

Bachelor's thesis
Spring term 2013
JAPK11

Lund University
Centre for Languages and Literature
Japanese studies

The functions of *no da*

A descriptive overview

Eric Ahl
Supervisor: Lars Larm



LUND UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to give a descriptive overview of the Japanese nominal predicate *no da*. The structure is looked at mainly through two separate perspectives; one investigating its modal properties and one investigating its influence on the information structure within its scope. A collection of data heavily dependent upon Japanese sources, as to make available information otherwise not readily found, has been made. As an extension of this data, research has been conducted through the use of an informant and the conduction of a survey. The research concerns the comparison of *no da* with other structures, as a means to identify what nuances that may be considered unique to *no da*.

Keywords: Cohesion, Japanese language, *n desu*, *no da*, nominal predicate, nominalization

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the help and support that I have received throughout the writing of this thesis. In no particular order, I would like to thank: Yoshiko Jöhnemark, Simon Karlsson, Manami Koyanagi, Lars Larm and Axel Svahn. This thesis, and its completion, would not have been possible without your support and encouragement.

CONTENTS

Abstract and keywords	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Conventions	v
1. Introduction	
1.1 The topic	1
1.2 Methodology and organization	2
2. Previous research	
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 Morphology	3
2.3 The modal <i>no da</i>	
2.3.1 Introduction	5
2.3.2 <i>No da</i> , an explanatory form	5
2.3.3 <i>No da</i> in interrogative sentences	7
2.3.3.1 <i>Kara da</i>	8
2.3.4 <i>No da</i> in emphatic sentences	9
2.3.5 <i>No da</i> in mild correction	10
2.3.6 <i>No da</i> 's effect on politeness	11
2.4 The focus of <i>no da</i>	
2.4.1 Introduction	13
2.4.2 The placement of focus	14
2.4.3 Negation	15
2.4.4 Exceptions to the necessity of <i>no da</i>	17
2.5 Concerning the translation of <i>no da</i>	18

3. My research	
3.1 Introduction	20
3.2 Methodology	20
3.3 Example 1	21
3.4 Example 2	22
3.5 Example 3	23
3.6 Example 4	24
3.7 Example 5	25
3.8 Conclusion	26
4. Final remarks	27
5. References	28
Appendix	30

CONVENTIONS

Typographical conventions

Double quotes will be used in the text to denote running quotations and single quotes to denote translations of Japanese words into English. *Italics* will be used in the running text to mark words that are outside of the English lexicon. Translations of example sentences derived from sources originally written in Japanese are provided by me. The system for romanization of Japanese used in other sources has in some cases been altered at my own discretion to be in accordance with the system used in the thesis.

Glossing

Glossing in this thesis will be in accordance with the Leipzig Glossing Rules and exceptions to these are derived from Larm (2006).

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	IMP	imperative
ADN	adnominal	INF	inferential
AGT	agitative	IO	indirect object
CMPL	completion	LOC	locative
CONJ	conjunctural	NEG	negative
COMP	complementizer	NML	nominalizer
COP	copula	NOM	nominative
CP	conjunctive particle	NPAST	nonpast
DED	deductive	PAST	past
EXEV	external evidence	POL	polite
FP	final particle	PROG	progressive
GEN	genitive	QP	question particle
GER	gerund	SPEC	speculative
HON	honorific	TOP	topic
HORT	hortative		

1. Introduction

1.1 The topic

The grammatical structure discussed in this thesis, *no da*, is one of many forms and functions and the objective of this thesis is to give a descriptive overview of these. *No da* which, arguably, has the function of a nominal predicate is frequently employed as a marker of presupposition and the concept of cohesion may be considered central to the function of the structure.

The most widely discussed function of what I in this thesis refer to as the modal *no da* is the explanatory function. In addition to this, other functions of the modal *no da*; such as *no da* in emphatic sentences, *no da* in an imperative context and *no da*'s affect on politeness have also been included into the scope of this thesis. The following is an example of the explanatory function of the modal *no da*.

- (1) Chotto mat-te kudasa-i. Hanashi ga ar-u n desu
little wait-GER give-IMP (HON) chat NOM exist-NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST
'Just a moment please. I have something to tell you.'

No da's influence on the information structure of the clause within its scope is, in my experience, a topic not so much covered in research conducted in English as it is in its Japanese counterpart. Subsequently, a lot of the information on this topic that is handled in the thesis has been derived from sources written in Japanese. In Japanese research, this function is often referred to as *sukoopu no no da*, 'the scope of *noda*'¹, but will in this thesis be referred to as "the focus of *no da*" and will be discussed in the part of the thesis with the same name. The following is an example of how *no da* can be employed to create contrastive focus following the aspectual inflection of a verb.

- (2) Fur-u n janai. Fut-te-iru n da
fall-NPAST n janai fall-GER-PROG NODA.NPAST
'It is not that it will rain. It is that it is raining.'

Sentence structures which bear a resemblance to either the modal or focus function of *no da* will also be dealt with in this thesis; first with reference to prior research and then further investigated in my own research. The main objective of the thesis is to identify the different functions and their respective restrictions, investigate the possibility of counterparts and then to further the research on the possible differences that may exist between them.

¹ See for example Noda (1997).

A central question in the writing of this thesis has been the question of whether or not the function of *no da* is totally and utterly exclusive or can be accurately paraphrased using other constructions. This topic is not totally nonexistent in prior research, but due to the fact that much of the prior research has been conducted by Japanese native speakers aimed at Japanese native speakers, some of the nuances that the respective authors may have disregarded as obvious are often lost on non native speakers.

1.2 Methodology & organization

The thesis is divided into two parts to separate the research which has been conducted specifically for this thesis from that which has been derived from other sources. The section consisting of previous research is divided into three parts: a brief introduction to the morphology of the structure, a section discussing the modal functions of *no da* and a section discussing the so called focus of *no da*. In addition to this a short discussion of the translation of *no da* has been added at the end of the part containing the prior research. These parts will partially serve to give the reader a comprehensive view of the topic, but will also serve as a springboard to the conducted research and to the conclusions, whatever they may be, that are drawn in my own research.

My own research, which may be considered an extension of the data collected from prior research, will mainly be based on the discussion with an informant. But I will also conduct a survey, not as much in the hope to draw any final conclusions, but as to create a foundation which I may build from together with the informant. The informant is a female native of Tokyo, currently studying at Gifu University in Gifu, Japan.

2. Previous research

2.1 Introduction

This part will, as noted in the introduction, hopefully serve to give the reader a comprehensive view of the topic as well as serve as a basis for the research conducted specifically for this thesis. The research will be split into different parts for morphology, the modal *no da* and the focus of *no da* respectively. It is important to note however, that due to the concept of the focus of *no da* not being completely separated from the modal *no da*; some functions of the structure may be brought up in both parts, albeit from different perspectives.

2.2 Morphology

Although generally viewed as a single structure, *no da* is comprised of two separate components; the nominalizer *no* and the copula *da*. Although one may argue that these two components should be treated as a single grammatical structure the morphological properties of the structure clearly support the previously stated fact. For example, the copula may be replaced by its polite form *desu* or *de aru*, the latter being a form used mostly in formal writing, with no modification being made to the nominalizer. The structure may come after a negation as well as be subject to negation itself by negating the copula, creating the form *no dewanai* or the abbreviated, colloquial *n janai*. Again, without any necessary modification to the nominalizer. This being said, the degree to which the ability (or lack thereof) to separate *no da* into two separate parts is present varies depending on which function of the structure that is being employed. This will hopefully become further evident below, in the discussion concerning the structure's different functions.

The nominalizer in *no da* is in conversations for the most part abbreviated to only *n*, thus making the structure *n da* or *n desu*. It is noteworthy that since *de aru* is almost exclusively used in writing it is not likely to appear together with *n*, the abbreviated form of *no*.

In short form question sentences, *n da*, *no* or *no ka* may be employed². The *no* form may also be used in a declarative sense. However, this particular function may be considered exclusive to female speakers (McGloin 1986:13). To separate the declarative function from the interrogative, a rise in intonation is applied when used in question sentences.

As previously noted, the *no* in *no da* has the function of a nominalizer, and as such application of the structure will follow the standard pattern of a *no*-nominalization. This pattern is as follows:

² Tanomura (1990:153) notes that the *no ka*-form does not function together with interrogative words such as *dare*, 'who', *dooshite*, 'why', etc.

Verbal	Taberu eat-NPAST	Taberu n[o] da eat-NPAST <i>n[o] da</i>
Adjectival	Ooki-i big-NPAST	Ooki-i n[o] da big-NPAST <i>n[o] da</i>
Adjective-nominal	Benri da convenient COP	Benri na n[o] da convenient-COP.ADN <i>n[o] da</i>
Nominal	Inu da dog COP	Inu na n[o] da dog COP.ADN <i>n[o] da</i>

In addition to what is shown in the table³, the structure may come after a predicate or copula made into the past tense. However, the structure itself may also appear in the past tense, forming *no datta*. Tanomura (1990:115) does however note that the sphere which this form may be used in is considerably smaller than that of the one carrying the present tense, and is far more commonplace in written language than in spoken language. When the past tense is used in spoken language it is often in the context of the speaker recollecting something previously known, and may even be considered obligatory in a sentence such as (3) where the form is following an action verb (Iori 2001:248).

- (3) Raishuu haikingu ni ik-u *n dat-ta*
 next.week hiking DAT go-NPAST NODA-PAST
 'It's next week we're going hiking!'

Further, in Noda (1997:211-215) the possibility of combining the *no da*-structure with modality markers such as *kamoshirenai*, *daroo*, *yoo da*, *soo da*, *rashii* etc. is discussed, with the conclusion that it in most cases it is possible. Noteworthy exceptions are, however, *yoo da* and *rashii* which cannot be preceded by the *no da* structure, and *daroo* which cannot precede *no da*. The reason for this incapability concerning *yoo da* and *rashii* is because they also have a quality of inference as to the grounds for the situation which the speaker is commenting on (Moriyama 1989, as cited in Noda 1997:211). A similarity in function is also the reason for *daroo* not being able to precede *no da*. I will in my own research conduct a further investigation into the differences between *no da* and *yoo da*.

The information given in the following sections concerning the structure's different functions will hopefully serve to further explain topics which have been touched upon here.

³ The table is an adaption of one that appears in Martin (1988:852).

2.3 The modal *no da*

2.3.1 Introduction

In this section of the thesis the modal *no da* and the plethora of functions pertaining to it will be discussed. In Alfonso (1966) three different functions are described, these being: “NO DESU, an Explanatory Form”, “NO DESU, in Emphatic Sentences”, “NO DESU in Mild Correction”. I have chosen these as a starting point, with the addition of a discussion concerning *no da*'s effect on politeness, which is a topic not covered in Alfonso (1966).

No da is in Japanese research often referred to as *setsumei no modaritii*, ‘explanatory modality’, and one may think of its most common function being just that. That being said, not all of the functions work to give explanations and in studies such as Noda (1997) the distinction between a modal *no da* containing cohesion to surrounding circumstances and one without is made. As I feel that this is an area in need of further investigation I would prefer for the information in this thesis to speak for itself, with no clear cut distinction being made.

2.3.2 *No da*, an explanatory form

This, being what one may consider the most common function of the structure, is the area most covered in previous literature concerning the structure. Tanomura (1990:1-2) makes the case that the structure is fundamentally used to create a [X *wa* (TOP) Y *da* (COP)] sentence pattern utilizing a predicate instead of a subject. Further proof of this lies in Tanomura's claim that the *no* of the *no da* clause is the same as the *no* of a *no wa*-clause.

- (4) Jimen ga nure-te-iru no wa, ame ga fut-ta *no da*
ground NOM get.wet-GER-PROG NML TOP rain NOM fall-PAST NODA.NPAST
‘The ground being wet is due to rain having fallen.’

Even though (4) might seem like a quite unnatural sentence, we can see that the same concept is applicable in an example such as the following.

- (5) Chotto mat-te kudasa-i. Hanashi ga a-ru *n desu*
little wait-GER give-IMP (HON) chat NOM exist-NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST
‘Just a moment please. I have something to tell you.’

Out of the two sentences which make up this example the first one is, as Alfonso (1966:407) expresses it; “The statement or situation which NO DESU explains”, and the following sentence is “The statement with NO DESU”. It is safe to say that this is the most fundamental usage of the

structure, that it occurs in various forms⁴, and that there are so many variations that it would be unpractical to cover them all here.

This sentence structure, often referred to as [P wa (TOP) Q *n da*], where P describes a condition and Q describes the reasons for P being what it is, may occur with P as an implicature, not explicitly stated (Teramura 1984:306), meaning that when P is apparent to both the speaker and the listener P may very well be omitted.

The following sentence, one might imagine, is said in a context where the information contained in P is expressed through a visual medium.

- (6) Ano hito wa ureshi-i *n da*
that person TOP happy-NPAST NODA.NPAST
'That person is very happy.'

Also, Noda (1997:65) notes that in a case such as this, opening a discourse with a sentence describing the emotional state of a third party would sound unnatural without the usage of *no da*.

Tanomura (1990:28-29) also notes the structure's inability to function as a discourse-opener in cases where the speaker's statement is in reaction to a sudden development in conditions. If the structure is in reference to an already settled condition however, the structure appears to be applicable. Tanomura (1990:28) gives an example in the context of a speaker and listener both watching a snake when it suddenly moves.

- (7) *Aq, ugoi-ta *n da!*
ah move-PAST NODA.NPAST
'(lit.) Ah, it's that it moved!'

Aq, iki-te-iru *n da!*
ah live-GER-PROG NODA.NPAST
'(lit.) Ah, it's that it is alive!'

As Takatsu (1991:172) advocates, what is most fundamental to the function of a proposition containing *no da* is the cooperation necessary between the listeners and speakers in understanding each other's implicatures. Therefore the examples of the explanatory *no da* not being appropriate are cases where the speaker by using *no da* would go against the cooperative principle.

⁴ Alfonso (1966:407) implies that a structural cataphora is possible by placing the *no da*-structure before the circumstances which it explains.

2.3.3 *No da* in interrogative sentences

One may think of this function of *no da* as derived from the explanatory function of the structure, seeing how they possess similar qualities of cohesion. If we consider McGloin's (1980:123) suggestion that a question not containing the structure may be viewed as a pure "information-seeking-question", whereas a question containing it may be viewed as an assumption made by the speaker based on information either exclusive or non-exclusive (such as a general fact) to the relationship of the speaker and the listener. Furthermore, Teramura (1984:309) states that if there is no implicature to be made the question will be asked without the usage of *no da*.

(8) Ame ga fut-te-imasu ka
rain NOM fall-GER-POL.PROG QP
'Is it raining?'

(9) Ame ga fut-te-iru *n desu* ka
rain NOM fall-GER-PROG NODA.POL.NPAST QP
'Is it that it is raining?'

In this example, which happens to be one of the most commonly cited, (8) is a pure information seeking question, but (9) on the other hand is an assumption rooted in a context where, for example, the speaker sees the listener walking in with a wet umbrella. Also, Iori (2001:239) notes that yes-no answers to questions containing *no da*, such as (10), might sound awkward in some cases. Seeing how the usage of *no da* implies that the speaker already has made an assumption as to the truthfulness of the statement a simple yes-no answer does not seem to suffice.

(10) Watashi no rusuchuu ni dare ga ki-ta *n desu*
I GEN during.absence.from.home DAT who NOM come-PAST NODA.POL.NPAST
ka
QP
'Is it that someone came by when I was away?'

Just as with the explanatory form discussed in 2.3.2, Tanomura (1990:55-56) also discusses the possibility of viewing questions containing the *no da* structure as mainly being applicable when the conditions contained in the question already are settled. For example the usage of the *no da* structure in a question such as *kyoo nani suru*, 'what will you do today?', will add the nuance of asking whether or not the listener already has settled on their plans for the day. The absence of *no da* will, however, imply that the speaker and the listener together will decide (Tanomura 1990:56).

Also in question sentences containing *naze* or *dooshite* it is very difficult to omit *no da*, and although there are examples of the just this, these seem have a certain ironical quality to them (Noda 1997:123-124). Interestingly enough it appears that it is possible to retain the meaning and grammaticality with a sentence structure such as (12), despite the omission of *no da*.

- (11) Dooshite sonna.ni hiyake shi-te-iru no?
 why like.that sunburn do-GER-PROG NODA.NPAST
 ‘Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’
- (12) Sonna.ni hiyake shi-te-iru no wa dooshite desu ka
 like.that sunburn do-GER-PROG NML TOP why COP.POL QP
 ‘Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’

This example where *no da* is absent is further proof that question clauses containing *dooshite* or *naze* do not necessarily have to include *no da*. However, one might also make the case that the presence of nominalization, in fact the same *no* (previously discussed as noted by Tanomura (1990:1)) as is incorporated in *no da*, projects a similar effect upon the information structure of the sentence. This example will be further investigated in my own research.

2.3.3.1 *Kara da*

The existence of structures related to *no da*, such as *kara da*, ‘it is because’, as possible counterparts, has been well noted in prior research. Kuno (1973:226) notes that the replacement of *no desu* with *kara desu* in a situation such as displayed in (13) is fully possible.

- (13) Kaze o hik-imashi-ta. Ame ni fu-rare-te nure-ta kara desu
 cold ACC caught-POL-PAST rain AGT fall-PASS-GER get.wet-PAST because COP.POL
 ‘I have caught a cold. It is because I was rained on and drenched.’

Teramura (1984:309) notes that the relationship of cause and effect is stronger in expressions such as *kara da* and *wake da* than in the *no da* structure. Kuno (1973:226) further notes that explanations do not necessarily make causes and that the replacement of the *no da*-structure with *kara da* may in some cases be awkward - if not completely ungrammatical. The incapability of *kara da* to give an explanation or cause in an imperative context is one example of this (Kuno 1973:227-228).

Further, and most noteworthy, is *kara da*’s ungrammaticality when employed to state the reason for a “vague and syntactically unspecified concept” (Kuno 1973:228), which is one of the primary functions of the explanatory *no da*.

- (14) *Ame ga fut-te-iru kara desu ka
rain NOM fall-GER-PROG because COP.POL QP
‘(Intended to mean) Is it because it’s raining (that you are wet)?’

The difference in nuance between the two structures will be further investigated in 3.6.

2.3.4 *No da* in emphatic sentences

A topic far less covered than the topic of the preceding section is that of the usage of *no da* in emphatic sentences. This function pertaining to the modal function of the structure may be used by the speaker to convey strong emotions, often in the form of a question clause, although not necessarily.

- (15) Ittai nani o shi-te-ita *n desu* ka
the.dickens what ACC do-GER-PROG.PAST NODA.POL.NPAST QP
‘What the dickens have you been doing?’

Both Tanomura (1990:66) and Alfonso (1966:412) note that this usage of *no da* often is seen together with the emphatic *ittai*.

Tanomura (1990:66) describes questions which employ this particular function of *no da* as often having an element of suspicion, criticism, dissatisfaction, impression, admiration etc. in them, and as such one should exercise caution when including them in questions such as:

- (16) E, anata mo issho.ni kuru *n desu* ka
oh, you also together come.NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST QP
‘Oh, will you also come with us?’

In a question clause like this one, Tanomura (1990:67) explains, the lack of appropriate tone of voice and mannerisms might lead the listener to perceive the message as being one of dissatisfaction.

The structure is often used to emphasize an alternative contrary to the expectation or opinion of the listener, or as Ootake (2009:183) accurately points out, when the the speaker anticipates the listener’s misinterpretation.

- (17) Kanashi-kute nai-te-ru *n jana-i.* Ureshi-kute nai-te-ru
 sad-GER cry-GER-PROG NODA.NEG-NPAST happy-GER cry-GER-PROG
*n da*⁵
 NODA.NPAST
 ‘It is not out of sadness that I am crying. It is out of happiness.’

In this sentence, the opinion which the speaker wishes to debunk may be either explicit or implicit in the prior context. In examples such as this *no da* does not only add emphasis, but also changes the information structure within the sentence, a function further discussed in 2.4.

Kudoo (1996:16) further brings up the usage of a negated *no da* structure, often (albeit not necessarily) followed by the conjectural *daroo* or its polite counterpart *deshoo* as a rhetorical device⁶. In the following example one may imagine a student replying to the teachers inquiry about the absence of a fellow student.

- (18) Baito shi-te-iru *n jana-i* deshoo ka
 part.time.work do-GER-PROG NODA.NEG-NPAST CONJ.POL QP
 ‘Isn’t it that he is working?’

Concerning the usage of *n daroo* as opposed to just *daroo*, McGloin (1980:128-130) advocates that the meaning conveyed by *n daroo* is more subjective than that of just *daroo*. As such the usage of *daroo* would be inappropriate in a situation where the listener does not expect to hear assumptions that are based on perceptions or information exclusive to the speaker.

2.3.5 *No da* in mild correction

This form and its usage is according to Alfonso (1966:416-417) consistent with the explanatory function of *no da* and is often utilized when giving directions to a child.

- (19) Jidoosha ni ki.o.tsuke-ru *n desu* yo
 automobile of be.careful-NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST FP
 ‘Be careful of automobiles.’

In sentences such as the previous one Noda (1997:101-102) claims that one may consider the specific execution of the action which is asked for, not as something exclusive to the knowledge or judgement of the speaker, but rather as a general condition which is already settled.

⁵ The *i* of the aspectual marker *te-iru* is often omitted in colloquial speech, creating the form *te-ru*.

⁶ The conjectural particle *daroo* can actually be omitted. In such a case *n janai* will be subject to a rise in intonation.

Another interesting example of the usage of the form is as Tanomura (1990:24-25) notes, that in foreign dramas, if a person is told to sit three times the subtitles will read subsequently: *osuwari, suware, suwaru n da*. Tanomura explains that the function of *no da* in this context is to draw attention to the two preceding imperative forms of the word ‘sit’. This explanation is also supported by the claim by Noda (1997:101) that *no da* should be in reference to a previously established condition, and that a reversed sentence structure in this case, indeed, would be ungrammatical.

As for the negation of this usage of *no da* one might say that the negation generally takes place in the final copula, rather than verb preceding the structure. However, in Noda (1997:115) there seems to be an exception to this general rule. Whereas *suwaranai n da* (or *n desu*) is ungrammatical *suwaranai no* seems to be grammatical. No further explanation as to why it is grammatical is offered. Also, concerning the usage of the negated form of the structure in polite language Noda notes that while *n ja arimasen* sounds natural *n janai desu* does not.

Alfonso (1966:417) notes that the usage of final particles may somewhat soften the tone of the statement. A statement incorporating *yo* will sound masculine, *ne* will sound “soft and gentle” and the absence of particles will give the statement a “very strong and direct” tone.

2.3.6 *No da*'s affect on politeness

The presence of the *no da* structure in polite language to give a statement extra politeness and indirectness has been noted in texts such as Martin (1988:852-853). Further, McGloin (1980:141) says that “when the predicates which express the speaker’s desires or subjective feelings are embedded in *keredo/ga* clauses, *no desu* is obligatory.”

- (20) Kono kopii ga ichimai hoshi-i n desu ga
 this copy NOM one want-NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST CP
 ‘I would like to get one copy of this, but...’

On the other hand Noda (1997:172-173) claims that sentences beginning with the apologetic *mooshi wake nai (n) desu ga*, ‘I’m very sorry, but.../ excuse me, but...’, will function both with and without *no da*, and although both are grammatical it would appear that by including the *no da*-structure the speaker will sound slightly more apologetic.

Also on this subject McGloin (1980:142) observes that in a sentence such as (21) one may replace the *no da ga*-structure with *kara*, although with loss of indirectness and politeness.

- (21) Samu-i kara, chotto mado shime-te kure-na-i?
cold-NPAST because just window close-GER give-NEG-NPAST
'I'm cold. Won't you close the window for me?'

It would appear that the usage of *no da* also may cause a statement to become impolite. If we consider the following example, given by McGloin (1980:140).

- (22) Samu-i desu ka
cold-NPAST COP.POL QP
'Are you cold?'
- (23) Samu-i *n desu* ka
cold-NPAST NODA.POL.NPAST QP
'Is it that you are cold?'

McGloin then goes on to describe that the reason for (23) being impolite is that the statement sounds as if the speaker already has made up their mind as to whether or not the listener is cold. This conclusion falls in line with the statement by the same author brought up in 2.2.3 that *no da* in an interrogative clause can be viewed as the speaker making an assumption. Yamada (2012:145) also notes that *n desu ka* question clauses carry a harsher tone than that of ordinary polar questions. It would seem, however, that the colloquial *no* does not carry a harsh tone to the same extent as *n desu ka*.

2.4 The focus of *no da*

2.4.1 Introduction

The concept of the focus of *no da* is, as noted in the introduction, a subject more common in Japanese research than in its English counterpart. The study of the focus of *no da* one may refer to as being the study of how *no da* affects the information structure within a sentence. There are, however, examples which are ambiguous as to which of the two functions that is being employed. In such cases the context decides which type of *no da* that is being employed.

- (24) Atama ga ita-i *n da*
head NOM hurt-NPAST NODA.NPAST
'It is my head that hurts./It is that I have a headache.'

If the sentence is uttered in a comparative context where the speaker wishes to explain that it is the speaker's head, not stomach (for example) that is hurting, the function would be that of the focus of *no da*. If it is in the context of the speaker giving an explanation as to why he told the listener to be quiet, it would be that of the modal *no da* (Noda 1997:107-108).

As for the necessity of a distinction between these two functions of the structure one may return to the concept of cohesion. It would appear that *no da*'s ability to change the information structure is present even when a presupposition is not, such as in certain non-fiction texts (Noda 1997:198). Further proof of the existence of two separate functions of *no da* is the possibility of incorporating both these functions in the same sentence while retaining grammaticality (Noda 1997:201).

- (25) A: Watashi ni kii-te-iru *no?*
me DAT ask-GER-PROG NODA.NPAST
'Is it me you're asking?'
- B: Iya, omae ni kii-te-iru *n jana-i n da*
no you DAT ask-GER-PROG NODA.NEG-NPAST NODA.NPAST
'No, it is that I am not asking you.'

The capacities as well as the limitations of the focus-function of *no da* will hereafter be more deeply investigated.

2.4.2 The placement of focus

Just as an ordinary clause, *no da* has the ability to place the meaning of a verb under focus. But in addition to this it also has the capacity to place the conjugation to which the verb is subject to, such as the tense or aspect of the verb, in focus (Noda 1997:38-39). This becomes clear in the following examples.

- (26) Mi-ta *n jana-i.* Kii-ta *n da*
see-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST Hear-PAST NODA.NPAST
'It is not that (I) saw. It is that (I) heard.'
- (27) Mi-ta *n jana-i.* Mi-rare-ta *n da*
see-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST See-PASS-PAST NODA.NPAST
'It is not that (I) looked. It is that (I) was looked upon.'
- (28) Mi-ru *n jana-i.* Mi-te-ru *n da*
see-NPAST NODA.NEG-NPAST See-GER-PROG NODA.NPAST
'It is not that (I) will see. It is that (I) am seeing (now).'
- (29) Mi-ru *n jana-i.* Mi-ta *n da*
see-NPAST NODA.NEG-NPAST See-PAST NODA.NPAST
'It is not that (I) will see. It is that (I) saw.'

This example shows how the structure is used to place a certain part of the scope in focus, be it the meaning of the word, the tense, the aspect etc; and then deem it either suitable or non-suitable to the circumstances by the usage of the negation of *no da* into *no dewanai* (more thoroughly investigated in 2.4.3). Albeit Noda (1997:53) does also note that it is very hard to incorporate the negation itself into the focus of the clause.

- (30) *Mi-nakat-ta *n jana-i.* Mi-ta *n da*
see-NEG-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST See-PAST NODA.NPAST
'It is not that (I) didn't see. It is that (I) saw.'

According to my informant, this employment of contrastive focus is quite common in cases regarding to the speaker's volition.

- (31) Mi-yoo to shi-ta *n jana-kute,* mi-te shimat-ta *n da*
see-HORT COMP do-PAST NODA.NEG-GER see-GER COMPL-PAST NODA.NPAST
'(I) didn't mean to see it, (I) just happened to.'

Noda (1997:55-56) states that when both components which may be considered essential, and components which may not, exist within the scope of a *no da* clause the less important component generally becomes the focus. By nonessential components Noda is referring to components which act to ornament and modify the final predicate, be they adjectives, adverbs, nouns etc. If the speaker tries to project focus onto the final predicate despite the existence of a modifier, the statement will become infelicitous (Noda 1997:57). In contradiction to this, my informant tells me that an alteration of the sound structure may create an information structure different from the one previously described by Noda, without being ungrammatical.

Even modality markers such as the speculative⁷ *kamoshirenai*, ‘possibly’ and the deductive *ni chigainai*, ‘definitely’, may be placed within the focus of a *no da* clause for the purpose of displaying contrast (Noda 1997:35).

- (32) Fur-u kamoshirena-i *n jana-i*. Fur-u ni chigaina-i *n da*
 fall-NPAST SPEC-NPAST NODA.NEG-NPAST fall-NPAST DED-NPAST NODA.NPAST
 ‘It is not that it possibly will rain. It is that it definitely will rain.’

2.4.3 Negation

Essential to the study of the focus of *no da* and why it is applied is the knowledge of how *no da* may change the focus (i.e. what parts may be subject to this change) and understanding the focus of clauses not subject to *no da*. This becomes especially apparent when considering the difference between the negation of the preceding predicate and the negation of the *no da* structure itself.

One may think of the negation of the *no da* structure into *no dewanai* as exclusive to the focus of *no da*⁸. The reason for this being that the presence of *no dewanai* affects the information structure in the subordinate clause. Let us consider what happens when we try to apply negation to *no da* in this previously discussed example of the modal *no da*.

- (33) *Chotto mat-te kudasa-i. Hanashi ga ar-u *n jana-i*
 little wait-GER give-IMP (HON) chat NOM exist-NPAST NODA.NEG-NPAST
 ‘Please wait a little. (lit.)It is not that I have something to say.’

The presence of a negated *no da* will function to negate the part within the scope which is under focus, but does not necessarily offer an explanatory function such as the one previously discussed.

⁷ The terminology “the speculative *kamoshirenai*” and “the deductive *ni chigainai*” have been derived from Larm (2006).

⁸ With the noteworthy exception of the previously discussed *no dewanai* in mild correction (2.3.5).

In the example above, although it not being correct, one may think of *hanashi*, ‘chat’, as the part under focus.

One may claim that the part generally subject to the focus of the negation of a verb is the verb stem and its original meaning, not the circumstances that lie behind the utterance (Noda 1997:37). If we further investigate the difference in focus between a negated *no da* and a negated predicate.

(34) Atashi, kanashi-i kara nai-ta *n jana-i* no⁹ yo
 I sad-NPAST because cry-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST FP FP
 ‘It wasn’t because I was sad that I cried.’

*Atashi, kanashi-i kara nak-anakat-ta
 I sad-NPAST because cry-NEG-PAST
 ‘(lit.)It was because I was sad that I didn’t cry.’

As we see in this example the information structure within the sentence clearly changes due to the usage of *no da*. Noda (1997:32) explains that without the presence of *no da*, the part subject to denial is whether or not the speaker was crying, not the reasons for crying, and that the sentence not incorporating *no da* lacks any connotation to the possibility of opposing circumstances.

It is, however, as we saw before in 2.3.3, and as Noda (1997:33) points out, possible to create a grammatical alternative sentence with an identical meaning by moving the nominalizer, *no*:

(35) Nai-ta no wa, kanashi-i kara dewana-i
 cry-PAST NML TOP sad-NPAST because COP.NEG-NPAST
 ‘My crying wasn’t because I was sad.’

This sentence structure will, as also mentioned before, be further investigated in my research.

In 2.3.4 we saw evidence of *no dewanai* being employed when the speaker wishes to debunk or correct a certain expectation or opinion that the listener may have formed from the previous context. A restriction to this is, as Noda (1997:112) notes, that *no da* cannot be used when the second clause, which should be explaining the true conditions, is in contradiction to the first.

⁹ McGloin (1986:16) claims that, although *no* in most cases may be considered an abbreviated form of *no da*, there also exists a final particle *no*, that cannot be considered as being derived from *no da*. Proof of this may be sought in the particles frequent occurrence in discourse-openers.

- (36) * Kimura-san ni at-ta *no dewana-i*. Kekkyoku dare ni mo awa-nakat-ta
 Kimura-HON IO meet-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST In.the.end who IO even meet-NEG-PAST
 ‘It wasn’t that I met Kimura-san. In the end I didn’t meet anyone.’

The part which is under focus and which the speaker acts to debunk is in this situation not the meaning of the predicate, but rather the listeners expectation of with whom the speaker met, and therefore the focus of the two sentences are in contradiction, thus being ungrammatical.

In this case the following two sentences structures will function as grammatical alternatives.

- (37) Kimura-san ni wa awa-nakat-ta. Kekkyoku dare ni mo awa-nakat-ta
 Kimura-HON IO TOP meet-NEG-PAST In.the.end who IO even meet-NEG-PAST
 ‘It wasn’t that I met Kimura-san. In the end I didn’t meet anyone.’
- (38) Kimura-san ni ai wa shi-nakat-ta. Kekkyoku dare ni mo awa-nakat-ta
 Kimura-HON IO meet TOP do-NEG-PAST In.the.end who IO even meet-NEG-PAST
 ‘It wasn’t that I met Kimura-san. In the end I didn’t meet anyone.’

Noda (1997:111) also notes that *no dewana-i* is ungrammatical in situations where the speaker expresses determination towards an act. The above mentioned structures do, however, even in this case represent a grammatical alternative.

- (39) *Watashi, moo, Kimura-san ni a-u *no dewana-i*
 I again Kimura-HON IO meet-NPAST NODA.NEG-NPAST
 ‘(Intended to mean) I never want to meet Kimura-san again.’

The above mentioned structures will be subject to further investigation in my own research.

2.4.4 Exceptions to the necessity of *no da*

Here I will give brief discussion of cases where *no da* isn’t necessary to produce the desired focus.

Adverbs can, as mentioned before, be subject to focus in a *no da* clause. But interestingly enough it appears that when an adverb has a particularly strong connection to the predicate, such as in *isshookenmei hatarakanakatta*, ‘(I) didn’t work hard’, *no da* is not necessary for the incorporation of this adverb into the focus of the clause (Noda 1997:40). A further somewhat similar exception is:

- (40) Byooin de um-are-nakat-ta kara, ofukuro-san ga taihen dat-ta rashi-i
 hospital LOC born-PASS-NEG-PAST because mother-HON NOM tough COP-PAST EXEV-
 NPAST
 ‘Since I wasn’t born in a hospital it must have been very hard on my mother, it seems.’

Noda (1997:43) cites Kuno (1983:132) as claiming that a sentence such as (40) places the focus appropriately on *byooin de*, ‘in a hospital’ without the presence of *no da* due to the given nature of the statement. A statement such as (41) would however sound contrived (Noda 1997:43).

- (41) ?Boku wa byooin de um-are-nakat-ta
 I TOP hospital LOC born-PASS-NEG-PAST
 ‘I wasn’t born in a hospital.’

2.5 Concerning the translation of *no da*

As it may give further insight into function of *no da* I feel it necessary to address the topic of the translation of *no da* sentences. The topic is so problematic that entire books, such as Ootake (2009), have been devoted to the subject.

One of the noted functions of the particle *no* is the ability to replace a previous word and its qualities in the form of an uninflected word (Yamada 2012:45). And Martin (1988:852) further says “...nominalizations are used as full sentences, sometimes to emphasize the factual nature of expositions...” This above described relationship, which is that of the relationship between an antecedent and an anaphor, leads to the structure’s translation in textbooks often utilizing the English cleft and psuedocleft sentence, with the most common translation being ‘it is that’. Maynard (1996:939) also notes that the effect of “highlighting” is similar between the usage of *no da* and cleft sentences. The problem is however, as she explains, the occurrence of sentences such as (42), which also happens to be the most frequent type. As we can see here, the translation of the explanatory *no da* becomes somewhat problematic.

- (42) Ronarudo ga Eren ni hanbaagaa o age-ta no dat-ta
 Ronald NOM Ellen IO hamburger ACC give-PAST NODA-PAST
 ‘It was that Ronald gave Ellen a hamburger.’

Further support of the fact that there only is a loose connection between the two structures may be found in a study made by Noda (1997:236-237), where the usage of *no da* in a Japanese book and the usage of the ‘it is that’ structure in its translation into English are compared. It is concluded that

the structures only carry a very weak connection; a conclusion based in the fact that the two structures, in reality, more often than not appear independent of each other.

3. My research

3.1 Introduction

In this section of the thesis I will present my own research, which is based upon topics covered in the previous section. There may however be the occasional reference to research not previously discussed if I find it necessary to support my conclusions.

One might say that the research that I have conducted on my own is in reaction to previous research and areas that I believe are lacking. The research, although pertaining to the qualities of *no da*, mainly focuses on the possibility of replacing *no da* with other, sometimes similar structures. In making these comparisons I believe that I have been able to pinpoint some qualities that define the *no da*-structure.

3.2 Methodology

The example sentences discussed in this section have been taken from literature discussed in the previous section. Some of the examples have been altered, at my own discretion, as to not differ in the usage of honorifics. In the case of such alterations the examples have been checked by an informant.

Five different examples, each consisting of one example utilizing the *no da*-structure and one utilizing a possible substitute to the *no da*-structure, will be discussed. The information gathered is mainly from an informant, but apart from this I have also conducted a survey as to get a more general perspective on how native speakers view the examples in question. The purpose of the survey is also to question whether or not the nuances discussed are objective or highly personal of the individual, which in this case would be the informant.

The survey was conducted on the internet using Google Docs to create the survey and Facebook to spread it. The participants were all native speakers of Japanese, mainly college students. No distinction was made in gender, age nor place of birth due to these, according to the informant, not being deciding factors to the nature of the answers given by the participants.

In the survey I asked the participants whether or not they felt a strong difference in nuance between the example sentence incorporating the *no da*-structure and the one that did not. The answers were given on a scale from one to five, where one would mean that there is no difference in nuance and the sentences are completely alike, and five would mean that there is a very strong difference in nuance. The number of participants in the survey amounted to 50 in total.

As the survey itself would not serve as enough of a basis to draw any real conclusions from I have also conducted a more in depth interview with an informant as to be able to pinpoint the

different aspects which differentiate the *no da*-structure from its counterparts. The results of the survey are presented together with the examples to which they correspond. The original questionnaire is viewable in the appendix of the thesis.

3.3 Example 1

The sentence structure that is examined in example 1 is derived from Noda (1997:211). There it is explained that the inferential *yoo da* is able to replace *no da* as a way of explaining the circumstances that make up a situation. But since there isn't any information pertaining to the difference in nuance between the two I decided to conduct a further investigation into the matter.

- (43) Heya no yoosu ga chiga-u. Dare.ka ga hait-ta *n da*
 room GEN state NOM be.different-NPAST somebody NOM enter-PAST NODA.NPAST
 'The room looks different. It is that someone has entered.'
- (44) Heya no yoosu ga chiga-u. Dare.ka ga hait-ta *yoo da*
 room GEN state NOM be.different-NPAST somebody NOM enter-PAST INF COP.NPAST
 'The room looks different. It appears that someone has entered.'

In the survey it was concluded that 0% of the participants felt that the sentences carried the same nuance, and as many as 44% of the participants answered 4, showing that the difference between the sentences is quite large.

1 The same	2	3	4	5 Different
0 (0%)	10 (20%)	5 (10%)	22 (44%)	13 (26%)

My informant tells me that the sentence employing the *no da*-structure sounds as if the speaker is close to 100% certain of the inference that is being made, whereas the *yoo da*-sentence is somewhere closer to 70-80%.

This gap might be, according to my informant, lessened by the usage of the deductive *ni chigainai* in stead of *yoo da*.

I believe that further proof of the high percentage of confidence conveyed in a statement utilizing *no da* may be sought in what adverbs that function with the structure. My informant says

that a sentence such as (43) may incorporate both *kitto*¹⁰ ‘certainly’ and *tabun*¹¹ ‘probably’ while still sounding natural, but the incorporation of an adverb more speculative in nature such *moshikashitara*¹², ‘maybe’, would sound a bit out of place.

3.4 Example 2

The structures discussed in 3.4 and 3.5 were previously discussed in 2.4.3, but in a slightly different context. I want to further investigate the possible differences in nuance between these two constructions, which both have a similar information structure.

- (45) Kimura-san ni at-ta *no dewana-i.* Mori-san ni at-ta
 Kimura-HON IO meet-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST Mori-HON IO meet-PAST
no da
 NODA.NPAST
 ‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’
- (46) Kimura-san ni wa awa-nakat-ta. Mori-san ni wa at-ta
 Kimura-HON IO TOP meet-NEG-PAST Mori-HON IO TOP meet-PAST
 ‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’

In the results of the survey it becomes apparent that the majority of the participants felt that the difference between (45) and (46) was quite large. Although the most popular reply, with 46%, was 4, it is also worth noting that the number of participants who replied 5 (indicating a very high degree of difference) exceeds the number of participants who replied 1-3.

1 The same	2	3	4	5 Different
2 (4%)	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	23 (46%)	14 (28%)

My informant cites two main points of difference between the two examples. The first being that the scope of the negation is larger in the *no da*-sentence, both incorporating the indirect subject (*Kimura-san*) as well as the predicate, giving more possibilities as to the where focus can be applied. In (46) however, there exists only one part which may carry the focus.

¹⁰ *Kitto* is described in Larm (2006:140) as being compatible with the deductive *ni chigainai*.

¹¹ *Tabun* is described in Larm (2006:113) as being compatible with the conjectural *daroo*.

¹² Described as being compatible with the speculative *kamoshirenai* (Larm 2006:133).

Furthermore, my informant tells me that (45) is more emphatic and might even carry a slightly reproachful tone as if the speaker has been asked several times before with whom he or she met. (46) on the other hand merely conveys objective information.

3.5 Example 3

This structure is as mentioned before also present in 2.4.3 but in a slightly different context.

- (47) Kimura-san ni at-ta *no dewana-i.* Mori-san ni at-ta
 Kimura-HON IO meet-PAST NODA.NEG-NPAST Mori-HON IO meet-PAST
no da
 NODA.NPAST
 ‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’
- (48) Kimura-san ni ai wa shi-nakat-ta. Mori-san ni wa at-ta
 Kimura-HON IO meet TOP do-NEG-PAST Mori-HON IO TOP meet-PAST
 ‘(I) did not meet Kimura-san. (I) met Mori-san.’

This example, although quite similar to the one previously discussed, carried quite different results in the survey. In the previous example an overwhelming majority, with 74% answering 4 or 5, found the two alternatives to be very different. Also in this example the most given answer was 4 (32%), but surprisingly enough as many as 22% answered with a 2 indicating a quite small difference. Overall the results are quite spread out.

1 The same	2	3	4	5 Different
5 (10%)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)	16 (32%)	10 (20%)

My informant tells me that the alternatives, just as in the previous example, mostly differ in that *no da* acts to emphasize, whereas the latter does not.

In addition, there is a difference as to where the focus lies with in the clause. In (47), as previously discussed in 2.4.2, the focus of *no da* is applied to the part which acts as an ornament, in this case *Kimura-san ni*. In (48), on the other hand, *ai*, due to the usage of the topic particle, becomes the focus. This, my informant tells me, leads to (48) sounding a bit odd together with the second clause containing the same predicate.

3.6 Example 4

The following example, derived from Kuno (1973:224, 226), was first brought up in 2.3.3.1. There we looked at the possibility of replacing *no da* with *kara da* while still retaining grammaticality. Now we will further investigate the difference in nuance between the two structures.

- (49) Kaze o hii-ta. Ame ni fu-rare-te nure-ta *n da*
 cold ACC caught-PAST rain AGT fall-PASS-GER get.wet-PAST NODA.NPAST
 ‘I have caught a cold. It is that I was rained on and drenched.’
- (50) Kaze o hii-ta. Ame ni fu-rare-te nure-ta *kara da*
 cold ACC caught-PAST rain AGT fall-PASS-GER get.wet-PAST because COP
 ‘I have caught a cold. It is because I was rained on and drenched.’

The most common reply was 2 (28%), followed by 1 (20%), thus indicating only a slight difference in nuance. These results would not support the drawing of any conclusions, but I do believe that they serve as an indication that there actually only might be a slight difference in nuance between the two alternatives.

1 The same	2	3	4	5 Different
10 (20%)	14 (28%)	9 (18%)	9 (18%)	8 (16%)

Just as noted by Kuno (1973:226) both *no da* and *kara da* in an example such as this give a cause to the previous statement. My informant further notes that, although both do in fact give causes, the *no da*-structure objectively states the cause and *kara da* is more emphatic. A sentence structure such as (49) is, according to my informant, more common than that of (50). The usage of *kara* is more common in a sentence structure such as:

- (51) Ame ni fu-rare-te nure-ta *kara,* kaze o hik-imashi-ta
 rain AGT fall-PASS-GER get.wet-PAST because Cold ACC caught-POL-PAST
 ‘It is because I was rained on and drenched that I have caught a cold.’

My informant tells me that a further difference between the usage of the two structures is that while *kara da* can be employed when a listener isn’t present, *no da* is restricted to when in the presence of a listener. This goes to further the importance of cohesion, namely, the cooperation between a speaker and listener as a fundamental aspect of the function of *no da*.

3.7 Example 5

The last example to be discussed in this thesis is one that is derived from Noda (1997:129), albeit slightly altered to give the two examples the same usage of honorifics. Noda claims that this example is an exception to the general rule that *no da* is mandatory in question clauses containing *dooshite* or *naze*.

- (52) Dooshite sonna.ni hiyake shi-te-iru *n desu* ka
 why like.that sunburn do-GER-PROG NODA.POL.NPAST QP
 ‘Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’
- (53) Sonna.ni hiyake shi-te-iru no wa dooshite desu ka
 like.that sunburn do-GER-PROG NML TOP why COP QP
 ‘Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’

In the results of the survey we see an overwhelming tendency towards lower numbers with as many as 40% giving a 1 as their answer, thus indicating a very small degree of difference in the nuance between the two.

1 The same	2	3	4	5 Different
20 (40%)	16 (32%)	9 (18%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)

My informant confirms that the content is identical in the two alternatives and that there only is a very slight difference between the two. In colloquial speech (52) is far more common than (53). When (53) is employed it often carries a sarcastic tone and lays greater emphasis on *dooshite*, ‘why’.

According to my informant a sentence structure such as (52) might sound more spontaneous whereas (53) sounds more as if the speaker has considered the content of the statement before the utterance. Further, (53) is, according to my informant, more readily employed when the speaker wishes to put the statement in a somewhat negative light.

These structures are, as concluded both by the survey and the informant, very close in meaning, and it would seem that no final conclusion can be drawn as to in which context they respectively are most prominently uttered in. I believe that it might be highly personal.

3.8 Conclusion

My hope was for this section of the thesis to shed some light on the nuances of the *no da*-structure by attempting to replace it with other structures. Nuances such as those that have been discussed are, I believe, often personal (as somewhat shown by the survey), and it is very hard to draw any final conclusions as to any objective properties of the structures at hand.

In **3.3** by comparing *no da* to the inferential *yoo da*, although it wasn't my original intention, I discovered that by investigating what adverbs that are compatible with *no da* I could draw the conclusion that *no da* conveys a stronger sense of certainty compared to *yoo da*. Also, the question of whether or not *no da* can be used as a marker of evidentiality is something I find very intriguing.

In my opinion, one of the most interesting aspects of the results of the research conducted in this thesis is whether or not one is able to completely separate the focus of *no da* and the modal *no da* into two different categories. I believe that one is able to conclude that the examples discussed **3.4** and **3.5**, although carrying a information structure similar to the *no da*-sentence, clearly had a big difference in nuance, somewhat due to *no da*'s, in this case, emphatic nature. This I believe is a sign that these two different functions of *no da* actually are intertwined with each other and that a separation of the two, although it sometimes seems necessary, isn't fully possible.

Both **3.6** and **3.7** are examples where it would appear that the function is replaceable. Important to note is that in both these cases the sentences without *no da*, according to the informant, were not as common as the alternative containing the *no da*-structure.

I have seen that *no da*, indeed, may be replaceable in some contexts, but I feel safe in assuming that there is no counterpart which carries all the same functions as well as nuances as *no da*.

4. Final remarks

The aim of this thesis has been to give a descriptive overview of *no da*. The topic is one of many different aspects, and a plethora of different functions. In attempting to describe these different functions I found it necessary to go through quite large amounts of information written in Japanese. And in doing so, I believe that I have presented some information in English that before only may have been available in Japanese.

Furthermore, in the course of writing this thesis I have encountered several aspects of the structure, *no da*, that I feel are in need of further investigation. As mentioned throughout the thesis, the concept of cohesion seems to be very deeply rooted within the function of the modal *no da*. But, in my opinion, the full extent of this phenomena is yet to be explained. I would like to see a dissection of the structure's different functions, in the purpose of concluding to which extent they correlate with the explanatory function and the concept of cohesion.

In addition to this, I would very much like to see a full on investigation of how exactly *no da* differentiates itself from other structures, maybe even modality markers. I have come across small amounts of research into this subject, in books such as Noda (1997), but I feel that a further investigation, preferably conducted in English, is necessary. The structure is in Japanese research often referred to as 'explanatory modality', but to what extent does it relate to other forms of modality, such as evidential modality? In my own research I believe that not only differences between *yoo da* and *no da* were discovered, but also areas where an overlap in function is present.

Even though the main functions of *no da* are well explained in the research that is available in English, the more specific nuances that it carries are still largely unexplained. Even in Japanese research, these nuances, I believe, are not explained to a large enough degree. Of course, the reason for this being that these nuances probably are largely obvious to any native speaker.

Overall, I would claim that the structure *no da* is a well covered topic. But if there is to be further investigation into the subject, I would call for a widening of the sphere in which *no da* is looked at.

References

- Alfonso, A. (1966) *Japanese language patterns: a structural approach*. Tokyo: Sophia University L.L. Center of Applied Linguistics.
- Iori, I. (2003 [2001]) *Atarashii nihongo gaku nyuumon* (An introduction to new Japanese linguistics). Tokyo: 3A Network.
- Kudoo, M. (1996) On the meaning and function of ‘-no de wa nai’. *Yokohama kokuritsu daigaku jinbun kiyoo* (Yokohama National University Faculty of Human Sciences bulletin paper), 43, pp. 1 - 19. Available through Yokohama National University Repository website <<http://kamome.lib.ynu.ac.jp/dspace/handle/10131/2850>> [Accessed Feb 9 2013].
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Larm, L. (2006) *Modality in Japanese*. D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Martin, S. E. (2004 [1988]) *A reference grammar of Japanese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press; Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Maynard, K. S. (1996) A case of nominalization in Japanese and English discourse. *Language Sciences*, 18 (3-4), pp. 933 - 946. Available through <www.sciencedirect.com> [Accessed Feb 9 2013].
- McGloin, M. N. (1980) Some observations concerning no desu expressions. *The Journal of the Association of the Teachers of Japanese*, 15(2), pp. 117 - 149. Available through <www.jstor.org> [Accessed Dec 5 2012].
- McGloin, M. N. (1986) Feminine wa and no: why do women use them? *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 20(1), pp. 7-27. Available through <www.jstor.org> [Accessed Feb 8 2013].
- Noda, H. (1997) *No (da) no kinoo* (The function of ‘no(da)’). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Ootake, Y. (2009) ‘No(da)’ ni taioo suru eigo no koobun (Structures in English which correspond to ‘no(da)’). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Prince, F. E. (1978) A comparison of wh-clefts and it-clefts in discourse. *Language*, 54(4), pp. 883 - 906. Available through <www.jstor.org> [Accessed Mar 24 2013].
- Takatsu, T. (1991) A unified semantic analysis of the NO DA construction in Japanese. *The Journal of the Association of the Teachers of Japanese*. 25(2), pp. 167 - 176. Available through <www.jstor.org> [Accessed Dec 17 2012].
- Tanomura, T. (2002[1990]) *Gendai nihongo no bunpoo I: ‘noda’ no imi to yoohoo* (Present-day Japanese grammar (Vol. 1): The meaning and use of no da). Osaka: Izumi Shoin.

Teramura, T. (1984) *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi II* (Japanese Syntax and Meaning' (Vol. 2)).
Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Yamada, T. (2012[2004]) *Kokugo kyooshi ga shitte okitai nihongo bunpoo* (Japanese grammar that
teachers of the Japanese language will want to know). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan

Appendix

「のだ」と「のだ」の機能に違い表現との相違点について

Concerning the difference between *no da* and expression which resemble *no da*.

a), b)の文を読み、どのぐらいのニュアンスの違い、状況の違いを感じますか。

To what extent do you feel a difference in nuance or circumstances upon reading a) and b)?

このアンケートは論文に使わせて頂きます。

回答よろしくお願いたします。

This survey will be used in my thesis. Your cooperation is much appreciated.

1.

a)部屋の様子が違う。誰かが入ったんだ。

‘The room looks different. It’s that someone has entered.’

b)部屋の様子が違う。誰かが入ったようだ。

‘The room looks different. It appears that someone has entered.’

全く同じだと思う 1・2・3・4・5 全く異なっていると思う

I think that they are exactly the same. I think that they are utterly different.

2.

a)木村さんに会ったのではない。森さんに会ったのだ。

‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’

b)木村さんには会わなかった。森さんには会った。

‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’

全く同じだと思う 1・2・3・4・5 全く異なっていると思う

I think that they are exactly the same. I think that they are utterly different.

3.

a)木村さんに会ったのではない。森さんに会ったのだ。

‘It is not Kimura-san whom (I) met. It is Mori-san whom (I) met.’

b)木村さんに会いしなかった。森さんには会った。

‘(I) did not meet Kimura-san. (I) met Mori-san.’

全く同じだと思う 1・2・3・4・5 全く異なっていると思う

I think that they are exactly the same. I think that they are utterly different.

4.

a)風邪をひいた。雨に降られて濡れたんだ。

‘(I) have caught a cold. It is that I was rained on and drenched.’

b)風邪をひいた。雨に降られて濡れたからだ。

‘(I) have caught a cold. It is because I was rained on and drenched.’

全く同じだと思う 1・2・3・4・5 全く異なっていると思う

I think that they are exactly the same. I think that they are utterly different.

5.

a)どうしてそんなに日焼けしているんですか。

‘(lit)Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’

b)そんなに日焼けしているのはどうしてですか。

‘(lit)Why is it that you are sunburned to that degree?’

全く同じだと思う 1・2・3・4・5 全く異なっていると思う

I think that they are exactly the same. I think that they are utterly different.

アンケートにご協力頂きありがとうございます。

Your cooperation in filling out this form is much appreciated.