《Article》

On the Syntactic and Semantic Properties of VP Foci in Pseudocleft Sentences in Japanese[*]

Yuki Ishihara

Tokyo Institute of Technology/ University of Tokyo

ishihara@flc.titech.ac.jp

This paper looks into the properties of the VP focus pseudocleft construction in Japanese. It will be shown that elements such as the causative sase, *the passive* rare, *and the honorific* o--ninaru *can appear with a verb in the focus position, but not the tense or aspect morphemes. It will also be pointed out that a semantic constraint is imposed on the relation between the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase.*

Keywords: pseudocleft construction, VP focus, clause structure

1.   Introduction

The structure and the derivation of pseudocleft sentences in English have been studied since the early days of generative grammar (e.g. Akmajian (1970), Ross (1972, 2000), Higgins (1973), Chomsky (1977), Bošković (1997), Heycock and Kroch (1999), Den Dikken et al. (2000) among others). These are sentences where a presuppositional *wh*-clause occurs in the pre-copular position and the focus element occurs in the post-copular position as exemplified in (1).

(1) a.   What I had is [a book].
     b.   What I thought is [that you were a jerk].
     c.   What I did is [(to) pat the cat].
     d.   What I am is [a pro wrestler/proud of you].
     e.   What I did is [I patted the cat].   (Ross (2000: 388-389))

A variety of elements can be focalized in the construction: an argument NP (1a), a complement clause (1b), an infinitive (1c), a predicate nominal or AP (1d), and for some speakers, a whole clause (1e).

Similarly, in Japanese, pseudocleft sentences take a form in (2), and various elements occur in the pre-copular focus position.[1,2]

(2)   [presupposition-*no*]-*wa* [focus] Cop
(3) a.   Gakkai-ni   itta   no wa gakusei(-ga) huta-ri da.   (subject NP)
           conference-Dat go.Past   C   Top student-Nom two-Cl   Cop.Nonpast
           'It is two students that went to the conference.'

---

[1] Abbreviations used in this paper are: Nom=nominative, Acc=accusative, Dat=dative, Gen=genitive, Top=topic, Foc=focus, Fin=finite, T=tense, Hon=honorific, Cl=classifier, C=complementizer, Q=question particle, Cop=copula, Asp=aspect, Neg=negation, and Prt=particle.
[2] The construction under investigation is called "cleft" sentences by Fukaya and Hoji (1999), Koizumi (2000), Kizu (2005) and Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2012) among others. This is because it is considered that only NPs and PPs can be focalized in Japanese just as in English *it* cleft sentences. However, we will use the term "pseudocleft" in this paper, because adverbs can occur in the focus position as well as nominalized clauses and VPs.

b.   Taroo-ga   katta   no   wa   ringo(-o)   huta-tu   da.   (object NP)
      Taro-Nom   buy.Past   C   Top   apple-Acc   two-Cl   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is two apples that Taro bought.'

c.   Taroo-ga   yubiwa-o   ageta   no   wa   Hanako(-ni)   da.   (indirect object NP)
      Taro-Nom   ring-Acc   give.Past   C   Top   Hanako-Dat   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is to Hanako that Tom gave the ring.'

d.   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni   atta   no wa   Tokyo eki-de   da.   (locative PP)
      Taro-Nom   Hanako-Dat meet.Past   C   Top   Tokyo station-at   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is at Tokyo station that Taro met Hanako.'

e.   Taroo-ga   pan-o   kitta   no wa   naihu-de   da.   (instrumental PP)
      Taro-Nom   bread-Acc   cut.Past C   Top   knife-with   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is with a knife that Taro cut bread.'

f.   Taroo-ga   gohan-o   tabeta   no wa   yukkurito   da.   (adverb)
      Taro-Nom   meal-Acc   eat.Past C   Top   slowly   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is slowly that Taro ate his meal.'

g.   Taroo-ga   piano-o   hiita   no wa   shopan-no   yooni   da.   (adverbial)
      Taroo-Nom   piano-Acc play.Past   C   Top   Chopin-Gen like   Cop.Nonpast
      'It is like Chopin that Taro played the piano.'

h.   Taroo-ga   sitteiru   no wa   Hanako-ga   ikiteiru   koto(-??o)   da.   (complement CP)
      Taro-Nom know.Asp   C   Top   Hanako-Nom   alive.Asp   KOTO-Acc   Cop.Nonpast
      'What Taro knows is the fact that Hanako is alive.'

i.   Taroo-ga   mita   no wa   Hanako-ga   hon-o   nusumu   tokoro(-o)
      Taro-Nom   see.Past   C   Top   Hanako-Nom book-Acc   steal.Nonpast TOKORO-Acc
      da.   (complement CP)
      Cop.Nonpast
      'What Taro saw was Hanako's stealing a book.'

j.   Taroo-ga   okureta   no   wa   ame-ga   hutta   kara   da.   (adjunct CP)
      Taro-Nom   delay.Past   C   Top   rain-Nom   fall.Past   because   Cop
      'It was because of the rain that Taro was late.'

A focused NP, which occurs following a topic marker, *wa*, can be a subject (3a), an object (3b), or an indirect object (3c), and it can occur with/without a Case marker. Adjunct PPs and adverbials can also be focalized, as shown in (3d, e) and (3f, g). The examples (3h, i) indicate that clauses accompanied by formal nouns such as *koto* and *tokoro* occur in the focus position. If *koto* and *tokoro* are Complementizers, as is often claimed, complement CPs are focalized in these examples. Adjunct clauses also occur in a focus position, as in (3j).

     Moreover, a constituent that looks like VP can occur in a focus position, when they are accompanied by *koto*.

(4)   Taroo-ga   sita   no wa   Hanako-no   tame-ni   kangeekai-o   hiraku   koto
      Taro-Nom do.Past   C   Top   Hanako-Gen   sake-Dat   welcome.party-Acc   hold.Nonpast   KOTO
      da.
      Cop.Nonpast
      'What Taro did was hold a welcome party for Hanako.'

The aim of this paper is to investigate the categorial status of the focalized element in sentences like (4), which is a Japanese counterpart to (1c) where an infinitival clause or a bare infinitival VP is focalized.[3]

---

[3] In this paper we will not deal with sentences like (i) in which *koto* appears in the presuppositional clause as well as in the focus phrase.

This study is conducted within the framework of Minimalist Program proposed by Chomsky (1995), and for expository purposes, we take a cartographic approach to phrase structures following Rizzi (1997) and Cinque (1999). To be concrete, we assume the following clausal structure for Japanese. (cf. Minami (1974) and Takubo (1987) among others)

(5) [ForceP [TopP [FocP [TopP [FinP [TP [NegP [Hon1P [AspP [Hon2P [VoiceP [vP [VP ...V...] v] Voice] Hon2] Asp] Hon1] Neg] T] Fin] Top] Foc] Top] Force]

At first glance, it seems that VP is focalized in (4), but given the more articulated structure as in (5), it is necessary to examine more data to find out which verbal projections can or cannot be included in the focus position. Where does the dividing line fall between the phrases that can be focalized in the pseudocleft construction and those that cannot in the structure (5)? It is often the case that we divide a clause into three parts: VP as a thematic domain, TP as a propositional domain, and CP as a discoursal domain. Is the dividing line between the phrases that can be focalized and those that cannot coincide with the dividing line between the thematic domain and the propositional domain, or are there discrepancies? Is it the same as in English? We will determine the size of a possible VP focus in Japanese.

In addition to the structural properties of the VP focus, we will investigate the occurrence of the same element in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase. In English, when VP is focalized, it can appear either as a bare infinitive or as a *to-* infinitive, as shown in (1c). However, when a progressive *-ing* form is used in the presuppositional clause, the focus verb has to be in *-ing* form as well (6a), and when a perfective *-en* form is used in the presuppositional clause, the focus verb can optionally be in *-en* form, as in (6b).[4]

(6) a. What I'm doing is patting/*pat/*to pat the cat.
    b. What I have done is taken/take/to take a taxi to school.

Similarly, in Japanese the same morpheme sometimes occurs in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase.

(7) Taroo-ga Hanako-ni s-*ase*-ta   no wa heya-o   katazuke-ru/katazuke-*sase*-ru
     Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat do-Cause-Past C Top room-Acc   tidy.up-Nonpast/tidy.up-Cause-Nonpast
     koto   dat-ta.
     KOTO Cop-Past

We will examine which morphemes can be doubled in the construction, and whether such doubling is obligatory or optional. It will be shown that the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase are interpreted together more easily when the thematic roles assigned to their subjects are nondistinct from each other.

(i) Tyomusukii-ga sita   koto   wa   gengo-no   mikata-o kaeta   koto   datta.
     Chomsky-Nom do.Past   KOTO   Top language-Gen view-Acc change.Past KOTO Cop.Past
     'What Chomsky did was change the way we look at languages.'

Sentences like (i) are equative, unlike the pseudocleft sentences, which are specificational.   See Higgins (1973) and Mikkelsen (2005) among others on the semantics of copular sentences.
[4] The similar pattern is observed with VP preposing and VP ellipsis. See Lasnik (1995/1999), Potsdam (1997) and Rouveret (2012) for discussion.

(i) a.   Mary thought Sam would play *As time goes by* and [playing/*play that song] he undoubtedly was,
         when she arrived.   (Rouveret (2012: 908))
   b.   We thought she would lose her temper and lost/lose it she has.   (Emonds (1976: 115))
(ii) a. ?* John won't enter the competition, but Peter is.   (Lasnik (1999: 113))
   b.   Peter saw your parents last week, but he hasn't since.   (Lasnik (1999: 113))

37

Since previous studies on the Japanese pseudocleft construction have not paid much attention to the VP focus construction, this paper aims to give adequate description of the construction. In section 2, we will illustrate what we assume about the clause structure of Japanese. Section 3 examines what kind of elements can occur in the focus phrase and the presuppositional clause of the pseudocleft construction. In section 4 it will be shown what can occur with the sentence-final copula. Section 5 considers a semantic restriction on the focus phrase and the presuppositional clause. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Assumptions about the Clausal Structure of Japanese

We assume the cartographic clausal structure (5) for Japanese, which is repeated here as (8). This is a simplified structure with many details abstracted away, but it suffices for our purposes.

(8) $[_{\text{ForceP}}\ [_{\text{TopP}}\ [_{\text{FocP}}\ [_{\text{TopP}}\ [_{\text{FinP}}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ [_{\text{NegP}}\ [_{\text{Hon1P}}\ [_{\text{AspP}}\ [_{\text{Hon2P}}\ [_{\text{VoiceP}}\ [_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ \ldots V\ldots]\ v]\ \text{Voice}]\ \text{Hon}_2]\ \text{Asp}]\ \text{Hon}_1]$ Neg] T] Fin] Top] Foc] Top] Force]

To illustrate, let us look at several examples.

(9)   Taroo-wa tyoosyoku-o   tabe-te i-masen   ka?
       Taro-Top breakfast-Acc eat-TE Asp-Polite.Neg.Nonpast   Q
       'Hasn't Taro had his breakfast?' 'Isn't Taro eating his breakfast?'

In (9), Force is realized by a question marker, *ka*. Tense and Negation are spelled out with a politeness marker as *masen*, and Aspect is realized by an aspectual auxiliary *-te i(ru),* which can be interpreted either as perfective or progressive. We assume these elements undergo morphological merger at PF, but our discussion is not affected if head movement analysis is employed instead.

As for causatives, we follow Harley (1995) and regard the causative (*s)ase* as in (10a) as a realization of v. We also regard as v the light verbs, (*-te*) *ya(ru)* 'do someone a favor' and (*-te*) *moraw(u)* 'receive benefit,' examples of which are given in (10b, c).

(10) a.   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni   hon-o   yom-ase-ta.
           Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat book-Acc   read-Cause-Past
           'Taro made Hanako read books.'
     b.   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni   hon-o   yon-de   yat-ta.
           Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat book-Acc   read-TE   give-Past
           'Taro read a book for Hanako.'
     c.   Taroo-ga   titioya-ni   syukudai-o   tetudat-te   morat-ta.
           Taro-Nom father-Dat homework-Acc   help-TE   receive-Past
           'Taro had his father help him with his homework.'

Turning to passives, we assume that *(r)are* is a head of Voice Phrase, which is located above vP, following Pylkkänen (2008) and Harley (2012). This helps us account for the acceptability of (11) in which the passive morpheme follows the causative morpheme, because Voice[0] is located higher than v in (8).

(11)   Taroo-ga   sensee-ni   sakubun-o   kak-ase-rare-ta.
        Taro-Nom teacher-by composition-Acc write-Cause-Pass-Past
        'Taro was made to write a composition by his teacher.'

We divide honorifics into two groups: Hon$_1$ and Hon$_2$. Niinuma and Maki (2007) claim that *o- -ni naru* is a

circumfix attached to V as an honorific marker. In (8) this is indicated as Hon$_2$, which appears closer to V than Aspect, *iru*, but farther from V than Voice, *rare*.

(12)   Tanaka-sensee-ga Yamada-sensee-ni o-sikar-are-ni nat-te   i-ta.
              Prof. Tanaka-NomProf. Yamada-by Hon-scold-Pass-Hon-TE Asp-Past
              'Prof. Tanaka was being scolded by Prof. Yamada.'

On the other hand, honorific *(r)are* occurs higher than Aspect, which we categorize as Hon$_1$.

(13)   Tanaka-sensee-ga hon-o   yon-de   o-rare-ta.
              Prof. Tanaka-Nombook-Acc read-TE Asp-Hon-Past
              'Prof. Tanaka was reading a book.'

In (13) *-te oru*, a variant of *-te iru,* is used as an Aspect marker, and Hon$_1$, *rare*, occurs higher than Aspect but lower than Tense, as indicated by the word order.

     Finally, let us look at modals. Inoue (2007) and Ueda (2007) claim that true modals such as *daroo*, unlike pseudo-modals, are generated in the CP domain, taking TP as a complement.

(14)   Taroo-wa Hanako-ni   aw-u   daroo.
              Taro-Top Hanako-Dat meet-Nonpast probably
              'Taro will probably see Hanako.'

     With these structures in mind, in the next section we will consider what types of predicates can occur in the focus position of the pseudocleft construction.

3.   What Can/Cannot Appear in the Focus Position and the Presuppositional Clause

     Starting with the most embedded constituent in the clausal structure (8), i.e. VP, we will conduct our investigation to identify which elements are allowed in the VP focus position of the pseudocleft construction and which are not. We will then move on to look at less embedded constituents, i.e. vP, VoiceP, Hon$_2$P, AspP, Hon$_1$P, NegP and TP, until we reach CP.

3.1. Agentive Verbs

    Let us start by examining what types of verbs occur in the focus position.

(15) a.   Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa hon-o   yom-u   koto   da.
           Taro-Nom do-Past C Top book-Acc read-Nonpast   KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What Taro did was read the book.'
     b.   Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa omoikiri waraw-u   koto   da.
           Taro-Nom do-Past C Top heartily   laugh-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What Taro did was laugh heartily.'
     c. ?? Sono zisin-ga   si-ta   no wa muramura-o   hakaisu-ru   koto   da.
           the   earthquake-Nom do-Past C Top villages-Acc   destroy-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What the earthquake did was destroy the villages.'
     d. *Pen-ga si-ta   no wa tukue-kara oti-ru   koto   da.
           pen-Nom do-Past C Top desk-from fall-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What the pen did was fall from the desk.'

e. *Taroo-ga su-ru   no wa Saburoo-ni ni-ru   koto da.
   Taro-Nom do-Nonpast C Top Saburo-Dat resemble-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast
   'What Taro does is resemble Saburo.'

The VP pseudocleft construction is acceptable when the focused VP is agentive (15a).[5,6] (15b) shows that unergative VPs are permitted as well. When the subject of the focused VP denotes a natural cause such as an earthquake, which has no will or intention of its own as in (15c), the sentence sounds awkward. Unacceptable cases involve unaccusative VPs (15d) and stative VPs (15e). Thus an agentivity constraint is at work in this construction, just as it does in English. (cf. Jackendoff (1972))

3.2. Causatives and Other v Elements

The predicate in the focus position need not be simple in form.

(16) a. Taroo-ga [si-ta/si-te   yat-ta]   no wa   Hanako-ni   hana-o   kat-te   yar-u
         Taro-Nom   do-Past/do-TE give-Past   C Top   Hanako-Dat flower-Acc buy-TE   give-Nonpast
         koto   da.
         KOTO   Cop.Nonpast
         'What Taro did was buy flowers for Hanako.'
     b. Taroo-ga [si-ta/si-te   morat-ta]   no wa   titioya-ni syukudai-o   tetudat-te
         Taro-Nom   do-Past/do-TE receive-Past C Top   father-Dat homework-Acc help-TE
         moraw-u   koto   dat-ta.
         receive-Nonpast   KOTO   Cop-Past
         'What Taro did was have his father help him with his homework.'
     c. Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa   Hanako-o   waraw-ase-ru   koto   da.
         Taro-Nom   do-Past C Top   Hanako-Acc laugh-cause-Nonpast KOTO   Cop.Nonpast
         'What Taro did was make Hanako laugh.'

The focus predicate can be of a complex form containing such light verbs as (-te) yar(u) 'give' or (-te) moraw(u) 'receive,' or a causative morpheme -(s)ase, which occur in v.

3.3. Passives and Other Voice Elements

As for a passive morpheme *rare*, they are not allowed in the focus position of the *suru* pseudocleft sentences.

(17) a. *Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa   waraitobas-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
          Taro-Nom do-Past C Top   laugh.at-Pass-Nonpast KOTO   Cop-Past
          Lit. 'What Taro did was he was laughed at.'
     b. *Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa   musuko-o izime-rare-ru   koto   dat-ta.
          Taro-Nom do-Past C Top   son-Acc   bully-Pass-Nonpast KOTO   Cop-Past
          Lit. 'What Taro did was have his son bullied.'

Similarly, *-te morawu,* when used with a passive meaning, is disallowed.

---

[5] The names of thematic roles should be regarded as shorthand for feature complexes such as [+volitional], [-animate] and so on.
[6] Note that *suru* in the presuppositional clause is also agentive.

(18) ?? Taroo-ga si-ta no wa sensee-ni home-te moraw-u koto dat-ta.
　　　　Taro-Nom do-Past C Top teacher-by praise-TE receive-Nonpast KOTO Cop-Past
　　　　'What Taro did was have his teacher praise him.'

Masuoka (1991) observes that the *-te morawu* construction has a passive-like meaning as well as a causative-like meaning.[7] As we have seen in (16b), the causative-like *-te morawu* is allowed in the focus position just like the causative *sase*, in contrast to the passive-like *-te morawu* (18)*,* which is disallowed like the passive *rare.* The occurrence of *-te morawu* seems to be governed by its semantic property.

　　Interestingly, when the passive morpheme occurs both in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase, the sentence becomes acceptable.

(19) a.　Taroo-ga s-are-ta no wa *waraitobas-u/waraitobas-are-ru koto dat-ta.
　　　　　Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C Top laugh.at-Nonpast/laugh.at-Pass-Nonpast KOTO Cop-Past
　　　　　Lit. 'What was done to Taro was he was laughed at.'
　　　b.　Taroo-ga s-are-ta no wa musuko-o *izime-ru/izime-rare-ru koto
　　　　　Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C Top son-Acc bully-Nonpast/bully-Pass-Nonpast KOTO
　　　　　dat-ta.
　　　　　Cop-Past
　　　　　Lit. 'What was done to Taro was he had his son bullied.'

As shown in (19) the passive morpheme has to appear both in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase. Likewise, the doubling of the passive *-te morawu* seems obligatory.

(20)　Taroo-ga sensee-ni si-te morat-ta no wa *home-ru/home-te moraw-u
　　　Taro-Nom teacher-by do-TE receive-Past C Top praise-Nonpast/praise-TE receive-Nonpast
　　　koto dat-ta.
　　　KOTO Cop-Past
　　　Lit. 'What Taro was done by the teacher was he was praised.'

Since *rare* and *-te morawu* with a passive meaning are allowed in the focus phrase if the same element appears in the presuppositional clause, their occurrence in the focus phrase does not seem to be precluded syntactically. We will consider a condition under which passive foci are allowed in section 5.

3.4. Subject Honorific o- -ninaru *(Hon₂)*

　　The subject honorific circumfix *o- -ninaru* (Hon$_2$) can appear in the focus position as in (21).

---

[7] For example, the following contrast between the causative *-te morawu* (i) and the passive *-te morawu* (ii) concerning the ability to make imperatives shows that (i) is agentive in contrast to (ii).

(i)　　Otoosan-ni syukudai-o tetudat-te morawi-nasai.
　　　father-by homework-Acc help-TE receive-IMP
　　　'Ask your father to help you with homework.'
(ii)??Sensee-ni home-te morawi-nasai.
　　　teacher-by praise-TE receive-IMP
　　　'Ask your teacher to praise you.'

(21) Tanaka-sensee-ga   *si-ta/s-are-ta   no wa kenkyuu-o   hon-ni
      Tanaka-professor-Nom do-Past/do-Hon-Past C Top research-Acc book-Dat
      o-matome-ninar-u   koto   dat-ta.
      Hon-write-Hon-Nonpast   KOTO   Cop-Past
      'What Prof. Tanaka did was write a book on his research.'

The example (21) is not acceptable when a nonpolite form *si-ta* is used in the presuppositional clause. When *s-are-ta* is used instead, the sentence is fine, indicating that *o-V-ninaru* can be a focus.

3.5. Aspect

  The aspectual marker *-te iru* cannot occur in the focus position, whether it is interpreted as perfective or progressive.

(22) *Taroo-ga   su-ru/si-ta   no wa hon-o   kat-te i-ru   koto   da.
      Taro-Nom   do-Nonpast/do-Past C Top book-Acc buy-TE Asp-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast
      Lit. 'What Taro does is buying a book.'   'What Taro has done is buy a book.'

Even when *si-ta* is used in the presuppositional clause to facilitate the perfective meaning, the example is still unacceptable. Note that doubling of the aspectual marker does not help in this case.

(23) *Taroo-ga   si-te   i-ru   no wa hon-o   kat-te i-ru   koto da.
      Taro-Nom   do-TE Asp-Nonpast C Top book-Acc buy-TE Asp-Nonpast KOTO Cop.Nonpast

This is in contrast to the situation in English where *-ing* form doubles in the construction, as we have seen in (6a).

3.6. Subject Honorific rare *(Hon₁)*

  The subject honorific *rare* cannot appear in the focus position, even when honorific concord is satisfied within the presuppositional clause.

(24) Tanaka-sensee-ga   *si-ta/??s-are-ta   no wa kenkyuu-o   hon-ni
      Tanaka-professor-Nom do-Past/do-Hon-Past C Top research-Acc book-Dat
      matome-rare-ru   koto   dat-ta.
      write-Hon-Nonpast   KOTO   Cop-Past

3.7. Negation

  The focus phrase cannot be negative as in (25a).

(25) a. ?? Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa ie-no   soto-ni   de-na-i   koto   dat-ta.
        Taro-Nom do-Past C Top house-Gen outside-to go-Neg-Nonpast KOTO Cop-Past
        Lit. 'What Taro did was not to go out of the house.'
     b.   Taroo-ga   si-nakat-ta   no wa ie-no   soto-ni   de-ru/??de-na-i
        Taro-Nom   do-Neg-Past C Top house-Gen outside-to go-Nonpast/go-Neg-Nonpast
        koto   dat-ta.
        KOTO Cop-Past
        'What Taro didn't do was go out of his house.'

When the presuppositional clause is negative, it is acceptable when the focus phrase is affirmative, under the interpretation in which Taro did not go out of his house, as shown in (25b). When the focus phrase is negative with the negative presuppositional clause, the sentence is not acceptable under the same interpretation, nor is it feasible under the interpretation in which Taro went out of his house.

3.8. Tense

The past tense marker *-ta* is disallowed in the focus phrase, in contrast to the nonpast tense marker *-(r)u*, as shown in (26).

(26) a.   Taroo-ga   su-ru   no wa   hon-o   kaw-u/*kat-ta   koto   da.
           Taro-Nom do-Nonpast C Top   book-Acc buy-Nonpast/buy-Past   KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What Taro does is buy books.'

    b.   Taroo-ga   si-ta   no wa   hon-o   kaw-u/*kat-ta   koto   da.
           Taro-Nom do-Past   C Top   book-Acc buy-Nonpast/buy-Past   KOTO Cop.Nonpast
           'What Taro did was buy books.'

Suru in the presuppositional clause and the focus verb are not always identical in tense. When *suru* is in nonpast tense, the focus verb should be in nonpast tense as well (26a), but the focus verb must be in nonpast tense even when *suru* is in past tense (26b).[8] The generalization is: Whatever tense *suru* occurs in, the focus verb needs to be in nonpast form.

3.9. Modals

The modal of probability, *daroo* (27a), and the modal of improbability, *mai* (27b), cannot occur in the focus position of the pseudocleft sentences.

(27) a.   *Taroo-ga   su-ru   no wa   hon-o   yom-u-daroo   koto   da.
            Taro-Nom do-Nonpast C Top   book-Acc read-Nonpast-probably   KOTO Cop.Nonpast
            Lit. 'What Taro does is probably read the book.'

    b.   *Taroo-ga   su-ru   no wa   hon-o   yom-u-mai   koto   da.
            Taroo-Nom do-Nonpast C Top   book-Acc read-Nonpast-unlikely   KOTO Cop.Nonpast
            Lit. 'What Taro does is probably not to read the book.'

Note that they cannot occur in the presuppositional clause, either.

---

[8] Some speakers find the past tense form of the focus verb acceptable. These speakers interpret the specificational pseudocleft as equative, treating *no* as *koto* or some other ordinary nouns like *sippai* 'failure.' Equative sentences allow past tense in the focus phrase. See footnote 3.

(i)   Taroo-ga   si-ta   sippai-wa   kagi-o   kake-zu-ni   ie-o   de-ta/de-ru   koto
       Taro-Nom do-Past   failure-Top   key-Acc   lock-Neg-NI   house-Acc   leave-Past/leave-RU KOTO
       dat-ta.
       Cop-Past
       'The mistake Taro made was that he left his house without locking the door.'

(28) a. *Taroo-ga su-ru-daroo   no wa hon-o   yom-u(-daroo)   koto
       Taro-Nom do-Nonpast-probably C Top book-Acc read-Nonpast-probably KOTO
       da.
       Cop.Nonpast
       'What Taro will probably do is read the book.'

   b. *Taroo-ga su-ru-mai   no wa hon-o   yom-u(-mai)   koto
       Taroo-Nom do-Nonpast-unlikely C Top book-Acc read-Nonpast-unlikely KOTO
       da.
       Cop.Nonpast
       'What Taro will not probably do is read the book.'

3.10. Discussion

In this section we have examined which element can/cannot occur in the focus position and the presuppositional clause of the pseudocleft sentences. The elements we have considered are far from exhaustive, but we believe they are more or less representative. We have seen that while V, v, Voice and Honorific$_2$ can occur in the focus position, Aspect, Honorific$_1$, Negation, Past Tense and Modal cannot.

(29) [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TopP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{TopP}$ [$_{FinP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{NegP}$ [$_{Hon1P}$ [$_{AspP}$ [$_{\underline{Hon2P}}$ [$_{\underline{VoiceP}}$ [$_{\underline{vP}}$ [$_{\underline{VP}}$ ...V...] v] Voice] Hon$_2$] Asp] Hon$_1$]
      Neg] T] Fin] Top] Foc] Top] Force]

In (29) the underlined part can be included in the focus, but those outside Hon$_2$P cannot. This corresponds to a dividing line between the thematic domain and the propositional domain: while such valence changing elements as causatives and passives are considered to belong to the thematic domain, aspect, negation and tense belong to the propositional domain.

   A note is in order regarding the present tense marker, *-ru*. We have seen that the focus verbs must be in nonpast form, but it is rather mysterious why conflict in tense is allowed when the presuppositional clause is in past tense as in (26b). Taking into account the fact that bare infinitives or *to* infinitives occur in the focus position in English, we would like to suggest that what precedes *koto* in the focus position is not a finite V, but is a nonfinite V, because there is no contrast in tense in the focus position. Ishihara (2010) proposes that *-(r)u* preceding *koto* or *no* in the predicate doubling construction is an adnominal suffix, and that what looks like a present tense verb is tenseless before the noun. If the same holds true with the VP focus pseudocleft sentences, the focus verbs always take a nonfinite adnominal form, since the focused VP is nominalized by *koto*. Tense mismatch is not a problem because no tense is attached to the verb preceding *koto* in the first place. Once we cease to regard *-(r)u* preceding *koto* as a present tense marker, its distribution can be integrated with that of the past tense marker *-ta*: T cannot appear in the focus position. Henceforth we will treat *-(r)u* ending of V preceding *koto* in the focus position not as a tense marker but as an adnominal marker.

   Our conclusion can be supported with data involving adverbs as well.

(30) a. Taroo-ga kyoo su-ru   no wa tegami-o kak-u koto   da.
        Taro-Nom   today do-Nonpast C Top letter-Acc write-U KOTO Cop.Nonpast
        'What Taro does today is to write a letter.'

   b. ?? Taroo-ga su-ru   no wa kyoo tegami-o kak-u koto   da.
        Taro-Nom do-Nonpast C Top today letter-Acc write-U KOTO Cop.Nonpast
        'What Taro does is to write a letter today.'

   c. Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa issyookenmei   tegami-o kak-u koto   da.
        Taro-Nom do-Past C Top with.utmost.effort letter-Acc write-U KOTO Cop.Nonpast
        'What Taro did was try hard to write a letter.'

Time adverbs such as *kyoo* cannot occur in the focus position as indicated in (30b), but manner adverbs like *issyookenmei* can, which are often referred to as TP adverbs and VP adverbs, respectively. Those that are included within the thematic domain, i.e. VP in a broad sense, can be focalized in the pseudocleft construction.

Though this seems quite natural, it is not universal. We have seen that aspectuals and an infinitival marker *to*, which is often considered to reside in T, occur in the focus position in English. It may have something to do with how nonfiniteness is treated in each language. Crosslinguistic research is necessary in this area.

With respect to the presuppositional clause, we have seen that true modals and Hon$_2$ *o- -ninaru* cannot occur in it. Kizu (2005) argues that *no* in the presuppositional clause is C, based on the fact that it does not have any inherent semantic restriction on its referent, and that it cannot be modified by adjectives or numeral quantifiers. Our data concerning the true modals support her claim; if they reside in C, they cannot be included in the TP complement of *no*. The exclusion of *o- -ninaru* from the presuppositional clause is probably due to the fact that *suru* cannot be affixed by it (**o-si-ni naru*).

4. What Can Occur with the Copula

In the last section we have seen that the modals of probability and improbability occur in neither the focus position nor the presuppositional clause. Their appropriate position is at the end of the sentence, as shown in (31).[9]

(31) a. Taroo-ga su-ru   no wa hon-o   yom-u koto   daroo/dearoo.
         Taro-Nom do-Nonpast C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO probably/probably
         'Probably what Taro will do is read the book.'
     b. Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa hon-o   yom-u koto   de(-wa)-aru   mai.
         Taro-Nom do-Past C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO Cop(-Top)-Cop   unlikely
         'What Taro did cannot be read the book.'

In addition, the marker of tense (32a), negation (32b), and the sequence *noda* (32c) occur with the copula.

(32) a. Taroo-ga su-ru/si-ta   no wa hon-o   yom-u koto   dat-ta/deat-ta.
         Taro-Nom do-Nonpast/do-Past   C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO Cop-Past/Cop-Past
         'What Taro did was read the book.'
     b. Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa hon-o   yom-u koto   de(-wa)-nai.
         Taro-Nom do-Past C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO Cop(-Top)-Neg
         'What Taro did was not read the book.'
     c. Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa hon-o   yom-u koto   na   no da.
         Taro-Nom do-Past C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO Cop C   Cop.Nonpast
         'What Taro did was buy the book indeed.'

The example (32a) shows that the tense of the copula is independent of that of the presuppositional clause and has its own role as a tense marker. The example (32c) is interesting because it indicates that stacking of the copula is possible, given that *na* preceding *no* is an adnominal form of the copula, as argued by Miyama (2011).

Other elements that we have discussed do not occur with the copula.

---

[9] We assume following Nishiyama (1999) that *da* is a fused form of *dearu*.

(33) *Taroo-ga si-ta no wa hon-o yom-u koto de-sase-ta/de-rare-ta/
Taro-Nom do-Past C Top book-Acc read-U KOTO Cop-Cause-Past/Cop-Pass-Past/
de-te-i-ru/o-de-ni nar-u/dear-are-ru/de-te-yar-u/
Cop-TE-Asp-Nonpast/Hon$_2$-Cop-Hon$_2$-Nonpast/Cop-Hon$_1$-Nonpast/Cop-TE-give-Nonpast/
de-te-moraw-u
Cop-TE-receive-Nonpast

To sum up this section, we have seen that some modals, tense, negation and the sequence *noda* occur with the sentence-final copula.

5. Semantic Restriction on the Focus Position and the Presuppositional Clause

In section 3 we have observed that passive *-rare* and *-te morawu* have to be doubled in the pseudocleft construction. Why is the repetition of the same element necessary with *-rare* and *-te morawu*? Let us start our discussion with indirect passives.

(34) Taroo-ga gakusee-ni musuko-o izime-rare-ta.
Taro-Nom student-by son-Acc bully-Pass-Past
'Taro had his son bullied by students.'

(35) a. *Taroo-ga si-ta no wa gakusee-ni musuko-o izime-rare-ru koto dat-ta.
Taro-Nom do-Past C Top student-by son-Acc bully-Pass-RU KOTO Cop-Past
'What Taro did was have his son bullied by students.'

   b. Taroo-ga s-are-ta no wa gakusee-*ni/??ga musuko-o izime-ru koto dat-ta.
Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C Top student-by/Nom son-Acc bully-RU KOTO Cop-Past

   c. ?? Taroo-ga gakusee-ni s-are-ta no wa musuko-o izime-ru koto dat-ta.
Taro-Nom student-by do-Pass-Past C Top son-Acc bully-RU KOTO Cop-Past

   d. Taroo-ga s-are-ta no wa gakusee-ni musuko-o izime-rare-ru koto dat-ta.
Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C Top student-by son-Acc bully-Pass-RU KOTO Cop-Past

   e. Taroo-ga gakusee-ni s-are-ta no wa musuko-o izime-rare-ru koto dat-ta.
Taro-Nom student-by do-Pass-Past C Top son-Acc bully-Pass-RU KOTO Cop-Past

We assume, essentially following Kuno (1973), Kuroda (1979), Hoshi (1999) among others, that the passive morpheme of the *ni* indirect passives is a two place predicate which takes Affectee as an external argument and a vP complement.[10]

(36) [$_{TP}$ Taroo-ga$_i$ [$_{VoiceP}$ ~~Taroo-ga$_i$~~ [$_{vP}$ gakusei-ni [$_{VP}$ musuko-o izime] v] rare] ta].
Taro-Nom student-by son-Acc bully Pass Past

When the presuppositional clause contains V in an active voice as in (35a), the focalized V cannot be passive. The example (35b) is ruled out when *gakusee-ni* is used in the focus phrase, because *-ni*, which introduces an agent in the passive construction, cannot be licensed by the active V. When *gakusee-ga* is used instead, again it is ruled out because T is not available within the focus phrase to license nominative Case. In (35c) the problem of Case, which occurs in (35b), does not arise, for *gakusee-ni* is licensed by the passive *s-are-ta* in the presuppositional clause. Yet a mismatch in voice results in degraded acceptability. In contrast, the examples (35d, e) indicate that the sentences are acceptable when the passive morpheme appears in both the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase.

Notice that the examples (35d, e) illustrate that the agentivity constraint does not apply when the predicate in

---

[10] The structure (36) is similar to what Folli and Harley (2007) propose for *faire infinitif* of Romance causatives.

the presuppositional clause is *s-are-ru*. In section 3.1, we have stated that the agentivity constraint is imposed on the VP focus pseudocleft construction, but it is too strong; it holds true only with the construction with *su-ru* in the presuppositional clause. The more accurate generalization would be the following.

(37) Theta Nondistinctness Condition
The VP focus pseudocleft construction can be interpreted more easily when the subject of the presuppositional clause receives a thematic role nondistinct from the one assigned by the focus predicate to its subject within the focus phrase.[11]

This condition applies in the semantic component where LF is assigned its interpretation. The VP focus pseudocleft sentences will not be assigned its interpretation if they fail to satisfy the condition, even if they are syntactically well-formed. Let us assume that there is a phonetically null pronominal subject PRO within the focus phrase. In (35d, e) both Taro and PRO are Affectee arguments, and the condition on theta nondistinctness is met. In contrast, the same condition is not satisfied in (35c), because the predicate within the focus phrase assigns Agent thematic role to PRO, though the subject of the presuppositional clause is Affectee. The passive morpheme has to be doubled in the VP focus pseudocleft construction so as to satisfy the theta nondistinctness condition.

The agentivity constraint can be subsumed under the theta nondistinctness condition: when the predicate in the presuppositional clause is *suru*, the predicate in the focus phrase has to be agentive as well. The agentivity constraint has often been regarded as a property of the pseudocleft construction, but I suspect this is partly due to the fact that passives are not allowed in English pseudocleft sentences as in (38a).

(38) a. * What was done to John was kicked in the stomach/kick him in the stomach.
 b. What happened to John was he was kicked in the stomach.

In order to focalize action performed on Patient, sentences like (38b) have to be used instead. On the other hand, in Japanese it is possible to use passives in the pseudocleft sentences as in (35d, e), which makes it clear that the agentivity constraint is a subcase of the more general theta nondistinctness condition. In (35a) the theta nondistinctness condition (as well as the agentivity constraint) is violated, because *si-ta* assigns Agent to its subject while *izime-rare-ru* assigns Affectee to its phonetically empty subject.

The situation is the same with the pseudocleft constructions based on direct passive sentences.

(39) Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni waraitobas-are-ta.
Taro-Nom Hanako-by laugh.at-Pass-Past
'Taro was laughed at by Hanako.'
(40) a. *Taroo-ga   si-ta   no wa Hanako-ni waraitobas-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-PastC Top Hanako-by laugh.at-Pass-RU   KOTO Cop-Past
    'What was done to Taro was he was laughed at.'
 b. *Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa Hanako-ni/ga   waraitobas-u koto   dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C Top Hanako-by/Nom laugh.at-U   KOTO Cop-Past
 c. ?? Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni s-are-ta   no wa waraitobas-u koto   dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom Hanako-by do-Pass-Past C Top laugh.at-U   KOTO Cop-Past
 d. Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa Hanako-ni waraitobas-are-ru koto   dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-Pass-Past C To Hanako-by laugh.at-Pass-RU KOTO Cop-Past

---

[11] In this paper we leave open the question of how thematic roles are represented in grammar, i.e. whether there are such levels as argument structure and/or lexical conceptual structure, or whether they can be read off from syntactic structures, as proposed by Hale and Keyser (1993). In (37) the term "nondistinctness" is used because it is difficult to formulate the condition precisely without spelling out the number and kinds of thematic roles available.

e.   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni   <u>s-are-ta</u>   no wa   <u>waraitobas-are-ru</u> koto   dat-ta.
      Taro-Nom   Hanako-by   do-Pass-Past C Top   laugh.at-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past

Note that the acceptable sentences in (40d, e) involve indirect passives, because the focus phrase, *(Hanako-ni) waraitobas-are-ru koto,* is construed as an accusative object of *s-are-ta* in the presuppositional clause. Since the VP focus is necessarily construed as an accusative object, the passives in the VP focus pseudocleft sentences in Japanese are always indirect passives. Hence the account given for indirect passive examples in (35) carries over to (40) as well. The acceptable examples (40d, e) satisfy the theta nondistinctness condition, while the unacceptable ones (40a, b, c) do not, though (40b) is ruled out for reasons of Case as well.[12,13]

It may be possible to derive the theta nondistinctness condition from a more general parallelism requirement. The *s-are-ru* pseudocleft construction sounds better when the focus predicate denotes controllable action.

(41) a.   Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa   musuko-ni nak-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   do-Pass-Past C   Top   son-by   cry-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
           'What was done to Taro was his son cried on him.'
     a'.   Taroo-ga   musuko-ni s-are-ta   no wa   nak-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   son-by   do-Pass-Past C Top   cry-Pass-RU   KOTO   Cop-Past
     b.   Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa   koibito-ni   suter-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   do-Pass-Past C   Top   girlfriend-by   leave-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
           'What was done to Taro was his girlfriend left him.'
     b'.   Taroo-ga   koibito-ni   s-are-ta   no wa   suter-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   girlfriend-by do-Pass-Past C   Top   leave-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
     c. ?? Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa   musuko-ni sin-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   do-Pass-Past C   Top   son-by   die-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
           'What was done to Taro was his son died on him.'
     c'.?? Taroo-ga   musuko-ni s-are-ta   no wa   sin-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   son-by   do-Pass-Past C Top   die-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
     d. ?? Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa   ame-ni hur-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   do-Pass-Past C   Top   rain-by fall-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past
           'What was done to Taro was it rained on him.'
     d'.?? Taroo-ga   ame-ni s-are-ta   no wa   hur-are-ru   koto   dat-ta.
           Taro-Nom   rain-by do-Pass-Past C   Top   fall-Pass-RU KOTO   Cop-Past

---

[12] The example (40a) is acceptable under a construal in which Taro tried to be laughed at on purpose. This is due to the theta nondistinctness condition, because PRO subject of the focus phrase is Agent just as the subject of the presuppositional clause under this interpretation. I am thankful to an anonymous reviewer for this observation.
[13] An anonymous reviewer pointed out to me that (35c) and (40c) do not sound so bad, and cites (i) and (ii) as acceptable examples involving possessive passives and direct passives respectively.

(i)   Taroo-ga   s-are-ta   no wa   kutu-o   kakus-u koto   da.
       Taro-Nom   do-Pass-Past C Top   shoes-Acc   hide-U   KOTO   Cop.Nonpast
       Lit. 'What was done to Taro was hide his shoes.'
(ii)   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ni   s-are-ta   no wa   hikkak-u koto   da.
       Taro-Nom Hanako-by   do-Pass-Past   C Top   scratch-U KOTO   Cop.Nonpast
       Lit. 'What was done to Taro by Hanako was scratch him.'

S/he notes that the sentences become more acceptable when the effect on Taro is more direct and physical. Though I do not find (i) and (ii) acceptable, I agree that they sound better than (35c) and (40c). What seems to be involved here is affectedness. The theta nondistinctness condition is not absolute or inviolable, and sentences with strong affectedness may be able to override it. I leave the matter for future research.

The examples (41a, a', b, b'), which have an agentive predicate embedded within VoiceP in the focus phrase, are more acceptable than (41c, c', d, d'), which do not have an agentive predicate embedded within VoiceP. Here the parallelism required between the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase is more than just the occurrence of a passive morpheme or the theta nondistinctness of subjects. It seems that the predicates that take agentive subjects are more acceptable in the passive focus phrase, because *suru* in the presuppositional clause embedded under a passive morpheme is agentive in active form. It is well known that the parallelism requirement is imposed on the LF structures of an ellipsis site and its antecedent in the elliptical constructions. It may be possible to reformulate the theta nondistinctness condition in terms of structural parallelism and voice feature matching, since the pseudocleft construction consists of the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase that are cleaved apart syntactically and the parallelism helps us interpret the two parts together.

As for the *-te morawu* construction, Yamashita (2001) points out that it forms a pair with a passive with an adversative subject because both function as a valence increaser.[14]

(42) a.   Yamada-ga   watasi-o kuruma-de gakkoo-made ture-te   it-ta.   (active)
        Yamada-Nom I-Acc   car-by   school-to   take-TE go-Past
        'Yamada took me to school by car.'

    b.   Watasi-wa Yamada-ni kuruma-de gakkoo-made ture-te   ik-are-ta.   (passive)
        I-Top   Yamada-bycar-by   school-to   take-TE go-Pass-Past
        'I was taken to school by car by Yamada (against my will).'

    c.   Watasi-wa Yamada-ni kuruma-de gakkoo-made ture-te   it-te   morat-ta.   (*-te morawu*)
        I-Top   Yamada-bycar-by   school-to   take-TE go-TE receive-Past
        'I was taken to school by car by Yamada (and I'm thankful for that).'

                                     ((a-c): Yamashita (2001: 5))

Watasi in (42b) is Affectee, receiving a negative effect from Yamada's action, whereas *watasi* in (42c) is Beneficiary, receiving benefit from the same action. Since Beneficiary can be regarded as a kind of Affectee, the *-te morawu* construction can be dealt with in the same way as the passives. We regard *morawu* with a passive meaning as a realization of Voice^0, which gives rise to the beneficiary construction because of its semantic property.

(43)   [$_{TP}$ Taroo-ga$_i$ [$_{VoiceP}$ ~~Taroo-ga$_i$~~ [$_{vP}$ sensee-ni [$_{VP}$ home-te] v] morat] ta].
        Taro-Nom   teacher-by   praise-TE   receive Past
        Lit. 'What Taro was done by the teacher was he was praised.'

(44) a. ?? Taroo-ga si-ta   no wa sensee-ni home-te   moraw-u koto   dat-ta.
        Taro-Nom do-Past C Top teacher-by praise-TE receive-U KOTO Cop-Past
        'What Taro did was have Hanako buy flowers for him.'

    b. *Taroo-ga si-te morat-ta   no wa sensee-ni/ga   home-ru   koto   dat-ta.
        Taro-Nom do-TE receive-Past C Top teacher-by/Nom praise-RU KOTO Cop-Past

    c. ?? Taroo-ga sensee-ni si-te morat-ta   no wa home-ru koto   dat-ta.
        Taro-Nom teacher-by do-TE receive-Past C Top praise-RU KOTO Cop-Past

    d.   Taroo-ga si-te   morat-ta   no wa sensee-ni home-te   moraw-u koto
        Taro-Nom do-TE   receive-Past C Top teacher-by praise-TE receive-U KOTO
        dat-ta.
        Cop-Past

---

[14] Yamashita (2001) uses the term 'adversative passive' for (42b), but the term is usually used in the generative literature to refer to indirect passives with adversative interpretation, which (42b) is not.

e. Taroo-ga sensee-ni si-te morat-ta no wa home-te moraw-u koto dat-ta.
  Taro-Nom teacher-by do-TE receive-Past C Top praise-TE receive-U KOTO Cop-Past

Again only the sentences containing thematically nondistinct subjects in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase are allowed (44d, e), whether they may be lexical or phonetically null.

  We have seen that the obligatory doubling of the passive *rare* and *-te morawu* is due to the theta nondistinctness condition imposed on the presuppositional subjects and the focus subjects of the pseudocleft construction. In order to make sure this is the case, let us take a look at the causative *sase*, which allows optional doubling.[15]

(45) a. Taroo-ga si-ta no wa Hanako-ni heya-o katazuke-sase-ru koto dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-Past C Top Hanako-Dat room-Acc tidy.up-Cause-RU KOTO Cop-Past
    'What Taro did was make Hanako tidy up the room.'
  b. *Taroo-ga s-ase-ta no wa Hanako-ni/ga heya-o katazuke-ru koto dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-Cause-Past C Top Hanako-Dat/Nom room-Acc tidy.up-RU KOTO Cop-Past
  c. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni s-ase-ta no wa heya-o katazuke-ru koto dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat do-Cause-Past C Top room-Acc tidy.up-RU KOTO Cop-Past
  d. Taroo-ga s-ase-ta no wa Hanako-ni heya-o katazuke-sase-ru koto dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom do-Cause-Past C Top Hanako-Dat room-Acc tidy.up-Cause-RU KOTO Cop-Past
  e. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni s-ase-ta no wa heya-o katazuke-sase-ru koto dat-ta.
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat do-Cause-Past C Top room-Acc tidy.up-Cause-RU KOTO Cop-Past

Unlike the cases with passives and *-te morawu* with a passive meaning, the examples (45a) and (45c) are acceptable, in which the causative morpheme is not doubled. The structure we assume for causatives is the following.

(46) [$_{TP}$ Taroo-ga$_i$ [$_{vP}$ ~~Taroo-ga$_i$~~ [$_{vP}$ Hanako-ni [$_{VP}$ heya-o katazuke] v] sase] ta]
   Taro-Nom   Hanako-Dat room-Acc tidy.up   Cause Past

In (45a) *Taroo* in the presuppositional clause is an agentive subject. The subject of the focus phrase, PRO, is a Causer of the event and is coreferential with *Taroo*. The subject of a causative clause is not always agentive, as in *Sono sirase-ga Hanako-o kanasim-ase-ta* 'The news made Hanako sad,' but in the focus phrase in (45a), PRO, being a human, is interpreted as agentive. Since the two subjects are both agentive, the theta nondistinctness condition is satisfied in (45a). In (45c) the subject of the presuppositional clause, *Taroo*, is an Agent as well as a Causer. The subject of the focus phrase is PRO, which is coreferential with *Hanako*, and it is an Agent. Since the two subjects satisfy the theta nondistinctness condition, the doubling of the causative morpheme is not necessary. This example is important, because it shows that the two subjects need not be identical in reference so long as they satisfy the theta nondistinctness condition.

  If the doubling of the causative morpheme need not be invoked, why is it that the same morpheme occurs twice in (45d, e) in violation of the principle of economy, making no contribution to semantic interpretation? Interestingly, a similar phenomenon is observed with English pseudocleft sentences.

(47) a. What I did then was call the grocer.
  b. What I did then was I called the grocer.   (Ross (1972: 89))

---

[15] *-Te yaru* and *-te morawu* with a causative meaning allow optional doubling just like the causative *sase*, as we have seen in (16a, b).

Ross (1972) reports that most speakers find (47b) as acceptable as (47a), especially in colloquial speech.[16] When we utter complex sentences, we tend to be repetitive. This may be due to memory limitation or for ease of comprehension. One of the characteristic properties of human language is redundancy, as is evident from the appearance of agreement markers in various languages, which are semantically vacuous. It is not surprising then to find doubling of morphemes in such a complex construction as pseudoclefts, where parts of the same clause are scattered apart from each other. Any element that can occur within the focus phrase can be doubled in the presuppositional clause so long as the theta nondistinctness condition is respected.[17]

To sum up, it has been shown that the interpretation of the pseudocleft sentences is feasible when the subject of the focus phrase has a thematic role nondistinct from that of the subject of the presuppositional clause. The agentivity constraint follows from this condition as well as the occurrences of the passive *rare* and *-te morawu* with a passive meaning in the two positions in the construction.

6. Summary

In this paper we have looked into the syntactic and semantic properties of the VP focus pseudocleft construction in Japanese. We have shown that the focus phrase can include V, v, Voice and Hon_2 but no other higher elements. We have also observed that the presuppositional clause preceding *no* is TP, and that the sentence-final copula can be accompanied by TP internal elements as well as by TP external elements. It has been shown that the construction is subject to the theta nondistinctness condition: pseudocleft sentences in which a subject of the focus phrase has a thematic role nondistinct from that of the presuppositional clause are more readily interpreted than those in which the condition is not met. This condition might be derived from the structural parallelism requirement, though more needs to be investigated.

Based on these findings, we will consider the structure and the derivation of the VP focus pseudocleft construction in Japanese in the sequal to this paper, Ishihara (this volume).

References

Akmajian, Adrian (1970) *Aspects of the Grammar of Focus in English*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Bošković, Željko (1997) "Pseudoclefts," *Studia Linguistica* 51, 235-277.

Chomsky, Noam (1977) "On *Wh*-Movement," *Formal Syntax*, ed. by Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, 71-132, Academic Press, New York.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Den Dikken, Marcel, André Meinunger and Chris Wilder (2000) "Pseudoclefts and Ellipsis," *Studia Linguistica* 54, 41-89.

Emonds, Joseph (1976) *A Transformational Approach to Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.

Folli, Raffaella and Heidi Harley (2007) "Causation, Obligation, and Argument Structure: On the Nature of Little v," *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 197-238.

Fukaya, Takashi and Hoji Hajime (1999) "Stripping and Sluicing in Japanese and Some Implications," *WCCFL* 18, 145-158.

Harley, Heidi (1995) *Subjects, Events, and Licensing*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Harley, Heidi (2012) "External Arguments and the Mirror Principle: On the Distinctness of Voice and v," lingbuzz/001526, to appear in *Lingua*.

---

[16] However, there are speakers who do not accept sentences like (47b) at all, including Higgins (1973). The Japanese counterpart of (47b) is not acceptable.

[17] Except for honorifics. As we saw in section 3.10, *o*-V-*ninaru* has to be doubled by *s-are-ru* because *o-si-ninaru* is not acceptable.

Heycock, Caroline and Anthony Kroch (1999) "Pseudocleft Connectedness: Implications for the LF Interface Level," *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 365-397.

Higgins, Francis Roger (1973) *The Pseudo-Cleft Construction in English*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT. [Published by Garland, New York in 1979.]

Hiraiwa, Ken and Shinichiro Ishihara (2012) "Syntactic Metamorphosis: Clefts, Sluicing and In-Situ Focus in Japanese," *Syntax* 15, 142-180.

Hoshi, Hiroto (1999) "Passives," *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Natsuko Tsujimura, 191-235, Blackwell, Oxford.

Inoue, Kazuko (2007) "Nihongo no Moodaru no Tokutyoo Saikoo (Properties of Japanese Modals Revisited)," *Nihongono Syubun Gensyoo: Toogo Koozoo to Modaritii* (Main Clause Phenomena in Japanese: Syntactic Structures and Modality), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 227-260, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Ishihara, Yuki (2010) "Non-identical Verb Forms in the Japanese Predicate Doubling Construction," *Linguistic Research* 26, 39-65.

Ishihara, Yuki (this volume) "The Structure and Derivation of the VP Focus Pseudocleft Construction in Japanese," *Linguistic Research* 28.

Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kizu, Mika (2005) *Cleft Constructions in Japanese Syntax*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Koizumi, Masatoshi (2000) "String Vacuous Overt Verb Raising," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 9, 227-285.

Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki (1979) "On Japanese Passives," *Exploration in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*, ed. by George Bedell, Eiichi Kobayashi and Masatake Muraki, 305-347, Kenkyusha, Tokyo.

Lasnik, Howard (1995) "Verbal Morphology: *Syntactic Structures* Meets the Minimalist Program," *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Carlos Otero*, ed. by Héctor Campos and Paula Kempchinsky, 251-275, Georgetown University Press. [Reprinted in Howard Lasnik (1999) *Minimalist Analysis*, 97-119, Blackwell, Oxford.]

Masuoka, Takashi (1991) "Judoo Hyoogen to Syukansee (Passive Expressions and Subjectivity)," *Nihongo no Voice to Tadoosee* (Voice in Japanese and Transitivity), ed. by Yoshio Nitta, Kurosio, Tokyo.

Mikkelsen, Line (2005) *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication and Equation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Minami, Fujio (1974) *Gendai Nihongo no Koozoo* (The Structure of Modern Japanese), Taishukan, Tokyo.

Miyama, Mioko (2011) "Da and the Zero Form as the Two Contracted Forms of the Japanese Copula," *Online Proceedings of GLOW in Asia Workshop for Young Scholars 2011*, 190-204.

Niinuma, Fumikazu and Hideki Maki (2007) "A Note on the Subject Honorific Form *o*-X *ni naru* in Japanese," *Eigo to Bunpo to: Suzuki Hidekazu Kyooju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshu* (English and Grammar: A Festschrift for Prof. Hidekazu Suzuki on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday), ed. by Akira Mizokoshi et al., 315-326, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.

Nishiyama, Kunio (1999) "Adjectives and the Copulas in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8, 183-222.

Pylkkänen, Liina (2008) *Introducing Arguments*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Potsdam, Eric (1997) "English Verbal Morphology and VP Ellipsis," *NELS* 27, 353-368.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Ross, John Robert (1972) "Act," *Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. by Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman, 70-126, Reidel, Dordrecht.

Ross, Háj (2000) "The Frozenness of Pseudoclefts: Towards an Inequality-based Syntax," *CLS* 36, 385-426.

Rouveret, Alain (2012) "VP Ellipsis, Phases and the Syntax of Morphology," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30, 897-963.

Takubo, Yukinori (1987) "Toogo Koozoo to Bunmyaku Joohoo (Syntactic Structures and Contexual Information)," *Nihongogaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 6, 37-48.

Ueda, Yukiko (2007) "Nihongo no Modaritii no Toogo Koozoo to Ninsyoo Seegen (The Syntactic Structure and

Person Restriction of Modality in Japanese)," *Nihongo no Syubun Gensyoo: Toogo Koozoo to Modaritii* (Main Clause Phenomena in Japanese: Syntactic Structures and Modality), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 261-294, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Yamashita, Yoshitaka (2001) "Meiwaku Ukemi no Puroto Taipu (The Prototype of Adversative Passives)," *Journal of International Student Center* 5, 1-15, Hokkaido University.