

**Summaries of the Papers Read at the 31st Annual Meeting of  
the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society**

## *No-da* Constructions and Two Types of Cleft Sentences

Keita Ikarashi, Takashi Shizawa, Suguru Mikami

This study investigates the derivations of *no da* constructions like (1), cleft sentences like (2), and pseudo-cleft sentences like (3):

- (1) Taro-ga ringo-o tabeta no da.  
 Taro-Nom apple-Acc ate nom. Cop  
 ‘It is that Taro ate apples.’
- (2) Taro-ga tabeta-{no/\*kudamono}-wa ringo-o da.  
 Taro-Nom ate-{nom./fruit}-Top apple-Acc Cop  
 It is apples that Taro ate.
- (3) Taro-ga tabeta-{no/kudamono}-wa ringo da.  
 Taro-Nom ate-{pro./fruit}-Top apple Cop  
 ‘What Taro ate is apples.’

With respect to the derivations of *no da* constructions and cleft sentences, Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) hold that the latter is derived from the former. In contrast, we prove that the two constructions are derived from respective base structures: *no da* constructions are derived from small clauses (SC), and clefts from *no da*-less-sentences (e.g. *Taro-ga ringo-o tabeta.*) via the focalization of an element and the topicalization of the remnant. In addition, we also argue that there is no derivational relation between clefts and pseudo-clefts, although both constructions have been analyzed without distinguishing each other; that is, pseudo-clefts are derived from SCs through the movement of a *no*-clause to TP-spec.

In demonstrating the details of the derivations, we first introduce two theoretical backgrounds. First, let us consider the structure of copula sentences. Generally, the copula verb *da* can only be attached to nominal elements (cf. Watanabe (1953), Suzuki (1972)); thus, *da* can be adjoined to the nominal phrase *gakusei* ‘student’, but not to the adjective *kawaii* ‘pretty’, and the *to*-clause as shown in (4) and (5):

- (4) Hanako-wa {gakusei da /kawaii (\*da)}.  
 Hanako-Top {student Cop/pretty Cop}  
 Hanako is {a student/pretty}.
- (5) \*<sub>[DP</sub> Taro-ga itta no]-wa <sub>[CP</sub> Hanako-ga neko-o katteiru to] da.  
 Taro-Nom said nom.-Top Hanako-Nom cat-Acc have Comp Cop  
(Hasegawa 1997:33)

On the basis of this traditional description, we propose a more abstract condition on the structure of copula sentences, as schematized in (6):

$$(6) [ \quad \alpha P \quad [ \quad \alpha P \quad da \quad ] ]$$

The condition in (6) requires *da* to combine two elements that have the same categorial properties; since subjects usually are NPs, predicates should also be NPs.

The second theoretical background we introduce is the nominalization of complementizers. To explain this, we adopt Hiraiwa's (2005) supercategorial theory. Based on this theory, *c3*, called supercategory, does not have any inherent/unvalued features at merge. Arriving at the point of transfer, these features are inserted into the supercategory: if -n feature is inserted, the category becomes CP, and if +n, DP.

Taking these theoretical backgrounds into considerations, we propose the derivations of the three constructions. Let us begin by considering the derivation of *no da* constructions exemplified in (1). They derive as follows:

$$(7) \text{ a. } [_{VP} [[_{SC} [_{DP} \text{ringo-ga nai toiu koto}] [_{FinP/DP} [_{TP} \text{Taro-ga tabeta}] [_{Fin/D} \text{no}]]] [_{V} \text{da}]] \\ \text{ b. } [_{TP} [_{DP} \quad ] [_{VP} [[_{SC} [_{DP} \quad ] [_{FinP/DP} [_{TP} \quad ] [_{Fin/D} \text{no}]]] [_{V} \text{da}]]] \\ \text{ c. } [_{TP} [_{DP} \quad ] [_{VP} [[_{SC} [_{DP} \quad ] [_{FinP/DP} [_{TP} \quad ] [_{Fin/D} \text{no}]]] [_{V} \text{da}]]]$$

This construction has an SC as its base structure, where the nominalizer *no* is inserted to satisfy the condition in (6), as illustrated in (7a). According to Tanomura (1990), *no da* constructions have topics which refer to the preceding contexts even when they are not linguistically realized; hence, we add the topic *ringo-ga nai toiu koto* 'that there is no apple' to the left side of the SC as shown in (7a). Then, the topic moves to TP-spec to satisfy the EPP on T, as in (7b). Finally, the DP in TP-spec is optionally omitted, as illustrated in (7c).

Let us turn to the derivation of clefts like (2). It proceeds as follows:

$$(8) \text{ a. } [_{TP} \text{Taro-ga ringo-o tabeta}] \\ \text{ b. } [_{FocP} \text{ringo-o}_i [_{TP} t_i ]] \\ \text{ c. } [_{TopP} [_{FinP/DP} [_{TP} t_i ] [_{Fin/D} \text{no}]] [ [_{FocP} \text{ringo-o}_i [_{FinP} [_{TP} t_i ] ] ] [_{Top} \text{da} ] ]]$$

Following Koizumi (1995), we argue that the sentence is derived from *no da*-less-sentences, as in (8a). Then, a focused DP is extracted out of the TP domain to FocP-spec to be interpreted properly, as represented in (8b). Finally, as in (8c), the remnant FinP, which contains the lower copy of the focused DP, is raised to TopP-spec. Notice in this structure that the copula verb *da* and the nominalizer *no* are inserted as last resort strategies: *da* is inserted to TopP-head to make a proper predicate relation between the FinP in TopP-spec and the DP in FocP-spec; the nominalizer *no* is inserted to the FinP-head at the level of transfer so as to satisfy the condition of the copula verb *da*, as shown above in (6).

Finally, let us consider the derivation of pseudo-clefts such as (3). It converses in the following way:

- (9) a. [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> Taro-ga tabeta {no/kudamono}]] ringo ] [<sub>V</sub> da ]  
 b. [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> {no/kudamono}]] [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> ~~{no/kudamono}~~] DP] [<sub>V</sub> da ]]]  


The base structure of this construction is an SC, as in (9a); and then, the noun phrase on the left side of the SC is raised to TP-spec to fulfill the EPP, as illustrated in (9b). Note here that *no* in pseudo-clefts, unlike that in clefts, can be substituted for other common nouns such as *kudamono* ‘fruit’, as is clear from the contrast between (2) and (3); this behavior follows from the assumption that *no* in pseudo-clefts is a pronominal. Therefore, we can conclude that it is modified by a relative clause.

These derivations are supported by some pieces of evidence. The first evidence concerns the Nominative Genitive Conversion (NGC), a syntactic phenomenon that optionally alternates a nominative subject with a genitive subject:

- (10) a. [Taro-~~{ga/??no}~~ ringo-o tabeta no] da.  
 b. [Taro-~~{ga/??no}~~ tabeta no]-wa ringo-o da.  
 c. [Taro-~~{ga/no}~~ tabeta no]-wa ringo da.

In the examples of *no da* constructions in (10a) and cleft sentences in (10b), the nominative subject *Taro-ga* cannot be alternated with the genitive subject; on the other hand, in pseudo-clefts, the alternation of the subject does not raise any problem as in (10c). According to Maki and Uchibori (2008), an external D head licenses genitive Case in the NGC constructions, as schematized in (11). Given this analysis, the proposed derivations can probably capture the fact in (10). *No* in *no da* constructions and clefts appears in FinP-head to satisfy the condition in (6) as repeated in (12a) and (12b), and an external D does not exist. Therefore, NGC is not licensed in these constructions. In contrast, an external D does exist in

pseudo-clefts and the D-head assigns genitive Case to the subject, as illustrated in (12c), because *no* is a pronominal.

(11) [[[ ... DP-<sub>GEN</sub> predicate ] N(over/covert)] D ]

- (12) a. [<sub>FinP/DP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Taro-ga ringo-o tabeta]] [<sub>Fin/D</sub> no]]  
 b. [<sub>FinP/DP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Taro-ga *t<sub>i</sub>* tabeta] [<sub>Fin/D</sub> no]]]  
 c. [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> Taro-ga tabeta] [<sub>D</sub> no/kudamono]]]

The second evidence comes from island-sensitivity, as in (13).

- (13) a. \* [John-ga kaita hito-o hihansita no]-wa kono ronbun-o da.  
 John-Nom wrote person-Acc criticized nom.-Top this paper-Acc Cop  
 b. [John-ga kaita hito-o hihansita no]-wa kono ronbun-o da.  
 John-Nom wrote person-Acc criticized pro.-Top this paper Cop

The cleft sentence in (13a) shows an island effect, whereas the pseudo-cleft sentence in (13b) is not. In the proposed analysis of clefts, the focused element moves to FocP-spec as illustrated in (5b). This movement causes the island violation because the DP *kono ronbun-o* crosses an island boundary, as in (14).

(14) \*John-ga [<sub>island</sub> *t<sub>i</sub>* kaita hito]-o hihansita no wa kono ronbun-o<sub>i</sub> da

On the other hand, since the DP *kono ronbun* in pseudo-clefts occurs as an element of an SC, no movement out of an island takes place throughout the derivation.

In conclusion, we have proposed the derivations of *no da* constructions and two types of cleft sentences: *no da* constructions are derived from an SC, clefts from *no da*-less-sentences via the focalization of an element and the topicalization of the remnant, and pseudo-clefts from an SC through the movement of a *no*-clause to TP-spec.

### SELECTED REFERENCES

- Hiraiwa, Ken (2005) *Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture*, Doctorial dissertation, MIT.  
 Hiraiwa, Ken and Shinichiro Ishihara (2002) "Missing Links: Cleft, Sluicing, and "No da" Construction in Japanese," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 43, 35-54.  
 Maki, Hideki and Asako Uchibori (2008) "Ga/No" Conversion," *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Miyagawa, Shigeru and Mamoru Saito, 192-216. Oxford University Press, Oxford.