Focus Particle Licensing:

A Case Study of *made, sae* and *demo* in Japanese

Masaki SANO

even

0. Introduction

There are many focus particles in Japanese. Despite their apparent diversity, we can classify them into only a few types according to the type of category that licenses their occurrence. This paper illustrates this with three focus particles which are apparently synonymous, namely *made, sae,* and *demo.*

1. Japanese Analogues of "even": *made, sae,* and *demo*

The focus particles *made*, *sae*, and *demo* have a use that expresses a meaning roughly translatable into English *even*, as illustrated in (1):

(1) Ken-wa   [tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni] (-made/-sae/-demo)   soodan-sita.
      Ken-Top   undependable-looking person-Dat(-even)   consult-Past
      'Ken consulted (even) undependable-looking persons.'

The so-called light verb construction is chosen here as an example involving the focus particles (although their occurrence is not restricted to such a construction): the predicate of this sentence consists of a verbal noun (VN) *soodan* 'consulting' followed by the light verb *suru* 'do(-Pres)' in its inflected, past form *sita* 'did,' and the bracketed dative complement of the predicate hosts any one of the three focus particles in parentheses. The type of complement is determined by the verbal noun alone: the complement is marked dative in (1) simply because *soodan* may select a dative

complement, and the presence of the light verb attached to it is irrelevant to the choice. This is evident in an example like the following:

(2) Ken-wa   oya-ni   soodan-no   kekka, yatto kokoro-o kime-ta.
    Ken-Top   parent-Dat consulting-Gen result at-last mind-Acc decide-Past
    'At last Ken made up his mind as a result of consulting his friends.'

In (2), the verbal noun *soodan* 'consulting/consultation' appears without its associated light verb, as a genitivized (*no*-marked) nominal to function as (part of) the complement to the following noun *kekka* 'result'; the whole phrase headed by *kekka* functions as an adverbial adjunct of the entire sentence. Despite the absence of the light verb, *oya-ni* is marked dative, as a complement selected by the verbal noun. However, the dative complement in (2) does not equally host all of the three focus particles that are equally possible in (1), as shown below:

(3) Ken-wa   tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni-{made/(?)sae/*demo} soodan-no   kekka,
    Ken-Top   undependable-looking person-Dat-even   consulting-Gen result
    yatto   kokoro-o   kime-ta.
    at-last mind-Acc   decide-Past
    'At last Ken made up his mind as a result of consulting even undependable persons.'

As indicated, *made* is perfectly acceptable with the verbal noun alone, but *demo* is drastically degraded in this context; *sae* falls within the acceptable category, though it may sound somewhat awkward as compared with *made* in the same context or with its occurrence in (1). This indicates that the three focus particles, while apparently interchangeable in (1), have different syntactic and/or semantic properties that affect the acceptability of their occurrence in certain contexts.

2. What Licenses demo?

What is responsible for the pattern of acceptability shown in (3), in particular the degradation of *demo*? A possibility we will explore is that it is related the absence of a tense inflection (past or present) in the adjunct phrase headed by *kekka*, whose complement lacks the light verb associated with the VN *soodan* and hence lacks a tense inflection to be affixed to it.

There is some reason to believe that the presence of the (light) verb alone is not enough to license an occurrence of *demo* and a functional category like T(ense) is necessary for its occurrence. To see this, consider first an example involving *v*P-topicalization such as the following, where only the right boundary of *v*P is indicated and its left boundary is deliberately left unspecified:

(4) Ken-wa   oya-ni-{a. made /b. sae /c. demo}   soodan-*si* [vP]-*wa*   si-nak-atta.

Ken-Top parent-Dat-even   consult-do-Top   do-Neg-Past

(Lit.) 'Consult even his parents, Ken didn't.'

In (4) the *v*P whose head position is probably occupied by the (raised) light verb *si* in italics is topicalized/focalized by the italicized postpositional Topic/Contrastive marker *wa* (*si* is inflected for hosting such a postposition, not for tense); this is a process similar in function to predicate (or VP/*v*P) fronting in English. This *wa*-marked *v*P is the target of the negation expressed by the negative morpheme *nak*, which is affixed to the preceding "dummy" verb *si* that typically appears in this type of *v*P-topicalization construction (this dummy verb is not to be confused with the light verb associated with a verbal noun). The dative complement of the VN *soodan* can host any of the three focus particles: *made* in (4a), *sae* in (4b), and *demo* in (4c). The choice of focus particle *fp*, however, determines the possible syntactic positions of the complement and hence the possible scopal order between *fp* and the negative. The *made*-focused dative complement (4a) can remain within the *v*P, and hence within the scope of negation, giving a Neg>*fp* scope order reading such that it is not the case that Ken consulted even his parents. The *made*-focused complement may also be outside the *v*P, as a result of (string-vacuous) overt phrasal movement. This overt movement is possible, though perhaps marginally, out of a focus island like the *wa*-marked *v*P, unlike covert movement/agreement, which is more severely restricted and is blocked by the presence of such islands (including *wh*-island; see among others Sano (2000, 2001a, 2004), Hirata (2001) for relevant discussions). The *made*-focused complement displaced from its *v*P-internal original position is outside the scope of negation, leaving only the VN *soodan* as the target of negation. The resulting *fp*>Neg scope order gives a reading such that even Ken's parents are members of the set of people that he did not consult. The possibly marginal nature of this reading may be attributed, at least partly, to the marginality of extraction out of the *wa*-marked *v*P, although we will not go into the matter here. Virtually the same is true of *sae*, so that the *sae*-focused complement (4b) may be within or outside *v*P (the latter via movement), allowing either the Neg>*fp* or the *fp*>Neg scope order reading just indicated. The difference in syntactic position, hence scope order, is reflected in phonology: the *fp*>Neg scope order reading associated with a *v*P-external position of the relevant focused complement is accompanied by a phonological break between the relevant focus particle and *soodan-si-wa*, there being a *v*P-boundary between the two; such a phonological pause is absent in the Neg>*fp* scope order reading. Turning to *demo*, this particle forces the dative complement it attaches to to be outside the *v*P and to outscope negation: (4c), if interpretable at all, must be read with a phonological break after the focus particle and with the accompanying *fp*>Neg scope order.

These observations are confirmed by placing before the dative complement an adverbial interpreted within the scope of negation, as in the following:

(5) Ken-wa   isoide   oya-ni-{a. made /b. sae /c. *demo} soodan-si-wa   si-nak-atta.
    Ken-Top   in-a-hurry   parent-Dat-even   consult-do-Top do-Neg-Past
    (Lit.) 'Consult even his parents in a hurry, Ken didn't.'

Isoide 'in a hurry,' morphologically the "continuative" form of the verb *isog(u)* 'hurry(-Pres),' func-
tions as a predicate-modifier, as an adverbial which in a negative sentence falls within the scope of
negation. Let us assume that the adverbial is generated *v*P-internally, or at least adjoined to *v*P.
Then it confines the dative complement that follows it within the same *v*P that it belongs to. As
shown in (5), *made* and *sae* may be preceded by this adverbial, but only with the Neg>*fp* scope
order reading without an intonational break following. In contrast, *demo*, requiring the complement
it attaches to to be outside *v*P, cannot be preceded by the *v*P-internal adverbial, so that (5c) is unac-
ceptable with the only possible *fp*>Neg scope order blocked by the adverbial.

Why is it that the *demo*-focused complement cannot stay within the *v*P it originates in? We
might say intuitively that *v*P is too "small" a category for *demo* to reside in; each focus particle has a
"size" associated with it and can only reside in a phrase large enough for its size. Pursuing this
intuition, let us develop the idea that each focus particle is associated with the head H of some
phrase HP, H a licenser of the particle and HP its scope. Thus *demo* is not licensed by any verbal
element associated with *v*P, such as *v*, V or VN, requiring some functional element higher than *v* as
its licenser. Under the standard assumption about clausal architecture, the functional element
immediately above *v* is T. Suppose T is a licenser of *demo*. Then in (1), *demo* is licensed by T, in
this case the Past inflection associated with the light verb, possibly via movement of the comple-
ment it attaches to out of *v*P to a position close enough to T. In (3) *demo* is impossible because of
the absence of T within the adjunct *kekka*-phrase, which is presumably an island for movement of
the *demo*-focused complement to be licensed by T outside the adjunct. In (4) *demo* is possible
under (perhaps marginal) movement of the complement it attaches to out of the *wa*-marked *v*P, to a
position close to matrix T, an operation that could not have applied in (5).

This account is given plausibility by the fact that replacing the verbal noun phrase (VNP) com-
plement of *kekka* 'result' in (3) with its clausal counterpart containing T makes the acceptability dif-
ference found in (3) virtually disappear:

(6) Ken-wa   tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni-{made/sae/(?)demo} soodan-sita   kekka,
    Ken-Top undependable-looking person-Dat-even   consulting-did result
    yatto   kokoro-o   kime-ta.
    at-last   mind-Acc decide-Past
    'At last Ken made up his mind as a result of having consulted even undependable
    persons.'

In (6), the verbal noun that is genitivized in (3) is instead followed by its associated light verb in its

past form *sita* 'did'; the complement of *kekka* with such a tense inflection is (or contains) a TP and the occurrence of *demo* in it is clearly more acceptable than its occurrence in the tenseless analogue in (3). The slight awkwardness that one might find with *demo* in (6) may be related to the fact that the (clausal) complement to a noun like *kekka* tends to refer to a single event such as would be incompatible with a semantic property of *demo*, which requires that the clausal domain it takes scope over refer to a state (see Noda (1995: 29) for a similar claim) or to series of events, and not to a single, specific event. Changing *kekka* to a noun which as its lexical property takes a clausal complement satisfying this requirement, such as *sue* or *ageku* 'end,' makes the use of *demo* more natural:

(7) Ken-wa tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni-demo   soodan-sita   {sue(-ni)/ageku},
    Ken-Top undependable-looking person-Dat-even consulting-did   end(-at)/end
    yatto kokoro-o kime-ta.
    at-last mind-Acc decide-Past
    'At last Ken made up his mind as the (final) result of having consulted even
    undependable persons.'

In contrast, the noun *ato* 'after' is more incompatible with *demo* than *kekka* is, and the noun *tyokugo* 'immediately after' even more so, as a consequence of stronger tendency of such nouns to take a clausal complement referring to a single event:

(8) Ken-wa tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni-demo   soodan-sita
    Ken-Top undependable-looking person-Dat-even consulting-did
    {a. ??ato(-de) / b. *tyokugo(-ni)},   yatto   kokoro-o kime-ta.
        after(-at) /   immediately-after(-at) at-last mind-Acc decide-Past
    'At last Ken made up his mind after/immediately after having consulted even
    undependable persons.'

While acceptability of *demo* is partly affected by semantic (aspectual) properties of its scopal domain, in particular of its containing clausal complement of a nominal head inducing the relevant properties, it seems safe to conclude that *demo* requires the syntactic presence of T (or at least some functional category higher than *v*) as its licenser. Note that even a noun like *sue* or *ageku* that goes naturally with occurrence of *demo* in its clausal complement rejects its occurrence in its non-clausal, tenseless complement; the use of *demo* in a example like the following is no better than its use in (3):

(9) Ken-wa   tayorinasa-soona   hito-ni-{made/sae/*demo} soodan-no

Ken-Top undependable-looking person-Dat-even   consulting-Gen

{sue(-ni)/ageku}, yatto   kokoro-o   kime-ta.

end(-at)   at-last mind-Acc decide-Past

'At last Ken made up his mind as the (final) result of consulting even

undependable persons.'

3. Licensers of *made* and *sae*

If *demo* requires T as its licenser, what about *made* and *sae*? We already know that they do not require T, as is clear from examples like (3) and (9). Although *made* and *sae* behave alike in the previous examples, there are cases where they differ in ways that seem to be accounted for in terms of their different licensers. Consider first the *v*P-topicalization structure with a quantifier-like element before the dative complement of *soodan*, as in the following:

(10) Ken-wa subete oya-ni   soodan-si-wa   si-nak-atta.

Ken-Top all   parent-Dat consult-do-Top do-Neg-Past

(Lit.) 'Consult his parents on all, Ken didn't.'

Subete 'all' is a universal quantifier whose categorial status depends on the context. In (10), it functions semantically as a thematic object of the verbal noun. Syntactically, however, the quantifier here is an adverbial (perhaps an adverbial quantifier "floated off" from a thematic object, elided here); it lacks the accusative Case *o* that a thematic nominal object is typically marked with. Note that such a Case-marker usually cannot be omitted from an object noun without creating an colloquial flavor:

(11) Ken-wa   sono subete-o oya-ni   soodan-si-wa   si-nak-atta.

Ken-Top its   all-Acc   parent-Dat consult-do-Top do-Neg-Past

(Lit.) 'Consult his parents on all of it, Ken didn't.'

In (11) the presence of the determiner-like adnominal *sono* 'the/its' forces its modified element, *subete*, to be a noun requiring the accusative *o* (underlined), omission of which necessarily accompanies a colloquial or even sloppy flavor that is absent in (10).

Now notice that on the most natural reading of (10), the quantifier is interpreted within the scope of negation; the sentence has a "not all" reading such that not all were talked about by Ken to his parents. The opposite, "all not" scope order reading that all were such that they were not talked about, is somewhat unnatural, requiring a distinct pause after *subete* and inducing a special pragmatic implication not found in the "not all" reading. Consider what happens if the focus particles

we are concerned with attach to the dative complement, as in the following:

(12) Ken-wa   subete   oya-ni-{a. made /b. (*)sae} soodan-si-wa   si-nak-atta.
      Ken-Top all   parent-Dat-even   consult-do-Top do-Neg-Past
      (Lit.) 'Consult even his parents on all, Ken didn't.'

With *made*, no special problem arises and the "not all" scope order that is most natural in (10) is still available in (12a). With *sae*, however, this scope order is impossible, so that (12b) is either unacceptable or must be read with the unnatural "all not" scope order (and with *sae* over or under the scope of negation). Why should this be so? An answer is given by a natural assumption concerning the syntactic position of *subete.* As noted, this quantifier, while an adverbial without a nominal property of requiring a Case-marker, is nevertheless playing the semantic role of the theme of the verbal noun *soodan*. Let us assume that it occupies a position associated with a thematic object, namely a position within a projection of V (abstracting away the distinction between V and VN), an assumption that automatically accounts for the "not all" scope order. Since the dative complement of *soodan* must also be base-generated within a projection of V, it follows that the dative complement in (12), irrespective of the focus particle that attaches to it, is confined within VP, under the standard assumption (already adopted tacitly in the discussion of (5)) that adverbials, unlike nominal complements, do not undergo phrasal movement (hence do not provide the following complement with a position external to VP). Since *made* is possible but *sae* is not in this VP-internal position at least on the "not all" reading, it must be that the former but not the latter can be licensed by V/VN.

The impossibility of the "not all" reading of (12) with *sae* is thus attributed to the lack of a licenser of *sae* within the VP the particle is confined in. The marginal availability of the "all not" reading for (12) (and also for (10)) is perhaps due to the marginality of *subete* base-generated outside *v*P. That is, the clausal architecture of Japanese might be such that it allows such an adverbial quantifier to be base-generated in a position higher than NegP to function as something like a secondary topic, linked to the rest of the sentence by some aboutness condition (in much the same way that a Case-less nominal focused by an adverbial particle like *dake* 'only' is so generated as suggested by Hoshi and Miyoshi (2005)). Naturally, this base-generation option should be only marginally available in a special *v*P-topicalization construction like (10) and (12). If the *sae*-focused complement in (12) is to escape from VP to be licensed by some category higher than VP, *subete* must be generated in a "secondary topic" position outside the scope of negation, a very marginal option in this case.

What, then, is *sae* licensed by? The following example suggests that the functional category immediately above V, namely *v*, can license *sae*:

(13) Ken-wa subete-o oya-ni-{a. made /b. sae} soodan-si-wa   si-nak-atta.
     Ken-Top all-Acc parent-Dat-even   consult-do-Top do-Neg-Past
     (Lit.) 'Consult even his parents on all, Ken didn't.'

This example differs from (12) in having *subete* Case-marked with *o*. There is, however, a more important difference that accompanies that superficial difference: (13) contrasts with (12) in allowing the "not all" reading with *sae* as well as with *made*. Apparently, this is puzzling. The quantifier *subete* in (13) must have been marked accusative because it is a nominal object of *soodan*, and if so, it must have been base-generated within VP, not outside, confining the dative complement also within VP. (13) should therefore have the same structure as the structure of (12) with a VP-internal instance of *subete* , and yet *sae* is possible in (13) even on the "not all" reading. Notice, however, that there is no reason to assume that a nominal object behaves syntactically like an adverbial in resisting phrasal movement. In fact, it is likely that an object generated within VP can undergo *v*P-internal movement, to be adjoined to some projection of *v*, an operation analogous to the so-called Object Shift. If as a result of this operation *subete-o* in (13) occupies a VP-external but *v*P-internal position, a position that can still be within the scope of negation, then the focused dative complement can also occupy some VP-external and *v*P-internal position, and the acceptability of *sae* on the "not all" reading follows if *sae* is licensed in such a position by the *v* head of *v*P, a phrasal category "large" enough for the particle to reside in. Note that in this case *sae*, like *made*, is interpreted within the scope of negation, a natural consequence from the universal quantifier being located *v*P-internally within the scope of negation. (The same applies to *made* in (12), with the quantifier VP-internal.)

4. Genitive *no* as a Licenser of *sae*

If *sae* is licensed by *v,* however, a question arises why in examples like (3) and (9) the *sae*-focused complement of *soodan* is acceptable. In these examples, the verbal noun is immediately followed by the genitive Case-marker *no* and does not have the light verb attached to it. In a case like this it is hard to imagine the presence of *v* as a licenser of *sae* within the adjunct containing the genitivized VNP, and yet *sae* is possible in this context. There is some reason to believe, however, that the genitive *no* itself is playing a role similar to *v*, licensing an occurrence of *sae*. This is suggested by comparing (14) with (15):

(14) Ken-wa   oya-ni-{made/sae} soodan-no   ato   yatto kokoro-o kime-ta.
     Ken-Top parent-Dat-even   consulting-Gen after at-last mind-Acc decide-Past
     'At last Ken made up his mind after consulting even his parents.'

(15) Ken-wa   oya-ni-{made/?*sae} soodan-go   yatto   kokoro-o   kime-ta.

Ken-Top   parent-Dat-even   consultation-after at-last mind-Acc decide-Past

'At last Ken made up his mind after consulting even his parents.'

In (14) the VNP headed by *soodan* is marked with *no* and functions as the event-denoting comple-ment of *ato* 'after' (cf. (8a)). Here there is no significant difference in acceptability between *made* and *sae*. In (15), the same VNP functions as the complement of *go*, a dependent noun or nominal suffix synonymous with the independent noun *ato*. With the dependent noun *go* directly suffixed to it, the VNP is not marked with *no*, and occurrence of *sae* is degraded in acceptability as compared either with *made* or with its occurrence in (14). We might characterize the situation informally by saying that *sae* in (15) occurs in too "small" a category to reside in. Let us elaborate our previous assumptions and take *made* to be licensed by a verbal lexical category like V or VN and *sae* by a functional category immediately higher than this lexical category. Then in (14) *made* is licensed by *soodan*, a VN, and *sae* is licensed by *no*, the functional category immediately above VN, on the assumption that *no* in (14) is merged with the VNP headed by *soodan*. Thus the licenser of *sae* includes at least two functional categories, both similar in function: one is the little (or light) verb *v*, which functions as a "verbalizer" of a category-neutral root as suggested by Chomsky (2004), and the other is genitive *no* (or perhaps more generally, "the little noun" *n*), which we might regard as a "nominalizer" of such a root or of what has been referred to as VN. The low acceptability of *sae* in (15) indicates that the nominal suffix *go* is not such a functional category as is (fully) qualified as a licenser of *sae*, although it could be regarded as a nominalizer of what it attaches to.

Note that in (14) the *sae*-focused complement has probably undergone phrasal movement, out of VNP but within its containing functional category KP ("Case Phrase"), adjoining to some projec-tion of *no*, the head of KP; this is an operation analogous to *v*P-internal phrasal movement that pre-sumably has applied in the previous examples in which *sae* is licensed by *v*. Such movement is nec-essary if some locality condition ("minimality") prohibits intervention of a potential licenser (like VN) between a focus particle (here *sae*) and its actual licenser (*no*). The locality condition predicts that inapplicability of such KP-internal movement leads to degradation of *sae* but not *made* in a con-text analogous to (14). The following contrast appears to be more or less in the predicted direction:

(16) Ken-wa   [Mari-ga   sinseki-ni-{made/??sae} soodan]-no   ato   yatto

Ken-Top   Mari-Nom relative-Dat-even   consulting-Gen after   at-last

kokoro-o   kime-ta.

mind-Acc   decide-Past

'At last Ken made up his mind after Mari's consulting even (her/their) relatives.'

This example has a subject *Mari(-ga)* before the (focused) dative complement. If this subject is within the VNP headed by *soodan* as indicated by brackets, the appearance of such an overt expres-

sion before the dative complement indicates that the complement has not moved out of VNP but stays inside. The locality condition would dictate that *sae* attaching to the VNP-internal complement is not licensed by *no* across the potential licenser *soodan*; and in fact appearance of *sae* in such a position is degraded in acceptability as compared with *made*, which, unlike *sae*, can be licensed VNP-internally by *soodan,* the closest possible licenser. Note that changing the order of the subject and the focused complement in (16) makes the acceptability difference disappear:

(17) Ken-wa   sinseki-ni-{made/sae} Mari-ga   soodan-no   ato   yatto
      Ken-Top   relative-Dat-even   Mari-Nom   consulting-Gen after at-last
      kokoro-o   kime-ta.
      mind-Acc   decide-Past
      'At last Ken made up his mind after Mari's consulting even her parents.'

This again is predicted, since the focused complement occurring in the left-peripheral position of the *no*-headed KP opens up the possibility that it has undergone movement out of VNP to adjoin to a projection of *no*. This movement is necessary only for the *sae*-focused complement and not for the *made*-focused complement, which might simply have moved to the left of *Mari-ga* VNP-internally, or perhaps have been base-generated in such a position.

Note further that if, in (14), the VNP has a PRO subject controlled by matrix *Ken(-wa)*, this phonetically empty element could occupy the position occupied by *Mari-ga* in (17), to the right of the focused complement rather than to its left, so that the acceptability of *sae* in (14) with such a structure falls under the same account as is given to *sae* in (17).

5. Concluding Remarks

We have argued that the focus particles *made, sae* and *demo,* apparently sharing a use that expresses a meaning akin to English *even,* nevertheless differ from each other in the category that licenses their occurrence. *Made* is licensed by V (or VN) in such a way that the complement of V/VN that has *made* attached to it may stay within VP/VNP. *Sae* is licensed by a functional category immediately above V/VN, namely by the light verb *v* or the genitive *no* (or the "light noun" *n*), so that the complement of V/VN that has *sae* attached to it cannot stay within VP/VNP but must be moved to be an immediate constituent of a projection of *v* or *no/n*, under the locality condition on licensing. The licenser of *demo* is an even higher functional category such as T. The *demo*-focused phrase originating within VP/VNP as its complement must therefore be moved across VP/VNP and *v*P to be an immediate constituent of a category like TP, in order for the particle to be properly licensed.

Now under the standard assumption about the clausal architecture, functional categories above T include such clause-peripheral (and thus potentially discourse-oriented) elements as

M(odal) and C. What may be termed the exemplification use of *demo* and the evaluative use of *koso* are plausible candidates for the focus particles licensed by M (Moriyama (1998), Sano (2000, 2001b, 2004)):

(18) Ken-wa　Mari-ni-{a. demo ╱b. koso}　soodan-sita*(-nitigainai).

　　　Ken-Top　Mari-Dat　　　　　　　　consult-Past-must

　　　(Lit.) 'It must be that Ken consulted Mari.'

The exemplification use of *demo* in (18a) is somewhat similar to the English use of *say* for mentioning something as an example (as in "Can you play a wind instrument, say a flute?"). This use of *demo* differs from the "even" use of *demo* we have been discussing in that it requires the presence of a modal element like the parenthesized auxiliary *nitigainai* 'must' in (18). As indicated by the asterisk outside the parenthesis, the absence of such a modal renders *demo* in (18a) unacceptable for the exemplification interpretation, forcing the (here somewhat unnatural) "even" interpretation on it. Similarly, the evaluative use of *koso* in (18b), expressing an evaluative attitude (typically of the speaker) toward what is focused by the particle, is licensed by the modal auxiliary, the absence of which makes the use of *koso* infelicitous.

　　On the other hand, what may be termed the concessive use of *koso* is licensed by a more clause-peripheral (and more obviously discoursed-oriented) element, namely a "concessive" conjunction like *ga* "but" or *keredomo* "although," which is an instance of C or at least a category higher than M (Sano (2000)). We can see this licensing relation in an example like the following (where *koso* is simply glossed as K, there being no English analogue):

(19) Ken-wa　Mari-ni-koso　soodan-sita　{keredomo╱ga},　Mika-ni-wa

　　　Ken-Top　Mari-Dat-K　　consult-Past　although/but　　Mika-to-Top

　　　damatte　　　　ita.

　　　saying-nothing　was

　　　'Although Ken consulted Mari, he said nothing to Mika.'

The material preceding *keredomo╱ga* in (19) would be unacceptable without the conjunction (plus what follows it), unless *koso* is left out. That is, the presence of *koso* in (19) requires a concessive interpretation of its containing clause such as is created by the conjunction: it is licensed by such a concessive conjunction. The propositional content of the *koso*-containing concessive clause is something that the speaker admits and presents as a "concession" to a discourse participant (typically the hearer), with a *koso*-focused constituent of the clause (here *Mari*) serving as the target of the concession.

　　We thus find that virtually every head element of the categories constituting a clause has associated with it a focus particle that it licenses. We may expect that every focus particle is licensed by

some head element of the categories constituting a clause. Furthermore, whether or not the relevant focus particle is discourse-oriented is likely to be in proportion to the discourse-orientedness of its licenser. Thus in accordance with the discourse-orientedness or the clause-peripheralness of the licenser, the concessive use of *koso* is most discourse-oriented, or more discourse-oriented than its evaluative use; the latter and the exemplification use of *demo* are more discourse-oriented than the "even" use of *demo*, which in turn is more discourse-oriented than *sae*, etc. Recall that the phrase with a focus particle (except the one with *made*) must be eventually located in a peripheral position as required by the peripherality of its licenser.

To see to what extent this is true or can be generalized to other focus particles not discussed in this paper, and what the theoretical implications are, further investigation is necessary.

References

Chomsky, Noam (2004) "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy," Adriana Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond,* pp.104-131, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hirata, Ichiro (2001) "The Notion 'Phase' and *Ka*-Movement Analysis of Japanese *Wh*-Interrogatives," *KLS 21: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting,* pp.23-33.

Hoshi, Koji and Nobuhiro Miyoshi (2005) "A Derivational Approach to Association with Focus in Japanese and its Consequences," paper presented at the 131st Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan.

Moriyama, Takuro (1998) "Reiji no Fukujoshi *demo* to Bunmatsu Seiyaku (The Adverbial Particle *demo* of Exemplification and the Sentence-Final Constraint)," *Nihongo Kagaku* 3, pp.86-100.

Noda, Hisashi (1995) "Bun no Kaisoukouzou kara Mita Shudai to Toritate (Topic and Focus as Seen from the Hierarchical Structure of Sentences)," Masuoka Takashi, Noda Hisashi and Numata Yoshiko (eds.) *Nihongo no Shudai to Toritate* (Topic and Focus in Japanese), pp.1-35, Kurosio Publishers.

Sano, Masaki (2000) "Island Effects on Invisible Movement of Focus Particles: A Case Study of *koso* and *sae* in Japanese," *English Linguistics* 17, pp.330-360.

Sano, Masaki (2001a) "Nihongo no Toritateshi no Sosei-idou Bunseki to Minimality Kooka (A Feature-Movement Analysis of Focus Particles in Japanese and the Minimality Effect)," *Papers from the Eighteenth National Conference of The English Linguistic Society of Japan,* pp.181-190.

Sano, Masaki (2001b) "Reiji no *demo* no Toogoron (Syntax of *demo* of Exemplification)," *Ritsumeikan Bungaku* 568, pp.277-306.

Sano, Masaki (2004) "Visible Successive-Cyclic Movement of Focus Particles in Situ," *English Linguistics* 21, pp.376-408.