The goal of this dissertation is to analyze the function and meaning of the Japanese particles wa and ga in the modern Japanese language from the syntactic standpoint.

Wa and ga have so far been analyzed from the point of view of pragmatics and information structure, but the necessity of actual syntactic analyses has been questioned. In other words, wa has been analyzed as a marker used exclusively for marking the topic, and ga as a particle functioning on a level below the sentence level, that is to say, in noun-modifying or subordinate clauses. However, if we consider cases such as the following, it turns out that there is room for modifications of this rule.

Ordinarily, topic and subject are clearly indicated by separate means (for example, in Czech the form of the word indicates the subject, and the word order indicates the topic); otherwise, they are both indicated by methods which are not opposite to each other in their linguistic form and there should be no need to choose between the form of a subject and the form of a topic. However, in Japanese it is impossible to follow wa directly with ga, in fact, it is necessary to choose one of them. Otherwise, a contradiction in principles would occur.

Therefore, in this dissertation I admit the opposition between wa and ga. While pointing out that wa is not only a topic marker, but also may function as a subject marker in the same way ga does, I want to offer an analytical description of the meaning and function of wa and ga using the following arguments.

First, Japanese complex sentences may have not only the following structure [subject1 • predicate1, subject 2 • predicate2], but also the following one [subject1 • subject2 • predicate1 • predicate2]. On the basis of the hypothesis that owing to the existence of wa and ga it is easy to comprehend sentences with two or more subjects, I demonstrate that in order to create a multi-layer-subject sentence, wa and ga take on a sentence-structuring function.

Secondly, in simple sentences, the word-unifying function necessary for complex sentences becomes unnecessary and in many sentences it is grammatically possible to replace ga with wa and vice versa, but some of those sentences will take on the additional meaning of "contrast" or "selection designation." So far, no one has offered a unified explanation concerning the appearance of such additional meaning. I believe it can be explained in the following way: Two forms of indicating the subject, that is, wa and ga, are necessary in complex sentences. A single form is sufficient for simple sentences. However, because it is always necessary to maintain two forms for complex sentences, it is possible to argue that in
order for the two to co-exist in a simple sentence, a separation of meaning between wa and ga must occur.

In that case, how and when do the ordinary subject and the subject with additional meaning of "contrast" or "selection designation" appear? I propose the following rule: If the subject fulfills the following conditions, it is an ordinary subject, and if wa and ga are replaced by each other, the meaning of "contrast" or "selection designation" appears:

1. If the perceiving subject (person) is indicated in the sentence, the "perceiving subject" is marked by wa and the "perceived object" is marked by ga.

   ex.: Watashi-wa uchi-ni kaette kita. Inu-ga danro-no mae-ni ita.
   perceiving subject             perceived object

   ex.: Hito (watashi)-wa inu-ga mieru/-to omou/suki-da. etc.
   perceiving subject             perceived object

2. If the perceiving subject (person) is not indicated in the sentence, wa indicates the perceived object as a "single construction," and ga indicates the perceived object as a "set construction."

   set construction --> ga Yuki-ga shiroi (subject is perceived together with multiple varied objects)
   single construction --> wa Yuki-wa shiroi (subject is perceived by itself as the only object)

   ex.: ( ) Kare-wa/ga gakusei-da.
   perceiving subject             perceived object

   ex.: ( ) Yuki-wa/ga shiroi/furu/hiyasu.
   perceiving subject             perceived object