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This thesis presents a comprehensive study of the Japanese double-ga construction and offers an explanation as to why the Japanese double-ga construction does not allow scrambling.

In chapter 2, the particle-ga and the particle-wa are defined as the focus marker and the topic marker respectively. The different shades of meaning that both particles have are also explained.

Chapter 3 illustrates the Japanese double –ga construction. Chapter 4 deals with the impossibility of scrambling in the double-particle constructions. A strong parallelism is shown between the double-ga construction and the double-wa construction. The claim is that there are three “pragmatic slots” that the particle-ga and –wa can occupy in the sentence. The rigid-fixed-order of these three slots contributes to the prohibition of scrambling.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Japanese language has an intriguing structure called the double-nominative construction. It is often commented upon because in this robustly evidenced construction a sentence presents two supposed nominative case markers, -ga, in a row in a simple sentence. At first glance, it seems that there are two subjects in the sentence. That is why this structure is sometimes also called the double-subject construction. This peculiar structure, which I call the double-ga construction, behaves differently from other simple sentences in Japanese. It does not allow scrambling. That is, the position of these two NP-ga cannot be switched. This is an exceptional and puzzling phenomenon considering the nature of free word order in the Japanese language.

This thesis presents a comprehensive study of the Japanese double-ga construction and offers an explanation as to why scrambling is not possible with respect to this construction. The various chapters are dedicated to exploring this issue and offering some explanatory insights.

Chapter 2 explains that the Japanese particle-ga is actually not a nominative case marker, the most common understanding, but a focus marker. In addition, chapter 2 explains the three interpretations that particle-ga allows in a sentence. Also, the particle-wa, which is commonly understood as a “topic marker,” will be examined. An intriguing parallelism between the pragmatic focus marker-ga and the topic marker-wa will be presented.

Chapter 3 presents the Japanese double-ga construction. The double-ga construction will be illustrated by detailed explanations and examples.

In the final chapter, chapter 4, the prohibition of scrambling in the double-ga construction, as well as the double-wa construction, will be studied. Again, a strong parallel
will be shown between these two double-particle constructions. In this final chapter, a functional explanation regarding the impossibility of scrambling is provided. The claim will be made that there are three “pragmatic slots” that particle-\textit{ga} and –\textit{wa} can occupy in the sentence. Finally, how the rigidly-fixed-order of these three “pragmatic slots” contributes to the impossibility of scrambling will be analyzed.
2. THE FOCUS MARKER-\textit{ga} AND THE TOPIC MARKER-\textit{wa}

2.1 Scrambling in Japanese

It is widely known that Japanese, which is a strongly head-final language, demonstrates a phenomenon called “scrambling.” Any constituent can be “scrambled,” i.e., moved, almost freely as long as the verb remains at the sentence-final position. Thus, although the Japanese language is often typologized as an SOV language, OSV order is also common (when S is defined as the active/agentive role and O is the passive/patientive role in transitive clauses). Unlike English, which depends on word order to express the meaning of a sentence, Japanese uses postpositional particles. These are attached to every noun phrase and represent case relationships, and other functions that are similar to English prepositions. The existence of these particles allows the Japanese language relatively free word order. As examples presented below illustrate, even though arguments are scrambled, and the connotations and emphasis is slightly different, the referential meaning of the sentence is still retained. Observe the following examples. The particle-\textit{ga} is glossed with \textit{–GA} throughout this thesis.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(1)]
\begin{itemize}
\item a. Ken-ga Mai-ni tegami-o kaita.
\item\hspace{1em} Ken-GA Mai-dat letter-acc wrote
\item\hspace{1em} ‘Ken wrote Mai a letter’
\item b. Ken-ga tegami-o Mai-ni kaita.
\item\hspace{1em} Ken-GA letter-acc Mai-dat wrote
\item\hspace{1em} ‘Ken wrote a letter to Mai’
\item c. Mai-ni Ken-ga tegami-o kaita.
\item\hspace{1em} Mai-dat Ken-GA letter-acc wrote
\item\hspace{1em} ‘To Mai Ken wrote a letter’
\item d. Mai-ni tegami-o Ken-ga kaita.
\item\hspace{1em} Mai-dat letter-acc Ken-GA wrote
\item\hspace{1em} ‘To Mai, a letter Ken wrote’
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
There is, however, an exception to this rule. In the Japanese double –ga construction, the order of the two –ga phrases is strictly fixed in the order of SOV, and if the order is reversed, this causes a change in meaning. These constructions are rather mysterious because the postpositional particle, -ga, which is often considered as a nominative case marker, can also occur in non-subjects. Observe the examples below of such double-ga constructions.

(2) a. Ken-ga tenisu-ga suki-da
   Ken-GA tennis-GA like
   ‘Ken likes tennis.’

   b. ??? Tenisu-ga Ken-ga suki-da
      tennis-GS Ken-GA like
      ‘Tennis likes Ken.’

(3) a. Mai-ga kami-ga nagai
     Mai-GA hair-GA long
     ‘Mai has long hair’

     b. ??? Kami-ga Mai-ga nagai.
        Hair-GA Mai-GA long
        ‘Hair’s Mai is long’

     Ken-GA English-GA speak-able
     ‘Ken can speak English.’

     b. ??? Eigo-ga Ken-ga han-aseru.
        English-GA Ken-GA speak-able
        ‘English can speak Ken.’
The examples (b) in (2)-(5) shown above cannot only hold the same meaning as that of examples (a) but they are semantically awkward. Thus, the double-\textit{ga} construction is an exceptional instance where scrambling is not possible.

2.2. The Japanese Particle –\textit{ga}

2.2.1. Introduction

Many scholars have noted the semantics of the particle-\textit{ga}. Kuno (1973), Shibatani (1977; 1990), Kiss (1981), Davis (1989), Noda (1996), and Thompson (2000) are the most noteworthy. Some of the data presented throughout this study was taken from these works and some are my own constructions as a native speaker of Japanese. All of the data presented in this thesis is based on standard Japanese, which is spoken in the Yamanote area of Tokyo, Japan.

It is commonly understood that the particle –\textit{ga} is the nominative case marker and is situated in the subject position. Consider the example below:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [(6)] Ken-ga ringo-o tabeta.
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  Ken-GA apple-acc ate \\
  \end{tabular}
  ‘Ken ate an apple’
\end{itemize}

However, it could be argued that the Japanese particle-\textit{ga} should be defined as “a pragmatic marker” and not as a nominative case or a subject marker. This position is similar to Ono and Thompson (2000) who claim that –\textit{ga} is “a discourse-pragmatic marker.” They are strongly opposed to the notion of –\textit{ga} as a nominative or a subject marker, or an object
marker. They define the function of –*ga* as “to mark an NP as a participant of the state-of-affairs named by the predicate in pragmatically highly marked situations” (p. 65). They also point out that the pragmatic nature of –*ga* usually carries a ‘new’ or ‘unpredictable’ meaning.

In this chapter, chapter 2, an attempt will be made to clarify and define what the Japanese particle-*ga* is. The aim in this chapter is to provide a clear definition of the particle-*ga* and also the particle-*wa*. Various examples will be provided as illustration.

2.2.2. Strong Focus Value of -*ga*

Japanese is typologically categorized as an SOV language. However, this categorization can be misleading because the Japanese language is more “topic-prominent” than “subject-prominent.” The examples (7) and (8) from (Davis, 1989) illustrate the typical topic-comment structure, which contrasts with the subject-predicate syntax of English.

(7) [Hana-*wa*] [zoo-*ga*] [nagai]
    nose       elephant   long
    ‘Speaking of noses, the elephant’s is long.’

(8) [Sakana-*wa*] [tai-*ga*] [ii]
    fish       red snapper   good
    ‘Speaking of fish, red snapper is good.’

A common type of sentence, such as (7) and (8), throws doubt on the understanding of the traditional descriptive grammar which commonly assumes that the particle-*ga* is the nominative case marker.

The position here is that the particle-*ga* is semantically and pragmatically the focus marker, [+ Focus], in Japanese. “Focus” here strongly corresponds to what Kuno (1973) calls an “exhaustive-listing” (‘exclusive’ or ‘singling out’) meaning. The main function of this “focus –*ga*” is reminiscent of the English cleft-sentence construction; that is, “It is X that ….” This construction is employed by a speaker in order to single out, highlight, and
clearly delineate an element X from other possible referents. When a speaker chooses to mark a NP with –ga, the NP is singled out of a possible list of referents. These referents need not be currently active in the discourse.

Although the Japanese particle-ga is the focus marker, the predicate is what seems to control the interpretation of the NP-ga, the focus marker. The claim here is that the Japanese focus marker-ga allows two interpretations. One is the focus interpretation. The other is what could be called a “neutral” interpretation, what Kuno calls a “neutral description” (1973). This is because depending upon the kind of predicate that follows, the “focus” reading of –ga can be muted or reduced. Also, when the particle –ga appears in certain structures such as subordinate clauses, relative clauses, and the structures with interrogative pronouns, where the structures themselves inherently focus the relativized or questioned referent, the contrastive focus reading is also muted.

Let us first examine the semantic meaning of predicates where the intrinsic focus marker-ga is highlighted. Observe examples (9)-(10) below. Notice that these predicates show no change of state. Instead, the predicates represent more or less permanent states. In such cases, only the focus interpretation of NP-ga is possible. The following examples show the contrastive meaning of –ga. Example (9) cannot mean that Ken is a student along with everyone else we are thinking about. Similarly, examples (10)-(13) must have a contrastive reading of the subject role NP.

(9) Ken-ga gakusei desu.
    Ken-GA student is
    ‘(Of all the people we are talking about) Ken (and only Ken) is a student.
    or It is Ken who is a student.’

(10) Saru-ga ningen-no senzo desu.
    Monkey-GA human’s ancestor is
    ‘It is the monkey that is the ancestor of mankind.’
(11) Ken-ga nihongo-o shitte iru.
Ken-GA Japanese-OBJ knowing is
‘It is Ken who knows Japanese.’

(12) Tokyo-ga nihon-no shuto desu.
Tokyo-GA Japan-’s capital is
‘It is Tokyo that is the capital of Japan.’

(13) Suiyoobi-ga hima desu.
Wednesday-GA free am
‘It is Wednesday that (I) am free.’

However, it should be noted that examples in (9)-(13) shown above sound awkward when spoken without any context. They each need the context which requires a Focus NP in the answer. They are quite appropriate for answers to questions such as Who is a student?, Who is the ancestor of mankind?, Who knows Japanese?, Where is the capital of Japan?, and When are (you) free? Let us look at the examples presented below:

(14) Dare-ga hoomuran-o utta-ka.
Who-GA home run-OBJ hit-Q
‘Who hit the home run?’

(15) Yagi-ga hoomuran-o utta.
Mr. Yagi-GA home run-OBJ hit
‘It is Mr. Yagi who hit the home run.’

What a speaker is asking here is who specifically hit the home run. Therefore, the answer will be that out of all of the players, it was Mr. Yagi (and only Mr. Yagi) who hit the home run. In (14), the speaker’s concern is who hit the home run. The speaker’s primary focus, dare, ‘who’, naturally requires the focus marker-ga. The answer for the question in (15) also must be exclusive, focusing the answer to who, which is Mr. Yagi. This is why the NP Yagi must carry the focus marker-ga for its postposition.
2.2.3. “Muted” Focus Value of –ga

Let us next see examples where the contrastive focus meaning of –ga is reduced because of the kind of predicates that follow. Notice that the different sets of predicates are presented in examples (16)-(28) below. Examples (16)-(20) show predicates that are objectively observable action verbs. The next set of examples (21)-(24) present predicates that express momentary existence. And in the last set of examples (25)-(28), the predicates are either adjectives or nominal adjectives\(^1\) that express a change of state. In sum, these predicates are all confined to a what happened-only-once type of action, or a temporal and momentary state. The capitalized letters indicate the sentence stress.

(16) Ame-ga FUTTEIRU.
Rain-GA falling-is
‘It is raining (right now).’

(17) Basu-ga KITA.
Bus-GA came
‘A bus came (just now).’

(18) Mai-ga NAITA.
Mai-GA cried
‘Mai cried.’

(19) John-ga asoko-ni TATTE-IRU.
John-GA there-at standing-is
‘John is standing there.’

(20) Hana-ga SAITE-IRU.
flower-GA blooming is
‘Flowers bloom (now).’

(21) Koko-ni neko-ga IRU
here-at cat-GA is
‘There is a cat here.’

(22) Gakko-ni kodomo-ga IRU
school-at children-GA are
‘There are children at school.’
Another very similar environment where the focus meaning of -ga becomes muted is when “discontinuous” and “unpredictable” information is introduced by a speaker. See the example below.

(29) Sora-ga AKAI.
    sky-GA is-red
    ‘Look! The sky is red.’

The sentence above can be articulated by a speaker without any discourse context. It expresses a new and momentary state of the sky being red in the twilight time. Look at another example in (30).

(30) Kennedy daitooryoo-ga kyoo ANSATUSARE-MASHITA.
    Kennedy president-GA today is assassinated-past
    ‘President Kennedy was assassinated today.’

Now, the breaking news is broadcast, reporting the assassination of the President from the radio. This information is unexpected for a listener, and President Kennedy is “new to the
role” and was not in any way active in the previous discourse. This sentence conveys unexpected, new, and discontinuous information that the hearer does not know and the verb is highlighted rather than the –ga marked NP.

Sentence stress may mute the force of the focused constituent and transfer focus to the stressed constituent. For instance, compare the two different readings of (31) and (32). In (31), the constituent marked by -ga is emphasized. In (32), on the other hand, the focus reading on the –ga marked constituent is muted because of stress.

When the sentence above (31) is actually articulated by a speaker, a clear contrastive stress can be observed. Compare the stress articulated by a speaker shown below. The capitalized constituents indicate that the speaker pronounced these louder and slower and sometimes even with a pause.

(31) JOHN-GA shinda. ‘It is John who died.’ [+ Focus]
(32) John-ga SHINDA. ‘Oh, John died.’ [- Focus]

(32) has a stress on shinda. On the other hand, (31) clearly shows the stress on John.

These differences in stress apparently correlate with the [+ Focus] and [- Focus] of the particle-ga. When the inherent focus meaning is highlighted, the sentence stress is accompanied as in (31). And when the meaning of focus is reduced, the sentence stress is shifted to the predicate, which is predictable. These differences in stress also affect the meaning of the sentences. (31) will be articulated by a speaker for an answer for a question such as who died (among the list referents, however, they are not necessarily active in the discourse). What the speaker wants to convey is not John’s death itself but who actually died. On the other hand, a phone rings, and a listener picks up the phone and hears (32) unexpectedly. In this case, it is not who died but the fact that “John died” is conveyed.
Thus, although it is ambiguous to interpret the sentence in (31-32) in writing, a listener can receive an unequivocal interpretation between [+ Focus]-ga and [- Focus]-ga in an actual conversation.

In simple sentences, a pragmatically highlighted NP may be marked by –ga (FOCUS) or –wa (TOPIC) as is illustrated by (33) and (34).

(33) Ken-ga sensei-da.
Ken-GA teacher-is
‘It is Ken who is a teacher.’

(34) Ken-wa sensei-da.
Ken-WA teacher-is
‘As for Ken, he is a teacher.’

In embedded clauses, however, the subject is always marked with –ga, as is seen in examples (35)-(37).

(35) Watashi-{wa/ga} [ Ken-{ga/*wa} sensei-da ] to shitteiru.
I-WA1/GA2 Ken-GA teacher-is that know
1 ‘As for me, I know that ken is a teacher.’
2 ‘It is I who knows that Ken is a teacher.

(36) a. Haha-wa shinda.
Mother-WA died
‘As for (my) mother, she died.’

b. Haha-ga shinda.
Mother-GA died
‘It is (my) mother who died.’

c. [haha-{ga/*wa} shinda toki,] Mai-{wa/ga} go-sai deshita.
Mother-GA died when Mai-WA/GA five-years old was
‘Mai was five years old, when her mother died.’

(37) a. Tomodachi-wa kita.
(my) friend-WA came
‘As for (my) friend, s/he came.’
b. Tomodachi-ga kita.
   (my) friend-GA came
   ‘It is (my) friend who came.’

c. [Tomodachi-{ga/wa} kita node,] watashi-{wa/ga} shigoto-o shimasendeshita.
   Friend-GA came since I-WA/GA work-OBJ did not
   ‘Since my friend came, I did not work.’

What, however, about the relative clause? Can the same phenomenon be observed?

In the Japanese relative clause construction, the relative clause directly precedes the head that
it modifies. Also, there are no relative pronouns or adverbs required. The following are
examples of relative clauses:

(38) [Ken-{ga/wa} katta] tokei-wa takak-atta.
   Ken-GA bought watch-WA expensive-past
   ‘The watch Ken bought was expensive.’

(39) a. Watashi-{ga/wa} hon-o nusu-nda.
   I-GA/WA book-OBJ steal-past
   1. ‘It is I who stole the book.’
   2. ‘I stole the book.’ or ‘As for me, I stole the book.’

b. Kore-{ga/wa} hon desu.
   This-GA/WA book is
   ‘This is a book.’

c. [Watashi-{ga/wa} nusunda modifier hon-{ga/wa} head RC] kono hon desu.
   I-GA stole book-GA/WA this book is
   ‘The book that I stole is this book.’

Examples of subordinate clauses in (35)-(37) and examples of relative clauses in (38)
and (39) illustrate the required focus marker –*ga* on the subject of the subordinate clause, a
requirement which is predictable since both constructions inherently focus their subject NPs.

For that matter, as mentioned earlier, the structure with interrogative pronouns also
requires the focus-marker-*ga*. Notice the examples listed below.

(40) Dare-ga gakusei desu-ka.
    Who-GA student is-Q
    ‘Who is a student?’
As examples (40)-(44) show, interrogative pronouns require the focus marker-\textit{ga}. This is because the answer that each is seeking among all people or things is only one exclusive thing. The above examples indicate that the focus marker-\textit{ga} can also saliently be observed in the interrogative-pronoun-structures.

The three different structures, subordinate clauses, relative clauses, and the structures with interrogative pronouns, shown above all require the focus marker-\textit{ga}. The reason for this can be explained by the fact that these constructions themselves inherently focus the marked constituent. Because of this, the contrastive meaning of the focus marker-\textit{ga} will be muted, and the interpretations of these –\textit{ga} are “muted” instead of “focused.”

2.3. The Japanese Particle-\textit{wa}

Besides the focus marker-\textit{ga}, another highly scrutinized Japanese particle is the particle-\textit{wa}. Most scholars are in agreement that the Japanese particle-\textit{wa} is a topic marker. In addition to marking a topic, -\textit{wa} may mark NPs which are currently active in the discourse; i.e., they may indicate “continuous” and “expected” information. In this section, we will analyze the topic marker-\textit{wa} closely.
As examples (45)-(47) illustrate, the topic marker can be attached to any NPs in the sentence. Chafe (1975) claims that in a topic-prominent language such as Japanese, “real” topics can be more accurately defined as “the frame within which the sentence holds” rather than “what the sentence is about” (p. 51). Which NP the topic marker-\textit{wa} can be attached to depends on what a speaker wants to talk about or what a listener seems to want to know about. Observe the following examples below.

(45) Ken-wa ima-de terebi-o mite-imasu.
Ken-WA den-in TV-OBJ watch-ing
‘As for Ken, he is watching TV in the den.’

(46) Ima-de-wa Ken-ga terebi-o mite-imasu.
Den-in-WA Ken-GA TV-OBJ watch-ing
‘As for in den, Ken is watching TV (in it).’

(47) Terebi-wa den-de Ken-ga mite-imasu.
TV-WA den-in Ken-GA watch-ing
‘As for TV, Ken is watching (it) in the den.’

The above three examples basically state the same fact that \textit{Ken is watching TV in the den}. However, in (45), the speaker wants to talk about what \textit{Ken} is doing right now, or the listener wants to find out what \textit{Ken} is doing. In (46), what the speaker wants to talk about is not about what Ken is doing but what is going on \textit{in the den}. In the third example (47), the speaker is talking about the \textit{TV} and wants to convey that as for \textit{TV}, Ken is watching in the den.

\textit{–Wa} also marks the NP that is active in the discourse. The \textit{–wa} indicates “already given”, “continuous”, and “expected” information. Chafe (1975) suggests that a speaker “may assume that something is in the addressee’s consciousness on the basis of either extralinguistic or linguistic context” (p. 31). For instance, Tom sees that Mary is looking at a painting on the wall. Then, Tom says to Mary that “I bought it last week.” In a situation
like this, Tom assumes that Mary knows what he is referring to, which is “the painting.”

This example shows that the speaker’s consciousness determines the idea of “given information,” which is comparable to *it* in the sentence that Tom uttered. This shows also that just as *it* in the context of the above never receives the sentence stress, similarly the Japanese “muted” topic-*wa* does not have the stress.

The following examples illustrate the different interpretations of –*wa*. The (a) sentences illustrate topic –*wa*, and the (b)s show examples of topic marker-*wa*, indicating “already given,” “continuous,” and “expected” information.

(48)  
   a. Ken-wa kyoo gakkoo-ni ikimashita-ka.
   Ken-TOP today school-to go-past-Q  
   ‘Speaking of Ken, did he go to school today?’

   b. Hai, Ken-wa/*ga kyoo gakkoo-ni iki-mashita.
   Yes, Ken-TOP today school-to go-past  
   ‘Yes, he went to school today.’

(49)  
   a. Anata-no ie-wa koko-kara chikai desu-ka.
   You-’s house-TOP here-from near is-Q  
   ‘Speaking of your house, is it close from here?’

   b. Hai, watashi-no ie-wa sugu-soko desu.
   Yes, I-’s house-TOP right-there is  
   ‘Yes, my house is right there.’

(50)  
   Yesterday-TOP what time-at return-past-Q  
   ‘Speaking of yesterday, what time did (you) come home?’

   Yesterday-TOP six-o’clock-at return-past  
   ‘(I) came home at six o’clock yesterday.’

(51)  
   “Ring” called moive-TOP good-past is-Q  
   ‘Speaking of a movie called “Ring”, was it any good?’
b. Ano eiga-wa chittomo omoshiro-kunakatta desu.
   That movie-TOP not at all interesting-was not is
   ‘That movie was not interesting at all.’

The Topic constituents in the (a) sentences receive sentence stress. However, where
–wa indicates “already given information” the stress is shifted to the new information portion
of the sentence. Compare sentence stress in the following sentences.

(52) a. MAI-WA kirei desu-ne.
   Mai-TOP pretty is-isn’t she
   ‘Speaking of Mai, she is pretty, isn’t she?’

b. Mai-wa ATAMA-MO II desu.
   Mai-TOP head-also good is
   ‘Mai is also smart, too.’

(52a) has a stress on Mai, and it is articulated louder and with a higher pitch. On the
contrary, (52b) shows the stress on the predicate, atama-mo ii. Mai is pronounced weaker
and with a lower pitch. These differences in stress clearly correspond with the interpretation
of the [+ Topic] and [-Topic] of topic marker-wa. When the meaning of topic-wa is
employed, the sentence stress goes with it. And when the function of topic –wa is attenuated,
the sentence stress is shifted to the predicate. This phenomenon shows a clear parallelism
with the focus marker-ga that we examined earlier.

In addition to signaling “given” information, the topic-wa can also be contrastive
(Kuno, 1973, p. 46). A speaker wishes to contrast one NP with another NP. In this case, the
possible referents are active in the discourse, and the referents discussed are clearly
understood by both speaker and hearer. NP-wa can appear more than once per sentence, and
when this happens, the second or third NP-wa gets this type of contrastive reading. Compare
this with the case of the focus-ga, where the speaker chooses one referent from a known list
but the other possible referents in that list are not active in the discourse. Chafe (1975) also
supports this interpretation by saying that “besides its use to signal givenness, wa evidently appears with a focus of contrast meaning” (p. 38). The following example illustrates such an instance.

(53) Ken-wa niku-wa sukida ga,² sakana-wa kiraida.
Ken-TOP meat-TOP like but fish-TOP dislike
‘Ken likes meat, but dislikes fish.’

The first NP–wa, Ken-wa, indicates the topic or the theme of the sentence. The second NP-wa, niku-wa, and the third NP-wa, sakana-wa, are NPs in contrast. Following are similar examples.

(54) Watashi-wa eigo-wa hanas-eru ga, furansugo-wa hanas-e-nai.
I-TOP English-TOP speak-able but French-TOP speak-able-not
‘I can speak English, but cannot speak French.’

Again, watashi is the topic of the sentence. The second NP, eigo, and the third NP, furansugo, are contrasted by the employment of the repeated use of marker-wa. Consider also the following.

(55) Mai-wa shinsetsuda ga, Ken-wa fu-shinsetsuda.
Mai-TOP kind but Ken-TOP not-kind
‘Mai is kind, but Ken is unkind.’

In (55) above, the speaker is making a contrast between Mai and Ken.

As for sentence stress, see (53) again for an example.

(53) KEN-WA NIKU-WA sukida ga, SAKANA-WA kiraida.
Ken-TOP meat-TOP like but fish-TOP dislike
‘Ken likes meat, but dislikes fish.’

As can be seen above, the sentence stresses fall on Ken, which is the topic of the sentence, and also on both niku ‘meat’ and sakana ‘fish’ which are contrasted Topics.

Therefore all three NP-wa receive stress.
3. The JAPANESE DOUBLE-GA CONSTRUCTION

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I present the two different Japanese double constructions, i.e., the double-ga constructions and the double-wa constructions. In these pragmatically marked constructions, the focus marker-ga or topic marker-wa appears more than once in one sentence. First, examples of double-ga constructions and their explanation will be presented.

3.2. The Double-ga Constructions

There are predicates that represent actions and predicates that represent states. For example, *iku* ‘to go’, *taberu* ‘to eat, *kiku* ‘to listen’, *miru* ‘to watch’ are all actions. On the other hand, predicates such as *nagai* ‘long’, *atatakkai* ‘warm’, *suki* ‘like’, *hoshii* ‘want’ all represent a state of being. Most verbs are semantically [-stative], and all adjectives and nominal adjectives are inherently [+ stative] in Japanese (Kuno, 1973).

There are some verbs, however, that represent a state of being in lieu of actions. The following verbs presented below all represent a state of being [+ stative].

(56) a. dekiru ‘can’
 b. wakaru ‘understand’
 c. iru ‘exist’ for animates, aru ‘exist’ for inanimates
d. verbs with –tai suffix ‘want to’
e. verbs with –eru suffix ‘be able to’

It is very important to note that the ‘double-ga’ can appear only with [+ stative] predicates. Shibatani (1999) argues that the predicates that call for the double-ga construction fall into certain semantic types and he categorizes them in the following way:
a) possession/existence; b) psychological states; c) physiological states; d) visual/auditory perceptions; e) necessity/desiderative states; f) potentiality/ability (p. 312-313).
Observe the following examples of the double-ga constructions paying close attention to the kinds of predicates presented below.

(57) Possession/Existence

a. Mai-wa/ga me-ga aoi.
Mai-TOP/GA eyes-GA blue
‘Mai has blue eyes.’

b. Masako-wa/ga musuko-ga futari iru.
Masako-TOP/GA son-GA two be/exist
‘Masako has two sons.’

(58) Psychological states

a. Watashi-wa/ga yuurei-ga kowai.
I-TOP/GA ghost-GA scared
‘I am scared of ghosts.’

b. Watashi-wa/ga ano koro-ga natsukashii.
I-TOP/GA those days-GA long for
‘I long for those days.’

(59) Physiological states

a. Ken-wa/ga ha-ga itai.
Ken-TOP/GA tooth-GA hurting
‘Ken has a toothache.’

b. Mai-wa/ga te-ga tsumetai.
Mai-TOP/GA hands-GA cold
‘Mai has cold hands.’

(60) Visual/audio perceptions

Ken-TOP/GA blackboard-GA well visible-neg
‘Ken cannot see the blackboard well.’

b. Ken-wa/ga Mai-no koe-ga kikoe-ta.
Ken-TOP/GA Mai-’s voice-GA audible-past
‘Ken could hear Mai’s voice.’
(61) Necessity/Desiderative states

a. Mai-wa/ga okane-ga iru.
   Mai-TOP/GA money-GA need
   ‘Mai needs money.’

b. Watashi-wa/ga atarashii kuruma-ga hoshii.
   I-TOP/GA new car-GA want
   ‘I want a new car.’

c. Watashi-wa/ga mizu-ga nomi-tai.
   I-TOP/GA water-GA drink-want to
   ‘I want to drink water.’

(62) Potential/ability

   Ken-TOP/GA tennis-GA can do
   ‘Ken can play tennis.’

b. Mai-wa/ga doitsugo-ga wakaru.
   ‘Mai-TOP/GA German-GA can understand
   ‘Mai can understand German.’

c. Tom-wa/ga furansugo-ga hanas-eru.
   Tom-TOP/GA French-GA can speak
   ‘Tom can speak French.’

As can be observed from the examples listed above, all of these predicates express states
instead of actions. Indeed, the Japanese double-\textit{ga} construction can appear only with
[+ stative] predicates.\textsuperscript{3}

The following are the main characteristics that can be observed in the Japanese
double –ga construction.

1. The leftmost NP-\textit{ga} is always interpreted as [+ Focus] and will always
   receive a sentence stress.
2. The focus meaning of the second NP-ga can be muted or reduced. Therefore, in the Japanese double-ga construction, the second NP-ga always receives a “neutral” interpretation.

3. The double-ga construction is marked and requires extensive context to be understood. The common construction is with a topicalized first constituent. (Shibatani, 1999, p. 314)

4. The double-ga construction does not allow any scrambling. This phenomenon will be closely examined in Chapter Four.

I will now present the possible Japanese double-ga constructions. Although some examples shown in this section display some differences, they all still share four main characteristics of the double-ga construction listed above.

Look at example (63). Notice that besides topic marker-wa, the first NP-ga has a NP-no counterpart.4

(63) a. ZOO-GA hana-ga nagai. Elephant-GA nose-GA long ‘It is an elephant that has a long nose.’

b. Zoo-no hana-ga NAGAI.5 Elephant-’s nose-GA long ‘An Elephant’s nose is long.’

c. ZOO-WA hana-ga nagai. Elephant-WA nose-GA long ‘As for an elephant, it has a long nose.’

Besides employing the topic marker-wa, which carries the most natural sound, a speaker has a choice between (63a) and (63b) to express the meaning of an elephant has a long nose in Japanese. In (63c), the topic marker-wa serves “to limit the applicability of the main predication to a certain restricted domain” (Chafe, 1975, P. 50). So, within the “domain,”
which is an elephant, a speaker is describing an essential attribute of a certain animal called ‘elephant’. And this attribute is something distinguishable from other animals. Therefore, (63c) will be uttered by a speaker when s/he wants to describe the permanent attribute of an elephant, which is that an elephant has a long nose. If a speaker intends to place an emphasis on the elephant, (63a) is more appropriate. The focus marker-ga that is attached to Zoo can manifest a speaker’s intention to specify exactly whose nose is long. The speaker is referring more exclusively in the sense that it is not a rabbit or a giraffe, but an elephant that has a long nose. The speaker’s intention here is not just observing the fact that an elephant has a long nose; instead, an elephant (and only an elephant, nothing else) has a long nose. However, in example (63b), the speaker is only referring to the elephant’s nose length, and it is not contrasted with any other animals. The differences in these two interpretations can be clearly observed by sentence stress. In (63a), the sentence stress predictably falls on Zoo-ga. On the other hand, in (63b), the stress is shifted to the predicate long, which is what the speaker wants to convey. Therefore, in (63b), the meaning of focus is muted, and the –ga will have a “neutral” interpretation.

This type of structure is quite prevalent in Japanese. Langacker (1991) points out that this construction is actually common in the languages of the world. In Japanese, the first NP-no and the second NP-ga in (64-68) (b) sentences have a “possessor” and “possessee” relationship. Following are more examples of this type of construction.

(64)  a. Ken-ga me-ga aoi.
     Ken-GA eyes-GA blue
     ‘It is Ken who has blue eyes.’

b. Ken-no me-ga aoi.
   Ken-’s eyes-GA blue
   ‘Ken’s eyes are blue.’
c. Ken-wa me-ga aoi.
   Ken-WA eyes-GA blue
   ‘As for Ken, he has blue eyes.’

(65) a. Kono sutereo-ga oto-ga ii.
   This stereo-GA sound-GA good
   ‘It is this stereo that has a good sound.’

   b. Kono sutereo-no oto-ga ii.
   This stereo-’s sound-GA good
   ‘This stereo’s sound is good.’

   c. Kono sutereo-wa oto-ga ii.
   This stereo-WA sound-GA good
   ‘As for this stereo, the sound is good.’

(66) a. Mai-ga kami-ga mijikai.
   Mai-GA hair-GA short
   ‘It is Mai who has short hair.’

   b. Mai-no kami-ga mijikai.
   Mai-’s hair-GA short
   ‘Mai’s hair is short.’

   c. Mai-wa kami-ga mijikai.
   Mai-WA hair-GA short
   ‘As for Mai, she has short hair.’

(67) a. Tom-ga ashi-ga nagai.
   Tom-GA legs-GA long
   ‘It is Tom whose legs are long’

   b. Tom-no ashi-ga nagai.
   Tom-’s legs-GA long
   ‘Tom’s legs are long’

   c. Tom-wa ashi-ga nagai.
   Tom-WA legs-GA long
   ‘As for Tom, he has long legs.’

(68) a. Mary-ga te-ga tsumetai.
   Mary-GA hand-GA cold
   ‘It is Mary whose hands are cold.’

   b. Mary-no te-ga tsumetai.
   Mary-’s hand-GA cold
   ‘Mary’s hands are cold.’
c. Mary-wa hand-GA cold
   ‘As for Mary, she has cold hands.’

The example (69) shown below exemplifies the next sets of the double-ga construction where the first NP-ga has a NP-ni counterpart, in addition to the topic NP-wa.

(69) a. KEN-GA nihongo-ga hanas-eru.
       Ken-GA Japanese-GA speak-able
       ‘It is Ken who is able to speak English.’

b. Ken-ni nihongo-ga HANAS-ERU
   Ken-to Japanese-GA speak-able
   ‘Ken is able to speak English.’

c. KEN-WA nihongo-ga hanas-eru.
   Ken-WA Japanese-GA speak-able
   ‘As for Ken, he can speak Japanese.’

Here again, in (69c), Ken is identified as what the speaker is going to talk about. In (69a), the focus marker-ga that is attached to Ken is fully directing a speaker’s intention of highlighting who exactly can speak Japanese. Example (69a) is employed if a speaker wishes to express that it is Ken, not Sam, Tom or anybody else who can speak Japanese. The speaker’s intention here is to delineate clearly Ken from anybody else under current discussion. Therefore, the focus interpretation of Ken (and only Ken, nobody else) can speak Japanese is expressed. In (69b), there is no “contrastive focus” connotation in Ken-ni. That is, the speaker does not contrast Ken with anybody else. What the speaker wants to convey is the fact that Ken does speak Japanese. Therefore, the innate meaning of the focus marker-ga in (69b) is reduced, and the interpretation of the –ga is “neutral.” The different interpretations of (69a) and (69b) correlate with the sentence stress. In (69a), Ken-ga receives the sentence stress, which is expected. On the other hand, in (69b), the sentence stress is shifted to the predicate hanas-eru, which is what the speaker wants to make known.
Here are more examples of the same type where the first NP-ga has a NP-ni counterpart.

(70)  
| (70) a. Mai-ga karate-ga dekiru.  
| Mai-GA karate-GA can do  
| ‘It is Mai who can do karate.’  
| b. Mai-ni karate-ga dekiru.  
| Mai-to karate-GA can do  
| ‘Mai can do karate.’  
| c. Mai-wa karate-ga dekiru.  
| Mai-WA karate-GA can do  
| ‘As for Mai, she can do karate.’  

(71)  
| (71) a. Ken-ga butsuri-ga wakaru.  
| Ken-GA physics-GA understand  
| ‘It is Ken who understands physics.’  
| b. Ken-ni butsuri-ga wakaru.  
| Ken-to physics-GA understand  
| ‘Ken understands physics.’  
| c. Ken-wa butsuri-ga wakaru.  
| Ken-WA physics-GA understand  
| ‘As for Ken, he understands physics.’  

(72)  
| (72) a. Watashi-ga okane-ga hitsuyoo-da.  
| I-GA money-GA necessary  
| ‘It is I who needs money.’  
| b. Watashi-ni okane-ga hitsuyoo-da.  
| I-to money-GA necessary  
| ‘I need money.’  
| c. Watashi-wa okane-ga hitsuyoo-da.  
| I-WA money-GA necessary  
| ‘As for me, I need money.’  

Look at the next set of examples. Besides NP-wa, which carries the most natural sound, only NP-ga is allowed in the sentence-initial position.
Ken-GA tennis-GA good-at is
‘It is Ken who is good at tennis.’
Ken-WA tennis-GA good-at is
‘As for Ken, he is good at tennis.’

(74) a. Watashi-ga okane-ga takusan hoshii.
I-GA money-GA a lot want
‘It is I who wants a lot of money.’
b. Watashi-wa okane-ga takusan hoshii.
I-WA money-GA a lot want
‘Speaking of me, I want a lot of money.’

(75) a. Watashi-ga shippai-ga hazukashii.
I-GA failure-GA ashamed
‘It is I who is ashamed of the failure.’
b. Watashi-wa shippai-ga hazukashii.
I-WA failure-GA ashamed
‘Speaking of me, I am ashamed of the failure.’

(76) a. Tom-ga nihongo-ga wakaru.
Tom-GA Japanese-GA understand
‘It is Tom who understands Japanese.’
b. Tom-wa nihongo-ga wakaru.
Tom-WA Japanese-GA understand
‘As for Tom, he understands Japanese.’

(77) a. Ken-ga supootsu-ga dekiru.
Ken-GA sports-GA can do
‘It is Ken who can play sports.’
b. Ken-wa supootsu-ga dekiru.
Ken-WA sports-GA can do
‘As for Ken, he can play sports.’

As discussed in Masuoka (1979), in the double-\(ga\) constructions as in examples (78)-(82), the second NP-\(ga\) and the predicate combine together to form an idiomatic predicate.

(78) a. Ken-ga ki-ga chiisai.
Ken-GA feelings-GA small
‘It is Ken who is timid.’
Some double-*ga* constructions, although they are a very limited number, allow for the second argument to carry the particle-*o*, which is usually understood as an object marker. The predicates that allow either –*ga* or –*o* for the second argument are nominal adjectives such as *suki* ‘like’, *kirai* ‘dislike’, and verbs with the –*tai* suffix which means ‘want to’.
(83) a. Watashi-ga/wa MIZU-GA nomi-tai.
   I-GA1/WA2 water-GA drink-want to
   1 ‘It is I who want to drink water.’
   2 ‘As for me, I want to drink water.’

b. Watashi-ga/wa mizu-o NOMI-TAI.
   I-GA1/WA2 water-OBJ drink-want to
   1 ‘It is I who want to drink water.’
   2 ‘As for me, I want to drink water.’

Compare the two sentences presented above. The only difference is the particles in the
second argument. Although the English translations are identical, there is a subtle difference
in meaning. When a speaker wants to drink water (not coffee, tea, or coke), the focus
marker-ga is employed as in (83a). On the other hand, if the speaker wants to drink water,
(83b) can express the speaker’s wish more appropriately. These differences are also
reflected in the sentence stress. Since what the speaker wants to emphasize is water, the
sentence stress predictably falls on the NP-ga, water-ga in (83a). In (83b), the act of
drinking is what the speaker wants to do. Therefore, the stress is on the predicate, nomi-tai.

Observe the following two sentences, paying close attention to the –ga and –o differences.

(84) a. Aa, atsui desu-ne. TSUMETAI MIZU-GA nomi-tai.
   Oh, hot isn’t it cold water-GA drink-want to
   ‘Oh, it is hot, isn’t it. (I) want to drink cold water.’

b. Ano hon-wa omoshiro-soo desu-ne. Watahi-mo ano hon-o KAI-TAI
   That book-WA interesting-seem isn’t it. I-also that book-OBJ buy-want to

In (84a), a speaker is very hot. So, s/he wants to drink ‘cold water’, not hot coffee, hot tea, or
hot milk. Remember that the focus marker-ga helps single out one particular NP in the
sentence and clearly delineate it from other referents. In this case, the speaker wants to draw
attention to “what s/he wants to drink”, which is cold water. Although this –ga is supposedly
the “muted” focus marker-ga in this case, we can still observe in (84a) that it carries the
focus connotation in the sentence. In (84b), on the contrary, what the speaker is expressing is that s/he wants to buy that book. The speaker’s emphasis is not on the kind of book but on the verb ‘buy’. In this sense, it is predictable why employing the object marker-\( o \) sounds more natural, because the speaker’s emphasis is on the verb (Muraki, 1975). More examples of this kind are presented below.

(85) a. Ken-ga/wa MAI-GA suki-da.
    Ken-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) Mai-GA like
    1 ‘It is Ken who likes Mai.’
    2 As for Ken, he likes Mai.’

b. Ken-ga/wa Mai-o SUKI-DA.
    Ken-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) Mai-OBJ like
    1 ‘It is Ken who likes Mai.’
    2 As for Ken, he likes Mai.’

(86) a. Mary-ga/wa TOM-GA kirai-da.
    Mary-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) Tom-GA dislike
    1 ‘It is Mary who dislikes Tom.’
    2 As for Mary, she dislikes Tom.’

b. Mary-ga/wa Tom-o KIRAI-DA.
    Mary-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) Tom-OBJ dislike
    1 ‘It is Mary who dislikes Tom.’
    2 As for Mary, she dislikes Tom.’

(87) a. Watashi-ga/wa ano EIJA-GA mi-tai.
    I-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) that movie-GA watch-want to
    1 ‘It is I who wants to watch that movie.’
    2 As for me, I want to watch that movie.’

b. Watashi-ga/wa ano eiga-o MI-TAI.
    I-GA\(_1\)/WA\(_2\) that movie-OBJ watch-want to
    1 ‘It is I who wants to watch that movie.’
    2 As for me, I want to watch that movie.’
4. PROHIBITION OF SCRAMBLING IN DOUBLE-\textit{ga} \\
AND DOUBLE-\textit{wa}

The double-\textit{wa} construction demonstrates a striking parallelism with the double-\textit{ga} construction in that it does not allow for scrambling. If the scrambling takes place, the meaning of the sentence is no longer retained. Observe the following example below.

(88) a. Tom-wa Mai-wa kirai-da. \\
      Tom-WA Mai-WA dislike \\
‘As for Tom, he dislikes Mai (but probably likes the rest of the girls in the group).

 b. Mai-wa Tom-wa kirai-da. \\
    Mai-WA Tom-WA dislike \\
‘As for Mai, she dislikes Tom (but probably likes rest of the boys in the group).

This phenomenon seems analogous to English, whose word order is strictly fixed.

Compare the following English examples.

(89) a. Tom dislikes Mai. \\
 b. Mai dislikes Tom.

What example (88) displays is similar to the English fixed-word-order rule. The word order of these arguments is rigidly fixed if the same meaning must be retained, and scrambling cannot take place. If the order of the arguments is switched, the sentence cannot retain the same meaning any longer.

In this final chapter, an attempt will be made to provide the reason as to why these double-\textit{ga} constructions never allow scrambling. I propose the following “pragmatic slots” in the order of the Japanese sentence. It can be argued that in the case of these two particles, -\textit{ga} and -\textit{wa}, the case marking system is superposed on the pragmatic markers. The “pragmatic slots” for the Japanese particles -\textit{wa} and -\textit{ga} are shown below in the tree.
I claim that there are basically three pragmatic slots that each –ga marker and –wa marker is allowed to occupy in the sentence. The rightmost slot is reserved for the Topic or “Given/Expected” information. The focus marker-ga occupies the second slot. The focus marker-ga, which means among the people/things under discussion, “X and only X”, “X nothing but X”, and “It is X that….,” carries the connotation of “exhaustive focus of contrast” (Chafe, 1975, p. 31). Therefore, it should not be at all surprising that the topic marker-wa when it gets contrastive reading “overlaps” with the focus marker-ga and shares the same slot. –Ga can occur in the third slot in which case it gets neutral reading or is interpreted as “unexpected” information.

Remember that both markers –wa and -ga allow more than one interpretation (each has three) and possess certain fixed slots in a sentence as shown in (89). It seems that this rigid-fixed-order of these pragmatic interpretations that both –wa and –ga markers have clearly contributes to the impossibility of scrambling. If that is the case, it explains why both double-ga constructions and double-wa constructions do not allow any scrambling. In the case of the double-ga constructions, the leftmost –ga will always be interpreted as “Contrastive Focus”, and the second –ga will be construed as “Semantically Neutral”
reading. In the double-\textit{wa} construction, as can be observed in illustration (89), the leftmost \textit{wa} is understood either as “Topic” or “Given/Expected information”, and the second \textit{wa} will be always interpreted as “Contrast of Topic.”

Examples (1a)\textendash (1f) presented in 2.1 show that as long as the particles of each argument are different, scrambling is possible, and the same basic meaning of the sentence can be retained. Look at the following examples below.

(90) a. Ken-ga sono ringo-o tabe-ta.
    Ken-GA that apple-OBJ eat-past
    ‘Ken ate the apple.’

    b. Sono ringo-o Ken-ga tabe-ta.
    The apple-OBJ Ken-GA eat-past
    ‘The apple, Ken ate.’

(91) a. Mai-ni butsuri-ga wakaru.
    Mai-to physics-GA understand
    ‘Mai understands physics.’

    b. Butsuri-ga Mai-ni wakaru.
    Physics-GA Mai-to understand
    ‘Physics, Mai understands.’

In both (90b) and (91b), even though arguments are switched, they still share fundamentally the same meaning with (90a) and (91a). However, compare them with the sentences below. The particle of each argument in (92) and (93) below is different, but the meaning of the sentence is no longer the same. In example (93), which is the scrambled version of (92), not only the connotation but also the meaning of the sentence is dramatically changed. Observe examples (92) and (93).

(92) Mai-wa Ken-ga suki-da.
    Mai-TOP Ken-GA like
    ‘As for Mai, she likes Ken.’
(93) Ken-ga Mai-wa suki-da.
Ken-GA Mai-WA like
‘It is Ken who likes Mai. (but, probably not Mary or Nancy)’

The above examples suggest that to receive Topic, Focus or Contrast readings the –ga and –wa marked NPs must occur in particular positions. What we are finding out here is that not only the double-wa and the double-ga constructions, but also the different markers (as long as they are –wa and –ga) do not allow scrambling if the same meaning is trying to be expressed. The reason for this phenomenon can be again explained by the rigidly fixed order of the “pragmatic slots” of the Topic marker-wa and the Focus marker-ga.

The following are the eleven possible sentences whose NP-wa and/or NP-ga can occupy either of three semantic slots. Each sentence will be shown with explanation and its appropriate position tree diagram. The constituents that receive the sentence stress are shown by capitalized letters.

(94) MR. JONES-GA sensei desu.
Mr. Jones-GA teacher is
‘It is Mr. Jones who is a teacher.’

(95)

In (94), the NP-ga, Mr. Jones-ga, is the focus marker, therefore it occupies the [Contrastive Focus] slot. This sentence would be the answer for a question such as who is the teacher?
In example (96), the NP-{ga}, Mai-{ga}, has a neutral reading because of the kind of predicate that follows. Since “laughing” is a momentary action, the focus meaning of –{ga} is reduced. Therefore, Mai-{ga} occupies the third slot in the tree as shown below.

\[(96)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{[Topic/Expected Info]} & \text{[Contrastive Focus]} & \text{[Neutral/Unexpected]} & \text{Predicate} \\
\text{-wa} & \text{-ga} & \text{-ga} & \\
\text{[Contrast of Topic]} & & & \\
\text{-wa} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
(96) & \text{Mai-{ga} \quad WARATTA.} \\
(98) & \text{Terebi-{ga} \quad KOWARETA.} \\
(99) & \text{Dare-{ga} \quad GAKUSEI desu-ka.} \\
\end{array}
\]

(98) Terebi-{ga} KOWARETA.
TV set-{GA} broke
‘TV set broke.’

The above sentence will be uttered if the TV set starts acting up all of a sudden. That is an unexpected event to a speaker. The NP-{ga}, terebi-{ga}, also occupies the third slot in the rigidly fixed semantic slot in the sentence as shown in the tree above.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{[Topic/Expected Info]} & \text{[Contrastive Focus]} & \text{[Neutral/Unexpected]} & \text{Predicate} \\
\text{-wa} & \text{-ga} & \text{-ga} & \\
\text{[Contrast of Topic]} & & & \\
\text{-wa} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
(99) & \text{Dare-{ga} \quad GAKUSEI desu-ka.} \\
\end{array}
\]

Who-{Ga} student is-Q
‘Who is the student?’

The NP-{ga}, Dare-{ga}, shown above also occupies the third slot. Since a sentence with
an interrogative pronoun such as shown above in (99) is inherently focused, the focus meaning of \(-ga\) becomes neutral.

\[
(100) \quad \text{MAI-WA} \quad \text{kirei desu-ne.} \\
     \quad \text{Mai-WA} \quad \text{pretty is-isn’t shie?} \\
     \quad \text{‘Mai is pretty, isn’t she?’}
\]

\[
(101) \quad \text{Hai, Mai-wa ATAMA-MO I I desu.} \\
     \quad \text{Yes, Mai-WA head-also good is} \\
     \quad \text{‘Yes, Mai is also smart.’}
\]

In example (100), Mai is the topic of the sentence. In (101), however, Mai is reintroduced again. She is the “already given” topic. Therefore, in both examples (100) and (101) Mai-wa occupies the leftmost slot in the tree as shown above.

Let us next see how double-wa, double-ga and their combinations are occupied in the tree. Again, the capitalized letters indicate the sentence stress.

\[
(103) \quad \text{KEN-WA SAKANA-WA taberu.} \\
     \quad \text{Ken-WA fish-WA eat} \\
     \quad \text{‘As for Ken, he eats fish (probably Ken is a vegetarian and eats only vegetables and does not eat meat at all. But he does eat fish.)}
\]

\[
(104) \quad \text{MAI-WA tennis-ga tokui-da.} \\
     \quad \text{Mai-WA tenisu-GA good at-is} \\
     \quad \text{‘As for Mai, she is good at tennis.’}
\]
Example (103) shows that the leftmost NPs are topics. The NPs in the second –wa slot set contrastive reading. In this case, both a speaker and hearer understand what the list referents are, namely, vegetable, meat, and fish. Example (104) shows the most common usage of the two particles -wa and –ga combination. The leftmost –wa signals the topic. The particle-ga in tenisu-ga receives neutral reading as sentence stress also indicates. Example (105) displays the case where both arguments received contrastive interpretations. It is Tom who likes Mai. In this case, the other referents, that is, other boys, are not necessarily active in the discourse. Tom is the only one whom the speaker wants to highlight. However, both the speaker and hearer understand the girls with whom they are comparing. It might be just Mai
and Mary, or it can be some others. Either way, these girls are all active in the discourse. In (106), it shows that it is Sam who dislikes Kim. Again, Sam is the one who a speaker wants to single out. Other referents are not active in the discourse. The second –ga receives the neutral reading.

It can be argued that it is because of a speaker’s choice to accomplish her/his discourse purposes that we have this peculiar double-ga construction. Therefore, it cannot be scrambled; otherwise, a speaker’s discourse intention will be defeated.
5. CONCLUSION

It was claimed in chapter 2 that the Japanese particle-\textit{ga} is a “pragmatic marker” rather than a grammatical marker, which is often assumed. The pragmatic marker-\textit{ga} inherently carries a “focus” meaning, which closely corresponds to what Kuno (1973) calls “exhaustive-listing.” However, there are some cases in which, depending upon the kinds of predicate that follows, the “focus” meaning [+ Focus] can be muted or reduced, allowing for what Kuno calls “neutral” interpretation [- Focus]. Although the –\textit{ga} is essentially a focus marker, it allows two different interpretations. One is the “focus” interpretation, and the other is the “neutral” interpretation. The focus marker-\textit{ga} can also indicate “unpredictable” and “discontinuous” information in some environments. These different interpretations also fully correlate with sentence stress. A strong parallelism was presented between the focus marker-\textit{ga} and the “topic” marker-\textit{wa}.

The Japanese particle-\textit{wa} is a topic marker. However, just as the focus marker-\textit{ga} allows three different readings, the topic marker-\textit{wa} also shares different shades of meaning. The topic marker-\textit{wa} can also indicate either “expected /continuous information” or “contrastive of topic.” Thus, each particle, –\textit{ga} and –\textit{wa}, allows three different readings.

Chapter 3 presented all possible Japanese double-\textit{ga} constructions. Examples were provided to show that the double-\textit{ga} construction can appear only with stative predicates. In the double-\textit{ga} construction, the leftmost NP-\textit{ga} is always interpreted as [+ Focus], and the second NP-\textit{ga} receives a “neutral” interpretation. It was explained that the double-\textit{ga} construction is highly marked and requires pragmatic context. In this chapter, the double-\textit{wa} construction was also presented and compared with the double-\textit{ga} construction. Again, it shows a strong analogy between these double-particle constructions. One of the most salient
parallels between them was that neither constructions allow scrambling. If two arguments are switched, they can no longer retain the same meaning.

Chapter 4 dealt with the impossibility of scrambling in the double-particle constructions. I argued that the pragmatic interpretations that each particle allows have their own “pragmatic slots” in the sentence as shown in (89). And the order of the “slots” is rigidly fixed. Chafe (1975) explains these different interpretations by suggesting that “a speaker must manipulate as he speaks, so as to be able to get his message across with due consideration to the current state of his listener’s mind” (p. 55). This helps to explain why the order of these “pragmatic slots” has to be strictly kept in each position.

In this thesis, I have sought an explanation as to why there is an impossibility of scrambling in the double-\textit{ga} construction in Japanese. I have approached this topic from a functional point of view. It seems to be the case that the answer will not be found in pure syntactic analysis. With respect to the Japanese particle –\textit{ga}, a functional approach is more appropriate. As Kuno has written: “It is time to reexamine every major ‘syntactic’ process and every major ‘syntactic’ constraint from a functional point of view, to find semantic explanations for its existence…to find a deeper and more accurate semantic generalization in case the syntactic facts are simply superficial and ‘almost correct’ syntactic manifestations of nonsyntactic factors” (Kuno, 1975, p. 438).

The Japanese language has a peculiar double-\textit{ga} construction to allow the speaker’s choice to accomplish his/her discourse purposes. Therefore, the double –\textit{ga} cannot be scrambled; otherwise, a speaker’s discourse intention will be defeated.
ENDNOTES

1 There are two types of adjectives in Japanese. One type is a regular adjective called keiyooshi or “i-adjectives”, because the dictionary form (the form listed in the dictionary) always ends in the syllable ‘i’. The other type is called a nominal adjective, keiyoodooshi or “na-adjectives”. The dictionary form of this type usually does not end in the syllable ‘i’, and adjectives of this type look like ordinary nouns when used as the predicate of a sentence.

Both types of adjectives conjugate, just like verbs, in terms of tense, politeness, and affirmation/negation. The primary difference between these two types of adjective is that they conjugate in different ways.

2 This –ga is usually translated into English as ‘but, or ‘although’. It shows that the contrastive focus marker–ga is not only attached to a noun phrase but can also be attached to a clause. An interesting extension of this study would be to investigate the development of focus–ga to an adversative clause subordinator.

3 Kuno(1973) argues that when the predicate is [- stative], -ga will receive an ambiguous interpretation between exhaustive-listing and neutral description as shown in the example below:

(A) JOHN-GA    shinda.
    John-GA    died
    ‘It is John who died (among those under discussion).’ (exhaustive-listing)

(B) John-ga    SHINDA.
    John-GA    died
    ‘Oh, John died.’ (neutral description)

However, if the predicate is [+ stative], the –ga particle can be interpreted only as an exhaustive-listing. This argument is also supported by Amano (1990) and Kikuchi (1996).
Kuno (1973) calls this ‘NP-no to NP-ga’ change “Subjectivization.” He claims that it is a transformational process that “the leftmost NP-no of a sentence” becomes its new subject (p. 70). And the newly formed subject NP-ga will always receive the “exhaustive-listing” reading. He explains the transformational process offering the following examples.

(C) Kono kurasu-no dansei-ga yoku dekiru.
    this class’s male-GA well are-able
    ‘It is the boys of this class that do well.’

I have used the same gloss for –GA as in the rest of this thesis in order to preserve uniformity in the exposition. If the “Subjectivization” is not applied, dansei-ga in (C) will receive a focus reading, since the verb dekiru is [+stative]. However, if “Subjectivization” is applied, the leftmost NP-no is replaced by the –ga particle, yielding the following sentence below:

(D) Kono kurasu-ga dansei-ga yoku dekiru.
    this class-GA male-GA well are-able
    ‘It is in this class that boys do well.’

The leftmost NP-ga receives focus reading, leaving the second NP-ga, dansei-ga, with reduced focus interpretation.

Example (63b) also cannot be scrambled although the two arguments carry different particles from each other.

(63) b. Zoo-no hana-ga nagai.
    Elephant’s nose-GA long
    ‘Elephant’s nose is long.’

d. Hana-no Zoo-ga nagai.
    Nose’s elephant-GA long
    ??? ‘Nose’s elephant is long.’

This is because zoo-no hana is a constituent. Although the Japanese language allows scrambling, its rule can be only applied to the constituent level. The following tree diagram illustrates the constituent, zoo-no hana:
There are other scholars who also attempted to offer an explanation as to why the double-\textit{ga} construction does not permit scrambling. Kuroda (1978), Tonoike (1980), Hale (1980), Kiss (1981), Langacker (1999), and Shibatani (1999) have all contributed an analysis in terms of the inner structure of the double-nominative (double-subject) construction. There are two types of analyses of the double-\textit{ga} construction: one is structural and the other discourse based. The major structural analyses are Tonoike (1980), Langacker (1999), and Shibatani (1999). The discourse based analyses are Hale (1980) and Kiss (1981).

Tonoike (1980) proposed a rule which he calls “Intra-Subjectivization”. Tonoike claims that double subject constructions are derived from the deep structures as such (F), whose surface structure is as in (G):

According to Tonoike, Intra-Subjectivization creates a new subject within a sentence. Tonoike explains that Intra-Subjectivization applies to the arguments of predicates whose
object is marked by the particle –*ga*, and this object is “promoted to a subject, turning the 
string consisting of the object and the verbal into a sentential predicate”. (p. 138).

Langacker (1999) deals with the type of double nominative constructions and claims 
that the double-subject constructions which are typologically not unusual bear “a strong 
affinity to possession” (p. 84). He explains the impossibility of scrambling from the 
standpoint of cognitive grammar. The basic structure of example (H) can be illustrated as 
follows:

(H)   Zoo-ga          hana-ga           nagai.  
     Elephant        nose                long  
‘Elephant has long nose.’

( I )  Zoo-ga  hana-ga  nagai 
outer subject       inner subject
________________________
inner clause
____________________________________
full clause
‘Elephant has long nose’

The structure is very similar to the one postulated by Tonoike. ‘Zoo-*ga*’ is the subject of the 
full clause, followed by an inner clause that can stand alone as an independent clause. 
Langacker calls this the “outer subject”. Inside the inner clause also contains an argument 
that can be interpreted as a subject, ‘*hana-ga*’. Langacker distinguishes this from the “outer 
subject” and calls it the “inner subject”. He explains that the full clause is indeed a single 
clause, and the outer subject does function as its subject. Langacker (1999) also argues that it 
is typical that the inner subject expresses a part of the outer subject’s body and describes 
some characteristics of the outer subject’s “mental or bodily experience” (p. 84). He points 
out that the outer subjects and the inner subjects share the “possessive” or “container-
content” relationship (Langacker, 1991, p. 350). Even though there are two nominals, a sentence such as (H) should be considered intransitive.

Langacker (1999) offers the following examples from Korean, Mandarin, and Luiseno, in addition to Japanese:

(J)  
\[ \text{Na pay apahu-ta.} \quad \text{‘My stomach aches.’} \quad \text{[Korean]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{I} & \quad \text{stomach} \\
\text{ache-ASSR} & 
\end{align*} \)

(K)  
\[ \text{Ku salam ttang-i manh-ta.} \quad \text{‘The man has a lot of land.’} \quad \text{[Korean]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{the man} & \\
\text{land-SUBJ} & \\
\text{much-ASSR} & 
\end{align*} \)

(L)  
\[ \text{Ta duzi e.} \quad \text{‘He is hungry.’} \quad \text{[Mandarin]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{he} & \\
\text{stomach} & \\
\text{hungry} & 
\end{align*} \)

(M)  
\[ \text{Ta tou teng.} \quad \text{‘He has a headache.’} \quad \text{[Mandarin]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{he} & \\
\text{head} & \\
\text{painful} & 
\end{align*} \)

(N)  
\[ \text{Noo=n no-puush konoknish.} \quad \text{‘I have green eyes’} \quad \text{[Luiseno]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{I=}1s:PRES & \\
\text{my-eye} & \\
\text{green} & 
\end{align*} \)

(O)  
\[ \text{Noo=up no-te’ tiiwu-q.} \quad \text{‘I have a stomach ache.’} \quad \text{[Luiseno]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{I=}3s:PRES & \\
\text{my-stomach} & \\
\text{hurt-PRES} & 
\end{align*} \)

(P)  
\[ \text{Tarro-ga hana-ga hikui} \quad \text{‘Taro has a flat nose.’} \quad \text{[Japanese]} \]

\( \begin{align*} 
\text{Taro-S} & \\
\text{nose-S} & \\
\text{flat} & 
\end{align*} \)

Shibatani (1999) also analyzes the inner structure of the double nominative constructions and provides the following tree diagram:

(Q)
Although Shibatani presents a similar inner structure to Langacker’s, Shibatani is opposed to Langacker’s analysis and argues that “there is no need to postulate the direct possessor-possessee relation between the large subject and the small subject.” (p. 332). Shibatani instead interprets the double subject construction as the large subject providing a “domain” for the predicate clause. In other words, the determination of the truth value of the predicate clause depends upon its domain, the large subject. Shibatani explains that this is why the internal clause cannot stand by itself, and it seems elliptical without the large subject.

Hale (1980) claims the following flat phrase structure for the double-nominative constructions in Japanese.

```
(R)
```

```
V
   /\  \\
N'  /  \\
  Ken-ga/   \tenisu-ga
     /     \\
  tokuida

'Ken is good at tennis.'
```

Hale argues that the fixed order of the structure above is not attributed to structural factors but is a “matter of surface interpretation”. He suggests that the “effect of a parsing principle” restricts the ordering of the phrases. That is, the first nominative is interpreted as the subject and the second is understood as the object. In Hale’s framework, there are no specific rules to prevent directly generating the ungrammatical sentence, ‘*Tenisu-ga Ken-ga tokuida.’ It is simply the “force of the parsing principle which precludes an interpretation” that tenisu-ga is the subject and Ken-ga is the object.

My conclusion follows similar lines.
Kiss (1981) presents the following analysis. The complement immediately dominated by $S''$ functions as Topics, and the complement immediately dominated by $S'$ functions as Focus. She explains that “the Topic and Focus roles are morphologically indicated, the former by the particle-\textit{wa}, the latter by the particle-\textit{ga}”. Kiss differentiates the Focus marker-\textit{ga} from the Nominative marker-\textit{ga} by claiming that “the \textit{ga} Focus marker is not identical with the \textit{ga} Nominative marker; it is merely homonymous with it”.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{tree.png}
\caption{Tree diagram for Kiss’s analysis.}
\end{figure}

This analysis is based upon Noda’s (1996). However, in his structural analysis, the particle-\textit{ga} is defined as a nominative case marker.

Haig (1979) explains the reason for the impossibility of the scrambling in the following way: “because of the identical case marking, no other information as to the function of each \textit{ga}-marked noun phrase within the sentence is available, other than order. The otherwise free scrambling rule is blocked from applying as to interchange two \textit{ga}-marked noun phrases so as to preserve the SOV ordering”.

\footnote{This analysis is based upon Noda’s (1996). However, in his structural analysis, the particle-\textit{ga} is defined as a nominative case marker.}

\footnote{Haig (1979) explains the reason for the impossibility of the scrambling in the following way: “because of the identical case marking, no other information as to the function of each \textit{ga}-marked noun phrase within the sentence is available, other than order. The otherwise free scrambling rule is blocked from applying as to interchange two \textit{ga}-marked noun phrases so as to preserve the SOV ordering”.
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