

ON GRAMMATICAL CODING OF PRE-EXISTING PROPOSITION

Tomoko Yasutake

(Department of Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language)

0. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I will examine and compare discourse-pragmatic functions of 'expletive' *it* in English and *no wa* marking in Japanese.

Consider the following sentences.

- (1) a. *Joo*ho to-yu kotoba ni *joo* no ji ga haitte-iru no wa fushigi de aru.
CM word LC GEN letter NM be-inside mystery is
b. It is a mystery as to why the word *joo*, which means feelings and passion, forms the better half of *joo*ho, or "information." (WT)
- (2) a. Zatsuon to gakuon no sabetsu o topparatte miseta no wa John Cage datta.
noise and musical sound GEN distinction AC remove show was
b. It was John Cage who eradicated the difference between noise and musical sound. (WT)

(1) and (2) are examples of extraposition and cleft construction, respectively. The juxtaposition of Japanese and English sentences reveals the unexpected yet remarkably perfect matching of *no wa* marking of Japanese embedded sentence and the English so-called 'expletive' *it* construction.

In what follows, the notion of 'prior existence' proposed in Yasutake (1991) as the key notion behind *no* nominalization in Japanese, will be extended to elucidate the nature of many different uses of 'expletive' *it* in English. This concept of prior existence, as we shall see below, is distinct from such discourse-relevant notions as 'presupposition' and 'givenness' of information. The coding of information as pre-existing has a pragmatic and cognitive effect of enforcing solidarity among discourse participants.

In order to guarantee true (not imaginary) correspondence between the two languages, I shall avoid introspectively-derived examples; crucial sentences in the discussion, including (1) and (2) above, are mostly from naturally occurring data¹.

1. *IT* AS A REFERENTIAL MARKER

The initial pronoun in sentences like (1b) and (2b) is commonly held to be a 'pronominal copy', which has no value beyond that of plugging a grammatical hole.

This view is still shared by many linguists today. Collins (1991), for example, regards it as a non-referential pronoun and Declerck (1991) calls it as an expletive (dummy) pronoun. Bolinger (1977 : 66), however, had a different idea and claimed that 'expletive' *it* is a referential pronoun whose meaning contrasts with its absence. Here are some of the examples Bolinger gave as evidence for the meaningfulness of *it*.

- (3) a. ?It's that he's a Republican that I find so objectionable.
 b. It isn't that he's a Republican that I find so objectionable.
- (4) a. *That the president has been indicted will be announced.
 b. It will be announced that the president has been indicted.
- (5) Q: What do you think of running him as a candidate?
 A1 : *To do that would be a good idea.
 A2 : It would be a good idea to do that.

In (3b), the speaker is negating a previously held assumption. (3a), however, sounds awkward out of the blue, since it contains nothing to guarantee its discourse-referential status. (4) refers to a future event but the content of the announcement is already known to the speaker at the time of utterance. In (5A2) 'expletive' *it* refers to a previously held proposition-- the speaker is picking up the idea from his interlocutor. What is relevant to all these cases, according to Bolinger, is the contrast between something previously unknown and something already settled. His claim may be summarized as follows.

- (6) 'Expletive' *it* is used to refer to something already settled, i.e. introduced.

Bolinger's argument, though essentially on the right track, falls short of accounting for the type of cleft which Prince (1978) calls information-presupposition *it*-cleft. For example, sentence (1b), which is (the English version of) the opening sentence of a short essay, lacks any prior basis for the information referred to by *it*. Likewise, there are cases where explicit antecedent is hard to find in the discourse environment. In the following sections, I will demonstrate that the key to solving the mystery around 'expletive' *it* comes from *no wa* construction in Japanese.

2. NO AS A PRIOR EXISTENCE MARKER

Japanese, which is a verb-final, topic prominent language, has grammatical means and systems quite different from English. For example, it does not have a grammaticalized pronoun system, let alone, expletive elements. If we go back to examples (1) and (2) once again, we notice the parallelism of *no wa* marking of embedded proposition in Japanese and the occurrence of 'expletive' *it* in English. We may posit the following (7) as a working hypothesis at this point.

- (7) Japanese *no wa* construction serves more often than not the same purpose as English 'expletive' *it* construction

Compare (1) with the following sentences with *koto* or *to* as the embedding marker.

- (8) a. Ano kata ga Long okusama ni hanashikake-nakatta koto wa

- that person NM Mrs. to speak-not-PAS
 watashi betsuni kamaimas-en wa.
 I particularly mind-not EM
- b. I do not mind his not talking to Mrs. Long. (PP)
- (9) a. Meikai ni shiji-suru koto wa, kotoba no kino no hyozan no ikkaku
 clearly as denote-do word LK function LK iceberg LK tip
 ni suginai.
 than not-more
- b. Denoting things clearly is only the tip of the iceberg as far as the function
 of language goes. (WT)
- (10) a. Zatsuo ga tsuneni akuyaku de-arui to wa kagira-nai.
 noise NM always the villain be limit-not
- b. Noise is not always the villain. (WT)
- (11) a. Sore ni ichiban kangeki-shita joshi-gakusei ga nochi-ni bokuno
 that by most moved co-ed NM later my
 nyobo ni-naru to wa chittomo shira-nai de...
 wife become not-at-all know-not and
- b. How could I know at the time that the girl who thought my half better than
 anybody else's would become my ...better half. (WT)

Careful examination of correspondence of Japanese and English expressions like the ones above reveals that neither *koto wa* marking nor *to wa* marking corresponds to 'expletive' *it* construction. To look for English equivalents of *koto* and *to* marking is a study in its own right, but here I will concentrate on *no* marking².

The postpositional particle *wa* is a well-known topic marker with a variety of discourse-pragmatic functions, as discussed extensively in Hinds et al. (1987). What is less known is the function of post-sentential *no* marking. Even the syntactic status of this grammatical item is far from being consentaneous among scholars. Kuno (1973) and N.A. McCawley (1978), for instance, argue that post-sentential *no* is a kind of complementizer. Nakau (1973) identifies the same as a nominalizer by way of proving that an embedded sentence followed by *no* constitutes a noun phrase. Kitagawa and Ross (1982) argue that it is a genitive-like connective between an embedded sentence and a PRO head noun. Details of syntactic arguments aside, I simply choose to subscribe to Nakau's nominalizer theory, and gloss the examples accordingly.

Kuno (1973) regards *no* in the following (12) and (13), which is a post-VP marker, as of different origin from *no* in (12) and (13).

- (12) John ga kekkon tyokugo shinde-simatta no wa higeki da.
 NM marriage right-after died tragedy is.
 'It is a tragedy that John died right after he got married.'
- (13) John ga sono yuwaku o kippari shirizoketa no wa migoto da.

NM the temptation resolutely rejected admirable is
 'It is admirable that John rejected the temptation resolutely.'

- (14) Eigo o hanasu no wa muzukashii.

English AM speak difficult.

'It is difficult to speak English.'

- (15) Hosokawa Shusho wa shotoku-zei genzei o jissurusu no wa tomen

Premier TM income tax reduction AM enforce presently

konnan to-no kangae o shimesita.

difficult as thought AM showed

'Prime Minister Hosokawa revealed that it would be difficult to enforce tax reduction for the time being.'

Kuno's argument is unfounded since both *no*'s are post-sentential nominalizing markers, hence one and the same. The only differences between the two types reside in the finiteness of the embedded sentence and the existence of PRO subject. Nakau (1977), who named the construction such as (1a), (12)-(15) Japanese cleft construction, paid no attention to the correspondence with its possible English counterpart. The following are examples from Nakau.

- (16) Brutus ga koroshi-ta no wa Caesar da.

NM kill-PAS is

'It was Caesar that Brutus killed. / The one who Brutus killed was Caesar.'

- (17) Caesar o koroshi-ta no wa Brutus da.

AM kill-PAS is

'It was Brutus that killed Caesar. / The one who killed Caesar was Brutus.'

- (18) Taro ga terebi de mi-ta no wa, kigeki da.

NM TV on see PAS comedy is

'It was a comedy that Taro watched on TV. / What Taro watched on TV was a comedy.'

- (19) Taro ga ko-naka-tta no wa byooki datta kara da.

NM come Neg PST ill was because is.

'It was because he was ill that Taro did not come. / The reason why Taro did not come was that / because he was ill.'

Kuno (1973), dealing with constructions like (12) and (13), the English version of which contain extraposed sentential subjects, argues that post-sentential *no* is used for representing a concrete event. Thus, some, such as (12) and (13) above, represent an action, state or event that the speaker presupposes to be true. It was this observation that led Kuno to set aside the cases like (14) and (15) as being of a different origin. For him they do not contain any presupposition about the truth value of the proposition. However, his argument is untenable because, as Kuno himself admits, not all sentences

with *no* marker carry presupposition. The following (20), for instance, involves no presupposition.

- (20) Mary wa John ga kuru no o kitaishite-ita.
 TM NM come AM was-expecting
 'Mary was expecting that John would come.'

Kuno's contention that (20) represents a strong conviction on the part of the subject that John would come is untenable, since the following (21) is equally grammatical in an appropriate context.

- (21) Mary wa John ga kuru no o kitaishite-inakatta.
 TM NM come AM was-not-expecting
 'Mary was not expecting that John would come.'

(Ironically, sentence (21) carries the implication that, contrary to Mary's expectation, John actually did come.) What is at work here is something other than the notion of presupposition.

Nakau (1973) dealt with clefts, but not with *no wa* construction, in connection with extraposition in English, whereas Kuno (1973), who discussed equivalent of extraposition, did not concern himself with cleft constructions. Yasutake (1991), dealing with both, identifies the function of all instances of post-sentential *no*-marking, as follows.

- (22) Post-sentential *no* nominalizes and objectifies a complete or potential proposition, thereby endorsing it the status of prior existence.

Prior existence is a notion which has nothing to do with truthvalue. A proposition or information is presented as pre-existing, if the speaker believes it to be in the air at the time of utterance. The addressee may or may not share his view, but for the speaker there is no questioning about its existence in the universe around him. Pre-existing information is thus not necessarily retrievable from immediate linguistic or situational context.

The notion of prior existence is superficially similar to such notions as presupposition or givenness of information. In fact, the three would sometimes overlap or coincide in each other's definition. They are, however, intrinsically different linguistic notions. We talk about presupposition when the speaker presupposes that the proposition of the action, state or event represented by the embedded sentence has the truth value true. We say that a piece of information is given (old, predictable) if it is recoverable from the preceding context and is a part of shared knowledge among the speech participants. The following (23) and (24) are the definitions by Collins (1991) and Kuno (1978), respectively.

- (23) 'Presupposition' involves a complete or potential proposition whose knownness or assumability is required for the success of the sentence. A presupposition is, in other words, a sort of 'given proposition.'
 (24) An element represents 'old, predictable (given)' information if it is retrievable

from the preceding context.

In sentences like (25) below, it is hardly likely that the content of the part which precedes *no* is known to the hearer or recoverable from the preceding context, though, for the speaker, there is no doubt about its existence prior to the time of utterance.

- (25) a. (Over the telephone)
 Ima tsuita n (<no) desu yo. Kore-kara sochira e ikimasu kara ne.
 now arrived is EX from now there to go because EM
 'I just arrived. I will be on my way to your place.'
- b. Atama ga itai no desu.
 head NM ache is
 'I have a headache.'

Let us posit the definition of prior existence as follows.

- (26) A complete or potential proposition is presented as 'pre-existing' if the speaker chooses to impose upon the hearer an obligation to assume its existence prior to the speech time, even when its retrievability is not textually or situationally warranted.

3. PRESENTATION OF PRE-EXISTING PROPOSITION

In the preceding section, we have identified the functional characteristics of *no*-nominalization in Japanese as that of prior existence marker. In what follows, I will try to demonstrate how English constructions with 'expletive' *it* serve the purpose of coding information as pre-existing.

Consider the following.

- (27) a. Watashi ga nonda no wa sherry desu.
 I NM drank
 b. It was sherry that I drank.
- (28) a. Sono hon o katta no wa kino desu.
 that book AM bought yesterday is
 b. It was yesterday that (I) bought that book.

In translating English cleft constructions, like (27), or extraposition constructions, like (28), into Japanese, the translator almost unconsciously uses *no wa* marking and vice versa. It is rather surprising that to my knowledge nobody thus far seems to have taken note of this correspondence. Following are some more examples from naturally occurring discourses of cases where English sentences with 'expletive' *it* appear in the translation of Japanese sentences with *no* nominalizer followed by topic marker *wa*.

- (29) a. America-jin demo, guntai no seifuku o kiru to, soon o
 Americans even military LK uniform AM wear then noise AM
 maki-chirasu koto ni mu-shinkei ni natte-shimau no wa naze-daro?
 spread matter to indifferent to become why

- b. Why is it that even Americans, when they don military uniforms,
become insensitive in their attitude toward public noise? (VPVD)
- (30) a. Sono Sharaku o, Velazquez ya Rembrandt to narabu sekai sandai
that AM and with equal world three
shozogaka no hitori ni kazoeta no wa Doitsu no Julius Kurt datta.
portraitist LK one as list Germany LK was
- b. It was the German, Julius Kurt, who ranked Sharaku as one of the world's
greatest portrait painters along with Velazquez and Rembrandt. (VPVD)

(29) is another example of extraposition and (30) of cleft. In neither (29) nor (30), the information marked by *no wa* and 'expletive' *it* is presupposed or given in the prior context. Sentence (29) is sandwiched between a comment on Americans' sensitivity to noise in public places and a discussion of the problem of Air Base noise pollution. Sentence (30), which follows an introductory comment on the mysterious painter, heads a new section on his recognition overseas. Although 'informationally given' items do occur inside, both sentences as a whole provide new information.

What is special about the two devices, i.e. English construction with 'expletive' *it* and Japanese *no wa* marking of embedded proposition is that they both identify the information as taken for granted and preclude any doubt or questioning of its existence, even if it is obviously unknown to the addressee. Sentences (31) and (32) below, like (1), appear at the beginning of separate essays. They provide clear cases of contextually new information being presented as pre-existing.

- (31) a. Ichibann yakkai-na no wa jishin de-mo taifu de-mo nakute,
most troublesome earthquake or typhoon or not
watashi-tachi jishin no karada de wa nai no ka.
our own LK body is TM not LK Q
- b. It is our own bodies which cause us trouble, even more than
typhoons or earthquakes. (WT)
- (32) a. 'Oi' to ieba ocha ga dete, 'are' to ieba necktie ga arawareru no wa,
hey Comp say tea NM come-up that Comp say NM appear
tannaru shukan no kyoyu de-atte, nani-mo inspiration ga
mere custom LK sharing be not-at-all NM
hataraku kara dewa arumai.
work because be guess-not
- b. It is simply the force of shared habit, not inspiration, which
explains why the wife knows to bring the tea when asked for "the whatsis"
and the necktie for "the whosis." (WT)

The topics of the sentences above are context-independent. The authors present the information marked by *no wa* (or 'expletive' *it*) as assumable at the outset of their essays. The readership is thus made to share the view of the author's, or to quickly introspect and activate the relevant piece of information in their minds.

Consider next the following sentences with discourse topics provided in the preceding contexts.

- (33) a. *Utai ya shigin ga karada ni ii no wa tashika rashii.*
 and NM body to good certain appear
 b. *It definitely appears to be the case that chanting utai and shigin is good for one's health.* (WT)
- (34) a. *Honmono no mukuchi-de iru no wa muzukashii.*
 genuine LK silent-be remain difficult
 b. *It's tough to be an expert at silence.* (WT)
- (35) a. *Konna-fu ni -- konna shakai de ikuban-mo sugosu no wa*
 this-way like this society in many evening spend
 nantomo gaman ga naranaitte kangaete irassharu no yo.
 no-way patience NM impossible think be Nom EX
 b. *You are considering how insupportable it would be to pass many evenings in this manner--in such society...* (PP)
- (36) a. *Watashi-tachi no nenpai ni naru to, mainichi atarashiku hito*
 we LK age to become then everyday anew person
 to chikazuki ni naru nado-to-yu no wa, amari yukai-na mono
 with acquainted to become like much pleasant thing
 ja-nai wa.
 neg EX
 b. *At our time of life it is not so pleasant, I can tell you, to be making new acquaintances every day.* (PP)

Sentence (33) appears in the context where the discourse topic is 'health'. The information marked by *no wa* or 'expletive' *it*, though unknown to the reader, is inferable from the preceding discourse. Sentence (34) is the concluding sentence of a short essay on silence, hence context dependent, and the information marked by *no wa* or 'expletive, *it* is indirectly retrievable. In these particular examples, the embedded proposition is presented as pragmatically known information; a sort of shared knowledge in the immediate community, even though it is not given in the preceding discourse. (35) and (36) are utterances containing information which is coherent to the topic of the conversation³.

Quite a few researches have been conducted on the discourse-functions of English clefts and pseudo-clefts, but to my knowledge not much attention has been paid to those of extraposition. It has traditionally been assumed that the main communicative effect of extraposition construction is that of placing a 'heavy' or grammatically complex unit at the end of the sentence to accommodate processing by the addressee. However, Japanese, which utilizes postpositional particle, rather than word order and 'expletive' elements, tolerates top-heavy sentences. As for the end-focus principle (cf. Quirk et al., 1985) both languages seem to observe it alike as far as unmarked word

order is concerned. Then what is the reason d'être of extraposition operation? What is notable here is that the examples of extraposition above are all expressions of the speaker's subjective, often negative, attitude toward, or probability judgement of, a proposition which he treats as pre-existent and a part of everybody's common knowledge. We cannot say anything definite without conducting ample quantitative study.

The following type of extraposition with a communication verb as the main predicate does not conform to this observation.

- (37) a. It is reported that he will run for Congress.
 b. Kare wa kaingiin ni rikkoho suru soda.
 he TM congressman to run do I hear

Here the Japanese equivalent does not involve *no wa* marking. The same thing can be said of (4) above. An independent study seems to be needed for the treatment of this type of extraposition.

4. OTHER EQUIVALENTS OF *NO WA* CONSTRUCTION

We have seen above that post-sentential *no wa* construction as a prior existence marker, has its functional equivalent in English 'expletive' *it* construction. However, *no wa* marking seems to correspond to pseudo-clefts in English as well. Since Japanese has *wh*-words but not expletive grammatical items equivalent to 'it', better structural correspondence obtains between *no wa* and pseudo-cleft. As the sentences in (16)–(19) exemplify, it is often the case that we can use either cleft or pseudo-cleft constructions in translating *no wa* sentences into English. However, in cases like the following, cleft construction is unusable.

- (38) a. Wakatte-iru no wa, Kansei 6-7 nen no 10-ka-getsu kan ni, Sharaku
 known-be year LK months period during
 no rakkan no aru yaku 140 ten no ukiyoe ga nokotta
 LK seal LK exist about piece LK woodblock prints NM remain
 to-yu-u koto dake de-aru.
 that fact only is
 b. What is known is that there are about 140 woodblock prints with
 Sharaku's seal on them produced during 10 months in 1794 and 1795.
 (VPVD)

- b' * It is that there are about 140 woodblock prints with Sharaku's seal on them
 produced during 10 months in 1794 and 1795 that is known.

This shows that in some cases cleft construction and pseudo-cleft construction are interchangeable but in others they are not. Prince (1978) and Collins (1991) are two representative works on the difference between various types of clefts and pseudo-clefts in English. If we pursue this problem further, an interesting research may be conducted along their lines.

It must be noted, as the following (39) demonstrates, that English cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions are not the only devices equivalent to Japanese *no wa* construction. Consider the following case.

- (39) a. Kyoshi o shite-ite ichiban komaru no wa, shiranai koto o
 teacher AM doing most be-in-trouble ignorant thing AM
 shitsumon-sareta toki de-aru.
 was-asked time is
- b. The bitterest pill for a teacher pops up when he is asked something he doesn't know. (WT)

Thus, other expressions are possible and at times work better in translating *no wa* constructions. However, in this particular case, it is possible to express the same idea using pseudo-cleft. In place of (39b), we can say, for instance, as follows.

- (39) c. What a teacher loathes most is answering a student's question which is beyond his knowledge and ability.

The following are examples where various types of clefts and pseudo-clefts, other than basic *it*-cleft are used to translate Japanese *no wa* construction into English.

- (40) a. "Sekai wa baanto de wa naku mesomeso to owaru," to-yu Elliot
 world TM bang with TM not whimper as finish conj
 no shiku ni katsute miserareta no wa shuumatsuron-teki naiyo
 GEN verse by once charmed eschatology-like content
 yorimo giongo no kooka no sei datta ka-mo-sire-nai.
 than onomatopoeia GEN effect GEN cause was may
- b. The reason why I was once fascinated by Eliot's line that the world will go out with a whimper and not a bang may be attributable more to its onomatopoeic effect than its eschatological content. (WT)
- (41) a. Oto to imi toshintai no kankei ga gakumon-teki-ni kaimei
 sound and meaning and body LK relation NM scholarly solved
 sareru no wa itsu no hi ka?
 be nom TM when LK day Q
- b. When will the day come when scholars will be able to elucidate the relationship between sound, meaning and the body? (WT)
- (42) a. Vocalese ya scats ga tokini kashi no aru uta yori
 and NM sometimes words LK be song than
 yuben-na no wa, shinshin ga mibunka-na jotai ni
 eloquent LK TM body-and-soul NM undifferentiated state in
 arawareru to-yu mono no chikara daroo ka?
 appear conj thing LK power may Q
- b. The reason why songs composed of vocalese and scats are occasionally more eloquent than ones with words may be due to the power of soul, the soul in which the mind and body appear in an undifferentiated state.

(WT)

- (43) a. Mizukara no uchi-naru zatsuen ni koshite 0.1 percent no
 self LK from-inside noise in resisting LK
 kakusareta imi o saguru no wa kotoba ni yoru
 hidden meaning AM seek words on depend
 dentatsu ni-oite mo onaji da.
 communication on also same is.

- b. Exploring that .1percent of meaning in defiance of the rest which is noise
 produced by oneself is what verbal communication is all about as well.

(WT)

- (45) a. Otoko nara dare de-mo, mochiron boku o fukumete, jibun ga
 men if any be of-course I AC include self NM
 Hamlet da to omou no wa, kotoba ni nara-nai-de ita jibun no
 is conj think words to become-not be self LK
 nazo no bubun ga Hamlet ni-yotte gengo-ka sareru kara de-arau.
 riddle LK part NM by language-put-into be because be
- b. The fact that all men — and, of course, I'm no exception — identify with
 Hamlet comes form Hamlet verbalizing for them the riddle of the part of
 their own identity which has remained silent. (WT)

There is no evidence that the same distinctions as pointed out by Prince (1978) and Collins (1991), are present in Japanese. We need a corpus-based study of discourse environment of a vast majority of cleft constructions in Japanese before we can say anything definite on the possible distributional properties of various clefts and pseudo-clefts. All I can say at this point is that correspondence between *no wa* construction and various types of cleft or pseudo-cleft, depends upon a combination of syntactic and semantic factors. Another point of interest is the existence of some factors which would prevent the correspondence between *no wa* marking and English clefts/pseudo-clefts, as in the case of (4) and (37).

5. CONCLUSION

We have looked at various cases of correspondence between English 'expletive' *it* and Japanese *no wa* construction and arrived at the following hypothesis.

- (46) English 'expletive' *it* and Japanese *no wa* marking each presents a complete or potential proposition which is pre-existing and assumable at the time of utterance.

Sometimes the information marked by these devices is discourse referential and recoverable, but frequently it is not. It may be something that is in the air or pre-existing at the time of speech, at least for the speaker. Their constructional meaning is, "this is established prior to the utterance of this sentence"

The cognitive effect of these grammatical devices is to send a signal to the hearer

to be cooperative by informing him that if the content of the proposition is not found in the immediate context, it is a part of pragmatic knowledge of everybody concerned. Viewed differently, these constructions put the hearer on the alert by sending the message, "you must be able to activate this quickly". The speaker then goes on to supply the missing piece of information or comment on the pre-existing theme. This is precisely the reason why the proposition in question is spelled out. If the relevant information is contextually retrievable, pro-forms or zero anaphora is more likely to be used.

English 'expletive' *it* and Japanese *no wa* marking both have a favorable side effect of establishing solidarity among speech participants. By requiring the listener to assume the content of the proposition as pre-existing, the speaker succeeds in inviting solidarity and mutual cooperation.

Notes

1. Examples marked by WT, VPVD, and PP are citations from the following.
 WW: Tanigawa, S., Y. Odajima, Y. Takahashi and R. Pulvers. 1985. *Words in Transit*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
 VPVD: *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*. Vol. 70. 1987. Tokyo: Hara Shobo.
 PP: Austen, J. *Pride and Prejudice*. Modern Library College Editions. 1950 (Japanese Translation by Tomoji Abe, 1964)
2. Kuno (1973)'s claim that *koto* presents a factual but abstract concept and *to* presents a non-factual concept appears to be correct. Sentences like (8) and (9) may tempt us to claim correspondence between *koto wa* marking of proposition and English gerundive construction. But I will leave this issue for future research.
3. They are, incidentally, examples where the English version is the original and the Japanese version is the translation. Exactly the same correspondence is observed here as in the reverse case, where the translation is made from Japanese into English.

References

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. *Meaning and form*. London: Longman.
- Collins, Peter C. 1991. *Cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions in English*. London: Routledge.
- Declerck, Renaat. 1991. *A comprehensive descriptive grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199-244.
- Hinds, John. et al. eds. 1987. *Perspectives on topicalization: The case of Japanese "wa"*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Le Van Cu. 1988. 'No' *ni yoru bun umekomi no kozo to hyogen no kino*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Kitagawa, Chisato and Claudia N. G. Ross. 1982. Prenominal modification in Chinese and Japanese. *Linguistic Analysis* Vol.9, No.1.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- McCawley, N.A. 1978. Epistemology and Japanese syntax: complementizer choice. *CLS* 14: 272-284.
- Nakau, Minoru. 1973. *Sentential complementation in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Prince, Ellen. 1978. A comparison of WH-clefts and *it*-clefts in discourse. *Language* 54: 883-906.
- Quirk, Randolph. et al. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Harlow, Essex:

ON GRAMMATICAL CODING OF PRE-EXISTING PROPOSITION

Longman.

Yasutake, Tomoko. 1991. Hobun-meidai no kison-sei to setsumei. *Gendai eigogaku no ayumi*.

Tokyo: Kaitakusha

(Received September 13, 1993)