Ga as a Marker for Topic-Establishment*
Taichi Hirota

1. Introduction

In this paper, I mainly examine Japanese noun-predicate sentences. In Japanese noun-predicate sentences, elements followed by the particle *ga* (henceforth, "pre-particle" elements) are traditionally analyzed as a part of the focus (*e.g.*, Mikami (1953), Kitahara (1981, 1984), Masuoka (1987), Sakahara (1990) *etc.*). Consider the example in (1).[1]

(1) A: *Dare-ga   syatyoo-desu ka*
        who-NOM president-COP Q
        "Who is the president?"

    B: *Yamada-ga   syatyoo-desu*
        Yamada-NOM president-COP
        "Yamada is the president"

In (1B), the pre-particle element (*i.e.*, *Yamada*) is focused, and the rest of the sentence is interpreted as expressing a thematic material. In an answer to the question in (1A), the particle *wa* can also be used. Because *wa* marks a thematic expression,[2] the order of noun phrases is reversed, as illustrated in (2B).

(2) A: *Dare-ga   syatyoo-desu ka*
        who-NOM president-COP Q
        "Who is the president?"

    B: *Syatyoo-wa   Yamada-desu*
        president-TOP Yamada-COP
        "The president is Yamada"

In (2B), the pre-particle phrase is presupposed, and the element occurred in the second slot (*i.e.*, *Yamada*; hereafter, a "post-particle" element) is focused. Information structures of *ga-/wa*-sentences are roughly sketched as shown above. Based on these observations, noun-predicate sentences are described simply as follows, in most previous studies; that is, while *wa* marks a pre-particle element as the presupposition and a post-particle element as the focus on the one hand, *ga* marks a pre-particle element as the focus and a post-particle element as the presupposition on the other.

Matters become more complicated, however, when we consider the cases where a post-particle element is focused even when a subject is marked by *ga*. For example:

(3) A: *Nyuusyoosya-wa dare-desu ka*

> prizewinner-TOP who-COP Q
>
> "Who are the prize winners?"
>
> B: *Iti-i-ga*   *Yamada-desu*
>
> first prizewinner-Nom Yamada-Cop
>
> "The first prize winner is Yamada"

In contrast to (1B), in (3B), in spite of its *ga*-marking, the post-particle element is focused. Amano (1995b) calls sentences like (3B) "Posterior-Focus"[3] *ga*-sentences, and little attention has been given to such sentences. As this example suggests, a generally accepted view concerning *ga-/wa*-sentences such as roughly stated above makes wrong prediction as for the information structure of (3B). In this paper, I suggest that the use of *ga* in Posterior-Focus sentences is pragmatically motivated by making differences clear among the above sentences. In particular, we will see that the notion of "topic-establishment" plays an important role when we consider information structures of *ga-/wa*-sentences.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first outlines Amano's (1995a, 1995b, 1996, 1998) analysis of Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, and then points out some problems with her proposal. Section 3 challenges Amano's claim by showing that it makes an incorrect claim when we consider more comprehensive data. I propose an alternative analysis, in which a pre-particle expression in a Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentence should be treated as a newly established topic. Thus Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences cannot be analyzed in much the same way as any studies that claim a pre-particle phrase expresses a presupposed material in that the hearer has already known about it before the sentence is uttered. Section 4 extends the analysis made in section 3 to Japanese predicational sentences. Section 5 is a brief conclusion.

2. Amano's Analysis

2.1. *Amano's Characterization of Posterior-Focus* Ga-*Sentences*

To my knowledge, Amano (1995a) is the first work that shows another type of noun-predicate *ga*-sentences, where a pre-particle element expresses presupposed material and is followed by the focus phrase. According to Amano (1996:6ff), the discourse function of Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences is defined as follows: pre-particle elements express the presupposition which can be considered to be "subcategorized" (henceforth, I refer to her notion of the presupposition as presupposition$_{sub}$), and it is interpreted "associatively" with reference to the (larger) presupposition that lies in, and hence easily recoverable from, the preceding discourse (or the situation). To see this, consider the following examples. Here,

a felicitous answer to the question in (4A) is not (4B), but (5) or (6):

(4) A: *Nyuusyoosya-wa dare-desu ka*
prizewinner-TOP who-COP Q
"Who are the prizewinners?"

B: **Nyuusyoosya-ga Yamada-desu*
prizewinner-Nom Yamada-COP
"The prizewinner is Yamada"

(5) *Nyuusyoosya-wa Yamada-desu*
prizewinner-TOP Yamada-COP
"The prizewinner is Yamada"

(6) *Iti-i-ga Yamada-desu*
first prizewinner-Nom Yamada-COP
"The first prizewinner is Yamada"

The unacceptability in (4B) shows that *ga* cannot mark the noun phrase repeatedly, which has been already given in the preceding discourse. If the speaker repeats this presupposed phrase in the pre-particle position, he must use *wa* instead of *ga*, as shown in (5). In (6), by contrast, the pre-particle expression is marked by *ga*. Here the pre-particle expression *iti-i* itself is not introduced in the statement released before, but this sentence is to be taken as entailing that *iti-i* is a subset of *nyuusyoosya*. In other words, *nyuusyoosya* is a (larger) presupposition that contains *iti-i* and others. In this sense, *iti-i* is a "subcategory" subsumed under the whole *nyuusyoosya*. Amano captures the anaphoric relation between the (larger) presupposition and the presupposition$_{sub}$ by "associative" anaphora. Amano then goes on to suggest that a Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentence can be used when an associative anaphoric relation obtains.

With these as background, let us now see some of Amano's (1996) observations. As is already shown in (5B), the speaker cannot repeat literally a presupposed expression in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences. In addition, Amano states that Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences have a strong inclination to involve adverbials which mean particularization (*e.g., tokuni* (in particular), *itiban, mottomo* (most)), quantification (*e.g., hotondono, daibubunno* (great majority of, most)), and comparison (*e.g., dooyooni* (equally, likewise), *motto* (more)). These expressions also imply other members of the whole set. According to her, when we say *mottomo popyuraa-na nomimono* (the most popular drink), for example, we are comparing others of less popularity, and assuming a drink as a super set including the most popular drink and the least popular drink.

As a further illustration for her claim that in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, a

pre-particle element expresses the presupposition$_{sub}$, let us consider the following contrast from Amano (1996:6):

(7)　(James Herriot, the author of a book, is explicitly stated in the beginning of the story. And in the ending, the following is stated as "About the author.")

James Herriot (...) {wa/*ga} igirisu-no　Yorkshire-no　moto-
James Herript-{TOP/*NOM} Britain-GEN Yorkshire-GEN ex-
jyuui-san-desu
vet-Mr.-COP
"James Herriot was a vet from Yorkshire in Britain"

(8) A:　*James Herriot-tati-wa　nani-mono-desu ka*
James Herriot-PL-TOP what-one-COP　Q
"What kind of persons are James Herriot and his party?"

B:　*James Herriot-ga　moto-jyuui-san-desu. Sorekara, M.N-ga*
James Herriot-NOM ex-vet-Mr.-COP　　and　　M.N-NOM
moto-kyoosi-desu
ex-teacher-COP
"James Herriot was a vet, and M.N was a teacher"

In contrast to (7) where the presupposed pre-particle phrase *James Herriot* cannot be repeated when *ga* is used, in (8B), the same phrase can be *ga*-marked. This is because, as indicated by the phrase *James Herriot-tati* in (8A), *James Herriot* and others constitute a larger set. In Amano's term, the pre-particle element is the presupposition$_{sub}$ which makes it possible to mark this element with *ga*.

Based on these observations, Amano (1996) concludes that *ga* functions as the presupposition$_{sub}$ marker only when it occurs in Posterior-Focus sentences. Amano further suggests the procedural meaning for Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences that the use of *ga* signals to search for a larger presupposition to which a *ga*-marked presupposition$_{sub}$ phrase belongs, and interpret the presupposition$_{sub}$ with reference to a larger presupposition.

Note here that this kind of dependency of the pre-particle phrase on the preceding discourse is optional in *wa*-sentences, that is, *wa* can mark both the (larger) presupposition and the presupposition$_{sub}$. This amounts to saying, with Amano (1998), that *ga* has no *unique* functions other than the function of nominative Case marking.

To sum up Amano's claim outlined in this subsection, (i) *ga* marks the presupposition$_{sub}$ in a Posterior-Focus sentence, and (ii) *ga* exclusively functions as a nominative Case marker. Recall that in *ga*-sentences, pre-particle phrase can be

the focus as well as the presupposition$_{sub}$.   The same holds true for the post-particle phrase.   Thus, when Amano speaks of (ii), she means that *ga* does not inherently have the function of marking a focus or presupposition phrase, such that in *wa*-sentences, a pre-particle phrase is the presupposition and a post-particle phrase is the focus.   I show problems with each point in the following subsection.

2.2.   Problems with Amano

Under Amano's analysis, a pre-particle element in a Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentence can be seen as the presupposition$_{sub}$ in the context.   I agree with Amano that in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, the pre-particle element cannot be identical with a presupposition phrase which is given in the preceding discourse.   I, however, challenge the idea that this characteristic shows that the *ga*-marked pre-particle phrase must express the presupposition$_{sub}$.

In spite of a consistent account of the given data, Amano's analysis leaves two problems unexplained.   First, contrary to her claim, there is a case where a Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentence cannot be regarded as a felicitous utterance, even though a pre-particle phrase expresses the presupposition$_{sub}$.   Second, the functional distinction between *wa* and *ga* cannot be maintained in her framework, and consequently, she cannot correctly predict which is an appropriate choice in an utterance between *wa* and *ga*.   In addition to these problems, I show that her notion of presupposition$_{sub}$ is inadequate to account for the data I present below.   In what follows, let us consider each problem in detail.

Firstly, Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences that involve an *explicit* larger presupposition phrase in the pre-particle position are judged to be unacceptable, even though the pre-particle phrase still expresses what Amano calls the presupposition$_{sub}$.   Observe the following example:

> (9) A: *Nyuusyoosya-wa dare-desu ka*
>   prizewinner-TOP who-COP Q
>   "Who are the prizewinners?"
>
> B: * *Nyuusyoosya-no iti-i-ga   Yamada-desu*
>   prizewinner-GEN first-NOM Yamada-COP
>   "The first prizewinner is Yamada"

In (9B), the pre-particle phrase expresses the presupposition$_{sub}$, but we find the sentence very unnatural.[4]   Because the relation "*nyuusyoosya* ⊃ *nyuusyoosya-no iti-i* (the prizewinner ⊃ the first prizewinner)" still holds here, it is insufficient to suppose merely that a pre-particle element expresses the presupposition$_{sub}$ in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences.

Keeping this in mind that there is a distributional difference between *ga*- and

wa-sentences, let us consider the second problem. As mentioned in section 2.1, since, pragmatically or semantically, the function of *ga* is covered by that of *wa*, Amano (1998) concludes that the unique function of *ga* is to mark the nominative Case. As Amano observes, the occurrence of *ga* in Posterior-Focus sentences is more restricted than that of *wa*, but, significantly, there is the cases where the use of *wa* makes an utterance unnatural. In such cases, only *ga* can mark a pre-particle phrase. Consider the following examples, for instance: [5]

(10) A: *Stones-no   konsaato-wa doo-datta?*
         Stones-GEN concert-TOP how-COP
         "How was the Stones's concert?"

    B: *{Zannen-datta/Gakkari-shita}-no-ga   kyaku-no*
       {bad-COP/disappointed-did}-Nz-NOM   audience-GEN
       taido-da (-ne)
       behavior-COP(-FP)
       "What made me feel disappointed was the behavior of the audience"

    B': *?? *{Zannen-datta/Gakkari-sita}-no-wa   kyaku-no*
           {bad-COP/disappointed-did}-Nz-TOP audience-GEN
           taido-da (-ne)
           behavior-COP(-FP)

It is clear from (10) that the *wa-ga* alternation is not always possible in a Posterior-Focus sentence. Since Amano suppose that *ga* has no unique pragmatic function, her analysis cannot predict this asymmetry correctly.

If we put the contrastive reading aside, the utterance in (10B') is unacceptable unless the speaker B has already known that something made him disappointed had happened to the speaker A in the concert. At least for me, (10B) is perfectly natural, in spite of the absence of such presupposed proposition. That is to say, there are cases in which Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences can be uttered felicitously, even though a pre-particle phrase is not "associatively" interpreted via the preceding discourse.

Thus Amano's analysis suffers from three major defects. First, as observed in (9), it cannot correctly predict the unacceptability of the Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentence when a (larger) presupposed phrase is explicated. Second, the reason why there is the distributional difference between Posterior-Focus *ga*- and *wa*-sentences remains to be proved. To put it differently, why are there cases where Posterior-Focus *wa*-sentences are ruled out when their *ga*-counterparts are felicitous, which is, undoubtedly, an unexpected result for Amano, since she assumes that *ga* merely marks the nominative Case, and thus there are no pragmatic

functions unique to *ga*? Third, an associative anaphoric relation between the (larger) presupposition and the presupposition$_{sub}$ is not always required in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences (*e.g.*, (10B)).

3. The Topic-Establishing Function

3.1. Ga *and a Newly Established Topic*

In this subsection, I would like to reconsider the examples in (10). Before turning to a closer examination of it, however, a few remarks as background should be made concerning the thetic and categorical judgments (cf. Kuroda (1972, 1992)). According to Kuroda, the categorical judgment is assumed to consist of two separate acts: one is the act of recognition of an entity which is to be made the Subject[6]; and the other, the act of affirming or denying what is expressed by the Predicate about the Subject. The thetic judgment, on the other hand, represents simply the recognition of a situation or an entity. Thetic sentences thus would be used to report perception of a situation, for example. As for a categorical sentence, it draws attention first to, for example, an entity, and then what is expressed by the Predicate is attributed to the entity.

We are now ready to turn to the case in (10). As already mentioned, (10B') is an infelicitous answer as long as the speaker B does not presuppose such that the speaker A had not been satisfied with the concert. Though (10B) appears not to have a theme in the sense that an element is hearer-old, the utterance is not a thetic, but a categorical sentence that involves a Subject or a presupposed object.[7] This is because the utterance does not tell us what happened as a single event, but predicates of the speaker B's recognition of an eventuality of the concert that made him disappointed. An important part of this view for my purposes is that the utterance in (10B) has a "presupposed" subject in the sense that a precondition for making the judgment is that the mind of the speaker A directs first to an object, before the predicate can be connected to it.

It is widely accepted that a "presupposed" subject (or a Subject) in Japanese is marked by *wa* (*cf.* Kuroda (1972)), but as shown in (10B), it can also be marked by *ga* when a pre-particle phrase is not established as a theme (see Heycock and Doron (2003) for a recent claim that there is a "categorical" subject in Japanese). The utterance in (10B) draws attention first to the eventuality that he is disappointed in the concert, and then says of the eventuality that it is caused by the audience. This utterance introduces a new topic into the relevant exchange, and it is this pre-particle phrase that functions as the Subject of the sentence.

Interestingly, (10B) can be paraphrased under the same discourse condition as

follows:

> (11) <u>Gakkari-sita-koto-ga</u>   <u>atte,</u>   <u>sore-wa</u> kyaku-no taido-desu
> disappointed-did-thing-NOM happen it-TOP audience-GEN behavior-COP
> "Speaking of what made me disappointed, that's the behavior of the audience"

The example in (11) is a paraphrase formally divided by the (underlined) part which introduces the topic in the discourse, and the (broken lined) part which marks the theme. In other words, the (newly established) topic part is left dislocated first, and the dislocated phrase in turn functions as a theme of the main clause, as indicated by the pronominalization. In (10B), these two parts come together in one form. The topic-establishing function of *ga* in Posterior-Focus sentences makes such unification of these two parts possible, I suppose.

Notice here that such paraphrase is impossible in Anterior-Focus *ga*-sentence, such as (1), repeated here for ease of reference:

> (12) A: *Dare-ga*   *syatyoo-desu*   *ka*
> who-NOM president-COP Q
> "Who is the president?"
>
> B: *Yamada-ga*   *syacyoo-desu*
> Yamada-NOM president-COP
> "The president is Yamada"
>
> B': * *Yamada nituite ieba,*   *kare-wa syacyoo-desu*
> Yamada about speaking he-TOP president-COP
> "Speaking of Yamada, he is the president"

The examples in (10)-(12) make it clear that *ga* shows different characteristics whether it occurs in Posterior-Focus sentences or in Anterior-Focus sentences. In Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, *ga* has the topic-establishing function, and thus it fits in the context where establishing a new topic is required, such as (10) and (11). In the Anterior-Focus *ga*-sentence, on the other hand, *ga* straightforwardly marks a focus phrase, and hence if we paraphrase it into expressions that have the topic-establishing function such as (12B'), the sentence becomes very unnatural. In the following subsection, I consider in what way Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences are not appropriate to provide an answer to a question straightforwardly.

3.2. Contrastiveness, and the Counter-Expectation

To see how a pre-particle expression in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences is not a straightforward answer, let me first observe their *wa*-counterparts. Posterior-Focus *wa*-sentences—even when they occur in the same context as their *ga*-counterparts— are given an extra interpretation, that is, a contrastive one, when a pre-particle

phrase has not been introduced in the preceding discourse (explicitly).   This can be seen in examples where a pre-particle phrase expresses the speaker's subjective evaluation or judgment.   Compare the following minimal pairs:

(13)   *Stones-no konsaato-wa doo-datta?* ("How was the Stones's concert?")

    a.   *Itiban yokatta-no-ga Slippin' Away-desu*
       most good-Nz-NOM Slippin' Away-COP
       "What was most impressive is Slippin'Away"

    b.   *Itiban yokatta-no-wa Slippin' Away-desu*
       most good-Nz-TOP Slippin' Away-COP
       "What was most impressive is Slippin'Away"

(14)   *Dono koosui-ga uretei-masu ka*
     which odor-NOM selling-COP Q
     "Which eau de toilettes are selling well?"

    a.   *Dansee-ni mo zyosee-ni   mo ninkina-no-ga   Oceanus-desu*
       man-DAT also woman-DAT also popular-Nz-NOM Oceanus-COP
       "What is in big demand among men and women is Oceanus"

    b.   *Dansee-ni mo zyosee-ni   mo ninkina-no-wa   Oceanus-desu*
       man-DAT also woman-DAT also popular-Nz-TOP Oceanus-COP
       "What is in big demand among men and women is Oceanus"

As for the example in (13), when *wa* is used, it is more likely to imply some extra meaning such that other songs are not so good.   Similarly in (14b), it means that Oceanus is indeed in high demand, but there are others that are more popular than that, or the like.   *Ga*-sentences, by contrast, do not convey such contrastive meanings.

A Posterior-Focus *wa*-sentence where a pre-particle phrase contains a quantifier can convey such contrastive meanings as well.

(15)   *Kimi-no daigaku-no   gakusee-wa doo-desu ka*
     you-GEN university-GEN student-TOP how-COP Q
     "How are the students of your university?"

   - a.   *Hotondo-no gakusee-ga   kanemoti-no musuko-desu*
       most   student-NOM rich-GEN   son-COP
       "Most students are sons of the rich"

    b.   *Hotondo-no gakusee-wa   kanemoti-no musuko-desu*
       most   student-TOP rich-GEN   son-COP
       "Most students are sons of the rich"

As (15) illustrates, both *ga* and *wa* can be used to mark the pre-particle phrase. However, when we compare (15b) with the sentence that does not contain the

quantifier, *i.e.*, *Watasi-no daigaku-no gakusee-wa kanemoti-no musuko-desu* ("The students of my university are sons of the rich") under the same context, only (15b) always conveys an extra meaning such that "most students are sons of the rich, but, in fact, there are some exceptional cases".

Wa generally marks a theme; but if a pre-particle phrase is not established as a theme, then contrastive readings result. Instead, *ga* marks the pre-particle phrase without yielding contrastive meanings. In my framework, this asymmetry is accounted for as follows; in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences a newly introduced expression in the pre-particle position is first established as a topic, and then the topic functions as a theme of the sentence, even though this interpretational procedure is not formally represented as in the left dislocation sentence in (11). To see this, consider (13), for example. Both in (13a) and (13b), the pre-particle expression is discourse-new. In (13a), however, the speaker takes dual interpretive procedures in which he first introduces the expression at issue into the discourse, and then he reanalyzes as a theme of the sentence. The first procedure is absent in (13b), which means that by using (13b), the speaker takes an unusual or marked way of answering the question, since the pre-particle expression is not established as the theme of the discourse. In the meantime, I consider that a contrastive meaning is implied in (13b) because of its marked form.

To sum up what I have argued so far, *ga* in Posterior-Focus sentences marks a pre-particle phrase as a newly established topic in the relevant discourse; on the other hand, *wa* in Posterior-Focus sentences marks a pre-particle phrase when it can be interpreted as a theme. In Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, as Amano observes, a pre-particle phrase itself is not introduced up to the point of the utterance, and hence *ga* must be used in order to establish a topic of the sentence, which is required by a categorical sentence.

Note that in the same context as (10), a theme does not always have to be expressed overtly, and the hearer can understand what is at issue from her background knowledge. Therefore in contrast with the exchange (10A)-(10B'), the answer in (16B) is perfectly acceptable, even when we do not read it contrastively:

(16) A: *Stones-no consaato-wa doo-datta?*
Stones   concert-TOP how-COP
"How was the Stones's concert?"

B: *Omosirokatta-no-wa oopuningu-da(-ne)*
amusing-Nz-TOP   opening-COP(-FP)
"What amused me is their opening performance"

Generally speaking, when the speaker A asked the speaker B how the concert he

went was, the speaker A more or less expects that the speaker B had amused himself at the concert. That is, that the concert was amusing can be considered to be recorded in the registry of the present discourse. This is why the pre-particle phrase in (16B) can be the theme. Based on such a shared knowledge, the answer in (10B') is rather "unexpected"; for this reason, the speaker in (10B') is required first to establish the "unexpected" proposition in the hearer's registry of discourse, for example, by using *ga*, or introductory statements such as *nituite iuto* ("speaking of").

4. More on the Counter-Expectation: A Japanese Predicational Sentence

In this section, I extend my analysis made on Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences to predicational sentences. It is widely known that in predicational sentences, a subject phrase is marked by *wa*. Contrary to this view, Takahashi (1997) remarks on the existence of *ga*-marked predicational sentences such as:

(17) *Isida-wa itumo bentoo-o   2-tu   mo*
      Isida-TOP always packed lunch-ACC 2-Classifier   as many as
      taberu. Sonna oomesigurai-no Isida-ga   ano konbini-no
      eat   such gluttonous   Isida-NOM that convenience store-GEN
      bentoo-o   ooi   to   kanziteiru
      packed lunch-ACC plenty of COMP feel
      "Ishida always eats as many packed lunches as two. Such edacious
      Ishida feels that the packed lunch at that convenience store is overfull."

According to Takahashi (1997), such *ga*-marking in predicational sentences is only possible when the subject phrase expresses something "unexpected". The first sentence in (17) has created the idea that Ishida is edacious. The second sentence thus describes what is "contrary to expectation". Hence, if such counter-expectation is removed from the subject phrase, the *ga*-marking is not allowed any longer:

(18) *Mukasi,   aru   yamaoku-ni   hitori-no oziisan-ga*
      a long time ago certain deep in the mountains-in one   old man-NOM
      *sundei-masita. Oziisan-{wa/*ga}   105-sai-desita.*
      Living-COP   old man-{TOP/*NOM} 105-year-old-COP
      "A long time ago, there is a old man living deep in a mountain. He was
      105 years old."

Takahashi (1998) attempts to explain the relation between the *ga*-marking and the counter-expectation by saying that this type of sentences is "themeless", and is used to report an unexpected situation, or it simply affirms the existence of an

eventuality that reflects the counter-expectation. Takahashi (1998:48) notes that the first-person subject phrase is generally marked by *wa* as in (19), but if the counter-expectation is added to the subject phrase, it must be marked by *ga*, as illustrated in (20).

(19) *Kinoo,   watasi-{??ga/wa} haisya-ni itta*
yesterday I-{??NOM/TOP} dentist-to went
"Yesterday, I went to the dentist"

(20) *Dai-no haisya-girai-no watasi-{ga/??wa}, kinoo   haisya-ni itta*
great dentist-phobia I-{NOM/??TOP}   yesterday dentist-to went
"I hate going to the dentist's, but I went there yesterday"

In (20), an unexpected event is referred to. Takahashi (1998) claims that in order to express this counter-expectation, the thetic mode of judgment must be chosen.

Note, however, that the sentence in (20) still describes the same event as (19), and the modifier phrase in the subject phrase expresses the persona's inherent character. Thus, the two sentences must be considered to be representing the same mode of judgment, and the first-person pronoun must be logically presupposed by the speaker, as is the case in (19). That is, the first-person pronoun in (20) is a theme as well as in (19). Similar behavior of *wa* and *ga* can be seen in generic sentences. The statement in (21) is about *neko* in general, and so is in (22).

(21) *Neko-{??ga/wa}   ganrai   otonasii seekaku-no doobutu-dearu*
cat-{??NOM/TOP} by nature docile character animal-COP
"Cats are a docile animal by nature"

(22) *Ganrai   otonasii seekaku-no neko-ga, imaya konnani   kyooboo-na*
by nature docile character   cat-NOM now   in this way aggressive
seekaku-ni   narimasita
character-DAT became
"Cats that have a docile character by nature became aggressive now in this way"

In both examples, the predicates represent a property or a description that is to be attributed to cats in general. Since properties are part of the basis of a categorical judgment (cf. Ladusaw (1994)), the subject phrase must be a theme,[8] both in (21) and (22). Takahashi is right in that the *ga*-marked predicational sentence reflects the counter-expectation, but, as illustrated above, just because the subject phrase is marked by *ga*, it does not follow that the sentence is themeless.

Having discussed the existence and characteristic of *ga*-marked predicational sentences, let us now consider why a subject phrase in predicational sentences at issue appears to be a theme even when it is marked by *ga*, and why such a

counter-expectation is created. Recall that in section 3.2, I mentioned that there are cases where the counter-expectation is reflected in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences, and that when the counter-expectation is not reflected, *wa* can be used to mark a pre-particle phrase (*cf.* (10) and (16), in particular). Since *wa* marks a phrase that can be considered as an already-established expression (*i.e.*, a theme), no counter-expectation is reflected. This in turn indicates that *wa*-sentences take over a topic from the preceding discourse. As I have discussed in section 3, *ga* has the topic-establishing function that introduces a new element into a discourse, which amounts to saying that *ga* signals that a topic has shifted to another. In connection with this, it is noteworthy that the counter-expectation can be seen as the "denial of expectation/ presupposition". For example, the sentence in (22) makes sense only when there is a presupposition that docile animals are expected not to behave aggressively, and then the predicate denies this presupposed expectation (cf. Gary (1978)). Similar comments will apply to any other examples that involve topic-establishing *ga*. Consider the example in (3), for illustration. In (3A), the speaker asks about who the prizewinners are. In this case, the speaker normally believes that the hearer will know who the prizewinners are and she will give information about it. Here the phrase *prizewinners* is a discourse topic, but the speaker B cancels the current topic and introduces a new topic *the first prizewinner*. Strictly speaking, the speaker A's presupposition which the speaker B will answer his question without changing the current topic is denied. In greater or lesser degrees, the counter-expectation is created in such a way stated above.

Let me summarize the main points we saw in this subsection. I briefly noted that, contrary to Takahashi, a subject phrase in *ga*-predicational sentences is, in fact, a theme, even though it is not marked by *wa*. As far as I can tell, these sentences cannot be thetic sentences. For example, under normal circumstances, the following sentence is unacceptable:

(23) * *Ah! Dai-no haisya-girai-no watasi-ga haisya-ni itta*
　　　 Look! great dentist-phobia I-NOM dentist-to went
　　　 "Look! I who hate the dentists' went to there (lit.)"

This shows that these examples are categorical sentences. This then leads us to the same conclusion that we saw in Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences. That is, the sentence does not present what happened as a single event, but the speaker's mind first directs to an entity expressed by the subject phrase, and then it is connected to the predicate. In this sense, the subject phrase is presupposed, and this is what I call a theme of the sentence. As mentioned before, *ga* signals that a topic has changed into a new one, and because of the presuppositional nature of the subject of

a categorical judgment, the newly established topic must be presented, before moving on to the predicate where a property is attributed to it. In the case of *ga*-marked predicational sentences, a predicate represents a denial of the presupposition that an entity denoted by a subject phrase is expected to have.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that the use of *ga* in categorical sentences is pragmatically motivated. Once we admit the topic-establishing function for the nominative Case marker *ga*, it become possible to explain the distribution of *wa* and *ga* in a more principled way. To sum up, *wa* always marks an already-established element as a theme under normal circumstances, and on the contrary, *ga* marks a newly established element as a topic, for example, in Posterior-Focus sentences or predicational sentences. It follows that in the former case, when a *wa*-marked phrase represents a topic, it must be a "discourse" topic, and thus it must be shared knowledge among the participants; in the latter case, on the other hand, a *ga*-marked phrase can be a "sentence" topic in the sense that it is set in an utterance for the first time and the topic itself need not to be taken over to the following discourse. Of a great importance is that the topic-establishing function always involves dual interpretive procedures, that is, the procedure of setting a new expression into a discourse, and that of reanalyzing it as a theme of the sentence. Therefore, in the sentences observed in this paper, despite their *ga*-marked subject phrases, a thetic construal is never available. I hope what I showed in this paper will contribute to a deeper understanding of any constructions that involve *ga* and *wa*.

NOTES

* I am grateful to Yukio Hirose, who has given me comments on every manuscript that has preceded this paper. I am also indebted to five reviewers for *TES*, for many helpful criticisms and suggestions. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

[1.] In this paper, I use the following abbreviations: ACC=Accusative marker, COMP=Complimentizer, CL=Classifier, COP=Copular, DAT=Dative marker, FP=Final Particle, GEN=Genitive marker, NOM=Nominative marker, Nz=Nominalizer, PL=Plural morpheme, Q=Question marker, TOP=Topic marker. The labels used here are for illustrative purposes only.

[2.] See Kuno (1973) for introductory remarks of *wa*.

[3.] The term "Posterior-Focus" is a translation of Amano's "Kookoo-Syooten" made by Kato (2000). Likewise, in what follows, I refer to sentences such as in (1B) as "Anterior-Focus" *ga*-sentences, in which a pre-particle element bears focus and a post-particle element is the presupposition. Thus we now have two types of noun-predicate *ga*-sentences (cf. Kato *(ibid.)*):

(i) Anterior-Focus *ga*-sentences: X bears focus and Y is the presupposition in *X-ga Y-(da)* "X-NOM Y-(COP)".

(ii) Posterior-Focus *ga*-sentences: X is the presupposition and Y bears focus in *X-ga Y-(da)* "X-NOM Y-(COP)".

Following Kato, I use these terms, for simplicity.

[4.] I suppose that the unacceptability of (9B) is not due to such principles as the Avoid Pronoun Principle, or I-Principle (see Levinson (2000), for the latter notion).   Note that its *wa*-counterpart is neither unacceptable nor unnatural, though it will, in fact, be more common not to repeat the same expression as the one occurred in the preceding discourse:

(i) A: *Nyuusyoosya-wa dare-desu ka*

prizewinner-TOP who-COP Q

"Who are the prizewinners?"

B: *Nyuusyoosya-no iti-i-wa   Yamada-desu*

prizewinner-GEN first-TOP Yamada-COP

"The first prizewinner is Yamada"

If a principle of some kind concerning the performance of our language use prohibits the noun phrase at issue from occurring the pre-particle position, (iB) should be judged to be unacceptable as well as (9B).

[5.] The utterance in (10B') can be felicitous only with a contrastive reading, which is taken up in the next section.

[6.] Kuroda (1992) uses the capitalized terms "Subject" and "Predicate" to refer to the paradigm of subject-predicate in the judgment theory.   Roughly speaking, "Subject" corresponds to a presupposed material or a topic/theme, and "Predicate" a comment.

[7.] Here, an "object" ranges over both individuals and eventualities (cf. Ladusaw (1994)).

[8.] Furthermore, as Kuno (1973:41) puts it, "[g]eneric noun phrases seems to be in the permanent registry of discourse", which amounts to saying that generic noun phrases are always presented as themes.   Thus, if the speaker assumes that the hearer does not know what *eta* ("social outcasts") is, he will have to start a discourse such an introductory remarks as:

(i) In Japan, there is a class, called *eta*, of social outcasts   (Kuno (1973))

REFERENCES

Amano, Midori. (1995a) "'Ga-niyoru toochi-shitei —'Tokuni osusume-na-no-ga kore-desu' toiu bun-nitsuite—," *Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyu* 88, 1-21, Niigata University.

Amano, Midori. (1995b) "Kookoo-syooten-no 'A-ga B-da'-bun," *Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyu* 89, 1-24, Niigata University.

Amano, Midori. (1996) "Kookoo-syooten-no meishi-jyutsugo-bun —'wa' to 'ga'-no koosatsu-no kiten —," *Wako Daigaku Jinbun Gakubu Kiyou* 31, 1-10, The University of Wako.

Amano, Midori. (1998) "'Zentei/Syooten'-koozoo –kara mita 'wa' to 'ga'-no kinoo," *Japanese Linguistics* 3, 67-85, National Language Research Institute.

Gary, Norman. (1978) "A Discourse Analysis of Certain Root Transformations in English," in M. Yasui (ed.) *Kaigai Eigogaku Ronsoo*, 40-68, Eichosha, Tokyo.

Heycock, Caroline and Edit Doron. (2003) "Categorical Subjects," *Gengo Kenkyu* 123, 95-135.

Kato, Masahiro. (2000) "Functions of Japanese *Ga*-clefts in Discourse: A Relevance-theoretic Approach," in C. Iten and A. Neeleman (eds.) *UCLWPL* 12, 97-122, London, University College London.

Kitahara, Yasuo. (1981) *Nihongo-no bunpoo*, Chuokoronsha, Tokyo.

Kitahara, Yasuo (1984) "Sooki to cyuuritsu-jyojyutsu –syukaku-jyoshi 'ga'-no 2-tsu-no yoohoo –," in *Nihongo bunpoo-no syooten*, 115-127, Kyoiku-Shuppan, Tokyo.

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

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. (1972) "The Categorical and the Thetic Judgment," *Foundations of Language* 9, 153-185.

Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. (1992) *Japanese Syntax and Semantics: Collected Papers*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.

Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. (1995) "Sentence, Judgments, and Propositions," ms. University of California, San Diego.

Ladusaw, William A. (1994) "Thetic and Categorical, Stage and Individual, Strong and Weak," in M. Harvey and L.Santelemann (eds.) *Proceedings of SALT IV*, 220-229, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Masuoka, Takashi. (1987) *Meidai-no bunpoo*, Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.

Mikami, Akira. (1953) *Gendai-gohoo-jyosetsu*, Toukou-Shoin, Tokyo.

Rodman, Robert. (1997) "On Left Dislocation," in Anagnostopoulou, Elena. et al. (eds.) *Materials on Left Dislocation*, 31-54, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Sakahara, Shigeru. (1990) "Yakuwari, ga·wa, unagi-bun," in Japanese Cognitive Science Society (ed.) *Ninchi-kagaku-no hatten* 3, 29-66, Kodansha, Tokyo.

Takahashi, Minako. (1997) "Sotei-bun-no ichimen –Syukaku-meishiku-ga 'ga'-de maaku-sareru sotei-bun-nitsuite," *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyu* 4, 33-46, Osaka University.

Takahashi, Minako. (1998) "Bun-no jyojyutsu-naiyoo to syudai-no umu-nitsuite-no oboegaki," *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyu* 5, 41-51, Osaka University.

Doctoral Program in Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Tsukuba

E-mail: hirota_taichi@r9.dion.ne.jp