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1. Introduction

Discourse particles from East Asian languages such as Japanese, Korean, Mandarin Chinese to European languages such as German, Italian, West Flemish, Romanian and so forth (Haegeman 2010, Haegeman and Hill 2014, Murasugi 2012, Li 2006, Munaro and Poletto 2003, Pak 2006, Saito 2013, Speas and Tenny 2003, Zimmermann 2004, among others) are a fervent topic of discussion. This paper mainly attempts to explicate from the point of view of generative grammar the syntactic nature of discourse particles in Japanese, such as yo, sa, and né in Tokyo dialect (Murasugi 2012), as well as bai and tai in Hichiku dialect. According to previous studies concerning discourse particles (Murasugi 2012, Haegeman and Hill 2014, among others), discourse particles in the Tokyo dialect such as yo and sa appear in a head of a lower Speech-Act Phrase 2, SAP₂, in the same way as discourse particles such as wè in West Flemish (a Dutch dialect) appear in SAP₂, while both ne in Tokyo dialect and né in West Flemish occur in a head of a higher Speech-Act Phrase 1, SAP₁. On the other hand, taking discourse particles bai and tai in Hichiku dialect into consideration, bai and tai have similar properties to yo and sa in Tokyo dialect and wè in West Flemish in that they assert the meaning of the propositional content. Therefore, in this article, I propose that bai and tai occupy the head of SAP₂.

The outline of this paper is as follows. First, Section 2.1 reviews Rizzi (1997, 2004) with a focus on the split-CP hypothesis. Next, Section 2.2 clarifies the characteristics of discourse particles in West Flemish, as advocated by Haegeman and Hill (2014). Furthermore, we discuss the syntactic nature of West Flemish discourse particles like né(m), wè, zé, and zè and Japanese ones like yo,
ne, and sa. In Section 3, we will look at the function of discourse particles such as bai and tai in Hichiku dialect, and show the similarities and differences between bai and tai and yo and sa. Consequently, I propose that bai and tai occupy the head of SAP₂, as well as yo and sa syntactically because they function as discourse particles which assert the meaning of the proposition. Section 4 summarizes the paper.

2. Syntactic Configuration of CP

2.1 Split CP proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2004)


![Diagram of the C system in Japanese](image)

The lexical layer headed by V at the bottom of this hierarchy is a layer in which V assigns 0-role to an argument that appears in its complement. The inflectional layer is the layer pertaining to functional categories for case agreements, adverbs, and so forth.¹ In order to elaborate a syntactic configuration within the complementizer layer, Rizzi (1997, 2004) endeavors a refinement of the complementizer layer, as shown in (2):

![Diagram of the refined C system](image)

¹ Cinque’s (1999, 2006) cartographic approach provides a similar view of layered vP. In the same fashion, Pollock (1989) suggests split IP/TP system because he observes that a system with a single inflectional head would be insufficient to accommodate the four positions that a lexical verb can occupy in French. However, a full discussion of the vP system and IP/TP system is beyond the scope of this paper.
A fine-grained hierarchy of a CP layer above IP as described in (2) is the syntactic configuration in Italian. Force signifies “Illocutionary force” involved in speech acts expressing sentence types such as declarative, interrogative, and imperative. Fin(iteness) determines that the proposition is either finite or non-finite clause. Constituents interpreted as a topic or focus in sentences appear in Top(ic) and Foc(us) heads. TopP and FocP are activated when such a constituent exists within IP or VP.

2.2 Syntactic Configuration of Discourse Particles

There are several studies about the syntactic configuration of discourse particles. However, it seems that inquiries into discourse particles have been hitherto neglected from the framework of generative grammar because discourse particles fulfill a function in “discourse.” In other words, it has been considered that they are not a question of sentence grammar for a long time. In recent years, however, studies examining the syntactic configuration of discourse particles from the viewpoint of generative grammar have been increasingly implemented not only in Japanese but also in German, Italian, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, West Flemish. In this section, we will focus mainly on the characteristics of discourse particles adopting a cartographic approach advocated by Rizzi (1997, 2004).

2.2.1 Characteristics of Discourse Particles in West Flemish

In this section, let us overview previous explorations concerning discourse
particles such as *né(m)*, wè, zé, and zè in West Flemish. According to Haegeman and Hill (2014) (henceforth, H and H 2014), *né(m)* describes ostensivity and surprise in a conversation, so that it is eventually translated into “so there” in English. *Wè* functions as conveying the authority of the experience, therefore, it is utilized as a means to express the meaning of interjection “you know” in English. *Zé* with raising intonation is used as the attention drawer in the speech event, while *zè* with falling intonation has an evidential reading, conveying to the hearer that there is salient contextual evidence for the propositional content expressed by the speaker. More precisely, zé and zè are used in the sense of interjection “look here” in English.

Haegeman (2010) investigates the co-occurrence relation between discourse particles in West Flemish. As argued by Haegeman (2010), two is the maximum number of discourse particles that appear at the edge of clauses:

(3) a. *Men artikel* is gedoan wè zé né.
   My article is finished wè zé né
   ‘My article has done.’


(3a) is not acceptable because more than two discourse particles appear, while (3b) is acceptable because the number of discourse particles doesn’t exceed two, such as zè né with falling intonation, and wè zè with rising intonation.

Crucial for reviewing the co-occurrence relation of discourse particles at the end of strings, there is rigid ordering restriction on discourse particles in West Flemish, as in (4):

(4) a. *Men artikel* is gedoan wè né.

b.*Men artikel* is gedoan né wè.

c.*Men artikel* is gedoan zè wè. (cf. Haegeman and Hill 2014)

As exemplified in (4a), wè can co-occur with né. In this case, wè must precede né, not *vice versa* as in (4b). In (4c), unlike (3b), zé and wè do not co-occur in such

---

2 Haegeman (2010) and Haegeman and Hill (2014) investigate not only West Flemish but also Romanian.
word order.

Additionally, the availability of discourse particles relies on clause-typing.

(5) a.*Ekj gedoan we?
   Have you finished we?
   ‘Lit., Have you finished?’ (Haegeman and Hill 2014)

b. Men artikel is gedoan we.

As shown in (5a), we is not compatible with interrogatives. Rather, it is compatible with declaratives, as in (5b). Because of this, H and H (2014) suggest that we is sensitive to clause-typing.

To account for the co-occurrence relation of discourse particles, H and H (2014) assume two functional categories above ForceP, or Speech-Act Phrases (henceforth SAPs), which are suggested first by Speas and Tenny (2003). The upper SAP (henceforward SAP\(_1\)) serves as an “attention seeking layer” that encodes the setting up of the discourse layer. On the other hand, the lower SAP (henceforward SAP\(_2\)) works as a “layer to consolidate the discourse relation between speakers and hearers” and c-selects ForceP as its complement. It can be said that SAP\(_1\) is insensitive to clause-typing and involves the hearers in that the discourse particles which occupy the head of SAP\(_1\) aim to solicit a response from the hearers. On the other hand, SAP\(_2\) is sensitive to clause-typing and plays a role in asserting the meaning of the proposition.\(^3\)\(^4\) Let us look at an example of discourse particles such as we and né as schematized in (6):

(6) a. Men artikel is gedoan we né.

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SAP}_1 \\
\text{SA}_1 \\
\text{SA}_1' \\
\text{SA}_1 \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SAP}_2 \\
\text{SA}_2 \\
\text{SA}_2' \\
\text{SA}_2 \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{we} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^3\) H & H (2014) assume that SAP has shell structures modeled on the VP shell analysis proposed by Larson’s (1988) pioneering study as in (i):

(i) \[\text{[saP}_1 \text{[saP}_1 \text{[saP}_2 \text{[ForceP} \ldots]SA}_2 \text{sa}_2 \text{]}SA}_1 \text{sa}_1\]

A full discussion of the VP shell analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.

\(^4\) H & H (2014) suppose that there are vocative phrases at the specifier of SAP\(_1\) or SAP\(_2\).
According to H and H (2014), \textit{wè} c-selects ForceP as its complement and is derived in SA\textsubscript{2}. In addition, \textit{né} is merged as SA\textsubscript{1} to solicit attention from the hearers. Furthermore, ForceP obligatorily moves to the specifier of SAP\textsubscript{2}; the final locus of \textit{né} is derived by moving the projection headed by final \textit{wè} to the specifier of SAP\textsubscript{1}.

To summarize, first, the number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively is maximum two. Second, there is ordering restriction on discourse particles. Third, the availability of discourse particles relies on clause-typing. Finally, there are two functional categories above ForceP; SAP\textsubscript{1} and SAP\textsubscript{2}.

2.2.2 Characteristics of Japanese Discourse Particles

There is a variety of discourse particles such as \textit{yo}, \textit{ne}, and \textit{sa} in Tokyo dialect, the standard variety in Japan. Such discourse particles play a significant role in connecting speakers and hearers in the discourse. For Japanese discourse particles, for instance, Kido and Murasugi (2012) encapsulate three representative characteristics, as shown in (7):

\begin{enumerate}
\item The maximum number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively is two.
\item Discourse particles are sensitive to word order.
\item The occurrence of discourse particles is constrained by clause-typing.
\end{enumerate}

(Kido and Murasugi 2012)

First, the number of discourse particles that appear at the end of the strings is limited to two, in the same way as West Flemish discourse particles, as argued in (3). See (8)

(8) a. Taro-wa Boston-o hoomon-si-ta \textit{yo/ne/sa}.
    Taro-\textsc{top} Boston-\textsc{acc} visit-do-\textsc{past} \textit{yo/ne/sa}
    ‘Taro visited Boston.’

b. Taro-wa Boston-o hoomon-si-ta \textit{sa} (pause) \textit{ne/yo ne}.

c. Taro-wa Boston-o hoomon-si-ta \textit{*yo ne sa/*sa ne yo}.

\footnote{H & H (2014) do not explain the reason why such a movement occurs, although it would be desirable that the trigger and constraints on the head movement of the particle be clarified. The explanation of the reason why ForceP and SAP\textsubscript{2} move to the position of SAP\textsubscript{2} and SAP\textsubscript{1} respectively is open question.}
As exemplified in (8a) and (8b), a maximum of two discourse particles can show up consecutively. In addition, *sa* co-occurs with *ne* when there is a pause between *sa* and *ne*. However, if more than two particles appear in single string, the sentence is ill-formed, as in (8c).\(^6\)

Second, as argued in Murayama (1993), Japanese discourse particles such as *yo*, *sa*, and *ne* are sensitive to word order, as illustrated in (9):

\[
(9) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Issyookennmei yareba, nantoka nar-u } \text{ yo ne/*ne yo.} \\
& \quad \text{Hard do-Subjunctive manage.to-do-PRES. yo ne ne yo} \\
& \quad \text{‘If you do your best, it will get better.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Issyookennmei yareba, nantoka nar-u } *\text{yo sa/*sa yo.} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Issyookennmei yareba, nantoka nar-u } \text{ sa (pause) ne/*ne sa.}
\end{align*}
\]

Although *yo* co-occurs with *ne* as in (9a), it must precede *ne*, not *vice versa*. Furthermore, *sa* and *yo* cannot co-occur consecutively in any circumstance, as shown in (9b). If *sa* follows *ne* as in (9c), it is an unacceptable sentence. However, it can co-occur with *ne* when there is a pause between them.

Third, the occurrence of each Japanese discourse particle is constrained by clause-typing, just as the discourse particles in West Flemish. Consider the following examples of declarative clauses.\(^7\)

\[
(10) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{[ForceP [FinP [TP Taroo-wa kasiko-i] (no)]]} \text{ yo/ne/sa.} \\
& \quad \text{Taroo-TOP smart-PRES. NMNZ yo/ne/sa} \\
& \quad \text{‘Taroo is smart.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{[ForceP [ModalP [FinP [TP Taroo-wa kasiko-i] (no)] daroo]]} \text{ yo/ne/sa.} \\
& \quad \text{Taroo-TOP smart-PRES. NMNZ will yo/ne/sa} \\
& \quad \text{‘Probably, Taroo will be smart.’}
\end{align*}
\]

As presented in (10a), all three discourse particles can s-select the sentence whose type is declarative. Even when a modal particle such as *daroo* intervenes between

\(^6\) More than two discourse particles can appear only when *wa* comes first:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(i)} & \quad \text{Taroo-wa kohii-o nom-u wa yo ne.} \\
& \quad \text{Taroo-TOP coffee-ACC drink-PRES. wa yo ne} \\
& \quad \text{‘Taroo drinks a cup of coffee, doesn’t he?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^7\) Although there are many previous studies concerning *no* (Kuno 1973, among others), I tentatively suppose that *no* is a nominalizer, NMNZ (cf. Ono 2006).
NMNZ and the discourse particle, the discourse particles can co-occur, as in (10b).

Next, consider some different sentence types. (11a) is interrogative and (11b) imperative:

(11) a. \[[\text{ForceP} \ \text{Taroo-wa} \ \text{nani-o} \ \text{kat-ta no} \ \text{des-u} \ \text{ka}] \ *\text{yo/\text{ne}}/*\text{sa}.

\text{Taroo-TOP} \ \text{what-ACC} \ \text{buy-PAST} \ \text{NMNZ be-PRES,Question yo/\text{ne}/} \ \text{sa}

‘What did Taroo buy?’

b. \[[\text{ForceP} \ \text{Hayaku} \ \text{hasir-inasai}] \ \text{yo/\text{ne}}/*\text{sa}.

\text{Fast} \ \text{run-IMPERATIVE. yo/\text{ne}/} \ \text{sa}

‘Run fast!’

It seems that, as in (11a), \text{yo}, as well as \text{sa}, compete with \text{ka}, which decides that the sentence type be interrogative (Tenny 2006).\(^8\) Furthermore, while \text{yo} and \text{ne} are compatible with imperative sentences, \text{sa} is completely incompatible as in (11a) and (11b).\(^9\)

Thus, with respect to Japanese discourse particles, first, the number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively is limited to two. Second, discourse particles are sensitive to word order. Third, there is a co-occurrence relation between clause-typing and each discourse particle. These three characteristics of Japanese discourse particles appear to be similar to those of West Flemish, discussed by H and H (2014).

### 2.2.3 Syntactic Distribution of Japanese Discourse Particles

There have been a plethora of studies about Japanese discourse particles which stand for the attitude of speakers associated with mental expressions such

---

\(^8\) When \text{yo} accords with \text{ka}, it is implicated in the meaning of “rhetorical question.”

(i) \[[\text{CP Dare-ga soko-ni ik-u} \ (\text{no}) \ \text{ka}] \ \text{yo}.

\text{who-NOM} \ \text{there-to} \ \text{go-PRES. NMNZ Question yo}

‘Who will go there? = No one will go there.’ (cf. Saito 2013)

\(^9\) One of the anonymous reviewers pointed out that it is difficult to account for the following sentence if discourse particle \text{ne} is not sensitive to clause-typing.

(i) \[[\text{ForceP} \ \text{Hayaku hasir-e}] \ \text{yo/*ne/*sa}.

\text{Fast} \ \text{run-IMPERATIVE} \ \text{yo/ ne/} \ \text{sa}

‘Run fast.’

The reason why \text{ne} cannot co-occur with (i) in footnote 9 is open question. This is an issue in the future.
as *yo*, *sa*, and *ne* (Kinsui 1993, Murayama 1993, among others). Let us first look at the fundamental function of *yo*. Kinsui (1993) argues that *yo* is available when speakers convey information that hearers do not know, or mark the important information for hearers, as illustrated in (12):

(12) Abuna-i *yo!*
    Watch.out-*PRES.* yo
    ‘Watch out!’

*Yo* expresses “assertion” in that it is used by speakers to convey information that hearers have not yet noticed. Here, consider the distribution of *yo* by applying SAP (H and H 2014) to Japanese discourse particles. Murasugi (2012) suggest that *yo* occurs in the head of SAP2 because *yo* functions to consolidate the discourse relation between speakers, in the same way as *wè* in West Flemish.

Then, consider the function of *ne*. The fundamental function of *ne* is to confirm the propositional content to the hearers, as presented in (13):

(13) A. Anata-ga Tanaka-san des-*u ne* B. Hai, soo des-*u.*
    You-*NOM* Tanaka-san be-*PRES.* ne    Yes, so be-*PRES.*
    ‘You are Mr. Tanaka, right?’          ‘Yes, I am.’ (Miyazaki 2002)

*Ne* in (13A) plays functions to confirm the propositional content to the hearer, B. More importantly, *ne* is not subject to any restriction on s-selection of its complement. *Ne* can c-select every type of ForceP including declarative, interrogative, and imperative as discussed in (10) and (11). Because of this, Murasugi (2012) suppose that *ne* is base-generated in the head of SAP1 because *ne* involves the hearers and is insensitive to clause-typing, in the same way as *né* in West Flemish.

Alternatively, let us also look at the distribution of *sa*, which is used to convey speakers’ intentions to the hearers when speakers realize that the

---

10 No discourse particles appear in embedded clauses, unless the propositional content is a direct quote.
11 As Miyazaki (2002) argues, *na* is analogous to the function of *ne* as shown in (i):
(i) Yoku ganbat-*ta na/ne.*
    Well make.effort-*Past na/ne*
    ‘Good job.’
propositional content is true (Murayama 1993).

(14) Yankisu-ga katu-ni kimatte-ru sa.
    Yankees-NOM win-to be.self-evident-PRES. sa
    ‘The Yankees are sure to win.’

Sa in (14) works by highlighting the speaker’s intention for the hearer. To put it another way, *sa* has the function of consolidating the discourse relation between speakers and hearers, like *yo* in Tokyo dialect and *wè* in West Flemish. Based on H and H’s (2014) account and Murasugi’s (2012) consideration as shown in (10) and (11), *sa* c-selects ForceP whose sentence type is declarative. That is why, this paper suggests that *sa* occupies the head of SAP₂ syntactically and proposes the following structure:

(15) The split CP above ForceP in Japanese

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SAP}_1 \\
\text{SA}_1' \text{SA}_1' \\
\text{SAP}_2 \\
\text{SA}_2' \text{SA}_1 \text{SA}_2' \\
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{SA}_2 \text{SA}_1 \text{SA}_2 \text{SA}_1' \text{SA}_2' \\
\text{sa/yo}
\end{array}
\]

In (15), *sa* and *yo* occur in the head of SAP₂. On the other hand, *ne* is positioned in the head of SAP₁.

In this way, *yo* is used when speakers convey crucial information that hearers do not. It can be said that *ne* plays an important role in its function of confirming the proposition to hearers, and is insensitive to clause-typing, like *né* in West Flemish. Finally, *sa* is used to convey the speakers’ belief that the propositional content is true. In addition, *yo* and *sa* are sensitive to the clause-typing of ForceP and serve to consolidate the discourse relation between speakers and hearers, in common with discourse particles such as *wè* in West Flemish.

3. Hichiku Dialect

Tokyo dialect is, of course, not the only Japanese dialect. Although the
number of dialects depends on the definition, it is said that there are approximately 16 dialects of Japanese (NINJAL 2003). In this section, first we overview the grammar for Hichiku dialect, which frequently uses discourse particles such as *bai* and *tai*. Second, we consider the functions of *bai* and *tai*. Finally, we look at the syntactic distribution of *bai* and *tai* in terms of the split-CP hypothesis advocated by Rizzi (1997, 2004) and of the two Speech-Act layers proposed by H and H (2014). By doing so, I show that the target discourse particles can also be accounted for, just as those in West Flemish. That is to say, I propose that the syntactic distribution of discourse particles in Hichiku dialect are consistent with that of the Tokyo dialect, and of the West Flemish particles. It has important implications for the study of natural languages. The syntactic structure of East Asian languages such as Japanese, particularly the Tokyo and Hichiku dialects, and of European languages such as Dutch, particularly West Flemish, is significantly parallel.

### 3.1 Discourse Particles in Hichiku Dialect

Hichiku dialect (肥筑方言) is spoken in Kyushu, which is circled in Figure 1. Specifically, Hichiku dialect is spoken in Fukuoka prefecture (福岡県), Saga prefecture (佐賀県), Kumamoto prefecture (熊本県), and Nagasaki prefecture (長崎県) as illustrated in Figure 2:

![Figure 1: A map of Japan](image1.png)

![Figure 2: A distribution of three dialects in Kyushu area quoted from Hirayama (1997:2)](image2.png)
Over the past few decades, numerous researchers have scrutinized the function of discourse particles such as naa, ne(e), yo, sai, bai, and tai in Hichiku dialect from the perspectives of pragmatics and semantics (Hirakawa 2008, Kambe 1992, Kodama 2006, Okano 1991, Ono 1991a,b, Tsubouchi 1995a, b; 2001; 2009, among others). It has been known that there are discourse particles such as naa, ne(e), yo, sai, bai, and tai, which are used for different situations, deference, and politeness. Before looking at the data concerning discourse particles in Hichiku dialect, we must illuminate the dichotomy of the Tokyo and Hichiku dialects. First, the accusative case marker -o in Tokyo dialect is -ba in Hichiku dialect. Second, no pronounced in Tokyo dialect is pronounced as to. Third, the adjective suffix -i is pronounced as -ka in Hichiku dialect. Bearing these phonological differences in mind, let us look at several examples:

(16) Nukka kotaa nuk-ka  naa / nee
hotter kind.of hotter-PRES. naa / nee
‘It is kind of hotter.’ (Ono 1991b:366)

With rising intonation, naa is used among old men. On the other hand, nee with rising intonation is used among young women. The fundamental function of naa (henceforward, naa1) and nee in Hichiku dialect is to convey the feeling of exclamation to the hearers. Also, naa has the function of marking conjecture (for convenience, naa2). Fujiwara (1982) notes that it is possible that the function of ne(e) has recently become mixed with the function of nee originally used in Hichiku dialect and that of ne used in Tokyo dialect. That is; it follows that there are two types of ne(e) in Hichiku dialect. First, nee is originally used in Hichiku dialect to convey speaker’s feeling of exclamation as indicated in (16). Second, ne is used for the same function of ne in Tokyo dialect, which functions to confirm the propositional content to the hearer.

With these facts in mind, Fujiwara (1982:333) and Okano (1991b:208) further point out that complex discourse particles such as tai ne, tai naa2, bai naa2 are observed in Hichiku dialect. We will discuss these phenomena in 3.2.

For discourse particle yo in Hichiku dialect, according to Ono (1991b), it functions as “assertion” in that it is used by speakers to convey information that hearers have not yet noticed, as shown in (17):
Okiran-ba okurui yo. if.you.do.not.wake.up-Subjunctive be.late yo ‘Wake up early, or you will be late.’ (Ono 1991:367)

Although it is difficult for us to say whether it is due to chance or to necessity, interestingly, this function of yo in Hichiku dialect is the same as that of yo in Tokyo dialect.

Ono (1991b:368) mentions the function of sai in Hichiku dialect as well. Sai work as the assertion of the propositional content as in (18):

(18) Kuwasika kotaa siran sai.
    specific-PRES. fact I.do.not.know sai
    ‘I don’t know that in detail.’ (Ono 1991:368)

In (18), sai functions as highlighting the proposition; namely, Kuwasika kotaa siran, to the hearer. It is said that this function of sai in Hichiku dialect is largely similar to that of sa in Tokyo dialect.

Thus, although there are differences in their functions with respect to deference and politeness, discourse particles such as ne, ne, naa1, naa2, yo, and sai used in Hichiku dialect are parallel to discourse particles like ne, yo, and sa in Tokyo dialect. In the following section, we will discuss the function of bai and tai. They are representative discourse particles in the sense that they are not observed in Tokyo dialect.

3.1.1 Functions of Bai and Tai

This section sketches the specific function of bai and tai respectively. Bai and tai display distinct properties in practical discourse. First of all, let us look at the function of bai and tai as follows:

(19) The function of bai

Bai is used when speakers know information, but hearers do not, speakers announce information to hearers. (Okano 1988: 243-244)
(20) The function of *tai

a. *Tai is available when speakers convey information that speakers must know to hearers.  
   (Kodama 2006: 85)

b. *Tai is the discourse particle that speakers use to state proudly that their propositional content is right.  
   (Tsubouchi 1995a, b; 2001; 2009)

To the extent that speakers convey important information that hearers do not notice, the function of *bai is akin to that of *yo in Hichiku dialect and *yo in Tokyo dialect, which is gentle assertion (cf. Ono 1991a:216). On the other hand, the function of *tai is quite similar to that of sai in Hichiku dialect and *sa in Tokyo dialect, which all function as strong assertion (cf. Okano 1991:208). The main difference between *bai and *tai is reflected in a contextualized discourse. Consider (21):

(21) **Situation:** Taroo and Hanako are getting on a train. They arrived at their destination, but Hanako is sleeping. Then, Taroo talks to Hanako.

\[
\text{Tui-ta } \text{ *bai/ } *\text{tai.} \\
\text{arrive-PAST bai } \text{ tai} \\
\text{‘(We) arrived (at our destination).’}
\]

In this case, *Taroo* (a speaker) knew that they had arrived at the destination, but *Hanako* (a hearer) did not. In informing *Hanako* of having arrived at the destination, *bai* is appropriate while *tai* is not because *tai* is for when speakers evaluate that hearers should be aware of the propositional content.

In contrast to (21), in the following example only *tai* is accepted pragmatically.

(22) **Situation:** Hanako hesitates on a purchase for a birthday present for Taroo’s mother. Hanako is not confident in the purchase, but Taroo is.

\[
\text{Hanako: Hontoni korede yo-ka to?} \\
\text{really this fine-PRES. NMNZ} \\
\text{‘Is this all right with you?’}
\]
In the case of (22), Taroo asserts with perfect confidence that this present is suitable to give to his mother. He states his statement positively. Hence, tai can be used in this situation because of the function as in (20b), while bai is not used because bai is appropriate to be used to convey information hearers do not know.

Therefore, with respect to the function of bai and tai, bai is analogous to yo in Hichiku dialect and yo in Tokyo dialect. Meanwhile, tai is similar to sai in Hichiku dialect and sa in Tokyo dialect.

### 3.2 Syntactic Distributions of Bai and Tai

According to Okano (1991), Hirakawa (2008) and Kodama (2006), focusing research on particular discourse particles such as bai and tai in Hichiku dialect, it seems natural that bai and tai share the function as follows:

(23) a. Bai and tai appear in declarative sentences.
   b. They have the function of assertion.

Given the descriptive observations from pragmatics and semantics, the assumption from the perspective of syntax is as follows:

(24) a. Bai and tai do not select ForceP whose sentential type is not declarative.
   b. They do not co-occur with discourse particles that occupy a head of SAP₂ syntactically.

As argued in 2.2.2, it has been considered that discourse particles share the following properties.

(7) a. The maximum number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively is two.
   b. Discourse particles are sensitive to word order.
   c. The occurrence of the discourse particles is constrained by clause-typing.

(Kido and Murasugi 2012)
If discourse particles in Hichiku dialect share the properties in (7), like Tokyo dialect, it suggests that the principles regarding discourse particles in West Flemish argued by H and H (2014) and in Tokyo dialect proposed by Kido and Murasugi (2012) are adequate cross-linguistically. In the subsequent section, I evaluate the validity of the hypotheses in (7) and (24).

Let us then look at the data concerning the syntactic distribution of bai and tai to see whether Kido and Murasugi’s (2012) principles about Japanese discourse particles are correct or not. First, the maximum number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively in Hichiku dialect is two, in common with Tokyo dialect and West Flemish as in (25).

(25) a. Taroo-wa kasiko-ka (to) naa1/naa2/ne/nee/y0/sai/tai/bai
    Taroo-TOP smart-PRES. NMNZ naa1/naa2/ne/nee/y0/sai/tai/bai
    ‘Taroo is smart.’
   b. Taroo-wa kasiko-ka (to) tai ne/tai naa2/bai ne/bai naa2
   c. Taroo-wa kasiko-ka (to) *tai ne naa2/*tai naa2 ne
   d. [[[ForceP [FinP [TP Taroo-wa kasiko-ka] (to)]] bai/tai] ne/naa2].

In (25a), each discourse particle appears in the terminal string unaccompanied. While up to two discourse particles can co-occur as in (25b), three or more cannot, as shown in (25c).

Second, discourse particles in Hichiku dialect are sensitive to word order, as illustrated in (26).

(26) Taroo-wa kasiko-ka to *ne tai / *nna2 tai/ *ne bai/ *na2 bai

In the same way as Tokyo dialect and West Flemish, it seems that discourse particles in Hichiku dialect are also constrained on word order as in (26).

Third, bai and tai do not co-occur with either the type of interrogative in (27) or imperative as illustrated in (28):

    Taroo-TOP what-ACC buy-PAST NMNZ be-PRES. ka bai/tai
    ‘What did Taroo buy?’
   Fast run-IMPERATIVE bai/tai
   ‘Run fast!’
   

In the light of (27) and (28), it is said that bai and tai are highly sensitive to clause-typing. In other words, bai and tai do not select any ForceP other than declaratives.

   As indicated from (25) to (28), it is considered that bai and tai have the same nature as yo and sa in Tokyo dialect and wè in West Flemish in that they share the three characteristics of discourse particles seen in (7).

   Crucially, bai and tai never co-occur with sai, yo, nee, and naa₁ as in (29):

(29) a.*Taroo-wa kasiko-ka sai bai/bai sai/sai tai/tai sai.
   b.*Taroo-wa kasiko-ka yo bai/bai yo/yo tai/tai yo.
   c.*Taroo-wa kasiko-ka nee bai/bai nee/nee tai/tai nee.
   d.*Taroo-wa kasiko-ka naa₁ bai/bai naa₁/naa₁ tai/tai naa₁.
   e.*Taroo-wa kasiko-ka bai tai/tai bai.

   From (29a) to (29d), it is shown that bai and tai cannot co-occur with sai, yo, nee, and naa₁ in any circumstance. Furthermore, more crucially, in (29e), bai cannot co-occur with tai in a string either. In contrast, ne and naa₂ can be followed by bai and tai as repeatedly indicated in (25b) (Okano 1983, 1991, Fujiwara 1982, Kambe 1992):

(25) b. Taroo-wa kasiko-ka to tai ne/tai naa₂/bai ne/bai naa₂

   In (25b), it is shown that ne and naa₂ can be attached to bai and tai respectively.

   If these descriptive observations, thus far, are right on the track, then it is adequate to consider that ne and naa₂ are base-generated in a head of SAP₁ and that nee, naa₁, yo, and sai appear in the head of a SAP₂ as shown in (30) because while SAP₁ involves the hearers in that the discourse particles which occupy the head of SAP₁ seek to solicit a response from the hearers, SAP₂ functions to assert the propositional content.
4. Conclusion and Implications

In this present paper, I have presented that Japanese discourse particles, primarily those in Tokyo dialect and Hichiku dialect, are highly analogous to those in West Flemish. Regardless of the differences among the languages, there were two types of discourse particles, namely, SA₁ and SA₂. In particular, I have presented the following three facts: 1) the functions of bai and tai in Hichiku dialect, 2) the syntactic distribution of bai and tai, and 3) the co-occurrence relation between bai and tai. As H and H (2014) have argued, first, the maximum number of discourse particles that can appear consecutively is two. Second, discourse particles are highly sensitive to word order. Finally, the occurrence of discourse particles is constrained by clause-typing. SAP₁ serves as an “attention seeking layer” that encodes the setting up of the discourse layer, is insensitive to clause-typing, and involves the hearers in the sense that the discourse particles which occupy the head of SAP₁ seek to solicit a response from the hearers. On the other hand, SAP₂ works as a “layer to consolidate the discourse relation between speakers and hearers,” c-selects ForceP as its complement, and is sensitive to clause-typing.

Bai and tai occupied the head of SAP₂, and c-select as their complement only ForceP-s that indicate that the sentence type is declarative. Furthermore, bai and tai never co-occurred with sai, yo, nee, and naa₁ in any circumstance. It has been suggested that sai, yo, nee, naa₁, bai, and tai appear in the same locus syntactically, the head of SAP₂. In addition, bai and tai can take discourse particles, ne and naa₂, above them such as bai ne and tai naa₂. Consequently, I have proposed the following syntactic configuration of bai and tai in Hichiku dialect:

(30) The split CP above ForceP in Hichiku dialect

\[
\text{SAP}_1 \\
\quad \text{SA}'_1 \\
\text{SAP}_2 \\
\quad \text{SA}'_2 \text{ ne, naa}_2 \\
\quad \text{ForceP} \\
\quad \text{SA}_2 \\
\quad \text{nee/naa}_1/yo/sai/tai/bai}
\]
In this paper, although the function of each of discourse particle in terms of pragmatics like reverence and politeness is slightly different from area to area in the region where Hichiku dialect is spoken, I have proposed that the syntactic structure of these discourse particles are universal in Hichiku dialect. Moreover, I have presented that the syntactic structure above ForceP in Japanese, particularly in Tokyo dialect and Hichiku dialect, is consistent with the one in Dutch, particularly West Flemish, cross-linguistically. To put it another way, it is considered that the present article not only contributes to research concerning discourse particles, but also provides strong support for H and H’s (2014) proposal as it has shown that the syntactic nature of Japanese discourse particles like sai, yo, nee, naa₁, bai and tai in Hichiku dialect, as well as those like yo, sa, and ne in Tokyo dialect are closely similar to that of West Flemish discourse particles like wè and nè (H and H, 2014).
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肥筑方言における「バイ」と「タイ」の統語構造

木戸 康人
（神戸大学）

本稿では、肥筑方言において使われる談話不変化詞「ばい」と「たい」の統語的位置が東京方言における談話不変化詞「よ」と「さ」及びオランダ語の方言である西フレマン語における談話不変化詞 \textit{wè} と同じであると提案する。Rizzi (1997, 2004)が提案する CP 領域のカートグラフィー研究に基づき、談話不変化詞が CP 領域内の最上部に位置する \textit{Speech Act Phrase} に基底生成すると議論する(Haegeman and Hill 2014, Murasugi 2012)。また、西フレマン語の談話不変化詞が示す三つの統語的特性が日本語（東京方言と肥筑方言）にも当てはまることを示す。西フレマン語と日本語（東京方言・肥筑方言）における談話不変化詞は、第一に、文末に二つまでは生起可能だが三つ以上が生起することは難しい。第二に、談話不変化詞は一定の語順でのみ現れる。第三に、談話不変化詞は文のタイプを決定するものではないが、文のタイプにより共起できるものとできないものがある(木戸・村杉 2012)。日本でも談話不変化詞の意味と機能は方言によって異なるが、本稿は、談話不変化詞には少なくとも三つの統語的特性があり、その統語的特性は西フレマン語における談話不変化詞の統語的特性とも類似している点で、談話不変化詞が持つ統語的特性は通言語的に共通していることを示すものである。
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