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1. Introduction

In part I of the present series, I argued 1) that there are two major types of functions associated with the particle *ga* (i.e., *ga* as a subject marker and *ga* as a focus marker), along with four minor types of functions (i.e., *ga* as an object marker, *ga* as a genitive case marker, *ga* as a conjunctive marker, and *ga* as an emphatic marker), and 2) that there are five different types of functions associated with the particle *wa* (i.e., *wa* as a topic marker, *wa* as a contrastive marker, *wa* as a generic noun marker, *wa* as an emphatic marker, and *wa* as a conditional clause marker).

I also argued that, in addition to the two indispensable grammatical primitives (i.e., grammatical relations [level of syntax] and surface cases [level of semantics]), there should be one more level of grammatical primitives, namely, functional particles [level of pragmatics]. The necessity for incorporating the third level of grammatical primitives was initially recognized and emerged into Takano (2003a, 2003b) in order to scientifically account for every occurrence of the two particles *ga* and *wa* in Japanese that are associated with the several different types of functions just delineated above.

I further argued that the differences between *ga* and *wa* that might show up in the pairs of example sentences of the following sort should be scientifically accounted for under the grammatical framework proposed
in the first series of this paper and in Takano (2010).

A: Watashi *ga* yuushoku wo tsukur-imashita.
   \[\text{FOCUS}\]

B: Watashi *wa* yuushoku wo tsukur-imashita.
   \[\text{CONTRAST}\]

C: Watashi *ga* Suzuki desu.
   \[\text{FOCUS}\]

D: Watashi *wa* Suzuki desu.
   \[\text{TOPIC}\]

More specifically, the *ga* in A and C is associated with the function of focus, the *wa* in B is associated with the function of contrast, and the *wa* in D is associated with the function of topic. These different types of functions were shown to be scientifically accounted for in terms of pragmatic functions (at the level of pragmatics) by means of facilitating appropriate discourse contexts where these example sentences might have been uttered.

In this second part of the series, I will further attempt to account for the functions of the two particles *ga* and *wa* that appear in the pairs of example sentences of the following sort, of which I suggested at the end of the first series.

E: Ichiro *ga* hoomuran wo ut-ta yo.
F: Ichiro *wa* hoomuran wo ut-ta yo.

G: Jishin *ga* totsuzen yatte-ku-ru.
H: Jishin *wa* totsuzen yatte-ku-ru.

I: Wagahai *ga* neko dear-u.
J: Wagahai *wa* neko dear-u.
And other types of functions associated with *ga* and *wa* that might appear in the following types of example sentences will be dealt with by examining their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors in this second part of the series. (The asterisk (*) provided at the beginning of a sentences is intended to be read as ungrammatical in the following and subsequent examples.)

K: A, kirei-na tsuki *ga* dete-i-ru yo.
L: *A, kirei-na tsuki *wa* dete-i-ru yo.

M: [Mari *ga* kai-ta ronbun] *wa* takaku hyookas-are-ta.
N: *[Mari *wa* kai-ta ronbun] wa* takaku hyookas-are-ta.

In connection with the introductory remarks above, let us try to provide referential names for the five pairs of example sentences, (1) “Ichiro” Type (pair of E-F), (2) “Jishin” Type (pair of G-H), (3) “Wagahai” Type (pair of I-J), (4) “Tsuki” Type (pair of K-L), and (5) “Mari” Type (pair of M-N), for the sake of expository purpose in the subsequent discussion.

The structure of this second part of the series is built up as follows. In section 2, which immediately follows this section, the functions of *ga* and *wa* that are associated with the five types of paired example sentences will be discussed to the extent that native speakers of Japanese would feel comfortable about their intuitions on the accounts of the two particles. In section 3, formal accounts of the clausal structures for the five types of paired example sentences will be briefly discussed. Section 4 will summarize the second part of this series and suggest some residual problems for the next sequel to this one.

2. The Functions of *Ga* and *Wa* in the Five Different Types

In this second section, the nature of functions associated with *ga* and
wa that appeared in the five aforementioned different types of paired example sentences will be discussed from the viewpoints of three levels of grammatical primitives, namely, the level of syntax, the level of semantics and the level of pragmatics, along with a few types of nouns that are marked with either ga or wa from the semantic point of view.

2. 1. The functions of Ga and Wa in the “Ichiro” Type

Let me kick off this first subsection by examining some differences that are associated with ga and wa in the “Ichiro” Type. The paired example sentences are reproduced here with English translation supplied for them. ¹), ²), ³)

E: Ichiro ga hoomuran wo ut·ta yo.

SUBJ homerun OBJ hit-PAST I am telling you
Ichiro hit a homerun (I am telling you).

F: Ichiro wa hoomuran wo ut·ta yo.

TOP homerun OBJ hit-PAST I am telling you
ICHIRO hit a homerun (I am telling you).

Observe that the first occurrence of the noun “Ichiro” in the example sentence in E is marked with ga, of which the English translation is given “SUBJ(ect)” for its word-for-word translation. This type of sentence can be classified as a typical example sentence often referred to as a “genshoo-bun (a sentence that is uttered to report (or describe) a phenomenon that the speaker sees, observes or hears around him or her),” and this terminology is due to Isago Mio (1948). That is, the speaker of this sentence is assumed to be reporting a phenomenon that Ichiro hit a homerun out of which the speaker was actually watching the ball game on television (or in an actual ball game stadium) to his or her listener(s) who was (were) around the speaker, but was (were) not watching the ball game for some reason at the time Ichiro hit a homerun.
In such a *genshoo-bun*, the subject noun phrase of the sentence should be marked with *ga* since it is assumed to have the structure linguistically referred to as a proposition in terms of grammatical relations (i.e., from the syntactic point of view).

The example sentence in F in which “Ichiro” is marked with *wa* shows that this *wa* should be interpreted as having the function of topic. That is, the speaker of this sentence uttered it to his or her listener(s) to tell or assert what happened to “Ichiro.” For instance, the example sentence would sound much more natural if a phrase like “Kinoo no Yankiizu-sen de (*In yesterday’s ball game against the Yankees*)” is supplied for the original as the following example shows.

(1) (Kinoo no Yankiizu-sen de),
(Yesterday’s ball game against Yankees in),
Ichiro wa hoomuran wo ut-ta yo.

*I.CHIRO hit a homerun (in yesterday’s ball game against the Yankees) (I am telling you).*

I other words, the speaker presupposes that his or her listener(s) already share(s) the knowledge of this noun “Ichiro” from the previous discourse context. The *wa* in the uttered sentence, therefore, should most naturally be analyzed in terms of pragmatic functions (i.e., from the pragmatic point of view).

I will come back to talk more about the formal accounts of the paired example sentences in E and F in section 3.

2. 2. *Ga and Wa in the “Jishin” Type*

I would like to move on to discuss the paired example sentences provided in G and H, which are reproduced below with English translation supplied for them. 4)
As the English translation of the example sentence in G indicates, the sentence is assumed to have been uttered by the speaker who just felt an earthquake having occurred to him or her. It is also assumed that the speaker of this sentence should have been able to utter this sentence to his or her listener(s) in a type of discourse context shown below, for instance.

(2) (Sono toki), jishin ga totsuzen yatte-ki-ta (node, ...).

That time SUBJ because

(Because) an earthquake unexpectedly occurred (then), ...

Or, the sentence could have been expressed in a written material in such a manner shown immediately below as (3).

(3) (Sono toki), jishin ga totsuzen yatte-ki-ta.

SUBJ

(Boku wa isshun no aida tamerat-ta ga, jishin wa I TOP moment hesitate-PAST but earthquake TOP mamonaku osamat-ta.)

moment calm down-PAST

An earthquake unexpectedly occurred (then). (I hesitated a moment, but the EARTHQUAKE calmed down shortly after.)

In short, the particle ga marking the noun “jishin (an earthquake)” in
G is interpreted as having the function of subject in terms of grammatical relations. Note also that the noun “jishin (an earthquake)” here is functioning as a common noun, which in turn means that the speaker had the intention of reporting what had happened to his or her listener(s) at that point in time.

On the other hand, the particle wa marking the noun “jishin (an earthquake)” in H is interpreted as having the function of “generic” in terms of pragmatic functions. That is, the noun “jishin (EARTHQUAKE)” this time is functioning as a generic noun. The observation that generic nouns, in general, are marked with the particle wa was first reported by Kuno (1973). He also reported that generic nouns could also be topicalized, provided that these nouns are once registered in the present discourse of the speaker. This author basically agrees with his insightful observation of the fact. The difference between Kuno’s and this author’s account, however, should be noted here. That is, Kuno did not consider this type of generic nouns as one of the pragmatic functions in a par with other functions, namely, wa of topic and wa of contrast, while this author considers the particle wa which marks generic nouns is treated as a generic noun marker, which should be distinct from the wa of topic or the wa of contrast.

Thus, the choice of either the particle ga or the particle wa may affect the interpretation of the noun in question. Interestingly, a similar case can be observed in English also. Observe some English examples below.

(4)a. Man is a thinking reed.
   b. A man is waving his hand at us.
   c. The man ate sushi.

The bare noun Man in (4)a is functioning as a generic noun in English, while the noun phrase A man in (4)b and the noun phrase The man in (4)c are both functioning as common nouns. Just as can be observed in the English examples above, the interpretation of the subject noun seems to
depend crucially upon what type of noun it is in a given sentence. The equivalent Japanese examples for (4)a, (4)b and (4)c are provided as (5)a, (5)b, and (5)c respectively below for the sake of comparison.

   Man GENER thinking reed-be-PRES
   MAN is a thinking reed.
b. Otoko ga watashi-tachi ni te wo futte-i-ru.
   Man SUBJ us at hand OBJ wave-PROG-PRES
   A man is waving his hand at us.
c. Otoko wa sushi wo tabe-ta.
   Man TOP OBJ eat-PAST
   The MAN ate sushi.

The noun “Ningen (MAN)” in (5)a is marked with the particle wa of generic and seems to be functioning as a generic noun in this sentence. While the noun “Otoko (A man)” in (5)b and the noun “Otoko (The MAN)” in (5)c are both interpreted as common nouns, the noun “Otoko (A man)” in (5)b is marked with ga of subject, suggesting that the sentence is a genshoo-bun, and the noun “Otoko (The MAN)” in (5)c is marked with wa of topic. Thus, Japanese particles ga and wa and English definite and indefinite articles “the” and “a” along with the choice of a bare noun may, in some interesting way, be correlated in terms of the interpretation of the types of nouns. However, this subsection is closed simply by noting that I leave this interesting topic for future study.

2.3 Ga and Wa in the “Wagahai” Type

It is well known that there exist a number of first person pronouns in Japanese, which include lexical items like wagahai, watashi, washi, atashi, atai, boku, ore, oira, and sessha. Among them, the first lexical item “wagahai” was used as a part of the title of the famous novel written
by Soseki Natsume (1907).

In this third subsection, therefore, I would like to consider the occurrence of the particle *wa* which appeared as the title of Soseki's novel in contrast with the occurrence of the particle *ga* which appears in the same type of structural environment, and find out why the particle *wa*, but not the particle *ga*, was chosen as the title of the novel by Soseki. The paired example sentences are, once again, provided in I and J below.

I: Wagahai *ga* neko dear-u.
I        FOC  cat   be-PRES
         *It is I who is a cat.*
J: Wagahai *wa* neko dear-u.
      TOP
      *I am a cat.*

The first thing I would like to talk about the example sentence given in I above is concerned with the semantics of the pronoun “Wagahai (*I*).” Some of the semantic features associated with this word could be stated that it be a first person pronoun and be basically used by a male speaker with an arrogant tone, to say the least here. To be more specific on this point, it is conjectured by this author that the writer of this novel had expected or imagined his future readers to be pragmatically linked to the title of the novel at the time when he came up with deciding the title.

It is not totally the case, however, that the particle *ga* does not mark these first person pronouns. In fact, the particle *ga* may appear in certain limited discourse contexts, just as shown in the example sentence provided in I, for example. In such a case, the particle *ga* is interpreted as having the function of focus. The function of focus is analyzed as being one of the pragmatic functions by a number of linguists including this author, which would require an appropriate discourse context for its proper use in a given sentence. The clearest way to illustrate the point this author is trying to convey to the reader could be found by comparing it
to the example sentence reported by Kuno (1973). Kuno reported that the sentence with the particle ْga marking the noun “John” in (6)b would answer the question, “Dare ga gakusei desu ka (Who is a student?)” given in (6)a right below, even though he provided the grammatical terminology *exhaustive-listing* for such a case.

(6) a. Dare ْga  gakusei desu ka.
    Who  FOC  student be-PRES Q
    Who is a student?

b. John ْga  gakusei desu.
    FOC  student be-PRES
    (Of all the people under discussion)
    John (and only John) is a student.
    It is John who is a student.

[Cf. FOC = Exhaustive-listing by Kuno (1973: p.38)]

Therefore, it is concluded by this author that the particle ْga of focus would not have been appropriate for the title of the novel.

This subsection is capped by summarizing that Soseki did indeed choose the particle *wa* which is interpreted as having the function of topic that was intended to be linked to his future readers at the level of pragmatics.

2.4 *Ga* and *Wa* in the “Tsuki” Type

While the example sentence given in K is perfectly grammatical, the example sentence given in L is ungrammatical. The contrast between the two is that the noun phrase “kirei na tsuki (a beautiful moon)” is marked with the particle ْga, while the same noun phrase is marked with the particle *wa.*

Oh, **beautiful moon** _SUBJ_ be-PROG-PRES I am telling you

*Oh, there is a beautiful moon (in the sky).*

L: *A, kirei-na tsuki _wa_ dete-i-ru yo.

*TOP*

This asymmetry in the grammaticality judgment is stemmed from the fact that the subject of a *genshoo-bun* should be marked with the particle _ga_ and that it cannot simply be marked with the particle _wa_ in this particular sentence structure since it is functioning as a unit of linguistically significant constituent referred to as a proposition.

However, it should be remarked here in passing that the noun phrase “kirei na tsuki (*beautiful moon*)” is pretty much free to appear in different types of sentence structures. A couple of examples are provided below, where the noun phrase “kirei na tsuki (*beautiful moon*)” is indeed marked with the particle _wa_.

(5)a. Kirei na tsuki _wa_ juugoya ni mi-rare-masu.

*TOP* a full moon in see-POTEN-PRES

*The beautiful moon can be seen in a full moon night.*

b. Kirei na tsuki _wa_ kumo no naka ni kakurete-shima-imashita.

*TOP* cloud GEN in hide-COMPLETE-PAST

*The beautiful moon ended up being hidden in the clouds.*

The particle _wa_ in both example sentences is assumed to have the function of topic which is pragmatically linked to their appropriate discourse contexts at the time when those sentences were uttered by the speaker.

2.5. *Ga* and *Wa* in the “Mari” Type

In this subsection, let us consider the particles _ga_ and _wa_ which mark
the subject phrase of a relative clause. It is immediately observed below that the noun “Mari” which is marked with the particle *ga* is perfectly grammatical, while the same noun “Mari” which is marked with the particle *wa* is ungrammatical as the following paired examples attest.

\[
\text{M: } [\text{Mari } ga \text{ kai-ta ronbun}] \text{ wa takaku hyookas-are-ta.}
\]

\[
\text{SUBJ wrote thesis TOP highly evaluate-PASS-PAST}
\]

\[
\text{The thesis Mari wrote was evaluated highly.}
\]

\[
\text{N: } *[\text{Mari } wa \text{ kai-ta ronbun}] \text{ wa takaku hyookas-are-ta.}
\]

\[
\text{TOP}
\]

It is observed that the subject of a relative clause must always be marked with the particle *ga* in terms of grammatical relations (at the level of syntax). Otherwise, the clause or the sentence that contains a clause in it would end up being ungrammatical just as the example in N shows.

An attempt has been made to provide appropriate discourse contexts for the two particles *ga* and *wa* that are associated with various types of syntactic and pragmatic functions that appeared in the five types of paired example sentences in this section. A brief discussion on the formal account of the two particles *ga* and *wa* will be provided in the section which immediately follows this one.

### 3. Formal Account of *Ga* and *Wa*

In part I of the present series, I proposed a set of clausal structures which was assumed to provide scientific accounts for the various types of functions associated with the two particles *ga* and *wa* that mark certain types of constituents in basic Japanese clausal structures. The set of clausal structures proposed in Takano (2010) is reproduced here as (7) immediately below for the expository purpose of our present discussion.
The clausal structures presented in (7) contain four different types of clauses of the left periphery which include topic, contrast, focus and emphatic, all of which are considered to be pragmatic functions.

It is by utilizing this schematized set of clausal structures that I wish to account for various types of functions associated with the two particles ga and wa that have been discussed in the previous section.

I would also like to introduce two other grammatical models that have recently been developed by two linguists, Hajime Hoji (2010) and Nobuko Hasegawa (2010a) below and suggest that the set of schematized clausal structures given in (7) is a universal instantiation of the clausal structures that is in harmony with the two grammatical models proposed by Hoji (2010) and Hasegawa (2010a).

3.1. Grammatical Model by Hoji (2010)

Hoji (2010) proposed a grammatical model to represent the Computational System which reflects the properties of the human language faculty. The Computational System by Hoji in turn is based upon the conception of the Computational System proposed by Chomsky (1993). Hoji’s grammatical model is provided in (8) below.

(8) The Model of the Computational System:

\[
\text{Numeration } \mu \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{CS} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PF}(\mu)
\end{array} \rightarrow \text{LF}(\mu)
\]

Numeration \( \mu \): a set of items taken from the mental Lexicon
LF(\( \mu \)): an LF representation based on \( \mu \)
PF(\( \mu \)): a PF representation based on \( \mu \)
Even though the grammatical model given in (8) above looks very simple, this author believes that the essential parts of the properties of the human language faculty are scientifically represented by this model. Hoji argues that the LF (Logical Form) and the PF (Phonological Form) representations are abstract representations that underlie a sequence of sounds/signs and its interpretation (or meanings). Hoji goes on to say that the Computational System is meant to be about what underlie the language users’ intuitions about the relation between sounds/signs and meanings.

Based on this model of grammar, Hoji conducted a research project entitled “Evaluating the Lexical Hypothesis about “otagai”” on a number of informants to obtain empirical results. He further goes on to argue that the Computational System can, in fact, be tested on the basis of the informant judgments to attain the goal that his grammatical model is scientifically justified.

It is in this line of scientific inquiry proposed by Hoji that the present series of papers is trying to accomplish its goal. That is, this author believes that it is by providing appropriate discourse contexts for the functions of the two particles *ga* and *wa* that we wish to obtain our empirical results, which in turn should be based on the native speakers’ intuitions about the two particles.

### 3.2. Grammatical Model by Hasegawa (2010)

Hasegawa (2010a) attempted to propose a grammatical model which is intended to describe a clear picture of the interface of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Her model of grammar is largely based upon the grammatical model proposed by Luigi Rizzi (1997) which takes the right-branching tree structure of the following type.
Based on this model which was intended to show universal clausal structures of the left periphery of the world languages including European and Asian languages, Hasegawa attempted to provide a schematized model of the following type. ⁷)
According to Hasegawa, the syntactic structures consist of three types of layers including CP, IP, and VP and the force of speech-act is represented as CP which includes sentence types such as wh-questions, imperatives, modal elements, etc. The CP layer can, therefore, be regarded as the interface of syntax and the information structure which are supposed to be pragmatically linked to one another. The IP layer is concerned with syntactic elements such as tense, operators, scope of quantifiers, and cases. And the layer of VP is mainly concerned with the representations of lexical elements including agreement and theta assignment.

3.3. Formal Account of *Ga* and *Wa*

Three types of pragmatic functions including *ga* as a focus marker, *wa*
as a topic marker, and *wa* as a generic noun marker in the five different types of paired example sentences and *ga* as a subject marker found in a *genshoo-bun* and in a relative clause will be formally accounted for in this section.

The first type of paired example sentences is shown directly below.

E: Ichiro *ga* hoomuran wo ut·ta yo. (*a genshoo-bun*)

F: Ichiro *wa* hoomuran wo ut·ta yo.

In this pair, the example sentence in E is analyzed as having the clausal structure given in (10)E, and the example sentence in F is analyzed as having the clausal structure given in (10)F below.

(10)E. [ModP [ForceP [FinP [IP [vP Ichiro ga hoomuran wo ut·ta]]] yo]
(10)F. [ModP [ForceP [TopicP Ichiro wa [FinP [IP [vP ti hoomuran wo ut·ta]]]]] yo]

Notice that the sentence final particle “yo” occupies the layer “ModP,” which appears at the beginning of the clausal structures provided in (10)E and in (10)b.

The second type of paired example sentences is reproduced below.

G: Jishin *ga* totsuzen yatte-ki-ta. (*a genshoo-bun*)

H: Jishin *wa* totsuzen yatte-ku-ru.


The noun “jishin” can, of course, function as a topic, provided that an
appropriate discourse context is supplied. However, I will not touch upon such a case in this series and move on to discuss the third pair of example sentences, which is reproduced directly below.

I: Wagahai ga neko dear-u.  
   *FOC*  
J: Wagahai wa neko dear-u.  
   *TOP*  

The two example sentences are assumed to have the clausal structures given in (12)I and (12)J respectively.


The paired example sentences given in K and L are provided below, but the only grammatical example sentence given in K will be formally accounted for.

K: A, kirei-na tsuki ga dete-i-ru yo. *(a genshoo-bun)*  
   *SUBJ*  
L: *A, kirei-na tsuki wa dete-i-ru yo.  
   *TOP*  


Finally, the paired example sentences which contain a relative clause are reproduced below and only the grammatical sentence in M will be given its clausal structure.

M: [Mari ga kai-ta ronbun] wa takaku hyookas are-ta.  
   *SUBJ* *(subject of a relative clause)*
It has been demonstrated that three different types of pragmatic functions (i.e., *wa* as a topic marker, *wa* as a generic noun marker, and *ga* as a focus marker) and one type of syntactic function, namely, *ga* as a subject marker which appeared in a *genshoo-bun* and in a relative clause, have been shown to have their respective clausal structures, all of which are, not to mention, claimed to be universal.

4. Concluding Remarks

The differences between the two particles *ga* and *wa* that showed up in the five different types of nouns at the initial positions of basic Japanese sentences were seen to be different types of syntactic and pragmatic functions in the previous sections.

In the “Ichiro” type, the particle *ga* was interpreted as having the function of subject in terms of grammatical relations, while the particle *wa* in the same structural environment was interpreted as having the function of topic in terms of pragmatic functions. In the “Jishin” type, the *ga* was interpreted as having the function of subject at the level of syntax, while the *wa* was interpreted as having the function of generic at the level of pragmatics. In the “wagahai” type, the *ga* was perceived as having the function of focus in terms of pragmatic functions, while the *wa* was perceived as having the function of topic which is assumed to be linked to future readers at the level of pragmatics. In the “Tsuki” type, the *ga* was interpreted as having the function of subject in a *genshoo-bun*, while the *wa* was not allowed to appear in this position due to the restriction imposed on the subject of a *genshoo-bun*. And in the “Mari” type, the *ga*
was interpreted as having the function of subject in a relative clause, while the **wa** was not allowed in this subject position of a relative clause.

All of the functions associated with the particles **ga** and **wa** that were covered in the present series have been shown to be scientifically accounted for by means of utilizing the clausal structures provided in (7). However, it should be noted at this closing section that there remain residual problems concerning the clausal structures I proposed in this series of papers. That is, I have not discussed the fundamental issue of how these pragmatic functions are linked to their respective original positions in the propositional structure. Nor have I brought up the issue of how the layers of these pragmatic functions in the clause structures are ordered in the manner which was represented in (7).

In order for me to answer these residual problems, example sentences like the following types which contain multiple occurrences of the particles **ga** and **wa** will be taken up and examined carefully.

(15) Soodan **wa** Tanaka-san ni **ga** shi-yasuku **wa** aru
    Consult *TOP* FOC easy to do *EMPH*
    n desu ga, ...
    is but
    *As for the consulting, it is with Mr. Tanaka that is indeed easy (for me) to do, but ...*

(16) Gakusei **wa** senshuu **wa** kyooshitsu de **wa**
    Students *TOP* last week *CONT* classroom in *CONT*
    keitai **wa** tsukai **wa** shi-masen-deshita ga, ...
    mobile-phone *CONT* use *EMPH* did not but
    *As for the students, (they) did not indeed use their mobile phones last week, but ...*

I hope to be able to answer these important residual problems in the next sequel to part I and part II of this series.
Notes

1) The abbreviated forms such as \textit{TOP} for a topic marker, \textit{FOC} for a focus marker, \textit{GENER} for a generic noun marker, \textit{CONT} for a contrastive marker, \textit{SUBJ} for a subject marker, and \textit{GEN} for a genitive case marker will be employed for the word-for-word translations in the following and subsequent examples. See “List of Abbreviations” provided at the end of this paper for other abbreviated forms also.

2) Yoshio Endo (2010) reported that there are two types of clause final particles (FPs, henceforth), namely, “Interpersonal FPs” and “Speaker-Oriented FPs.” According to Endo, both types involve modal interpretation, and the “Interpersonal FPs” includes clause final particles such as “\textit{wa}” and “\textit{ze}” and the “Speaker-oriented FPs” includes clause final particles such as “\textit{yo},” “\textit{ne},” and “\textit{sa}.” Endo also argues that the clause final particle “\textit{yo}” is classified as one of the “Speaker-oriented FPs,” which is translated as “\textit{I am telling you}” for the pair of example sentences given in E and F by this author. However, a detailed discussion of this sentence final particle “\textit{yo}” is intentionally omitted from the present series of part II.

3) The noun marked with \textit{wa} of topic or \textit{wa} of generic will be spelt out with capital letters in the English translation for the following and subsequent examples.

4) The example sentence provided in the main text has been slightly modified. That is, the tense of the verb “\textit{yatte-ku-ru (occurs)}” has been changed to “\textit{yatte-ki-ta (occurred)}” in G, for the reason germane to a more interesting and clear contrast in relation to the particle \textit{wa} in H.

5) In passing, however, it should be noted that the subject marker \textit{ga} in a relative clause can be altered with the genitive case marker “\textit{no}”
without losing its semantic equivalent as the following example shows.

(i) [Mari no kai-ta ronbun] wa takaku hyookas-are-ta.

**GEN**

_The thesis Mari wrote was evaluated highly._

6) There is a slight modification in the clausal structures presented as (7). That is, the “TP” layer has been changed to “IP” following Hasegawa’s latest model without further discussion in this second series of paper.

7) The grammatical model by Hasegawa is written in Japanese, so the English terms in the parentheses are supplied by this author.

8) A detailed discussion of the clausal structures is omitted from the present series. I wish to do this formally in the next sequel to the present series. Nonetheless, it is worth noting Endo’s (2010) argument here that Japanese sentence final particles such as _Ne_, _Yo_, _Na_, and _Wa_ are modal elements which receive modal interpretations and that they can be ordered as the following scale of modal elements show.

(i) Speech-Act > Evaluative > Evidential > Epistemic

| Ne | Yo | Na | Wa |

_[Endo (2010): p.81]_

I would like to adopt “_EvalP_” to indicate the sentence final particle “yo.” However, a more general term “_ModP_” for a set of sentence final particles will be employed to replace the specific modal element “_EvalP_” in this paper without a further discussion.

9) The layer for “_GenericP_” has not been included in the clausal structures I proposed in (7) in the main text. The reason for this is attributed to the
observation that the layer for “GenericP” is assumed to occupy the same layer for “TopicP” by this author. Even though I suggested in Takano (2003a, 2003b) that *wa* of generic is a special case of *wa* of topic, I do not have any direct evidence for this assumption at present. The difference between *wa* of topic and *wa* of generic is assumed to be attributed to the observation that *wa* of topic marks a moved phrase from its proposition, while *wa* of generic marks a phrase that is base-generated in that position, which in turn is linked to its original position in the proposition by some copying mechanism.

**List of Abbreviations**

CONT = Contrastive (marker *wa*)
FOC = Focus (marker *ga*)
GEN = Genitive (case marker *no*)
GENER = Generic (noun marker *wa*)
OBJ = Object (marker *wo*), in terms of grammatical relations
PRES = Present (tense)
PROG = Progressive form
SUBJ = Subject (marker *ga*), in terms of grammatical relations
TOP = Topic (marker *wa*)
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