

⇒ 論 說 ⇐

## How are English wh-clefts and it-clefts translated into Japanese?

Yoko Yamada

**Abstract:** This study examines how the discourse functions of two English cleft constructions, the wh-cleft (e.g. *What you have to do is check the train timetable immediately*) and the it-cleft (e.g. *It was John who broke the window*), influence the choice of Japanese constructions in translations. When these two types of English cleft constructions are translated into Japanese, *~ no wa ... da* constructions (henceforth, *wa*-clefts) tend to be chosen as the corresponding construction. However, this does not mean that wh-clefts and it-clefts are always interchangeable: the two types of cleft constructions are significantly different both pragmatically and syntactically. It also does not mean that Japanese *wa*-clefts have all the discourse functions of wh-clefts and it-clefts. By examining empirical data, this study demonstrates that the choice of *wa*-clefts is strongly influenced by the discourse functions of wh-clefts but is less influenced by those of it-clefts. In the case of it-clefts, types of clefted constituents also influence the choice of corresponding constructions.

**Key words:** discourse functions, wh-clefts, it-clefts, *wa*-clefts, translations

### 1. Introduction

This study examines how the discourse functions of two English cleft constructions, the wh-cleft and the it-cleft, influence the choice of Japanese constructions in translations. Consider the following examples from *Genius English-Japanese Dictionary* (fourth edition).<sup>1</sup>

(1) a. What she did was (to) ask for help.

b. Kanozyo-ga okonat-ta no wa tasuke-o motomeru koto dat-ta.  
     she-NOM do-PAST NLZ TOP help-ACC ask thing COP-PAST

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used. ACC: Accusative, CAUS: Causative, COP: Copulative verb, FP: Sentence-final particle, GEN: Genitive, IMP: Imperative form of the verb, LOC: Locative, NOM: Nominative, NLZ: Nominalizer, NONP: Nonpast, PASS: Passive, PAST: Past, POL: Polite, PROG: Progressive, PT: Other particle, Q: Question, QT: Quotative, TE: *te*-form of the verb, TOP: Topic

(2) a. It is your efforts that count in the end.

b. Saigo ni zyuyouna no wa anata-no doryoku da.  
 last PT important NLZ TOP you-GEN hardwork COP

(1a) is a wh-cleft and (2a) is an it-cleft. Following previous studies on cleft constructions (e.g. Delin and Oberlander 1995; Weinert and Miller 1996), let us term the constituent following the copula (i.e. *(to) ask for help* in (1a) and *your efforts* in (2a)) the clefted constituent. We will term the clause introduced by the wh-word in wh-clefts (i.e. *what she did*) and the clause following the clefted constituent in it-clefts (i.e. *that count in the end*) the cleft clause.

Interestingly, when wh-clefts and it-clefts are translated into Japanese, *~ no wa ... da* constructions (henceforth, *wa*-clefts) tend to be chosen as the corresponding construction, as shown in (1b) and (2b). However, this does not mean that wh-clefts and it-clefts are always interchangeable. Both are syntactically built to focus on some constituents in the clause. However, the two types of cleft constructions differ significantly at the pragmatic level (as well as the syntactic level). In addition, Japanese *wa*-clefts do not have all the discourse functions of wh-clefts and it-clefts. Let us briefly overview the discourse functions of wh-clefts, it-clefts and *wa*-clefts.

Wh-clefts, which have also been called pseudo-clefts, have some discourse functions (e.g. Sornicola 1988; Kim 1995; Weinert and Miller 1996; Biber et al. 1999). Weinert and Miller (1996), for example, distinguish the micro-discourse function from the macro-discourse function of wh-clefts. The micro-discourse function is the function inside the ‘immediate clause complex’ (Weinert and Miller 1996: 196), and the macro-discourse function is the function ‘in larger stretches of discourse’ (Weinert and Miller 1996: 196).

According to Weinert and Miller (1996), the micro-discourse function of wh-clefts is to focus on some constituents. (‘To focus on’ means ‘to make salient’ in Weinert and Miller 1996: 194.) Some types of focusing may be overtly contrastive and others covertly contrastive. Focusing on some constituents in wh-clefts goes beyond specifying an unspecified element of a cleft clause — the function that many previous studies have associated with cleft constructions. One reason for this arises from the potential for an ‘independent status of the clefted constituent’ (Weinert and Miller 1996: 195).

Weinert and Miller (1996) suggest that the macro-discourse function is the main function of wh-clefts. According to them, wh-clefts have the macro-discourse function of pointing forwards: wh-clefts often introduce topics or mark an important starting point for the following discourse. Consider example (3) below.

- (3) What I thought I'd do Chairman: as you all know, the most important issue  
at the moment is the poll-tax. (Weinert and Miller 1996: 196)

In (3), the wh-cleft does not have an integrated structure; the cleft clause is not tied to the following chunk and 'is more of a general please-pay-attention message allowing the audience to concentrate their minds before the important information arrives' (Weinert and Miller 1996: 196). According to Weinert and Miller, in their data of a body of task-related dialogues, wh-clefts function to sum up a section of discussion and point forward to a new and important instruction. Linking up with the previous discourse and serving to signpost what follows is the function of wh-clefts found in their spontaneous conversation data, though a section of discussion is less commonly applicable to conversation data.

Weinert and Miller's (1996) macro-discourse function of wh-clefts is consistent with Kim's (1995: 255) 'gist-marking' function of wh-clefts.<sup>2</sup> Examining wh-clefts in spoken data, Kim (1995: 256) points out that a speaker uses wh-clefts to summarise the preceding talk and 'attempts to direct the talk in a certain direction relevant to the action that he purports to initiate'.

Weinert and Miller suggest that unlike wh-clefts, it-clefts are neutral with respect to the direction of the signposting and function 'as neutral attention markers' (Weinert and Miller 1996: 181). Weinert and Miller (1996: 200) regard it-clefts as the preferred cleft for overtly expressing contrast: in their data, while 0.5% of wh-clefts overtly express contrast, 36% of it-clefts do so. The following is an example of the it-cleft overtly expressing contrast.

- (4) We're we're after everything I mean not not not the phonetics because that's  
fairly well known anyway em *it's the SYNTAX we're after*  
(Weinert and Miller 1996: 200)  
(italics and capital letters in the original)

In this example, the clefted constituent is contrasted with the preceding element, *phonetics*.

Weinert and Miller (1996) relate the specificational function to the use of it-clefts. They propose that it-clefts are used when specification of the clefted constituent is primarily important. However, this suggestion should be taken as a tendency rather than as a necessary and sufficient condition in the usage of it-clefts, since their data demonstrate that not all it-clefts

---

<sup>2</sup> Weinert and Miller's (1996) macro-discourse function of wh-clefts is also consistent with Biber et al. (1999). Moreover, as Weinert and Miller (1996) point out, their macro-discourse function of wh-clefts is not unlike Somicola's (1988) textual function of wh-clefts.

have the specificational function. Some it-clefts in which cleft clauses carry new information contribute more to assigning a property to an entity rather than to specifying that entity.<sup>3</sup>

Japanese *wa*-clefts have been examined from several points of view, including semantics and discourse functions.<sup>4</sup> For example, Sunakawa (2005) suggests that *wa*-clefts function to fill a gap between the speaker's information and the hearer's information. According to Sunakawa, the subject of the *wa*-cleft is a proposition in which one element is unspecified. The unspecified element is specified as a referent in the predicate. If we follow Sunakawa (2005), the interpretation of example (5) is as follows: the subject of the *wa*-cleft is the proposition that X broke the window. The unspecified element X is specified as the referent in the predicate (i.e. *Taroo*).

- (5) Madogarasu-o            wat-ta            no            wa            Taroo    dat-ta.  
 window glass-ACC        break-PAST        NLZ        TOP        Taro       COP-PAST  
 'It was Taro who broke the window.'

Sunakawa (2005) suggests that *wa*-clefts denote the specificational function.

So far, we have briefly overviewed the discourse functions of wh-clefts, it-clefts and *wa*-clefts. Unlike it-clefts and *wa*-clefts, wh-clefts function to point forwards. The specificational aspect of clefts is a background feature. Unlike wh-clefts, it-clefts are preferred for overtly expressing contrast. They are used when specification of the cleft constituent is primarily important, consistent with the discourse function of *wa*-clefts. However, there are it-clefts that do not have the specificational function.

The similarities and differences between wh-clefts, it-clefts and *wa*-clefts at the pragmatic level raise questions as to how discourse functions of wh-clefts and it-clefts influence the choice of Japanese constructions in translations. The purpose of this study is to address this question.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, I will introduce the data in this study. Then, I will analyse wh-clefts and it-clefts in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Section 5 is the summary of the study.

<sup>3</sup> Various studies have noted the existence of it-clefts in which cleft clauses express new information (e.g. Prince 1978; Delin and Oberlander 1995; Huddleston and Pullum 2002; Collins 2006; Lahousse and Borremans 2014). However, it is not entirely clear whether the interpretation of what is meant by new/given is the same among previous studies.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Kumamoto (2004) compares *wa*-clefts with wh-clefts and it-clefts, focusing on three points: whether more than one constituent can be a clefted constituent or not, whether the adverb *also* can be added to the clefted constituent or not and whether *everybody/ every one* can be a clefted constituent or not. The results of Kumamoto's (2004) examination suggest that *wa*-clefts and it-clefts share some characteristics.

## 2. Data

For the purpose of this study, first, I manually collected wh-clefts and it-clefts from five British mystery stories and five American mystery stories. They were all published within the last 20 years and have Japanese translations.<sup>5</sup> The books used as the sources of data are listed in Table 1:<sup>6</sup>

Table 1. *Books used as the sources of data*

British/American mystery stories	Japanese translations
Mo Hayder's <i>Gone</i>	<i>Soushitsu</i> (translated by Sumie Kitano)
Reginald Hill's <i>Midnight Fugue</i>	<i>Gozen reiji no fuuga</i> (translated by Sachiko Matsushita)
Peter Lovesey's <i>The Vault</i>	<i>Chika bochi</i> (translated by Yayoi Yamamoto)
Ian Rankin's <i>Exit Music</i>	<i>Saigo no ongaku</i> (translated by Yasuko Nobuhara)
R. D. Wingfield's <i>Winter Frost</i>	<i>Fuyu no furosuto</i> (translated by Megumi Serizawa)
C. J. Box's <i>Open Season</i>	<i>Chinmoku no mori</i> (translated by Yuriko Noguchi)
Dan Brown's <i>The Lost Symbol</i>	<i>Rosuto · shinboru</i> (translated by Toshiya Echizen)
Patricia Cornwell's <i>Dust</i>	<i>Gishiki</i> (translated by Makiko Ikeda)
Jeffery Deaver's <i>Roadside Crosses</i>	<i>Roodo saido · kurosu</i> (translated by Makiko Ikeda)
Robert B. Parker's <i>Painted Ladies</i>	<i>Nusumareta kifujin</i> (translated by Takuro Kagayama)

I collected wh-clefts and it-clefts from the first 300 pages for stories of more than 300 pages long. For stories shorter than 300 pages, I collected wh-clefts and it-clefts from the whole story.<sup>7</sup> The stories depict present-day British/American society.

Weinert and Miller (1996: 176) suggest that the functions of it-clefts in which clefted constituents contain question words, as in (6), differ from those of it-clefts in declarative clauses.

(6) Where is it that you're at the now? (Weinert and Miller 1996: 204)

<sup>5</sup> Ten books were translated by nine translators. This means that the books were translated by different translators. This is an important point, since, as Johansson (2001) points out, translators may have individual preferences.

<sup>6</sup> The first five books are the British mystery stories; the remainder are the American mystery stories.

<sup>7</sup> Among the books used as the sources of data, two American mystery stories, C. J. Box's *Open Season* and Robert B. Parker's *Painted Ladies*, are less than 300 pages.

In addition, Weinert and Miller (1996) note that it is not necessarily easy to distinguish between *it*-clefts without cleft clauses and ‘anaphoric *it* + copula + complement’ structures. Considering these two points, I included only *it*-clefts that have cleft clauses and occur in declarative clauses.

In total, 101 instances of *wh*-clefts and 121 instances of *it*-clefts were obtained. Tables 2 and 3 present the numbers and distribution.<sup>8</sup> The figures in parentheses indicate the percentages of distribution.

Table 2. *Distribution of wh-clefts*

wh-cleft overtly expressing contrast	wh-cleft covertly expressing contrast		TOTAL
	wh-cleft having the function of pointing forwards	others	
40 (39.6%)	38 (37.6%)	23 (22.8%)	101 (100%)

Table 3. *Distribution of it-clefts*

it-cleft overtly expressing contrast	it-cleft covertly expressing contrast		TOTAL
	cleft clause carries new information	cleft clause carries given/accessible information	
57 (47.1%)	40 (33.1%)	24 (19.8%)	121 (100%)

The tables indicate two features with respect to clefts overtly expressing contrast. First, compared with Weinert and Miller (1996), the data in this study contain far more *wh*-clefts expressing overt contrast. Second, there is no sharp difference between *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts with respect to the proportion of instances overtly expressing contrast, which also differs from the results of Weinert and Miller (1996).

After obtaining instances of *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts, I examined how Japanese translators deal with these. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate the results.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> By ‘cleft overtly expressing contrast’, I mean clefts in which the clefted constituent is contrasted with a set of other referents expressed explicitly in the discourse. The *it*-cleft in example (4), for instance, is such a cleft construction. As for the information status of cleft clauses, I applied Chafe’s (1994) notion. In Chafe’s consciousness-based approach to information flow, there are three types of information: new information, given information and accessible information. New information is information newly activated at a given point in a discourse. Given information is already activated, and accessible information was previously semi-active. In my data, cleft clauses do not necessarily carry given/accessible information when *it*-cleft overtly express contrast. Some of them carry new information.

<sup>9</sup> Two instances have a ~ *no ga* ... *da* construction. This construction occurs in a subordinate clause, which is why *ga* is used instead of *wa*. For this reason, I included these instances as instances of *wa*-clefts. Similarly, one instance has a ~ *no mo* ... *da* construction. *Mo* makes a word a topic and it is possible to replace *wa* with *mo* (e.g. Tsukuba Language Group 1995<sup>2</sup>). For this reason, I included it as an instance of a *wa*-cleft.

Table 4. *Japanese translations of wh-clefts*

	wh-cleft overtly expressing contrast	wh-cleft covertly expressing contrast	
		wh-cleft having the function of pointing forwards	others
<i>wa</i> -cleft	32 (80.0%)	4 (10.5%)	10 (43.5%)
noncleft structure	8 (20.0%)	34 (89.5%)	13 (56.5%)
TOTAL	40 (100%)	38 (100%)	23 (100%)

Table 5. *Japanese translations of it-clefts*

	it-cleft overtly expressing contrast	it-cleft covertly expressing contrast	
		cleft clause carries new information	cleft clause carries given/accessible information
<i>wa</i> -cleft	39 (68.4%)	10 (25.0%)	13 (54.2%)
noncleft structure	18 (31.6%)	30 (75.0%)	11 (45.8%)
TOTAL	57 (100%)	40 (100%)	24 (100%)

As Table 4 indicates, Japanese translations vary according to the discourse functions of wh-clefts. When the main discourse function is to focus on some constituents (i.e. the micro-discourse function in Weinert and Miller 1996) and the focusing is overtly contrastive, wh-clefts tend to be translated as Japanese *wa*-clefts. This is because this function is the specificational function and is thus consistent with the function of *wa*-clefts.

By contrast, when the main discourse function of wh-clefts is to point forwards (i.e. the macro-discourse function in Weinert and Miller 1996), wh-clefts tend to be translated as Japanese noncleft structures. In short, the results illustrated in Table 4 demonstrate that the discourse functions of wh-clefts have strong influence on the choice of Japanese constructions in translations.

The influence of discourse functions of clefts on the choice of Japanese *wa*-clefts is weaker in the case of it-clefts (see Table 5). When it-clefts are used to overtly express contrast, specification of the cleft constituent is primarily important. However, approximately 32% of the it-clefts were translations of some noncleft structures.

We shall now take a closer look at the data of wh-clefts (Section 3) and it-clefts (Section 4).

### 3. Translations of wh-clefts

First, let us look at the translations of wh-clefts that overtly express contrast. When wh-clefts that overtly express contrast are translated into Japanese, *wa*-clefts tend to be chosen as the corresponding structures (32 out of 40 instances; 80.0%). Some examples are as follows:

- (7) a. What you're looking at now is a record of the construction work, not the excavation.

(Peter Lovesey, *The Vault*: 25)

b. Keisi-san-ga				ima	goranninat-teir-u		no
police superintendent-Mr-NOM				now	look. POL-PROG-NONP		NLZ
wa,	hakkutu	de	wa	naku,	kensetukouzi-no		kiroku
TOP	excavation	COP	TOP	NEG	construction work-GEN		record
	desu.						
	COP. POL						

(*Chika bochi*: 44)

- (8) a. “You love him?” I said.  
 “I thought I did. What I loved was the mask, the costume of respectability he wore to cover himself.”

(Robert B. Parker, *Painted Ladies*: 105) (underline added)

b. Demo	watasi-ga	aisi-ta		no	wa	kamen,	otto-ga
but	I-NOM	love-PAST		NLZ	TOP	mask	husband-NOM
zibun-o	kakusu	tameni		matottei-ta		rippana	gaiken
self-ACC	hide	in order to		wear-PAST		great	appearance
	dat-ta						
	COP-PAST						

(*Nusumareta kifujin*: 138)

In (7), the clefted constituent is overtly contrasted with the following element, *the excavation*. In (8), the clefted constituent is overtly contrasted with the preceding element, *him*.

We now move on to the case in which wh-clefts function to point forwards. In this case, the predominant Japanese translations of wh-clefts are not *wa*-clefts but noncleft structures (34 out of 38 instances; 89.5%). We see three typical types of noncleft structures as translations of wh-clefts:



- (i) noncleft structures roughly corresponding to the noncleft counterparts of wh-clefts
- (ii) noncleft structures in which the cleft clauses of wh-clefts are translated into some expression illustrating the macro-discourse function of the wh-clefts
- (iii) noncleft structures in which the cleft clauses of wh-clefts are not translated

Let us consider these three types of noncleft structures.

Examples (9) and (10) illustrate type (i).

- (9) a. ‘Any road, I don’t mean right off. Thing is, I’m meeting this lass for lunch there. Twelve o’clock, high noon. What I’d like you to do is watch us.’

(Reginald Hill, *Midnight Fugue*: 80) (underline added)

- b. Kimi-ni-wa        wareware-o        mihat-tei-te        hosii  
 you-PT-TOP        we-ACC        keep watching-PROG-TE        want

(*Gozen reiji no fuuga*: 83)

- (10)a. ‘So you’ve said,’ Rebus interrupted. ‘But what I’m wondering is, how did you know her name and address? She’s not in the phone book.’

(Ian Rankin, *Exit Music*: 114) (Underline added)

- b. douyatte    kanozyo-no    namae    to    zyuusyo-o    sit-ta    no  
 how    she-GEN    name    and    address-ACC    know-PAST    NLZ  
 ka    to    omoi-masi-te    ne.  
 Q    QT    think-POL-TE    FP

(*Saigo no ongaku*: 141)

In (9) and (10), the Japanese translations roughly correspond to the noncleft counterparts of the wh-clefts. (10) is an interesting example. Based on word order, it is clear that the clefted constituent is independent from the cleft clause. Without the cleft clause, the clefted constituent conveys all the information necessary to interpret the speaker’s intention. The independence of the clefted constituent from the cleft clause is emphasised by the comma.

Next, examples (11) – (13) illustrate type (ii).

- (11)a. “What I’m thinking,” Dance began reasonably, “is that he was just *pretending to be a gangbanger.* [...]”

(Jeffery Deaver, *Roadside Crosses*: 48)  
 (italics in the original; underline added)

- b. ‘Kouiukoto zya nai kasira’ dansu-wa odayakani  
 thing like this COP NEG FP Dance-NOM quietly  
 kiridasi-ta. ‘Hannin-wa gyangu-no menbaa-no  
 open-PAST criminal person-TOP gang-GEN member-GEN  
huri-o si-ta.  
 pretending-ACC do-PAST

(*Rodo saido · kurosu*, (*Jou*): 74) (underline added)

- (12)a. Trish laughed. “Year, sounds crazy, I know. What I mean is that it quantified the nation’s emotional state. [...]”

(Dan Brown, *The Lost Symbol*: 98)

(italics in the original; underline added)

- b. Tumari, zenkokumin-no kanzuyoo-no zyoutai-o  
 in other words whole the nation-GEN feeling-GEN state-ACC  
 sokutei suru n desu yo.  
 measure do NLZ COP. POL FP

(*Rosuto · shinboru*, (*Jou*): 144)

- (13)a. [...] and what this suggests to me is someone tampered with the DNA in CODIS and didn’t bother to check what the stain was comprised of or [...]

(Patricia Cornwell, *Dust*: 285) (underline added)

- b. Tumari, CODIS-ni tourokus-are-ta DNA-no deeta-o  
 in other words, CODIS-LOC register-PASS-PAST DNA-GEN data-ACC  
 dareka-ga kaizansi-ta n da to omou wa.  
 someone-NOM change-PAST NLZ COP QT think FP  
 Sono zinbutu-wa, bunseki ni tukaw-are-ta taieki-ga donna  
 that person-TOP analysis PT use-PASS-PAST body fluid-NOM what  
 syurui-no mono dat-ta ka tasikameru no o  
 kind-GEN thing COP-PAST Q make sure NLZ ACC  
 okotat-ta.  
 neglect-PAST

(*Gishiki*, (*Ge*): 166)

In these examples, there are some expressions that illustrate the macro-discourse function of wh-clefts. In (11b), the Japanese expression *kouiukoto zya nai kasira* (‘isn’t it like this?’) signals that the speaker’s conclusion drawn from the preceding discourse is introduced in the following discourse. In (12b) and (13b), the Japanese expression *tumari* (‘in other words’) serves to

express the speaker's summarising the preceding discourse.

Examples (14) – (16) illustrate type (iii).

- (14)a. What I want you to do, Rebus, is crawl away from here and tick off the days on the calendar.

(Ian Rankin, *Exit Music*: 226)

- b. Kimi-wa otonasiku zitaku-e modori, taisyoku-no hi  
 you-TOP quietly home-LOC go back retirement-GEN day  
 made koyomi-ni sirusi-o take-te sugosu n da.  
 until calendar-LOC mark-ACC tick-TE pass days NLZ COP

(*Saigo no ongaku*: 271)

- (15)a. 'Watch you?' she said. This could be worse than she'd imagined.

'Aye. Well no. What I mean is, I'd like you to keep your eyes skinned and see if there's any other sod watching us. [...]'

(Reginald Hill, *Midnight Fugue*: 80) (underline added)

- b. Kimi-wa yoku meohikar-ase-te, hoka ni watasitati-o  
 you-TOP well watch-CAUS-TE other PT we-ACC  
 mihat-teir-u ningen-ga i-nai ka sirabe-te  
 watch-PROG-NONP human-NOM exist-NEG Q check-TE  
 kure.  
 request-IMP

(*Gozen reiji no fuuga*: 84)

- (16)a. "What's the point?" Marino retorts as he glances at me repeatedly.

"What I can tell you is he has one that means something to him. His behavior is calculated and it all starts with what he sees and fantasizes about." Benton predicts and projects, offering details that might sound ludicrous if they came from someone else.

(Patricia Cornwell, *Dust*: 127) (underline added)

- b. Kare ni wa mokuteki-ga ari, sore-wa nanika-no  
 he PT TOP purpose-NOM exist that-TOP something-GEN  
 imi-o motteir-u to iu koto da.  
 meaning-ACC have-NONP QT say thing COP

(*Gishiki, (Jou)*: 242)

In these examples, the cleft clauses of the wh-clefts are not overtly present in the translations.

In (14) – (16), without the cleft clause, the clefted constituent conveys all the information necessary to interpret the speaker’s intention. It is supposed that owing to this feature, the cleft clauses of wh-clefts are not translated into Japanese.

#### 4. Translations of it-clefts

##### 4.1. Translations of it-clefts that overtly express contrast

The data included 57 instances of it-clefts overtly expressing contrast, and approximately 68% of the it-clefts are translated as *wa*-clefts. Some examples are given in (17) – (19).

(17)a. ‘My name’s Roddy Liddle,’ the young man was telling them. ‘I work for Megan.’

‘And who exactly *is* Megan?’ Rebus asked. Liddle stared at him as if he were maybe making a joke. ‘All our boss told us,’ Rebus explained, ‘was to come down here and talk to someone with that name. Apparently she phoned him.’

‘It was me who did the phoning,’ Liddle said, making it sound like yet another arduous task that he’d taken in his stride.

(Ian Rankin, *Exit Music*: 68)

(italics in the original; underline added)

b. Denwa-o            kake-ta            no            wa            watasi            desu  
telephone-ACC    call-PAST        NLZ        TOP        I            COP. POL

(*Saigo no ongaku*: 88)

(18)a. *And you have lost your mind.* “I’m sorry, but you’ve chosen poorly,” Langdon said. “I don’t know anything about any ancient portal.”

“You don’t understand, Professor. It was not I who chose you ... it was *Peter Solomon*.”

(Dan Brown, *The Lost Symbol*: 52)

(italics in the original; underline added)

b. Omae-o            eran-da            no            wa            ore            de            wa            nai ...  
you-ACC            choose-PAST        NLZ        TOP I            COP        TOP        NEG

(*Rosuto · shinboru, (Jou)*: 78)

(19) a. He’s not the same or maybe it’s me who’s changed and I’m seeing him in a way I haven’t before.

(Patricia Cornwell, *Dust*: 144) (underline added)

b. Kawat-ta no wa, mosikasitara watasi-no hou na no  
 change-PAST NLZ TOP perhaps I-GEN side COP NLZ  
 kamosirenai.  
 may

(*Gishiki, (Jou)*: 271)

In these examples, the it-clefts are used to specify unspecified elements of the cleft clauses. Therefore, it is natural that *wa*-clauses are chosen as the corresponding structures.

The question that arises from the results illustrated in Table 5 is as follows: why are as many as 32% of it-clefts that overtly express contrast translated as nonclefts? One possible explanation derives from the tendency of the clefted constituents of it-clefts to be subjects in noncleft counterparts (see Table 6).

Table 6. *Japanese translations of it-clefts that overtly express contrast*

types of clefted constituents in noncleft counterparts \ Japanese translations	<i>wa</i> -cleft	noncleft structure
subject	33	11
object	2	3
others	4	4
TOTAL	39	18

In Japanese, subjects are marked by the particle *ga*. There are several types of *ga*, one of which has the feature of exclusiveness (e.g. Kuno 1973).<sup>10</sup> As examples (20) and (21) demonstrate, this type of *ga* is used to mark clefted constituents of it-clefts, when Japanese translations of it-clefts are noncleft structures roughly corresponding to the noncleft counterparts of the it-clefts.

(20)a. The Poetry Library was a modern building cleverly concealed amidst the tenements. A member of staff sat behind the counter and beamed a smile in their direction. The smile evaporated when Rebus showed her his warrant card.  
 ‘Poetry reading a couple of nights back – Alexander Todorov.’  
 ‘Oh yes,’ she said, ‘quite marvellous. We have some of his books for sale.’  
 ‘Was he in Edinburgh on his own? Any family, that sort of thing ...?’  
 The woman’s eyes narrowed, and she clutched a hand to her cardigan.  
 ‘Has something happened?’

<sup>10</sup> Kuno (1973) suggests that it-clefts are similar to the particle *ga* with respect to the feature of exclusiveness.

It was Clarke who answered.

(Ian Rankin, *Exit Music*: 23) (underline added)

b. Siboon-ga        sore        ni        kotae-ta.  
Siobhan-NOM    it        PT        answer-PAST

(*Saigo no ongaku*: 36)

(21) a. “This isn’t making a damn bit of sense.” Marino is thoroughly frustrated now.  
He looks angry enough to have a stroke.

“Did you talk to this guy?” It’s Machado who asks.

(Patricia Cornwell, *Dust*: 138) (underline added)

b. Machado-ga        kii-ta.  
Machado-NOM    ask-PAST

(*Gishiki, (Jou)*: 260)

In (20b), the particle *ga* contrasts the clefted constituent (i.e. *Siobhan Clarke*) with a limited set of other referents explicitly in the discourse (i.e. *Rebus*). In (21b), *ga* contrasts the clefted constituent (i.e. *Machado*) with a limited set of other referents explicitly in the discourse (i.e. *Marino*).

The following are special cases of this.

(22) a. The one thing he’d made her promise was that there’d be no surprise parties his last week at work. Their boss at Gayfield Square has even offered to host something, but Rebus had thanked him with a shake of the head.

‘You’re the longest-serving officer in CID,’ DCI Macrae had persisted.

‘Then it’s the folk who’ve put up with me who deserve the medal,’ Rebus had retorted.

(Ian Rankin, *Exit Music*: 34-35) (underline added)

b. Ore    ni    naganen    gamansitekure-ta    rentyuu    koso,    houbi    ni  
I    PT    long years    endure-PAST    people    PT    reward    PT  
ataisi-masu            yo  
deserve-POL            FP

(*Saigo no ongaku*: 49)

(23) a. ‘Hi,’ she said. ‘Table for two, please.’

*One* meant you were either a hooker or just sad.

‘Have to be on the upper terrace,’ he said in a rather sexy Italian accent.

‘Garden terrace she is all booked up. Sorry.’

The terrace was on two levels, the upper one protected from the weather by an awning, the lower open to the skies. Today, with little breeze and lots of warm autumn sunshine, it was the al fresco area that was most popular.

(Reginald Hill, *Midnight Fugue*: 118)

(italics in the original; underline added)

- b. Sora-o            saegira-nai            gedan-no            hou-ga            ninki  
 sky-ACC        shot out-NEG        lower terrace-GEN    side-NOM        popular  
 dat-ta.  
 COP-PAST

(*Gozen reiji no fuuga*: 122)

In (22) and (23), like (20) and (21), the noncleft Japanese translations roughly correspond to the noncleft counterparts of the it-clefts, and the clefted constituents of the it-clefts function as the subject in the noncleft counterparts. Example (22) differs from (20) and (21) in that the translation of the clefted constituent is marked by the restrictive particle *koso* rather than by the particle *ga*. *Koso* indicates exclusiveness more strongly than *ga*. Thus, the specification of the clefted constituent becomes more salient with the use of *koso*. As for (23), the salience of the specification of the clefted constituent is enhanced by inserting the expression *no hou* between the clefted constituent and *ga*.

Examples such as (20) – (23) suggest the availability of Japanese noncleft structures for the specification of the clefted constituent functioning as the subject in noncleft counterparts. Unlike in it-clefts, in wh-clefts, clefted constituents tend to be objects in the nonclefted counterparts (see Table 7).

Table 7. Japanese translations of wh-clefts that overtly express contrast

Japanese translations types of clefted constituents in noncleft counterparts	<i>wa</i> -cleft	noncleft structure
subject	2	2
object	20	2
others	10	4
TOTAL	32	8

In Japanese, entities that function as objects are not marked by the particle *ga* except for objects of several verbs such as verbs indicating a person’s feelings (e.g. ‘like’ and ‘dislike’) or a person’s ability. Thus, compared with it-clefts, wh-clefts are more likely to be translated as Japanese *wa*-clefts when their main function is specificational.

Noteworthy examples are those in which it-clefts are translated neither as *wa*-clefts nor noncleft structures roughly corresponding to the noncleft counterparts of it-clefts. Consider the following.

- (24)a. ‘That I don’t love him any more. I’m not even jealous he’s seeing someone.  
I’ve gone way past that. It’s just the injustice of it that gets to me.’

(Mo Hayder, *Gone*: 294) (underline added)

- b. Rihuzin      dat-te      koto      ni      haragatatu      dake      yo  
injustice      COP-TE      thing      PT      get angry      only      FP

(*Soushitsu*: 260)

- (25)a. Even so, it was a different sound that scared Katherine even more [...]

(Dan Brown, *The Lost Symbol*: 251) (underline added)

- b. Sore      izyou      ni      osorosii      betu-no      oto-ga      suru  
that      more      PT      dangerous      another-GEN      sound-NOM      do

(*Rosuto · shinboru*, (*Chuu*): 42)

The clefted constituents in (24a) and (25a) function as the subject in the noncleft counterparts. It is supposed that examples such as (24b) and (25b) reflect the tendency of Japanese to avoid inanimate subjects with transitive verbs.<sup>11, 12</sup>

#### 4.2. Translations of it-clefts that covertly express contrast

The data include 40 instances of it-clefts covertly expressing contrast and cleft clauses carrying new information. Thirty instances (75.0%) are translated not as Japanese *wa*-clefts but as Japanese noncleft structures. 19 out of 30 instances are the ones in which either time expressions or place expressions are the clefted constituents of it-clefts. Examples are provided in (26) – (28).

- (26)a. It was then that her phone sounded.

(Jeffery Deaver, *Roadside Crosses*: 178)

- b. Sonotoki,      keitaidenwa-ga      nat-ta.  
then      cell phone-NOM      sound-PAST

(*Rodo saido · kurosu*, (*Jou*): 258)

<sup>11</sup> ‘Gets to’ in (24a) is not a transitive verb but functions as a transitive verb.

<sup>12</sup> Although we do not deny the possibility that the style of texts influences the choice of constructions in Japanese translations, we do not deal with it in this study.



- (27)a. It was here that the director met with the governor and individual legislators while they were in town for the legislative session and where laws and new regulations were hammered out and concessions were made.

(C. J. Box, *Open Season*: 159)

- b. Koko de kyokutyō-ga kaiki tyū ni tizi ya  
 here LOC director-NOM session during PT governor and  
 giintati to ai, houritu ya atarasii kisei-o  
 legislators PT meet law and new regulation-ACC  
 utidasi tari, ayumiyori-o si tari suru.  
 hammer out PT concession-ACC do PT do

(*Chinmoku no mori*: 210)

- (28)a. Liz handed back the print-out. ‘So what do we do? If she insists, we’ve got to go ahead.’

‘I’ll go and sweet talk the old cow,’ said Frost. ‘You do a bit of back-peddalling with the cabbie: we don’t want him suing for wrongful arrest.’ It was then he noticed how tired and drawn she looked.

(R. D. Wingfield, *Winter Frost*: 17) (underline added)

- b. Furosuto-wa sonotoki hazimete, rizu · moodo-ga zuibun tukareta  
 Frost-NOM then first time Liz Maud-NOM quite tired  
 kao-o siteir-u koto ni kizui-ta.  
 face-ACC do-NONP that PT notice-PAST

(*Fuyu no furosuto*, (*Jou*): 25)

In these examples, the noncleft Japanese translations roughly correspond to the noncleft counterparts of the it-clefts. The clefted constituents are anaphoric and link with the preceding discourse. On the other hand, the information carried by the cleft clauses is new and it assigns a property to the clefted constituents.<sup>13</sup>

It is noteworthy that the data contain three instances of *no da* constructions. In the following examples, it is supposed that the *no da* constructions are used for giving an explanation.

- (29)a. How much easier life would be without love, she thought. The Holy Joes are forever preaching that it’s love that makes the world go round.

(Reginald Hill, *Midnight Fugue*: 209) (underline added)

- b. Ai-ga aru kara koso sekai-wa ugoku no da  
 love-NOM exist because PT world-NOM move NLZ COP

(*Gozen reiji no fuuga*: 208)

- (30) a. The director had been furious for being stood up and it was only through Vern's intervention that Joe was able to later meet with the director and secure the post.

(C. J. Box, *Open Season*: 38) (underline added)

- b. Vaan-no torinasi de youyaku zyoo-wa gozitu  
 Vern-GEN intervention PT finally Joe-NOM later  
 mendan-o yuru-sare-te, syoku-o kaku-hosi-ta no  
 job interview-ACC permit-PASS-TE job-ACC get-PAST NLZ  
 dat-ta.  
 COP-PAST

(*Chinmoku no mori*: 52)

It should be noticed in passing that when it-clefts covertly express contrast and cleft clauses carry new information, clefts contribute more to assigning a property to an entity rather than to specifying that entity. This feature of it-clefts is predicted to be inconsistent with the specificational function of *wa*-clefts. However, the data contain 10 instances in which the it-clefts with this feature are translated as *wa*-clefts (see Table 5). Does this mean that like it-clefts, *wa*-clefts could contribute more to assigning a property to an entity rather than to specifying that entity? To answer the question, a detailed examination of *wa*-clefts using data collected from Japanese texts is necessary.<sup>14</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

This study has examined how the discourse functions of two English cleft constructions, the *wh*-cleft and the *it*-cleft, influence the choice of constructions in Japanese translations. On the basis of empirical research, this study has demonstrated that the influence of the discourse functions of cleft constructions on translation varies according to the type of cleft construction. First, the choice of Japanese *wa*-clefts is strongly influenced by the discourse functions of *wh*-clefts. Second, unlike the case of *wh*-clefts, the choice of Japanese *wa*-clefts is

<sup>13</sup> In (28a), the referent expressed by the subject NP in the cleft clause (i.e. *he*) and the referent expressed by the subject NP in the preceding discourse (i.e. *Frost*) are the same character. So the subject NP *he* presents given information. The information status of the subject NP is illustrated by the use of *wa* in (28b).

<sup>14</sup> Instances in which the subjects of *wa*-clefts carry new information are found in some previous studies on *wa*-clefts. See, for instance, Noda (1996).

influenced less by the discourse functions of it-clefts. In the case of it-clefts, the type of clefted constituent also influences the choice of the corresponding construction. These results deepen our understanding of English cleft constructions and their correspondences in Japanese. The findings also contribute to the field of language education. In order to gain a deeper understanding of English cleft constructions and their correspondences in Japanese, it is necessary to broaden our research; for example, by examining English correspondences of Japanese *wa*-clefts. However, this is left for further studies.

## References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Chafe, Wallace (1994) *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Collins, Peter (2006) *It-clefts and wh-clefts: Prosody and pragmatics*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1706-1720.
- Delin, Judy and Jon Oberlander (1995) Syntactic constraints on discourse structure: The case of *it*-clefts. *Linguistics* 33: 465-500.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, Stig (2001) The German and Norwegian correspondences to the English construction type *that's what*. *Linguistics* 39: 583-605.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun (1995) WH-clefts and left-dislocation in English conversation: Cases of topicalization. In: Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan (eds.) *Word order in discourse*, 247-296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kumamoto, Chiaki (2004) Bunretsu bun no tokuchou ni tsuite. [On some properties of cleft sentences]. *Saga Daigaku Bunka Kyouiku Gakubu Kenkyuu Ronbunshuu [Journal of the Faculty of Culture and Education, Saga University]* 8: 95-104.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The structure of the Japanese language*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Lahousse, Karen and Marijke Borremans (2014) The distribution of functional-pragmatic types of clefts in adverbial clauses. *Linguistics* 52: 793-836.
- Noda, Hisashi (1996) 'Wa' to 'ga'. ['Wa' and 'ga']. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Prince, Ellen F. (1978) A comparison of WH-clefts and *it*-clefts in discourse. *Language* 54: 883-906.
- Sornicola, Rosanna (1988) *It-clefts and wh-clefts: Two awkward sentence types*. *Journal of Linguistics* 24: 343-379.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko (2005) *Bunpoo to danwa no setten: Nihongo no danwa ni okeru shudai tenkai kinoo no kenkyuu*. [The interface between grammar and discourse: A study on functions of topic development in Japanese discourse]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

- Tsukuba Language Group (1995<sup>2</sup>) *Situational functional JAPANESE volume 1: Notes*. Tokyo: Bonjinsha Co. Ltd.
- Weinert, Regina and Jim Miller (1996) Cleft constructions in spoken language. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 173-206.

### Dictionary

*GENIUS English-Japanese Dictionary Fourth edition*. (2006) Tokyo: Taishukan.

### Sources of data

- Box, C. J. (2012) *Open Season*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Brown, Dan (2010) *The Lost Symbol*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Cornwell, Patricia (2013) *Dust*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Deaver, Jeffery (2010) *Roadside Crosses*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Hayder, Mo (2010) *Gone*. London: Bantam Books.
- Hill, Reginald (2010) *Midnight Fugue*. London: Harper.
- Lovesey, Peter (2014) *The Vault*. London: Sphere.
- Parker, Robert B. (2011) *Painted Ladies*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Rankin, Ian (2008) *Exit Music*. London: Orion.
- Wingfield, R. D. (2000) *Winter Frost*. London: Corgi Books.
- Echizen, Toshiya (2012) *Rosuto · shinboru. (Jou) (Chuu)*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Ikeda, Makiko (2013) *Roodo saido · kurosu. (Jou) (Ge)*. Tokyo: Bungeishunju Ltd.
- Ikeda, Makiko (2014) *Gishiki. (Jou) (Ge)*. Tokyo: Kodansha Publishers Ltd.
- Kageyama, Takuro (2012) *Nusumareta kifujin*. Tokyo: Hayakawa Publishing, Inc.
- Kitano, Sumie (2012) *Soushitsu*. Tokyo: Hayakawa Publishing, Inc.
- Matsushita, Sachiko (2011) *Gozen reiji no fuuga*. Tokyo: Hayakawa Publishing, Inc.
- Nobuhara, Yasuko (2010) *Saigo no ongaku*. Tokyo: Hayakawa Publishing, Inc.
- Noguchi, Yuriko (2004) *Chinmoku no mori*. Tokyo: Kodansha Publishers Ltd.
- Serizawa, Megumi (2013) *Fuyu no furosuto. (Jou) (Ge)*. Tokyo: Tokyo Sogensha Co., Ltd.
- Yamamoto, Yayoi (2004) *Chika bochi*. Tokyo: Hayakawa Publishing, Inc.