

REANALYSIS OF CONTRASTIVE *-wa* IN JAPANESE: PERSPECTIVES FROM NEWSPAPER ARTICLES¹

Toshiko Yamaguchi

Abstract

This paper examines the behavior of contrastive *-wa* in Japanese written discourse. While supporting its local nature (Clancy and Downing 1987), the paper argues, based on a survey of newspapers, that localness alone is not sufficient to understand the nature of contrast. It proposes that the use of contrastive *-wa* is motivated by how the writer perceives the world, or what Chafe (1994) calls ‘conscious experience’. We propose literal opposition, evaluation, association, and conflict as its main components. In the final part, the paper relates the results to the recent study on Contrastive Topic (Lee 1999, 2000, 2003), stating that the CT-approach is still unable to account for the entire range of phenomena discovered. The paper suggests that the discrepancies arise because of the fact that natural data integrates the writer’s context-specific intentions, to which priority is not given in formalistic approaches.

Keywords: Written discourse, Contrastive *-wa*, Conscious experience, Speaker/writer, Contrastive Topic.

1. Introduction

The leading view in the current linguistic literature on the “topic” particle *-wa* in Japanese is that it is associated with two functions, thematic and contrastive, in complementary distribution, and these two functions further stand in contrast to the functions of the “nominative” particle *-ga* (see Hinds et al. 1987: vii). Researchers in the 1970s started to examine the behavior of *-wa* more systematically to gain insights into the nature of this particle. They were concerned initially with semantic-functional factors, associated mainly with the property of the referent of the NP to which *-wa* is attached. Kuroda (1972-3, 1987, 1990), for instance, treats *-wa* as categorical in that it reflects the writer’s point of view on the state of affairs expressed in the sentence, and *-ga*, by contrast, is considered to bethetic in that it merely describes a state of affairs without the writer’s subjective commentary. In a similar vein, Nagano (1972) dubs sentences with *-wa* ‘sentences of judgment’, and those

¹ I am grateful to a reviewer from Pragmatics, whose helpful comments have improved the quality of this paper.

with *-ga* ‘sentences with immediate description’.² Kuno’s (1973) stance is essentially to elaborate these two opposing concepts proposed by Kuroda and Nagano; *-wa* is either thematic or contrastive, while *-ga* either describes the objective facts or marks an exhaustive listing of items. The themehood of *-wa* has also been understood in relation to given or shared information, consistent with some discussions on the notion of topic in the general linguistic literature (see Gundel 1985), while *-ga* is taken to signal new information (Inoue 1979, 1982). Papers in Hinds et al. (1987) have delineated the behavior of thematic *-wa* from discourse-pragmatic perspectives. Importantly, discourse functions such as *thematization* (Hinds 1987) or *staging* (Maynard 1987) are proposed to explain the referents marked by *-wa* even when they are newly introduced in the discourse. (1) and (2), given in English translation, illustrate the cases in point. (1) is from Hinds (1987: 99), part of the fifth paragraph of a daily column in *Asahi Shimbun*, in which Rikyu, the late tea ceremony master, is *-wa* marked despite its first mention. Hinds’ explanation is that the mention of Rikyu is connected to the overall theme of the article, which deals with episodes about *waribashi* ‘Japanese disposable wooden chopsticks’. This use of *-wa* is explained as thematization. (2) is an example of staging. In the beginning of a short story,³ the main protagonist, Asako, is *-wa* marked despite its first mention. Because of its staged status by constantly remaining activated in the writer’s mind, Asako serves as a topical element in the short story. Note that Fumito, Asako’s husband, is *-ga* marked because of his secondary role in the story.

- (1) Rikyu(WA), on the mornings of days on which he was expecting visitors, got out some red Japanese cedar wood and whittled just enough pairs of chopsticks for the expected number of visitors.
- (2) “Why?”
Asako(WA) asked while pouring Jasmine tea into the pot.
“What do you mean by ‘why’?”
After having put a newspaper he was reading on the table, Fumito(GA) raised his head.

These two devices, thematization and staging, come close to notions in Western literature such as ‘macrostructure’ (van Dijk 1985), ‘supertopics’ (Chafe 1994: 121), or ‘topic/participant continuity’ (Givón 1983: 8), all of which take for granted the existence of a global theme or a topical participant as the pivot around which a narrative text is organized. Hinds et al. (1987) emphasize that the use of *-wa* is not restricted only to the expression of old information (already mentioned in discourse) but also to the expression of newly introduced information; it is motivated by multi-dimensional factors which operate at the discourse level.

The other function of *-wa*, contrast, has been investigated in detail by Clancy and Downing (1987) who state that *-wa* serves not only to thematize a referent but also to bring

² I follow Hinds (1987: vii) and Maynard (1987: 62) with regard to these English translations for Nagano’s notions in Japanese.

³ The source of this data is a short story *Jasumin tii no asa* ‘Morning with Jasmine Tea’ written by Keiko Ochiai from her collection entitled *Koibitotachi* [Lovers] (1996), Kodansya, Tokyo.

two adjacent elements into contrast. Contrastive *-wa* thus arises from cohesion between two contrasting clauses in local, as opposed to global, environments (ibid.: 28). Japanese newspaper articles often contain *-wa* marked NPs being contrasted with another entity, either explicitly or implicitly. Extract (3) illustrates the latter where only one of the pair, *jouhou-wa* ‘information(WA)’, is verbalized and the thing contrasted – organizational problems the host Ueno city is facing – is inferable only from the preceding context. The writer has two contrasting elements in mind and verbalizes only one alternative in the discourse.

- (3) [...] *minami afurika* *tiimu-ga* *Hong Kong* *de-no*
- South Africa team-GA Hong Kong LOC-GEN
kokusai-taikai *ni* *syutujou* *su-ru* *to* *i-u*
international-meet LOC attendance do-PRES QT say-PRES
jouhou-wa *izen* *kara* *de-tei-ta.*
information-WA before from come.up-ASP-PAST
(Asahi.com 11 April 2002)
‘[...] We already had the information(WA) that the South African team was going to participate in the international meet to be held in Hong Kong.’

We can correctly assume that the use of contrastive *-wa* is not relatable to the global theme, which could be glossed as “Shortened stay of the South African soccer team” and/or “Disappointment of Ueno City”, but rather it arises from two opposite situations which are locally identifiable: One is the South Africans’ plan to go to Hong Kong, discernible from (3), and the other is that the city is burdened with reorganization tasks, inferable from the preceding context. I agree with Clancy and Downing that the use of contrastive *-wa* is locally motivated, though the point I will make is that contrast is not characterized merely by its localness; or more precisely, localness should be defined more explicitly than its being the opposite of globalness. This need for refinement is derived from the following observations: The one is that thematic *-wa* can also be triggered locally (Section 3), which indicates that the dichotomy between global and local coherence does not explain the nature of contrastive *-wa*, and the other is that contrast does not merely mean ‘opposition’ (ibid.: 29) or ‘incompatibility’ (ibid.: 30), but it mirrors the aspects of our minds (Section 4).

In a recent study on Contrastive Topic, Lee (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2003) proposes that Contrastive Topic arises from a set of alternatives which reside in the speaker’s mind, and that a contrasting pair is then ‘selected’ in a discursive environment such as in a question and answer sequence. In this regard, contrast carries ‘old’ information (1999: 320), in that the information is ‘given’ within the speaker’s knowledge. Thus, when one part of contrast is not verbalized, ‘implicature’, or more precisely, ‘a stronger denied proposition’ to the previously expressed is evoked. Lee’s system rests on semantic/pragmatic properties such as event contrast, cancellative functions, meaning strength scale, or global potential topic, on the basis of which Contrastive Topic is identified and characterized (Section 5). I agree with Lee (2000b) that the use of contrast reflects our minds, but the point I will emphasize is that, on the face of the data at hand, the meaning of contrast in Japanese seems to be understood correctly if the data is examined at the metapragmatic level (Mey 2001: Chap. 7) rather than stipulating correctness conditions. It appears that Lee’s and our conception of human minds represent two opposite poles. I believe that the picture of

human minds in the context of contrastive events is grounded in our evaluative power or what Chafe aptly terms conscious experience (1994: Chap. 3), which we utilize, among others, to reflect on our own use of language (the use of contrast in our study), and it is these ‘implicit activities’ which need to be accounted for.

News discourse has been actively inspected from the writer’s evaluative power. Kress (1983) examines the degrees of the writer’s ideological views reflected in the choice of lexical items and grammatical means in two newspaper articles which differ in genre. Similar lines of argument are represented more extensively in Hodge and Kress (1993). Caenepeel (1995) also points out the different degrees in the writer’s evaluative participation in the production of newspapers: Reports, or what she calls event-updating texts, make more use of “indicative declarative sentences” (ibid.: 223), while commentaries or editorials involve the writer’s social or ideological points of view. The finding by Francis (1989) that there are different ways of developing thematic progression within and across different types of news items (e.g. news reports, editorials, letters) also indicates the writer’s intervention in media text production. The expression of emotion is another category which highlights the writer’s intervention. According to Ungerer (1997), who examines popular and quality papers in both English and German, emotional expressions operate regardless of types of papers or languages but the writer’s strategies to achieve them distinguish these two types of newspapers. More recently, Maynard (2002) has investigated Japanese news items about the collision of two vessels, and the ways in which the writer alternates referential expressions for vessels (e.g. *Ehime maru*) with different lexical items (e.g. *jishuusen* ‘training ship’, *fune* ‘ship’), this phenomenon being said to convey the writer’s emotional relationship to the incident. In more general terms, Cotter’s (2001) emphasis on the ‘process’ involved in the production of media discourse casts light on the existence of the correlating roles of the writer and his/her receptive audience. The present study will foreground the issue of the writer’s involvement in newspaper articles by arguing that the writer gains, or enhances, his/her evaluative power when proposing two contrasting entities.

This study is based on a survey of 30 newspaper articles extracted randomly from printed daily newspapers with national circulation (the *Asahi*, *Mainichi*, and *Yomiuri* newspapers) as well as those downloaded from the internet homepages of two newspapers (the *Asahi* and *Saga* newspapers) during 2001 and 2002. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the functions of *-wa*. Thematic *-wa* is subclassified as (i) textual when it is interpreted above the sentential level, and (ii) sentential when it is interpreted within a sentence.⁴ Contrastive *-wa* is subclassified as (i) literal opposition, (ii) evaluation, (iii) association, (iv) conflict, which we deal with in Section 4. Note that the occurrence of contrastive *-wa* is 9.75 % of that of thematic *-wa*.⁵

⁴ This function frequently contains PPs and they often limit the scope of the predication in their sentence. See the first sentence of example (11) as an instance of this function. See footnote 9.

⁵ Contrast of Evaluation and Literal Opposition necessarily accompany the occurrence of two *-was* in a sentence, while Contrast of Association and Conflict require only one. The numbers for Evaluation and Literal in the Table, therefore, indicate the tokens in which two *-was* appear.

<i>-wa</i>	function	token
thematic	textual	265
	sentential	47
	sub-total	312
contrastive	literal	8
	evaluation	4
	association	5
	conflict	15
	sub-total	32
	total	344

Table 1. Distribution of *-wa* in 30 newspaper articles

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a brief overview of previous studies on contrastive *-wa* in Japanese. Section 3 provides four examples with thematic *-wa* which trigger local cohesion, and we argue that local motivation alone is not an essential property of contrast. Section 4 demonstrates that contrast is expressed by four types of conscious experiences of *-wa*: Literal opposition, evaluation, association, and conflict. Conflict is subdivided into five categories according to different aspects of the writer’s consciousness experience. Section 5 examines Lee’s theory and highlights three generalizations which do not accord with our data. Section 6 sums up the findings and draws several conclusions.

2. Previous studies of contrast

Many previous studies on contrastive *-wa* have focused on its nongeneric, nonanaphoric, or accentuated statuses, as opposed to thematic *-wa* which can have generic, anaphoric, and nonaccentuated statuses (e.g. Inoue 1982; Kuno 1973; Miyagawa 1987). The basic semantics for a sentence with contrastive *-wa*, generally accepted by researchers, is positive versus negative predications with two lexical entities in opposition (see also Noda 1996). To summarize Kuno (1973: 46-7), (4) is identified as a contrastive sentence in which the difference between John and Mary is highlighted in terms of the positive and negative uses of the predicate ‘read’.⁶

- (4) *John-wa sono hon o yon-da ga Mary-wa*
 John-WA that book ACC read-PAST but Mary-WA

⁶ Nariyama (2002: 397) calls this type of contrast ‘prototypical’. In her study further refinement is not made. She surmises that the speaker’s varying degrees of intention may give rise to a contrast.

yom-anakat-ta.
 read-NEG- PAST
 ‘John (WA) read the book, but Mary (WA) didn’t.’

Another contrastive sentence, provided by Kuno (1973: 47), is (5) where two different predicates are used to express two qualitatively different, but contextually related, situations. The two predicates do not stand in lexical opposition but the second clause supplements the first by providing information about the nature of the participants (here ‘people who attend the party’) mentioned previously.⁷

- (5) *Oozei no hito-wa party ni ki-masi-ta ga,*
 many GEN person-WA party LOC come-POL-PAST but
omosiro-i hito-wa hitori mo i-mas-en
 Interesting-PRES person-WA one too exist-POL-NEG
desi-ta.
 COP.POL-PAST
 ‘Many people(WA) came to the party, but no interesting person(WA) was there’

Against this background, Clancy and Downing (1987) highlight the relevance of local cohesive functions of *-wa* between adjacent clauses. Based on spoken narrative data, Clancy and Downing propose three conditions governing the use of contrastive *-wa*. The occurrence of *-wa* is dependent on the way in which two adjacent clauses are related semantically. Clauses are also considered contrastive even though they do not contain two NPs marked by *-wa* (i.e. one NP is marked by *-ga*) if the relational conditions are met. In addition, cases where a single *-wa* is verbalized but its counterpart is withheld are also subsumed under contrast when they are seen as representing one of the contrastive relations, as presented in (6) to (8) below. This latter characterization coincides with independent remarks in Chafe (1976: 33-5) in terms of English, with Noda (1996: Chap. 21) in terms of Japanese, and with Lee (1999) in terms of Korean, who admit that contrast does not always pertain to the explicit references of two entities. Thus, Chafe’s sentence *Ronald made the hamburger* (with an accentuation on *Ronald*) can be contrastive if Ronald is taken to be contrasted with the person X even if he is not identifiable in the discourse. In what follows, the three conditions are illustrated in their English translations. When an NP occurs with *-wa*, it is marked with capital letters in parentheses (i.e. (WA)), and a contrastive NP is presented in italics. Elliptic NPs are in parentheses.

The first condition (Parallel Activities/States) refers to the contrast between parallel activities carried out by two participants of equal thematic status (here, two children playing in the playground). (6) shows that Taroo and Hiroshi are contrasted in terms of their activities, an opposition expressed by two different predicates. Our previous example (4) falls under this type. Note that both NPs take *-wa*.

⁷ Iwasaki (2002: 245-6) refers to ‘propositional contrast’ when not a particular element but the entire proposition is brought into contrast.

- (6) And *Taroo*(WA) was loading sand onto the back of a toy truck. Then *Hiroshi*(WA) was making a sand castle.
(see Clancy and Downing 1987: 31, (11))

The second condition (Action/State Reaction) refers to the contrast between existing situation and a new action, the latter being produced in response to the former. In (7) *Taroo*'s action of kicking over the sand castle is provoked by the fact that *Hiroshi*'s sand castle is nice. Although *Taroo* in this contrastive event is the second mention, Clancy and Downing claim that successive activities provide sufficient grounds for the use of contrastive *-wa*.

- (7) *Taroo*(WA) is playing, loading sand in a truck, and, because *Hiroshi*'s castle is so nice, *Taroo*(WA) kicks it over.
(see Clancy and Downing 1987: 38, (17))

The third condition (Indirect Contrast Marking Without Subject Switch) resembles the second in that there is only one participant on the scene, but it differs in that the contrast is triggered through two consecutive activities, which are judged to be in opposition, carried out by the same participant. As shown in (8), Clancy and Downing explain that *Yuki*'s abrupt action of letting go of her balloon changed the idyllic, happy state of affairs described by the first clause into an unhappy one. This change, according to Clancy and Downing, is sufficient to bring about the contrastive interpretation.

- (8) *Yuki*(WA) was playing on the slide. But, while *Yuki*(WA) was sliding, (she) let go of (her) balloon.
(see Clancy and Downing 1987: 40-1, (19))

3. Locally motivated *-wa* without contrastive meaning

This section examines four excerpts where the use of *-wa* is locally motivated, though it is not assigned a contrastive interpretation. This fact does not accord with Clancy and Downing, who put forward the dichotomy between global and local categorizations as the primary distinction between thematic and contrastive *-wa*, respectively. The discussion that follows shows that local cohesion is a property not only of contrastive *-wa* but also of thematic *-wa*.

Thematic *-wa* can be interpreted locally in conjunction with the preceding context. In (9) the *-wa* marked NP, *keikoku-wa* 'warning-WA' summarizes what the preceding two sentences explain. Similarly, the information associated with *egao-wa* 'smile-WA' in (10) functions as an elaboration of what the previous sentence describes regarding the way the baseball-athlete, *Kataoka*, speaks after the game. The motivation for the use of *-wa* in these two instances cannot be derived directly from a global theme. Consider (9) again which is extracted from an article reporting the anniversary of the terrorism of 11 September 2001, and the 'warning' by the policewoman apparently does not have a direct bearing on the overall theme of the article (i.e., the one-year anniversary), but it arises as the writer develops a discourse by connecting its parts. The use of an anaphoric expression *kousita*

‘this way’ validates this connection. Similarly, the article, of which (10) is part, does not deal with Kataoka’s smile as a global theme, either, but it is cited in response to the preceding context in which he is described as slow of speech. The use of –*wa* does not trigger a contrastive interpretation in (9) and (10).

- (9) [...] “*kamikaze-tero*” *no kiken o yokoku si-tei-ta*
 Kamikaze-terrorism GEN danger ACC warning do-ASP-PAST
josei-sousakan-ga Minnesota-syuu ni i-ta. tero
 policewoman-GA Minnesota.State LOC exist-PAST terrorism
kekko o sisa suru kaiwa mo
 carrying.out. ACC implication do.PRES conversation too
bouju sare tei-ta. Daga, kousita keikoku-wa
 interception do.CAUS ASP-PAST but this warning-WA
ikas-are-nakat-ta.
 realize-PASS-NEG-PAST

(Asahi Shimbun 11 September 2002: 1)

‘There was a policewoman in Minnesota who envisaged the danger of Kamikaze-terrorism. The conversation on the decision to initiate the act of terrorism was also intercepted. These warnings(WA), however, were not made the best use of.’

- (10) *Siai go, Kataoka-wa⁸ poturi, poturito kuti o hirai-ta.*
 game after Kataoka-WA little little mouth ACC open-
 PAST
egao-wa mise nakat-ta.
 smile-WA show NEG-PAST

(Asahi.com 19 August 2002)

‘After the game, Kataoka gradually opened his mouth. He did not show a smile(WA).’

The third excerpt (11) resembles (10) in that the second clause provides related information to the first, but the difference is that three NPs marked by –*wa* in the second clause in (11) serve to ‘exemplify’ (see Longacre 1996: 83-4) a series of events that occurred on 11 September 2001. In this example, as well, local cohesion obviously triggers –*wa* marking on the grounds that the exemplified events are related to the event mentioned previously (= no possibility to make long-distance calls on the day of the terrorism). However, the fact that contrastive meaning does not arise with the –*wa* marked NPs reinforces our point that localness is not the only property that gives rise to contrast.

- (11) *11 niti no jiken go-wa⁹ sigai-tuuwa-ga*
 11 day GEN incident after-WA long-distance.call-GA

⁸ This is an instance of thematic –*wa* which displays a textual function, since the article is about a baseball player, Kataoka. See footnotes 4.

⁹ This is an instance of thematic –*wa* which displays an intrasentential function in that the sentential proposition is modified by the information of this postpositional phrase (see Table 1, page 4).

<i>tuuji</i>	<i>nakat-ta.</i>	<i>Muryou</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>nat-ta</i>
go.through	NEG-PAST	free.of.charge	LINK	become-PAST
<i>tikatetu</i>	<i>o nozoite</i>		<u><i>koutuukikan-wa</i></u>	<i>tomari,</i>
subway	ACC stop		traffic-WA	stop
<i>gakkou-wa</i>	<i>jugyou o</i>	<i>yame,</i>	<u><i>kousou-biru-wa</i></u>	<i>heisa,</i>
school-WA	class ACC	stop	high.building-WA	closure
<i>mati</i>	<i>ni-wa</i>	<i>keikan</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>patokaa-ga</i>
downtown	LOC-WA	policeman	and	patrol.car-GA
<i>ikika-u</i>				
go.round-PRES				

(Asahi Shimbun 14 September 2001)

‘After the incident on 11 September, it wasn’t possible to make long-distance calls. Except for the subway which turned out to be free of charge, all traffic(WA) stopped, schools(WA) did not have classes, buildings(WA) were closed, and in the city policemen and patrol cars were out on the streets.’

The last evidence for the existence of local cohesion with thematic *-wa*, slightly different from (9) to (11), is example (12), which contains the NP *otoko-wa* ‘man-WA’ three times in the passage. Note that this NP is accompanied by a prenominal modification *nigeta* ‘ran away’ when it is produced for the third time in the second sentence. It is obvious that the offender is already in the consciousness of the reader, who also knows that the offender had already left the murder scene. In this regard, the modification *nigeta* is redundant, but its addition serves to strengthen the thematic continuation of the offender. The writer’s choice to attach *nigeta* to *otoko-wa* ‘man-WA’ is thus strongly locally motivated, but not a trigger of contrastive meaning.

- (12) *Otoko-wa* *tome ni hait-ta dansei ni mo naifu*
 man-WA stop LINK enter-PAST man LOC too knife
de osoi-kakarou to si, dansei ga hirun-da suki
 INST attack QT do man GA flinch-PAST moment
ni otoko-wa jitensya de tousou si-ta
 LOC man-WA bicycle INST run.away do-PAST
to i-u.
 QT say-PRESENT
Nige-ta otoko-wa sintyou 160-165 senti de
 run.away-PAST man-WA height 160-165 cm and
hatati zengo.
 20.year.old about

(Mainichi Shinbun 24 June 2002: 27)

‘The man (= offender)(WA) was going to attack the man (= eyewitness) when he tried to stop him, and when the eyewitness flinched, the offender (WA) ran away with the bicycle. The man (= offender)(WA) who ran away is ca. 160-165 cm tall and about 20 years old.’

The above four examples show that local cohesion is not only the property of

contrastive *-wa* but is also utilized to create and strengthen the thematic bond in the course of text production. These phenomena might fall neatly under discourse notions such as ‘thematic groupings’ (Dooley and Levinson 2001), ‘topic drift’ (Hobbs 1990), or, more generally, ‘thematic continuity’ (Givón 1984). What these notions have in common is that they take for granted that a thematic bond is established on the basis of local connections between adjacent clauses. Hobbs, for instance, claims that topic drift “occurs by means of successive small modifications in the topic” (p. 3), proposing three what he calls ‘coherence relations’ for his spoken dialogue data: (i) parallelism, (ii) explanation, and (iii) metatalk (p. 8-9). It is plain to see from the data above that decisions made locally appear ultimately to facilitate the global organization of a text (see also Linell and Korolija 1997: 169). If, as Clancy and Downing (1987: 3-4) argue, local cohesion is closely linked to the expression of contrast, all the examples above would have to be interpreted as contrastive in some way. The point I will emphasize is that what differentiates contrastive *-wa* from thematic *-wa* is not a matter of ‘localness’ in the sense of linear relations between two adjacent clauses, but ‘localness’ in the sense that adjacent clauses create a scene in which contrastive *-wa* expresses human conscious experiences (henceforth, CE), arising from the co-existence of opposing events, states, interests, or ideas.

4. Writer’s conscious experience

4.1. Contrast and CE

As remarked by Clancy and Downing (1987: 41) and Noda (1996: 209), contrastive *-wa* is in fact often found with adversative conjunctions such as ‘but’ or ‘although’. Researchers in Western literature (Sweetser (1990); Lang (2000); and Schwenter (2000)) have also taken the concept of clash or incompatibility as the starting-point of their study. Thus, sentence such as *John is short but he’s a good basketball player* (Schwenter 2000: 260) asserts a clash between shortness and basketball-playing ability. Note, however, that the meaning of contrast is not always decided in its own right. For example, the polarity between John’s richness and Bill’s poverty can be conceived of differently.

- (13) a. John is rich but Bill is poor.
 b. John is rich, and Bill is poor.
 c. John is rich, but Bill is rich, too.

Lang (2000: 244) argues that the clash clearly observed in (13)a is an adequate reply to the question like ‘Are they both rich?’, while (13)b, which enjoys the same knowledge about John and Bill as (13)a, is an adequate answer to a question like ‘What about their income?’. The reason for this difference is that the latter does not perceive the polarity as opposing but adding. By contrast, (13)c lacks contrast despite the presence of *but*. These examples suggest that the concept of contrast does not always represent the simple concept of opposition. In other words, the speaker, who uses it, interprets the contrastive situation on the basis of the background. To use Lang’s terms, the meaning of contrast is ‘inferred from’ (ibid.: 244-246) discourse contexts. The inspection of our data supports the same point, though the notion ‘inference’ alone is not sufficient to explain the varying mental processes

associated with contrastive *-wa* (Section 4.2 to 4.5). This brings what Chafe calls ‘conscious experience’ (1994: Chap. 3) into the picture. He says:

Consciousness is what we experience constantly while we are awake and often while we are asleep. [...] Every human being possesses a complex internal model of reality. Call it a world view, call it a knowledge structure, this model is essential to the human way of coping with the world. (1994: 27)

He continues:

Consciousness is to a large extent made up of experiences of perceptions and actions. Concomitant with them, and usually if not always present at the same time, are the emotions, opinions, attitudes, desires, and decisions that they engender or, conversely that engender them. I include here whatever aspects of conscious experience attach values to perceptions and actions. (ibid.: 31)

CE thus advocates the idea that language users activate their implicit activities, or ‘pragmatic acts’ to use Mey’s word (2000: Chap. 8), while they use the language. More precisely, when we bring two things into contrast, we simultaneously embody our mental attitudes.

Let us demonstrate examples based on Chafe (1994: 26ff.) to get a picture of the nature of CE. When we see the rain in the midst of a drought, we bring rain and drought into contrast, which finally evokes in us emotions such as relief or gladness. If we, on another occasion, see the rain on the morning of an excursion, what we mentally experience may neither be relief nor gladness. When we see a new model of furniture with a unique design, we are tempted to touch or take a closer look at it out of curiosity. Similarly, when we hear about a child from a well-off family, who is not eager to work in a privileged private school, some may feel regret or disappointment, while others may feel anger. These examples explicitly tell us that contrast concomitantly conveys a message about our perceptual world. In the following sections four types of CE are explained.

4.2. *Literal opposition*

(14) indicates a literal opposition. The writer refers to the positive and negative identifications of offenders by an individual RF. Opposition itself serves as CE.

- (14) *Jyuugyouin no RF niyoruto, rokugatu to hatigatu*
 employee GEN RF according.to June and August
no nikai, tyuutoukei no otoko yonin-ga hait-te
 GEN twice Middle.East GEN man four-GA enter-LINK
ki-ta. Eigo de sandwich o futatu tyuumon si
 come-PAST English INST sandwich ACC two order do,
betuni siropan o hati mai tanonda. jiken
 separately white.bread ACC eight piece order-PAST incident

*go ni syasin o mise-rare, ata-wa*¹⁰ wakat-ta.
 after LOC picture ACC show-PASS Ata-WA identify-PAST
sikasi hoka no san-nin-wa wakar-ana-i.
 but others GEN three-person-WA identify-NEG-PRES

(Asahi.com 6 Feb. 2002)

‘According to an employee, RF, four men, who looked Middle-Eastern, came to the hotel twice in June and August. They ordered sandwiches and eight pieces of white bread separately, in English. RF was shown pictures after the incident, and he could identify Ata(WA), but not the other three(WA).’

4.3. Evaluation

(15) represents evaluation as CE; the writer posits a difference in the degree of liking, and through this difference s/he succeeds in evaluating the people’s fondness for America. (15) is from an article which deals with the results of a questionnaire reflecting people’s opinions about America. At first sight, (15) could be considered to fall under Literal Opposition (Section 4.2) in the sense that there are opposing entities (Hollywood movies/American TV programs and American Policy) and positive versus negative uses of a predicate, *like* and *dislike*. The theme of the article (impressions of the countries about America) leads us to realize that what the writer is concerned with is not the opposition between Hollywood movies/American TV programs and American Policy, but rather the fact that people who answered the questionnaire do not favor the American policy as much as they do movies and TV programs. By means of contrastive *-wa*, the writer selects two perspectives, through which s/he evaluates the country by underlining the different degrees of fondness for America.

(15) *Hollywood-eiga ya bei terebi bangumi-wa*
 Hollywood-movie and American TV program-WA like
suki ga, isuraeru-yori no tyuutou-seisaku-wa
 like but, Israel-leaning GEN Middle.East-policy-WA
daikira-i to i-u kekka-ga de-ta.
 dislike-PRES QT say-PRES result-GA emerge-PAST

(Asahi Shimbun 13 April 2002)

‘It was reported that (they) like Hollywood movies and American TV programs(WA), but (they) do not like the Middle East policy(WA) leaning on Israel.’

¹⁰ In the following examples thematic *-wa* is distinguished from contrastive *-wa* by not being underlined.

4.4. Association

(16) represents association as CE. The writer first asserts the objective fact¹¹ to which the opposing information (east versus west) is added to enhance the informativeness of the message. The concept ‘associative’ refers to a situation in which the writer links one entity to another to complement the existing information, and indicates that in the writer’s mind the information provided by the first clause correlates with the information contained in the second clause.¹² (16), appearing at the beginning of reportage, illustrates the location of Papua New Guinea in contrast to the neighboring country, Indonesia. This additional information serves to illustrate the location of Papua New Guinea more explicitly for the readers.

- (16) *Higasi-gawa ga Papua New Guinea, nisi-gawa-wa Indonesia*
 east-side GA Papua New Guinea west-side-WA Indonesia
no Irianjaya syuu da.
 GEN Irian.Jaya state COP
 (Asahi Shimbun 13 April 2002)
 ‘The East side is Papua New Guinea(GA), the West side(WA) being Irian
 Jaya in Indonesia.’

(17) displays an opposition between non-existence (*ryouasi* ‘both legs’) and existence (*ryoute no itibu* ‘part of both hands’), whereby the writer associates the two states to portray the person under discussion vividly. This man, despite his physical disability, was elected a member of his municipal assembly in Brazil. (18), which immediately follows (17), substantiates our interpretation.

- (17) *Ryouasi-ga tukene kara nai. Ryoute no*
 both.legs-GA joint from non.existent.PRES both.hands GEN
itiubu-wa ar-u.
 part-WA exist-PRES
 (Asahi Shimbun 13 April 2002)
 ‘X does not have both legs(GA) from the joint, but he does have part of his
 hands (WA).’¹³

- (18) *itigatu, burajiru-nanbu sarutodepirapoora no*

¹¹ In the associative use of contrastive *-wa*, the first NP is marked typically by *-ga* and the NP in the following clause is marked by contrastive *-wa*.

¹² See Lyons (1999: 7-8) who refers to associative uses of the definite article in English (e.g. I’ve just been to a wedding. **The bride** wore blue (bold face in original)), the definition of which comes close to our concept of association.

¹³ The reviewer mentioned that ‘part of both hands’ is first contrasted to the whole body, but not directly to ‘both legs’. This premise may be possible if we look at the example from a formalistic point of view, but, as the discussion in Section 5 indicates, this is rather redundant from our non-formalistic point of view, since the writer’s main concern in a given setting is the fact that X can work because he has hands. Nowhere in the newspaper article does X’s whole body play a role for the perceived contrast to be properly interpreted.

January	Brazil-south	Salto de P.	GEN
<i>sigi</i>		<i>ni</i>	<i>nat-ta.</i>
member.of.the.municipal.assembly		LOC	become-PAST
'In January X became a member of the municipal assembly in Salto de P., in the south of Brazil.'			

4.5. Conflict

The fourth type of contrast represents conflict as CE. It occurs when the writer has two conflicting ideas or interests in mind, and one member of the pair is typically not expressed by overt linguistic forms. In what follows we identify five subclasses of conflict.

4.5.1. Incompleteness

Contrastive *-wa* is used when the writer feels incomplete due to the fact that he or she does not know explicitly about the whole story. The first sentence of (19) contains the predication *tukkondarasii to iu koto-wa wakatta* 'I understood the fact \emptyset_1 apparently crashed into \emptyset_2 ', which evokes the conflicting feeling that the knowledge the writer already has is still not sufficient. The third sentence explains that the author cannot recall the name of the second city in addition to New York (s/he believes that another plane crash happened in a city), because of the landlord's dialectal pronunciation of 'Pentagon'. The conflict lies in the discrepancy between the knowledge about the two plane crashes and the lack of knowledge of the exact names of the cities.

(19)	<i>Okusan no</i>	<i>hanasi kara</i>	<i>douyara,</i>	<i>koukuuki-ga</i>	<i>haijack</i>
	wife GEN	talk from	somewhat	airplane-GA	hijack
	<i>sa-re</i>	<i>biru</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>tukkon-da</i>	<i>rasii to</i>
	do-PASS	building	LOC	crash-PAST	seem.PRES QT
	<i>i-u</i>	<i>koto-wa</i>	<i>wakat-ta.</i>	<i>Soremo</i>	<i>ni</i>
	say-PRES	fact-WA	understand-PAST	in.addition	two
	<i>kasyo douji</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>i-u.</i>	<i>Ikkasyo-wa</i>
	places simultaneity	COP QT	say.PRES	one.place-WA	
	<i>New York</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>ga, sate,</i>	<i>mou hitotu no</i>	<i>"penagan"</i>
	New York	COP	but well	more one	GEN penagan
	<i>to i-u</i>	<i>no-wa</i> ¹⁴	<i>doko no</i>	<i>tosi</i>	<i>dat-ta</i>
	QT say-PRESS	NML-WA	where GEN	city	COP-PAST
	<i>ka.</i>				

Q

(Asahi.com 8 November 2001)

'I understood at least the fact(WA) that, according to what the female landlord told me, airplanes were hijacked and crashed into buildings. It happened concomitantly in two places. One(WA) is New York but the

¹⁴The use of two WAs falls under literal opposition.

other(WA) is, well, I wonder which city ‘Penagan’ is.’

Incompleteness can also be observed in (20) in which the writer reports that he could not see that the South-African golfer, Els, cried out of joy for his championship, because he was in front of a large crowd. Contrastive *-wa* attached to the predication *hourinageru no dake-wa mieta* ‘I could see \bar{A}_1 throwing \bar{A}_2 away’ is used to highlight that the only thing that the writer could only see is part of what was happening.

- (20) [...] *yuusyou batto o kappu ni nejikonda toki,*
 victory bat ACC cup LOC twisted.in time
erusu-wa namida o nagasita darou ka. [...] *t o o k*
u-te
 Els-WA tears ACC shed assume Q far-as
soko made-wa wakar-anakat-ta. [...] *soudati*
 that up.to-WA understand-NEG-PAST stand.all.at.once
ni nat-ta kansyuu no kage ni nat-te
 LOC become-PAST audience GEN shade LOC become-as
yoku mie-nakat-ta node ar-u. kare-ga
 well see-NEG-PAST as exist-PRES he-GA
yukkurito bousi o hourinageru no dake-wa
 slowly cap ACC throw.away-PRES NML only-WA
mie-ta.
 see-PAST

(Asahi.com 25 July 2002)

‘I wonder whether Els cried out of joy when he placed his golf club into the trophy somewhat emotionally. I could not see that because it was in the distance. I could not see that because of the crowd who were standing in great numbers. The only(WA) thing I could see was him slowly throwing his cap into the crowd.’

4.5.2. Indirectness

By attaching contrastive *-wa* to an NP, the writer manages to avoid expressing his opinion directly. We call this device indirectness.¹⁵ (21) is reported speech by a Korean student who lives in Japan. The use of *-wa* in *kodawari-wa* ‘prejudice(WA)’ represents a conflict in his mind; he feels that there still remains prejudice because of the history of relations between Korea and Japan but, at the same time, he wants to avoid expressing it explicitly. The use of *-wa* evokes the speaker’s awareness of the need for reconciliation on the occasion of the World Cup which was held in Korea and Japan in 2002. The existence of these conflicting feelings is evidenced by the use of an adversative conjunction *demo* ‘but’.

- (21) *Kako no rekisi ni-wa mada kodawari-wa ar-u*
 past GEN history LOC-WA yet prejudice-WA exist-PRES

¹⁵ Tannen (1985: 124-5) highlights the relevance of indirectness as representative of conflicting messages in conversation.

demo, kankoku to nihon-wa itiban tika-i kuni.
 but Korea a Japan-wa most close-PRES country
Nakayoku nat-te hosi-i.
 friendly become-LINK want-PRES

(Asahi Shimbun 24 April 2002)

‘Although I feel prejudice(WA) because of our history, nevertheless, Korea and Japan are geographically very close, and I would like them to have friendly relations.’

Similarly, *-wa* is used in (22) to avoid a direct statement. The conflicting idea is expressed where the prefectural office has someone in mind as a successor of the present prefectural governor although they know that the choice of successor should be determined by the citizens of the prefecture. Indirectness comes into play when people involved deliberately make their attitude ambiguous to the public by using *-wa*.

- (22) *Koukeisya-wa kenmin-ga kime-ru koto da*
 successor-WA citizen.of.prefecture-GA decide-PRES fact COP
ga, ityuu no hito-wa i-ru
 but in.mind GEN person-WA exist-PRES

(Saga Shinbun 6 August 2002)

‘The successor should be determined by the citizens of the prefecture, but we have someone(WA) in mind.’

4.5.3. Assumption

The *-wa* marked NP expresses the writer’s assumption about a situation described in the preceding context. (23) is reported speech by the Japanese ambassador in India in which the use of *-wa* attached to *kikensei* ‘a sign of danger’ indicates that war might break out. The conflict lies in the fact that war has not begun yet, but the speaker sees a possibility of war.

- (23) *Senso-ga hajimat-ta wake de-wa na-i ga*
 war-GA begin-PAST reason COP-WA NEG-PRES but
kikensei-wa ar-u.
 danger-WA exist-PRES

(Asahi Shimbun 10 June 2002)

‘War has not begun yet, though there are danger signs(WA).’

Likewise, (24) refers to the writer’s hypothesis that there is a possibility of recharging the Japanese economy if Japan learns from outside through the current narrow window of opportunity. The conflict is that although the Japanese economy has deteriorated, the writer assumes that this bad situation can be improved.

- (24) *Mado-wa hirai-tei-ru semai mado da ga,*
 window-WA open-ASP-PRES narrow window COP but
soko kara seiki o kyuusyuu si-te

there from air ACC absorb do-LINK
nihonkeizai *o saisei sa-se-ru*
 Japanese.economy ACC revisalization do-CAUS-PRES
kanousei-wa *ar-u*
 possibility-WA exist.PRES
 (Asahi.com 23 August 2001)
 ‘The window is open. It is not open very much but if we can assimilate
 the lessons that come through it, there is a chance(WA) of revitalizing
 the Japanese economy.’

4.5.4. Emphasis

By using contrastive *-wa* the writer emphasizes one fact, which stands in contrast to the preceding context. In (25) *-wa* is used to emphasize the writer’s opinion that we could observe children’s growth without having to use video. The preceding context for (25) describes the way in which parents nowadays are absorbed in using video. The writer’s emphasis on the alternative attitude toward children engenders conflicting situations: One is the reality in present-day Japan and the other is criticism of it.

- (25) *Faindaa no naka bakari nozoi-tei-ru to, me*
 finder GEN inside only look.into-ASP-PRES when eye
ni hair-u no-wa wagako dake, fanda
 LOC enter-PRES NML-WA own.child only finder
ni hair-ana-i tokoro de-mo, kodomo no
 LOC enter-NEG-PRES place LOC-too child GEN
seityou-wa *mie-ru.*
 growth-WA see-PRES
 (Asahi.com 29 September 2001)
 ‘If we look through the viewfinder of the video, all we can see is our own
 children. We can see our children’s growth(WA) without this, too.’

Likewise, (26) is reported speech by a woman who responds to the interviewer’s question whether women benefit from their gender minority in the workplace. Contrastive *-wa* is used to lay emphasis on the fact that there are also men who were promoted on grounds other than merit. Here, the conflict arises when the interviewee insists by bringing two situations into contrast that not only women but also men gain promotion regardless of their qualities.

- (26) *Son si-tei-ru bun mo ippai arun-des-u*
 disadvantage do-ASP-PRES part too enough exist-POL-PRES
kara. Otoko no hito datte, jituryoku kadouka
 as men GEN person also merit whether
wakarazuni syousin no tyansu o morat-ta
 without.realizing promotion GEN chance ACC receive-PAST

hito-wa *i-ru.*
 person-WA exist-PRES
 (Asahi.com 6 April 2002)

‘There is no gainsaying that women are disadvantaged in many ways. However, there are also men(WA) who were given the chance of promotion independently of their competence.’

4.5.5. Qualification

Qualification means that *-wa* serves to restrict the generality of a stated proposition, in which it appears, by providing supplementary information. In (27) the predisposition to skin rashes suffered by some people is qualified by the fact that the condition can be controlled by medication; the validity of the statement in the first clause is restricted or made less generalized by the speaker’s view in the following clause.

- (27) *Kabure* *o* *okosi-yasu-i* *hito-wa* *i-ru.*
 skin.rash ACC have-easy-PRES person-WA exist-PRES
 “*Tasikani* *sententekina* *youso-ga* *ooki-i* *ga,*
 certainly genetic element-GA big-PRES but
tiryuu *no* *sikata de* *taisitu* *o* *ookiku*
 treatment GEN method INS predisposition ACC largely
kaizen *su-ru* *koto-wa* *deki-ru*”
 improvement do-PRES fact-WA can-PRES
 (Saga Shinbun 21 August 2002)

‘There are people(WA) who are prone to skin rashes. “Certainly, this is largely genetic, but the fact is that we can alleviate the predisposition with medication”.’¹⁶

Qualification might also explain (28) which illustrates a case within Japanese socio-cultural convention. The conflict arises from the fact that the writer believes that people normally make some noise when eating noodles, though the people s/he met in this restaurant were eating very quietly. Like (27), the validity of the socio-cultural understanding associated with the clause ‘There were some guests’ is qualified by the writer’s experience on the spot expressed by the preceding clause ‘It was very quiet’.

- (28) *Sensyuu* *tyuusyoku* *ni* *sobaya* *ni*
 last.week lunch LOC noodle-restaurant LOC
it-te *odorai-ta* *siinto* *si-tei-ru.* *awatate*
 go-LINK be.surprised-PAST quite do-ASP-PRES quickly
mawari *o* *mi-ta.* *kyaku-wa* *i-ru.*
 round ACC look-PAST guest-WA exist-PRES

¹⁶ In this example contrastive *-wa* occurs twice. The function of the second *-wa* (*koto-wa*) expresses ‘emphasis’ because the writer succeeds in emphasizing the alternative point of view toward the perceived reality that the skin rashes are largely genetic (see Section 4.5.4).

(Asahi Shimbun 17 May 2001)

‘I was surprised when I went to a noodle restaurant for lunch the other day. It was very quiet. I took a quick look round. There were some guests(WA)’

5. Lee’s analysis

5.1. Main claims

Lee’s principal idea about Contrastive Topic (henceforth, CT) is to be explained in his own words (1999: 318):

A Topic in the discourse (e.g., in a question) is divided into parts and a Contrastive Topic is about one part in contrast with the rest of the parts and the speaker has the alternative in contrast in mind. By cancellative function, a Contrastive Topic gives rise to an implicature concerning the alternative in contrast in the polarity opposite to the given.

The reason an NP marked by a contrastive morpheme such as *-(n)un* in Korean or *-wa* in Japanese is called ‘topic’ is that the meaning of contrast is characterized by the fact that the speaker chooses an adequate pair from a definite set of alternatives which s/he has in mind (1999: 320). The question *What did Bill’s sisters do?* evokes a set of sisters and the answer *Bill’s youngest sister kissed John* shows that the speaker has chosen the youngest as a contrastive element (ibid.: 321). At this level CT is stated to deal with ‘old’ information, and, hence, it can also overlap with what Lee calls noncontrastive Topic, or more generally thematic Topic (ibid.: 319). CT is seen to bear new information, too, because the choice of ‘youngest’ is new to the hearer. Lee says in conjunction with Potential Topic (henceforth, PT):

CT is topical in the sense that it comes from a potential Topic and somewhat focal in the sense that the choice of the particular part is not known to the hearer (2003: 355).

The question *Did she go on the stage?* gets the interlocutor to choose an answer *She arrived* with a contrastive accent, which denotes that there is an unuttered pair part (i.e. she didn’t go on the stage). This answer is chosen because the ultimate goal in the speaker’s mind is ‘going on the stage’ and this fact of being talked about is sufficient grounds for its status as a topic. In this regard, Lee argues that PT is seen to be partitioned into parts and the predicate which contains CT exhibits one particular part. If the answer is something like ‘Her arriving and going on the stage was blocked by the crowd of her fans’ (2003: 360), which does not match with a given set, this sentence marks ‘a rare case of noncontrastive Topic (ibid.: 361).

The same idea is reflected in (29) (1999: 322) where PT is ‘money’, which is partitioned into ‘coins’ and ‘bills’ (ibid.: 323). CT appears alone and *-(n)un* is attached to *tongceon* ‘coin’. His explanation is that this sentence has a conversational implicature that the speaker does not have bills. To cite his words, “the speaker becomes curious about the unanswered part” (ibid.: 323). In other words, contrast is for Lee a pair which has a weaker, less relevant unuttered part combined with the part which is typically unuttered but which bears more relevance.

- (29) *Na tongceon-un iss-eo*
 I coin-CT exist-DEC
 ‘I have coins’

Lee goes on to say that the selection of particular candidate as an alternative reflects the existence of a scalar structure, which guides the interlocutor to make the right selection of alternatives. This act of selection is pragmatic, while all the other mechanisms (e.g. meaning strength scale, polarity-reversal) are semantic (2000a: 246). The scale is organized not only at the level of discourse but also at the temporal level. Lee’s idea is that (31) is chosen correctly from the scale because it supports the presence of the higher and stronger predicate (see above). (33) is the right choice because it is a subset of the PT of eating fruits, and peeling by default precedes the act of eating an apple (2000a: 246).

- (30) Did she go on the stage?
 (31) She arrived.
 (32) I peeled an apple.
 (33) But I didn’t eat it.

Another related notion introduced by Lee is the distinction between event vs. individual contrast. He formulates it in the following way (2000b: 27):

A Contrastive Topic applied to a verb/adjective is **event-contrastive**, implicating the denial of a higher or stronger event/state than the given event/state in contrast on the triggered **scale** relevant in the discourse context (boldface in original).

In Korean as well as Japanese, CT can be applied to nominals or verbs, as exemplified in Lee’s examples from Japanese (2000b: 27, (12)2 and (13)2), as given as (34). (34)a is event contrast because the event-nominal *gookaku* ‘success’ is attached by *-wa* and expresses the predication of passing, while (34)b is individual contrast because the CT-marked nominal is an individual, not denoting an action as part of a contrast.

- (34) a. *Watasi-wa gookaku-wa si-ta.*
 I-CT success-CT do-PAST
 ‘I passed (accentuation on passed)’
 b. *Watasi-wa gookaku si-ta.*
 I-CT success do-PAST
 ‘I passed (accentuation on I)’

Both (34)a and (34)b imply a denial of a proposition such that the speaker has his/her roommate in mind who may not have passed the exam (1999: 319-20), though scalarity is not always obvious with individual contrast (2003: 346). Lee’s main focus in his papers is on event contrast since he is concerned with the quantificational scalarity (2000b: 28). Neither event nor individual contrast is claimed to list all CTs, and scalar structure thus makes sense only when one part is uttered.

The essential difference between Lee’s approach and the one illustrated in this paper closely parallels differences between formalistic and functional (see Nuyts 1992) paradigms (see also Caffi 1994: 2463, who uses the expression ‘practical’ for the latter). Lee describes

the semantic and pragmatic properties of contrast and presents the ‘correctness’ of these properties. Contrast is considered to be an objective asset of a language which takes a neutral observer for granted. As a result, conclusions are drawn following regulative principles, and they are assumed to be applicable across the board. In my view, contrast is the expression of a subjective asset of a language, whereby the speaker/writer personally interacts with their interlocutor to facilitate communication. I chose CE as an expression of this personal interaction and sought to define the examples in Section 4 in accordance with a given background setting. Notions such as ‘scale’, ‘cancellation’, ‘conversational implicature’, or ‘polarity reversal’ are logically applicable to our data. Most of Lee’s examples are constructed, and this can create a fictional environment in which the speaker is given more freedom to interpret given examples (see also Nuyts 1992: 63). Our closer look at the data reveals that natural data imparts some restrictions which in turn create discrepancies between his theory and what is, we perceive, happening in reality. The next section will look more closely at Lee’s three generalizations and indicate where the discrepancies lie.

5.2. Discrepancies

5.2.1. Scale

I claimed in Section 3 that example (10) is not assigned a contrastive interpretation but the *-wa* marked NP (i.e. *egao-wa* ‘smile-WA’) arises due to the thematic bond. It was mentioned by the reviewer that (10) can be contrastive because it could be subsumed under a scale which has <smile> as a higher event. However, it is hard to determine that smiling is more important than slowness of speech in a given context. Lee might set up a question-answer formula as in (35), in which ‘smiling’ serves as PT.

- (35) A: Did Kataoka smile?
B: He opened his mouth gradually.

Logically, we can state that B’s utterance, if it is accented, evokes a conversational implicature, that Kataoka did not smile, but the empirical fact we are confronted with does not support the existence of such a polarity. As shown by the grammaticality of (36), what is happening is that the writer is conjoining two pieces of information; the second clause continues to elaborate on Kataoka’s reflection on the baseball game. By using synonymous expressions, the writer makes the message more impressive. In Lee’s system polarity reversal is evidenced by the insertion of an adversative conjunction ‘but’. As exemplified by (37), it is odd to have *ga* attached to *hiraita* ‘opened’ in Japanese, validating our account. Moreover, it is doubtful that the first clause in (10) contains a CT, since *Kataoka-wa* is likely to be a thematic topic. For smiling to be the second higher part of the contrast, either *kuti* ‘mouth’ or *hiraku* ‘open’ has to be CT-marked, as exemplified by (38).

- (36) After the game, Kataoka gradually opened his mouth, and he did not show a smile.
(37) ?*Siai go kataoka-wa poturi, poturito kuti o*

game after Kataoka-WA little little mouth ACC
hiraita-ga egap-wa mise-nakat-ta.
 opened-but smile-WA show-NEG-PAST
 ‘After the game Kataoka gradually opened his mouth, **but** he did not
 show a smile.’

- (38) a. *Siai go, kataoka-wa poturi, poturito kuti wa*
 game after Kataoka-WA little little mouth CT
hiraita ga, egao-wa mise nakat-ta.
 opened but smile-WA show NEG-PAST
 b. *Siai go kataoka-wa poturi, poturito kuti o*
 game after Kataoka-WA little little mouth ACC
hirki-wa sita ga, egao-wa mise nakat-ta.
 open-CT did but smile-WA show NEG-PAST

5.2.2. Listing

One of Lee’s strong claims is that ‘real’ CTs are normally not listed on the surface. If CTs are listed, however, they are called partial topics. Lee’s Coherence Constraint (2000b: 31) says that when partial topics are distinguished by predications, the sentence retains contrast. When elements have identical predication, as shown in (39) (Lee’s example from (2000b: 30)), no distinction between the topics is made, and, hence, no contrast is realized. The same thing happens in Japanese, as Lee correctly states (40).

- (39) **Bill-un nae-ka silheha-ko Tom-un nae-ka siheha-n-ta.*
 Bill-CT I-ka dislike-and Tom-CT I-ka dislike-PRES
 -DEC
 ‘Bill, I don’t like and Tom, I don’t like’
- (40) **Bill-wa kirai-da-si Tom-wa kirai-da.*
 Bill-WA dislike-COP-and Tom-WA dislike-COP
 ‘Bill, I don’t like and Tom, I don’t like’

As in (41), when partial topics are supported by distinct predications (41b), listing retains contrast (2000b: 30).

- (41) a. What grades are your children in?
 b. The elder is in 4th grade and the little one is in 2nd grade.

Example (11) was mentioned by the reviewer as a case of listing CTs with a potential Topic (something like ‘consequences of terrorism’), which governs this listing. It is indeed the case that (11) expresses parallel events on the day of the terrorism and they are expressed by different predicates. From this fact, we may be tempted to support ‘List CTs’. This account is not without problems, however. Firstly it is hard to determine that these parallel events in (11) express contrast when we consider the background setting. As mentioned in Section 4.1, ‘parallelism’ can be conceived of differently depending on the type of question.

For instance, (41b) can be seen as ‘adding’ when the question is rephrased as ‘Have your children already started with school?’. Although Lee does not lay emphasis on the setting, it is evident that (41a) is imposing conditions on the way in which the answer (41b) is formulated. Following this, I do not see the point of assigning contrast to the parallel events in (11). Secondly, the Coherence Constraint may not be able to explain why in the final clause ‘policemen’ and ‘patrol cars’ are not CT-marked but *ga*-marked, because the event of being out on the streets can likewise serve to distinguish predications.

Another problem might be that (11) structurally resembles cases with Association such as (17), which I claimed as an instance of contrast. Lee states (2003: 357) that if CTs are listed, the first element is often not CT-marked. In Chinese, as in (42)b, the contrast between *I* vs. *you* retains *ne* as CT attached to *you* only (ibid.: 2003: 357, (33)).

- (42) a. *Ni* *shi* *hanguoren* *ma?*
 you COP Korean Q
 ‘Are you Korean?’
 b. *Wo* *shi,* *ni* *ne?*
 I am you CT
 ‘I am, and you?’

Both (11) and (17) contain a *ga*-marked NP in the first clause. The question is whether we should treat (11) and (17) under the same umbrella. Lee might say yes, but my position is that (11) presents the correlation between the first and second clauses, whereby no opposition is predicted, while in (17) the second clause is seen to stand in opposition to the first (‘no legs’ versus ‘parts of hands’). Through the use of contrast the writer succeeds in integrating his/her viewpoint that it is this fact that enables X to work in the municipal assembly. If (17) is treated as a thematic bond like (11), the whole sentence would be rephrased something like (43), in which the second clause simply details X’s physical deformity, and here the writer’s original intention would readily disappear.

- (43) *Ryouasi-ga* *tukene kara* *na-i.* *Ryoute-wa*
 both.legs-ga joint from non.existent-PRES both.hands-WA
 itibu-sika-na-i.
 part-only-non.existent-PRES
 ‘X does not have both legs from the joint. He only has part of his hands’

5.2.3. Polarity reversal

One important characteristic of event contrast in Lee’s system is polarity reversal, which is brought about when one part is unuttered on a scale. All examples from Literal Opposition (4.2), Association (4.3), and Evaluation (4.4) run counter to this generalization, since examples ((14) to (17)) under these categories list contrasting elements explicitly, but are still considered to be event contrast. I do not disagree with the notion of event contrast (see example (5)), but the point is that the conditions stipulated for the use of this contrast are still restricted. In other words, these cases may suggest that polarity can be achieved without scalar structure. At first glance, Contrast of Conflict (4.5) fits nicely into Lee’s

system, in that this contrast expresses polarity implicitly. As mentioned in 5.2.1, however, I still doubt that two conflicting alternatives always need to be derived from scalar structure to be properly interpreted. Take example (21). It might be possible to stipulate a scale of <<prejudice <fight>> at which <fight> is an unuttered part with higher significance. What this scale tells us is that <fight> is an ultimate goal, and by denying this higher proposition the lower proposition ‘I feel prejudice’ gains its contrastive interpretation. Our closer look at the data suggests that this analysis does only part of the job. We still do not get across the writer’s intention, which concerns the Korean student’s conflicting feelings on the occasion of the World Cup. As shown in (44), it is possible to attach *-ga* to *kodawari* ‘prejudice’ instead of contrastive *-wa*. This change still can result in the same scalar interpretation, indicating that polarity reversal might not be the special property of *-wa*, but can also be expressed by *-ga*. What we cannot get from (44) is the CE interpretation, which is derived only from the presence of contrastive *-wa*.

- (44) *Kako no rekisi ni-wa mada kodawari-ga ar-u.*
 past GEN history LOC-WA yet prejudice-GA exist-PRES
demo kankoku to nihon-wa itiban tika-i kuni.
 but Korea and Japan-WA most close-PRES country
Nakayoku nat-te hosi-i.
 friendly become-LINK want-PRES
 ‘Although I feel prejudice(GA) because of our history, nevertheless,
 Korea and Japan are geographically very close, and I would like them to
 have friendly relations.’

6. Conclusion

In the preceding sections I have shown that the appearance of contrastive *-wa* in Japanese newspaper articles is a local phenomenon, but that localness is not the concept merely conceived of in contrast to the global theme in a given discourse. I took the framework proposed by Clancy and Downing (1987) as the starting-point of this study and adopted the idea of conscious experience from Chafe (1994) to delineate the data. I then matched the results of my analysis with the recent study of Contrastive Topic by Lee (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2003). My conclusion is that the use of contrast reflects our subjective viewpoints about the world in which we live. The writer gains or enhances his/her expressive power as well as broadens his/her narrative world by bringing two alternatives into opposition. The point of departure in our analysis was the insight that ‘opposition’, the concept about which previous studies have not posed questions seriously, reveals fine-grained aspects about our minds, which are framed sensitive to the background settings. Such settings provide elements to determine the way in which the writer performs his/her act. (26) and (28) exhibit the same structural property with an existential verb *iru* ‘exist’, which may lead Lee to conclude that they are event contrast. The fact that they impart conceptually distinct interpretations readily signals that the setting plays a significant role.

If the approach demonstrated is on the right track, it is obvious that Lee’s formalistic approach, which does not take the subjective participation of the speaker/writer into account, may not match with the nature of contrast. Accordingly, an approach which

strictly rests on the linguistic interpretation may ultimately lack explanatory value in the context of the actual data, which is clearly a reflection of the communicative intentions of the speaker/writer (see also Nuyts 1992).

I have not touched upon the question of whether contrastive *-wa* overlaps with thematic *-wa*, which is suggested in Lee's theory. Clancy and Downing's second and third conditions ((7) and (8)) could be, under certain circumstances, interpreted as local thematic *-wa*. It appears, however, these examples do not pertain to the contrastive categories I have proposed in Section 4. This might mean that they are not, in essence, instances of contrast, but thematic.

What we have pursued in this paper appears to consort with Mey's (2001) metapragmatics, the notion proposed to emphasize the significance of our 'implicit activities' which we perform in tandem with the creation of written/spoken text, and this act is taken to explain why we use language the way we do. Accordingly, metapragmatics is particularly interested to study 'hidden conditions' (ibid.: 190) in discourse. One can realize that these acts overlap with Chafe's conscious experiences, and, in this perspective, let us cite Mey (2001: 191), whose words justly summarize this paper:

Since these (= metapragmatic) conditions are embodied in the language users, they cannot simply be identified with the restrictions imposed by grammar, by content (e.g., in the shape of truth conditions) or even by the rules of conversational practice; transcending all these, they represent the whole of human sociality (the first parentheses added by the author).

Appendix

Abbreviations in glosses

ACC	Accusative
ASP	Aspect
CAUS	Causative
COP	Copula
CT	Contrastive Topic
DEC	Declarative
GA	Postpositional particle <i>ga</i>
GEN	Genitive
INST	Instrument
LINK	Linking marker
LOC	Location
NEG	Negation
NML	Nominalizing marker
POL	Politeness marker
PASS	Passive
PAST	Past
PRES	Present
Q	Question marker
QT	Quotation
WA	Postpositional particle <i>wa</i>

References

- Caenepeel, Mimo (1995) Aspect and text structure. *Linguistics* 33: 213-253.
- Caffi, Claudia (1994) Metapragmatics. In R.E. Asher (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Vol. 4*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 2461-2466.
- Chafe, Wallace (1976) Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C.N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 25-55.
- Chafe, Wallace (1994) *Discourse, consciousness, and time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clancy, Patricia M., and Pamela Downing (1987) The use of wa as a cohesion marker in Japanese oral narratives. In J. Hinds et al. (eds.), *Perspectives on topicalization. The case of Japanese 'wa'*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins, pp. 3-56.
- Cotter, Collen (2001) Discourse and media. In D. Schiffrin et al. (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 416-36.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1985) Structures of news in the press. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse and communication. New approaches to the analyses of mass media discourse and communication*. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, pp. 69-93.
- Dooley, Robert, and Stephen H. Levinsohn (2001) *Analyzing Discourse. A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics International.
- Francis, Gill (1989) Thematic selection and distribution in written discourse. *Word* 40.1-2: 201-21.
- Givón, Talmy (1983) Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction. In T. Givón (ed.), *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-language study*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam/New York, pp. 3-41.
- Givón, Talmy (1984) *Syntax: A functional typological introduction, vol 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gundel, K. Jeanette (1985) 'Shared knowledge' and topicality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 83-107.
- Hinds, John (1987) Thematization, assumed familiarity, staging, and syntactic binding in Japanese. In Hinds et.al 1987, pp. 83-106.
- Hinds, John, Senko K. Maynard, Shoichi Iwasaki (eds.) (1987) *Perspectives on Topicalization. The Case of Japanese 'wa'*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hobbs, Jerry R (1990) Topic Drift. Conversational Organization and its Development. In B. Doral (ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 3-22.
- Hodge, Robert, and Gunther Kress (1993) *Language as Ideology* [second edition]. London: Routledge.
- Inoue, Kazuko (1979) Furui jouhou atarasii jouhou [Old information and new information]. *Gengo* 8.10: 22-34.
- Inoue, Kazuko (1982) An interface of syntax, semantics, and discourse structures. *Lingua* 57: 259-300.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi (2002) *Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Kress, Gunther (1983) Linguistic processes and the mediation of 'reality': The politics of newspaper language. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 40: 43-57.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, Shigeyuki (1972-73) The categorical and the thetic judgment. *Foundations of Language* 9: 153-85.
- Kuroda, Shigeyuki (1987) A study of the so-called topic wa in passages from Tolstoi, Lawrence, and Faulkner. In Hinds, et al. (eds.), *Perspectives on Topicalization. The Case of Japanese 'wa'*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 143-61.
- Kuroda, Shigeyuki (1990) The categorical and the thetic judgment reconsidered. In Mulligan, Kevin (ed.), *Mind, Meaning and Metaphysics. The Philosophy and Theory of Language of Anton Marty*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 77-88.
- Lang, Ewald (2000) Adversative connectors on distinct levels of discourse: A re-examination of Eve Sweetser's three-level approach. In Couper-Kuhlen, E. and B. Kortmann (eds.), *Cause Condition Concession Contrast. Cognitive and discourse perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 235-256.
- Lee, Chungmin (1999) Contrastive Topic: A locus of the interface. Evidence from Korean and English. In K. Turner (ed.), *The Semantics/Pragmatics interface from different points of view*, Elsevier, pp. 317-342.
- Lee, Chungmin (2000a) Contrastive predicates and conventional scales. In A. Okrent & J. Boyle (eds.), *Chicago Linguistic Society* 36: 243-257.
- Lee, Chungmin (2000b) Topic, Contrastive Topic and Focus: What's on our minds. *Journal of Cognitive Science* 1: 21-38.
- Lee, Chungmin (2003) Contrastive Topic and proposition structure. In A.M. Di Schiullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 45-371.
- Linell, Per, and Natascha Korolija (1997) Coherence in Multi-Party Conversation. Episodes and Contexts in Interaction. T. Givón (ed.), *Conversation. cognitive, communicative and social perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 167-205.
- Longacre, Robert E (1996) *The Grammar of discourse* [second edition]. New York/London: Plenum Press.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999) *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maynard, Senko (1987) Thematization as a staging device in the Japanese narrative. In Hinds et al. (1987), pp. 57-82.
- Maynard, Senko (2002) In the name of a vessel: Emotive perspectives in the reporting of the Ehime Maru-Greenville collision in a Japanese newspaper. *Linguistics* 40.5: 1047-1086.
- Mey, Jacob (2001) *Pragmatics. An introduction*. [second Edition]. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1987) *Wa* and the wh phrase. In Hinds et al., pp. 185-217.
- Nagano, Masaru (1972) *Bunshouron sousetsu* [Introduction to the sentence structure]. Tokyo: Asakura Shoten.
- Nariyama, Shigeko (2002) The WA/GA distinction and switch-reference for ellipted subject identification in Japanese complex sentences. *Studies in Language* 26.2: 369-431.

Noda, Naofumi (1996) *Wa to ga* [Wa and ga]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Nuyts, Jan (1992) Aspects of a cognitive-pragmatic theory of language. On cognition, functionalism, and grammar. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schwenter, Scott. A. (2000) Viewpoints and polysemy: linking adversative and causal meanings of discourse markers. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Cause Condition Concession Contrast. Cognitive and discourse perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 257-281.

Sweetser, Eve E. (1990) From etymology to pragmatics. Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (1985) Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse. In D.R. Olson, N. Torrance, A. Hildyard (eds.), *Literacy, language, and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ungerer, Friedrich (1997) Emotions and emotional language in English and German news stories. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.), *The Language of emotions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 307-328.