat).[14] Because speaker B does not intend to request speaker A to specify the value of the *wh*-word, it does not presuppose the existence of a hearer. Thus, the italicized sentence is fully acceptable.

5. Consequences
5.1. Ka *is Not a Question-Marker*

I have proposed that *ka* turns the expression within its scope into a private expression. This means that *ka* is an expression which does not presuppose the presence of a hearer. The proposal then has the consequence that *ka* is not a question-marker which falls under the class of public expressions (cf. Takiura (2008)).[15] Why, then, is *ka* used in questions frequently? I would like to propose

---

[14] The *ka* in (37) does not indicate speaker B's private expression. This is supported by the fact that *ka* expressing speaker B's private expression can appear at the sentence final position, as illustrated in (i).

(i) A: Nani-o taberu?
    B: Nani-o taberu ka tte <u>ka</u>↗ Nani-mo tabe nai yo.
(ii) Nani-o taberu ka   tte ka
          Speaker A   Speaker B

[15] Noda (1995) also claims that *ka* is not a question-marker. Strangely enough, however,

that the meaning of *ka* is compatible with one of the properties of question and thus its use ensures, or evokes, the interpretation of question.

　　Searle (1969) claims that the illocutionary act of question consists of the following properties:[16]

(39)　a.　*Propositional content*:
　　　　　Any proposition or propositional function.
　　　b.　*Preparatory condition*:
　　　　　1. <u>S does not know 'the answer', i.e., does not know if the proposition is true, or, in the case of the propositional function, does not know the information needed to complete the proposition truly</u>.
　　　　　2. It is not obvious to both *S* and *H* that *H* will provide the information at that time without being asked.
　　　c.　*Sincerity condition*:
　　　　　S wants this information.
　　　d.　*Essential condition*:
　　　　　Counts as an attempt to elicit this information from *H*.

<div align="right">(Searle (1969:66); underline mine)</div>

As noted in section 3.1, *ka* expresses the speaker's uncertainty.　The use of *ka* thus linguistically expresses the underlined preparatory condition 1; by using *ka*, the speaker makes the hearer to infer that the expression conveyed is a question.　In this sense, *ka* can function as an illocutionary force indicator of question.　That is why *ka* frequently appears in questions.[17]　Note that the analysis here should be

---

she assumes that *ka* functions to signal the speaker's demand for an answer from the hearer in explaining the unacceptability of *wh*-questions where *ka* co-occurs with non-honorific forms (see section 2.1).

[16] Nitta (1991:137) provides a similar characterization of question.

[17] Rising intonation can also be regarded as an illocutionary force indicator of question. Moriyama (1989b) points out that rising intonation expresses the speaker's demand for a response from the hearer.　This means that it phonologically indicates the essential condition in (39d), and ensures the interpretation of question.　As pointed out in section 1, *ka* does not always appear in questions.　This is because rising intonation guarantees the interpretation of question.　Notice, however, that rising intonation is no more a device specialized as the illocutionary force indicator of question than *ka* is.　The following sentences, though having rising intonation, are not questions:

(i)　Kami-ni　nani-ka　　tui　　tei　masu　yo↗
　　　hair-DAT　something　stick to　ASP　POL　　SFP
　　　'Something is on your hair.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Oshima (2013:52))
(ii)　a.　Irassyai　　mase↗
　　　　　Welcome　POL.IMP
　　　　　'Welcome, may I help you?'

distinguished from that proposed by Uyeno (1971), who claims that the use of *ka* "is a direct reflex of the performative verb ASK" (Uyeno (1971:39)).　This means that *ka* linguistically expresses all three types of conditions, namely, preparatory condition, sincerity condition, and essential condition.　Her claim, however, fails to systematically explain examples in which in spite of the existence of *ka*, the speaker does not require the hearer to provide information (see section 2.2; see also Kendall (1985), Itani (1993)).

5.2.　*Two Types of Private Expressions*

　　　Based on the proposal in this paper, I assume that there are two types of private expressions: one is motivated by the unmarked mode of expression in Japanese and the other by special linguistic expressions.　According to Hirose (1995), Japanese is a language where sentences without addressee-oriented expressions are, by default, interpreted as private expressions (for details, see Hirose (1995)).　To put it differently, the unmarked mode of expression in Japanese is private expression.　For instance:

(40)　Ame da.
　　　rain　COP
　　　'It's raining.'

The example has no addressee-oriented expression and sounds like a soliloquy (Hirose and Hasegawa (2010)).　Notice that the private expression motivated by the unmarked mode is a default interpretation and can be suspended in certain environments.　For example, the following sentence is used to warn the hearer to watch out for the snake around him:

(41)　Kiotukero!　*Hebi　da!*
　　　watch out　snake　COP
　　　'Watch out!　It's a snake!'

Clarity is at issue here because there is an imminent danger.　In such a situation,

---

　　　b.　Misete↗
　　　　　show
　　　　　'Show me.'

(Kori (2013:225))

Some property of rising intonation may be compatible with the essential condition, and in questions, it often plays a role in marking the sentence as a question.　I will not deal with this issue any further here and leave it to future research.

sentences without addressee-oriented expressions can be interpreted as public expressions.

Ka, on the other hand, linguistically motivates the interpretation of private expression. Unlike the interpretation of private expression motivated by the unmarked mode, that motivated by linguistic expressions is not cancelable unless there are addressee-oriented expressions within the scope of *ka*. The difference between the two types of private expressions is illustrated by the following contrast:

(42) *Itu   itta   ka ↗
     when went SFP
     'When did you go?'   (= (3b))

(43) Itu   itta ↗
     when   went
     'When did you go?'   (= (3a))

The expression *itu itta* in (42) falls under the scope of *ka* and thus is a private expression motivated by this linguistic expression. On the other hand, (43) includes no addressee-oriented expression and thus *itu itta* is, by default, a private expression motivated by the unmarked mode. Recall that a *wh*-word normally needs to be contained within a public expression (see section 3.2). This necessity turns the sentence in (43) into a public expression; the default interpretation motivated by the unmarked mode is suspended here. Hence, (43) is acceptable. By contrast, the private expression marked by *ka* in (42) does not become a public expression; hence the unacceptability of (42). The analysis here implies that two types of private expressions co-exist in Japanese.

6. Conclusion

The Japanese sentence-final particle *ka* has been traditionally considered as a question-marker. This view, however, does not capture the idiosyncratic distribution of *ka*, and furthermore, it does not give a unified account of the distribution of *ka* in other situations than typical questions. In order to solve these problems arising under the analyses of previous studies, this paper has proposed that *ka* turns the expression within its scope into a private expression. I have demonstrated that this proposal correctly accounts for the distribution of *ka* in a unified way. The proposal then leads us to conclude that contrary to the traditional view, *ka* is not a question-marker. *Ka* is frequently used in questions because it can linguistically realize the preparatory condition of the illocutionary act of question and therefore causes the hearer to infer that the expression conveyed is a question.

Furthermore, the proposal has the consequence that there are two types of private expression: the private expression motivated by the unmarked mode of expression and that motivated by special linguistic expressions.   The former can be suspended in certain environments, turning into a public expression.   The latter remains a private expression in any environment; that is, it may not be suspended.

REFERENCES

Akatsuka, Noriko (1998) "Zyookenbun to Desirability no Kasetu (Conditionals and a Theory of Desirability)," *Modaritei to Hatuwa Kooi* (Modality and Speech Acts), ed. by Minoru Nakau 2-97, Kenkyusha, Tokyo.

Akazawa, Mika (2005) *Nihongo no Wh-Gimonbun nitaisuru Kinooteki Seeyaku nituite: Eego tono Hikaku o Tyuusin ni* (Functional Constraints on Japanese *Wh*-Questions: With Special Reference to English), Unpublished Master's thesis, Reitaku University.

Akazawa, Mika and Shin Watanabe (2007) "Nihongo no *Wh*-Gimonbun no Koobun Tokusee: "Dare-ga Kuru Ka?" wa Naze Yoonin Sarenai No Ka? (The Property of Japanese *Wh*-Questions: Why *Dare-ga Kuru Ka?* Is Not Acceptable?)," *Eego to Bunpoo to: Suzuki Hidekazu Kyoozyu Kanreki Kinen Ronbun Shuu* (English and Grammar: A Festschrift for Prof. Hidekazu Suzuki on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday), ed. by Akira Mizokoshi, Hiromi Onozuka, Shigeyuki Hujimoto, Nobuhiro Kaga, Toshiaki Nishihara, Makoto Kondo, and Michiyo Hamasaki, 14-25, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1988) *Sprachkompetenz: Grundzuege der Theorie des Sprechens*, France, Tübingen.

Culpeper, Jonathan (1996) "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness," *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 349-367.

Hirose, Yukio (1995) "Direct and Indirect Speech as Quotations of Public and Private Expression," *Lingua* 95, 223-238.

Hirose, Yukio (2012) "Kooteki Hyoogen/Siteki Hyoogen to Nitiee no Wahoo (Public/Private Expression and Reported Speech in Japanese and English)," *Eego Gohoo Bunpoo Kenkyuu* (Studies in English Grammar and Usage) 19, 20-34.

Hirose, Yukio (2013) "Shukan no Kyakutaika aruiwa Shukanteki Hyoogen no "Kyakkantekina" Yoohoo nituite: Sitekiziko/Kootekiziko no Kanten kara (On Objectification of Subjectivity or "Objective" Usage of Subjective Expressions: From the Perspective of Private Self/Public Self)," ms., University of Tsukuba.

Hirose, Yukio and Yoko Hasegawa (2010) *Nihongo kara Mita Nihonzin: Shutaisee no Gengogaku* (Japanese People as Seen from the Japanese Language: The Linguistics of Subjectivity), Kaitakusha, Tokyo.

Ikarashi, Keita (2013) "The Performative Clause *I Tell You*, Interpersonal Relationship, and Informational Superiority," *Tsukuba English Studies* 32, 111-126.

Itani, Reiko (1993) "The Japanese Sentence-Final Particle *Ka*: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach,"

Lingua 90, 129-47.

Kendall, Sue (1985) "Japanese Sentence-Final Particles as Commitment Markers," *BLS* 11, 164-174.

Konno, Hiroaki (2012) "I-oti: Katati to Imi no Intaafeesu no Kanten kara (The Japanese Adjectival Conjugational Ending Drop Construction: From a Syntax-Semantics Interface Perspective)," *Gengo Kenkyu* 141, 5-31.

Kori, Shiro (2013), "Hantei Yookyuu no Sitsumonbun niokeru Gimongata Zyooshootyoo to Sono Onseeteki Tokutyoo (Interrogative Rise in Tokyo Japanese)," *Gengo Bunka Kenkyuu* (Language and Culture Stadies) 39, 221-244.

Kuno, Susumu (1980) "The Scope of the Question and Negation in Some Verb-Final Languages," *CLS* 16, 155-169.

Kuwabara, Kazuki (2013) "Peripheral Effects in Japanese Questions and the Fine Structure of CP," *Lingua* 126, 92-119.

Masuoka, Takashi (1992) "Huteesee no Reberu (The Level of Indefiniteness)," *Nihongo Kyooiku* (Teaching Japanese) 77, 14-25.

Miyagawa, Shigeru (1987) "LF Affix Raising in Japanese," *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 362-367.

Miyazaki, Kazuhito, Taro Adachi, Harumi Noda, and Shino Takanashi (2002) *Modaritei* (Modality), Kurosio, Tokyo.

Mizutani, Osamu and Nobuko Mizutani (1987) *How to Be Polite in Japanese*, Japan Times, Tokyo.

Morikawa, Masahiro (2009) *Gimonbun to "Da": Toogo/Oto/Imi to Danwa no Kankee o Misuete* (Interrogatives and *Da*: From the Viewpoint of the Relationship between Syntax/Speech Sound/Semantic and Discourse), Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Moriyama, Takuro (1988) *Nihongo Doosi Zyutugobun no Kenkyuu* (A Study of Japanese Verb-Predicate Sentences), Meiji Shoin, Tokyo.

Moriyama, Takuro (1989a) "Ninsiki no Muudo to Sono Shyuuhen (Epistemic Mood and Its Congeners)," *Nihongo no Modaritei* (Modality in Japanese), ed. by Yoshio Nitta and Takashi Masuoka, 57-120, Kurosio, Tokyo.

Moriyama, Takuro (1989b) "Bun no Imi to Intoneeshon (Meaning of Sentences and Intonation)," *Nihongogaku Yoosetu* (An Overview of Japanese Linguistics), ed. by Yutaka Miyaji, 172-196, Meiji Shoin, Tokyo.

Nitta, Yoshio (1991) *Nihongo no Modaritei to Ninsho* (Japanese Modality and Person), Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Noda, Harumi (1995) "~ No Ka?, ~ No?, ~ Ka?, ~ ø?: Situmonbun no Bunmatu no Katati (~ No Ka?, ~ No?, ~ Ka?, ~ ø?: Sentence Final Forms of Interrogatives)," *Nihongo Ruigi Hyoogen no Bunpoo* (The Grammar of Japanese Synonyms), ed. by Tatsuo Miyajima and Yoshio Nitta, 210-219, Kurosio, Tokyo.

Onoe, Keisuke (1983) "Huteego no Gosee to Yoohoo (The Characteristic of Indefinite Words and Its Usage)," *Hukuyoogo no Kenkyuu* (A Study of Adverbial Phrases), ed. by Minoru Watanabe, 404-431, Meiji Shoin, Tokyo.

Oshima, Yoshikazu D. (2013) "Nihongo niokeru Intoneeshongata to Shuuzyosi Kinoo no Sookan nituite (On the Relation between the Intonation Types and the Functions of Discourse Particles in Japanese)," *Forum of International Development Studies* 43, 47-63.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.

Searle, John R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Takiura, Masato (2008) *Poraitonesu Nyuumon* (An Introduction to Politeness), Kenkyusha, Tokyo.

Tsuchihashi, Mika (1983) "The Speech Act Continuum: An Investigation of Japanese Sentence Final Particles," *Journal of Pragmatics* 7, 361-387.

Uyeno, Tazuko Y. (1971) *A Study of Japanese Modality: A Performance Analysis of Sentence Particles*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Yamaguchi, Haruhiko (2009) *Meisekina Inyoo, Sinayakana Inyoo: Wahoo no Nitiee Taisho Kenkyuu* (Clear Reported Speech, Flexible Reported Speech: A Contrastive Study of Reported Speech between Japanese and English), Kurosio, Tokyo.

Yoshida, Tomoyuki (2012) "*Wh*-Questions and Informativeness," *Lingua* 122, 1596-1612.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics
University of Tsukuba
ikarashi.k61@gmail.com