

## Grammar of Anti-Exhaustivity

In this presentation, I present an analysis of Japanese Contrastive Topics (CTs), which are known to elicit semantic/pragmatic effects of uncertainty, non-finality and/or incompleteness. The proposed analysis is based on the following facts. (I) A CT in Japanese receives focal accent and can be the lone focalized element in a sentence, contrary to Rise-Fall contour in German (cf. Büring 1997, 2003, Krifka 1998, Hara 2006). (II) It comes with the particle *-wa*, which is also used to indicate a thematic topic in the sense of Kuno (1973). (III) It appears quite naturally in Speech Act sentence other than assertion (e.g., questions, imperatives, exhortatives, and performatives).

The basic assumptions employed in the presentation are (i) *Alternative Semantics for Focus* (Rooth 1985, 1992, and particularly Kratzer 1989), (ii) Speech Act Projection in syntax (Krifka 2001, 2002), and (iii) the general Gricean reasoning. First, combination of the assumptions (i) and (ii) opens up a possibility of having a set of alternative Speech Acts as a semantic object. More concretely, I propose that a CT guarantees that a focus value of the sentence not be 'used up' at the propositional level but be 'preserved' until the level of Speech Act Phrase at LF. This means that, out of the set of possible Speech Acts that the speaker could have engaged in, the ordinary value of the sentence is the only one that she actually did. The general Gricean reasoning comes in and invites us to speculate possible reasons for this particular choice. The possibility is wide-open, however. It could be that the speaker knows that the alternative acts embed false propositions, or that the speaker does not know whether those propositions are true or false, or even that the speaker knows that at least some of the propositions are true but find it inappropriate socially to assert them. Indeed, such a wide range of possibilities are often associated with the use of a CT. The analysis also makes some sense out of the particular morphology used for a CT: if anything is beyond the scope of Speech Act, it is a sentence topic (cf. Krifka 2001). This 'outside of Speech Act' scope property is shared with the CT use of *wa*.

This system in its most basic form does not get all the facts, however. A CT is predicted to be felicitous even when the speaker has the full knowledge for a given topic question. For instance, the speaker has chosen a particular assertion because the alternatives turn out to be assertions of false propositions. This kind of 'Exhaustive' interpretation is in most cases unavailable with a CT. To get the right results, we need to incorporate the notion of 'competition between a CT and a focus. I argue that, when the situation is compatible for both a CT and a focus, the speaker is expected to use the focus strategy because it would lead to a stronger Speech Act.

**Selected References:** Büring, D. (2003) 'On D-trees, beans, and B-accents,' *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 511-545. Hara, Yurie. (2006) *Grammar of Knowledge Representation: Japanese Discourse Items at Interfaces*, Ph.D. thesis, U. of Delaware. Kratzer, A. 1991: 'The representation of focus,' in A. von Stechow et al (eds.), *Semantics: International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Berlin: de Gruyter. Krifka, M. (1998) 'Scope inversion under rise-fall contour in German,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:1: 75–112. \_\_\_\_\_ (2001) 'Quantifying into Question Acts,' *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 1-40.