The Distribution of Particles in Japanese and the Structure of CP
Norio Nasu
Kobe City University of Foreign Studies

The primary purpose of this paper is to argue for the existence of a projection in the CP layers that appears only in the main clause. It demonstrates that the relevant projection is located on top of ForceP and constitutes the outermost part of clause structure. To this end, the present paper examines a new type of colloquial construction Japanese where the topic particle *wa* appears in the sentence-initial position without being attached to an NP. This construction (call it *particle stranding*) appears exclusively in a question-answer context as in (1), where the preceding question (1A) serves as the discourse antecedent of the reply (1B).

Particle stranding came into use quite recently and has attracted little attention in the literature of generative syntax. Existing accounts (Yoshida (2004) and Sato and Ginsburg (2007)) derive it from topicalization via ellipsis of the topic NP. Thus, (1B) is allegedly derived from (2) by phonologically eliding the NP *kono yubiwa* 'this ring'. However, particle stranding exhibits striking differences from topicalization. For instance, while topicalization of an anaphor is not possible (see (3B)), a particle stranding sentence (4) can be used in the same context without changing the intended meaning. This asymmetry indicates that a particle stranding sentence does not involve ellipsis of a topic NP. Particle stranding differs from topicalization in terms of syntactic distribution, too. While topicalization may take place either within the main clause or within the complement clause of an epistemic verb as in (5Ba), particle stranding is restricted to the main clause (see (5Bb)). In fact, it is limited to the initial position of the main clause. Thus, (6) is ill-formed as a reply to (1A).

The distribution of particle stranding is parallel with that of sentence-final particles, that is, they are both allowed only in the peripheral position of the main clause. Similarly to particle stranding, a sentence-final particle like *yo* is excluded from the embedded clause and is only allowed to occur in the final position of the main clause (see (7)). They share pragmatic functions as well. For instance, the final particle *yo* appears only in a dialogue where the speaker intends to signal that his/her utterance is directed to a particular hearer. Thus, its presence is obligatory in (8), where the speaker talks to a particular individual in order to direct the latter's attention to the dropped wallet. By contrast, it is excluded from a newspaper article like (9), which usually targets the general public. Likewise, particle stranding appears only in the context where the speaker replies to a question the hearer has asked, and therefore is excluded from a narrative (10a) and from an utterance that does not presuppose a question (see (10bB)).

In order to account for syntactic and pragmatic parallelism between particle stranding and sentence-final particles, this paper proposes the structure given in (11), adopting and modifying the articulated CP structure proposed in the split CP hypothesis (Rizzi (1997) among others). The projection FP, which is located on top of ForceP, encodes speaker-hearer interactions and their linguistic reflexes. The head F^0, which is assumed to be equipped with the feature [+addressee], hosts a sentence-final particle, a category that appears only in the conversational context where the speaker addresses a particular individual. On the other hand, its specifier position is occupied by the stranded initial particle *wa*, which also appears only in the utterance that requires the presence of a particular hearer and hence is considered to carry the feature [+addressee]. Consequently, the parallelism between the sentence-initial and sentence-final particles under consideration is reduced to Spec-Head agreement, a general syntactic relation established by virtue of feature-sharing.

The reason why FP is located above ForceP is as follows. The head of ForceP serves to determine clause types in terms of illocutionary force. Japanese also has various morphemes, such as those underlined in (12a-e), each of which is associated with a particular clause type. Thus, each of them is qualified as the head of ForceP. Notice that those morphemes must precede a sentence-final particle, as illustrated by (12a-e). Given the head-final character of Japanese phrase structure, this means that the projection headed by a sentence-final particle is located above ForceP.

In conclusion, the proposed analysis successfully captures the distribution of particle stranding and sentence-final particles as well as their parallelism from a pragmatic perspective. It also provides a clue to the issue of what counts as a main clause phenomenon. More specifically, the involvement of speaker-hearer interactions governs the availability of main clause items such as initial and final particles.

Examples

(1) A: Kono yubiwa-wa dare-ga hirotta no? – B: **Wa** boku-ga hirottandesu.
　　　this ring-Top who-Nom found Q　　　　　Prt I-Nom found
　　　'Speaking of this ring, who found it?'　　　　　'I found it.'

(2) Kono yubiwa-wa boku-ga hirottandesu.
　　This ring-Top I-Nom found

(3) A: Dare-ga zibun-o semeteru no? – B: *Zibun-wa Taroo-ga semeterundesu.
　　　who-Nom self-Acc is.blaming Q　　　Self-Top Taro-Nom is.blaming
　　　'Who is blaming himself?'　　　　　'Taro is blaming himself.'

(4) **Wa** Taroo-ga semeterundesu.
　　Prt Taro-Nom is.blaming 'Taro is blaming himself.'

(5) A: Taroo-wa donna hito na no?
　　　Taro-Top what person is Q
　　　'What kind of person is Taro?'

　Ba: (**Taroo-wa**) Minna(-ga) [(**Taroo-wa**) usotuki da to] omotteimasu.
　　　(Taro-Top) everyone(-Nom) (Taro-Top) liar is that think
　　　'Everyone thinks that Taro is a liar.'

　Bb: (**Wa**) Minna(-ga) [(***wa**) usotuki da to] omotteimasu.
　　　(Prt) everyone(-Nom) (*Prt) liar is that think

(6) *Boku-ga **wa** hirottandesu.
　　I-Nom Prt found

(7) Minna(-ga) [Taroo-wa usotuki da (***yo**) to] (***yo**) omotteimasu (**yo**).
　　everyone(-Nom) Taro-Top liar is (*Prt) that (Prt) think (Prt)
　　'(Believe me,) everyone thinks that Taro is a liar.'

(8) Mosimosi, saihu-o otosimasita *(**yo**).
　　excuse.me wallet-Acc dropped Prt 'Excuse me, but you've dropped your wallet.'

(9) Syusyoo-wa kinoo daitooryoo-to kaidansita (***yo**).
　　prime.minister-Top yesterday president-with had.a.dialogue (*Prt)
　　'The prime minister had a dialogue with the president.' [intended as a newspaper article]

(10) a. Taroo-wa 5-zi-ni dekaketa. ***Wa** 6-zi-ni eki-ni tuita.
　　　　Taro-Top 5-o'clock-at left *Prt 6-o'clock-at station-at arrived
　　　　'Taro left at 5 o'clock. He arrived at the station at 6 o'clock.'

　　b. A: Taroo-wa kyoo-mo konakatta ne.
　　　　　Taro-Top today-too did.not.come Prt 'Taro didn't turn up today either.'

　　　B: ***Wa** byooki nandesu.
　　　　*Prt ill is 'He is ill.'

(11) [FP wa[+addressee] [F' [ForceP …] F^0[+addressee]]]

(12) a. Taroo-ga {ki-ta-**yo** /*ki-**yo**-ta}.
　　　　Taro-Nom {came-Decl-Prt / *came-Prt-Decl} 'Taro came.' (declarative)

　　b. Suguni {ik-e-**yo** /*ik-**yo**-e}!
　　　　right.now {go-Imp-Prt /*go-Prt-Imp} 'Go right now!' (imperative)

　　c. Saa {ik-oo-**ze** /*ik-**ze**-oo }.
　　　　let's {go-Exh-Prt /*go-Prt-Exh} 'Let's go.' (exhortative)

　　d. Sokoni {iku-na-**yo** /*iku-**yo**-na}!
　　　　there {go-NegImp-Prt /*go-Prt-NegImp} 'Don't go there!' (negative imperative)

　　e. Taroo-wa {kita-ka-**ne** /*kita-**ne**-ka}?
　　　　Taro-Top {came-Q-Prt /*came-Prt-Q} 'Did Taro come?' (interrogative)

References

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by L. Haegeman, 281-337, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Sato, Y. and J. Ginsburg (2007) "A New Type of Nominal Ellipsis in Japanese," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 55: *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* 4, 197-204.

Yoshida, T. (2004) "Syudai no Syooryaku Gensyoo" (Topic Ellipsis Phenomena) *Nihongo Kyooikugaku no Siten* (Perspectives of Japanese Language Education), 291-305, Tokyodo Syuppan, Tokyo.