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0. Introduction

In part I and part II of the present series, I extensively discussed the several different types of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions that are associated with the two particles ga and wa in Japanese. More specifically, I argued and suggested there that there should be two major functions of the particle ga; namely, ga as a subject marker and ga as a focus marker, along with four minor functions; namely, ga as an object marker, ga as a genitive case marker, ga as a conjunctive clause marker and ga as an emphatic clause marker, and that there should be five different types of functions associated with the particle wa; namely, 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. 1)

On the basis of the contrasts obtained from those two particles examined there, I argued that those different types of functions should be able to be scientifically accounted for in terms of a set of clausal structures I initially proposed in Takano (2009) and slightly revised in Takano (2011), which is reproduced here as (1) below for the sake of our expository purpose.

Clausal Structures of Japanese

(1)  [ForceP [TopicP [ContrastP [FocusP [EmphaticP [FinP [IP [VP....]]]]]]]]
In this third part of the present series, I will argue that the set of clausal structures reproduced here as (1) above should indeed be a verifiable and sustainable set of clausal structures in order to account for every possible occurrence of the two particles ga and wa in Japanese.

In particular, I will argue that the layers of those different types of functions (i.e., TopicP, ContrastP, FocusP and EmphaticP) in the set of clausal structures should be ordered in terms of the layer labels just as they are provided in (1) above, according to the results I obtained from a set of collected data examined in this series of papers and in Takano (2009). ²)

Even though the set of clausal structures delineated as (1) above was originally proposed to account for frequent occurrences of the two particles ga and wa that are assumed to function as indispensable parts of Japanese grammar to make up various types of clausal structures, it is claimed that the results obtained in (1) should also be a universal instantiation of the clausal structures of the world languages including, of course, Japanese. ³)

The organization of this third part of the present series is as follows. Multiple occurrences of the particle ga that are analyzed as having a couple of major functions (i.e., ga as a subject marker and ga as a focus marker) will be taken up and discussed in section 1. It will be argued in this first section that ga as a focus marker is one of the pragmatic functions and it occupies the layer labeled as “FocusP,” which is followed by the second topmost and third topmost layers labeled as “TopicP” and “ContrastP.” It will further be argued that the pragmatic function referred to as “focus” may occupy the layer “FocusP” multiplicatively (possibly two foci at most as long as our collected data are concerned) in certain syntactic strings of words in Japanese.

Section 2 is concerned with multiple occurrences of the particle wa, which show up in certain syntactic strings of words in Japanese. It will be argued in this section that the particle wa is interpreted as having at least five different types of functions, among which wa as a generic noun
marker and *wa* as a conditional clause marker will be excluded from the present set of clausal structures provided in (1) above for the reason that is not germane to the present discussion. (See note 2 also.)

A brief summary of this third part will be provided and some residual problems that were suggested at the end of part II and derived from the present series will be discussed to some extent in the final section.

1. Multiple Occurrences of *Ga*

It has been observed in the history of Japanese language studies that syntactic structures involving multiple occurrences of the particles *ga* are relatively pervasive. A few typical examples of such primitive syntactic structures can be observed in (2) below.

(2)a. John *ga* sake *ga* suki-na (koto)  
  *SUBJ*  *OBJ*  like-PRES (fact)  
  *(The fact that) John likes sake.*

b. Watashi *ga* okane *ga* hoshi-i (koto)  
  *SUBJ*  *OBJ*  want-PRES (fact)  
  *(The fact that) I want money.*

c. Hanako *ga* Roshiago *ga* hanas-e-ru (koto)  
  *SUBJ*  *OBJ*  speak-POTEN-PRES (fact)  
  *(The fact that) Hanako can speak Russian.*

Kuno (1973), for instance, observes that the first occurrence of *ga* should be interpreted as having the function of subject and the second occurrence of *ga*, as having the function of object in terms of grammatical relations in each example sentence provided in (2) above. This author basically has no objection to Kuno’s observation as far as the example sentences in (2)a-c are concerned.
However, when those syntactic strings of words are actually uttered in certain discourse contexts, the function of the first occurrence of *ga* may change to the function of “focus,” as the following examples indicate.

(2a’). John *ga* sake *ga* suki-desu.

\[ FOC \quad OBJ \quad \text{like-PRES} \]

*It is John who likes sake.*

b’. Watashi *ga* okane *ga* hoshii-desu.

\[ FOC \quad OBJ \quad \text{want-PRES} \]

*It is I who want money.*

c’. Hanako *ga* Roshiago *ga* hanas-e-masu.

\[ FOC \quad OBJ \quad \text{speak-POTEN-PRES} \]

*It is Hanako who can speak Russian.*

It is assumed that each one of the example sentence provided in (2)’ above has probably been uttered in a certain limited discourse context. That is, the example in (2)a’, for instance, is assumed to have been an answer to the question “Dare *ga* sake *ga* suki-desu ka (Who likes sake?),” having a focus on the interrogative word “who.” This in turn means that “John” is interpreted as a focused constituent in (2)a’.

Or, the function of “subject” may change to the function of “topic” in certain discourse environments as the following example sentences are intended to show. (The topic phrase is capitalized in the English translation in the following examples.)

(2a”). John *wa* sake *ga* suki-desu.

\[ TOP \quad OBJ \quad \text{like-PRES} \]

*JOHN likes sake.*
Notice that the topic phrases in (2)” used to serve as the subject phrases of the primitive syntactic structures given in (2) above.

It seems to be the case, however, that there appear to be some strings of words in Japanese that may not be straightforwardly accounted for. First such example is directly provided as (3)c below.

(3)a. Nishi no sora de kaminari ga natte-i-ru.
   West GEN sky in thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PRES
   Thunders are roaring in the west sky.

b. *Nishi no sora de ga kaminari ga natte-i-ru.
   West GEN sky in FOC thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PRES

c. Nishi no sora ga kaminari ga natte-i-ru.
   West GEN sky FOC thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PRES

It is (in) the west sky that thunders are roaring.

It is assumed here that the string of words given in (3)a above can and should be interpreted as a perfectly grammatical syntactic structure of Japanese, in which “nishi no sora (in) the west sky)” is seen to be functioning as a locative adverbial phrase that is adjoined to the nucleus syntactic structure “kaminari ga natte-i-ru (thunders are roaring).” It is further assumed that the string of words given in (3)c is perfectly grammatical, in which the locative phrase “nishi no sora ga (in) the west sky)” is assumed to be functioning as a focused phrase in relation to the nucleus syntactic structure “kaminari ga natte-i-ru (thunders are roaring)."
A possible problem we may have to face here is that it is not clear whether (3)a and (3)c can be related to one another theoretically. I simply assume here that (3)a and (3)c are independent strings of words that cannot be theoretically related to one another. That is, (3)c should be interpreted as a special syntactic string of words in Japanese that contains a focused phrase adjoined to the nucleus syntactic structure “kaminari ga natte-i-ru (thunders are roaring).”

Now, observe the following example, where another extra focused phrase is adjoined to the example provided in (3)c above.

(4) Kinoo ga nishi no sora ga
Yesterday FOC western GEN sky FOC
kaminari ga natte-i-ta.
thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PAST

*It was yesterday (and) (in) the west sky that thunders were roaring.*

The example provided in (4) above suggests that multiple occurrences of focused constituents may be allowed in Japanese and this author believes that it is indeed the case in Japanese. Consequently, it should be remarked here that the phenomenon just observed in (4) above is quite new and even innovative in the history of Japanese language studies.

At the very end of part II of the present series, I also suggested that I should examine multiple occurrences of the two particles *ga* and *wa* which often appear in certain strings of words in Japanese and find out what type of functions they may be associated with and how these functions are layered in the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

First, I would like to take up an interesting string of words that contains multiple occurrences of the particle *ga*, which shall be provided as (5) below. 4)

(5) Toyota ga haiburiddo-sha ga seizoo ga junchoo ni
FOC hybrid car FOC production SUBJ favorably
nobite-i-ru.
expand-PROG-PRES

*It is Toyota (and Toyota’s) hybrid cars that the production (of hybrid cars) is favorably expanding.*

I assume that the example sentence given in (5) above is grammatically a possible string of words for the native speakers of Japanese.

Furthermore, it should be observed that those first two occurrences of *ga* can be altered freely with the genitive case marker *no* as the following examples show.

(5)a’. Toyota *no* haiburiddo-sha *no* seizoo *ga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hybrid car</td>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

junchoo ni nobite-i-ru.
favorably expand-PROG-PRES

*Toyota’s hybrid cars’ production is favorably expanding.*

b’. Toyota *no* haiburiddo-sha *ga* seizoo *ga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hybrid car</td>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

junchoo ni nobite-i-ru.
favorably expand-PROG-PRES

*It is Toyota’s hybrid cars that the production (of hybrid cars) is favorably expanding.*

c’. Toyota *ga* haiburiddo-sha *no* seizoo *ga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hybrid car</td>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

junchoo ni nobite-i-ru.
favorably expand-PROG-PRES

*It is Toyota that the production of hybrid cars is favorably expanding.*

Or, those first two occurrences of *ga* can also be altered with the particle *wa* as the following examples show.
It appears to be the case that the example sentences in (5)a” and (5)b” are perfectly grammatical strings of words, provided that those strings of words were uttered in appropriate discourse contexts. More concretely, the topic phrase “Toyota” is followed by the contrastive phrase “haiburiddo-sha (hybrid cars)” in (5)a, and the same topic phrase “Toyota” is followed by the focused phrase “haiburiddo-sha (hybrid cars)” in (5)b. However, the example sentence in (5)c” actually sounds a bit unnatural and it is conjectured by this author that this unnaturalness of grammaticality should be attributed to the ordering of those two types of functions; namely, the function of focus and the function of contrast in that order. (I should like to come back to talk more about the ordering of those different types of layers in section 3.)

Leaving a detailed discussion on the ordering of those different types
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of functions for section 3, I should now like to examine some example sentences that contain multiple occurrences of the particle *wa* in section 2, which immediately follows this section.

### 2. Multiple Occurrences of *Wa*

In this section, a couple of clausal structures that contain multiple occurrences of the particle *wa* will be taken up and discussed with a special focus on the positions of the layers including “TopicP,” “ContrastP,” “FocusP,” and “EmphaticP.”

First, observe the following example provided in (7)a that contains multiple occurrences of *wa*.

(7)a. Soodan *wa* Tanaka-san ni *ga* shi-yasuku *wa* aru

Consult *TOP*  

*FOC* easy to do *EMPH*

*is but*

*As for the consulting, it is with Mr. Tanaka that it is indeed easy (for me) to do, but ...*

b. Tanaka-san ni soodan ga shi-yasu-i (koto) with consult OBJ do-easy-be-PRES (fact)

*(The fact that) it is easy (for me) to consult with Mr. Tanaka.*

It is assumed by this author that the example given in (7)a has been derived from the example sentence given in (7)b by having gone through three major processes; namely, topicalization, focalization, and emphasizing of a verbal phrase. More specifically, it is assumed that the phrase “soodan *(consulting)*” has gone through the process often referred to as “topicalization,” the phrase “Tanaka-san ni *(with Mr. Tanaka)*,” the process called “focalization,” and the verbal phrase “shi-yasu-i *(easy (for me)to do),” the process tentatively referred to as “emphasizing” by changing it to “shi-yasuku *wa* aru *(is indeed easy to (for me) to do).*” \(^5\)
We would now like to see what would happen if the focused phrase “Tanaka-san ni ga (with Mr. Tanaka)” were fronted before the topic phrase “soodan wa (as for the consulting).” Thus, consider the following example given as (7)c below.

(7)c. ??*Tanaka-san ni ga soodan wa shi-yasuku wa aru

FOC consult TOP easy to do EMPH

ndesuga, ...
is but

?? *It is with Mr. Tanaka, as for the consulting, that it is indeed easy (for me) to do, but ...

The example sentence given in (7)c above sounds unnatural. I believe that this unnaturalness of grammaticality should be attributed to the fact that the focused phrase “Tanaka-san ni ga (with Mr. Tanaka)” has been reversed to precede the topic phrase “soodan wa (as for the consulting).” This fact suggests that the appropriate ordering of those two functions should be “TopicP” and “FocusP,” which, in fact, accords with the ordering of the layers in the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

Secondly, consider the following example sentence provided as (8) below.

(8) 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 in the classroom last week, but ...

I believe that native speakers of Japanese would consider the example given in (8) as a meaningful string of words in Japanese and perfectly grammatical. As can be observed from this grammatical unit of clausal
structure, five consecutive occurrences of the particle *wa* are identified. Those five consecutive occurrences of *wa*, from the topmost, are assumed to be the types of functions referred to as *wa* of topic, *wa* of contrast (three of them), and *wa* of emphasis.

Excluding the discussion of “topicalization” for the time being, the interpretations of those three consecutive occurrences of *wa* as a contrastive marker should be executed in the following manner: the first occurrence of the time adverbial phrase “senshuu (*last week)*” should be interpreted in such a manner that it is compared with the same type of time adverbial phrase such as “konshuu (*this week)*,” for instance. The second locative adverbial phrase “kyooshitsu de (*in classroom)*” should be interpreted in such a manner that it is compared with “shokudoo (*cafeteria)*,” for instance, and the third object phrase “keitai (*mobile phone)*” should be interpreted in such a manner that it is compared with “sumaho (*smart-phone)*,” for instance.

As for the final occurrence of *wa* in the verbal phrase, it is assumed that “tsukai *wa* shimasen-deshita (*did not indeed use*)” has been derived from the verbal phrase “tsukai-masen-deshita (*did not use*),” where the action of the verb is emphasized to the extent that the whole verbal phrase would get an emphatic effect, which is expressed by the word “indeed” in the English translation.

3. Formal Account for Multiple Occurrences of *Ga* and *Wa*

In this section, all of the strings of words covered in this part of the series that contain multiple occurrences of *ga* and *wa* shall be formally accounted for, having recourse to the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

3.1. Formal Account for Multiple Occurrences of *Ga*

We have seen that the function of focus which is associated with the
particle *ga* may indeed exist in Japanese. A basic and typical example of such string of words was shown as (3)c in the previous section, which is reproduced immediately below.

(3)c. Nishi no sora *ga* kaminari ga natte-i-ru.

*West GEN sky FOC thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PRES*

*It is (in) the west sky that thunders are roaring.*

This grammatical string of words that contains the function of focus can be formally accounted for by utilizing a part of the clausal structures provided in (1), where “nishi no sora *(in) the west sky*” occupies the layer labeled as “FocusP” in the clausal structure provided in (8) below.

(8) [\[\text{ForceP} [\text{FocusP} \text{Nishi no sora } \text{ga} \\
\text{[FinP [IP [VP kaminari ga natte-i ]] -ru ]]}]]

We have also seen that an extra focused constituent may be allowed to be adjoined to the clausal structure shown above. Such a string of words was provided as (4) in the previous section, which is reproduced right below.

(4) Kinoo *ga* nishi no sora *ga*

*Yesterday FOC western GEN sky FOC thunder SUBJ roar-PROG-PAST*

*It was yesterday (and) *(in) the west sky* that thunders were roaring.*

Because the string of words provided in (4) above is meaningful and perfectly grammatical, it must somehow be accounted for with recourse to the clausal structures provided in (1) also. I assume that the example sentence provided in (4) would have the following clausal structure, where there are two consecutive occurrences of the focused phrases, both
of which are marked by the particle *ga*.

(13) \[[\text{ForceP} \quad [\text{FocusP} \; \text{Kinoo} \; \text{ga}] \quad [\text{FocusP} \; \text{Nishi no sora} \; \text{ga}]
\quad [\text{FinP} \quad [\text{IP} \; [\text{vP} \; \text{kaminari ga natte}] -i \; -ta ]]]]\]

A similar type of example sentence to (4) was also adduced in (5) previously, which is reproduced right below.

(5) Toyota *ga* haiburiddo-sha *ga* seizoo *ga* junchoo ni FOC hybrid car FOC production SUBJ favorably nobite-i-ru.
expand-PROG-PRES
*It is Toyota (and Toyota’s) hybrid cars that the production (of hybrid cars) is favorably expanding.*

In this example too, there are two consecutive occurrences of *ga*, both of which are assumed to be associated with the function of focus. This example is formally accounted for in the clausal structure provided in (14) below in a similar fashion to the example sentence provided in (4) above.

(14) \[[\text{ForceP} \quad [\text{FocusP} \; \text{Toyota} \; \text{ga}] \quad [\text{FocusP} \; \text{haiburiddo-sha} \; \text{ga}]
\quad [\text{FinP} \quad [\text{IP} \; [\text{vP} \; \text{seizoo ga junchoo ni nobite}] -i \; -ru ]]]]\]

In this subsection, we have seen that a few typical examples that contain multiple occurrences of *ga* that are assumed to be associated with the function of focus can be formally accounted for by means of utilizing a part of the clausal structure provided in (1).

In the next subsection, I will discuss how the multiple occurrences of *wa* will be formally accounted for.
3.2. Formal Account for Multiple Occurrences of *Wa*

It was noted in the previous section that multiple occurrences of *ga* that appear in certain Japanese clausal structures could be altered to the particle *wa* depending upon the discourse contexts where these examples are likely to be uttered. For instance, the string of words provided as (5)a previously could be altered to the string of words shown in (5)a”, which is reproduced right below.

(5)a”. Toyota *wa* haiburiddo-sha *wa* seizoo *ga*

As for Toyota, the production of hybrid cars (compared with other types of cars) is favorably expanding.

In this specific clausal structure, the topic phrase “Toyota” precedes the contrastive phrase “haiburiddo-sha (*hybrid cars)*.” The ordering of these two functions, i.e., “TopicP” and “ContrastP,” is exactly expected in the set of clausal structure provided in (1). Thus, the example in (5)a” is assumed to have the following clausal structure provided in (11) below.

(11) [ForceP [TopicP Toyota *wa* [ContrastP haiburiddo-sha *wa*]

As for the example previously given as (5)b” , the following clausal structure is assumed in (12), where the focused phrase “haiburiddo-sha (*hybrid cars)*” follows the topic phrase “Toyota.”

(5)b”. Toyota *wa* haiburiddo-sha *ga* seizoo *ga*
As for Toyota, it is the hybrid cars that the production is favorably expanding.

(12) [ForceP [TopicP Toyota wa [FocusP haiburiddo-sha ga ] [FinP [IP [vP seizoo ga junchoo ni nobite]-i]-ru ] ] ]

It was also noted previously that the example given in (5)c”, which is reproduced below, would sound a bit unnatural.

(5)c”. ??Toyota ga haiburiddo-sha wa seizoo ga FOC hybrid car CONT production SUBJ junchoo ni nobite-i-ru.
favorably expand-PROG-PRES
??It is Toyota that the production of hybrid cars (compared with other types of cars) is favorably expanding.

It appears to be the case that this example would greatly improve its grammaticality if the focused phrase and the contrastive phrase were reversed as the example provided as (5)d below indicates.

(5)d. Haiburiddo-sha wa Toyota ga seizoo ga Hybrid car CONT FOC production SUBJ junchoo ni nobite-i-ru.
favorably expand-PROG-PRES
The hybrid cars (compared with other types of cars), it is Toyota that the production is favorably expanding.

The comparison of the example provided in (5)c” and the example provided in (5)d above suggests that the ordering of those two functions would indeed affect the grammaticality judgment. That is, it is
conjectured that the appropriate ordering of those two functions should be “ContrastP” and “FocusP,” but not vice versa, as it is predicted in the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

Thus, the example in (5)d is formally accounted for by providing the following clausal structure given in (13) below.

\[(13) \begin{array}{c}
[\text{ForceP}]
[\text{ContrastP}]
\text{Haiburiddo-sha wa}
[\text{FocusP}]
\text{Toyota ga}
[\text{FinP}]
[\text{IP}]
[\text{vP}]
\text{seizoo ga junchoo ni nobite -i} -\text{ru}]
\end{array}\]

Now we are in a position to discuss the following example which was previously given as (7)a.

\[(7)a. \text{Soodan wa Tanaka-san ni ga shi-yasuku wa aru}
\text{Consult TOP FOC easy to do EMPH}
\text{n desu ga, ...}
\text{is but}
\text{As for the consulting, it is with Mr. Tanaka that it is indeed easy (for me) to do, but ...}
\]

This example is formally accounted for by providing the following clausal structure. 6)

\[(14) \begin{array}{c}
[\text{ModP}]
[\text{ForceP}]
[\text{TopicP}]
\text{Soodanj wa}
[\text{FocusP}]
\text{Tanaka-san ni ga}
[\text{EmphaticP}]
\text{shiyasuku k wa aru}
[\text{FinP}]
[\text{IP}]
[\text{vP}]
\text{ti ti t_k} -\text{n des} -\text{u}]
\end{array}\]

Finally, the string of words that contains five consecutive occurrences of \textit{wa;} namely, \textit{wa} of topic, \textit{wa} of contrast (three of them), and \textit{wa} of emphasis, will be formally accounted for. This example is reproduced here as (8) below, and the formal analysis of such string of words is provided in (15) below.
As for the students, (they) did not indeed use their mobile-phone in the classroom last week, but ...

In this section, it has been shown that both the particle *ga* and the particle *wa* that are associated with several different types of functions such as subject, focus, topic, contrast, and emphasis should be scientifically accounted for in terms of the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

A brief summary and some residual problems that are derived from the contents of part Β and the present series shall be discussed in the final section.

3. Summary and Some Residual Problems

In part Β of this present series, I dared to take up the issue of multiple occurrences of the two particles *ga* and *wa* which are assumed to be associated with several different types of pragmatic functions and argued that those different types of pragmatic functions should be able to be scientifically accounted for by means of having recourse to the set of clausal structures provided in (1).

As for the particle *ga*, which is assumed to have the function of focus (one of the pragmatic functions), we observed that, in addition to a single
occurrence of *ga* in a given string of words, multiple occurrences of *ga* may also be allowed to take place in certain strings of words in Japanese and that such strings of words should be able to be formally accounted for.

However, it appears to be the case that the focused phrase of a locative adverb we dealt with in this series was seen as a type of grammatical constituent which does not seem to require any particle (i.e., “de (in)”) before *ga* of focus. Consequently, it is stipulated in this final section that time and locative adverbial phrases should be special in that they do not seem to require any particle when they are marked by *ga* of focus. At this point in time, I do feel that more and careful research into this area of inquiry needs to be conducted to find out more about the process referred to as focalization. 7)

As for the particle *wa*, we observed a couple of syntactic strings of words that contain several different types of pragmatic functions including topic phrases, contrastive phrases, and an emphatic verbal phrase in this paper. It was argued then that those different types of functions should be ordered in the manner they are layered in the set of clausal structures provided in (1). However, this author feels that it would not be sufficient to come to the conclusion yet, unless more careful and insightful research into the issue of ordering those different types of functions are thoroughly conducted. In particular, the function of contrast and the function of focus must be examined to a certain extent in the future, since the results of reversing those two phrases were not seen as clear-cut especially in the grammaticality judgments.

This final section is closed by mentioning some residual problems that are seen to have been derived from the positioning of layers provided in the set of clausal structures provided in (1). In addition, the layer labeled as “EmphaticP” in the set of clausal structures may also need to be adjusted due to some unsettled factors involved in the types of emphatic functions. It is into this sort of residual problems that I wish to further pursue my research in the future.
Notes

1) The reader is referred to part I of the present series for example sentences of the four minor types of functions that are associated with the particle *ga*. As for the five different types of functions associated with the particle *wa*, all of which are claimed by this author to be pragmatic functions, the reader is referred to the series of works reported in Takano (2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2009).

2) There are two other functions that are supposed to be included in the set of clausal structures provided in (1). Those functions are termed by this author as “*wa*” of a conditional clause marker, which was extensively discussed in Takano (2006), and “*wa*” of a generic noun marker. Those two functions should be technically labeled as “ConditionP” and “GenericP” respectively in (1). However, it should be remarked here that those two types of functions are assumed to occupy the same layer as the “TopicP,” which is the layer right under the topmost layer labeled as “ForceP.” It is, therefore, assumed by this author that “*wa*” of a topic marker on the one hand and “*wa*” of a conditional clause marker and “*wa*” of a generic noun marker on the other are considered to be mutually exclusive in their occurrences in a given string of words in Japanese and therefore never co-occur with one another in the same string of words. That is to say that there should be no such clausal structure in Japanese that contains those two different types of functions that are mutually exclusive.

3) Compare the set of clausal structures given in (1) and the set of clausal structures proposed by Hasegawa (2009), which is provided as (i) below.

\[
(i) [\text{ForceP} [\text{TopicP} [\text{FocusP} [\text{FinP} [\text{TP} [\text{VP } \ldots\ldots]]]]]]
\]
Notice that the set of clausal structures shown in (i) above is a simplified version of the set of clausal structures proposed by Rizzi (1997), which takes the form of a right-branching tree diagram as shown in (ii) below.

(ii) Clausal Structures proposed by Rizzi

```
Force P
   /   '
  Force TopP*
     /  '
    Top0 FocP
       /  '
      Foc0 TopP*
         /  '
          Top0 FinP
             /  '
              Fin0 IP
```


The set of clausal structures proposed by Rizzi contains only three major layers (i.e., “TopP*,” “FocP,” and “TopP*”) in the CP zone, while the set of clausal structures provided in (1) is supposed to contain six different types of layers including “TopicP,” “GenericP,” “ConditionP,” “FocusP,” “ContrastP,” and “EmphaticP.” However, it should be remarked here, once
again, that the two layers labeled as “GenericP” and “ConditionP” are not included in the present set provided in (1), due to the reason that those two layers are assumed to occupy the same layer as “TopicP.”

4) Kuno (1973) reports that the following string of words provided in (i) below, where multiple occurrences of the particle *ga* are observed, is a grammatical string of words in Japanese.

(i) *Bunmeikoku ga* d a n s e i ga *heikin-jumyoo ga* mijika-i.  
Civilized countries *E-L men* E-L average life span *SUBJ short-PRES*  
*It is civilized countries that men---their average life span is short in.*

(Kuno (1973): p. 71)

While Kuno argues that the first two occurrences of *ga* are obtained as a result of “subjectivization” which is altered from the genitive case marker *no* and provides only the first occurrence of *ga* with a terminological word referred to as “Exhaustive-Listing (E-L)” following Mikami (1963) and Kuroda (1965), this author regards the first occurrence of *ga* as a “focus” marker, the idea of which was first brought up and incorporated in Takano (2003a, 2003b), and the second occurrence of *ga* as a “focus” marker also.

Recently, Morikawa (2012) argues that more than one focused phrases may appear in a given string of words. His example is cited as (i) below.

(i) *Doko no kuni ga dansei dake ga* 
Which GEN country *FOC* male only *FOC* 
*heikinjumyoo ga mijikai-desu ka.* 
average life span *SUBJ Short-COPULA-PRES Q*  
*Which country and which sex is the average life span short?*
Based on the example provided in (i) above, Morikawa argues that the lexical item “dake (only)” itself is considered to be an focused element, which in turn is followed by the particle ga. He goes on to say that the second occurrence of ga can be interpreted as having the function of focus without recourse to the presence of the word “dake (only).”

5) As for the process of emphasizing various types of grammatical constituents, see the work reported in Takano (2005).

6) A detailed discussion on the modals in Japanese will be omitted from the present set of clausal structures provided in (1). Interested readers are referred to Nitta (1989), Inoue (2011), and Morikawa (2012), among others. The final lexical item “ga (but)” functioning as a conjunctive clause marker in this clausal structure is also excluded from the present analysis to avoid a possible unnecessary complication also.

7) The ga of focus may be allowed to appear to mark various types of grammatical constituents as the following representative examples may suggest.

(i)a. Tarabagani wa Hokkaidoo ga honba-da.
   King crab TOP FOC authentic place-be-PRES
   As for king crab, it is (in) Hokkaido that is the authentic place.

b. Kore kara ga honban-des-u.
   This moment from FOC real-be-PRES
   It is from this moment on that will become real.

c. J uppeji made ga shukudai-des-u.
   Page 10 as far as FOC homework-be-PRES
   It is as far as page 10 that is (your) homework.
d. Biiru wa natsu no aida ga ichiban oishi-i.
Beer TOP summer during FOC tastiest-be-PRES
As for beer, it is during the summer that (it) is the tastiest.

e. Ai ga aru ka nai ka ga
Affection SUBJ exist Q non-exist Q FOC mondai-desu.
question-be-PRES

Whether (one) has affection (toward someone) or not, (that) is the question.

However, it should be remarked here that it seems to be difficult to find some examples in which the object phrase is marked by *ga of focus.

(ii)a. *John wa kono-hon ga kat-ta.
 TOP this-book FOC buy-PAST
 As for John, it is this book that (he) bought.

b. *John wa kono-hon wo ga kat-ta.
 TOP this-book OBJ FOC buy-PAST

(c.f.) (a). John ga kat-ta no wa kono-hon-da.
 SUBJ bought CLEFT this book-be-PRES
 What John bought is this book.

(b). John ga kat-ta no wa kono-hon wo-da.
 SUBJ bought CLEFT this book-OBJ-be-PRES
 What John bought is this book.

It does not seem to be the case, however, that such examples do not exist at all in Japanese. As a matter of fact, a couple of such example sentences were reported in Maeda (2000), which were cited from Sugimoto (1995). Interested readers are referred to Maeda (2000) and Sugimoto (1995),
both of which are listed in the “References” at the end of this paper.

List of Abbreviations

CONT = Contrastive (marker wa)
E-L = Exhaustive-Listing (marker ga)
EMPH = Emphatic (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
OBJ = Object (marker ga), in terms of surface cases
POTEN = Potential (verbal morph)
PRES = Present (tense)
PROG = Progressive form
SUBJ = Subject (marker ga), in terms of grammatical relations
TOP = Topic (marker wa), in terms of functional particles
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