VP-Focus Pseudocleft Sentences in Japanese: An Argument for Question-Answer Pair Analysis^{*}

YUKI ISHIHARA Tokyo Institute of Technology ishihara@ila.titech.ac.jp

Abstract: This paper examines properties of Japanese VP-focus pseudocleft sentences, and offers support for the question-pair analysis of pseudocleft sentences proposed by Ross (1972, 1979) and Den Dikken et al. (2000) among others. In Japanese pseudocleft sentences, a part denoting presupposition is linked to a part denoting focus by a sentence-final copula. The presuppositional part takes the form of a nominalized clause followed by the morphological topic marker, *-wa*. We point out this has exactly the same form as a fragment question, which can be regarded as direct evidence for the question-answer pair analysis. We also show that the occurrence of the same morpheme, such as a passive morpheme and a causative morpheme in both the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase at the same time can be explained naturally, if we consider that the presuppositional part and the focus phrase of pseudocleft sentences correspond to a question and its answer respectively.

1. Introduction

VP-focus pseudocleft sentences in English takes the following form.

(1) [PRESUPPOSITION] COPULA [FOCUS] e.g. [What Taro did] was [read a book].

The corresponding VP-focus pseudocleft sentences in Japanese takes the similar form, as shown in (2). The copula appears sentence-finally, because Japanese is a head-final language. The presuppositional part is nominalized by Complementizer, *no*, which is followed by the topic marker, *wa*.

^{*} I am thankful to the audience of FLYM 3, especially to Hsu-Te Johnny Cheng, Takeshi Oguro, Jun Abe and Jairo Nunes for valuable comments and questions. I am also grateful to Noriko Imanishi and Akira Watanabe for discussions and suggestions. Needless to say, all errors are my own. This research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25370544.

(2) [PRESUPPOSITION-no]-wa [FOCUS] COPULA e.g. [Taroo-ga si-ta-no]-wa [hon-o yom-u koto] da.¹ Taro-NOM do-PST-C-TOP book-ACC read-U NMNL COP.NPST 'What Taro did was read a book.'

2. Forms of VP that can Appear in the Focus Position

There are some restrictions imposed on the form of VP that appears in the focus position. Firstly, it must be nominalized by Nominalizer, *koto*, so that the copula can immediately follow it.

(3) Taroo-ga si-ta-no-wa [hon-o yom-u *(koto)] da. Taro-NOM do-PST-C-TOP book-ACC read-U NMNL COP.NPST 'What Taro did was read a book.'

Secondly, the type of VP that is allowed in the focus position is limited.

(4) Hanako-ni a. Taroo-ga si-ta-no-wa [{ Hanako-o waraw-ase-ru/ Taro-NOM do-PST-C-TOP Hanako-ACC laugh-CAUSE-RU/ Hanako-DAT hana-o titioya-ni syukudai-o tetudat-te kat-te yar-u/ moraw-u} flower-ACC buy-TE give-U/ father-by homework-ACC help-TE receive-U da. koto] NMNL COP.NPST 'What Taro did was {make Hanako laugh/ buy Hanako flowers/ have his father help him with his homework.}' b. Taroo-ga Saburoo-ni s-are-ta-no-wa [nagur-are-ru koto] da. do-PASS-PST-C-TOP hit-PASS-RU Taro-NOM Saburo-by NMNL COP.NPST Lit. 'What Taro was done by Saburo is he was hit.' C. Tanaka-sensee-ga s-are-ta-no-wa [kenkyuu-o hon-ni Tanaka-professor-NOM do-HON-PST-C-TOP research-ACC book-as o-matome-ninar-u koto] da. HON-write-HON-U NMNL COP.NPST 'What Prof. Tanaka did was write a book on his research.'

V in the focus position can be accompanied by a causative *(s)ase*, or the benefactive use of *te* yar(u) or *te moraw(u)* as in (4a). The focus V can also occur with passive *(r)are*, as in (4b), or an honorifice *o*-*ninar(u)*, as in (4c). In contrast, it cannot be accompanied by morphemes such as

¹ The abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: NOM=Nominative case, ACC=Accusative case, DAT=Dative case, PST=Past tense, NPST=non-past tense, C=Complementizer, TOP=Topic, NMNL=Nominalizer, COP=Copula, TE=continuative verbal inflection, (R)U=infinitival verbal inflection, CAUSE=Causative, PASS=Passive, HON=Honorific, ASP=Aspectual, POL=Polite, NEG=Negation, and SFP=Sentence final particle.

aspectual *te i(ru)*, polite mas(u), negative na(i), past ta,² or modals like *daroo/mai*, as demonstrated in (5).

(5) Taroo-ga si-ta-no-wa hon-o [{yon-de i-ru/ yomi-mas-u/ Taro-NOM do-PST-C-TOP book-ACC read-TE ASP-RU/ read-POL-U/ yoma-na-i/ yon-da/ yom-u-daroo} koto] da. read-NEG-I/ read-PST/ read-NPST-maybe} NMNL COP.NPST Lit. 'What Taro did was {reading/read (polite) / not read/ have read/ may read} a book.'

Japanese is an agglutinative language, and various morphemes occur with V. These morphemes are structured hierarchically in accordance with Rizzi's (1997) cartography, as represented in (6).

(6) [[[[[[[[[[...V...] Causative] Voice] Honorific/Give (benefactive)/ Receive (benefactive)] Asp] Polite] Neg] T] Fin] Top] Foc] Top] Force]

The elements that can occur in the focus position of VP-focus pseudocleft sentences are underscored in (6). They constitute a vP phase in a broad sense. (cf. Harwood's (2014) dynamic approach to phases.) No higher element is allowed in the VP focus position.

3. Question-Answer Pair Analysis of Pseudocleft Sentences

3.1. Connectivity Effects in Specificational Pseudocleft Sentences

It is well known that specificational pseudocleft sentences show connectivity effects.

(7) a. What John_i is is [proud of { $himself_i$ / * him_i / *John_i}].

b. Kinoo <u>Taroo</u>_i-ga si-ta-no-wa [{<u>zibunzisin</u>_i-o / <u>zibun</u>_i-o / *kare_i-o / yesterday Taro-NOM do-PST-C-TOP himself-ACC/ self-ACC/ him-ACC/
*Taroo_i-o} takame-ru koto] da. Taro-ACC improve-RU NMNL COP.NPST *'What Taro did was improve himself.'*

In (7a), the reflexive pronoun, *himself*, is allowed in the focus position unlike the pronoun or R-expression that is coreferential with *John*, even though it is not c-commanded by its antecedent in the presuppositional clause. The same effect is observed in Japanese, as shown in (7b), where the reflexive pronoun, *zibunzisin/zibun*, is allowed in the absence of c-command by its antecedent.

Another example that illustrates the connectivity effect involves binding of a pronoun by a quantificational nominal.

² The V-(r)u form, which is glossed as "-(R)U" in this paper, is ambiguous between the present-tense form and the nonfinite form, but the fact that past tense is not tolerated in the focus position indicates that it is infinitival rather than present-tensed.

(8) (Sharvit (1999)) a. What no student; enjoys is [his; finals]. dono gakusee_i-mo [zibuni-no hahaoya-ni tegami-o b. Kinoo si-ta-no-wa yesterday every student-also do-PST-C-TOP self-GEN mother-to letter-ACC kak-u koto] da. write-U NMNL COP.NPST 'What every student did was write a letter to his mother.'

In (8a, b), *his finals* and *zibun no hahaoya* 'self's mother' have a bound variable reading, respectively, even though *no student* and *dono gakusee* 'every student' in the presuppositional clauses do not c-command them.

Licensing of Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) shows connectivity as well.

(9)	a.		What John bought was [some wine].	
	b.	?	What John didn't buy was [any wine].	(Den Dikken et al. (2000))

The status of (9b) is subject to idiolectal variation, but some people find that the NPI, *any wine*, is allowed in the focus position, even though it is not c-commanded by *not*. Indefinites can marginally appear in the focus position of cleft sentences in Japanese as well.

(10)	a.	?	Kinoo	Taroo-ga	at-ta-no-wa	[dare	e-ka-ni]	da.			
			yesterday	Taro-NOM	meet-PST-C-TOP	some	one-or-DAT	COP.NPST			
			'Who Tar	'Who Taro met was someone.'							
	b.	?	Kinoo	Taroo-ga	awa- <u>nakat</u> -ta-no-	wa	[dono	gakusee-ni-mo]	da.		
			yesterday	Taro-NOM	meet-NEG-PST-C-7	ГОР	any	student-DAT-also	COP.NPST		
			'Who Taro didn't meet was anyone.'								

As shown in (10b), the NPI, *dono gakusee-ni-mo* 'any student' can be licensed, even though NEG within the presuppositional clause does not c-command it.

Note in passing that unlike (10b), where NP is focused, VP focus pseudocleft sentences in Japanese do not allow NPIs in the focus position.

(11)	Taroo-ga si- <u>nakat</u> -ta-no-wa	[dono	wain-mo	ka-u koto]	da.						
	Taro-NOM do-NEG-PST-C-TOP	any	wine-also	buy-U NMNL	COP.NPST						
	?*'What Taro didn't do was buy any	?*'What Taro didn't do was buy any wine.'									
	^{OK} 'What Taro didn't do was buy every wine.'										

The only reading available for *dono wain* 'any wine' in (11) is a universal reading, and no NPI reading is available. This does not constitute a counterargument against the connectivity effect observed in (10b). The NPI object needs to be licensed locally by a selecting V with a negative morpheme affixed to it. However, as we have seen in the previous section, only vP-phase-level categories are allowed in the focus position from which NEG is excluded. Even though NEG

cannot occur in the focus position, the existence of V in the affirmative form, blocks licensing of the NPI by NEG in the presuppositional clause, which is not local enough. So the lack of NPI licensing in (11) is due to the factor independent of connectivity.

We conclude that connectivity effects obtain in pseudocleft sentences in Japanese as in English.

3.2. The Occurrence of the Topic Marker *Wa* in Pseudocleft Sentences

In order to account for the connectivity effects observed between the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase of pseudocleft sentences, Ross (1972, 1997), Shlenker (2003), Den Dikken et al. (2000) among others have proposed a question-answer pair analysis of these sentences. This is the analysis I argue for in this paper, though various other analyses have been proposed in the literature.

(12)	a.		syntactic approaches
		i.	question-answer pair analysis
		ii.	presuppositional clause as a free relative (Akmajian (1979), Heggie (1988)
			etc.)
		iii.	monoclausal analysis (Meinunger (1998), Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2012) etc.)
	b.		semantic approaches (Heycock and Kroch (1997), Sharvit (1999) etc.)

This analysis is motivated by the parallelism between pseudocleft sentences and question-answer pairs. For instance, connectivity effects obtain in question-answer pairs as in (13) just as we have seen with pseudocleft sentences in (9).

(13)	a.		What did John buy?	Some wine.	
	b.	?	What didn't John buy?	Any wine.	(Den Dikken et al. (2000))

When the question is negative as in (13b), the NPI is licensed, even though there is no ccommand relation between NEG in the question and the NPI as its answer. It is natural to consider that the NPI in the fragment answer is licensed not by NEG in the question, but by NEG within the same clause, which can optionally undergo ellipsis along with a subject NP and V, as indicated by parentheses in (14).

(14)	a.		What did John buy?	(He bought) some wine.	
	b.	?	What didn't John buy?	(He didn't buy) any wine.	(Den Dikken et al. (2000))

We can apply the same analysis to pseudocleft sentences.

a. What John bought was (he bought) some wine.
b. ? What John didn't buy was (he didn't buy) any wine. (Den Dikken et al. (2000))

Specificational pseudocleft sentences sometimes take IP focus, which can be regarded as an answer to the question represented by the presuppositional clause. If ellipsis applies to IP focus to derive a focus phrase of a smaller size, the connectivity effect follows naturally.

 (16) (?)[TopP [What Mary didn't buy] [TOP is/was] [TP she didn't buy any wine]] Question Answer (Den Dikken et al. (2000))

Now let us turn to Japanese. (17a) is a specificational pseudocleft sentence, which is embedded within *Hanako-ga omotteiru* 'Hanako thinks' to show that the occurrence of the topic marker *wa* is not due to its being in a matrix clause. Here *hon* 'a book' is focused and contrasted with alternatives such as a pen and a pencil.

(17)	a.	[Taroo-ga	[Taroo-ga kat-ta-no- <u>wa</u>		hon da		Hanako-ga	omotteiru.				
		Taro-NOM	buy-PST-C-TOP	book	COP.NPST	С	Hanako-NOM	think.NPST				
		'Hanako thinks that what Taro bought is a book. (not a pen etc.)'										
		[Taroo-ga kat-ta-no- <u>ga</u>										
	b.	[Taroo-ga	kat-ta-no- <u>ga</u>	hon	da	to]	Hanako-ga	omotteiru.				
	b.	[Taroo-ga Taro-NOM	kat-ta-no- <u>ga</u> buy-PST-C-NOM			-	Hanako-ga Hanako-NOM	omotteiru. think.NPST				

In contrast, in (17b), the topic marker *wa* in the presuppositional clause is replaced with a nominative case marker *ga*. This sentence does not have a specificational pseudocleft reading. Here *hon* 'a book' is not a focus. What is focused is *Taroo-ga kat-ta-no* 'What Taro bought,' which is contrasted with such alternatives as what Hanako bought and what Taro wrote. This minimal pair demonstrates the obligatoriness of the topic marker *wa* in the presuppositional clause of specificational pseudocleft sentences.

Now consider sentence fragments as in (18).

(18) a. Taroo-ga. Taro-NOM *'Taro will do it.' 'Taro hasn't come yet.' 'Did Taro do it?' etc.*b. Taroo-wa. Taro-TOP
#'Taro will do it.' #'Taro hasn't come yet.' ^{OK} 'What about Taro?' ^{OK} 'Has Taro come?' etc.

When a subject NP with a nominative marker occurs alone without VP, as in (18a), we can interpret the fragment by filling in plausible meanings for the missing VP from the context, such as *will do it* and *hasn't come yet*. It is also possible to interpret (18a) as a fragment question. On the other hand, when NP with a topic marker occurs as a fragment, the fragment topic phrase must be interpreted only as a question. The missing VP of a fragment *wa*-phrase cannot be interpreted by making use of some old information available in the context, because it must constitute a

comment for the topic phrase. While an answer to a question makes a good comment, the old information available in the context does not.

The same holds true with fragment questions involving a sentential subject.

(19)	Q:	Taroo _i -ga	si-ta-no-	<u>wa</u> .					
		Taro-NOM	do-PST-C	-TOP					
		#'Taro bought a	ı book. ^{, OK} 'W	What did Taro d	do?'				
	A:	(Taroo _i -ga) zi	ibun _i -no	hahaoya-ni	hana-o	age-ru	koto	da	
		Taro-NOM se	elf-GEN	mother-DAT	flower-ACC	give-RU	NMNL	COP.NPST	
		(yo).							
		SFP							
		'He gave flowers to his mother.'							

In (19a) the sentence ends with a topic marker, and it only has a question reading. I argue that the same holds true with pseudocleft sentences as in (20).

(20)	[Taroo-ga			Q	uestion			
	Taro-NOM	do-PST	-C-TOP					
	[Taroo_i-ga	zibun _i -no	hahaoya-ni	hana-o	age-ru	koto]	da.	ANSWER
	Taro-NOM	self-GEN	mother-DAT	flower-ACC	give-RU	NMNL	COP.	NPST
	'What Taro _i	did was give f	lowers to his _i m	other.'				

What is remarkable here is that the question in (19a) and the presuppositional clause of a pseudocleft sentence in (20) have exactly the same form, unlike in English. The fact that a presuppositional clause must be marked by *wa* indicates that it constitutes a question, since a fragment topic must be interpreted as a question. This in turn suggests that the focus phrase represents its answer. Japanese, a language with a topic marker, thus offers novel support for the questionanswer pair analysis of pseudocleft sentences.

4. Doubling Phenomena in Pseudocleft Sentences and the Parallelism Requirement on Ellipsis

This section explores a consequence of the question-answer pair analysis of pseudocleft sentences. I will show that the doubling phenomena observed with pseudocleft sentences occur in fragment answers as well, which are both subject to the parallelism constraint.

(21)Tanaka-sensee-ga s-are-ta-no-wa [kenkyuu-o hon-ni Tanaka-professor-NOM do-HON-PST-C-TOP research-ACC book-as {o-matome-ninar-u/??matome-ru} koto] da. HON-write-HON-U/ write-RU NMNL COP.NPST 'What Prof. Tanaka did was write a book on his research.' (=(4c))

When honorific *rare* is used in the presuppositional clause, honorific *o*-*ninaru* must occur in the focus position, as indicated by (21).³ Similarly, in the answer to a question in which the honorific *rare* is used, the honorific *o*-*ninaru* must be used as well, as in (22).

(22)	Q:	Tanaka-sensee-ga		s- <u>are</u> -ta-no-wa?					
		Tanaka-professo	or-NOM	do-HON-PST-C-TOP					
		'What did Prof. Tanaka do?'							
	A:	Kenkyuu-o	hon-ni	{o-matome-ninar-u/??matome-ru}	koto	da			
		research-ACC	book-as	HON-write-HON-U/ write-RU	NMNL	COP.NPST			
		(yo).							
		SFP							
		'It is to write a book on his research.'							

Likewise, the passive morpheme (*r*)are must be doubled both in pseudocleft sentences as in (23) and in question-answer pairs as in (24). This is known as 'voice matching effect.' (cf. Merchant (2013))

[{*nagur-u/^{OK}nagur-are-ru} (23)Taroo-ga Saburoo-ni s-are-ta-no-wa koto] Taro-NOM do-PASS-PST-C-TOP {hit-NPST/ hit-PASS-RU} NMNL Saburo-by da. COP.NPST Lit. 'What Taro was done by Saburo is he was hit.' (24)Q: Taroo-ga Saburoo-ni s-are-ta-no-wa? Taro-NOM Saburo-by do-PASS-PST-C-TOP Lit. 'What was Taro done by Saburo?'

(i) Tanaka-sensee-ga [kenkyuu-o s-are-ta-no-wa hon-ni matome-rare-ru Tanaka-professor-NOM do-HON-PST-C-TOP research-ACC book-as write-HON-RU da. koto] COP.NPST NMNL 'What Prof. Tanaka did was write a book on his research.'

³ Though the honorific morpheme used in the presuppositional clause differs from the one used in the focus phrase, we regard it as an example of honorific doubling, since **o-si-ninar-u* 'HON-do-HON-NPST' is not morphologically acceptable. The doubling of honorific *rare* yields a good doubling sentence.

A: {??Nagur-u/^{OK}Nagur-<u>are</u>-ru} koto da (yo). {hit-NPST/ hit-PASS-RU} NMNL COP.NPST SFP *'It is hitting/ to be hit.'*

As shown in (24), the voice matching effect seems weaker with the question-answer pairs, maybe because the answer can be construed as starting with 'It is ...' rather than 'He was ...,' since Japanese allows null subjects.

Causative *(s)ase* can, but does not have to, double in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase, as shown in (25), and the same is true with question-answer pairs as in (26).

(25)		Taroo-ga	kodomo-ni	s- <u>ase</u> -ta	-no-wa	[]	neya-o	katazuke-(<u>sase</u>)-ru		
		Taro-NOM	child-DAT	do-CAUS	SE-PST-C-	TOP ro	oom-ACC	tidy.up-(CAUSE)-RU		
		koto] da	a.							
NMNL COP.NPST										
		'What Taro f	forced his child	to do is ti	dy up his re	oom.'				
(26)	Q:	Taroo-ga	kodomo-ni	s- <u>ase</u>	e-ta-no-w	a?				
		Taro-NOM	child-DAT	do-Ca	AUSE-PST	-C-TOP				
		'What did Ta	'What did Taro force his child to do?'							
	A:	Heya-o	katazuke-(s	ase)-ru	koto	da	(yo).			
		room-ACC	tidy.up-(CAU	ISE)-RU	NMNL	COP.NP	ST SFP			
		'It is to (mak	e him) tidy up h	his room.'						

As for benefactive verbs te yar(u) or te moraw(u), they can, but do not have to, double in the presuppositional clause and the focus position.

(27)	a.	Taroo-ga	kodomo-ni	si- <u>te</u>	<u>yat</u> -ta-no-wa	[hon-o	ka(t- <u>te</u>	<u>yar</u>)-u			
		Taro-NOM	child-DAT	do-TE	give-PST-C-TOP	book-ACC	buy(-TE	give)-U			
		koto] da	1.								
		NMNL COP.NPST									
		'What Taro d	lid for his child	l is buy hin	1 a book. '						
	b.	Taroo-ga	titioya-ni	si- <u>te</u>	<u>morat</u> -ta-no-wa	[syukudai-o	o tetsu	da(t- <u>te</u>			
		Taro-NOM	father-by	do-TE	receive-PST-C-TOP	homework-A	CC help-7	ΓE			
		<u>moraw</u>)-u	koto] da	-							
		receive-U	NMNL CO	P.NPST							
		'What Taro d	lid was have hi	s father he	lp him with his homev	vork. '					

These verbs can double optionally in question-answer pairs, too.

(28)	Q:	Taroo-ga	kodomo-ni	si- <u>te</u>	<u>yat</u> -ta-no-wa?			
		Taro-NOM	child-DAT	do-TE	give-PST-C-TOP			
		'What did Taro do for his child?'						

	A:	Hon-o	ka(t- <u>te</u>	<u>yar</u>)-u	koto	da	(yo).		
		book-ACC	buy(-TE	give)-U	NMNL	COP.NPST	SFP		
		'It is to buy h	'It is to buy him a book.'						
(29)	Q:	Taroo-ga	titioya-r	ni si- <u>te</u>	mora	<u>t</u> -ta-no-wa?			
		Taro-NOM	father-by	do-TE	receiv	e-PST-C-TOP			
		'What did Ta	What did Taro have his father do for him?'						
	A:	Syukudai-o	o tetsu	da(t- <u>te</u>	<u>moraw</u>)-	u koto	da	(yo).	
		homework-A	CC help-TE		receive-U	NMNL	COP.NPST	SFP	
		'It is to help him with his homework.'							

To summarize our observation so far, the honorific and the passive morphemes must double in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase of pseudocleft sentences as well, as in question-answer pairs. The causative and the benefactive morphemes can double optionally in the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase of pseudocleft sentences and in question-answer pairs. The question-answer pairs seem to be less restrictive than pseudocleft sentences with respect to doubling, since they allow subject shifts more readily, but otherwise they exhibit the same pattern, which can be regarded as another argument for the question-answer pair analysis.

For the sake of concreteness, I propose the following structure for pseudocleft sentences.

(30)
$$\begin{bmatrix} T_{\text{TopP}} \begin{bmatrix} CP & Op_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} TP & Taroo_j-ga & Saburoo-ni t_j & t_i-are-ta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C & no \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$
-wa
Taro-NOM Saburo-by PASS-PST C-TOP

$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & [P_{\text{redP}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F_{\text{ocP}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_{\text{oiceP}} & t_j & nagur-are \end{bmatrix}_i - ru \begin{bmatrix} Taroo_j-ga & Saburoo-ni \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} t_j & nagur-are \end{bmatrix}_i + it-PASS-RU & Taro-NOM & Saburo-by & hit-PASS \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{T}{P_{\text{red}}} \begin{bmatrix} F_{\text{oc}} & koto \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{\text{red}} & da \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} T \end{bmatrix} TOP \end{bmatrix} (=(23))$$
NMNL COP.NPST
Lit. 'What Taro was done by Saburo is he was hit.'

The presuppositional clause is situated in Spec of TopP, followed by the topic marker, *wa*. Passive movement of *Taro* takes place in the presuppositional clause. Operator movement also takes place in the presuppositional clause, leaving a verbal variable, which gets pronounced as s- 'do,' a dummy verb inserted at PF to host the passive affix *-are*. In the focus TP, passive movement of *Taro* takes place in parallel with the presuppositional clause. This TP contains FocP, which hosts a fragment answer, as proposed by Merchant (2004). Focus movement takes place, preposing the focused passive phrase headed by *nagur-are* 'hit-PASS' to Spec of FocP, to which *-(r)u* is attached postsyntactically to make an adnominal form for the nominalizer, *koto*. The remnant TP, from which focus movement has taken place, is deleted under identity with the presuppositional clause. (cf. Merchant (2013))

The behavior of doubling morphemes in pseudocleft sentences can be stated as in (31).

(31) a. When an internal argument of V is externalized in the antecedent clause, the same must hold true in the ellipsis clause. The focused phrase must be large enough to

explicitly express the externalization of the internal argument. (e.g. passives (23))

- b. When an internal argument is not affected, doubling of a grammatical morpheme is not necessary. (e.g. causatives (25), benefactives (27))
- c. When honorification is involved in an antecedent clause, it must be explicitly expressed in the ellipsis clause as well. (21)

(31a, b) state that doubling depends on whether an internal argument of V is externalized or not. In this light let us consider (32). When causatives are passivized in the presuppositional clause, both the causative and the passive morpheme must be present in the focus phrase as in (32a), or both must be absent from it as in (32c). It is not possible to retain only a causative or a passive morpheme in the focus phrase, as in (32b).

(32)			Taroo-ga	Saburoo	-ni	s- <u>ase-ra</u>	<u>re</u> -ta-no-v	va	
			Taro-NOM	Saburo-by	y	do-CAUS	E-PASS-P	ST-C-TOP	
	a.	a.	[e-o	kak-ase-	-rare-ru	l	koto]	da.	
			picture-ACC	draw-CA	USE-PA	SS-RU	NMNL	COP.NPS	Т
	b.	?*	[e-o	kak- <u>ase</u> -	-ru/ ka	k-are-ru		koto]	da
			picture-ACC	draw-CA	USE-RU	J/ draw-PA	ASS-RU	NMNL	COP.NPST
	c.		[e-o	kak-u	koto]	da.			
			picture-ACC	draw-U	NMNI	COP.1	NPST		
			Lit. 'What Taro was forced to do by Saburo was (he was forced) to draw a picture.'						

Note that voice mismatch is allowed between the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase in (32c). It is not simple voice matching that is required of pseudocleft sentences. In (32a) it is the causativized V *kak-ase* 'cause to write' that is passivized, and *Taro* undergoes externalization. In this case the passive morpheme must double along with the causative morpheme, as stated in (31a).

$$(33) \begin{bmatrix} T_{\text{TopP}} & T_{\text{arooj-ga}} & Saburoo-ni t_j & t_i\text{-ase-rare-ta} & [C no] \end{bmatrix} \text{-wa} \\ Taro-NOM & Saburo-by & CAUSE-PASS-PST C-TOP \\ \begin{bmatrix} T_{\text{P}} & [P_{\text{redP}} & [V_{\text{P}} & e-o & kak]_i] \text{-u} & [T_{\text{PP}} & Taroo_j\text{-ga} & Saburoo-ni \\ picture-ACC & draw-U & Taro-NOM & Saburo-by \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} t_j & [V_{\text{P}} & e-o & kak]_i] \text{-ase}] \text{-rare} \end{bmatrix} T \begin{bmatrix} F_{\text{oc}} & koto \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{\text{red}} & da \end{bmatrix} T \end{bmatrix} TOP] \\ picture-ACC & draw-CAUSE-PASS & NMNL & COP.NPST \end{bmatrix}$$

On the other hand, in (32c), the structure of which is represented as (33), it is the minimal V and not the causativized V that is passivized, and e 'picture,' the direct object of V, is not externalized. Hence it is possible to focalize the minimal VP *e-o kak-u* 'draw a picture' without doubling the causative and the passive morpheme.

Ellipsis applies in the focus position of pseudocleft sentences with a presuppositional clause as its antecedent. It obeys a parallelism requirement with respect to grammatical proper-

ties of nominals (e.g. externalization of arguments/ target of honorification), and verbal morphology must be focused along with V that indicates that the elided nominals have marked properties (e.g. having undergone externalization/ target of honorification).

5. Conclusion

This paper discussed the properties of VP-focus pseudocleft sentences in Japanese. I have shown that VP-focus constitutes a vP phase in a broad sense. I have also argued that the presuppositional clause of pseudocleft sentences is a question based on the occurrence of a topic marker in the presuppositional clause. Finally, it is demonstrated that the presuppositional clause and the focus phrase are subject to the same parallelism constraint on ellipsis.

References

Akmajian, Adrian. 1979. Aspects of the Grammar of Focus in English. New York: Garland.

- Cho, Sungdai, John Whitman and Yuko Yanagida. 2008. Multiple Focus Clefts in Japanese and Korean. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 44.1: 61-77.
- den Dikken, Marcel, André Meinunger and Chris Wilder. 2000. Pseudoclefts and Ellipsis. *Studia Linguistica* 54.1: 41-89.

Harwood, William. 2014. Being Progressive is Just a Phase: Celebrating the Uniqueness of Progressive Aspect under Phase-based Analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33.2: 523-573.

Heggie, Lorie A. 1988. The Syntax of Copular Structures. PhD dissertation, University of Southern California.

Heycock, Caroline and Anthony Kroch. 1997. Pseudocleft Connectedness: Implication for the LF Interface Level. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 365-397.

Higgins, Francis Roger. 1979. The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English. New York: Garland.

- Hiraiwa, Ken and Shinichiro Ishihara. 2012. Syntactic Metamorphosis: Clefts, Sluicing and In-Situ Focus in Japanese. *Syntax* 15.2: 142-180.
- Meinunger, André. 1998. A Monoclausal Structure for (Pseudo-)cleft Sentences. *Proceedings of the North-Eastern Linguistic Society* 28: 280-300.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. Linguistics and Philosophy 27: 661-738.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and Ellipsis. Linguistic Inquiry 44.1: 77-108.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Haegeman, Liliane (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Ross, John R. 1972. Act. In Davidson, Donald and Gilbert Harman (eds.), Semantics of Natural Language. Dordrecht: Reidel, 70-126.
- Ross, Haj. 2000. The Frozenness of Pseudoclefts Towards an Inequality-based Syntax. *Proceedings from the An*nual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society 36.1: 385-426.
- Sharvit, Yael. 1999. Connectivity in Specificational Sentences. Natural Language Semantics 7.3: 299-339.
- Shlenker, Philippe. 2003. Clausal Equations (A Note on the Connectivity Problem). *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.1: 157-214.