

## <Articles>Some Remarks on Contrastive Sentences in Japanese

著者	Hirota Taichi
journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	23
page range	43-55
year	2004-09-21
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7468">http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7468</a>

## Some Remarks on Contrastive Sentences in Japanese\*

Taichi Hirota

### 1. Introduction

This article is largely concerned with a sentence where the Japanese particle *wa* is involved. It is standardly assumed that the sentence involving *wa* is polysemous in that it may have (at least) two readings:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Taroo *wa* matigatte-iru.  
 Taro WA wrong-STAT  
 'Taro is wrong.'

The first is that the particle *wa* marks topical (or thematic) expressions. In (1) *wa* may be used to indicate that the syntactic subject, Taroo, has already been introduced into the relevant discourse. This is broadly known as the "topical/ thematic" use of *wa*.<sup>2</sup> The second is that the *wa*-marked expression may be construed to indicate a contrastive set, e.g. in (1) "Taroo, but not Kazuki, is wrong." In the latter case, the set consists of at least Taroo and Kazuki, and *wa* is contrastively used to indicate that the speaker refers to not only Taroo but Kazuki (or someone else). Being comparison, when a *wa*-marked expression is interpreted contrastively, it must be construed as a member of some set of alternates. For example in (1), for the contrastive reading to be obtained, Taroo must be a member of such a set as {Taroo, Kazuki, ...}. Thus, contrastive sentences must be related, via some salient set, to one or more alternates already evoked in the preceding discourse.

In this study I primarily address some problems posed by the contrastive use of *wa*, and elucidate the nature of *wa*. Contrastive sentences that this paper deals with include multiple *wh*-questions and what I call here the contrastive interrogative reduplication, each of which is illustrated below:

- (2) A: dare ga nani o motte-iru no?  
 who NOM what ACC have-STAT Q  
 'Who has what?'  
 B: Taroo ga terebi wa motte-iru.  
 Taro NOM TV WA have-STAT  
 lit. 'Taro has a TV.'
- (3) A: dare-dare ga iku n?  
 who-who NOM go Q  
 lit. 'Who will go?'  
 B: Taroo to Kazuki ga iku.  
 Taro and Kazuki NOM go

‘Taro and Kazuki will go.’

The utterance in (2A) is an example of multiple *wh*-questions. As is pointed out in the literature (e.g. Bošković (2002), Ross (2000)), if there are  $n$  question words in the question ( $n \geq 2$ ), then the answer must have at least  $2n$ -tuples in it. Thus, in the multiple question “Who ordered what?” a satisfactory answer will be such as “John ordered coffee, and Jim ordered tea” (cf. Ross (2000:387f)). Unlike this, Japanese accepts a single-pair answer to a multiple *wh*-question as illustrated in (2B). I will examine this peculiar behavior to multiple *wh*-questions in Japanese.

The example in (3) shows a phenomenon observed in colloquial western Japanese (especially in Kansai dialect) that I call the contrastive interrogative reduplication, which involves a copy of interrogative words and yields contrastive meanings. The contrastive interrogative reduplication also requires that answers be multiple. Again in (3), the answer clause can be *single* when a syntactic subject is marked by *wa*:

- (4) A: dare-dare ga iku n?  
       who-who NOM go Q  
       lit. ‘Who will go?’  
 B: Taro wa iku (yo).  
       Taro WA go (I-tell-you)  
       lit. ‘(I tell you) Taro will go.’

Reduplicated interrogative words indicate that the asker has in mind that the answer will not be a single one, and in this sense, this form of question deviates from a standard one which is neutral with respect to the number interpretation (i.e. answers can be either single or pair-list). It appears, contrary to the asker’s expectation, that a single answer is possible, as (4B) illustrates.

Contrastive interpretations are often seen as depending on contexts, and it is tacitly admitted that whether the contrastiveness follows or not is due to the tendency for an entity (or entities) in question to be related with other entities in discourse. Put differently, the contrastiveness emerges, depending on whether or not, under some circumstances, one can easily bring to his/her mind certain contrastive materials (cf. Onoe (1981), Noda (1996)). In my view, the contrastiveness emerges via the inference attached to the semantic content of linguistic forms, but not the lexical form itself, nor some particular context. In what follows, I assess the validity of this assumption, and examine to what extent the contrastiveness is dependent on pragmatic factors.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 examines the nature of contrastive interpretations by considering multiple *wh*-questions in Japanese. Section

3 extends the analysis to other sentences including the interrogative contrastive reduplication, which are contrastively interpreted. Section 4 is a brief conclusion.

## 2. Multiple *Wh*-Questions

As is well known, single-pair answers cannot be felicitous with questions like (5) in English:

(5) Who bought what?

Thus, according to Bošković (2002:357), (5) is an infelicitous question when John sees someone buying something, but does not see who it is and what the person is buying, and then he goes to the sales clerk to ask (5). The situation described by Bošković indicates that the asker has in mind (viz. presupposes)  $n$ -tuples ( $n \geq 2$ ) of alternates that are to be answered. Unlike (5), Japanese allows a single-pair answer to a multiple *wh*-question, as in (6):

(6) A: dare ga nani o katta no?  
       who NOM what ACC bought Q  
       ‘Who bought what?’  
       B: Taro ga terebi wa katta.  
       Taro NOM TV WA bought  
       lit. ‘Taro bought a TV.’

Japanese multiple *wh*-questions like (6A) is also infelicitous in such a situation described above.<sup>3</sup> Even when the asker expects that the answer will be a pair-list one, however, the single-pair answer in (6B) can still be answered naturally.

It should be noticed that the (only) reading available in (6B) is such as “Taro bought a TV, but not anything other than a TV”, viz. a contrastive one. In (6), the asker may presuppose the existence of such a set as {a TV, a radio, ...}. Otherwise, *wa* cannot be used in (6B).<sup>4</sup> To see this, consider the following answer to the same multiple *wh*-question as (6):

(7) A: dare ga nani o katta no?  
       who NOM what ACC bought Q  
       ‘Who bought a TV?’  
       B: \*Taro wa terebi wa katta.  
       Taro WA TV WA bought  
       lit. ‘Taro bought a TV.’

It is generally observed that when two *wa*-marked expressions occur in one sentence, for example in (7B), only the last one (viz. the right-most *wa*-marked element) is interpreted contrastively, and another functions as a topical material (cf. Kuno (1972)). Given this, in (7B), Taro cannot be construed as being involved in some contrastive

set, and thus, the utterance is seen as a predication of Taroo only. In other words, since the first *wa*-marked expression functions as a topical material, the speaker in (7B) cannot use *wa* when he does not presuppose such a (buyers') set as {Taro, Joe, Tom, ...}. This incorrectly indicates that Taroo is interpreted contrastively. Contrary to this prediction, (7B) cannot be interpreted contrastively, and hence an infelicitous answer.

Noda (1996:210f.) notes that in the following utterance the single phrase *syokki* 'dishes/eating utensils' is not contrasted with *nabe* 'pans/kitchen utensils', but 'children's bringing dishes' and 'children's not bringing pans' are contrasted.

- (8) *kodomo-tati wa syokki wa motte-kita.*  
 child-PL WA dish WA brought  
 lit. 'The children brought dishes.'

Notice that in (8) the sentence-initial expression is also marked with *wa*. In this case, as we have seen in (7), (because of the double occurrence of *wa*-marked phrase) the initial *wa*-marked phrase must be a topic, and thus the question will be *What did the children bring?* If the sentence in (8) is uttered as an answer to a multiple *wh*-question, then (8) is ruled out.

In the case of (6), what is answered in (6B) is again only Taroo's act of buying, although the asker expects a pair-list utterance to be answered (e.g. *x* bought X, *y* bought Y, and *z* bought Z). The answer in (6B) can also mean an event of Taroo's *not* buying something such as a radio, a DVD player and the like, exclusively. Such a meaning is nonetheless about Taroo's act, and thus it simply describes Taroo's act of buying and not buying. Since answers to multiple *wh*-questions are pair-list ones, (6B) as well must be interpreted so. Then, a question arises; in what sense is (6B) construed as a pair-list answer?

To see this, let us first consider how the initial *ga*-marked expression in (6B) contributes to the sentence meaning. It is well known that (in specificational sentences) *ga* functions as *listing* a value for a variable involved in some propositional function. In the case of (6A), "*x* bought (something)" is a propositional function, and Taroo is listed as a value for the variable *x*. In (6B), unlike (7B), Taroo is marked with *ga*, and so it does not need to be construed as expressing an already evoked element. By the speaker B's referring only to Taroo, the sentence means the exclusion of other possible alternates than Taroo. Such an inference appears independent on whether or not a certain particular set of alternates is presupposed by participants. That is to say, if the asker presupposes that there are more than one person who would buy something, then he can ask (6A). Thus, if Taroo is listed as a buyer of a TV, then the addressee will expect that someone other than Taroo buys

something other than a TV. Given the listing function of *ga*, it is plausible to assume that the speaker can specify a value without any presupposed set of alternates (and in fact it is so in many cases). I have noted above that the asker will presuppose a set like {a TV, a radio, ...}. Thus, if a TV is selected as being bought by Taroo, then other alternates e.g. a radio can contrastively be connected with someone other than Taroo, since at least two variables must be specified in multiple *wh*-questions.

Notice that the answer in (6B) involves two different specificational acts; that is, one, the specification from a set, and the other, the one without a set. The former specificational act concerns with *wa*, and the latter with *ga*. In other words, the speaker *selects* a candidate for a variable from a set when *wa* is used; on the other hand, the speaker *lists* (but not selects) a candidate for a variable when *ga* is used. In (6B), by the speaker's selecting a TV, the addressee will interpret the utterance as implicating that: since a radio is not selected for Taroo's buying *x*, thus a radio is not applied to a candidate for Taroo's buying *x*. The same heuristic (Q-heuristic ('what is not said is not the case'); cf. Levinson (2000)) holds with the speaker's listing Taroo. That is, as the speaker refers (only) to Taroo, the addressee will infer that this is not the case with someone other than Taroo. Given such heuristics, in the former case, because of the pre-existence of a set for listing, the contrastiveness follows. With the latter specificational act, the speaker simply lists a candidate, and thus, this yields the exclusiveness (but not the contrastiveness, since there are no presupposed compatibles). This observation shows that Japanese does require a pair-list answer to a multiple question, at least implicitly.

Interestingly, if the syntactic object (*terebi*) is attached by the accusative case marker *o* in (6B), a single-pair answer to the same multiple *wh*-question as (6) will not be accepted any more. Equally remarkable is the fact that a pair-list answer will in turn be accepted even though the object is marked by *o*.

(9) dare ga nani o katta no?

who NOM what ACC bought Q

'Who bought what?'

a.?? Taroo ga terebi o katta.

Taroo NOM TV ACC bought

'Taro bought a TV.'

b. Taroo ga terebi o, Ziroo ga razio o katta.

Taroo NOM TV ACC Ziroo NOM radio ACC bought

'Taro bought a TV, and Ziro bought a radio.'

As the awkwardness of the answer in (9a) shows, we cannot use the same heuristic as the one in (6). This, however, does not mean there are not any

presupposed sets for listing here. What this awkwardness shows is that it is required to refer to a comparable set of alternates *explicitly* when *o* is used, as illustrated in (9b). The (un)acceptability of the minimal pair (6B) and (9a) indicates that only *wa* can implicate a set of alternates for listing (i.e. the contrastiveness). It should be noticed here that whether a set for listing pre-exists or not is the matter of multiple question clauses. Since, as mentioned above, *wa* marks a topical expression, the use of *wa* simply signals that the *wa*-marked expression is a topic; and, in answer clauses to multiple *wh*-questions, the answer is interpreted contrastively via Q-heuristics. We should thus regard the contrastive interpretation is the meaning derived, through Q-heuristics, from the semantic content of linguistic forms where *wa* is used. The particle *wa* inherently marks a topic expression only, and the topic in turn construed as consisting of a contrastive set, and thus the utterance yields a contrastive meaning.

It is noteworthy that it is not necessarily the case that the speaker expects a pair-list answer, when a multiple *wh*-question is embedded in a negative clause:

- (10) dare ga nani o itta no ka wakara-nak-atta.  
 who NOM what ACC said NZ Q understand-NEG-PAST  
 'I didn't know who said what.'

The sentence in (10) can be uttered in the situation where a person talks to the speaker, but he cannot recognize who it is and what he says. In this case, because of the negation in the main clause, the embedded multiple *wh*-question does not require that there is a pair-list clause to be answered to specify the variables *dare* 'who' and *nani* 'what'. Thus, one can follow this utterance with a single-pair utterance such as in (11):

- (11) Joe ga aisatu o sita (yo).  
 Joe NOM greeting ACC did (I-tell-you)  
 lit. '(I tell you) Joe greeted you.'

This shows that multiple *wh*-questions allow a single-pair response when they are embedded in negative clauses. Recall that (9a) is unacceptable because (9a) cannot indicate a pair-list meaning even when required by the question. Since there is no such requirement in (10), the response in (11) can be felicitously uttered. In the same situation, the utterance where *wa* is used again contrasts with (11) (the parenthesized asterisk indicates that the utterance is unacceptable to the utterance in (10)):

- (12) (\*)Joe ga aisatu wa sita (yo).  
 Joe NOM greeting WA did (I-tell-you)  
 lit. '(I tell you) Joe greeted you.'

The use of *wa* requires that the expression to be marked with *wa* be already evoked previously, but in (12), as the negation in the main clause in (10) shows, there are no

such presupposition. Thus, as expected, one cannot use the form where *wa* is involved as a response to (10). Under this situation, the participants do not have any presupposition, and thus *wa* cannot be used in answer clauses to list an alternate. This shows that the so-called contrastive use of *wa* is always dependent on the topical use of *wa*.

Here, I am not saying that the contrastiveness arises depending solely on some variable context. Rather, I claim that the contrastiveness always follows when the particle *wa* is used. The contrastive meaning, however, is not a lexicalized part of *wa*, but is derived via Q-heuristic, and thus it is defeasible.

- (13) A: *kyoodai wa nan-nin iru no?*  
 brothers WA what-CL have Q  
 'How many brothers do you have?'  
 B: *kyoodai wa 3-nin iru.*  
 brothers WA 3-CL have  
 lit. 'I have three brothers.'

In (13B), *kyoodai* 'brothers' cannot be interpreted as consisting of a contrastive set. This is because the asker has already selected the noun phrase from a set like {brothers, families, cousins}, before the speaker B answers the question. It thus appears that there is no choice for the speaker B to choose an alternate. Accordingly, the *wa*-marked part in (13B) is regarded simply as a repetition of a part of the asker's utterance. This is what is generally called a topical use of *wa*. Since the speaker in (13A) asks a question after selecting an object as an expected topic in the answer clause, no contrastive interpretations follow (cf. also (7), (8)).

We have seen that the contrastiveness arises in connection with the topical use of *wa*. When an element is selected from a set of alternates, which is salient to both the speaker and addressee, the contrastive meaning is also suggested. What is important here is how this comes about. I have suggested that the contrastiveness is derived by Q-heuristics. As we saw, this is an inference based on the topical use of *wa*, which clearly relies on a specific context to emerge. *Wa* itself only marks topical materials, but if the speaker does not refer to entities which might have been said, then the utterance, as a whole, yields a contrastive interpretation. The point I made is summarized in (14):

- (14) *Wa* only marks a topical material, and the contrastiveness arises when of a set of alternates, the speaker did not say what might have been said. That is, the topical material is seen as consisting of a contrast set, and, by Q-heuristics, use of one alternates indicates inapplicability of other alternates, and thus the contrastiveness follows.



### 3. Topicality, and the Contrastiveness

In the preceding section, I observed Japanese multiple *wh*-questions and consider how the contrastive interpretation emerges. I claimed that in Japanese multiple *wh*-questions, irrespective of forms of answer clauses, they inherently request pair-list answer reading. In this section, I would like to see how the generalization in (14) works in other contrastive sentences. In colloquial Kansai dialect, there is a construction that I call the contrastive interrogative reduplication that involves a copy of interrogative words and yields contrastive meanings.<sup>5</sup> Morphologically, this appears to be such plural forms of noun phrases as *yama-yama* 'mountain-mountain, i.e. mountains', *ie-ie* 'house-house, i.e. houses' or *hito-bito* 'person-person, i.e. people.' The contrastive interrogative reduplication, however, should be differentiated with such coordinated phrases. Compare the following examples:

- (15) a. dare to dare ga iku n?  
           who and who NOM go Q  
           'Who will go?'  
       b. dare-dare ga iku n?  
           who-who NOM go Q  
           'Who will go?'

The asker in (15a) where a conjunctive form is used will expect that the people who will go are exactly two. On the other hand, in (15b), the question indicates that the answer will involve at least two people who will go. Thus, if (16) is taken as an answer to (15a), it is judged quite unnatural:

- (16) John to Joe to Tom ga iku.  
       John and Joe and Tom NOM go  
       'John, Joe and Tom will go.'

By contrast, the utterance in (16) can be a felicitous answer to the question in (15b). To my knowledge, this construction previously receives no attention in the literature. Below are other examples of this construction:

- (17) a. nani-nani o katta n?  
           what-what ACC bought Q  
           'What did you buy?'  
       b. doko-doko ni iku n?  
           where-where to go Q  
           'Where are you going to go?'  
       c. itu-itu ni kuru n?  
           when-when on come Q  
           'When are you going to come?'

- d. dare-dare ga nani-nani (o) katta n?  
 who-who NOM what-what (ACC) bought Q  
 'Who bought what?'

As the examples in (17) illustrate, the reduplicated interrogatives range over *dare* 'who' (17a), *nani* 'what' (17b), *doko* 'where' (17c) and *itsu* 'when', and often occurs simultaneously as (17d). All these utterances require multivalued answers, and single answers are usually infelicitous with these questions. For example, as an answer to (17a), the multivalued answer in (18a) can be felicitously uttered, but its single counterpart in (18b) is not regarded as a proper answer:

- (18) a. terebi to razio o katta.  
 TV and radio ACC bought  
 'I bought a TV and a radio.'  
 b. \* terebi o katta.  
 TV ACC bought  
 'I bought a TV.'

However, even among single answers, not all of them behave identically. For example, if I try to answer to (15b) with single answers, I find that the answer in (19a) is more natural than (19b), and (19c) is distinctly less natural than (19b):

- (19) a. iya, Kazuki dake ga iku.  
 no Kazuki only NOM go  
 'Uh-uh, only Kazuki will go.'  
 b.? Kazuki wa iku.  
 Kazuki WA go  
 lit. 'Kazuki will go.'  
 c. \* Kazuki ga iku.  
 Kazuki NOM go  
 lit. 'Kazuki will go.'

The contrastive interrogative reduplication usually requires multivalued answers. When the speaker uses this form to ask, he presupposes that there must be  $n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ) candidates to be specified. Though I have little to say about the utterance in (19a), it should be noticed that, as the negative exclamation *iya* 'uh-uh' in (19a) shows, when the speaker answers such questions with single answers, he will have to deny the asker's presupposition first, and then emphasize that the possible candidate is *exactly* one (and not more) by using e.g. *dake* 'only'. Such answers as (19a) is distinctly preferable, but it, in fact, is possible to answer the contrastive interrogative reduplication without denying the speakers presupposition explicitly, which is shown in (19b). The grammaticality judgment prefixed in (19b) is the one when it is

compared with (19a), and the utterance in (19b) is also a quite natural one. In contrast, (19c) cannot be a felicitous utterance as an answer to (15b).

With these in mind, let us consider the difference in acceptability between (19b) and (19c). As we saw in the previous section, for an expression to be marked by *wa*, it must be evoked previously. The asker in (15b) presupposes that the answer is multivalued, and thus, in (19b), Kazuki is seen as one member of a certain set. In this case, as (14) predicts, the event of Kazuki's going is contrastively interpreted by the Q-heuristic. The utterance in (19b) denies the asker's presupposition by referring only to Kazuki, which implicates inapplicability of other members to the propositional function "x will go." In (19c), Kazuki is marked with another particle *ga*. Here the use of *ga* indicates that Kazuki is not seen as being contained in such a contrast set, and because of the absence of a set of compatibles, the speaker's referring to Kazuki simply indicates  $x=Kazuki$ , and thus, no contrastive interpretations obtained. In this case, the utterance cannot deny the asker's presupposition, and hence the unacceptability.

As the above examples and (14) indicate, whether an utterance is interpreted contrastively or not is crucially dependent on the topicality of an expression. But, it is clearly the case that the pre-existence of such a contrastive set is not always assured. Kuno (1972) observes that there are cases where *wa*-marked expressions cannot be interpreted topically, but when they are put in a contrastive context, grammatical sentences are obtained (cf. Kuno (1972:270f.)):

- (20) a. *ame wa hut-teiru (ga, yuki wa hut-tei-nai).*  
*rain WA fall-STAT (but snow WA fall-STAT-NEG)*  
 lit. 'Rain is falling, but snow is not falling.'
- b. *Oozei-no hito wa paatii ni kita (ga, omosiroi hito wa*  
*many person WA party to come (but interesting person WA*  
*hito-ri mo ko-nak-atta).*  
*one-CL even come-NEG-PAST)*  
 'Many people came to the party, but not a single interesting person came.'

Let us first consider the example in (20a). This utterance can be seen as an answer to the question such as *how is the weather?* Apparently, in this case, the addressee does not presuppose the *wa*-marked expression *ame* 'rain', and thus it seems that the generalization (14) fails to predict the acceptability of this sentence. Notice that, although there are no coreferential expressions in the preceding discourse, for (20a) to be felicitously uttered, *ame* 'rain' must be related to *the weather* which is previously evoked. The sentence in (20b) is uttered as an answer to a question like *What kind of*

*people came to the party?* In this case again, *oozei-no hito* ‘many people’ (and *omosiroi hito* ‘an interesting person’) are related to the people who came to the party.<sup>5</sup>

With this in mind, I propose the following condition on felicitous topic marking:

- (21) The expression marked by *wa* must stand in a salient partially ordered set (or poset) relation to an entity or a proposition previously evoked in discourse context.

Posets may informally be represented in a relation such as *is-a-part-of*, *is-a-subtype-of*, *is-an-attribute-of*, *is-equal-to*, and the like (cf. Hirschberg (1985), among others). For example in (20a), the poset can be defined by a type-subtype relation, and in (20b), a whole-part ordering is involved. Given (21), we get a poset, for example in (20a),  $\langle \{\text{rain, snow}\}, \text{weather} \rangle$ . This poset relation assures topicality of the expression *ame* ‘rain’. Based on this observation, I claim, contrary to Kuno (1972), that *ame* in (20a) also represents a topical material.

Clearly, this kind of inference is highly dependent on a contextual meaning, or our world knowledge. Once an entity represented by a *wa*-marked expression stands in a salient poset relation to an evoked entity, it can be seen as representing a topic. After a topic is set, via such a poset relation, the contrastive interpretation follows. Thus, the contrastive interpretation simply dependent on a linguistic form where *wa* is used, and (Q-)inferences involved here must be a context independent one. By these statements, I mean that contrastive interpretations interact only with the topical use of *wa*, but the contrastiveness and contexts are in fact independent.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper, I presented an analysis of the so-called contrastive use of *wa*. It is often explained by real-world or pragmatic factors; this is because *wa* always marks a topical material, and such a context dependent inference as poset relations assures topicality of an entity represented by a *wa*-marked expression. However, I have claimed that the contrastiveness is derived based on already evoked entities in a sentence, and it must be related to a semantic content of a linguistic form. In this sense, contrastive interpretations lie at the interface between pragmatics and semantics, because they emerge based on the topical use of *wa*, which depends on particular context on the one hand, and they rely on meanings the structure has on the other.

#### NOTES

<sup>5</sup> I am grateful to *TES* reviewers for their helpful comments. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

<sup>1</sup> For illustrative purposes only, the following abbreviations are used in the glosses of example

sentences: ACC = accusative case marker, CL = classifier, COP = copula, GEN = genitive case marker, NEG = negative morpheme, NOM = nominative case marker, NZ = nominalizer, PAST = past tense morpheme, PL = plural morpheme, Q = question marker, STAT = stative morpheme. Because of the purpose of this paper, WA is literally used for labels not to indicate some specific meanings.

<sup>2</sup> I use the term 'topic' to indicate that entities (or events) marked with *wa* are evoked in the preceding discourse. I have little to say here about the notion 'theme/topic' in the sense of the judgment theory. (cf. Kuroda (1972))

<sup>3</sup> Bošković (2002:357) observes that, unlike the English multiple question in (5), (6A) can be used in this situation (although Bošković attributes this judgment to Mamoru Saito). However, according to the result of my asking around as much as possible, this is not a correct observation. Thus, throughout this paper, I suppose that Japanese multiple *wh*-questions also require that the speaker presuppose *n*-tuples of alternates,  $n \geq 2$ , to be answered.

<sup>4</sup> What is included in a set may not necessarily be clarified, and thus the asker in (6) can have such a presupposition that someone will buy electric appliances which are a superset of e.g. {a TV, a radio}. See section 3 for further discussion on this point.

<sup>5</sup> There are similar *wh*-expressions in Korean (cf. Chung (1999)). Chung calls the following *wh*-words (*wh*-)doublets (cf. Chung (1999:281f.)):

- (i) a. nominals: *mwukwu-mwukwu* 'who-who', *mwunes-mwunes/mwe-mwe* 'what-what', *eti-eti* 'where-where', *encey-encey* 'when-when', etc.  
 b. adnominals: *enu-enu* 'which-which', *mwusun-mwusun* 'what-what', etc.  
 c. adverbials: *ette-ettehkey/?ettehkey-ettehkey* 'how-how'  
 d. predicates: *ette-etteha* 'to be of which properties'

While Korean *wh*-singlets (for example, *mwu(ka)* 'who(-NOM)') may be either singularly answered or plurally answered, doublets are plural in their number interpretation (cf. Chung (1999:285)). See also Kim (1999) where multiple *wh*-questions (including Korean doublets) are cross-linguistically examined.

<sup>6</sup> Arguments of this kind are given in the literature that discusses English Topicalization (and Left-dislocation). (cf. Ward and Prince (1991), Gregory and Michaelis (2001))

## REFERENCES

- Bošković, Željko. (2002) "On Multiple *Wh*-Fronting," *Linguistic Inquiry* 33-3, 351-383.  
 Chung, Daeho. (1999) "On WH-Doublets in Korean," *Enehak* 25, 281-301.  
 Gregory, Michelle L. and Laura A. Michaelis (2001) "Topicalization and Left-Dislocation: A Functional Opposition Revisited," *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1665-1706.  
 Hirschberg, Julia. (1985) "A Theory of Scalar Implicature," University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. diss.  
 Kim, Jeong-Seok. (1999) "A Note on Multiple WH-singlet/doublet Questions," *Studies in Generative Grammar* 9-2, 381-402, The Korean Generative Grammar Circle.

- Kuno, Susumu. (1972) "Functional Sentence Perspective: A Case Study from Japanese and English," *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 269-320.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. (1972) "The Categorical and the Thetic Judgment," *Foundations of Language* 9, 153-185.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.
- Noda, Hisashi. (1996) 'Wa' to 'Ga', Tokyo, Kurosio.
- Onoe, Keiichi. (1981) "Wa no Kei-zyosi sei to Hyougen teki Kinou," *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 58-5, 118.
- Ross, Haj. (2000) "The Frozenness of Pseudoclefts- Towards an Inequality-based Syntax," *CLS 36: The Main Session*, 385-426. The Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Ward, Gregory L. and Ellen F. Prince. (1991) "On the Topicalization of Indefinite NP's," *Journal of Pragmatics* 16, 167-177.

Doctoral Program in Humanities and Social Sciences  
University of Tsukuba  
Email: [hirota\\_taichi@r9.dion.ne.jp](mailto:hirota_taichi@r9.dion.ne.jp)