Title	日本語に於ける焦点連結現象に関する派生理論的分析
Sub Title	A derivational analysis of association with focus in Japanese
Author	星, 浩司(Hoshi, Koji)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要刊行委員会
Publication year	2006
Jtitle	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要. 英語英米文学 No.49 (2006. 9) ,p.17- 63
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN10030060-20060930-0017

A Derivational Analysis of Association with Focus in Japanese*

Koji Hoshi

1. Introduction

Kuroda (1965) is the first attempt to provide a formal syntactic analysis of the nature of association with focus concerning (quasi-)quantificational focus particles such as *wa* 'topic, contrast', *mo* 'also', *dake* 'only', and *sae* 'even' in Japanese in the generative grammatical tradition (see also Kuroda 1969, 1970). Recasting Kuroda's (1965) attachment transformation analysis of association with focus in Japanese within the framework of principles-and-parameters approach, Aoyagi (1998, 1999) propounds an LF-movement-based analysis, in which focus particles (, or Q-particles in his terms) move to a licensing functional head like T or v at LF, from where they are associated with the focused element in their c-command domain. In the meantime, Kayne (1998, 2000) proposes an overt movement analysis of association with focus in English, suggesting but not spelling out a possibility of extending his analysis to the analogue in Japanese.[1]

The main goal of this paper is to articulate an extension of Kayne's (1998, 2000) idea into the empirical domain of association with focus in Japanese with special reference to two focus-sensitive particles like *mo* 'also, too' and *dake* 'only.'[2] The relevant basic paradigms of association with narrow focus involving *mo* and *dake* are illustrated below (cf. Aoyagi 1998, 1999 and

references therein *inter alia*.):[3, 4, 5]

(1) a. ***John**-mo Mary-ni hon-o watasita.*

      John-also Mary-Dat book-Acc handed to

      'Lit.John also handed a book to Mary.'

      = In addition to someone else's handing a book to Mary,

        John handed a book to Mary.

  b. *****John**-ga-mo Mary-ni hon-o watasita.*

  c. *****John**-mo-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita.*

  d. John-ga ***Mary-ni**-mo hon-o watasita.*

      John-Nom Mary-Dat-also book-Acc handed to

      'Lit.John handed a book also to Mary.'

      = In addition to John's handing a book to someone else,

      he handed a book to Mary.

  e. *John-ga ***Mary**-mo-ni hon-o watasita.*

  f. John-ga Mary-ni ***hon**-mo watasita.*

      John-Nom Mary-Dat book-also handed to

      'Lit.John handed also a book to Mary.'

  g. John-ga Mary-ni ***hon-o**-mo watasita.*

      John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc-also handed to

      'Lit.John handed a book also to Mary.'

      = In addition to John's handing something else to Mary,

        he handed a book to her.

  h. *John-ga Mary-ni ***hon**-mo-o watasita.*

  i. ***John-ga** Mary-ni hon-o watasi-mo sita.*

      John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc hand-also did

      'Lit.John also handed a book to Mary.'

      = In addition to someone else's handing a book to Mary,

        John handed a book to Mary.

  j. John-ga *Mary-ni* hon-o watasi-mo sita.

     John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc hand-also did

     'Lit.John handed a book also to Mary.'

     = In addition to John's handing a book to someone else,

       he handed a book to Mary.

  k. John-ga Mary-ni *hon-o* watasi-mo sita.

     John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc hand-also did

     'Lit.John handed a book also to Mary.'

     = In addition to John's handing something else to Mary,

       he handed a book to her.

  l. John-ga Mary-ni hon-o *watasi*-mo sita.

     John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc hand-also did

     'Lit.John also handed a book to Mary.'

     = In addition to John's doing something else to Mary with a book,

       he handed a book to her.

  m. *John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasi*-mo sita.

     John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc hand-also did

     'Lit.John handed a book to Mary, also.'

     = In addition to something else's happening, John handed a book

       to Mary.

(2) a. *John*-dake Mary-ni hon-o watasita.

       John-only Mary-Dat book handed to

       'Lit.Only John handed a book to Mary.'

       = Nobody other than John handed a book to Mary.

    b. *John*-dake-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita.

       John-only-Nom Mary-Dat book handed to

       'Lit.Only John handed a book to Mary.'

= Nobody other than John handed a book to Mary.

c. *__John-ga__-dake Mary-ni hon-o watasita.

d. John-ga *Mary*-dake-ni hon-o watasita.

John-Nom Mary-only-Dat book-Acc handed to

'Lit.John handed a book only to Mary.'

= John handed a book to nobody other than Mary.

e. John-ga **Mary-ni**-dake hon-o watasita.

John-Nom Mary-Dat-only book-Acc handed to

'Lit.John handed a book only to Mary.'

= John handed a book to nobody other than Mary.

f. John-ga Mary-ni *hon*-dake watasita.

John-Nom Mary-Dat book-only handed to

'Lit.John handed only a book to Mary.'

= John handed nothing other than a book to Mary.

g. John-ga Mary-ni *hon*-dake-o watasita.

John-Nom Mary-Dat book-only-Acc handed to

'Lit.John handed only a book to Mary.'

= John handed nothing other than a book to Mary.

h. *John-ga Mary-ni *hon-o*-dake watasita.

i. *__John-ga__ Mary-ni hon-o watasi-dake sita.

j. *John-ga *Mary-ni* hon-o watasi-dake sita.

k. *John-ga Mary-ni *hon-o* watasi-dake sita.

l. *John-ga Mary-ni hon-o *watasi*-dake sita.

m. *__John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasi__-dake sita.

    The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 briefly goes over Kayne's (1998, 2000) derivational analysis of association with focus in English. Then, in section 3, I will develop an analysis of association of focus (both narrow focus and wide focus in the sense of Aoyagi 1998, 1999)

based on Kayne's (1998, 2000) insight. More specifically, on the hypothesis of head-initial clausal configuration in Japanese (cf. Kayne 1994, Whitman 2001, Yanagida 2003 and Ogawa 2003 *inter alia*.), it will be demonstrated that association of not only narrow focus but also wide focus can be derived as a result of series of overt movement operations. In section 4, I will consider some consequences of my analysis of association with focus in Japanese in connection with Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) paradigms concerning the nature of association with focus in Japanese. Finally, section 5 summarizes and concludes this paper.[6]

2. Kayne's (1998, 2000) Analysis of Association with Focus in English

Kayne (1998, 2000) proposes a derivational syntactic analysis of association with focus, whereby (some instances of) the phenomena of association with focus are viewed as involving overt movement to [Spec,Foc] in all languages, with the focus-sensitive operators like *only*, *even*, *too* in English and their analogues in other languages always attracting a phrase to their Spec overtly, being subject to the following licensing condition on association with focus (cf. Kayne 1998: 156, 2000: 243):[7, 8]

(3) <u>Licensing Condition on Association with Focus:</u>

Focus-sensitive operators such as *only*, *even*, *too*, *also* or their counterparts in other languages can only associate with either the phrase or its subpart that has moved to their Spec overtly.

Let me illustrate Kayne's (1998, 2000) analysis of association with focus with reference to the focus-sensitive operator *only* below. Consider the following paradigm (in what follows, the focus-associated element in a sentence is indicated in bold-faced italics):

(4) John read only *Aspects*.

(5) Only *John* came to the party. (= adapted from Kayne 1998: 156, 2000: 243, (119))

(6) a. John only *gave Bill a book*.

  b. John only *gave* Bill a book.

  c. John only gave *Bill* a book.

  d. John only gave Bill *a book*.

        (= Kayne 1998: 157, 2000: 243, (121))

In (4), at surface, the focus-sensitive operator *only* is located between the main verb *read* and the direct object *Aspects*. Kayne (1998, 2000) claims that *only* cannot be merged with a DP like *Aspects* directly in (4).[9] Instead, he derives (4) from a structure resembling (7) along the line of (8) (note that the derivation in (8) shows the point before the subject *John* is merged):

(7) John only read *Aspects*.

(8) … only read Aspects → (attraction by *only*)

   … [Aspects$_i$ only] read t$_i$ → (raising of *only* to W)

   … only$_j$+W [Aspects$_i$ t$_j$] read t$_i$ → (VP-preposing to [Spec,W])

   … [[read t$_i$]$_k$ only$_j$+W] [Aspects$_i$ t$_j$] t$_k$

In (8), *only* attracts *Aspects* to [Spec,only] in the first step. Then, in the second step, the focus operator *only* is raised to an abstract functional head W.[10] Finally, the VP is preposed to [Spec,W] in deriving the correct surface word order. Then, in accordance with the condition in (3) the focus-associate turns out to be the direct object *Aspects*.

  How about the derivation of (5)? Kayne (1998, 2000) proposes the one

in (9):

(9) … only [John came to the party] → (attraction by *only*)

  … [John$_i$ only] [t$_i$ came to the party] → (raising of *only* to W)

  … only$_j$+W [John$_i$ t$_j$] [t$_i$ came to the party]

  In (9), *only* takes a TP as its complement, attracting *John* to [Spec,only] in the first step. Then, just as in (8), the focus operator only is raised to W in the second step. Note that the subject *John* is correctly licensed as the focus-associate, according to the condition in (3).

  Finally, let us look at the cases in (6). The relevant derivation is proposed by Kayne (1998, 2000) as follows:

(10) … only gave Bill a book → (attraction by *only*)

  … [gave Bill a book]$_i$ only t$_i$→ (raising of *only* to W)

  … only$_j$+W [gave Bill a book]$_i$ t$_j$ t$_i$

Notice that in the second step in (10) the whole VP is situated at [Spec,only], which accounts for the fact that the focus-associate can be the main verb *gave*, either the indirect object *Bill* or the direct object *a book*, or the whole VP *gave Bill a book*, as predicted by the condition in (3).

  Kayne (1998, 2000) suggests that basically the same analysis can be applied to languages such as Japanese, but he does not spell out such an extension of his idea into the case of Japanese. In the next section, I will articulate a possible Kaynean analysis of association with focus in Japanese.

3. The Kaynean Analysis of Association with Focus in Japanese

3.1. Some Assumptions on Case-particles and Focus-sensitive Particles

  First of all, let me spell out some important assumptions on Case-particles and focus-sensitive particles in Japanese that I will stand on in the following

discussion.

Following Kayne's (1994: 143) idea that (some) Case particles and (some) focus particles in Japanese are merged as an independent "pure" functional head, I will assume that the nominative Case particle *ga* is introduced so that it takes its complement on its right (see also Takezawa and Whitman 1998, H.Hoshi 1999, Whitman 2001, Yanagida 2003 and Ogawa 2003 *inter alia* for the same idea that the nominative Case particle *ga* is a clausal head in Japanese).[11]

However, departing from Kayne (1994) and others, I will assume that, unlike the nominative Case particle, the accusative Case particle and the dative Case particle are directly merged to a nominal projection. This demarcation is motivated in part by the facts discussed by Kuno (1973), Saito (1985), Shibatani (1990), and Hoji (1990). They observe that the nominative Case-marked DP is incapable of moving by scrambling or clefting, whereas the accusative Case-marked DP, the dative Case-marked DP, and the PP are freely allowed to move by such operations in Japanese.[12] This fact would naturally follow from the assumption that only the nominative Case is to be merged separated from its DP associate, while the accusative Case and dative Case are to be merged with a DP directly to make up a constituent just like a PP does.

Furthermore, unlike Takezawa and Whitman (1998), H.Hoshi (1999), Whitman (2001) and Yanagida (2003), I propose to analyze the functional head T as (optionally) selecting the nominative-Case particle projection *ga*P (see Ogawa 2003).[13] Also, departing from Takezawa and Whitman (1998), Whitman (2001) and Yanagida (2003), but following H.Hoshi (1999), I will assume that the nominative Case particle *ga* is selected from the lexicon as an independent functional element different from INFL/T and is merged into the clausal projection in Japanese. The verbal inflectional suffix *ru/-ta* in

Japanese is assumed to occupy T, which (optionally) takes a *ga*P headed by the nominative Case particle as an independent functional head.[14]

Given these assumptions, the underlying clausal configuration in Japanese can be represented below:

(11) $[_{TP}$ T $[_{gaP}$ [ga $[_{vP}$ DP $[_{v'}$ v $[_{VP}$ DP-ni $[_{V'}$ [V DP-o]]]]]]]]

At this point, the above assumption on the nominative Case particle in Japanese might possibly strike one as bizarre in terms of UG. However, the (fairly conventional) assumption also adopted in the current minimalist program in fact allows for such a possibility. Chomsky (2000: 100) states as follows:

(12)

"UG makes available a set ***F*** of features (linguistic properties) and operations C_{HL} (the computational procedure for human language) ... On these (fairly conventional) assumptions, acquiring a language involves at least selection of the features [F] (from ***F***, K.H.), construction of lexical items Lex (out of [F], K.H.) …"

Thus, in principle, a Case feature (or its analogue) might be assembled together with other elements of [F] to make a lexical item such as a nominal N in some languages or it might be employed to produce an independent lexical item like a Case particle in other languages. Given this, the postulation of the nominative Case particle as an independent functional head in Japanese is not off the wall at all from the perspective of UG entertained in the minimalist program.

Next, with respect to focus particles in Japanese, along the lines of Aoyagi (1998, 1999) and the references cited therein, I will assume that there is a formal demarcation between two kinds of focus particles. Aoyagi (1998,

1999) alludes to the following demarcation of focus particles as recognized by traditional Japanese grammarians (e.g., Matsushita 1930, Yamada 1936, Hashimoto 1969 *inter alia.*):

(13) <u>K-particles (= kakari-zyosi) vs. F-particles (= fuku-zyosi)</u>

    a. K-particles: wa, mo, (sae)

    b. F-particles: dake, made, bakari, (sae)

Based on this demarcation of focus particles, I will assume that K-particles such as *wa* 'contrast', *mo* 'also, too', and possibly *sae* 'even' will be merged to a "(propositional) verbal/clausal unit," while F-particles such as *dake* 'only', *made* 'even', *bakari* 'only', and possibly *sae* 'even' will be merged to either a "nominal(-like) unit" or a "(non-propositional) verbal unit" in the course of core syntactic computation.[15] As a representative case from each camp in (14), I will take up *mo* 'also' and *dake* 'only' in the following discussion.[16]

3.2. Deriving the Basic Facts of Association with Narrow Focus

In this section, I will attempt to derive the basic facts of association with narrow focus in Japanese, as exemplified in (1)–(2).[17, 18]

First, let us consider the derivation for (1a). Suppose that in this case the nominative Case projection is null (,thus, there is no necessity to fill its Spec, although it might well be attached to *mo* in PF), and the K-particle *mo* takes vP as its complement. In addition, suppose that the focus head *mo* carries an EPP feature which attracts the DP *John* to [Spec,*mo*]. The derivation at hand should proceed as follows:

(14) [mo [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]

        (→ *John* attracted to [Spec,*mo*], W merged,

           the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,W])

[[**John**$_i$-mo [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]$_j$ [W t$_j$]]

(→ the null nominative Case particle *Øga* merged, T merged)

[$_{TP}$ –ta [Øga [[**John**$_i$-mo [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]$_j$ [W t$_j$]]]]

(→ V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta [Øga [[**John**$_i$-mo [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_k$ hon-o]]]]$_j$ [W t$_j$]]]]

(→ ØgaP attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [Øga [[**John**$_i$-mo [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_k$ hon-o]]]]$_j$ [W t$_j$]]]$_m$

[$_T$ [$_T$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta t$_m$]]]

→ Since the DP *John* is the only element in [Spec,mo], it will be licensed as the associate of *mo* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

Note that under this analysis the reasons for the ungrammaticality in (1b,c) are straightforward: in order to derive the sequence *John-ga-mo*, the DP *John* must first move to [Spec,*ga*] and then *[DP-ga]* must be put into [Spec,*mo*]. But, the movement of *[DP-ga]* to [Spec,*mo*] is impossible due to the non-constituency of *[DP-ga]* in addition to the general ban on lowering. Likewise, for the sequence *John-mo-ga*, the DP *John* must first be raised to [Spec,*mo*] and then *[DP-mo]* must be raised to [Spec,*ga*]. But, the movement of *[DP-mo]* to [Spec,*ga*] is illicit by virtue of the non-constituent status of *[DP-mo]*.

Second, let us turn to the case in (1d). Here, the K-particle *mo* takes VP as its complement. The derivation for (1d) should go as follows:

(15) [mo [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]

(→ *Mary-ni* attracted to [Spec,mo], W merged)

[W [**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ watasi hon-o]]]

(→ VP attracted to [Spec,W])

[[$_{VP}$ t$_i$ watasi hon-o]$_j$ W [**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]]

(→ the whole FocP scrambled to WP)

[[**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]$_k$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ watasi hon-o]$_j$ W t$_k$]]

    ($\rightarrow$ v merged, *John* merged, the nominative Case particle *ga* merged)

[ga [$_{vP}$ John [v[[**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]$_k$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ watasi hon-o]$_j$ W t$_k$]]]]]

    ($\rightarrow$ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged)

[$_{TP}$ –ta [John$_l$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [v[[**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]$_k$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ watasi hon-o]$_j$ W t$_k$]]]]]]

    ($\rightarrow$ V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{m-n}$-ta [John$_l$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [t$_n$ [[**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]$_k$

                                            [[$_{VP}$ t$_i$ t$_m$ hon-o]$_j$ W t$_k$]]]]]]]

    ($\rightarrow$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_l$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [t$_n$ [[**Mary-ni**$_i$-mo t$_j$]$_k$ [[$_{VP}$ t$_i$ t$_m$ hon-o]$_j$ W t$_k$]]]]]]$_o$

                                            [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta t$_o$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the PP *Mary-ni* is the only element in [Spec,*mo*], it will be licensed as the associate of *mo* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

Notice that the ungrammaticality of (1e) can be naturally accounted for under the present analysis: the sequence *Mary-mo-ni* cannot be simply created because *[Mary-ni]* must be moved as a unit to [Spec,*mo*], due to the general ban on P-stranding in Japanese.

    Third, what about the cases in (1f,g)? They can be also analyzed as the K-particle *mo* taking VP as its complement. The relevant derivation should be something like the following:[19]

(16) [mo [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon(-o)]]

    ($\rightarrow$ *hon(-o)* attracted to [Spec,mo], W merged)

  [W [**hon(-o)**$_i$-mo [Mary-ni watasi t$_i$]]]

    ($\rightarrow$ VP attracted to [Spec,W])

[[Mary-ni watasi t$_i$]$_j$ W [**hon(-o)**$_i$-mo t$_j$]]

($\rightarrow$ v merged, *John* merged, the nominative Case particle *ga* merged)

[ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [[Mary-ni watasi t$_i$]$_j$ W [***hon(-o)***$_i$-mo t$_j$]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged)

[$_{TP}$ –ta [John$_k$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [v [[Mary-ni watasi t$_i$]$_j$ W [***hon(-o)***$_i$-mo t$_j$]]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{l\text{-}m}$-ta [John$_k$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [t$_m$ [[Mary-ni t$_l$ t$_i$]$_j$ W [***hon(-o)***$_i$-mo t$_j$]]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_k$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [t$_m$ [[Mary-ni t$_l$ t$_i$]$_j$ W [***hon(-o)***$_i$-mo t$_j$]]]]]$_n$

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{l\text{-}m}$-ta t$_n$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the DP *hon(-o)* is the only element in [Spec,*mo*], it will be licensed as the associate of *mo* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

Note that the source of the ungrammaticality in (1h) is clear: the sequence *hon-mo-o* cannot be simply created since *[hon-o]* must be moved as a unit to [Spec,*mo*], and Case-marker-stranding movement is in general banned in Japanese.

Finally, let us turn to the derivations in (1i-m). In these cases, the K-particle *mo* apparently selects vP as its complement. On this point, however, I will depart from the widely accepted view that the verb to the left of the K-particle *mo* is a bare V (or stem) with a high vowel *i* being inserted by epenthesis (see Aoyagi 1998).[20] Rather, I will regard it as a *renyookei*/ adpredicative form of the V in question which requires a functional element/ a kind of inflectional affix such as *i* (Teramura 1984) and assume that the *renyookei*, or the adpredicative inflectional form of the relevant V is created as a result of V-movement to the non-finite T through v in Japanese.[21] If this is correct, what the K-particle attaches to is not a vP, but a non-finite TP, and so the traditional term "VP-fronting" in the literature is a misnomer as it is

applied to apparent Japanese counterpart (cf. Hoji, Miyagawa and Tada 1989, Hasegawa 1990, Kishimoto 2001 *inter alia*.). Given these assumptions, the derivations for (1i-m) should proceed as follows:

(17) $[_{TP}$ T [ga $[_{vP}$ John [v $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ watasi hon(-o)]]]]]]

   (→ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], V-v-T movement applied, *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

$[_{TP}$ [John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$ $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]

   (→ *mo* merged to the non-finite TP)

[mo $[_{TP}$ [John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$ $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]]

   (→ the non-finite TP attracted to [Spec,*mo*], W merged)

[W $[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

          $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]]

   (→ the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,W])

$[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

          $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]

   (→ T merged)

$[_{TP}$ -ta $[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

          $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]]

   (→ the dummy light verb *su(ru)* is inserted at T to support the tense suffix, the whole WP attracted to [Spec,T])[22]

$[_{TP}$ $[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

  $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]$_o$ $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ si-ta t$_o$]]]

→ Since the whole non-finite TP is located in [Spec,*mo*], not only the whole non-finite TP but also its subparts will be licensed as the associates of *mo* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3), i.e., the subject *John-ga*, the indirect object *Mary-ni*, the direct object *hon-o*, and the verb *watasi*, depending upon the placement of a focal

stress and/or a preceding linguistic context.

Alternatively, the derivation may well run as follows:

(18) $[_{TP}$ T [ga $[_{vP}$ John [v $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ watasi hon(-o)]]]]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], V-v-T movement applied, *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

$[_{TP}$ [John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$ $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ *mo* merged to the non-finite TP)

[mo $[_{TP}$ [John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$ $[_{T'}$ $[_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ the non-finite TP attracted to [Spec,*mo*], W merged)

[W $[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

$[_{T'}$ *[$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ tl]]]*$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,W])

$[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

$[_{T'}$ *[$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]*$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]

  ($\rightarrow$ the dummy "unaccusative" light verb *su(ru)* is merged)[23]

$[_{VP}$ su $[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

$[_{T'}$ *[$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]*$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ T is merged)

$[_{TP}$ -ta $[_{VP}$ su $[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

$[_{T'}$ *[$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]*$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]]]

  ($\rightarrow$ the "unaccusative" light verb *su* is raised to T, the matrix VP attracted to [Spec,T])

$[_{TP}$ $[_{VP}$ t$_o$ $[[_{TP}$ *[John$_i$-ga $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ [t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]$_l$*

$[_{T'}$ *[$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$ t$_l$]]]*$_m$ [mo t$_m$]]]$_n$ [W t$_n$]]]$_p$ $[_T$ $[_T$ si$_o$-ta t$_p$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the whole non-finite TP is located in [Spec, *mo*], not only the whole non-finite TP but also its subparts will be licensed as the associates of *mo* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3),

i.e., the subject *John-ga*, the indirect object *Mary-ni*, the direct object *hon-o*, and the verb *watasi*, depending upon the placement of a focal stress and/or a preceding linguistic context.

Furthermore, if the bifurcation of the verb *suru* 'do' in Japanese into the (dummy) light verb and the heavy verb is correct, there is another derivation for (1i-m) which involves the heavy verb *suru* 'do' (see Miyagawa 1987, Tsujimura 1990, Kageyama 1982 and Mihara 1994 among others for more on the light verb *suru* and the heavy verb *suru* in Japanese).[24] The derivation in question would be something like the following:

(19) $[_{TP}$ T $[Øga [_{vP}$ PRO $[v [_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ watasi hon(-o)$]]]]]]$

      (→ the nominative Case projection *ga*P is null, the subject is PRO, V-v-T movement applied, null *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

$[_{TP} [Øga [_{vP}$ PRO $[t_j [_{vP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t_i hon-o$]]]]]_k [_{T'} [_T$ watasi$_{i\text{-}j}$ $t_k]]]$

      (→ *mo* merged to the non-finite TP)

$[mo [_{TP} [Øga [_{vP}$ PRO $[t_j [_{vP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t_i hon-o$]]]]]_k [_{T'} [_T$ watasi$_{i\text{-}j}$ $t_k]]]]$

      (→ the non-finite TP attracted to [Spec,*mo*], W merged)

$[W [_{TP} [(Øga) [_{vP}$ PRO $[t_j [_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t_i hon-o$]]]]]_k [_{T'} [_T$ watasi$_{i\text{-}j}$ $t_k]]]_l$ [mo $t_l]]]$

      (→ the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,W], the heavy verb *su* merged)

$[_{VP}$ su $[[_{TP} [Øga [_{vP}$ PRO $[t_j [_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t_i hon-o$]]]]]_k [_{T'} [_T$ watasi$_{i\text{-}j}$ $t_k]]]_l$
                             [mo $t_l]]_m$ [W $t_m]]]$

      (→ v merged, *John* merged, the nominative Case particle *ga* merged)

$[ga [_{vP}$ John $[v [_{VP}$ su $[[_{TP} [Øga [_{vP}$ PRO $[t_j [_{VP}$ Mary-ni $[_{V'}$ t_i hon-o$]]]]]_k$
                        $[_{T'} [_T$ watasi$_{i\text{-}j}$ $t_k]]]_l$ [mo $t_l]]_m$ [W $t_m]]]]]]$

      (→ *John* attracted to [Spec, *ga*], PRO controlled by *John*)

[John$_n$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_n$ [v [$_{VP}$ su [[*[$_{TP}$ [Øga [$_{vP}$ PRO [t$_j$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni [$_{V'}$ t$_i$ hon-o]]]]]$_k$*

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{i-j}$ t$_k$]]]$_l$ [mo t$_l$]]$_m$ [W t$_m$]]]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ T merged, V-v-T movement applied, *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_n$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_n$ [t$_p$ [$_{VP}$ t$_o$ [[*[$_{TP}$ [Øga [$_{vP}$ PRO [t$_j$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni [$_{V'}$ t$_i$ hon-o]]]]]$_k$*

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{i-j}$ t$_k$]]]$_l$ [mo t$_l$]]$_m$ [W t$_m$]]]]]]]$_q$ [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ si$_{o-p}$-ta t$_q$]]]

$\rightarrow$ The embedded subject PRO is understood as coreferential with the
matrix subject *John* via controlling. Since the whole non-finite TP
is located in [Spec,*mo*], not only the whole non-finite TP but also
its subparts will be licensed as the associates of *mo* in accordance
with the licensing condition in (3), i.e., the indirect object *Mary-ni*,
the direct object *hon-o*, and the verb *watasi*, depending upon the
placement of a focal stress and/or preceding linguistic context.

Note that since the embedded subject is an empty category PRO, it seems
that it cannot be interpreted as the associate of the focus particle *mo* even if
it is contained within the non-finite TP in [Spec,*mo*]. This intuition is to be
corroborated much more clearly by the following "VP-fronting" context:

(20) [[PRO Mary-ni hon-o watasi]-mo]$_i$ John-ga t$_i$ sita.

           Mary-Dat book-Acc hand to-also John-Nom did

   'Lit.Also hand a book to Mary, John did.'

In (20), the matrix subject *John* cannot be interpreted as being associated with
the K- particle *mo*.

    In order to account for the insensitivity of empty categories including
traces with respect to association with focus, I will propose the following PF
condition on empty categories including traces:

(21) <u>PF Condition on Empty Categories:</u>

    Empty categories including traces cannot be the focus-associates in

association with focus-sensitive operators, due to the incompatibility between the notion of focushood and the lack of phonological material. Thus, the associate of a focus particle must be phonologically overt at [Spec, Foc] at PF.

Notice that although the condition in (21) is a PF condition, it is somehow rendered relevant to LF as well. One possibility is that an interpretable [focus] feature is (optionally) assigned to the associate of a focus particle when entering the Numeration and the interpretable [focus] feature will carried over both PF and LF after Spell-Out, securing the relevancy in both sides (cf. Jackendoff 1972 for the idea of focus features).

Now, let us turn our attention to the paradigm for the F-particle *dake* in (2). First, consider the case in (2a). Here, the F-particle is directly merged with the DP *John*. The derivation for (2a) would go as follows:[25]

(22) [Øga [$_{vP}$ [dake [John]] [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]

      ($\rightarrow$ The F-particle *dake* takes *John* as its complement, *John* attracted to [Spec,*dake*])

[Øga [$_{vP}$ [***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$] [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]

      ($\rightarrow$ the nominative Case projection *ga*P is null, hence no raising of *John-dake* to [Spec,*ga*], T merged, V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{j-k}$-ta [Øga [$_{vP}$ [***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$] [t$_k$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]

      ($\rightarrow$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [Øga [$_{vP}$[***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$] [t$_k$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_j$ hon-o]]]]$_l$ [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$-ta t$_l$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the DP *John* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

Similarly, the derivation for (2b) should run as follows:

(23) [ga [$_{vP}$ [dake [John]] [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]

   (→ *dake* takes *John* as its complement, *John* attracted to
    [Spec,*dake*])

  [ga [$_{vP}$ [***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$] [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi hon-o]]]]

   (→ *John-dake* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged, V-v-T movement
    applied)

  [$_{TP}$ watasi$_{j-k}$-ta [[***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_l$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [t$_k$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_j$ hon-o]]]]]

   (→ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

  [$_{TP}$ [[***John***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_l$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [t$_k$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_j$ hon-o]]]]$_m$

               [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{j-k}$-ta t$_m$]]]

 → Since the DP *John* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will be
  licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing
  condition in (3).

It is to be noted that the reason for the ungrammaticality of (2c) is clear:
the sequence *John-ga-dake* cannot be simply generated due to the non-
constituency of *John-ga* in the first place under my analysis.

  Now, let us look at the derivation for (2d), in which the F-particle *dake*
is directly merged with the DP *Mary*:

(24) [ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ ni [dake [Mary]] watasi hon-o]]]]

   (→ *dake* takes *Mary* as its complement, the FocP in turn selected by
    the dative Case particle *ni*, *Mary* attracted to [Spec,*dake*])

  [ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ ni [***Mary***$_i$-dake t$_i$] watasi hon-o]]]]

   (→ the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,*ni*])

  [ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ [[***Mary***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$-ni t$_j$] watasi hon-o]]]]

   (→ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged, V-v-T movement
    applied)

  [$_{TP}$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ [[***Mary***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$-ni t$_j$] t$_k$ hon-o]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ [[***Mary***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$-ni t$_j$] t$_k$ hon-o]]]]$_n$

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{k\text{-}l}$-ta t$_n$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the DP *Mary* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

Similarly, the derivation for (2e) should go as follows.[26]

(25) [ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ [dake [ni [Mary]]] watasi hon-o]]]]

($\rightarrow$ The dative Case particle *ni* takes *Mary* as its complement, *dake* in turn selects the dative PP, *Mary* attracted to [Spec,*ni*], the result of which attracted to [Spec,*dake*])

[ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ [***Mary***$_i$-ni t$_i$]$_j$-dake t$_j$] watasi hon-o]]]]

($\rightarrow$ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged, V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{k\text{-}l}$-ta [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ [[***Mary***$_i$-ni t$_i$]$_j$-dake t$_j$] t$_k$ hon-o]]]]]

($\rightarrow$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ [***Mary***$_i$-ni t$_i$]$_j$-dake t$_j$] t$_k$ hon-o]]]]$_n$

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{k\text{-}l}$-ta t$_n$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the dative PP *Mary-ni* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

It is also to be noted that the dative PP *Mary-ni* is counted here as a nominal-like element to be attached by the F-particle *dake*.

Next, let us turn to the derivations for (2f,g), which should look something like the following:

(26) [ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi [o [dake [hon]]]]]]]

($\to$ *dake* takes *hon* as its complement, the FocP in turn is selected by the accusative Case particle *o*, *hon* attracted to [Spec,*dake*])

[ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi [o [***hon***$_i$-dake t$_i$]]]]]]]

($\to$ the whole FocP attracted to [Spec,*o*])

[ga [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni watasi [[***hon***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$ [o t$_j$]]]]]]]

($\to$ *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*], T merged, V-v-T movement applied)

[$_{TP}$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_k$ [[***hon***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$

[o t$_j$]]]]]]]]

($\to$ *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_m$-ga [$_{vP}$ t$_m$ [t$_l$ [$_{VP}$ Mary-ni t$_k$ [[***hon***$_i$-dake t$_i$]$_j$ [o t$_j$]]]]]]]$_n$

[$_{T'}$ [$_T$ watasi$_{k-l}$-ta t$_n$]]]

$\to$ Since the DP *hon* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing condition in (3).

In (26), if the accusative Case particle is dropped/phonologically null, the surface form in (2f) obtains. Now, the important question is why (2h) is ungrammatical. Although I cannot pin down the exact source of the ungrammaticality of (2h), I will speculate that the maximal nominal unit to be concatenated with the accusative Case particle must be immediately to its left in PF along with the assumption that the F-particle *dake* retains nominality (cf. Aoyagi's 1998 idea on morphological requirements on particles in Japanese). To put it differently, the accusative Case particle must be located outside the whole related nominal expression at PF. This might have to do with the phonological realization of the accusative Case particle in Japanese. In (2h), since the accusative Case particle occurs to the left of the F-particle *dake*, this PF condition on the accusative Case particle is violated.[27]

Finally, the reason for the ungrammaticality of (2i-m) is to be attributable

to the violation of the F-particle's selectional requirement: it can only take a nominal-like element (or the verbal unit VP) as its complement. Note that in (2i-m) *dake* putatively takes a non-finite TP as its complement. Hence, the ungrammaticality of (2i-m), irrespective of the positions of the associates within the non-finite TP.

3.3. An Extension to Association with Wide Focus in Japanese

The Kaynean analysis of association with narrow focus in Japanese that I have developed in the preceding sections will bring some interesting consequences to the analysis of association with wide focus, viz., another type of association with focus in Japanese which has been well-known in the literature since Kuroda's (1965) original observation. First, consider the following paradigm in (27) involving the K-particle *mo*, adapted from Aoyagi (1999: 33, (12)):[28]

(27) (Kinoo-no paatii-de-wa Mary-ga odotta dake-de naku …)

    yesterday-Gen party-at-Top Mary-Nom danced not-only but …

    ('At yesterday's party, it not only happened that Mary danced, but …)

    a. John-ga piano-o hiki-mo sita.

       John-Nom piano-Acc play-also did

       '(Intended) It also happened that John played the piano.'

    b. John-ga piano-mo hiita.

       John-Nom piano-also played

       '(Intended) It also happened that John played the piano.'

    c. John-mo piano-o hiita.

       John-also piano-Acc played

       '(Intended) It also happened that John played the piano.'

Under the precontext in (27), all the sentences in (27a-c) can be naturally

uttered on the intended interpretations, although both (27b) and (27c) may definitely have a more prominent narrow focus association interpretation, as discussed in the preceding sections.

Recall from section 3.2 that the interpretation of sentences such as (27a) with the whole proposition *[John-ga piano-o hiki]* being the associate of the K-particle *mo* involves the stage of its derivation where the non-finite TP *[John-ga piano-o hiki]* is in [Spec,*mo*], as required by the licensing condition in (3). If the licensing condition holds in general and the interpretation of association with wide focus in (27b-c) also requires the same as in (27a), the derivations of (27b-c) with the interpretation of association with wide focus should involve the stage at which a propositional unit occupies [Spec,*mo*]. Given this assumption, the relevant derivations for (27b) and (27c) would proceed as (28) and (29), respectively:

(28)   [mo [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano(-o)]]]]

   ($\rightarrow$ vP attracted to [Spec, *mo*])

 [[$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano(-o)]]]$_i$ [mo t$_i$]]

   ($\rightarrow$ W merged, raising of *mo* to W, *piano(-o)* attracted to [Spec, W])

[piano(-o)$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ hii t$_k$]]]$_i$* [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]

   ($\rightarrow$ the nominative Case particle *ga* merged, *John* attracted to [Spec,*ga*])

[John$_l$-ga [piano(-o)$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [v [$_{VP}$ hii t$_k$]]]$_i$* [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]

   ($\rightarrow$ T merged, V-v-T movement applied, *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

[$_{TP}$ [John$_l$-ga [piano(-o)$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ t$_l$ [t$_n$ [$_{VP}$ t$_m$ t$_k$]]]$_i$* [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]$_o$

                            [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ hii$_{m-n}$-ta t$_o$]]]

$\rightarrow$ Since the vP *[John hii piano(-o)]* is the only element in [Spec, *mo*], it will be licensed as the associate of *mo* in accordance with the

licensing condition in (3).

(29)   [mo [$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano-o]]]]

      (→ vP attracted to [Spec, *mo*])

  [*[$_{vP}$ John [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano-o]]]*$_i$ [mo t$_i$]]

      (→ W merged, raising of *mo* to W, *John* attracted to [Spec, W])

  [John$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano-o]]]*$_i$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]

      (→ the null nominative Case particle *Øga* merged)

  [Øga [John$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [v [$_{VP}$ hii piano-o]]]*$_i$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]

      (→ T merged, V-v-T movement applied, *ga*P attracted to [Spec,T])

  [$_{TP}$ [Øga [John$_k$ mo$_j$+W [*[$_{vP}$ t$_k$ [t$_m$ [$_{VP}$ t$_l$ piano-o]]]*$_i$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]$_n$

                                                      [$_{T'}$ [$_T$ hii$_{l\text{-}m}$-ta t$_n$]]]

→ Since the vP *[John hii piano(-o)]* is the only element in [Spec, *mo*],
   it will be licensed as the associate of *mo* in accordance with the
   licensing condition in (3).

    Next, let us look at the case of association with wide focus containing
the F-particle *dake*. Aoyagi (1998, 1999) observes that, unlike the K-particles
like *mo*, the F-particle *dake* cannot extend its domain of focus beyond VP.
Consider the following paradigms adapted from Aoyagi (1998: 160–161):

(30) a. John-wa [$_{VP}$ manga-o yon]-da-dake-de zenzen benkyoo-si-nakatta.
     John-Top   comics-Acc read-only   at all   study-do-did not
     'John only read comics and did not study at all.'

   b. John-wa [$_{VP}$ manga-dake yon]-de zenzen benkyoo-si-nakatta.
     John-Top   comics-only read   at all   study-do-did not
     'Lit. John read only comics and did not study at all.'

(31) (Watasi-no kioku-de-wa …)

I-Gen   memory-by-Top

('To the best of my memory, …)

a. [John-ga [$_{VP}$ sara-o arat]]-ta-dake desita.

   John-Nom dish-Acc washed only Cop-Past

   'It only happened that John washed dishes.'

b. [John-ga [$_{VP}$ sara-dake arai]] masita.

   John-Nom dish-only wash Pol-Past

   'John washed only dishes.'

Given an appropriate precontext, (30b) and (31b) could be interpreted on a par with (30a) and (31b), respectively, under the association with wide focus involving *dake*.

Recall from section 3.1 that I postulated that the F-particle *dake* can occur as an independent functional head separated from the focus-associate. More specifically, I will assume that it can take VP as its complement underlyingly just like the F-particle *mo*. Given this assumption, the relevant derivations for (30b) and (31b) should look something like (32) and (33), respectively (I will only show the relevant portion of the derivation for (30b) and (31b) just for expository simplicity below):

(32) [dake [$_{VP}$ yon manga]]

            (→ VP attracted to [Spec,*dake*], W merged)

      [W [$_{VP}$ *yon manga*]$_i$ [dake t$_i$]]]

            (→ raising of *dake* to W, *manga* attracted to [Spec,W], v merged,
               John merged)

      [$_{vP}$ John [v [manga$_k$ [dake$_j$+W[$_{VP}$ *yon t$_k$*]$_i$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]]]

            …………………………………………………………………

      → Since the VP *[yon manga]* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will
         be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing

condition in (3).

(33) [dake [$_{VP}$ arai sara]]

 (→ VP attracted to [Spec,*dake*], W merged)

[W [*$_{VP}$ arai sara*]$_i$ [dake t$_i$]]]

 (→ raising of *dake* to W, *sara* attracted to [Spec,W], v merged,
 John merged)

[$_{vP}$ John [v [sara$_k$ [dake$_j$+W[*$_{VP}$ arai t$_k$*]$_i$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]]]]

 …………………………………………………………

→ Since the VP *[arai sara]* is the only element in [Spec,*dake*], it will
 be licensed as the associate of *dake* in accordance with the licensing
 condition in (3).

It is to be noted that, unlike the case of association with narrow focus, association with wide focus in Japanese involves a reordering process during the course of derivation in which the focus particle will be raised to the abstract functional head W, which is followed by some phrasal movement to [Spec,W], "masking" such an "invisible reordering." I believe that this derivational "markedness" is to be related to the "markedness" of association with wide focus in Japanese.

 To summarize, in this section, I have demonstrated that the Kaynean analysis of narrow focus association in Japanese can be naturally extended to the case of association with wide focus in Japanese. If the analysis in this section in on the right track, Kayne's (1998: 165, 2000: 250) conjecture must be partially modified to fully accommodate the case of association with wide focus in Japanese.

4. Some Consequences for Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) Paradigms

 In this section, I will consider some consequences of my Kaynean analysis

of association with (narrow and wide) focus to bear upon Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) paradigms on the properties of association with focus in Japanese.

4.1. Impossibility of Sideway Focus Shift

First, Aoyagi (1998, 1999) points out that there is no sideway shift of association with focus in Japanese, as illustrated in (34)–(35):

(34) (Kinoo Mary-wa John-o karakatta si …)

yesterday Mary-Top John-Acc made fun of and …

('Yesterday, Mary made fun of John, and …)

a. (kanozyo-wa) kare-o buti-mo sita.

She-Top   him-Acc slap-also did

'(She) also SLAPPED him.'

b.#(kanozyo-wa) kare-mo butta.

She-Top   him-also slapped

'Lit.(She) slapped also HIM.'

(= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 42, (28))

(35) (Kinoo-wa Mary-ga John-o karakatta si …)

yeterday-Top Mary-Nom John-Acc made fun of and …

('Yesterday, Mary made fun of John, and …')

a. Lucy-ga kare-o karakai-mo sita.

Lucy-Nom him-Acc make fun of-also did

'LUCY also made fun of him.'

b.#Lucy-ga kare-mo karakatta.

Lucy-Nom him-also made fun of

'Lit.Lucy made fun also of HIM.'

(= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 46, fn.22, (i))

As indicated in (34b), the focus particle *mo* attached to the object cannot be associated with the verb so that it has the same interpretation as (34a). Similarly, as (35b) shows, the focus particle *mo* attached to the object cannot be associated with the subject to yield the same interpretation as (35a). How can this impossibility of shifting focus sideways be accounted for under my analysis in the text? If (34b) and (35b) involve association with narrow focus, then only *kare* 'him' is to be interpreted as the focus associate, being located at [Spec,*mo*] during the course of derivation. Thus, there are no other possibilities for focus association.

On the other hand, if (34b) and (35b) involve association with wide focus, there should be a stage of derivation where the whole vP *[kanozyo but kare]/[Lucy karakat kare]* is located at [Spec,*mo*]. Thus, apparently, focus association with the verb or the subject seems to be possible on a par with (34a) and (35a), respectively, as it stands. One possibility to account for lack of such focus association is to appeal to the existence of the focus particle raising to W in the case of association with wide focus, as discussed in section 3.3. Notice that as a result of raising of the focus particle to W, the head of the FocP will turn into a trace. Given this, I will speculate that, although the whole phrase is licensed as the focus associate once it lands on [Spec, Foc], the licensing of its subpart as the focus associate might well requires that it remain at the Spec of the <u>overt</u> focus particle head throughout the derivation. Admittedly, more in-depth investigation into this matter is called for before arriving at the final conclusion.

4.2. An Argument-Adjunct Asymmetry

Second, Aoyagi (1996, 1998, 1999) also observes an argument-adjunct asymmetry with respect to possibility of wide focus association, as illustrated below:

(36) (John-wa maiasa tyuusya-o utta dake-de naku …)

    John-Top every morning shot-Acc took not only but

    ('John not only took a shot every morning, but …)

    a. itiniti sankai kusuri-o nomi-mo sita.

       one day three-times medicine-Acc take-also did.

       '(he) also took medicine three times a day.'

    b. itiniti sankai kusuri-mo nonda.

       one day three-times medicine-also took

       'Lit.(he) took also medicine three times a day.'

    c. itiniti saikai-mo kusuri-o nonda.

       one day three-times-also medicine-Acc took

       '(he) took medicine as often as three times a day.'

                        (= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 46, (35))

(37) (Uti-ni kaette kara …)

    home-to came since …

    ('Since she came home, …)

    a. Mary-wa ippai mizu-o non-da-dake da.

       Mary-Top one-CL water-Acc drank-only Cop

       'Lit.it is only that Mary has drunk one glass of water.'

    b. Mary-wa ippai mizu-dake nonda.

       Mary-Top one-CL water-only drank

       'Mary has drunk only one glass of water.'

    c. Mary-wa ippai-dake mizu-o nonda.

       Mary-Top one-CL-only water-Acc drank

       'Mary has drunk only one glass of water.'

                        (= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 47, (36))

It has been standardly established in the literature that, although operator

phrases formed from adjuncts are subject to movement, adjuncts *per se* do not form chains by "long" movement unlike arguments (cf. Saito 1985, Chomsky 1995: 48 *inter alia*.). Thus, in both (36) and (37), it is not plausible to take that an adjunct like *itiniti sankai* or *ippai* has undergone movement from the VP-internal position to the VP-external [Spec, W] to obtain association with wide focus. Thus, the only possibility for adjuncts in (36) and (37) is to merge as a complement to the particle *mo* or *dake*, followed by attraction to [Spec, *mo*] and [Spec, *dake*], respectively.[29] Notice that as far as the interpretation of the particle *mo* in (36) is concerned, it carries a degree interpretation such as "as often as," which is quite different from the usual focus particle *mo* 'also' (cf. Aoyagi 1999:49, fn.27). Thus, it seems reasonable to take the particle *mo* attached to an adjunct in (36) as not an instance of the focus particle *mo* under discussion in Japanese.

4.3. Dislocated DPs

Third, Aoyagi (1999) observes that once an argument DP with a focus particle is moved to a sentence-initial position by scrambling or topicalization, association with wide focus becomes impossible, as illustrated below:

(38) (Kinoo-wa iroiro mezurasii koto-ga atta. 4-gatu nanoni
   yesterday-Top many unusual things-Nom April though
   ooyuki-ga hutta, sosite …)
   heavy snow-Nom fell and
   ('Yesterday, many unusual things happened. Although it is April by now,
    it snowed heavily, and …')
   a. Mary-ga gohan-o tukuri-mo sita.
      Mary-Nom meal-Acc make-also did
      'It also happened that Mary made a meal.'

b. Mary-ga gohan-mo tukutta.

   Mary-Nom meal-also made

   'Lit.Mary made also a meal.'

c. gohan-mo Mary-ga ec tukutta.

   meal-also Mary-Nom made

   'Lit.Also a meal, Mary made.'

<div align="right">(= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 50, (38))</div>

(39) (Uti-ni kaette kara …)

   home-to came since …

   ('Since he came home, …)

   a. John-wa hahaoya-ni tegami-o kaita-dake da.

      John-Top mother-to letter-Acc wrote-only Cop

      'John has only written a letter to his mother.'

   b. John-wa hahaoya-ni tegami-dake kaita.

      John-Top mother-to letter-only wrote

      'John has written only a letter to his mother.'

   c. tegami-dake John-wa hahaoya-ni ec kaita.

      Letter-only John-Top mother-to   wrote

      'Lit.Only a letter, John has written to his mother.'

<div align="right">(= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 50–51, (39))</div>

In order to obtain the interpretation of association with wide focus in (38c), the focus particle *mo* must take the vP *[Mary tukur gohan]* as its Spec, followed by raising of the subject DP *Mary* to [Spec,*ga*], raising of *mo* to W, raising of the object DP *gohan* to [Spec, W], V-to-v-to-T movement, plus the whole WP movement to [Spec,T]. Note that in (38c) the abstract functional head W must be merged between T and *ga*P, breaking the former selectional relation with the latter, which I take is responsible for the impossibility of taking (38c) as

involving association with wide focus.

As for (39c), the interpretation of association of wide focus is not an option from the beginning, since the F-particle *dake* can only take VP at its Spec, thus, placing the abstract functional head W higher than the topic head is simply impossible. Hence, the lack of association with wide focus reading in (39c).

4.4. Upperboundedness

Finally, Aoyagi (1999) observes that *mo* in (40b) cannot take matrix scope unlike in (40a), as illustrated below:

(40) (John-wa Mary-ga sake-o nomeru to omotteiru dake de naku …)

John-Top Mary-Nom sake-Acc drink-can Comp think not only but

a. (kare-wa)[Nancy-ga sasimi-o taberareru to] sinzite-mo iru.

Nancy-Nom raw fish-Acc eat-can Como believe-also be

'(He) also believes that Nancy can eat raw fish.'

b. (kare-wa) [Nancy-ga sasimi-mo taberareru to] sinzite iru.

Nancy-Nom raw fish-also eat-can Comp believe be

'(He) believes that Nancy can eat also raw fish.'

(= adapted from Aoyagi 1999: 53, (41))

Notice that in order to derive (40b) from the underlying structure for (40a) to obtain the matrix scope interpretation of *mo* in (40b), the abstract functional head W must be introduced within a lower cycle, viz., the embedded clause. But, such a counter-cyclic merger is in general prohibited in UG, accounting for the lack of matrix scope reading of *mo* in (40b).

5. Summary and Conclusion

As an alternative to Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) LF-movement-based analysis

of association with focus in Japanese, I proposed an extension of Kayne's (1998, 2000) overt movement approach to the association with focus in English into the comparable empirical domain in Japanese. It was demonstrated that the Kaynean analysis could successfully capture all the phenomena of association with focus in Japanese (both narrow focus and wide focus) as a result of series of overt movement operations, which are supplied by UG. At this point, it remains to be seen which of the two approaches is superior both theoretically and empirically. However, to the extent that my analysis of association with focus in Japanese is tenable at all, it could do away with such theoretical devices as [+focus] feature copying from the focus particle to any element c-commanded by it at the time of merger and the optional process of percolating/propagating [+focus] feature up in the tree assumed in Aoyagi (1998, 1999). This may well be a welcome move in terms of the tenet of the minimalist program (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001a,b). It was also pointed out that Kayne's (1998, 2000) conjecture on association with focus in "head-final" languages like Japanese is partly correct: it holds only for the association with narrow focus in Japanese, but it does not apply to the association with wide focus in the language.

Notes

1   See also Kayne (2003a,b) for discussions of such an overt movement approach to the phenomenon in question and its refinement. Although I will keep to the version in Kayne (1998, 2000) in this paper, the version in Kayne

(2003a,b) would be equally implementable in analyzing the phenomenon of association with focus in Japanese.

2   A comparison between Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) analysis and my own analysis in the text is beyond the scope of this paper, so I will leave it to future research.

3   I will refer to the kind of association with focus in which the focus associate is located within the c-command domain of a focus particle as "association with narrow focus" and the one where such a c-command relation does not hold as "association with wide focus," following Aoyagi's (1998, 1999) terms. Since the phenomenon of so-called association with wide focus in Japanese will be dealt with in section 3.3, the paradigms in (1)-(2) do not contain such a case in point.

4   Although Aoyagi (1998, 1999), following Yamada (1936), judges that both *DP-o-dake* and *DP-dake-o* are fine, I find the former quite unacceptable, disagreeing with their position on this matter. Furthermore, Aoyagi (1998, 1999) judges that the focus particle *dake* in Japanese can appear in the environment as in (2h–m), I do not concur with his judgments on this matter, either. Several informants I consulted with also agreed with my judgments. Thus, the paradigm in (2) does not solely reflect my judgments. See also Teramura (1991:156–157) on this matter.

5   Although Aoyagi (1998, 1999) does not mention the possibility of the subject as the associate of the focus particle *mo* in such a configuration as (9i), I judge that it is also possible as an option. Thus, I will explicitly include the case in the paradigm in (1).

6   Addressing the issues related to the mechanism of semantic interpretation of association with focus in Japanese in the text is beyond the scope of this paper. In this connection, Herburger's (2000) approach of event semantics to focus utilizing structured Davidsonian decomposition seems to be a promising line of research, but, I will leave an attempt at applying her event semantics to the domain of association with focus in Japanese to another occasion.

7   In this paper, departing from Kayne (1998, 2000), I will simply assume that attraction of some phrase to [Spec,Foc] is triggered by the requirement that an EPP-feature at the Foc head be satisfied and that such an operation can in principle be independent of the operation Agree, unlike Chomsky (2000, 2001a,b) (see also Dejima 2000, Miyagawa 2001, Takano 2003 for the view that movement can be driven solely by an EPP-feature without involving

Agree). One of the reasons for my not committing myself to the possibility that the relation between the focus-sensitive particle and its associate is mediated by a kind of formal feature-checking/Agree comes from the fact in (i) below pointed out by Kayne (1998: 156, 2000: 271, n.70):

(i) John is only doing PRE-doctoral work this year.

Given the fact that the focus particle *only* can be associated with the prefix *pre-* in (i), the relation between the focus particle *only* and its associate cannot be established in syntactic terms such as (LF) categorial/feature movement or Agree. This is so because, for such syntactic operations, the whole adjectival unit *[pre-doctoral]* is opaque, due to lexical integrity concerning derivational morphology. I will take it that this holds in natural languages in general. On the other hand, Tancredi (2004) observes some island-like effects with respect to association with focus in English. Thus, it remains to be seen how such locality effects could be handled without invoking an overt/covert movement of the focus-associate to (the neighborhood of) the focus-sensitive operator. I will leave an investigation into this issue to another occasion.

8   Aoyagi (1994, 1996) and Maki (1995) among others take the position that focus particles stand as heads that project. On the other hand, appealing to Sells (1995), Aoyagi (1998) argues that such an assumption on focus particles cannot account for "categorial transparency effects" of focus particles with respect to (categorial) selection. They reason that since an independent focus particle head intervenes between a selecting head and its selected (maximal projection of a) head, the relevant selectional relation will be broken by the focus particle. Based on this reasoning, Aoyagi (1998) proposes that focus particles be treated as adjunct clitics, with their adjunct status being the source for their categorial transparency effects. However, there is an alternative account for the effects in question. Suppose that such an intervening effect with respect to (categorial) selection is regulated by c-command in such a way that in (i) below X cannot select for Z(P) due to the intervening head Y c-commanding Z(P) (see Collins 2001 for a similar view):

(i) $[_{XP}$ X $[_{YP}$ Y $[_{ZP}$ Z …]]]

   (where X c-command Y(P), and Y c-command Z(P))

Under my analysis of focus particles in conjunction with the Kaynean head-initial structure in Japanese, a focus particle is a head Y which attracts an element, say, ZP in (i) to its Spec, as illustrated below:

(ii) $[_{XP}$ X $[_{YP}$ $[_{ZP}$ Z …$]_i$ $[_{Y'}$ Y $t_i]]]$

Suppose that the relevant selectional relation between X and Z(P) is established at the stage in (ii). Notice that according to Kayne (1994) and Chomsky (1995) a Spec element cannot be c-commanded by its right-hand head. Thus, in (ii) although X c-commands Z(P), Y does not c-command Z(P). Hence, it can be correctly predicted that no intervention effects will occur. If this reasoning is on the right track, the "categorial transparency effects" argument against the focus particle head projection analysis in Sells (1995) and Aoyagi (1998) does not necessarily hold water. Thus, I will assume in this paper, following Aoyagi (1994, 1996) and Maki (1995) among others, that a focus particle can head its own functional projection FocP.

9   Kayne (1998, 2000) accounts for the following contrast (in his dialect of English) on the basis of the assumption that the focus operator *only* is not directly merged with the DP *Bill* (Kayne 1998, 2000 puts ? in front of (ia) just to indicate that speakers show a substantially different range of judgments from fully acceptable to fully unacceptable):

(i) a. ?John spoke to only Bill.

   b. John spoke only to Bill.

Kayne argues that (ib) should have the following derivation:

(ii) … only spoke to Bill $\rightarrow$ (attraction by *only*)

   … [to Bill$_i$ only] spoke t_i $\rightarrow$ (raising of *only* to W)

   … only$_j$+W [to Bill$_i$ t_j] spoke t_i $\rightarrow$ (VP-preposing to [Spec, W])

   … [[spoke $t_i]_k$ only$_j$+W] [to Bill$_i$ t_j] t_k

In comparison with (ib), Kayne points out that (ia) would be generated if the focus operator *only* could attract the DP *Bill*, stranding the preposition *to*. Then, he suggests that such a P-stranding under attraction to *only* is not available on a par with the cases in the middle or heavy-NP shift construction, as illustrated below:

(iii) a. *That kind of person doesn't speak to very easily.

    b. *I was speaking to about linguistics the same person you were.

If Kayne's reasoning is in the right direction, the assumption that the focus operator *only* does not merge with the DP *Bill* is tenable (see Kayne 1998, 2000 for more detailed explication on this point).

10   In this paper, I will not be concerned with the exact status of the abstract functional head W postulated in Kayne (1998, 2000), simply assuming such a functional element is made available for all languages by UG. See Kayne

(2003a,b) and references cited therein for relevant discussions on the status of such a functional head. Kayne (1998, 2000) puts forward the following conjecture in (i):

(i) Conjecture: Languages that are like Japanese in being robustly head-final (in particular having little or no 'leakage' of arguments to the right of V) never have *only*, *even*, *too* raising to W (i.e., never have these elements preceding their associated XP).

<div align="right">(= Kayne 1998: 165, 2000: 250, (166))</div>

I will claim in this paper that the conjecture in (i) is partly correct with respect to Japanese. More specifically, it will be demonstrated that (i) can only hold for the association with "narrow focus" and that the association with "wide focus" requires raising of elements like *mo* 'also, too' and *dake* 'only' to W in Japanese during the course of derivation, even though at surface those focus particles never precede their associated XP. I will return to this point in section 3.3.

11 If Vance (1993) is correct, case particles in Japanese cannot be considered as inflectional affixes or possibly clitics.

12 Whitman (2001) alludes to several pieces of evidence in support of the nominative Case particle as a clausal head. Among them is the fact that *ga*-marked subject cannot undergo scrambling or clefting (cf. Kuno 1973, Saito 1985, and Shibatani 1990 for the former and Hoji 1990 for the latter), as illustrated below:

(i) *[sono hon-ga]$_i$ [Taroo-ga [t$_i$ ii to] omotteiru (koto)
   that book-Nom Taroo-Nom good Comp thinks (fact)
   '(… that) that book, Taroo thinks is good.'
(ii) *Eri-o aisiteiru no-wa Mari-ga da
   Eri-Acc loves Comp-Top Mari-Nom Cop
   'It is Mari who loves Eri.'

If the nominative Case particle *ga* is a clausal head, then it will not make up a constituent with the preceding DP. Hence, it is correctly predicted that the sequence of *DP-ga* cannot undergo any movement. Note in passing that if the analysis of the K-particle *mo* 'also' in the text is correct, it is predicted that *mo* cannot be attached to the focus element of the cleft construction on a par with the nominative Case particle. Fukui and Sakai (2003: 338) judges the following sentence as acceptable:

(iii) ringo-o   tabeta-no-wa Taroo-mo da
    apple-Acc ate-NL-Top   Taroo-also Cop

'It is also Taroo that ate apples.'

Does the apparent acceptability of (iii) pose any problem to the text analysis? Not exactly. Although I agree with Fukui and Sakai (2003) on the apparent acceptability of (iii), I believe that the acceptable surface form of (iii) is to be derived from the following underlying form with the deletion of the portion *na-no* by predicate ellipsis (cf. Fukui and Sakai 2003):

(iv) ringo-o tabeta-no-wa Taroo-mo ~~na-no~~ da.

    Apple-Acc ate-NL-Top Taroo-also Cop-NL Cop

Thus, if this possibility of derivation is removed when judging (iii), I believe that (iii) is ill-formed as a genuine cleft construction. In this connection, it is instructive to compare the following paradigm involving another K-particle *wa* 'contrastive':

(v) a. *ringo-o tabeta-no-wa Taroo-wa da. (= cleft)

     apple-Acc ate-NL-Top Taroo-Cont Cop

   b. *ringo-o tabeta-no-wa Taroo-wa ~~na-no~~ da. (= predicate ellipsis)

     Apple-Acc ate-NL-Top Taroo-Cont Cop-NL Cop

Note that in this case both the cleft in (va) and the predicate ellipsis in (vb) are ill-formed. This fact seems to give credence to my reanalysis of Fukui and Sakai's (2003) example in (iii) above.

13   I will assume that the nominative Case phrase projection is selected by T in the clausal architecture, since it is well-known that, in Japanese, the nominative Case-marked phrase is licensed by tense T (see, e.g., Shibatani 1977, Takezawa 1987, Ura 2000).

14   I will assume with Honda (1999, 2002, 2003) that there is V-to-T movement via v in Japanese under the Kaynean underlying SVO order. The obligatoriness of V-movement to T via v might be due to the suffixal properties of V, v, and T in Japanese (cf. Chomsky 2001b: 10). See Hoshi (in preparation) for some consequences of the theory of phrase structure that I am adopting in the text in connection with issues related to V-movement in Japanese.

15   With respect to the characterization of the nature of the K-particle and the F-particle here, I am following Aoyagi (1998, 1999) in assuming that the former is [+F,−L], i.e., a purely functional category and the latter is [+F, +L], i.e., a functional category with lexical properties. However, I am implementing the distinction in a different theorizing, by claiming that although the K-particle can only be merged as a functional head independent of a nominal element, the F-particle can be either merged as such or merged

directly with a nominal element due to the featural compositions of the two focus particles. Unlike K-particles, F-particles retain nominality, thus, only the latter can appear DP-internally.

16   Kazumi Matsuoka (personal communication) brought my attention to the fact that (some) children acquiring Japanese will produce the sequence of *DP-mo-wa(-ga)*, but not *DP-wa-mo(-ga)*. One possibility is that at that point of language acquisition they are taking both of the K-particle *wa* and *mo* on a par with the F-particle *dake*, so that they can be merged into the nominal projection which is to be moved to [Spec, *ga*], rather than merged as an independent functional element. But, it remains to be seen why the relative order *mo-wa* is allowed, while the opposite *wa-mo* is not under this analysis.

Alternatively, another possibility, which seems to be more interesting, is that the very sequence *DP-mo-wa(-ga)* reflects the relative functional clausal hierarchy in Japanese among the particles *mo*, *wa*, and ga, as illustrated below:

(i) a. [-ga [-wa [-mo [… DP . . .]]]]

   b. [DP_i [mo_j-wa_k-ga [t_k [t_j [… t_i . . .]]]]]

(ia) is the underlying structure, and *mo* is head-moved to the contrastive topic particle *wa*, with the complex *wa-mo* being head-moved to *ga*, plus the DP is raised to [Spec, *ga*], yielding the order in (ib). Under this analysis, it remains to be accounted for why the particles *wa* and *mo* can enter into head-movement, no requiring their Spec to be overly filled unlike in adult Japanese grammar. I will leave an in-depth investigation into this matter to future research, though. See Matsuoka (2004) for details on children's acquisition of the additive particle *mo* in Japanese.

17   See Aoyagi (1998: chap.3) for an alternative attempt to account for the co-occurrence restrictions and the relative orders among Case-particles/ postpositions and focus particles such as (14)–(15) based on specified morphological selectional requirements of functional or lexical heads in conjunction with his theory of morphological case.

18   Although I will limit attention to the simplex sentence environment here, both *mo* and *dake* can appear to the right of the complementizer *to*, as illustrated in (i) below:

(i) a. Bill-wa [[John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita) to]-mo itta.

   Bill-Top John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc handed to Comp also said

   'Lit.Bill said also that John handed a book to Mary.'

b. Bill-wa [[John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita] to]-dake itta.

    Bill-Top John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc handed to Comp only said

    'Lit.Bill said only that John handed a book to Mary.'

However, with respect to the distribution of the K-particle *mo*, there is a restriction to the effect that it cannot appear to the right of a finite T at surface, unlike the F-particle *dake*, as illustrated in (ii) below (see Kishimoto 2001 for a similar observation on the distribution of the Q-particle *mo* in indeterminate pronoun binding in Japanese):

(ii) a. *Bill-wa [[John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita]-mo to] itta.

    Bill-Top John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc handed to also Comp said

    'Lit.Bill said that also John handed a book to Mary.'

  b. Bill-wa [[John-ga Mary-ni hon-o watasita]-dake da to] itta.

    Bill-Top John-Nom Mary-Dat book-Acc handed to only Cop Comp said

    'Lit.Bill said that it is only that John handed a book to Mary.'

This fact seems to suggest the following generalization under my Kaynean analysis in the text:

(iii) The K-particle *mo* in Japanese cannot take a finite TP as its complement.

19   I will assume that the accusative Case marker can be optionally dropped in Japanese (cf. Saito 1983, 1985 *inter alia.*).

20   In discussing the phenomenon of binding of indeterminate pronouns by Q-particles/focus particles like *mo* 'also,' Kishimoto (2001) adopts the assumption that *mo* can be directly merged with/affixed to V to form a complex verbal unit [V-mo], which in turn moves to v overtly in Japanese. I will depart from Kishimoto (2001) in assuming that K-particles like *mo* never directly merges with V in Japanese. However, there is a possibility that the Q-particle *mo* 'every' to be associated with an indeterminate pronoun is syntactically and semantically different from the additive focus-sensitive particle *mo* 'also' in the context of association with focus, so I will leave an investigation of indeterminate pronoun binding in Japanese to another occasion, without implying they are the same phenomena (cf. also Takahashi 2002 for a treatment of indeterminate pronoun binding in the framework of minimalist program). An in-depth research is called for to decide whether the two phenomena can be lumped together or not. If Takahashi (2002) is correct, the Q-particle *mo* 'every' is a D which selects an indeterminate to make up a DP. Thus, it must always be merged within a

DP, unlike the case of the additive *mo* 'also' in Japanese.

21 Teramura (1984, chap.4) claims that predicative conjugation in Japanese involves a stem and its inflection and that the inflectional element is a kind of functional morpheme with the function of indicating the speaker's mood. Thus, if this kind of "modal" inflectional element is an instance of T in Japanese, the assumption here does not seem to be off the mark. Bloch (1946a,b) identifies the traditionally called *renyookei* of V as a kind of infinitive form. I will follow his characterization on this matter.

22 I will follow Kuroda (1965) in assuming that in this context what he calls *su*-support applies, where the dummy light verb *su* is inserted under T to support its tense in Japanese.

23 If this dummy "unaccusative" light verb has also a vP layer, v is merged after V. But, for expository simplicity, I will omit such a layer here.

24 The traditionally so-called "VP-fronting" as in (i) will disambiguate this ambiguity. Only the heavy verb *suru*, which assigns an Agent role to the subject, allows such an operation, as illustrated by the contrast in (ii) below (cf. Hasegawa 1990: 250)

(i) [[[Mary-ni hon-o watasi]-mo]$_i$ [John-ga t$_i$ sita]]
     Mary-Dat book-Acc hand to-also John-Nom did
     'Hand a book to Mary, John did.'

(ii) a. ame-ga huri-mo sita.
         Rain-Nom fall-also did
         'Lit.Also rain fell.'
      b.*[[huri]-mo]$_i$ ame-ga t$_i$ sita.
         fall-also rain-Nom did
         'Lit.Also fall, rain did.'

(ii) contains an unaccusative verb *huru* 'fall', which does not assign an Agent role to the subject. Hence, the ungrammaticality in (iib). Although Hoji, Miyagawa and Tada (1989) identify the relevant movement as in (i) as an instance of VP (or vP in the current term) movement by scrambling, if my analysis in the text is on the right track, it should be identified as a FocP movement by scrambling. See Hasegawa (1990) for an argument that shows the predicate internal subject hypothesis is compatible with such a "VP preposing" phenomenon, contrary to Hoji, Miyagawa, and Tada's (1989) claim.

25 Here, I will follow Kayne's (1998, 2000) suggestion for the DP-internal *only* in English to the effect that there is possibly no W to be generated

within the (extended) projection of DP in general. Although there remains a possibility for the opposite, I will employ the simpler possibility for the DP-internal K-particle *dake* in this section.

26 It will be claimed in section 3.3 that there is another possible derivation in cases like (26)–(28) under my analysis of association with the F-particle *dake*. Recall from section 3.1 that I am assuming that the F-particle *dake* can be merged to the verbal unit VP as well as to the nominal-like projection DP or PP. But, here, I will suppress the derivation involving the former possibility just for expository simplicity.

27 Notice that there is no such a PF requirement on the dative Case particle *–ni* in Japanese: it can occur either to the right or the left of the F-particle dake. This difference between the accusative Case particle and the dative Case particle might be related to the different modes of theta-marking with respect to the complement DP: the accusative Case particle-attached DP must receive its theta-role from V, while the dative Case-attached DP can obtain its theta-role from the "postposition-like" dative Case particle. I will leave a full investigation into this matter to future research, though.

28 Note in passing that when association with wide focus is involved, the element to the left of the focus particle is not put any focal stress. On top of that, in order to obtain such an association with wide focus, the contrasted vP content and VP content must be contextually clearly identified to give rise to an appropriate interpretation at hand.

29 I assume that "short" movement of adjuncts from the complement of the focus particle to the Spec of the focus particle is licit, unlike the "long" movement of adjuncts in question, on the grounds that the following examples allow for association with narrow focus:

(i) Mary-wa kyoo-mo eigo-o benkyoo-sita.
    Mary-Top today-also English-Acc studied
    'Lit. Mary studied English also today.'

(ii) Hanako-wa yukkurito-mo hanasita.
    Hanako-Top slowly-also   spoke
    'Lit. Hanako spoke also slowly.'

(cf. Okutsu et al. 1986:138, (18))

References

Aoyagi, Hiroshi. "On Association with Focus and Scope of Focus Particles in

Japanese." *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* 1, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 24, 23–44, 1994.

Aoyagi, Hiroshi. "On Kuroda's Scope Mystery." *Academia* 61, 97–133, Nanzan University, 1996.

Aoyagi, Hiroshi. On the Nature of Particles in Japanese and Its Theoretical Implications, Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1998.

Aoyagi, Hiroshi. 1999. "On Association of Quantifier-like Particles with Focus in Japanese." In Masatake Muraki and Enoch Iwamoto (eds.), *Linguistics: In Search of the Human Mind*, 24–56, Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Bloch, Bernard. "Studies in Colloquial Japanese, Part I, Inflection." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66, 97–109, 1946a.

Bloch, Bernard. "Studies in Colloquial Japanese, Part II, Syntax." *Language* 22, 200–248,1946b.

Chomsky, Noam. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridege, Mass: MIT Press, 1995.

Chomsky, Noam. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." In Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2000.

Chomsky, Noam. "Derivation by Phase." In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale:A Life in Language*, 1–52, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2001a.

Chomsky, Noam. "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy." *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20, 1–28, 2001b.

Collins, Chris. "Eliminating Labels." *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20, 1–25, 2001.

Dejima, Mayumi. "Scrambling as 'Agreeless Move' in Japanese." Paper Presented at the 121st Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan, 2000.

Fukui, Naoki and Hiromu Sakai. "The Visibility Guideline for Functional Categories: Verb Raising in Japanese and Related Issues." *Lingua* 113, 321–375, 2003.

60

Futagi, Yoko. Japanese Focus Particles at the Synatx-Semantics Interface. Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 2004.

Hasegawa, Nobuko. "On the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis." In Tsutomu Sakamoto and Yasuaki Abe (eds.), *Nihongo Kyouiku Kokusai Sinpoziumu Houkokusyo*, 249–254. Nanzan University, Nagoya, 1990.

Hashimoto, Shinkichi. *Zyosi-Zyodoosi no Kenkyuu*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969.

Herburger, Elena. *What Counts: Focus and Quantification*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2000.

Honda, Kensuke. Universal Word Order and Language Variation: A Case Study in Comparative Syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Dokkyo University, 1999.

Honda, Kensuke. "Hantaisyousei kara Mita Nihongotougoron [An Antisymmetric Approach to Japanese Syntax]." In Tsukuba Daigaku Gendaigengogaku Kenkyukai (ed.), *Zisedai no Gengokenkyu* I, 175–224, 2002.

Honda, Kensuke. "Antisymmetry and the Licensing of Negative Polarity Items in Japanese: A Preliminary Study." *Kogakuin Daigaku Kenkyu Ronsoo* 41, 151–164, 2003.

Hoji, Hajime. "Theories of Anaphora and Aspects of Japanese Syntax." Ms., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1990.

Hoji, Hajime, Shigeru Miyagawa, and Hiroaki Tada. "NP Movement in Japanese." Ms. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Ohio State University, and MIT, 1989.

Hoshi, Hidehito. "The Phrase Structure of Japanese and Scrambling." *ESCOL '99*, 95–106, 1999.

Hoshi, Koji. In preparation. The Head-Initial Clausal Configuration and V-Movement in Japanese. Ms., Keio University, Yokohama.

Jackendoff, Ray. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1972.

Kageyama, Taro. "Word formation in Japanese." *Lingua* 57, 215–258, 1982.

Kayne, Richard S. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press,

1994.

Kayne, Richard S. "Overt versus Covert Movement." *Syntax* 1, 128–191, 1998.

Kayne, Richard S. *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kayne, Richard S. "Antisymmetry and Japanese." *English Linguistics* 20, 1–40, 2003a.

Kayne, Richard S. "Some Remarks on Agreement and on Heavy-NP Shift." In Masatomo Ukaji, Masayuki Ike-Uchi and Yoshiki Nishimura (eds.), *Current Issues in English Linguistics*, 67–86. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 2003b.

Kishimoto, Hideki. "Binding of Indeterminate Pronouns and Clause Structure in Japanese." *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 597–633, 2001.

Kuno, Susumu. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973.

Kuroda, S.-Y. Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, 1965.

Kuroda, S.-Y. "Remarks on the Notion of Subject with Reference to Words Like *also*, *even* or *only*," Part I. *Annual Bulletin, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 3, 111–129, University of Tokyo, 1969.

Kuroda, S.-Y. "Remarks on the Notion of Subject with Reference to Words Like *also*, *even* or *only*," Part II. *Annual Bulletin, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 4, 127–152, University of Tokyo, 1970.

Maki, Hideki. The Syntax of Particles. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1995.

Matsuoka, Kazumi. "Addressing the Syntax/ Semantics/ Pragmatics Interface: The Acquisition of the Japanese Additive Particle *Mo*." Proceedings of the 28th Boston University Conference on Language Development, 2004.

Matsushita, Daizaburo. *Hyoozyun Nihonkoogohoo*. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1930.

Mihara, Ken-ichi. *Nihongo no Tougokouzou* [Syntactic Structure of Japanese].

Tokyo: Shohakusha, 1994.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. "Lexical categories in Japanese." *Lingua* 73, 29–51, 1987.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. "The EPP, Scrambling, and Wh-in-Situ." In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 293–338. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2001.

Ogawa, Sadayoshi. "Remnant Movement and Appelative Constructions in Medieval French." Paper presented at the Zisedai no Gengokenkyu IV at the University of Tsukuba on December 26, 2003.

Okutsu, Keiichiro, Yoshiko Numata, and Takeshi Sugimoto. *Iwayuru Nihongozyosi no Kenkyuu* [The Study on the So-called Japanese Particles], Tokyo: Bonjinsha, 1986.

Saito, Mamoru. "Case and Government in Japanese." *WCCFL* 2, 247–259, 1983.

Saito, Mamoru. Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, 1985.

Sells, Peter. "Korean and Japanese Morphology from a Lexical Perspective." *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 277–325, 1995.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. "Grammatical Relations and Surface Cases." *Language* 53, 789–809, 1977.

Takahashi, Daiko. "Determiner Raising and Scope Shift." *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 575–615, 2002.

Takano, Yuji. "Rightward Positionings in Antisymmetric Syntax." In Masatomo Ukaji, Masayuki Ike-uchi, and Yoshiki Nishimura (eds.), *Current Issues in English Linguistics*, 42–66. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 2003.

Takezawa, Koichi. A Configurational Approach to Case-Marking in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, 1987.

Takezawa, Koichi and John Whitman. *Kaku to Gojun to Tougokouzou*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1998.

Tancredi, Christopher. "Associative Operators." *Gengo Kenkyu* 125, 31–82, 2004.

Teramura, Hideo. *Nihongo no Sintakusu to Imi II* [Japanese Syntax and Semantics II]. Tokyo: Kurosio, 1984.

Teramura, Hideo. *Nihongo no Sintakusu to Imi III* [Japanese Syntax and Semantics III]. Tokyo: Kurosio, 1991.

Tateishi, Koichi. The Syntax of 'Subjects.' Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1991.

Tsujimura, Natsuko. Ergativity of nouns and Case assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 277–287, 1990.

Ura, Hiroyuki. *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Vance, Timothy J. "Are Japanese Particles Clitics?" *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 27, 3–33, 1993.

Whitman, John. "Kayne 1994: P.143, FN.3." In Alexandrova, Balina M. and Olga Arnudova (eds.), *The Minimalist Parameter*, 77–100. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001.

Yamada, Yoshio. *Nihonbunpoogaku Gairon*. Tokyo: Hoobunkan, 1936.

Yanagida, Yuko. "Ga no Saikaisyaku to Nihongo no Kukouzou nituite- Kukouzou no Huhensei nikansuru Kayne (1994) no Sitekikensyoo." In Tsukuba Daigaku Gendaigengogaku Kenkyuukai (ed.), *Zisedai no Gengokenkyuu* II, 1–24, 2003.