

SOME REMARKS ON PSEUDO-CLEFT SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

ALEKSANDRA MIESZEK

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

1. *Pseudo-cleft sentences in English*¹.

Pseudo-cleft sentences are sentences composed of a *wh*-relative clause functioning as a subject or complement (Quirk 1972: 954), a copula verb — the presence of which is a characteristic feature of these constructions — and a constituent made prominent by its occurrence in the post-copular position. Their pattern can be represented in the following way:

$$S_{\text{rel}} V_{\text{cop}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{COMPLEMENT} \\ \text{SUBJECT} \end{array} \right\}$$

Two types of relative clauses can appear at the beginning of the pseudo-cleft sentences: the clauses with a nominal phrase containing a head-noun and headless relative clauses, e.g.,

- 1) *The one* Nixon chose was Agnew.
Who Nixon chose was Agnew.
- 2) *The thing* that John bought was a car.
What John bought was a car.
- 3) *The time* at which I met John was 4 o'clock.
When I met John was at 4 o'clock.

A more detailed pattern is as follows:

$$(N) \text{ wh-rel} \xrightarrow{S_{\text{rel}}} V_{\text{cop}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Comp} \\ \text{Subj} \end{array} \right\}$$

¹ The main source of this article is Akınajian (1969).

N=noun; wh_{rel}=wh-relative pronoun; S_{rel}=relative clause; V_{cop}=copula verb; Comp=complement; Subj=subject.

The pronoun *one* (singular or plural) may be the head of the initial relative clause. Due to the number agreement, a singular head must be followed by singular forms of: the verb in the relative clause, copula, and the element in the focus, i.e. in the post-copular position. Person agreement is only partially observed. Since the head-pronoun is always the third person, the verb in the relative clause will naturally reflect this dependency by taking a third person form too. The copula will also appear in the third person, disregarding the form of the personal pronoun that may follow it.

4) *The one who likes coffee is you.*

5) *The one who knows everything is me.*

Moreover, all the personal pronouns that occur in the focus are in the objective case². It is only in the inverted pseudo-cleft sentences, in which the focus pronoun takes the subject position, that the subject pronoun is marked for nominative. The copula agrees, then, with the subject both in number and in person; the verb of the relative clause agrees with the relative pronoun or its subject.

6) *I am the one who ^{does}_{*do} this job.*

7) *I am the one who(m) he wants to meet.*

8) *He is the one who I want to meet.*

9) *They are the ones who never know what to do.*

Another interesting point is provided by the reflexive pronouns used whenever an identity of reference takes place. The reflexive pronoun is either a third person singular or plural depending on the form of the head-pronoun. Consequently, there is no person agreement between the focus pronoun and the reflexive.

10) *The one who shaves himself with a (...) razor is not me.*

11) *The ones who nearly drowned themselves out in the lake are you and me (Akmajian 1969: 7).*

If, however, the personal pronoun is shifted from the focus position to the front of the sentence and functions as a subject, the reflexive pronoun agrees with it.

12) *I am the one who cut myself.*

13) *I am the one who has to protect myself (Akmajian 1969: 7).*

² O. Jespersen notices that "on the whole the natural tendency has been towards a state in which the nominative of pronouns is used only where it is clearly the subject) and where this is shown by close proximity to (...) a verb (generally before a verb) while the objective is used everywhere else" (quoted by Akmajian 1969: 4).

This is the only case in which the person agreement is permitted. The following sentences are considered unacceptable.

14) **The one that cut myself is me.*

15) **The one that cut yourself is you.*

16) **The ones that cut ourselves are us (Akmajian 1969: 8).*

So, the form of the reflexive pronoun is essentially determined by the head of the initial relative clause, and may be either a third person singular or plural.

The head pronoun, which at the same time is the subject of the pseudo-cleft sentence, also determines the form of the possessive pronouns. They are third person singular and plural, depending on the number of the head.

17) *The one who looked after his child was me³.*

18) *The ones who prepared their breakfast were us.*

The agreement between the possessive pronouns and the head of the pseudo-cleft sentence appears to be subject to no exception. Even phrases in which the person identity between the subject and the possessive pronoun is semantically relevant conform to this pattern when pseudo-clefted (Akmajian 1969).

19) *I turned up my nose at the suggestion (Hornby 1963: 1089).*

20) *The one who turned up her nose was me.*

21) **The one who turned up my nose at the suggestion was me.*

22) *We could not contain ourselves for joy.*

23) *The ones who could not contain themselves for joy were Jim and I.*

The above examples point to the syntactic role of the head of the initial clause in the formation of two agreement patterns prevailing in the structure of the pseudo-cleft sentence — number and person agreements. First of all, it imposes the number on the verb of the clause, on the copula and the focus element. Secondly, it requires the person concord with the verb of the clause and with the copula. This regularity justifies the peculiar co-occurrence of the first person focus pronoun with the third person possessive which refers to it.

The head position may be also filled in by such words as *thing, place, reason, way, etc.*

23) *The one (who) Nixon chose was Agnew.*

24) *The thing that John bought was a car.*

25) *The place where I saw John was Boston.*

26) *The time at which I met John was 4 o'clock.*

³ Sentences 17 and 18 are ambiguous in that the third person possessive is not necessarily coreferential with the first person pronoun in the focus. We can say:

The one who looked after my child was him.

as well as

The one who looked after his child was me.

The coreferentiality will be made clear if the possessive occurs with the adjective *own*:

The one who looked after his own child was me.

27) *The reason* that John came was to irritate me.

28) *The way* John did that was by standing on a ladder (Akmajian 1969: 14).

The agreement holding within these sentences concerns the number alone. The person does not come into question, since the focus elements are complements and adverbials.

Some relative clauses of the pseudo-cleft sentences seem not to admit of any head nouns for reasons yet unknown. The following examples, for instance, must be rejected as unacceptable;

29)*	the thing	that destroyed the grass was a herd of cattle ⁴ . (Akmajian 1969: 17)
	the things	
	the one(s)	
	the stuff	
	the group	

30) *The thing I want to meet is a bachelor.

Corresponding headless clauses, give perfectly grammatical sentences:

29a) What destroyed the grass was a herd of cattle.

30a) What I want meet to is a bachelor.

31) Where John went was to Boston (Akmajian 1969: 16).

The above sentences might be treated as a product of the reduction process which deletes the head-noun leaving an appropriate wh-word in its place. There may be cases, however, in which it will be difficult to find a proper head-form for the initial relative clause and, consequently, the reduction process will not apply. For this reason Chomsky's proposal of deriving cleft sentences seems to have stronger grounds:

[It (Nixon chose)]	(→who Nixon chose)
[It (John bought something)]	(→what John bought)
[It (I saw John somewhere)]	(→where I saw John)...
	(Akmajian 1969: 15)

Indefinite elements such as *one*, *somewhere*, *somehow*, *something*, etc., are replaced by the corresponding wh-relative pronouns which in the process

⁴ There must be some identity with respect to the nature of the head-noun and the focus noun. All the head-nouns in 29 and 30 do not meet this requirement and that is why they are unacceptable. However, the sentence

The group of animals that destroyed the grass was a herd of cattle cannot be rejected on the same grounds, since the relation between *the group of animals* and *a herd of cattle* is that of identity (the meaning of the head phrase is broader than that of the focus complement *a herd of cattle*). Maybe the lack of identity between the head and the focus element makes the following sentences unacceptable (noun = prepositional phrase):

**The place that I went to was to Boston.*

**The place to which John went was to Boston.*

**The place where John went was to Boston* (Akmajian 1969: 16), but: *Where I went was to Boston.*

of extraposition are shifted to the initial position of the relative clause. In case of the cleft constructions *it* is placed in the subject position of the relative clause.

Cleaving process is subject to some restrictions as regards permissible operations and elements that can be cleaved out. It is immaterial whether the focus element is under the domination of NP or VP (i.e. verb phrase complements). What is relevant is the fact that it is a kind of a nominal or can function as a nominal. Thus, the focus position permits the occurrence of noun phrases (with possible modifiers), adverbials in the form of prepositional phrases and verbal complements, if they are either nominalized or introduced by the head nouns such as "fact" (Akmajian 1969: 14).

Verb complements in the form of infinitives are less acceptable, though should not be totally rejected. Some linguists argue as to the acceptability of sentences like 33:

32) What they condemned him to was death.

33) What they condemned him to was to die (Bowers 1968: 86).

34) What she prefers is to talk with us (Wagner 1968: 89).

In these sentences the infinitive corresponds to the abstract noun resulting from the nominalization. Although sentences with an infinitive in the focus are less grammatical than those that contain the corresponding nominalized forms, they are still acceptable.

35) What you have got to do is *to destroy* this thing (...) (O.W. 216)

36) What he's done is (to) spoil the whole thing.

37) What John did to his suit was (to) ruin it.

38) What I'm going to do is (to) teach him a lesson.

} (Quirk 1972: 954)

The cleaved part of the sentence puts on a form of an infinitival clause with optional *to*. If the verb is used in progressive tense the complement must take the same form to match it.

39) What I'm doing is teaching him a lesson (Quirk 1972: 954).

Relative clauses can also appear in the focus, e.g.

40) What I want you to do is merely what you have done before (O. W. 288)

The constraints imposed on cleaving various elements are numerous. Thus, it is impossible to isolate any of the internal constituents of the focus nominal expression, since they make up a whole which loses its meaning when split up. This restriction refers to some prepositional phrases within the noun phrase and also to the genitive expressions.

41) He read *the preface to the editor*⁵.

42) What he read was the preface to the editor.

43) *What he read to the editor was the preface (Lees 1963: 378).

⁵ The sentence can be interpreted in two ways because it is ambiguous (one can ascribe two different underlying structures to it).

The splitting of the phrase *the preface to the editor* results in a change of meaning. The prepositional phrase *to the editor* modifies *the preface* in the attributive sense, while in the sentence 43 it functions as a complement.

The difference in meaning caused by isolating the attribute of the noun phrase is more evident in the following example in which the attribute is a non-animate noun. The split produces ungrammatical sentences.

44) He read the preface to the book (Lees 1963 : 378).

45) What he read was the preface to the book.

45a) *What he read to the book was the preface.

45b) *What he read the preface was to the book.

46) I am afraid of Peter's dog.

47) What I am afraid of is Peter's dog.

47a) *{What } dog I am afraid of is Peter's.
 {Whose }

47b)* What I am afraid Peter's of is dog.

There are cases in which the appearance of a prepositional phrase in the focus of the pseudo-cleft sentences is grammatically acceptable, though the corresponding cleft construction with the same prepositional phrase in its focus is perfectly correct. Akmajian (1969: 21) gives the following possibilities, all of which he considers ungrammatical:

48) *The one that I spoke to was to John.

48a) *The one to whom I spoke was to John.

48b) *The one that I spoke to was to John.

48c) *Who I spoke to was to John.

48d) *Who I spoke was to John.

but: It was to John that I spoke.

According to him, there is no justification for the appearance of the preposition *to* in the focus. Sentences 48 - 48d are being rejected on the grounds that the head-noun *one* cannot correspond to the prepositional phrase *to John* (noun=prepositional phrase). The rest of the quoted examples do not reveal the source of the preposition *to*.

It seems to me that *to* does not need to appear in the focus of the pseudo-cleft sentence, since it is not inherently connected with the noun *John* or any other noun permitted in this position. It expresses a certain relation between the action of speaking and its receiver. The preposition *to* indicates the direction of this process (speaking). For this reason it is neither attached to a verb nor to its complement. It appears with a verb in the pseudo-cleft construction and with a noun in the cleft one. Thus the acceptable variants of the discussed pseudo-cleft sentences may be:

49) Who I spoke to was John.

49a) The one that I spoke to was John.

49b) The one to whom I spoke was John.

The corresponding cleft sentences may express the relation between the process of speaking and its receiver in two ways:

50) It was to John that I spoke.

50a) It was John {to whom I spoke}
 {who I spoke to }

The pseudo-cleft sentence draws our attention to the receiver of the action, and the cleft sentence emphasizes either the receiver (50a) or the direction of the transmitted information⁶. The instances quoted below are not rejected as ungrammatical, though they contain prepositional phrases in the focus, e.g.

51) Where I saw John was in Boston. } (Akmajian 1969: 14)

52) When I met John was at 4 o'clock. }

53) Why I did it was out of spite.

This would indicate that prepositions are not permitted in the focus of the pseudo-cleft sentences which cleave out objects.

Some nouns are preceded by a preposition so that no article may be inserted between them. They become idiomatic and do not submit to cleaving.

54) I dropped it on my foot (Lees 1963: 379).

54a) What I dropped it on was my foot.

but: 55) I went there on foot.

55a)* What I went there on was foot.

A similar constraint is imposed on adverbials. They can occur in the focus but no splitting is admitted.

56) I called on him in the afternoon.

56a) *When I called on him in was the afternoon.

Another restriction makes it impossible to cleave out an indirect object nominal by a mere rearrangement of nominal elements within the sentence (Lees 1963 : 380). Direct objects can be isolated without difficulty.

57) Mary wrote John a letter.

57a) *Who Mary wrote a letter was John.

57b) What Mary wrote John was a letter.

⁶ Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968 : 138) treat prepositions as the features of nouns and as such uniquely associated with them, but this approach fails to account for such phenomena as the occurrence of different prepositions with the same noun under specific conditions, e.g.,

The day (on which) I met you.

In the days to come (Hornby 1966 : 250).

Their treatment of prepositions does not explain why they cannot appear in the focus, either. If the prepositions had been attached to the nouns they should have appeared together with the latter, which is not the case with the pseudo-cleft sentences.

Fillmore's theory of cases rather than that approach can throw some light on a more convincing interpretation of prepositions and their behaviour in various constructions.

If, however, the source sentence contains a preposition *to* before the indirect object, the cleaving process meets no obstacles.

58) Mary wrote a letter to John.

58a) Who Mary wrote a letter to was John.

We cannot isolate predicate nouns in copula sentences (Lees 1963: 380),

59) She is a teacher.

59a) *What she is is a teacher.

There are some pronominal determiners that prevent cleaving of the nominals they precede. They are: *no, every, neither* (Lees 1963: 380).

60) No man helped — *Who helped was no man.

61) Every man helped — *Who helped was every man.

62) Neither man helped — *Who helped was neither man.

Not all the adverbials can occur in the focus of the cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences. Only ordinary adverbials such as *slowly, here, now* can be abstracted by means of cleaving. The adverbials closely connected with verbs (the so-called verb particles), attributive adverbials and sentence adverbials cannot be cleft out (Lees 1963: 381).

63) I got up early.

63a) *How I got early was up.

64) I look forward to seeing him.

64a) *How I look to seeing him is forward.

65) I know her very well.

65a) *How I know her well is very.

66) -I came here almost at five.

66a) *How I came here at five was almost.

but: 67) I answered the question quickly.

67a) How I answered the question was quickly.

Finally, certain types of sentences do not submit to the cleaving process at all. These are existential sentences with expletive *it*, to mention two (Allan 1971: 8).

There in existential sentences plays a role of the subject and yet the pseudo-cleft version of the sentence *There are many lonely people in the world* is not grammatically correct. Obviously, *there* as a subject has a specific status.

Expletive *it* is also a subject of the sentence given below and yet cannot be abstracted either.

68) It is snowing — *What is snowing is it. *It is it that is snowing.

It used at the beginning of the cleft sentence has itself an expletive character and probably this makes it impossible to isolate it from the expletive sentence 68. The pseudo-cleft sentence being an underlying structure of the cleft sentence does not permit the occurrence of *it* in the focus as well.

2. Polish counterparts of English pseudo-cleft sentences.

Polish does not have a distinct group of sentences which, by virtue of their structural characteristics, might be called "pseudo-cleft". Two types of English pseudo-cleft constructions which cleave out complements and subjects have counterparts in Polish. In general, their pattern can be represented in the following way:

Jan lubi frytki.

(*To*), *co* Jan lubi, *to* frytki.

(*To*), *Rel_{pron}* — — *to* (*V_{cop}*) Compl

Rel_{pron} = relative pronoun *co*; *który*—in case of a human noun

S = sentence

V_{cop} = copula

Compl = complement

The demonstrative pronouns form a kind of a frame which is superimposed on the sentence:

To, *rel_{pron}* — — — — — , *to* — — — — —

Due to this operation, the sentence is split into two parts. The two pronouns serve a cataphoric function in that they both point to the focus element, placed at the end of the sentence. The initial demonstrative *to* is accompanied by the correlated relative pronoun *co* (of the same shape as the interrogative *co*). *To* is optional in many cases. The other demonstrative *to* is a mere pointer. It may be followed by the copula but more frequently it stands on its own, replacing the copula⁷.

69) (*To*), *co* Jan kupił, *to* samochód.

70) *To*, *co* czuleś do mnie przez cały czas (...), *to* była miłość (J. B. 161).

71) *To*, *co* podziwiam u niego, *to* jego wytrwałość.

72) Ale *czego* mu osobiście zadroszczę (...), *to* czułości, jaką potrafił przepoić swój stosunek do własnego domu (T. J. 4: 7).

73) *Czemu* się dziwię, *to* właśnie jego naiwności⁸.

74) *To*, *czego* chcemy się dowiedzieć, *to* ilość słów, jakie używamy na co dzień.

74a) *To*, *co* chcemy wiedzieć, *to* ilość słów, jakie używamy na co dzień.

The case of the relative pronoun is determined by the verb of the relative clause. The case of the focus element is also set by the verb. In most cases in which the copula follows the second demonstrative *to*, or when it is implicit (sentences 74 and 74a) the focus element is in the nominative.

The occurrence of the copula after the second *to* is somewhat obscure. As has been already mentioned, it does not appear in the majority of cases, and one may treat the sentences like 69, 71, 72, 73, as constructions in which one of the two identical verb phrases has been deleted, e.g.

⁷ The pointer *to* is sufficient to make the element it precedes emphatic.

⁸ Initial relative clauses which open with such nouns as *człowiek, mężczyzna, kobieta, osoba* are more likely to be accepted than those starting with a pronoun.

75) Czego mu zazdroszczę, to czułości mu zazdroszczę.

76) Czemu się dziwię, to jego naiwności się dziwię.

The case of the cleaved element would support this hypothesis, as it is affected by the reaction with the main verb. On the other hand, there are sentences in which the copula is used. These are usually sentences that relate some past state, e.g.

70) *To, co czuleś do mnie przez cały czas (...), to była miłość.*

77) *To, co podziwiałam u tego człowieka, to była jego ogromna cierpliwość.* However, the same sentences may be said without the copula and again, the case of the focus element will suggest the identical verb phrase deletion rather than the presence of the copula verb.

77a) *To, co podziwiałam u niego, to jego ogromną cierpliwość.*

Sentences 74 - 74a contain two different verbs in relative clauses: *dowiedzieć* and *wiedzieć*, which require the complement in the dative and accusative respectively. However in both sentences the focus element is used in the nominative, thus implying the existence of the copula in the underlying structure. This evidence seems to give support to the twofold nature of the focus position in those Polish pseudo-cleft sentences which abstract complements.

If a human noun is a complement, the initial relative clause opens with the demonstrative *ten/ta/to/ci/te*, (or more frequently with a head-noun like *człowiek, osoba, mężczyzna, kobieta*), depending on the gender and number of the complement. In these cases the relative pronoun *który* is used.

78) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Ten} \\ \text{Człowiek} \end{array} \right\}$, o którego tak dopytywałeś, to właśnie Drzewiecki.

79) *Ci, których najbardziej zapamiętałam, to bracia Rojek.*

Another group of Polish sentences, which isolate the subject, have the following pattern:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{(N)} \\ \text{Dem}_{\text{nom}}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{który} \\ \text{kto} \\ \text{co} \end{array} \right\} \text{S} \text{--- to (V}_{\text{cop}}) \text{Subj} \end{array}$$

N — head-noun (człowiek, osoba...)

$\text{Dem}_{\text{nom}} \longrightarrow \text{Dem}_{\text{instr}}/\text{V}_{\text{cop}}$

Dem_{nom} = demonstrative personal pronoun *ten/ta/to* in nominative; $\text{Dem}_{\text{instr}}$ = demonstrative personal pronoun in instrumental

Subj = subject (nouns or clauses)

The initial demonstrative pronoun has three genders and number. The relative pronoun that follows the head-form of the clause is chiefly the adjectival pronoun *który/która* but the substantival pronoun *co* and occasionally *kto* may occur as well (Urbańczyk 1966: 364). The presence of the head-pronoun

in the sentences of this type is obligatory, since the pronoun *który* must define some nominal element.

80) *Ten, który tam stoi, to mój brat.*

(*Tòn, kotryż tam steji, je mój brat*) Polański (1967: 79).

81) *Ten, który odpowiada za wszystko, to Kowalski.*

82) *Ta, co tak ładnie tańczy, to córka prezesa.*

83) *To, co właściwie najbardziej ogranicza naszą swobodę, to dziecko.*

84) *To, co nas łączy w Hiszpańskiej Ameryce, to nasz piękny język i nieważność wobec Stanów Zjednoczonych (St. 22: 8).*

The constructions with the copula verb in the focus position have a pronominal head in the instrumental case.

85) *Tym, co go przestraszyło, był krzyk (F.K. 14).*

86) *Tym, co ich zarazem zbliża i oddala jest charakter wizji przyszłego stanu ludzkiego (K.W. 201).*

87) *Tym, co mnie do niej przyciągnęło, była jej samowystarczalność. (J.B. 131)*

Sentences 88 and 89 have the inverted word order of the pseudo-cleft sentences with the subject in the initial position. Being regular relative clauses, they are more acceptable than 80 - 82, though the latter are also to be found in Polish.

Since only substantive demonstrative pronouns are permitted at the beginning of Polish relative clauses, the range of the abstracted constituents of the sentence is restricted to complements and subjects. All kinds of adverbials and attributes are exposed by means of lexical indicators of emphasis, e.g. particles⁹, and word order variations.

88) **Gdzie mieszkałem w czasie wojny, to była Warszawa.*

88a) **Gdzie mieszkałem w czasie wojny, to w Warszawie.*

89) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Miejsce} \\ \text{Miasto} \end{array} \right\}$, w którym mieszkałem w czasie wojny, to Warszawa.

Only relative clause with a head-noun is acceptable when the adverbial of place is isolated. The same formula does not, however, apply to other adverbials, i.e. time and manner.

90) **Czas, w którym go spotkałam, to piąta godzina.*

91) **Sposób, w jaki go pytała, to chaotycznie.*

Just as in English, juxtapositions do not permit cleaving of their internal elements.

92) *Czego nie mogłam zdobyć, to poradnika dla turysty.*

92a) **Czego nie mogłam zdobyć dla turysty, to poradnika.*

⁹ Mirowicz (1971: 149) applies this term to such words as *to, nawet, tylko, przecież, to właśnie*, which impose the speaker's individual interpretation on the sentence, or emphasize one of its constituents. They are directed to the listener as a sort of comment.

92b)* Dla kogo nie mogłam zdobyć poradnika, to dla turysty.

Sentences 92a - 92b are grammatically correct but they express the meaning different from that in 92. Only when the prepositional phrase is loosely connected with the noun can we cleave it without the risk of changing the original meaning.

93) Czego nie lubię, to herbaty ze śmietanką.

93a) Czego nie lubię ze śmietanką, to herbaty.

93b) Z czym nie lubię herbaty, to ze śmietanką.

It is impossible to isolate syntactically a predicate noun from a copula sentence. The reason for this is that the predicate noun does not function as the complement in this type of sentence, and in Polish the cleaving process is essentially connected with the role of the elements in the sentence; thus only complements and subjects submit to this process.

94) On jest inżynierem.

95) *Czym on jest to inżynierem.

Sentences that lack subjects and complements do not undergo the cleaving operation either.

96) Jest zimno od samego rana. — *Od kiedy jest zimno, to od samego rana.* Co jest, to zimno.

The individual constituents may be exposed by means of emphatic particles alone.

3. Comparison of English pseudo-cleft sentences with their Polish counterparts.

Out of all the English pseudo-cleft sentences only two types have syntactically corresponding constructions in Polish. Thus, the syntactic comparison of the sentences under discussion must be reduced to those two cases. The emphasis conveyed by the remaining pseudo-cleft sentences is rendered in Polish lexically, and will not be considered here.

The Polish constructions which I labelled "pseudo-cleft" cleave out complements and subjects. Their syntactic patterns show certain similarities with the English ones. Both in English and Polish the focus position of the discussed sentences is final. In English, however, the presence of the copula is necessary. Post-copular position appears to carry more emphasis than any other position in the sentence. In Polish the demonstrative particle *to* alone clearly points to the part of information we want to stress and does not need to be accompanied by the copula. As a result, the majority of Polish pseudo-cleft sentences contain only a pointer *to* in the place taken by the copula in English:

97) *What John bought was a car.*

98) (*To*), *co Jan kupił, to samochód.*

The absence of the copula verb in Polish pseudo-cleft sentences does not necessarily mean that it never appears in the focus position. It occurs especially in the past tense, and in a number of instances it is implicit. Thus the sentence *to jest X* may be considered the source of the second demonstrative *to*. In many

cases the focus of a pseudo-cleft sentence is formed by deleting from it the verb phrase, identical with that of the initial relative clause. What remains is the demonstrative particle *to* and the cleaved element.

Both English and Polish sentences under discussion may open with a head-(pro)noun, or — in English — with a *wh*-relative clause (headless). As has already been pointed out, it is difficult — if not impossible — to find a proper head-form for certain initial relative clauses of English pseudo-cleft sentences. This fact led Chomsky (quoted by Akmajian 1969: 15) to derive pseudo-cleft sentences from the underlying structure of the type

[It (John bought something)] (→ What John bought)...

rather than view them as the products of reduction of the head-form. In this way he is able to account for the formation of cleft sentences as well. Polish, however, lacks headless expansive relative clauses and the sentences given below have to be rejected as ungrammatical:

99) Who Nixon chose was Agnew.

100) *Kogo Nixon wybrał, to Agnew.

100a) *Którego Nixon wybrał, to Agnew.

The pronouns *kogo* and *który* must define some (pro)nouns which refer to the elements placed in the focus. When left alone in the initial position, devoid of demonstrative abilities, they can neither point to anything nor define anything. However, sentences that cleave out complements do not require a (pro)nominal head at the beginning of the relative clause.

There are some agreement patterns to be found in pseudo-cleft sentences in Polish and English. English copula, for instance, is systematically the third person singular or plural¹⁰, which is in accord with the form of the head pronoun of the initial relative clause. In those Polish pseudo-cleft sentences which cleave out subjects, the copula must agree in number and person with the abstracted element (i.e. subject) and the head of the relative clause which points to the focus. In sentences that cleave out objects the problem looks different. In the sentences which contain the copula — in various person forms the third form is the most likely to be used. The part of the sentence which follows it must have the nominative case. When the copula is not preceded by *to*, the head pronoun/noun puts on the instrumental, since the whole relative clause becomes a predicate. It is evident when the subject is shifted to the front position of the sentence.

101) Nie jestem tym, kto by się nadawał do roboty.

102) Ona jest tą, którą skrytykowano najostrzej.

¹⁰ It is not a fast and fixed rule. Akmajian (1969) checked his examples of cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences with the speakers of three different dialects, noting a number of differences among them. The majority of the sentences he gives are taken from his own dialect and certain regularities existing within those sentences refer to this particular dialect.

Reflexive pronouns in English pseudo-cleft sentences have the third person form (singular or plural) which agrees with the head (pro)noun. This agreement is of no significance in Polish, as the only existent reflexive pronoun is *się*.

English pseudo-cleft sentences permit the abstraction of the constituents other than subject and object. Cleaving may be rendered by means of headless relative clauses or those containing some kind of a head-form, though the latter are more problematic. In Polish the only way of emphasizing adverbials is by placing them at the beginning of the sentence or/and inserting such emphatic words as *właśnie*, *to właśnie*, *przecież*, and others. They may also be left in their original positions preceded by the above-mentioned words.

103) The place where I saw John was Boston.

104) *Miejscem, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{w którym} \\ \text{gdzie} \end{array} \right\}$ widziałem Jana był Boston.

104a) Widziałam Jana *właśnie* w Bostonie.

105) The time when I met John was 5 o'clock.

106) *Czas, w którym spotkałam Jana, to piąta godzina.

106a) *Kiedy spotkałam Jana to o piątej.

106b) Spotkałam Jana *właśnie* o piątej.

Thus the range of the elements permitted in the focus of the English pseudo-cleft sentences and the corresponding Polish constructions varies. English admits of nominal phrases, adverbials and verbal complements (in the form of nominalizations), sentences with the head-noun "fact", or, occasionally, infinitives. Polish accepts nominals, subordinate clauses and sometimes infinitives (*Czego nie mogę zrobić, to napisać listu*).

The constraints imposed on the elements available for cleaving are similar in the discussed languages. Thus, it is impossible to isolate any internal constituent of the noun phrase (possessives, prepositional phrases, etc.). English expletive constructions cannot be pseudo-clefted. The same holds true of some Polish sentences that correspond to them, mainly those that lack subjects and start with the copula verb. Sentences containing only a verb have an implicit subject and are available for cleaving.

107) It is raining. *What is raining is it.

108) Pada (deszcz/śnieg). To, co pada, to deszcz/śnieg.
but: It is cold. → *What is cold is it.

Jest zimno. → *Co jest zimno, to...

In Polish prepositional phrases can appear in the focus with a simultaneous usage of the identical preposition at the beginning of the sentence before a relative pronoun; prepositions may also appear initially only.

109) What I was speaking about, was the war.

110) *O czym* mówiłam, *to o wojnie*. *To, o czym* mówiłam, *to wojna*.

In English indirect objects cannot be pseudo-clefted, unless preceded

by the preposition *to*. In Polish inflexional endings of the nouns help eliminate ambiguity and both direct and indirect objects submit to cleaving.

111) Mary wrote John a letter.

111a) *Who Mary wrote a letter was John.

but: Who Mary wrote a letter to was John.

112) Maria napisała Janowi list.

Pronominal determiners such as *every*, *neither*, *no one/none*, etc. cannot be isolated in English and Polish.

113) *Who helped me was no one.

114) *Tym, kto mi pomógł był nikt.

114a) *Tym, kto mi pomógł nie był nikt.

English does not allow the abstraction of attributive adverbs and sentence adverbials in the focus.

Finally, existential sentences do not submit to cleaving in both languages.

Pseudo-cleft sentences are not very common in spoken English¹¹ since emphasis can be well expressed by means of intonation and stress. In the written text it is more difficult to establish which part of the sentence is the most relevant for communicating new information¹². This is the reason why syntactic indicators of emphasis (e.g. emphatic *do*, certain permissible changes in word order, cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences) are employed. The initial part of the pseudo-cleft sentence relates the whole to its context and signals the emphasized element placed in the focus (final position after the copula or pointer *to*), which makes the emphasis clear.

Pseudo-cleft sentences discussed here are fairly rare in Polish. Numerous changes of word order and the use of emphatic particles render clear emphasis. To many Poles these sentences seem awkward and outlandish.

Students who were asked to provide Polish equivalents of some chosen English pseudo-cleft sentences (with headless initial clauses) tended to render them by Polish relative clauses with head-nouns, e.g.,

115) Who I spoke to was John.

Osobą, z którą rozmawiałam był John.

116) Where I saw John was in Boston, not New York.

Miejscem, w którym widziałam Johna był Boston, nie Nowy Jork.

Miasto w którym widziałam Johna, to Boston, nie Nowy Jork.

**Tam, gdzie widziałam Johna, to Boston.*

117) Where the literary approach fails is in ignoring the existence of the contemporary spoken language.

¹¹ Irish, however, makes a superfluous use of these sentences (cf Jespersen 1949 : 149).

¹² Various linguists discuss pseudo-cleft and cleft sentences in terms of the functional sentence perspective. From this point of view "the pseudo-cleft sentence makes the distinction between given and new parts of the communication" (Quirk 1972 : 954).

*Slabym punktem koncepcji literackiej jest ignorowanie...
Miejscem, gdzie literackie podejście nie zdaje egzaminu...
Tym, co zawodzi w języku literackim, to ignorowanie...*

118) *What we want to know is the number of words we use in everyday affairs*

To, co chcemy wiedzieć, to liczba słów, jakie używamy na co dzień

To, czego chcemy się dowiedzieć, to ilość słów, jakie...

Zasadniczą rzeczą, którą chcemy poznać, to...

Liczba wyrazów, których używamy na co dzień jest tym, co...

Ilość słów, których używamy w codziennych sprawach, oto, co chcemy poznać.

One may usually encounter these types of sentences in the Polish literary translations from English, French, or German, which use such syntactic means of emphasis more frequently. Pseudo-cleft sentences can also be found in philosophical essays (which stress similarities and discrepancies between various theories) and in articles which describe distinguished people whose qualities and achievements deserve special mention.

Due to their rare usage and basically foreign structure, their emphatic load is comparatively greater than that of typical Polish sentences.

REFERENCES

- Akmajian, A. 1969. *On deriving cleft sentences from pseudo-cleft sentences*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Reproduced by the Indiana University Circle.
- Allan, K. 1971. "A note on the source of *there* in existential sentences". *JL* 7. 1 - 18.
- Bach, E., and Harms, T. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bowers, F. 1968. "English complex sentences formation". *JL* 4. 83 - 88.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Dahl, Ö. 1969. *Topic and comment: a study in Russian and general transformational grammar*. (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 4). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Dłaska, M. 1947. *Prozodia języka polskiego*. PAU. Prace Komisji Językowej.
- Fillmore, Ch. 1965. "On the notion of equivalent sentence structure". *Report 11*. (microcard).
- — 1968. "The case for case". In Bach, E. and Harms, T. 1968. 1 - 91.
- Firbas, J. 1966. "On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis". *Travaux linguistiques de Prague*. Akademie Prague. I. 267 - 280.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1968. "Notes on transitivity and theme in English". Part 3. *JL* 4. 178 - 280.
- Havránek, B. 1966. "On comparative structural studies of Slavic standard languages". *Travaux linguistiques de Prague*. Akademie Prague I. 59 - 66.
- Hornby, A., Gatenby, E., Wakefield, H. 1963. *The advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Jacobs, R., Rosenbaum, P. 1968. *English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Xerox Publishing Company.
- Jespersen, O. 1969. *Analytic syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jespersen, O. 1965. *A modern English grammar*. London: George Allen and Unwin. 7.4.
- Jodłowski, S. 1950. „Teoria zaimka”. *SPAU* 41. 262 - 272.
- Jodłowski, S. 1971. „Elementy semantyczne funkcji składniowych”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 102 - 120.
- Kirkwood, H. W. 1969. "Aspects of word order and its communication function in English and German". *JL* 5. 87 - 107.
- Klimentiewicz, Z. 1961. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- 1937. *Składnia opisowa współczesnej polszczyzny*. Kraków: PAU.
- 1969. *Studia syntaktyczne*. 2. Prace Komisji Językowej. Kraków: PAN.
- 1971. „O znaczeniu stosunkowym struktur składniowych”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 122 - 142.
- Koneczna, H. 1971. „Funkcje zdań jednoczłonowych i dwuczłonowych w języku polskim”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 60 - 92.
- Langendoen, D. T. 1970. *Essentials of English grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lees, R. 1963. "Analysis of the cleft sentences in English". *Zeitschrift zur Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*. Berlin. 16. 4.
- Lewicki, A. M. 1971. (ed.). *Problemy składni polskiej*. Kraków: PWN.
- Marvin, D. L. 1968. "A note on verb phrase complementation". *JL* 4. 285 - 286.
- Milewski, T. 1971. „Stanowisko składni w obrębie językoznawstwa”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 17 - 37.
- Mirowicz, A. 1948. „O partykułach, ich zakresie i funkcji”. *BPTJ*. 134 - 148.
- 1971. „Z zagadnień struktury zdania (wskaźniki językowo-konstytuacji)”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 142 - 157.
- Pisarkowa, K. 1967. „Obserwacja podmiotu zaimkowego”. *Język polski* 48. 12 - 33.
- 1968. „Zaimek w polskim zdaniu”. *Język polski* 48. 12 - 33.
- 1969. *Funkcje składniowe polskich zaimków odmiennych*. Prace Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, PAN.
- Polański, K. 1966. „Główne typy struktur zdaniowych w języku polskim”. *Zeszyty naukowe WSP w Katowicach*.
- 1967. *Składnia zdania złożonego w języku górnośląskim*. Wrocław: Słownoznawstwa PAN.
- Polański, K., Gołąb, Z., Heinz, H. 1970. *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*. Warszawa: PAN.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. 1972. *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Safarewicz, J. 1971. „Uwagi o podstawowych strukturach językowych”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 45 - 51.
- Swift, L. 1967. "Stress and deep structure". *Report resumes*. University of Kentucky foreign languages conference (microcard).
- Urbańczyk, S. (ed.). 1966. *Polszczyzna piękna i poprawna*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Wagner, K. H. 1968. "Verb complementation: a criticism". *JL* 4. 88 - 91.
- Wojtasiewicz, O. 1971. „O tzw. operatorach pragmatycznych”. In Lewicki, A. M. 1971. 156 - 160.
- Zawadowski, L. 1952. *Zagadnienia teorii zdań względnych*. Wrocław: Prace Wrocławskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego. Seria A. 31.

Quotations are taken from:

J. B. — J. Barth. *Koniec drogi*. 1971. Warszawa: PIW. Tłum. A. Słomianowski.

T. J. 4 — *Ty i Ja*. 1972. 4. p. 7.

O. W. — O. Wilde. 1945. *The picture of Dorian Gray*.

O. W.₁ — O. Wilde. 1971. *Portret Doriana Graya*. Warszawa: PIW. Tłum. N. Feldmanowa.

St — *Student*. 1973. 22. 5.