

*Functions of Japanese *ga*-clefts in discourse: A relevance-theoretic approach**

MASAHIRO KATO

Abstract

This article deals with the functional properties of Japanese *ga*-clefts in news reports. The main points argued here are (i) that Amano's (1995a, b) test framework which is designed to distinguish two options for *ga*-clefts is not in fact sufficient to do so; (ii) that in the framework of Relevance Theory, an alternative analysis can be proposed which claims that *ga*-clefts can be adequately accounted for without appealing to the semantic/pragmatic notions such as presupposition and focus, information structure, "direction of specificity" and so on; and (iii) that Japanese *ga*-clefts can be classified into three subcategories.

1 Introduction

Since the publication of Mikami (1953), Japanese clefts have been mainly studied in terms of the notions of specification and predication of copula sentences, and various proposals have been made to elucidate their semantic and functional properties. This article is concerned with *ga*-clefts, one of the two types of clefts in Japanese. It argues against the approach proposed in Amano (1995a, b), and outlines an alternative in the framework of Relevance Theory (hereafter, RT).

* This paper is an extended and revised version of Kato (in press). I would like to express my deep gratitude and intellectual indebtedness to Professor Deirdre Wilson, who spent a great deal of time commenting on and criticizing earlier versions of this paper. I am also grateful to Richard Horsey, and Naila McKenzie for stylistic improvements. All remaining errors are, of course, mine. I should like to thank Joetsu University of Education and my colleagues in Japan for allowing my studies at University College London. This work is supported in part by Japanese Government's Program of Overseas Research Scholars and a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) from the Japanese Society for Promotion of Science under Grant No. 07610462.

2 Two types of *ga*-clefts

It is generally acknowledged that there are two types of cleft sentences in Japanese:

- (1) Sakai-kun ga katta *no wa* kono hon da.¹¹ [X *no wa* Y da]
 Mr. Sakai NM bought CP TM this book is
 ‘What Mr. Sakai bought is this book.’ [X is Y]
- (2) Sakai-kun ga katta *no ga* kono hon da. [X *no ga* Y da]
 Mr. Sakai NM bought CP NM this book is
 ‘What Mr. Sakai bought is this book.’ [X is Y]

We will refer to the clefts that have a *wa* postpositional particle, exemplified in (1), as *wa*-clefts, and to those which have a *ga* postpositional particle, as in (2), as *ga*-clefts. Both of these clefts share the common structural property that the pre-particle elements constitute a clause, that is, *Sakai kun ga katta no* constitutes a clause in (1) and (2), and *no* is a complimentizer. Post-particle elements consist of either NP+copula *da* or Adj+copula *da*. We will refer to the pre-particle clause as *argument X* (henceforth, X) and to the post-particle elements as *argument Y* (henceforth, Y). Depending on the semantic properties of X and Y, Japanese cleft sentences are classified into different subtypes (Nishiyama (1985), Kanbayashi (1988), and Kumamoto (1989a,b)). We will not discuss these matters in detail in this article, and we will focus exclusively on specificational *ga*-clefts: that is, the *ga*-clefts whose semantic function is to specify a value for a variable in a sense discussed in Declerck (1988: 2). For example, the *ga*-cleft in (2) is specificational because it specifies a value (*kono hon*(this book) for the variable ‘Sakai-kun ga katta X’ (‘the X which Mr. Sakai bought’).

Kumamoto (1989a) analyzed the semantic properties of *wa*-clefts and *ga*-clefts and claimed that they differ in that Y specifies the content of X in *wa*-clefts and X specifies that of Y in *ga*-clefts:

- (3) Sore wo yaraseta *no wa* Taro de wa nai. Jiro da.
 that AM make CP TM Taro is CM not Jiro is
 ‘It was not Taro that made someone do it. It was Jiro.’

¹ In this paper, we will use the following abbreviations: AM = Accusative Marker, CP = Complimentizer, CM = Contrastive Marker, -F = Formal form, GM = Genitive Marker, LOC = Locative Marker, NM = Nominative Marker, PAS = Passive Morpheme, QM = Question Marker, QTM = Quotative Marker, SF = Sentence-final Particle, TM = Topic Marker.

- (4) Sore wo yaraseta *no ga* Taro de wa nai. Tomeyo to sita *no ga*
 that AM make CP NM Taro is CM not stop try CP NM
 Taro da.
 Taro is
 ‘It was not Taro that made someone do it. It was Taro that tried to stop someone from doing it.’

The meaning of (3) is that the one who made someone do it was not *Taro* but *Jiro* and that of (4) is that *Taro* is the person who tried to stop someone from doing it. What is presupposed in (3) is that someone made someone do something, and the presupposition in (4) is that the particular person who did something was *Taro*.

From these observations Kumamoto (1989a) concluded that X expresses a presupposition and Y bears focus in *wa*-clefts [*X no wa Y*] and Y expresses a presupposition and X bears focus in *ga*-clefts [*X no ga Y*]. According to her analyses the basic meaning of *wa*-clefts is that what is X is Y, and that of *ga*-clefts is that what is Y is X.

Amano (1995a, b) argues against Kumamoto’s analyses and claims that there are two options for *ga*-clefts: (i) Y expresses a presupposition and X bears focus, (ii) X expresses a presupposition and Y bears focus. The interpretation of *ga*-clefts, she maintains, depends on the context in which they are used:

- (5) E mo interia no ichibuto kanngaeru no ga Yoroppa no hitotachi desu.
 picture also interior of part as think CP NM Europe of people are-F
 sono tameni wainteria zenntai no nakade e dakeuitemienaiyona kufu
 that for CM interior total of in picture only not stand out means
 ga hituyou desu. Konotokiichiban taisetsuna no ga interia to
 NM necessary is-F then most important CP NM interior with
 no iroawase.

matching of colors

(Amano, 1995a: 8)

‘Those who consider pictures a part of interior decorations are Europeans. It is, thus, necessary that pictures should not stand out against the background of the interior decorations. What matters most is their matching of colors with the interior decorations.’

In the context of (5), if we follow Kumamoto’s claim that Y expresses a presupposition and X carries focus in *ga*-clefts, then, as Amano (1995a, b) points out, we will get a weird interpretation of the italicized *ga*-cleft to the effect that what constitutes the matching of colors with the interior decorations (Y) is the most important factor (X). We can get rid of this unnatural reading only by interpreting Y as the focus of the underlined *ga*-cleft; that is, what matters most (X) is the matching of colors with the interior deco-

rations (Y). Amano (1995b) concludes from these observations that there are two types of *ga*-cleft; one with X as its focus, the other with Y as its focus. She calls the former an anterior-focus *ga*-cleft (AFC) and the latter a posterior-focus *ga*-cleft (PFC):

- (6) Two types of *ga*-clefts:
 (i) Anterior-Focus *ga*-cleft (AFC): X carries focus and Y carries a presupposition in [X *no ga* Y].
 (ii) Posterior-Focus *ga*-cleft (PFC): X carries a presupposition, and Y carries focus in [X *no ga* Y].

3 Focus of *ga*-clefts

Amano (1995a) provides the following evidence for the existence of the Posterior-Focus *ga*-cleft: that it is possible to put the phrases (i) “dare da to omou (who do you think)”, and (ii) “tatoeba (for example)” in between X and Y in a PFC:

- (7) A: Kono shasin no nakade Jun wa dono hito na no.
 this picture of in LM Jun TM which person is QM
 ‘Which of those persons is Jun in this picture?’
 B: ?Boushi wo kabutteiru *no ga*, dare da to omou, Jun da yo. (ibid.: 12)
 cap AM wear CP NM who do you think Jun is SF
 *‘The one who wears a cap is, who do you think, Jun.’
- (8) Gesuto no nakade tokuni chumoku shitai *no ga*, dare da to omoimasu,
 guest of in specially notice want CP NM who do you think-F
 nyuyoku shiti bare no Darsey Kusler desu ne. (ibid.:13)
 New York City Ballet of Darsey Kusler is-F SF
 *‘What I want you to notice is, who do you think, Darsey Kusler of New York City Ballet.’

(1989a)). There remain, however, several defects in her definition of focus cited below and it is furthermore obscure in its application:

- (11) In the structure *A ga B da* (A is B) the proposition, known to the hearer, *A ga V da* or *V ga B da* (V: a variable), is the presupposition of *A ga B da* (A is B), and $V=B$ or $V=A$ is the focus of *A ga B da* (A is B). (Amano, 1995b: 4-6)

The *ga*-cleft, *Konotoki ichiban taisetsu na no ga interia to no iroawase* in (5), for example, is analyzed as [*konotoki ichiban taisetsuna mon ga V*] = presupposition, and [$V=interia\ to\ no\ iroawase$] = focus.

In (11), Amano (1995b) defines $[V=B]$ or $[V=A]$ as the focus of *A ga B da* (A is B). It is, however, inappropriate to call $[V=B]$ or $[V=A]$ a focus from the logical point of view. This part of the definition should be revised to “it is focus that specifies the value of the variable in the presupposition.” This revision is applicable to specific copula sentences in general (cf. Declerck, 1988).

A more serious problem resides in the fact that given a *ga*-cleft, we can not distinguish it as an AFC or a PFC solely based on the definition in (11). This is because the hearer must infer whether the variable V of the *ga*-cleft is in X or in Y of the *X no ga Y* construction. In this regard Amano also states the following:

Whether focus is in A or B in an “*A ga B da* sentence (A is B.)” depends on the context where it is actually used. That is, it is possible to interpret the same “*A ga B da*” sentence in two ways: the focus is in A in some context, or it is in B in another. (Amano, 1995b: 5)

It is reasonable to maintain that the focus in *ga*-clefts varies with the context. Amano (1995b), however, does not specify the inferential procedures allowing the hearer to select one option [A is the focus of *A ga B da*] over the other [B is the focus of *A ga B da*] in the context where they are used. Instead, she proposes the test referred to in Section 3: that if it is possible to put (i) “*dare da to omou* (who do you think)”, or (ii) “*tatoeba* (for example)” in between *X no ga* and Y of *X no ga Y*, then it is considered a PFC. This test, however, will not always work properly in actual discourse extracted from newspaper reports:

- (12) Roshia Seifu *ga* hikoushikini yaku 20okudoru no kankyoshakkan wo
 Russian Gov. NM unofficially about 2 billion environmental yen-loan AM
 youseisita *ga*, NihonSeifu wa genjiten de wa oujirarenai to suru hensho wo
 asked conj. Japanese Gov. TM at the moment CM not comply saying reply AM
 Roshia gawa ni okutteita koto *ga*, 10ka madeni akirakaninatta. *Roshia wa*
 Russia side to sent fact NM 10 th by revealed Russia TM
Nihon no Seifu no tojyoukokuenjo (ODA) no taishougai to iu no ga
 JapaneseGov of ODA of exclusion QTM saying CP NM
omotemuki no riyu daga, ryoudomondai de sinntenn *ga* mirarenaikagiri,
 ostensible of reason is territory issue in development NM unless progress
 ODA niyuru keizaienjoni oujirubeki de wa nai to suru ikenn *ga* seifunai ni
 ODA from financial aid should offer is CM not QTM opinion NM Gov. in
 tsuyoitame da. (*The Asahi*, 11 March, 1999)
 strong is

‘It is learned on March 10 that the Russian Government has unofficially asked for about two billion dollars environmental yen-loan, but the Japanese Government has sent them a reply saying “we could not comply with it at this stage.” What the ostensible reason is is that Russia is excluded from the ODA of the Japanese Government. In fact, it is because there is an adverse opinion that we should not offer a financial aid from the ODA unless negotiations on territorial issues make some headway.’

- (13) a. Roshia wa Nihonno Seifu no tojyoukokuenjo (ODA) no taishougai to
 Russia TM Japanese Gov. of ODA of exclusion QTM
 iu no *ga*, *nanda to omou*, omotemuki no riyu da yo.
 saying CP NM what do you think ostensible of reason is SF
 ‘What the ostensible reason is, what do you think, is that Russia is excluded from the ODA of the Japanese Government.’
- b. Roshia wa Nihonno Seifu no tojyoukokuenjo (ODA) no taishougai to
 Russia TM Japanese Gov. of ODA of exclusion QTM
 iu no *ga*, *tatoeba*, omotemuki no riyu da yo.
 saying CP NM for example ostensible of reason is SF
 ‘What the ostensible reason(s) is, for example, is that Russia is excluded from the ODA of the Japanese Government.’

The underlined part of (12) is a *ga*-cleft. If we insert the phrase “*nan da to omou* (what do you think)” or “*tatoeba* (for example)”, then we will have (13a) and (13b) respectively. Since these sentences are well formed, we could say, following Amano’s (1995b) test mentioned in Section 3, that the *ga*-cleft in (12) should be a PFC, that is, “*omotemuki no riyu* (the ostensible reason)” in the *ga*-cleft, which is Y in *X no ga Y*, is assigned focus. At the same time the rest of the sentence might be a presupposition. It is

obvious, however, that this conclusion fails to reflect linguistic facts. In the previous discourse in (12), it is stated that the Japanese Government sent a negative reply to the Russian request for the loan. It is natural to suppose that when a government rejects a request from another government, there should be a proper reason to do so. Then, we can safely maintain that “*omotemuki no riyu* (the ostensible reason)” in the *ga*-cleft in (12) is a presupposition rather than focus, and that “*Roshia wa Nihon no Seifu no tojyou-kokuenjo (ODA) no taishougai to iu (koto)* (That Russia is excluded from the ODA of the Japanese Government.)” should be the focus of this construction. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that the *ga*-cleft in (12) is an AFC.

When we scrutinize all the 85 AFC examples collected, we find among them several AFCs which permit insertion of “*nanda to omou* (what do you think)” or “*tatoeba* (for example)”. On the other hand, when we examine all the PFC examples collected, every PFC is acceptable with the same phrase inserted. It follows from this observation that while every PFC can permit the insertion of “*nanda to omou* (what do you think)” or “*tatoeba* (for example)”, the *ga*-clefts which exhibit this behavior cannot always be judged as cases of PFC.

The possibility of inserting “*nanda to omou* (what do you think)” or “*tatoeba* (for example)” is only a necessary condition for a *ga*-cleft to be a PFC, not a sufficient one. Now it is obvious that Amano’s (1995b) test is not accurate, and is inadequate to distinguish cases of AFC from PFC.

5 Relevance Theory

5.1 Cognitive effects and processing effort

We have shown that it is appropriate, as Amano (1995a, b) claims, to assume that there are two options for *ga*-clefts: the AFC and the PFC. It is not, however, tenable to accept her analyses as they stand, because several weaknesses are observable in the definition of focus and the tests based on it. Furthermore, several arguments have been made against the notion of presupposition itself (cf. Wilson & Sperber (1979), Atlas & Levinson (1981), Kumamoto (1989)). This paper aims to demonstrate that Japanese *ga*-clefts can be properly analyzed in the framework of Relevance Theory without raising theoretical difficulties, and that these clefts have several characteristic discourse functions.

Sperber & Wilson (1986, 1995) (hereafter, S&W) develop a theory of communication based on assumptions about human cognition, maintaining that a speaker, by claiming a hearer's attention, communicates that the information he is offering is relevant enough to be worth the hearer's attention. According to S&W, information is relevant to the hearer to the extent that it interacts with his existing (given) assumptions to yield cognitive

effects. Cognitive effects are classified into three types: (i) *contextual implication*, which is produced by the logical interaction of new information and the context, (ii) the *strengthening* of an existing assumption, and (iii) *contradicting* and *eliminating* an existing assumption.

5.2 Optimal relevance, principle of relevance, and comprehension procedure

Sperber & Wilson (1986, 1995) further claim that an utterance is expected to be not just relevant but optimally relevant. They go on to propose a communicative principle of relevance. Optimal relevance and the communicative principle of relevance are defined as:

(14) Optimal Relevance (OR)

An utterance is optimally relevant if and only if (a) it is relevant enough to be worth the hearer's processing effort, and (b) it is the most recent one compatible with the speaker's abilities and preferences.

(Wilson 1999b, Sperber & Wilson 1995: 270)

(15) (Communicative) Principle of Relevance (CPR)

Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

(Sperber & Wilson 1995: 260)

The definition of Optimal Relevance entails that an utterance is optimally relevant only if it has enough cognitive effects without claiming unjustifiable effort to acquire those effects. The Communicative Principle of Relevance states that a hearer is entitled to go ahead and interpret every utterance in the expectation that it is optimally relevant; that is, it attracts the hearer's attention by virtue of the fact that its interpretation is expected to yield adequate cognitive effects for the minimum justifiable processing effort. Wilson (1999a: 136) further discusses the following comprehension procedure which is motivated by CPR in (15):

(16) Relevance-theoretic comprehension procedure

Follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects.

(a) Consider interpretations in order of accessibility.

(b) Stop when your expectation of relevance is satisfied.

This procedure is automatically applied to the on-line processing of utterances and ensures that the hearer arrives at the intended interpretation of an utterance.

5.3 Natural linkage between linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation

Sperber & Wilson (1985, 1995: 212) criticise the approaches to explain the contrast between examples like (17a) and (17b), which appeal to vague notions such as ‘relative semantic weight’ or ‘relative newsworthiness’:

- (17) I’m sorry I’m late.
 (a) My CAR broke down.
 (b) My car was BOOBY-trapped.

S&W demonstrate that the contrast between (17a) and (17b) can be accounted for in RT without recourse to any ad hoc stress assignment rules. The information that the car was booby-trapped would still be quite relevant to the hearer of (17b), even after he has made the assumption that the speaker is late because something was wrong with the car. That is, the VP following the initially unstressed NP in (17b) has significant cognitive effects in a context derived by the processing of the initial NP, whereas the VP following the initially unstressed NP in (17a) does not. Thus, the VP in (17b) should be focally stressed, whereas the VP in (17a) should not.

S&W pursue the idea that

there is a natural linkage between linguistic structure and pragmatic interpretation, and no need for any special pragmatic conventions or interpretation rules: the speaker merely adapts her utterance to the way the hearer is going to process it anyhow, given the existing structural and temporal constraints

and show how it works out in analysing stylistic effects of stress assignment.

Japanese clefts have been studied in terms of various semantic/pragmatic paradigms: information structure (Sato, 1980), presupposition and focus (Amano, 1995a, b), “direction of specificity” (Kumamoto, 1989a, b), and “accessibility and persistence of referents” (Sunakawa, 1995). Although there are a number of scattered insights worth considering, these approaches, however, have hardly attained an explanatory theory of the relation between and their pragmatic effects. Along the lines developed in S&W (chapter 4), we would like to show that Japanese *ga*-clefts can be adequately accounted for in the framework of RT without appealing to the semantic/pragmatic notions used in the literature mentioned above.

5.4 Foreground information and background information

Sperber & Wilson (1986, 1995) analyse foreground and background information in the framework of RT as follows:

In our framework, background information is information that contributes only indirectly to relevance, by reducing the processing effort required; it need be neither given nor presupposed. Foreground information is information that is relevant in its own right by having contextual effects; it need not be new. (ibid.: 217)

They claim that although the given-new and focus-presupposition distinctions are regarded as the fundamental concepts in much linguistic and pragmatic theory, their foreground-background information does not play any role in linguistic theory, and in pragmatics “it is simply a descriptive label used to distinguish two complementary and independently necessary aspects of the interpretation process (ibid.: 217).”

They further claim that

backgrounding and foregrounding arise as automatic effects of the hearer’s tendency to maximise relevance, and of the speaker’s exploitation of that tendency. (ibid.: 217)

S&W have also pointed out the importance of exploring the communicator’s production process:

The cognitive processes at work in the communicator, and the social character and context of communication are, of course, essential to the wider picture, to the study of which we hope relevance theory can contribute, and from which it stands greatly to benefit. (ibid.: 279)

When we take the communicator’s point of view into consideration here, we can say that the speaker, assuming that the hearer is looking for an utterance that is as relevant as possible, will formulate the utterance so that a relevance-maximising hearer will make the right allocations of foreground and background information.² Thus, we stipulate, following S&W (ibid.: 217), background and foreground information as follows:

² I am indebted to Deirdre Wilson (p.c., 2000).

- (18) a. Background information is information that indirectly contributes to relevance, by reducing the processing effort required.
 b. Foreground information is information that is relevant in its own right by having contextual effects.

6 Three types of *ga*-clefts

6.0 We analyze *ga*-clefts in the framework of Relevance Theory, specifically in terms of background and foreground information as discussed in the previous section. In this section we will demonstrate that Japanese *ga*-clefts can be classified into three subcategories, rather than two, as in (6) proposed in Amano (1995b); (i) Anterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts, (ii) Posterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts, and (iii) Foreground *ga*-clefts.

Amano's observations are basically on the right track, and she acknowledges that the location of the focus of *ga*-clefts may depend on the context. She has not, however, specified in her works how it is determined or what sorts of interpretation processes are involved in deciding on the focus location.

The fact that the location of the focus of *ga*-clefts cannot be determined solely by their syntactic or semantic structures indicates that what is involved is the hearer's inferential procedures for choosing the appropriate option for *ga*-clefts, [X is the focus of X *ga* Y *da*] or [Y is the focus of X *ga* Y *da*], in the context where they are used. The Relevance-theoretic approach, as we will shortly argue, offers some insightful accounts of these inferential procedures.

Since "every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance", as stated in (15), given a *ga*-cleft in an utterance, the hearer interprets it with the presumption that it should achieve optimal relevance. That is, the hearer interprets the *ga*-cleft with the presumption that it will provide at least enough cognitive effects to offset the processing effort involved.

6.1 Data

My examples of *ga*-clefts were mainly collected from newspapers, weekly magazines, novels, and essays written in Japanese. Most of them were from written texts, but some were extracted from narrative parts of novels. The total number of specificational *ga*-clefts was 139, of which 83 were classified as Anterior-Foreground, 33 were Posterior-Foreground, and 23 were Foreground. Although the size of the corpus is not very large, it seems enough to capture fundamental properties and discourse functions characteristic of Japanese *ga*-clefts in general.

6.2 Anterior-foreground *ga*-clefts

Let us look at the following examples, which appeared in news reports from the point of view mentioned above:

- (19) 15 nichi kohyosareta koutekisikin chunyuko no keieikenzenka
 15th disclosed to the public banks borrowing government loan of financial reconstruction
 keikakude, kakukou ga kabushiki no mochiai kaishou
 plan in each bank NM stock of engagement of reciprocally holding dissolution
 notame, 1000 okuen kibo no kabushiki baikyaku wo kentousiteiru koto ga
 for 100 billion amount of stock selling AM planning fact NM
 akirakaninatta. *Kakakuhendou no hageshii kabushikino hoyuzandaka wo*
 disclosed fluctuations of intense stock of holdings of stock AM
herashi, jikosihonritu heno eikyo wo keigensuru no ga neraida.
 reduce proportion of their own capital to influence AM reduce CP NM aim

(*The Asahi*, 16 March, 1999)

‘On March 15th, the plan for financial reconstruction of the banks was disclosed to the public for the first time. In order to dissolve the engagement of holding reciprocal bank stocks, the banks are planning to sell their stocks for the amount of 100 billion dollars. By doing so, the banks hope to prevent intense stock price-fluctuations and reduce the influence such fluctuations have on the bank’s capital.’

It is stated in the context prior to the *ga*-cleft in (19) that they have been planning to sell their stocks to dissolve the engagement of holding reciprocal bank stocks. This context constitutes a part of the cognitive environment of the addressee when he interprets the *ga*-cleft. The pre-particle clause (argument X) of the *ga*-cleft in (19), *Kakakuhendou no hageshii kabushiki no hoyuzandaka wo herashi, jikosihonritu heno eikyo wo keigensuru* (they should reduce the balance of holdings of stocks which are vulnerable to fluctuations in stock price, and lessen its influence in proportion to their own capital), offers the addressee the reason for selling the stocks, and its effects. Thus the pre-particle clause, that is, X of the *ga*-cleft, yields sufficient contextual effects, which may alter the cognitive environment of the addressee, in a context created by processing of the immediately preceding passage.

The post-particle element (argument Y) of the *ga*-cleft in (19) is *nerai da* ((their) aim). It is interesting to note that *nerai da* could be substituted without changing the meaning of the whole utterance for *tame da* (for the sake of), which explicitly states the cause and effect relationship to the preceding context. *Nerai da* thus has the function of implying the logical relationship to the preceding context. Consequently, it is reasonable to claim that the post-particle element, that is, Y in the *ga*-cleft, indirectly contributes to rele-

vance in the sense that it reduces the processing effort required for the addressee to interpret the *ga*-cleft by giving him a logical clue to the link to foregoing discourse.

When we analyse these observations from the viewpoint of foreground and background information stipulated in 4.4, we can reasonably maintain the following: X in these *ga*-clefts, which is relevant in its own right by having cognitive effects, carries foreground information. Y in these *ga*-clefts, on the other hand, which contributes indirectly to relevance by reducing processing effort, carries background information. We define these *ga*-clefts as *the anterior foregrounding ga-clefts* (henceforth, AFC) whose X and Y arguments carry foreground information and background information, respectively.

6.3 Posterior-foreground *ga*-clefts

The following *ga*-cleft, which has the same syntactic structure *X no ga Y da*, as the one in (19), does not seem to share the same information structure:

- (20) J-rigu, Verudhi Kawasaki ni mo ita Udhineze (Itaria Serie A) shozoku no
 Japan league Verdy Kawasaki in formerly Wodinaze (Itaria Serie A) belonged to
 FW Amorozo mo “Kankoku to chigai, gijutu no reberu wa takai,” to
 FW Amorozo also Korea CM different skill of level TM high QTM
 Nihonno chikara wo hyoukasiteiru. *Nihondaihyou no hyouka wo ageteiru*
 Japan of ability AM evaluate Japanese players of evaluation AM raise
no ga, Itaria de katuyakusuru Nagada no sonzai da.
 CP NM Italy in play actively Nakada of existence is

(ibid., 31 March, 1999)

‘FW Amorozo of Wodinaze (Serie A, Italy), once a Verdy Kawasaki player, Japan League, has evaluated the Japanese team, saying that “their skills are relatively higher than those of the Korean team.” *It is the existence of Nakada, playing actively in Italy that has raised the reputation of the Japanese team.*’

X in this *ga*-cleft, *Nihondaihyou no hyouka wo ageteiru no* (the one who has raised the reputation of Japanese team), seems to carry the discourse function of helping to make a set of football players derived from encyclopedic information about football accessible to the addressee. That is, it narrows down the set of players who contribute to raising the reputation of the team from a larger set of Japanese football players, who were a topic in the preceding context. Thus, it is tenable to state that X in the *ga*-cleft indirectly contributes to the relevance of this utterance in the sense that it reduces processing effort by activating a set of possible players.

Y in the *ga*-cleft in (20), *Itaria de katuyakusuru Nagada no sonzai da* (the existence of Nakada, playing actively in Italy), specifies one particular player among a set of possible football players who may contribute to raising the reputation of the Japanese team. Therefore, Y is relevant in its own right by having the cognitive effect of altering the addressee's cognitive environment.

These observations concerning the *ga*-cleft in (20) lead us to stipulate that X in this *ga*-cleft, reducing processing effort, should carry background information, and Y in this *ga*-cleft, having cognitive effect, should carry foreground information. We define these *ga*-clefts as *posterior-foregrounding ga-clefts* (henceforth, PFC) whose X and Y arguments carry background and foreground information, respectively.

The following examples further illustrate the plausibility of distinguishing AFC from PFC:

- (21) Hito no jumyo wo meguru ronso ga beishijode moriagatteiru.
 human of life-expectancy AM concerning issue NM US paper in actively discussed
Idenshikenkyuno seika wo fumaete "kagakushatachi no kanshin wa,
 genetic studies of results AM based scientists of interests TM
jumyo wo 200sai made nobasukoto ni ututta" to houjirareta no ga
 life-expectancyAM 200 year to extension to shift QTM reported CP NM
kikkake.
 beginning (ibid., 22 March, 1999)

'Human life-expectancy has been a hot issue in US newspapers. The root of the controversy is due to reports based on the results of genetic studies, which have shifted scientists' focus to extending the human life expectancy to 200 years.'

- (22) Touseigaisha Doreifesu wa kongetsu chujun, touseika ni "Mohaya
 investment company Drafaus TM this month mid investors to any more
 intanettokabu ni wate wo dasuna. Gyouseki wohaneisinai koutoukabu
 internet stock to TM hand AM dabble not business results AM not reflect soaring shares
 ga oosugiru. Natsu niwa sinkokuna hanndou ga kuru darou," to
 NM too many summer in serious setback NM due will be QTM
 keikokushita. Kabushikibumu to tomoni kanetsugimina no ga,
 warned stock boom with overheating CP NM
shakkin izon wo takameteiru kojinshouhi da.
 debt dependence AM increasing private consumption is

(ibid., 31 March, 1999)

'This month, Drayfaus, an investment company warned investors to avoid internet shares. In the middle of this month, Drayfaus also warned that there are too many soaring shares that have not reflected business results and a serious setback is due

this summer. *It is private consumption increasingly dependent on debt that has been overheating along with a stock boom.*'

In example (21), the reader who has understood the earlier part describing the human life expectancy may have various assumptions concerning the life expectancy, including longevity-related genes, development of new medicine, and changes in life style. The reader draws from these assumptions and X in the *ga*-cleft, the conclusion that the issue of perennial youth and long life arises from the scientists' achievements in genetic studies, which alters the cognitive environment of the reader. Thus, X in the *ga*-cleft in (21) can be judged to carry foreground information. Since Y (*kikkake* (a beginning)) in the *ga*-cleft in (21) could be substituted, as in (19), without changing the logical content of the sentence, for *tame da* (for the sake of), which implies a cause and effect relationship to the preceding context, it can be said to carry background information, which reduces processing effort by implicitly indicating the logical relationship to the prior sentences. Consequently, the *ga*-cleft in (21) is regarded as an AFC.

The *ga*-cleft in (22) is an example of PFC. The preceding passage discusses the fact that investments in Internet-related shares have been overheating. Reading the article up to X in the *ga*-cleft, the reader, processing X and inspired by "*kanetugimi na no ga*" (what is overheating) in X, will entertain from his encyclopaedic knowledge assumptions concerning overheating phenomena in e-commerce, Internet banking, consumption, financial market, and so on. Y in the *ga*-cleft "*shakkin izon wo takameteiru kojishouhi da,*" (private consumption which has increased dependence on debt) specifies what is also overheating now as private consumption from the accessible context provided by X. Thus, we can consider the *ga*-cleft in (22) a PFC, where X indirectly contributes to relevance by reducing processing effort, and Y is relevant in its own right by yielding the cognitive effects.

6.4 Foreground *ga*-clefts

We find 23 examples in the corpus which do not come under the definition of AFC or of PFC. In her concluding remarks, Amano (1995a: 18) briefly suggested the possibility of a type of *ga*-clefts, whose X and Y both bear focus. She has not, however, developed this idea in any form of discussion so far.

- (23) Kaijyohoancho ga gennin wo senpaku ni kiita tokoro, sennai
 The Maritime Safety Agency NM cause AM ships AM inquired QTM inside ship
 de sagyochuni ayamatte ositanado sousamisu ga 26ken de mottomo
 LM at work during by mistake push mistakes NM 26case is most
 ookatta. *Shike de nami wo kaburi hasshinshita to iu no ga 4ken.*
 frequent stormy weather by wave AM covered sent signals QTM CP NM 4cases
 (ibid.: 8 March, 1999)

‘The Maritime Safety Agency, inquiring into the cause (of a false signal) from the vessels, reveals that the top of the list is mishandling, which amounts to 26 cases, such as sending out signals by mistake while at work in a ship. They report *four cases of false signals that involve a malfunction of the device by shipping water.*’

- (24) Nagoyadeha 12-13 ji no ranchitaimu ni wa renjitu, 27seki no supesu ni
 Nagoya in 12-13 hour of lunch time at TM everyday 27seat of space in
 100ni n chikai kyaku ga oshiyoseru ninki wo atsumeteiru no ga,
 100 people nearly customers NM swarm popularity AM win CP NM
 donburisenmonten “Miraitei” (Atsuta-ku, Sanbonmatsu).
 rice bowl speciality restaurant Miraite (Atsuta-ku, Sanbonmatsu)

(ShukanGendai, 20 March, 1999)

‘In Nagoya it is the rice bowl speciality restaurant “Miraitei” that has won enough popularity to attract nearly 100 people every day to 27 seats during lunchtime from 12-13.’

From assumptions accessible to the reader, derived from the preceding context, where the topic is the cause of sending SOS signals by mistake, and X in the *ga*-cleft in (23), he may draw the conclusion that shipping water is the cause of the accidental broadcast of signals. In this sense X in the *ga*-cleft carries foreground information, which yields cognitive effect shown above. As for Y, it also carries foreground information specifying the number of signals sent out by mistake, which is certain to alter the reader’s cognitive environment. Consequently, both X and Y in the *ga*-cleft in (23) carries foreground information. We refer to this option in *ga*-clefts as Foreground *ga*-clefts (henceforth, FC).

The *ga*-cleft in (24) appeared in a series of magazine articles that recommend budget restaurants to readers. Before reaching the *ga*-cleft, the reader may have derived such assumptions concerning a budget restaurant that is popular among people from his encyclopaedic knowledge as that it should give you good value for money, or that it must be crowded and so on. Reading X in the *ga*-cleft that describes how it is bustling and swarming, the reader acquires an interpretation that satisfies his expectations of relevance without the unjustified expenditure of effort. Therefore, we can safely say that X

bears foreground information. Y in the *ga*-cleft has relevance in its own right by revealing the name of the restaurant, and thus carries foreground information. Consequently, the *ga*-cleft in (24) can be considered as an FC.

We have proposed in this section that Japanese *ga*-clefts can be classified into three types, (i) Anterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts, (ii) Posterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts, and (iii) Foreground *ga*-clefts:

- (25) a. Anterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts:
Ga-clefts whose X and Y carry foreground and background information respectively.
- b. Posterior-Foreground *ga*-clefts:
Ga-clefts whose X and Y carry background and foreground information respectively.
- c. Foreground *ga*-clefts:
Ga-clefts whose X and Y carry foreground information.

7 Functional properties of anterior-foreground *ga*-clefts

Sunakawa (1994, 1995)³³ points out that the “Highlighted preposed referent type” of *ga*-clefts, which, although proposed in a different framework, is equivalent to AFC, has the discourse function “to highlight urgent and important information” in the X of *ga*-clefts. Kumamoto (1889) claims that X bears focus and Y expresses a presupposition in *ga*-clefts [X no *ga* Y *da*]. Her assertion also implies that X normally has the function of making its elements salient. Thus, it is generally acknowledged that X in the AFC has the function of highlighting its elements.

When we examine 83 examples of AFC in detail, we find that there is a strong tendency for the vocabularies appearing in Y of the AFC to converge on a relatively small set:

³³ Sunakawa (1994, 1995) analyzes Japanese *ga*-clefts based on accessibility of referents in the previous context and on persistence of referents in the subsequent discourse, and proposes two types of *ga*-clefts: “Highlighted preposed referent type,” which has nonpersistent postposed referents, and “Persistent postposed referent type,” which has persistent postposed referents.

TABLE 1

	vocabulary	frequency	%
1.	<i>nerai</i> (an aim, an objective)	13	15.7
2.	proper name	6	7.2
3.	<i>kikkake</i> (a beginning)	5	6
4.	<i>jitsujo</i> (actual state of affairs)	5	6
5.	<i>tokucho</i> (a characteristic)	4	4.8
6.	<i>genjo</i> (a present state)	3	3.6
7.	<i>mokuteki</i> (a purpose)	3	3.6
8.	<i>honno</i> (underlying motive)	3	3.6
9.	<i>shuchou</i> (a claim, an assertion)	2	2.4
10.	<i>gennin</i> (a cause)	2	2.4
11.	<i>housin</i> (a course, the line)	2	2.4
12.	<i>urimono</i> (a sales point)	2	2.4
13.	<i>riyu</i> (a reason)	2	2.4
		52	62.6

Table 1 shows a part of the list of the vocabulary occurring more than twice in Y of the AFC, its frequency, and percentage. (A full list is available in the Appendix.) It is interesting to note that the top seven items excluding proper names, cover 43.3 % of the total, and that it would amount to 55.3% if we take into consideration the items that occur more than once. This means that only twelve items account for more than half of all occurrences.

What is more salient about the list is that these items tend to express rather general and abstract concepts compared with those appearing in X of the AFC, which bear relatively specific or descriptive meaning:

- (26) Beikoku wajikoku no kannshinnoaru bunyade no goui wo
 the US TM own country of interesting area in of mutual agreements AM
 yuusen sasetai no ga honne da. (ibid.: 27 March, 1999)
 priority give CP NM true inclination is
 ‘The United States’ true inclination is to prioritize the attainment of mutual agree-
 ments in its areas of interest.’

- (27) Sikasi, kosuto ga kakaruwarini shueki ni suguni musubitukanai tame,
 but cost NM costly profit to directly not contribute because
 dokomo (sisankanrigataeigyō no) teichakuni kurousiteiru no ga
 every(company) property-management business stabilization have a difficult time CP NM
 jitsujo da. (ibid.: 25 March, 1999)
 the true facts is

‘Given the investment/profit ratio imbalance, every finance company has in fact had a difficult time stabilizing the property-management business.’

Neither *honne* in (26) nor *jitsujo* in (27) seems to bear any significant information, or rather imply the way the AFC is related to the preceding context. This is further confirmed by the fact that *honne* and *jitsujo* can be proposed to the initial position of the AFC with the import intact:

- (28) *Honne de wa*, Beikoku wa jikoku no kannshinnoaru bunyade no
 true inclination as for TM the US TM own country of interesting areas in of
 gouji wo yuusensasetai no dearu.
 mutual agreements AM prioritize CP is

‘As for their true inclination, the US wants to prioritize the attainment of mutual agreements in its areas of interest.’

- (29) Sikasi *jitsujo de wa*, kosuto ga kakaruwarini shueki ni suguni
 but in fact TM cost NM costly profit to directly
 musubitukanai tame, dokomo (sisankanrigataeigyō no) teichaku ni
 not contribute because every(company) property-management business stabilization
 kurousiteiru no dearu.
 have a difficult time CP is

‘In fact, given the investment/profit ratio imbalance, every finance company has had a difficult time stabilizing the property management business.’

Honne de wa and *jitsujo de wa* are employed as sentential adverbs here, and serve the discourse function of indicating a certain relationship to the preceding context. *Honne de wa*, corresponding to “as for one’s true inclination,” or “as for one’s underlying motive,” in English, implies that what has been stated in the prior context is only an apparent answer, and that the real intention will be revealed in the following discourse. *Jitsujo de wa*, corresponding to “in fact,” has an implication that what has been expressed in the preceding context may sound desirable or ideal, but does not actually reflect the present state of affairs.

It is now evident from the observation above that *honne* and *jitsujo*, that is, Y in the AFC, may contribute to reducing processing effort involved in the interpretation of the

AFC by offering the reader a clue to the connection with the prior context. Consequently, it is reasonable to claim that Y in the AFC tends to carry background information.

8 Functional properties of posterior-foreground *ga*-clefts

We have stipulated in 6.3 that the PFC carries background information in X and foreground information in Y. We have seen that

background information is information that contributes only indirectly to relevance, by reducing the processing effort required.

(Sperber & Wilson, 1986/1995: 217)

Therefore, we would expect that what is expressed in X of the PFC has a formal or semantic relationship to the preceding discourse, which may contribute to reducing the processing effort required to interpret the PFC. We analysed all the examples of 33 PFCs and found the following two characteristics:

- (30) Probability of using pro-forms (including repetition) in X of the PFC is relatively high.
- (31) The tendency for what is stated in X in the PFC to have some sort of semantic relationship with the topic in the preceding context is very high.

Let us first look at the examples which support (30) and (31):

- (32) Kono shuhou de chousa wo tudukeru no ga, daiokishin kenkyu no
 this method with research AM continue CP NM dioxin study of
 daiichininsha dearu Setsunandaigaku yakugakubu kyouju
 most outstanding researcher is-F Setsunan university Department of Pharmacology professor
 no Miyata Hideaki shi dearu. (Shukan Gendai, 13 March, 1999)
 of Miyata Hideaki Mr. is-F

‘The one who has continued the research with this method is Professor Hideaki Miyata, Department of Pharmacology at Setsunan University, who is the most outstanding researcher on dioxin.’

Kono is a Japanese demonstrative pronoun, which is equivalent to English *this*, and *Kono shuhou* (this method) refers to the topic, which illustrates the method of examining the concentration of dioxin, in the prior discourse.

(33) Tokoroga, Hino chokan wa bunsho no sonzai bakarika touji no
 however Hino Director General TM document of existence as well as then of
 ginkoukyoku kanbu no shomei to in ga osareteirukoto made bakurosi,
 Bank Bureau executive of hand and seal NM affixed even disclosed
 kokkai dewa okurashou no “kyogihoukokusho” dato daimondai ni
 the Diet in Ministry of Finance of false report is QTM a divisive issue to
 hattensiteiru.

has turned into

Kore ni okotta no ga Ookurashou no Nakai Shou Kokusaikyoku
 this with got angry CP NM Ministry of Finance of Nakai Shou International Bureau
 Jichou da Nakai si wa sakunen 6gatu ni okurashou kara
 Deputy Manager is Nakai Mr. TM last year June in Ministry of Finance from
 Kinyukantokuchou ga bunri sareru made ginkoukyoku tantou
 Agency of Finance Supervision NM split from PAS until Bank Bureau of
 singikan wo, tsutome Nissaigin kysai no jintoushiki wo tottekita
 councilor AM in charge The Credit Bank of Japan relief aid of the lead AM was taking
 jinbutsu.

Person

(*Shukan Posuto*, 12 March, 1999)

‘However, the Director General Hino has disclosed the existence of the document as well as the fact that it has been given under a Bank Bureau executive's hand and seal. In the Diet, the document has turned into a divisive issue, with allegations that the report may be a false one made by the Ministry of Finance.

This angered Shou Nakai, Deputy Manager of International Bureau in the Ministry of Finance. Mr. Nakai, who took the lead in organizing relief aid for the Credit Bank of Japan, was councilor of the Bank Bureau until last June, when the Agency of Finance Supervision split from the Ministry of Finance.’

Kore in (33) is also a Japanese demonstrative pronoun, equivalent to English *this*, and refers to the preceding topic about the dispute over an official document between the Ministry of Finance and the Agency of Finance Supervision.

According to our analyses of the data, 21 out of 33 examples have pro-forms in X in the PFC, which amounts to 63.6 % of the whole. 30 out of 33 examples, which amounts to 90.3 %, show that their X has something to do with the topic of the prior context. These figures, then, further support our hypothesis that X in the PFC carries background information that serves to reduce the effort involved in processing the PFC.

Now let us look closely at Y of the PFC, *Nakai Shou Kokusaikyoku Jichou* in (33). It is interesting to note that *Mr. Nakai* turns out to be a new topic in the following discourse. Based on this observation, we can hypothesize that what is introduced in Y in the PFC will tend to be a new topic in the succeeding context, that is, the PFC will have the function of topic shifting in discourse. Our analysis of the data supports this hypothesis: the

topic shift can be observed in 26 out of 33 examples of PFC, which amounts to 78.8 % of the examples of PFC. Thus, it is reasonable to claim the following:

- (34) Y in the PFC has the discourse function of breaking off the topic in the preceding context, and introducing a new topic. That is, Y in the PFC has the function of topic shift in discourse.

The topic shift function of PFC can be considered as a manifestation of the stipulation that Y in the PFC carries foreground information, and is thus relevant in its own right.

9 Functional properties of foreground *ga*-clefts

We have proposed in 6.4 that both X and Y in FC carry foreground information: that is, X and Y carry information that is relevant in itself by having contextual effects. Thus, it is predicted that the probability that either X or Y will turn up as a topic in the following discourse should be higher than AFC and PFC. The results obtained from 23 examples of FC support this prediction. 17 out of 20 examples show that either X or Y become a topic in the following context, which amounts to 85 % of all the FCs. Three examples of FCs are excluded from the calculation, because they appear in the final part of the text, and thus their topichood cannot be confirmed.

What is characteristic of FC is that Y as well as X may turn out to be a topic in the following context. Eight examples illustrate the former case, which amounts to 47% of the total, and one example the latter case, which amounts to 69%. The other eight examples show that the combination of X and Y, or the amalgamation of X and Y, become a topic in the following discourse. This accounts for 47% of cases.

However, when it comes to the functionally significant distinctions between PFC and FC, both of which present a relatively higher probability of Y's topichood in the succeeding discourse, we have not acquired sufficient evidence to propose relevant hypotheses. We would like to leave this issue open to further studies.

10 Conclusions

It has been argued in this article that Japanese *ga*-clefts may be divided in three major subcategories: anterior-foreground *ga*-clefts, posterior-foreground *ga*-clefts, and foreground *ga*-clefts. Although each subcategory shares the same syntactic structure,

roughly exemplified as [X *no ga* Y *da*], each subcategory differs in the composition of its information structures, and as a result in its discourse functions.

Instead of the conventional information structures based on the so-called “given-new” paradigm, we have employed the notions of foreground and background information developed in the framework of Relevance Theory. If X in a *ga*-cleft carries foreground information that is relevant in its own right and may alter the addresser’s cognitive environment, and Y carries background information which contributes indirectly to relevance, then we have an AFC. Conversely, if Y in a *ga*-cleft carries foreground information, and X carries background information, then we have a PFC. If both X and Y carry foreground information, then we have a FC.

There are various factors that may cause the speaker (or “communicator”) to prefer one form to another in a certain context. These factors, however, cannot be a set of ad hoc discourse rules or constraints. In this respect, S & W mention the choice of ostensive stimuli from the communicator’s perspective:

... from a range of possible stimuli which were equally capable of communicating the intended interpretation and equally acceptable to the communicator (given both her desire to minimise her own effort and her own moral, prudential, or aesthetic preferences), the communicator should prefer, and appear to prefer, the stimulus that would minimise the addressee’s effort.

(Sperber & Wilson, 1995: 269)

The communicator should choose the stimulus that appears most relevant to the addressee, since this will make her communication most likely to succeed.

(ibid.: 270)

The communicator aiming at optimal relevance should try to choose his utterance in such a way that it will achieve enough cognitive effects to be worth the addressee’s attention with no unjustifiable effort involved. Thus, he will choose an appropriate *ga*-cleft in a given context from the three possible options: AFC, PFC, and FC, which have the major function of highlighting X, topic shift, and topic continuity, respectively. It should be stressed, though, that the functional properties suggested in this paper are possibly only a tip of the iceberg.

In recent years serious studies have been carried out to investigate the properties of English cleft constructions in discourse. Declerck (1984, 1988, 1994) proposes that both *it*-clefts and *wh*-clefts can be subdivided into three major categories; (i) contrastive clefts, where the focus bears new information, and the *wh*/that clause given information (ii) unstressed-anaphoric-focus clefts, where the focus bears given information, and the

wh/that clause new information (iii) discontinuous clefts, where both focus and wh/that clause bear new information.

In her paper on topic-comment structure, Gundel (1988: 229) proposes “two independent, and sometimes conflicting principles”:

- (35) a. Given Before New Principle: State what is given before what is new in relation to it.
 b. First Things First Principle: Provide the most important information first.

She points out that “resolution in favor of Given Before New Principle” results in structures that put topic first, as in left dislocations, topicalizations, pseudo-clefts or subject-creating constructions. She also states that “resolution in favor of First Things First Principle” explains such structures as right dislocations, it-clefts or structures where an expression referring to the topic is located to the right of a sentence with a coindexed gap.

When we compare the tripartite subcategories, we are tempted to hypothesize that AFC may correspond to contrastive clefts, PFC to unstressed-anaphoric-focus clefts, and FC to discontinuous clefts in Declerck’s framework. When it comes to the functional properties of cleft constructions, we are tempted to conjecture that the function of AFC may have something to do with the First Things First Principle, and that of the PFC with the Given Before New Principle. A more comprehensive investigation of the interaction between foreground and background information in the framework of Relevance Theory and linguistic form in natural languages is required before we can determine whether this is a matter of mere coincidence or not.

References

- Amano, M. (1995a) ‘Ga’ni yoru touchi siteibun--- ---‘tokuni osusume na no ga koredesu’ to iu bun ni tuite. *Jinbunkagaku Kenky* 88: 1-21.
 Amano, M. (1995b) Koukoushouten no ‘A ga B da’ bun. *Jinbunkagaku Kenky* 89: 1-24.
 Atlas, J. D. & S. Levinson (1981) It-clefts, informativeness and logical form: Radical pragmatics (revised standard version). In Cole, P. (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*. 1-61. New York: Academic Press.
 Declerck, R. (1984) The pragmatics of it-clefts and wh-clefts. *Lingua* 64: 251-289.
 Declerck, R. (1988) *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts and Pseudo-Clefts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
 Declerck, R. (1994) Review article: The taxonomy and interpretation of clefts and pseudo-clefts. *Lingua* 93: 183-220.
 Gundel, J. K. (1977) *Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Indiana University Linguistics Club.

- Gundel, J. K. (1988) Universals of topic-Comment Structure. In Hammond, M. et al., (eds.). *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. 209-239. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kanbayashi, Y. (1988) Soteibun to shiteibun---wa to ga no ichimen---. *Tsukuba Daigaku Bungei Gengo Kenkyu Gengo hen* 14: 57-74.
- Kato, M. (1997) Wh-clefts in discourse: a relevance-theoretic approach. *International Journal of Pragmatics* VII: 1-17.
- Kato, M. (1998) A Relevance-theoretic approach to wh-clefts in discourse. *JELS* 15: 91-100. Papers from the Fifteenth National Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan. English Linguistic Society of Japan.
- Kato, M. (in press) Japanese ga-clefts in discourse: A relevance-theoretic approach. In Nakau Minoru sensei kanreki kinen ronbunshu henshuiinkai (eds.). *Imi to Katachi no Interface: Nakau Minoru Kyoju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshu*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Kumamoto, C. (1989a) Nichi/eigo no bunretsubun ni tsuite. *Saga Daigaku Eibungaku Kenkyu* 17: 11-34.
- Kumamoto, C. (1989b) Shitei to doutei---'---noga---da' no kaishaku wo megutt. *Eigogaku no Shiten*. In Ohe Saburo sensei tuitouronbunshu henshuiinkai (eds.). *Eigogaku no Shiten*. 307-318. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press.
- Mikami, A. (1953) *Gendai Goho Josetsu*. Tokyo: Toeshoin. reprinted by Kuroshio Shuppan, 1972
- Nishiyama, Y. (1985) Soteibun, siteibun, douteibun no kubetsu wo megutte. *Keio Gijuku Daigaku Gengobunka Kenkyujo Kiyu*. 17: 135-165.
- Sato, C. (1981) Nihongo no bunretsubun. In Yasui Minoru hakase kanreki kinen ronbunshu henshuiinkai (eds.). *Gendai no Eigogaku*. 538-546. Tokyo: Kaitakkusha.
- Sperber, D. & D. Wilson (1986/1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sunakawa, Y. (1995) Nihongo ni okeru bunretsubun no kinou to gojun no genri. In Nitta Yoshio (ed.). *Fukkubun no Kenkyu*. II. 353-388. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Wilson, D. (1992) Reference and relevance. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*. 4: 167-191.
- Wilson, D. (1999a) Metarepresentation in linguistic communication. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11: 127-161.
- Wilson, D. (1999b) Lecture notes from Pragmatic Theory 1999-2000. UCL ms.
- Wilson, D. & D. Sperber (1993) Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90: 1-25.

Appendix

vocabulary	frequency	%
1.nerai (an aim)	13	15.7
2.proper name	6	7.2
3.kikkake (a beginning)	5	6
4.jitsujo (actual state of affairs)	5	6
5.tokucho (a characteristic)	4	4.8
6.genjo (a present state)	3	3.6
7.mokuteki (a purpose)	3	3.6

8. <i>honne</i> (underlying motive)	3	3.6
9. <i>shuchou</i> (a claim, an assertion)	2	2.4
10. <i>gennin</i> (a cause)	2	2.4
11. <i>housin</i> (a course, the line)	2	2.4
12. <i>urimono</i> (a sales point)	2	2.4
13. <i>riyu</i> (a reason)	2	2.4
14. <i>jittai</i> (actual state of affairs)	1	1.2
15. <i>sinsou</i> (the truth)	1	1.2
16. <i>sukui</i> (relief)	1	1.2
17. <i>mikata</i> (a way of looking at)	1	1.2
18. <i>hashira</i> (a support)	1	1.2
19. <i>suji</i> (logic)	1	1.2
20. <i>kanrei</i> (custom)	1	1.2
21. <i>chousho</i> (a good point)	1	1.2
22. <i>shugan</i> (the main point)	1	1.2
23. <i>kangae</i> (an idea)	1	1.2
24. <i>mokuromi</i> (an intention)	1	1.2
25. <i>shinjo</i> (one's sentiment)	1	1.2
26. <i>kanji</i> (feeling)	1	1.2
27. <i>jiman</i> (a boast)	1	1.2
28. <i>hajimari</i> (a beginning)	1	1.2
29. <i>saisho</i> (the first)	1	1.2
30. <i>kibou</i> (a hope)	1	1.2
31. <i>sekinin</i> (responsibility)	1	1.2
32. <i>chokkan</i> (intuition, a hunch)	1	1.2
33. <i>ochi</i> (the punch line, the end)	1	1.2
34. <i>tokusaku</i> (a good policy)	1	1.2
35. <i>kimochi</i> (a mood)	1	1.2
36. <i>kotu</i> (a knack)	1	1.2
37. <i>kuchiguse</i> (one's favorite phrase)	1	1.2
38. <i>sakusen</i> (tactics, strategy)	1	1.2
39. <i>ichiin</i> (one of the causes)	1	1.2
40. <i>shuppatsuten</i> (the starting point)	1	1.2
41. <i>dageki</i> (a blow)	1	1.2
42. <i>tanoshimi</i> (pleasure)	1	1.2