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1 Introduction

This talk provides further support for the following typology of information structural notions and their mapping to the syntax, developed in Neeleman et. al. (to appear):

(1) **Syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-contrastive</strong></td>
<td>non-contrastive topic</td>
<td>information focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>contrastive</strong></td>
<td>contrastive topic</td>
<td>contrastive focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table expresses a couple of ideas. First, topic, focus and contrast are autonomous notions of information structure. Secondly, we take contrastive topic to be a composite of notions [topic] and [contrast] and contrastive focus to be a composite of [focus] and [contrast] (Vallduví & Vilkuša 1998, Molnár 2002, Tomioka 2007). It is also widely reported that topic, focus and contrast have syntactic reflexes. If these ideas are on the right track, we predict cross-cutting syntactic generalisations over topics, over foci and over contrastive items. Our main evidence for the typology comes from the syntactic distribution of items that share one of the privative notions.

(2) a. Rule for [topic]: Japanese – [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position
    b. Rule for [focus]: Russian – [focus] is licensed in clause-final position
    c. Rule for [contrast]: Dutch – [contrast] licenses A′-movement

The table does not preclude the possibility that one language has a rule for [topic] and a rule for [contrast]. In such an instance, a conflict arises for contrastive topic. I argue that in such an instance, one rule wins over the other. This predicts that if a language has rules for both [topic] and [contrast], then contrastive topic in that language should systematically behave either like non-contrastive topic, with respect to the rule for [topic], or like contrastive topic, with respect to the rule for [contrast]. I argue that this is indeed the case: Japanese instantiates the case where contrastive topic is subject to the rule regarding [topic], while in Korean, contrastive topic is subject to the rule regarding [contrast]. The rule for [contrast] in Japanese and Korean is the same as the one in Dutch.

**Claims:**
(3) Japanese:  - rule for [topic], rule for [contrast]
    - contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [topic]
(4) Korean:   - rule for [topic], rule for [contrast]
    - contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [contrast]

* This paper is part of the output of the AHRC-funded project ‘A Flexible Theory of Topic and Focus Movement’ at UCL. (Grant no. 119403). http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/ad/4.html

In this talk, I will show that...
- there is a rule for [topic] in Japanese and a rule for [contrast] in Dutch.
- Japanese also has the same rule for [contrast] as in Dutch, but only contrastive focus is subject to it.
- Korean has the same rule for [topic] as in Japanese, and the same rule for [contrast] as in Dutch, and contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [contrast].
- further differences between wa-phrases and nun-phrases in contrastive contexts.

2 Terminologies

2.1 **Topic**
This talk is concerned with ‘sentence topic’ and not ‘discourse topic’ (Reinhart 1981).

Sentence topics must be distinguished from items that simply refer back to them (Givon 1983, Chafe 1987, Lambrecht 1994, Vallduví & Engdahl 1996).

(5) A: Tell me about John.
    B: John likes hiking.

2.2 **Focus**

Highlighted information with respect to the material in the rest of the sentence, e.g. an item that answers the wh-part of a preceding question.

2.3 **Contrast**

A contrastive item is selected out of a set of alternatives to the exclusion of other alternatives.

(6) a. Maxine was introduced to the queen on her birthday.
    b. She was wearing a special dress for the occasion.

(7) A: Who did Max see yesterday?
    B: He saw Rosa yesterday.

Syntactic (and sometimes prosodic) differences between items identified as ‘sentence topic’ on the narrower notion and items that refer back to them have been reported for Italian, German, Catalan (Frascarelli & Hinterhöhl 2007, Vallduví 1992). In Japanese and Korean too, the distinction is crucial in explaining certain syntactic properties of topics in these languages.

2.4 **Information focus**

Information focus selects information that answers the wh-part of a preceding question.

(8) a. Contrastive focus: highlighted information and implicates that it has been selected out of a set of alternatives.
    b. Contrastive topic: what the sentence is about, affecting the topic of discourse, and implicates that it has been selected out of a set of alternatives.
Tomioka (2007) notes that focus operates at the level of proposition, while topic operates at the level of speech act. Thus, the reason for selecting focus out of a set of alternatives is because the other alternative propositions are false, while the reason for selecting a topic could be for a pragmatic reason. Contrastive focus therefore has a sense of exhaustiveness, while contrastive topic implicates that the speaker is not sure, or has some reason for not asserting the same for the alternatives.

(9) A: Which one of his friends wants to meet John? (Erteschick-Shir 2007: 49)  
B: JANET wants to meet John.

(10) A: Do you think that Fritz would buy this suit? (Büring 1997: 56)  
B: Well, I certainly wouldn't.

3 [Topic] and [contrast]
3.1 Rule for [topic]: Japanese (Vermeulen 2009, To appear)

(11) [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position.

Non-contrastive topic:

(12) ano boosi-nituite nanika osiete-kudasai  
that hat-about something tell-please

'Tell me something about that hat.'

(13) a. ano boosi-wa John-ga kinoo e, kaimasita  
that hat-wa John-nom yesterday bought
b. #John-ga ano boosi-wa kinoo kaimasita  
John-nom that hat-wa yesterday bought

'John bought that hat yesterday.'

Contrastive topic:

(14) kinoo-no pastii-de dare-ga pasuta-o tabeta no?  
yesterday-gen party-at who-nom pasta-acc ate Q

'Who ate the pasta at the party yesterday?'

(15) hmm, pasuta-wa doo-ka sir-ana-kedo,  
well, pasta-top how-whether know-not but,

a. #BILL-GA MAME-WA 8-zi-goro tabeteita (yo)  
Bill-nom beans-wa 8 o’clock-around eating.was particle
b. MAME-WA BILL-GA 8-zi-goro ti, tabeteita (yo)  
beans-wa Bill-nom 8 o’clock-around eating.was particle

'as for the beans, Bill was eating them around 8 o’clock.'

To be concrete, topic is adjoined to the highest maximal projection. The motivation for the displacement is to mark the constituent that is the sister to the moved topic as the comment, facilitating an isomorphic mapping between syntax and information structure, in the sense of Neeleman & van de Koot (2008).

(16) Syntax:  
\[ \text{XP}_{wa} \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{e}_{\text{t}} \quad \text{t}_1 \quad \ldots] \]

Information Structure:  
Topic \quad comment

3.2 Rule for [contrast]: Dutch (Neeleman, et. al. To appear)

(17) [Contrast] licenses A’-movement.

Landing site for A’-movement of contrastive items is not to a designated position. (double underline = contrastive topic; SMALL CAPS = focus)

(18)a. Ik geloof dat Jan Marie [alleen DIT boek] gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that John Mary only this book given has'

b. Ik geloof Jan Marie dat [zo’n boek] gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that only John has given such a book to Mary.'

(19)a. Ik geloof dat Jan Marie t gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that John Mary given has'

b. Ik geloof dat Jan [alleen DIT boek], Jan Marie t gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that Jan only John has given such a book to Mary.'

(20)a. Ik geloof dat Jan [alleen DIT boek], Marie t gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that Jan only this book Mary given has'

b. Ik geloof dat Jan [zo’n boek], alleen Marie t gegeven heeft.  
'I believe that only John has given such a book to Mary.'

Movement of a contrastive item affects the constituent that becomes the sister to the moved item. It marks it as the ‘domain of contrast’. The domain of contrast contains material which is relevant to calculating the set of alternatives.

(21) Syntax:  
\[ \text{XP}_{wa} \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{e}_{\text{t}} \quad \text{t}_1 \quad \ldots] \]

Information Structure:  
C.Top / C.Foc \quad Domain of Contrast

(19) a’ ... [alleen DIT boek], [\text{DoC} Jan Marie t gegeven heeft]  
only this book John Mary given has

(20) a’ ... Jan [alleen DIT boek], [\text{DoC} Marie t gegeven heeft]  
John only this book Mary given has

We assume that contrast is always based on an expression containing a single λ-bound variable (Schwarchild 1999). The domain of contrast for (19a) and (20a) are thus as in (22a) and (22b), respectively. It is a standard assumption that the alternatives generated by a contrastive item such as those in (18), (19), and (20) are propositions. We argue that existential closure applies to the domain of contrast in (20a’), transforming the domain of contrast to a proposition, giving the expression in (22b). The interpretation of the existentially bound variable is then provided by the immediate context.

(22) a. λx [John has given x to Mary]  
b. λx ∃y [y has given x to Mary]
A widely adopted idea of information structure is that an utterance is first and foremost
(Lambrecht 1994, Hajicová et al 1997):

(23) **[TOPIC [COMMENT FOCUS [BACKGROUND]]]**

If topic is to be interpreted with respect to the comment and focus with respect to the
background, it follows that the domain of contrast for contrastive focus must consist of
material from its background, and the domain of contrast for contrastive topic must consist of
material taken from the comment. Putting (21) and (23) together yield the following
predictions:

(24) a. topic: [vp FOCUS t_i]
    b. *FOCUS: [vp topic t_i]

The predictions are borne out:

(25) * Hoe zit het met *SOEP? Wie heeft *DIE gegeten?  
    *What about the soup? Who ate that?*

(26) a. dat Wim *van de bonen* meer gegeten heeft dan vorig jaar  (Foc Top)  
    *that Bill from the beans more eaten has than last year*  
    b. dat *van de bonen* Wim t_i meer gegeten heeft dan vorig jaar  (Top, Foc L)  
    *that from the beans Bill more eaten has than last year*  
    ‘that Bill has eaten more from the beans than last year.’

(27) * Hoe zit het met *Fred? Wat heeft *HII gegeten?  
    *What about Fred? What did he eat?*

(28) a. dat *Wim van de bonen* meer gegeten heeft dan vorig jaar.  (Top Foc)  
    *that Bill from the beans more eaten has than last year*  
    b. #dat *van de bonen* Wim t_i meer gegeten heeft dan vorig jaar  (#Foc, Top L)  
    *that from the beans Bill more eaten has than last year*  
    ‘that Bill has eaten more from the beans than last year.’

In fact, the considerations in (21) and (23) make stronger predictions, which are also correct:

(29) a. Top: [vp Foc t_i]  
    b. #Foc: [vp topic t_i]

(30) Hoe zit het met tante Jo? Wat heeft grootpapa haar nagelaten?  
    ‘How about auntie Jo? What has granddad bequeathed to her?’

(31) * Nou, dat weet ik niet, maar ik geloof ...  
    *Well, I don’t know, but I believe ...*  
    a. dat grootpapa *zijn buren* de klock heeft willen nalaten  (Top Foc)  
    *that granddad his neighbours the clock has want bequeath*  
    b. #dat *zijn buren* grootpapa t_i de klock heeft willen nalaten  (#Foc, t_i)  
    *that his neighbours granddad the clock has want bequeath*  
    ‘that granddad wanted to bequeath the clock to his neighbours.’

In sum:
- [contrast] licenses A'-movement which marks the domain of contrast
- the landing site of the A'-movement can be a variety of positions
- specific predictions on the syntactic distribution of contrastive topic and contrastive focus
  with respect to each other: (24), (29).

4 Japanese

(34) a. [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position, as above: (12)-(15)
    b. [contrast] licenses A'-movement that marks the domain of contrast, as in Dutch.
    c. Contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [topic].

(i) Contrastive focus can be moved to various positions:

(35) John-wa Sue-ni nani-o ageta no?  
    John-nom Sue-to what-acc gave Q  
    ‘What did John give to Sue?’

(36) a. John-wa Sue-ni *ANO CD-O* ageta  
    John-nom Sue-to thatCD-acc gave  
    ‘John gave that CD to Sue.’
    b. John-wa *ANO CD-O* Sue-ni t_i ageta  
    John-nom thatCD-acc Sue-to t_i gave  
    ‘John gave that CD to Sue.’
    Like Dutch (18a), (19a), (20a)

(ii) Contrastive topic must be moved to clause-initial position, see also (14)/15:

(37) Dare-ga Sue-ni ano *CD-O* ageta no?  
    Who-nom who-to thatCD-acc gave Q  
    ‘Who gave that CD to Sue?’

(38) Hmm, ano *CD-wa* doo-da-ka *siranai kedo*  
    Well, that CD-wa how-cop-whether not.know but  
    ‘Well, I don’t know about that CD, but...’  
    a. #JOHN-GA Sue-ni *ANO HON-WA* kinoo ageteita (yo)  
       John-nom Sue-to that book-wa yesterday gave prt  
    b. #JOHN-GA *ANO HON-WA* Sue-ni kinoo t_i ageteita (yo)  
       John-nom that book-wa Sue-to t_i yesterday gave prt
c. ANO HON-WA JOHN-GA Sue-ni kinoo titori ageteita (yo) that book-wa John-nom Sue-to yesterday gave prt
‘as for that book, John gave it to Sue yesterday.’

Unlike Dutch: (18b), (19b), (20b)

(iii) Contrastive focus movement marks the domain of contrast, as in Dutch. This makes the predictions in (24) and (29):

24a. a. topic, [∗FOCUS titori]
b. [*FOCUS, topic titori]

29a. a. Top, [∗FOCUS titori Foc]
b. #Foc, [∗FOCUS titori Top]

(24a): The example in (14)/(15) already shows that the prediction in is correct.

(24b): Because of the independent clause-initialness constraint on topics, this prediction must be tested involving embedded clauses.

First, it is possible to have an embedded topic:

(39) Context: John finds a book on Sue’s desk and he asks Bill to tell him something about the book, perhaps with the intention of finding out where Sue obtained the book. Bill does not know anything about the book, but he knew how Sue obtained a CD that was also on the desk. So, he decides to tell John about the CD. In describing this situation, you utter (40).

40. Bill-wa [KONO CD-WA Mary-ga karey-no mise-de Sue-ni titori ageta-to] itta. Bill-wa this CD-wa Mary-nom he-gen shop-at Sue-to gave-that said ‘Bill, said that as for this CD, Mary gave it to Sue in his shop.’

Secondly, focus can be moved from within the embedded clause to sentence-initial position:

(41) Bill-wa [Mary-ga Jane-ni kono CD-o karey-no mise-de ageta-to] itta. Bill-wa Mary-nom Jane-to this CD-acc he-gen shop-at gave-that said Lit.: ‘Bill, said that Mary gave this CD to Jane in his shop.’

(42) Tigau-yo. SUR-WA Bill-wa [Mary-ga kono CD-o karey-nomise-de Incorrect-prt Sue-to Bill-wa Mary-nom this CD-acc he-gen shop-at ageta-to] itta-ndayo gave-that said-prt Lit.: ‘No. It’s to Sue that Bill, said that Mary gave this CD in his shop.’

The precise prediction that follows from (24b) is that it should be impossible to combine the above two operations, as this will result in a structure like the following:

43. [*Foc [... [∗Top ... titori]]]
5 Korean

(49) a. [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position, as in Japanese
   b. [contrast] licenses A′-movement that marks the domain of contrast, as in Dutch
   c. Contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [contrast]


(50) ku moca-eytayhayse mal-hay-po-a
    this hat-about tell-do-try-imperative 'Tell me about this hat.'

(51) a. ku moca-nun/lul John-i ecey sasse   this hat-nun/acc John-nom yesterday bought
    b. #John-i ku moca-nun/lul ecey sasse     John-nom this hat-nun/acc yesterday bought
       'John bought this hat yesterday.'

Like Japanese: (12)/(13)

(ii) Contrastive topic does not have to be clause initial:

(52) ecey party-eyse nwuka pasta-lul mekesse?
    yesterday party-at who pasta-acc ate
    'Who ate the pasta at the party yesterday?'

(53) Hmm, pasta-nun molu-keyss-ko
    Well, pasta-nun not-know-but
    'Well, I don’t know about the pasta, but…'

   a. Bill-i    KHong-UN 8-si-ey mekesse (Foc Top)
      Bill-nom beans-nun 8 o’clock-at ate
   b. KHONG-UN Bill-i    8-si-ey mekesse (Top, Foc t)
      beans-nun Bill-nom 8 o’clock-at ate
       'as for the beans, Bill ate them around 8 o’clock.'

Unlike Japanese: (14)/(15)

(iii) Contrastive topic can move to a variety of positions:

(54) John-i nwuku-hantey ku CD-lul cwuess-e?
    John-nom who-to this CD-acc gave
    'To whom did John give this CD?'

(55) Hmm, ku CD-nun molu-keyss-ko
    Well, this CD-nun not-know-but
    'Well, I don’t know about this CD, but…'

   a. John-i    SUE-HANTEY 1 CHAYK-UN ecey cwuesse
      John-nom Sue-to this book-nun ecey t cwuesse
      this book-nun John-nom Sue-to yesterday gave
      'as for this book, John gave it to Sue yesterday.'

   b. *John-i    SUE-HANTEY 1 CHAYK-UN ecey t cwuesse
      John-nom Sue-to this book-nun ecey t cwuesse
      John-nom Sue-to yesterday gave
      'as for this book, John gave it to Sue yesterday.'

   c. 1 CHAYK-UN John-i SUE-HANTEY ecey t, cwuesse
      this book-nun John-nom Sue-to yesterday gave
      Like Dutch: (18b), (19b), (20b)
      Unlike Japanese: (37)/(38)

(iv) Contrastive focus can also move to a variety of positions:

(56) John-i Sue-hantey mwu-lul cwuess-e?
    John-nom Sue-to what-acc gave
    'What did John give to Sue?'

(57) a. John-i Sue-hantey i CD-lul cwuesse
    John-nom Sue-to this CD-acc gave
    John-nom this CD-acc Sue-to gave
    b. #John-i i CD-lUL Sue-hantey t cwuesse
    John-nom Sue-hantey t cwuesse
    John-nom Sue-to gave
    'John gave the CD to Sue.'

Like Dutch: (18a), (19a), (20a)
Like Japanese: (35)/(36)

(v) Like Dutch, contrastive focus and contrastive topic movements mark the domain of contrast. It therefore gives rise to the predictions in (24) and (29):

(24) a.   topic,   [tv  FOCUS t]
    b. *FOCUS,   [tv  topic t]
(29) a.   Top,   [tv  t Foc]
    b. #Foc,   [tv  t Top]

(24a): Already shown to be correct by (55b) and (55c).
(24b): The example in (58)/(59) shows that this prediction is also borne out in Korean.

(58) John-un/i ecey pathi-eyse mwuess-lul mekesse?
    John-nom/nom yesterday party-at what-acc ate
    'What did John eat at the party yesterday?'

(59) Hmm, John-un molu-keyss-ko
    Well, John-nom not-know-but
    'Well, I don’t know about John, but…'

   a. BILL-UN 8-si-ey KHONG-UL mekesse. (Top Foc)
      Bill-nun 8 o’clock-at beans-acc ate
   b. #KHONG-UL BILL-UN 8-si-ey t cwesse. (#Foc, Top t)
      beans-acc Bill-nun 8 o’clock-at ate
       'as for Bill, he was eating beans around 8 o’clock.'

Like Dutch: (27)
Like Japanese: (44)/(45)
(29a): Top, t, Foc is ok:

(60) John-nom Mary-hantey mwu-lul cwuesse? John-nom Mary-to what-acc gave

‘What did John give to Mary?’

(61) Hmm, Mary-nun molu-keyss-ko

Well, Mary-nun not-know-but

‘Well, I don’t know about Mary, but...’

a. John-i SUE-HANTEY-NUN ICHAYK-UL ecey cwuesse (Top Foc)

John-nom Sue-to-nun this book-acc yesterday gave

b. SUE-HANTEY-NUN John-i t _ ICHAYK-UL ecey cwuesse (Top, t, Foc)

Sue-to-nun John-nom this book-nun yesterday gave

‘as for Sue, John gave her this book yesterday.’

Like Dutch: (30)
Like Japanese: (47)/(48)

(29b): But it’s #Foc, t, Top:

(62) John-i nwuku-hantey ku CD-lul cwuesse?

John-nom who-to this CD-acc gave

‘To whom did John give this CD?’

(63) Hmm, ku CD-nun molu-keyss-ko

Well, this CD-nun not-know-but

‘Well, I don’t know about this CD, but...’

a. John-i SUE-HANTEY ICHAYK-UN ecey cwuesse (Foc Top)

John-nom Sue-to this book-acc yesterday gave

b. #SUE-HANTEY John-i t _ ICHAYK-UN ecey cwuesse (#Foc, t, Top)

Sue-to John-nom this book-nun yesterday gave

‘as for this book, John gave it to Sue.’

Like Dutch: (32)

Korean is not Dutch: there is no comparable rule for non-contrastive topic in Dutch:

(64) Vertel me eens wat over deze hoed
tell me once something about this hat

‘Tell me about this hat.’

(65) a. Oh, Jan heeft deze hoed gisteren gekocht
Well, John has this hat yesterday bought

‘Well, John bought this hat yesterday.’

b. #Oh, deze hoed, heeft Jan t _, gisteren gekocht
Well, this hat has John yesterday bought

6 Contrastive wa-phrases and contrastive nun-phrases:

The claim that one rule wins over the other in conflict resolution predicts a further difference in the syntactic distribution between wa-phrases and nun-phrases in contrastive contexts.

There is a debate as to whether wa and nun appearing on non-contrastive topic and contrastive topic are one lexical item or two lexical items (Kuno 1973, Kuroda 1992, 2005, Hara 2006, Tomioka 2007 for Japanese; Choi 1997, 1999, Han 1998, Gill & Tsoulas 2003, M. Lee 2006, Oh 2007 for Korean). Some authors argue that there is non-contrastive wa and contrastive wa, while others argue that there is only one lexical item wa/nun and the contrast arises from the context. However, there is overwhelming evidence that the particles have different syntax, semantics and prosody in the two circumstances in which they are used. For instance, the contrastive interpretation is invariably associated with freer syntax and emphatic stress. The prediction pertains only to cases where wa- and nun-phrases are interpreted contrastively. So, for this talk, I will assume there are two wa’s and two nun’s.


(66) NANINKA-WA kita
some.people-wa came

‘Some people came.’ (Implicature: ‘Not everyone came’)

(67) a. ∃(x) [[person(x)] [came (x)]]

b. a stronger scalar alternative: ∀(x) [[person(x)] [came (x)]]

c. (b) can be false.

However, there is nothing inherent in this kind of interpretation that makes contrastive wa- or nun-phrases contrastive ‘topics’. Indeed, several authors have argued for Japanese that the properties of contrastive wa are akin to other focal particles such as mo ‘also’ and sur ‘even’ (Kuroda 1965, 2005, Oshima 2008). A contrastive wa-phrase can answer a wh-question.

Japanese:

(68) A: Dare-ga siken-ni ukatta no?
who-nom exam-in passed Q
‘Who passed the exam?’

B: JOHN-WA ukatta
John-wa passed

‘John passed.’ (‘but I’m not sure about others’ / ‘but Bill didn’t’)

In Korean, the general convention is to call contrastive nun-phrases in-situ contrastive ‘focus’, but it is not necessarily read as exhaustive (Choi 1999: C. Lee 2003, M. Lee 2006).
As we saw above, a contrastive wa- or nun-phrase can also be contrastive topics. The kind of contrast indicated by contrastive wa and contrastive nun seems compatible with both focus and topic. I argue therefore that they are identified as contrastive topics only by pragmatic consideration, i.e., what the rest of the sentence is about, affecting the topic of discourse. In other words, contrastive topics are always marked by contrastive wa or nun, but contrastive wa-phrases and contrastive nun-phrases are not always contrastive topics (Kuroda 2005, Hetland 2007).

Similar arguments can be made for the so-called English B-accent. Contrastive topics are sometimes identified as items bearing the B-accent (Jackendoff 1972, Büring 1997, 2003), but B-accented items are not necessarily always contrastive topics. It is unclear in what sense the B-sentences below are about the verb or the quantified non-specific items. Conversely, if contrastive topics are to be identified as bearers of the B-accent, it is unclear what interpretation is shared by contrastive and non-contrastive topics. B-accent is only indicative of the kind of contrast (Constant 2006, Wagner 2008).

(70) A: How’s your revision going?
   B: Well, [I bought] the book, but I haven’t read it.

(71) A: How many people expressed interest in your house?
   B: Well, [lots] of people called, and [three] looked at it, but [nobody] made an offer. (McNally 1998: 152)

The fact that contrastive wa- and contrastive nun-phrases can be items other than contrastive topic predicts a further difference with respect to their syntactic distribution. I have argued that the rule for [topic] wins over the rule for [contrast] with respect to contrastive topic in Japanese. Thus, from a functional perspective, one would expect that this language would interpret any contrastive wa-marked phrase displaced to clause-initial position as topic. In other words, if a contrastive wa-phrase is not a topic, moving it to sentence-initial position should be dispreferred. On the other hand, in Korean, the rule for [contrast] wins over the rule for [topic]. Thus, it should be possible to move a contrastive nun-phrase to sentence-initial position.

Japanese: [topic] > [contrast]
(72) a. contrastive wa-phrase: (XP, –WA) YP (XP, –WA) ZP (XP, –WA) V
   b. contrastive topic: (XP, –WA) YP (XP, –WA) ZP (XP, –WA) V

Korean: [contrast] > [topic]
(73) a. contrastive nun-phrase: (XP, –NUN) YP (XP, –NUN) ZP (XP, –NUN) V
   b. contrastive topic: (XP, –NUN) YP (XP, –NUN) ZP (XP, –NUN) V

The prediction is borne out in two instances.

(i) A contrastive wa-phrase answering a wh-question cannot be frontal to clause-initial position, but a contrastive nun-phrase answering a wh-question can:

Japanese:
(74) Mary-wa Sue-ni nani-o ageta no desu ka?
   Mary-wa Sue-to what-acc gave nmz cop Q
   ‘What did Mary give to Sue?’

(75) a. Mary-wa Sue-ni ANO HON-WA agemasita.
   b. Mary-wa that book-wa give
   ‘Mary gave that book to Sue.’ (but I’m not sure if she gave anything else)

Korean:
(76) John-i Sue-hantey mwu-lul cwuesse?
   John-nom Sue-to this CD-nom gave
   ‘John gave the CD to Sue.’ (but I’m not sure if she gave anything else)
A contrastive *wu*-phrase projecting the contrast to a larger constituent cannot be fronted to clause-initial position, but a contrastive *nun*-phrase in the same context can:

**Japanese:**

(82) a. [AME-WA hutteita-ga] [John-ga KASA-WA motteikanakatta] rain-WA falling-but John-nom umbrella-WA bring-went-not


‘It was raining, but John did not bring an umbrella.’

(modified from Kuno (1973: 46) attributed to Minoru Nakau (p.c.))

**Korean:**

(83) a. [pi-nun o-nuntey] [John-i WUSAN-UN kacyeo-ci an-hassta] rain-nun come-but John-nom umbrella-nun bring-neg neg-past

b. [pi-nun o-nuntey] [WUSAN-UN John-i t, kacyeo-ci an-hassta] rain-nun come-but umbrella-nun John-nom bring-neg neg-past

‘It’s raining, but John didn’t bring an umbrella.’

It is not the case that in Japanese a contrasted item within focus cannot undergo movement.

(84) A: nani-ga atta no desu ka?

what-nom existed nmz cop Q ‘What happened?’

B: [TAROO-O, Hanako-ga t, nagutte-simai-masita] Taroo-acc Hanako-nom hit-end.up POLITE

‘Hanako hit Taro.’

7 Conclusion

The Japanese and Korean data expand the patterns of topic-, focus- and contrast-marking in a way that is predicted by the typology in (1).

(85) Japanese:

a. [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position

b. [contrast] licenses A’-movement that marks domain of contrast.

c. Contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [topic].

(86) Korean:

a. [topic] is licensed in clause-initial position,

b. [contrast] licenses A’-movement that marks the domain of contrast.

c. Contrastive topic is subject to the rule for [contrast].

Crucially, those are patterns that are predicted to exist. What is not predicted by the typology in (1) is that there is a language in which there is a rule that generalises over items that do not share a notion, i.e. non-contrastive topic and information focus, non-contrastive topic and contrastive focus, or information focus and contrastive topic.

Speaker variation: one Korean informant (out of five) reported a pattern exactly like the Japanese pattern, while two Japanese informants (out of seven) reported the Korean pattern. This suggests that the choice for which rule wins may be an issue of a parametric variation.

**APPENDIX: non-contrastive *wu* and *nun***

In Japanese non-contrastive topic must be marked with *wu*, but in Korean, it can be marked with a case marker. This observation, particularly with respect to subject topic, was initially noted by Haig (1982). Shimojo & Choi (2000) propose that *nun* establishes the topic of discourse, while *wu* marks any ‘activated’ item. Re-interpreting Shimojo & Choi’s proposal, I propose that the notion [topic] is relevant also for explaining this difference. Specifically, I argue for Korean, following Choi (1999) that *nun* marks [topic] in Korean, while a case marker is discourse-neutral. By contrast, in Japanese, *wu* must mark [topic], but it can also mark other discourse given material under certain circumstances, while a case marker cannot mark [topic] (Vermeulen 2008 for some discussion):

(87) Japanese:

a. *wu* marks [topic] as well as discourse given material under certain circumstances.

b. case marker cannot mark [topic].

(88) Korean:

a. *nun* marks [topic].

b. case marker is neutral with respect to discourse function.

The differences in (87) and (88) predict that Japanese *wu* can be used for items that are not topic, but Korean *nun* cannot. There are two instances in which this is true:

(i) Discourse anaphoric/given object can be *wu*-marked, but not *nun*-marked:

Japanese:

(89) Mary-wa ano hon-o tosyokan-de karita no? Mary-wa that book-acc library-at borrowed Q ‘Did Mary manage to borrow that book in the library?’

(90) Ie, Mary-wa ano hon-wa honya-de KA MASITA. No, Mary-wa that book-nom bookshop-at bought ‘No, Mary bought that book at the bookshop.

Korean:

(91) Mary-ka ku chayk-ul tosekwan-eyse pilyesse? Mary-nom this book-acc library-at borrowed nmz cop Q ‘Did Mary manage to borrow that book in the library?’

(92) #Aniyo. Mary-ka kyelkwuk ku chayk-un seeen-eyse sasse. No, Mary-nom in the.end that book-nom bookshop-at bought ‘No, Mary bought that book at the bookshop in the end.’

(ii) *wu*-marked discourse given item can be preceded by another item, but not a *nun*-marked discourse given item.

Japanese:

(93) Mary-wa dare-o mita no desu ka?

Mary-wa who-acc saw nmz cop Q ‘Who did Mary see’

(94) JOHNS-O Mary-wa t, mita John-acc Mary-wa saw ‘Mary saw John.’
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