

Scottish Gaelic Clefts: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics

By

Christine M. Sheil

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Linguistics
in the
Graduate Division
of the
University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Line Mikkelsen, Chair
Professor Peter Jenks
Professor Mairi McLaughlin

Fall 2016

Abstract

Scottish Gaelic Clefts: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics

by

Christine M. Sheil

Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Line Mikkelsen, Chair

This dissertation investigates the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of clefts in Scottish Gaelic, and represents the first in-depth look at Scottish Gaelic clefts. It also examines the Propositional Cleft. While the Propositional Cleft is acknowledged in Scottish Gaelic grammars, a thorough description and analysis has not been done. The Propositional Cleft is noteworthy for the presence of cleft morphosyntax—the copula, a *pro*-form, and the relative complementizer—but the absence of a clefted constituent. This lack of a clefted constituent is puzzling if the Propositional Cleft is to be included in the cleft paradigm, since it is the clefted constituent which is typically interpreted as the focus, and the interpretation of focus is typically assumed to be derived from the focus-background bipartite structure created by the cleft construction. This property of lacking a bipartite structure makes the Propositional Cleft, at first glance, an unlikely candidate for membership in the cleft paradigm. Over the course of the dissertation I describe and analyze the pragmatic effect of the Propositional Cleft, and I argue that the Propositional Cleft is in fact a member of the cleft paradigm, but that it instantiates a typologically rare combination of broad sized identificational focus. The syntactic and semantic analysis of clefts proposed here extends straightforwardly to derive the particular meaning and structure of the Propositional Cleft, and shows that broad focus is not incompatible with cleft meaning.

I argue that A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic are movement based, and propose a syntactic account of focus movement in clefts which involves the checking of focus features in C by the movement of the focus phrase to its specifier. This syntactic account of focus allows us to understand the absence of movement in the Propositional Cleft, since the broad size of focus means that the focus constituent is the complement of CP, and so can check the focus features of C *in situ*.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.1.1	The Scottish Gaelic Data	2
1.2	An Introduction to the Propositional Cleft	3
1.3	What the Propositional Cleft is Not	5
1.3.1	The <i>It is that</i> Construction	5
1.3.2	Verum Focus	7
1.3.3	Sentence Focus	8
1.4	Summary	10
2	The Meaning of Clefts in Scottish Gaelic	12
2.1	Scottish Gaelic Clefts as Focus Constructions	12
2.2	Exhaustivity in Scottish Gaelic Clefts	14
2.3	Analysis of Cleft Meaning	17
2.3.1	A Structured Discourse	18
2.3.2	The CLEFT Operator	20
2.3.3	An Analysis of Scottish Gaelic Clefts	21
2.4	Summary	24
3	The Propositional Cleft	26
3.1	The Propositional Cleft as a Cleft Construction	26
3.1.1	Contrast in the Propositional Cleft	27
3.1.1.1	Variability in Location of Contrast	29
3.1.1.2	Absence of Contrast	31
3.1.2	The Propositional Cleft as a Focus Construction	33
3.1.3	Summary: What must be explained	34
3.2	QUD Redux	35
3.3	The Pragmatic Effect of the Propositional Cleft	39
3.3.1	Creating a New Line of Inquiry	40
3.3.2	The Non-contrastive Propositional Cleft	44
3.4	Pragmatic Effect via CLEFT and Broad Focus	47
3.4.1	CLEFT Recap	47
3.4.2	The Context Set	48
3.4.3	The CLEFT Operator and Broad Focus	50

CONTENTS

3.5	Summary	53
4	Scottish Gaelic A-bar Dependencies	55
4.1	The Complementizer System	55
4.2	The Case Against A-bar Movement	60
4.2.1	Non-Identity Effects	61
4.2.1.1	Failure of Selection	61
4.2.1.2	Anti-Agreement	62
4.2.1.3	Case Mismatches	63
4.2.1.4	Idiom Interpretation Failures	64
4.2.1.5	Condition C (Non-)Reconstruction	65
4.2.1.6	Summary	65
4.2.2	A Base-Generation Analysis	65
4.2.3	Summary	68
4.3	Identity Effects in A-bar Dependencies	68
4.3.1	Selection	68
4.3.2	Agreement	69
4.3.3	Condition C	71
4.3.4	Variable Binding	71
4.3.5	Reciprocals	72
4.3.6	The Interpretation of Bare NPs	73
4.3.7	Summary	73
4.4	A Movement Account of A-bar Dependencies	75
4.5	Summary	78
5	The Structure of Clefts	79
5.0.1	The Morphosyntax of Copular Structures	79
5.1	Cleft Syntax	80
5.1.1	The Augment	81
5.1.1.1	Variation in the Form of the Augment	82
5.1.1.2	A Semantic Account of the Augment: Adger (2011)	86
5.1.1.3	Pronominal Subjects of Copular Structures	89
5.1.2	A Cleft Syntax	93
5.1.2.1	The Syntax of the Augment	94
5.1.2.2	The Nature of Agreement with the Augment	95
5.1.2.3	Focus Movement in Clefts	101
5.1.3	Summary	104
5.2	Implications for Copula Clauses	104
5.2.1	Structure of the Augmented Copula Clause	105
5.2.2	Adger and Ramchand (2003)	106
5.2.2.1	The Inverted Copula Clause (ICC)	106
5.2.2.2	The Augmented Copula Clause (ACC)	109
5.2.2.3	Summary	112
5.2.3	Comparison	112
5.2.3.1	The Copula and Inversion	113

CONTENTS

5.2.3.2	The Augment	123
5.2.3.3	Position of the Predicate DP	124
5.2.3.4	Summary	125
5.2.4	Structure for the Inverted Copula Clause	126
5.3	Summary	127
6	The Syntax of the Propositional Cleft	128
6.1	Cleft Meaning and Structure	128
6.1.1	The Meaning of Clefts	128
6.1.2	Cleft Syntax	130
6.1.3	Summary	131
6.2	The Propositional Cleft	131
6.2.1	The Meaning of the Propositional Cleft	131
6.2.2	The Predicted Structure for the Propositional Cleft	131
6.2.3	The Syntax of the Propositional Cleft	132
6.2.4	Summary	134
6.3	Restrictions on the Propositional Cleft	134
6.3.1	Embedding	136
6.4	Summary	138
7	Conclusion	139
7.1	Dissertation Summary	139
7.2	Implications for Focus and the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface	140
7.2.1	The Syntax of Focus	140
7.2.2	Broad Focus	141
7.2.3	A Cross-Linguistic Look at Broad Identificational Focus	141
7.2.3.1	Propositional Assertion in East Asian Languages	141
7.2.3.2	Discourse Particles	143
7.3	Summary	143
	Bibliography	145
	Source Abbreviations	151
	A Corpus of the Propositional Cleft	152

List of Tables

1.1	Summary of Interpretations Unavailable to the PC	11
4.1	Complementizers' Effect on Verb Form	60
4.2	Derivation of A-bar dependency via Move	68
4.3	Derivation of A-bar dependency via Agree	68
4.4	Summary of (Non-)Identity Effects in Scottish Gaelic A-bar Dependencies . .	74
5.1	The Form of the Augment and Type of Clefted Constituent	86
5.2	Form and Semantic Type of the Augment	87
5.3	Emphatic Pronouns	89
5.4	The Form of the Augment and Category of the Subject	95
5.5	Independent-Dependent Pattern and the Null Form of the Copula	116
5.6	Environments for <i>tu</i>	117

List of Figures

3.1	Partition on the Context Set: Narrow Informational Focus	49
-----	--	----

Glossing conventions

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
C	complementizer
COND	conditional mood
COP	copula
C.REL	relative complementizer
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DEP	dependent form of the verb
EMPH	emphatic particle
F	feminine gender
FREE.REL	free relative particle
FUT	future tense
GEN	genitive case
IMP	impersonal passive
INF	infinitive
INDEP	independent form of the verb
M	masculine gender
NEG	negation
OPTL	object shift particle
PAST	past tense
PASS	passive
PERF	perfect aspect
POSS	possessive pronoun
PRES	present tense
PROG	progressive aspect
PTCL	particle
Q	interrogative particle
REL	relative form of the verb
SG	singular number
TOP	topic
PL	plural number
VN	verbal noun
VOC	vocative

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I thank my committee for their guidance, suggestions, and encouragement. Line Mikkelsen has been an incredible advisor and mentor, and has spent the last six and a half years reading through some very rough drafts and somehow always extracting content and pearls of insight from even the most poorly formed thoughts. Peter Jenks has an inspirational enthusiasm for all things language, and has always had an appreciation for data that requires an unconventional analysis. And Mairi McLaughlin has been an incredibly insightful and supportive external member. Thank you all.

Thank you also to the many Scottish Gaelic speakers who have shared their language with me over the last three years. Thank you for listening to me stumble through the Gaelic, and for encouraging me to continue speaking the language. Thank you for spending time with me, especially because many of you had plenty of other work to do! Thank you for your thoughts, your comments, and your judgments: Gillebride Mac 'Illethaoil, Iain Campbell, Norman Graham Smith, Mòrag Maclean, Jane NicLeòid, Ian Greumach, Anne Frater, Angela Weir, Donnie Macdonald, Murdo MacLennan, Mairi MacDonald, Marie MacLeod, Colin George Morrison, Dolina Macleod, Linda Macleod, Niall Iain Macdonald, James Morrison, Mary Ann Kennedy, Aonghas MacNeacail, Kevin Murray, Norma Nicolson, Catriona Dunn, and Andrew Dunn. You were all so helpful, and kind, and amazing. Thank you for the biscuits, the cups of tea, and sharing your language, culture, and sense of place with me. I am also grateful to the Oswalt Endangered Languages Fund and the Berkeley Linguistics Department and Graduate Division for funding those trips.

There are many members of the linguistics community who have supported and encouraged me over the years. In particular, Jim McCloskey's amenability to discussing various aspects of the Celtic languages and fieldwork has been essential to the development of this dissertation. David Adger, for his support and interest in my work on Gaelic. And of course, my early mentors and advisors, Jamal Ouhalla and Abbas Benmamoun, without whose help and encouragement I would not have considered graduate school or a PhD program. To Belen and Paula, whose organization and expertise in the Berkeley bureaucracy, and whose support and friendly faces made dealing with the more mundane side of academia more of a pleasure. And thank you to my grad school friends and office-mates: Tammy, Nico, Florian, Elise, Oana, Eric, and everyone else. Together we were able to laugh off a lot of the stress, and that's my choice way of dealing with it!

Thank you to my friends and family, without whom graduate school would have been much more of a bumpy road. Although I didn't see you all that often, your presence in my

memories of Berkeley is great: Lauren, Veronica, Praveen, and Adam. Thank you, Mom and Dad, for understanding when I changed majors from a “practical” one to linguistics, and for supporting me wholeheartedly. And Eoin, thank you for encouraging me to have a substantial life outside of grad school, and for supporting me in every way you could. Thank you for taking the screaming baby on long walks, and for becoming such an amazing dad to our daughter. And Phaedra, thank you for being born. I love you.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Overview

This dissertation provides the first in-depth description and analysis of the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of clefts in Scottish Gaelic. It is also the first investigation of the PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT (PC), and analyzes the PC as a member of the cleft paradigm. The main objectives of this dissertation are i) to provide a syntax and semantics for clefts in Scottish Gaelic, ii) to characterize the pragmatic meaning contributed by the PC and iii) to use the PC as a case study in how identificational focus is read off the syntactic structure in cleft constructions. Two additional contributions of the dissertation for Scottish Gaelic in particular are i) a movement-based structure for A-bar dependencies and ii) a proposal for copular clauses which captures the variation form of the pronominal “augment.”

The inclusion of the PC in the cleft paradigm is initially motivated by its cleft morphosyntax: the PC utilizes the copula, the pronominal augment, and the relative complementizer. However, the PC lacks a clefted constituent, and on this count its status as a cleft construction may seem uncertain. I survey the discourse contexts in which the PC appears, and argue that its meaning bears similarities to the identificational focus contributed by regular clefts. Thus both the form and function together make the case for the PC to be analyzed as a cleft. This raises two questions concerning the PC: what is in focus, and why is the focus not displaced? The constellation of morphosyntactic properties exhibited by the PC is surprising on the assumption that the identificational focus conveyed by cleft morphosyntax is partially derived by the bipartite division of the sentence into focus (what is clefted) and background (what remains in the relative clause).

The theoretical and typological literature on clefts have largely discussed cleft constructions for which the focus constituent is the clefted constituent. That is, our understanding of clefts to date has been informed predominantly by narrow focus cleft constructions. I argue that the PC conveys broad-scope identificational focus. Thus the question of how focus is possible without a bipartite structure is partially resolved when we understand the PC as differing from regular clefts in the size of focus. The canonical focus-background division

of the sentence is simply inapplicable to a broad-scope focus construction. While cleft morphosyntax without a bipartite structure is not uncommon (cf. the *it is that* construction discussed below in §1.3.1), broad-scope identificational focus does seem to be typologically rare (if not unique to Scottish Gaelic).

This first chapter introduces the PC, its formal similarities to regular clefts and some surprising differences. I then turn to superficially similar constructions, and show that the PC cannot be reduced to any other documented cleft-like or focus construction. The function of the PC overlaps, but is not fully consistent with its characterization as an *it is that* construction, verum focus, or sentence focus. After proposing a semantic analysis of regular clefts in Chapter 2, in Chapter 3 I provide a positive characterization of the PC's meaning, arguing that, like regular clefts, it is a focus construction. Whereas regular clefts are licensed by focus congruence (Roberts 1996), the PC is licensed by a more complex discourse structure. I argue that this can be derived from the meaning of the CLEFT operator as it interacts with broad focus-marking.

1.1.1 The Scottish Gaelic Data

The data used in this dissertation comes largely from published texts and my own fieldwork. Elicited examples come from field trips to Scotland in the summers of 2013 (Glasgow, the Isle of Skye, and the Isle of Lewis) and 2014 (the Isle of Lewis), as well as subsequent e-mail elicitation with these same speakers. These locations still have a sizeable native-Gaelic speaking population. Both Skye and Glasgow have an active Gaelic studies program at the University level. Most of my consultants were born and raised in the Outer Hebrides (Lewis and Uist specifically), and use the language in their daily activities. I systematically repeated my elicitation across speakers, and report judgements which reflect the consensus, although I cite only a single elicitation session.

As for the textual sources, their selection was dictated by availability, and represents the texts which I had access to, including folktales, interviews, narratives, and a translation of early Welsh literature, totalling approximately 2,000 pages. These texts are cited using abbreviations and page numbers, and a full list of source abbreviations and bibliographic information is included in Appendix B. Several sources either do not have a line-by-line English translation, or lack a translation altogether. Where I have provided a translation, the translation is marked with an asterisk (e.g. (1.1a) below). I have also glossed all examples, and have provided a list of glossing conventions on page vi.

To my knowledge no academic literature has been devoted to the PC,¹ so I have included a corpus of examples of the PC in Appendix A for the interested reader.² This corpus contains all instances of the PC found in the text material. The PC is attested in Scottish

¹Adger (2011) discusses a similar cleft-like construction, but the construction reported there crucially does not involve the relative complementizer.

²A caveat regarding one of the texts: *Am Mabinogi* is a translation from Welsh. I have included it in the discussion here anyways. To my knowledge Welsh does not have a counterpart to the PC, and so I do not believe any interference from Welsh would arise regarding the pragmatic effect of the PC. Additionally, there was no obvious differences in the discourse function of the PC in this text compared to the other sources.

Gaelic as far back as the mid-1800’s, and is not found in Modern Irish, although it is found in dialects across Scotland (East Sutherland, East Perthshire, Skye, Ross-shire, the Outer Hebrides, Highlands, and even Nova Scotia).³ These textual sources, in which the PC is attested, reflect a diversity in geography and time, a fact that I believe underscores the need to understand the propositional cleft as a construction that is very much a unique and important part of Scottish Gaelic grammar.

1.2 An Introduction to the Propositional Cleft

Both regular clefts (1.1a) and the Propositional Cleft (1.1b) share three pieces of morphosyntactic structure, all bolded in (1.1): (i) the copula *is*, a proclitic typically represented as ’s; (ii) a *pro*-form “augment”, *ann* in (1.1)⁴; and (iii) the relative complementizer *a*. The PC is noteworthy in lacking a clefted constituent: there is no counterpart to the bracketed clefted constituent in the regular cleft in (1.1a). Instead of a syntactic division of the proposition into focused and backgrounded parts, the proposition is left whole, within the relative clause, in the PC. I provide an unclefted version below the clefted example to illustrate this: the clause is unaffected syntactically in the PC.

- (1.1) a. **’S ann** [a’ coiseachd] **a** bhiodh e gu math tric sios rathad na h-Airde.
cf. Bhiodh e a’ coiseachd gu math tric sios rathad na h-Airde.
- ’S ann a’ coiseachd a bhiodh e gu math tric
 COP in.3MSG PROG walk.VN C.REL be.COND 3MSG quite often
 sios rathad na h-Airde.
 down the Ard Road
 ‘He would often walk down the Ard Road.’*
 (*lit.* It’s walking that he would often be down the Ard Road) SAS: 27
- b. **’S ann a** bhios iad a’ toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad ’na rìgheachd.
cf. Bhois iad a’ toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad ’na rìgheachd.
- ’S ann a bhios iad a’ toir cuideachadh is
 COP in.3MSG C.REL be.FUT.REL 3PL PROG give.VN help and
 comhairlean seachad ’na rìgheachd.
 advice.PL away in-3MSG.POSS kingdom
 ‘They give out help and advice in the kingdom.’* TB: 10

The morphosyntactic similarities between regular clefts and the PC motivates the starting assumption that the PC should be treated as a member of the cleft paradigm. Chapters 2 and

³A historical survey into the origin of the PC is unfortunately beyond the scope of this dissertation, but future research will investigate questions regarding the differences between Modern Irish and Scottish Gaelic in the existence of the PC, and the timing of the emergence of the PC in Scottish Gaelic relative to the divergence of Scottish Gaelic as a separate language.

⁴There is variation in the form of the augment: it may surface as *ann* ‘in him/it’ or *e* ‘him/it’. I discuss this variation in more detail in Chapter 5, where I argue that the variation is a morphosyntactic reflex of an agreement relation between the augment and the clefted constituent.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

3 establish the focus function of regular clefts and the focus function of the PC, respectively. My claim is that the PC shares not only the structure but also the focus function associated with clefts.

Aside from the absence of a clefted constituent, the PC also shows divergent morphosyntactic behavior: it cannot be negated (1.2a) or questioned (1.3a). Regular clefts show no such restrictions (1.2b),⁵ (1.3b).

(1.2) a. *Chan ann a thuit e dhan allt.

*Chan ann a thuit e dhan allt.
 NEG.COP in.3MSG C.REL fall.PAST 3MSG to-othe burn
 ‘He didn’t fall into the burn.’ GLA_IC_03JUN2014_CMS

b. Cha b’ ann [a’ coimhead roimhe] a bha esan.

Cha b’ ann a’ coimhead roimhe a bha
 NEG COP in.3MSG PROG look.VN before.3MSG C.REL be.PAST
 esan.
 3MSG.EMPH
 ‘He wasn’t looking ahead of him.’
 (lit. ‘It wasn’t looking before him that he was.’) ST: 32

(1.3) a. *An ann a thachair e gum bhàsaich am beothach a nochd?

*An ann a thachair e gum bhàsaich am beothach
 Q in.3MSG C.REL happen.PAST 3MSG C die.PAST the beast
 a nochd?
 tonight
 ‘Did it happen that the beast died tonight?’ GLA_TS_02JUN2014_CMS

b. An ann [as do dheoghaidh] a bha e?

An ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e?
 Q in.3MSG after you C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 ‘Was he after you?’ (lit. ‘Was it after you that he was?’) ST: 24

One might be tempted to explain such atypical behavior by rejecting the categorization of the PC as a cleft construction. Given the unavailability of negation or questioning, the PC may be nothing more than an anomaly or fossilized construction. If this were the case, we would expect the PC to have a meaning distinct from regular clefts, and perhaps a pragmatic effect similar to other cleft-like, but crucially non-cleft, constructions. . It is the goal of this dissertation to argue for an analysis of the PC in which the PC is a true cleft construction. I specifically argue that the PC conveys the same type of focus—identificational focus—as

⁵The copula shows a restricted tense inflection. The form *is* is typically described as being used in present and future tense contexts, while the form *bu* is used in past and conditional contexts. This distinction is being lost, however, and the *is* form is increasingly found in past tense and conditional contexts. I discuss the form of the copula in more detail in Chapter 5. See also Gillies (1993: 209), Lamb (2003: 67), Adger and Ramchand (2003: 334). I gloss both forms simply as COP.

regular clefts, but that the size of focus is different. Before I turn to the task of arguing that the PC is a fully functioning member of the cleft paradigm, I first discuss similar superficially cleft-like and focus constructions, and show that the PC does not have the same pragmatic effect. This motivates an in-depth look at the PC’s meaning in Chapter 3, where I argue that the meaning of the PC is best understood if we take it to be part of the cleft paradigm.

1.3 What the Propositional Cleft is Not

The use of cleft morphosyntax without a clefted constituent is not unique to Scottish Gaelic. We need only look to English to find a surface-similar construction: the *it is that* construction. And many languages have propositional-level focus constructions: verum focus or sentence focus constructions. In this section I show that the PC cannot be reduced to any single one of these constructions, although particular instances may bear similarities to them. I will first show that the PC is not like the English *it is that* construction, to which it bears formal but not pragmatic similarities. I will then show that the PC cannot be reduced to any other clause-level focus construction (verum focus or sentence focus). Verum focus, in which focus is on the polarity of the sentence, involves contrast on an element high in the clausal spine (specifically, the truth of the proposition). Sentence focus, which conveys all-new information in the sentence, introduces a new (i.e. in-focus) proposition. While verum focus has a similar type of focus to the PC—emphatic or contrastive—the size of focus is arguably narrow, on the truth of the proposition, rather than the proposition itself. Sentence focus, on the other hand, shares with the PC a broad-sized focus, but differs in the kind of focus it conveys: sentence focus conveys informational, or all-new, rather than identificational focus.

1.3.1 The *It is that* Construction

Superficially, the Scottish Gaelic Propositional Cleft is similar to the English *it is that* construction (1.4). Both the PC and the *it is that* construction utilize the morphosyntactic pieces of clefts—the copula, a *pro*-form, and, apparently, in the case of English, a relative clause—but both fail to divide the proposition into two parts.

(1.4) (Nobody has invited me to the dance...)

It’s that I’m not pretty enough.

(Rosenkvist 2005: 248)

The pragmatic effect of the *it is that* construction is to explain or to interpret a previous statement (see Declerck (1992), Otake (2002) and Rosenkvist (2005)). In (1.4), the speaker is explaining the fact that she has not been invited to the dance: because she is not pretty enough.

Cleft-based constructions with this explanatory function have been identified in other languages. The Japanese *no da* construction (1.5a) and the South Swedish ‘Apparent Cleft’ (1.5b) have both been argued to have the same explanatory function as the English *it is that* construction.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

(1.5) (Nobody has invited me to the dance...)

a. Watashi wa amari kawaiku nai no da wa.
 I TOP enough pretty not C COP F.PL
 ‘It’s that I’m not pretty enough.’

b. Det är som jag inte är trillräckligt snygg.
 it is *som* I am not enough pretty
 ‘It’s that I’m not pretty enough.’

(Rosenkvist 2005: 248)

We might expect the Scottish Gaelic Propositional Cleft, because it too involves cleft morphosyntax without a division of the proposition, to convey a similar pragmatic meaning. However, it does not share the explanatory or interpretive function of the *it is that* family of constructions. Many instances of the PC simply cannot be translated with a felicitous *it is that* construction. In (1.6), for instance, there is no previous sentence requiring explanation.⁶

(1.6) (Roddy wants to marry a girl, and she insists on him buying her a ring. He gets one from a gypsy tinker, and he and the girl agree to marry after the fisheries.)

‘S a cheud oidhche bha dannsa aca ann an taighean Gordon,
 And the first night they had a dance in Gordon’s houses,

’s ann a thuit na clachan as an fhàinne.

’s ann a thuit na clachan as an fhàinne.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL fall.PAST the.PL stone.PL out.of the ring

‘(#it’s that) the stones fell out of the ring.’

LG: 275

If the PC were exclusively an explanatory construction, like the *it is that* family of constructions, this example would be unexplained.

Even more compellingly, speakers find the PC odd in contexts where an explanation is required. In (1.7), for instance, the speaker’s late arrival is explained by the fact that the bus was late. However, the PC is unnatural in this context.

(1.7) A: Tha thusa fadalach!
 be.PRES 2SG.EMPH late
 ‘You’re late!’

B: #’S ann a thàinig am bus air deireadh.

#’S ann a thàinig am bus air deireadh.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST the bus late

‘It’s that the bus was late.’

GLA_MM_06NOV2013_CMS

⁶The narrative continues with the girl breaking the engagement. The PC in (1.6) could conceivably be interpreted as an explanation for the subsequent development that the girl marries someone else and Roddy never sees her again. This, however, is a distinct pragmatic function from the one found with the *it is that* family of constructions.

I conclude the Scottish Gaelic Propositional Cleft is not an instance of the *it is that* family of constructions. It cannot be used in explicitly explanatory contexts, and furthermore appears in a broader range of contexts than the *it is that* construction can.

1.3.2 Verum Focus

Verum focus can be described at an intuitive level as emphasis on the truth of a proposition (cf. Höhle (1992), Romero and Han (2004)). I assume, following Samko (2016: 118-124), that verum focus is focus on the truth value of the sentence’s propositional content, or the polarity of the sentence. In English, verum focus is expressed with stress on the auxiliary or negation.

(1.8) I DID feed the cat!

Verum focus can be characterized as a way of answering a question regarding the truth of a proposition. Thus, in (1.8), it is easy to construe a context (for this native English speaker, anyway) in which the question of whether the speaker fed the cat is at issue (for instance, if the speaker is a child accused of skipping out on the chores). I will not go into the formal characterization of verum focus, but point the interested reader to the literature, especially Romero and Han (2004), Samko (2016: 104*ff.*), Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009), Gutzmann and Castroviejo Miró (2011) and references therein. For our purposes, it suffices that the literature converges on the claim that because there is focus on the polarity of the sentence, the propositional content must be provided in the discourse context.

Because verum focus is focus on the polarity of the sentence, the content of the sentence itself is backgrounded and must be at least partially given. Thus verum focus is felicitous in contexts where the propositional content has been introduced but not asserted, or where the truth of a proposition is at issue (Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009: 191), such as when an interlocuter expresses doubt about the truth of a statement. In (1.9), the propositional content is introduced by *wonder* but is neither asserted or denied. In this context, verum focus is felicitous, as it definitively asserts the truth of the proposition.

(1.9) A: I wonder whether Carl has finished his book.

B: Carl HAS finished his book. (Gutzmann and Castroviejo Miró 2011: 143)

In such contexts, where the propositional content is given and the truth is at issue, the PC is infelicitous. The PC cannot be used to assert the truth of the content introduced in a non-factive predicate such as *ràdh* ‘say’ (1.10) or *bi cinnteach* ‘be sure’ (1.11).

(1.10) A: Tha Màiri ag ràdh gun tèid sinn dhan tràigh a-màireach.

Tha Màiri ag ràdh gun tèid sinn dhan tràigh a-màireach.
 be.PRES Mary PROG say.VN C go.FUT 1PL to.the beach tomorrow
 ‘Mary says we’ll go to the beach tomorrow.’

B: #’S ann a thèid sinn dhan tràigh a-màireach.

#’S ann a thèid sinn dhan tràigh a-màireach.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL go.FUT 1PL to-the beach tomorrow

‘(It’s true,) we WILL go to the beach tomorrow.’ GLA__JN__05JUL2014__CMS

(1.11) A: Chan eil mi cinnteach gun do dh’fhàg Seònaig an taigh an-dè.

Chan eil mi cinnteach gun do dh’fhàg Seònaig an taigh
 NEG be.PRES.DEP 1SG sure C leave.PAST.DEP Seònaig the house
 an-dè
 yesterday

‘I’m not sure that Seònaig left the house yesterday.’

B: #’S ann a dh’fhàg i an taigh an-dè.

#’S ann a dh’fhàg i an taigh an-dè
 COP in.3MSG C.REL leave.PAST 3FSG the house yesterday

‘She DID leave the house yesterday.’ GLA__IC__05JUL2014__CMS

Finally, the PC can introduce all-new propositional content, as in (1.12). In such contexts, verum focus is infelicitous, since verum focus requires the propositional content to be given.

(1.12) Thòisich Cailean air an òran, ach chan robh e a’ faighinn air adhart glé mhath leis, bha a’ chas aige cho goirt.
 ‘Colin started on the song, but he didn’t get on very well with it, his leg was so sore.’

’S ann a thàinig balach a steach.

’S ann a thàinig balach a steach.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST boy in

‘Then a boy came in.’ (cf. #Then a boy DID come in.)

LG: 273

Not only is the PC infelicitous in contexts where verum focus is licensed, but the PC is found in contexts where verum focus is infelicitous. I conclude that the PC does not convey verum focus. The propositional content of the PC need not be given (cf. (1.12)), and the PC is not a felicitous means of asserting the truth of a previously introduced but unasserted proposition.

1.3.3 Sentence Focus

Sentence focus constructions convey all-new information, with both the argument and the predicate in focus. Sentence focus often introduces a new referent into the discourse or a new event (Lambrecht 2000: 623), and is felicitous in discourse-initial contexts. In (1.13), for example, no context is needed for the utterance to be pragmatically well-formed.

(1.13) My PLATE broke. (Lambrecht 2000: 632)

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

We saw in (1.12) above that the PC can be used to introduce all-new information like this. However, this is only an overlap in the information structure of the clause-internal constituents. The PC is infelicitous in the larger discourse contexts which license sentence focus utterances.

Sentence focus does not require a prior discourse context to be felicitous, and so sentence focus constructions are good answers to questions requiring an all-new answer, such as “what happened?” (Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009: 185). For the PC to be felicitous, however, my consultants reported that a context is needed. Indeed, the PC is not a felicitous answer to the question *Dè tha a’ tachairt?* “What’s happening?”⁷

(1.14) A: Dè a tha a’ tachairt?
 what C.REL be.PRES PROG happen.VN
 ‘What’s happening?’

B: #’S ann a tha an leanabh a’ dannsa.

’S ann a tha an leanabh a’ dannsa.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the child PROG dance.VN
 ‘The child is dancing.’

GLA__JN__02JUN2014__CMS

The PC also fails to show the same sorts of restrictions on clause-internal constituents as found in sentence focus utterances. Lambrecht (2000) shows that sentence focus constructions tend to de-topicalize the subject cross-linguistically. This creates restrictions on the realization of the subject, and is typically achieved by associating properties typical of objects with the subject.

While subjects are typically topical, in a sentence focus utterance the subject must be in focus (since sentence focus entails that everything in the sentence is in focus, i.e. new information). This means that in sentence focus utterances, null or pronominal subjects are typically banned (Lambrecht 2000: 618). In the PC, however, pronominal subjects are fully grammatical (1.15), and commonly attested.

(1.15) ’S ann a rachadh e gu àite a b’ fheàrr.

’S ann a rachadh e gu àite a b’ fheàrr
 COP in.3MSG C.REL go.COND 3MSG to place C.REL COP better
 ‘He was going to a better place.’

NBG: 10

Sentence focus constructions also tend to place restrictions on the semantic role of the subject, and on the argument structure of the verb. Subjects of sentence focus constructions are usually non-agentive and predicates tend to be restricted to intransitive verbs (Lambrecht 2000: 622-624). Propositional clefts show no such restriction. (1.16) shows a clearly transitive verb, *bìd* ‘bite’, with a prototypically agentive subject, *cù* ‘dog’.

⁷While the PC is not a good neutral answer in (1.14), some speakers allowed for an interpretation whereby the PC is reporting unexpected content. In (1.14), for example, the PC might imply that the child should not be dancing. Sentence focus constructions do not have this interpretation, and so this is another aspect in which the PC differs from sentence focus. I return to this unexpected-content interpretation in Chapter 3.

(1.16) Latha bha seo 's ann a bhìd cù a' chas.

Latha bha seo 's ann a bhìd cù a' chas.
 day be.PAST this COP in.3MSG C.REL bite.PAST dog the leg

'One day a dog bit him on the leg.'*

SAS: 27

Some languages do allow transitive verbs in sentence focus utterances; in these languages, the object must either be an object of a light verb or a topical pronoun (Lambrecht 2000: 650-652). Again, the Propositional Cleft is not restricted in this way. Fully lexical objects of contentful verbs are attested (1.17).

(1.17) Agus 's ann do rinn e an duin' a mharbh.

Agus 's ann do rinn e an duin' a mharbh.
 and COP in.3MSG do.PAST 3MSG the man OPTL kill.VN

'And with that he killed the man.'

ESG: 185

And the PC allows new information to be expressed in object position, such as *òganach mòr prionnsail* 'a tall, princely young man' in (1.18).

(1.18) Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt buidh-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach.

Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's
 at start the.GEN entertainment after the.GEN feast COP
 ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt
 in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL young.man big princely with hair
 buidh-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach.
 yellow-red PROG come.VN in

'At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall princely young man with reddish-blond hair coming in.'*

AM: 18

The Scottish Gaelic Propositional Cleft is clearly not a sentence focus construction. It need not convey all-new information, is infelicitous in contexts requiring an all-new utterance, and it shows none of the restrictions found in sentence focus utterances cross-linguistically. There is no restriction on the information status or semantic role of the subject or the object, and there is no restriction on the argument structure of the predicate.

1.4 Summary

The pragmatic function of the Propositional Cleft cannot be reduced to the explanatory function of the *it is that* construction, nor to verum focus, nor to sentence focus. This is summarized in Table 1.1, where (#) signals that the infelicity of the construction in a particular context is presumable given the meaning associated with the construction, but no infelicitous examples were given in this chapter.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

	<i>it's that</i>	Verum focus	Sentence focus	PC
Explanatory contexts	✓	(#)	(#)	# (1.7)
Given propositional content	(#)	✓	(#)	# (1.10, 1.11)
No context	(#)	(#)	✓	# (1.14)

Table 1.1: Summary of Interpretations Unavailable to the PC

The claim that I will develop in this dissertation is that the PC expresses the identificational focus associated with cleft morphosyntax, and that this focus scopes over the entire proposition. The remainder of the dissertation is organized as follows: in Chapters 2 and 3 I establish the pragmatic function of clefts and the PC, and in Chapters 4-6 I discuss the syntax of these constructions. In Chapter 2 I characterize the meaning of regular clefts in Scottish Gaelic. In Chapter 3 I turn to the PC and positively identify its pragmatic distribution as requiring a salient but unanswered super-question in the discourse, and derive this from the interaction of the CLEFT operator and broad focus-marking. In Chapters 4 and 5 I revisit the structure of A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic and provide a complete structure for clefts, with implications for copular structures more generally. Finally, in Chapter 6 I give a syntactic structure for the PC.

Chapter 2

The Meaning of Clefts in Scottish Gaelic

In this chapter I examine the semantics and pragmatics of cleft constructions in Scottish Gaelic.¹ Cleft constructions are cross-linguistically associated with identificational focus (Kiss (1998), Lyon (2013), a.o.), and I will show that Scottish Gaelic clefts pattern as expected, conveying narrow identificational focus. I first demonstrate that Scottish Gaelic clefts are indeed focus constructions before turning to the contrastive and exhaustive aspects of their meaning. I show that the exhaustivity conveyed by Scottish Gaelic clefts is not part of the at-issue content (cf. Lyon (2013) for Okanagan Salish clefts and Velleman et al. (2012) for English). I extend Velleman et al.'s (2012) CLEFT operator analysis to Scottish Gaelic; this analysis captures both the not-at-issue exhaustivity and focus-sensitivity of clefts.

2.1 Scottish Gaelic Clefts as Focus Constructions

In this section I show that Scottish Gaelic clefts are focus constructions. Borrowing a characterization of evidence from Constant (2014), whereby evidence may be ‘hard’ (via the use of diagnostics and tests) or ‘soft’ (via the examination of naturally-occurring examples in their discourse context), I present both hard and soft evidence that Scottish Gaelic clefts are focus constructions. The classic question-answer congruence test shows that clefts may answer an explicit question, and looking at clefts in narratives shows that Scottish Gaelic clefts may also provide the answer to an implicit question, as predicted by various work in the pragmatics of focus (e.g. Roberts (1996), Büring (2003), a.o.).

¹I do not include here the cleft-like ‘*S e X a th’ ann an Y*, which has a copular clause interpretation, e.g. ‘*S e tidsear a th’ annam*. ‘I am a teacher’ (*lit.* It’s a teacher that is in me). See Lamb (2003: 67) for some discussion. Not only is the interpretation of this cleft-like construction more like that of a copular clause, but the pragmatic force also seems to lack the identificational focus associated with the more canonical clefts discussed in this chapter. To what extent the ‘*S e X a th’ ann an Y*’ construction is related to clefts is a topic left to future research.

Scottish Gaelic clefts make good answers to *wh*-questions, showing that the clefted constituent is in focus, under the standard assumption that the phrase corresponding to the *wh*-phrase provides the new information. In (2.1) the clefted constituent provides the answer to who was in Barcelona, and in (2.2) the clefted constituent provides the answer to where everyone was.²

(2.1) (Who was in Barcelona with you?)

'S e [Mairi] a bh' ann am Barcelona comhla rium.

'S e Mairi a bh' ann am Barcelona comhla rium.
 COP 3MSG Mary C.REL be.PAST in Barcelona together to.1SG
 'It's Mary who was in Barcelona with me.'

GLA__GMM__24MAY2013__CMS__01

(2.2) (Where was everybody?)

'S ann [aig a' phartaigh] a bha iad.

'S ann aig a' phartaigh a bha iad
 COP in.3MSG at the party C.REL be.PAST 3PL

'They were at the party' (*lit.* It's at the party that they were.)

GLA__GMM__24MAY2013__CMS__02

Clefts may also introduce new information into the discourse outside of question contexts. We see this in (2.3), where the clefted constituent *piuthar dha* 'his sister' is the first mention of John Ferguson's sister.

(2.3) (One time John Ferguson was away)

agus 's e [piuthar dha] a bha gabhail roimhe ann am Bòrnais,

agus 's e piuthar dha a bha gabhail roimhe ann am
 and COP 3MSG sister to.3MSG C.REL be.PAST take.VN to.3MSG in

Bòrnais

Bornish

'His sister was keeping house for him at Bornish;'

ST: 8

In the context where the landlord (John Ferguson) is away, a natural question that arises is who will be managing his affairs. In this way, (2.3) can be seen as a natural extension of the question-answer congruence test: the cleft provides the answer to an implicit, rather than explicit, question.

Similarly the cleft in (2.4) answers a question implicit in the discourse. Here, there's a larger question, 'who owns each of three fish-salting houses?' The cleft identifies the owner of the third fish-salting house, an implicit question made salient by the identification of two of the fish-salting houses.

²The alternation in the form of the augment will be addressed in Chapter 5; I include examples illustrating clefts with both forms of the augment whenever possible to show that the form of the augment does not affect the pragmatics or semantics. Here and throughout the chapter I bracket the clefted constituent.

(2.4) Bha tri taighean saillidh ann an Seisiadair anns an naodhamh linn deug, aon le Aonghus Uilleam à Port Mholair agus aon le Domhnall Mac a’ Ghobhainn à Steòrnabhagh.

‘There were three fish-salting houses in Sheshader in the nineteenth century, one owned by Angus MacLeod from Portvoller and one owned by Donald Smith from Stornoway.’

’S ann [le Domhnall Griasaich] a bha an treas taigh saillidh.

’S ann le Domhnall Griasaich a bha an treas
COP in.3MSG with Donald Campbell C.REL be.PAST the third
taigh saillidh.
fish-salting house

‘It was Donald Campbell who had the third fish-salting house.’* SAS: 29

This example also illustrates the exhaustive component to cleft meaning. The context in (2.4) is such that there are three sub-questions to the larger question: who owns this fish-salting house, who owns that fish-salting house, and who owns the third fish-salting house? The cleft is used to answer the third sub-question, providing the ‘final answer’ to the larger question (cf. Velleman et al. (2012) for the idea that clefts are ‘inquiry-terminating’ constructions), and signalling that the owners of the three fish-salting houses have now been identified.

In this section I have shown that clefts in Scottish Gaelic can be characterized as focus constructions in the sense that they answer a question, whether explicit or implicit, in the discourse. This, however, is not the full extent of the meaning of clefts; clefts are also associated with an exhaustive meaning.

2.2 Exhaustivity in Scottish Gaelic Clefts

The clefted constituent in Scottish Gaelic clefts, as in clefts cross-linguistically, is interpreted exhaustively (*i.e.* clefts are identificational focus constructions). In this section I show that Scottish Gaelic clefts are associated with an exhaustive meaning, and furthermore that this exhaustivity is not part of the at-issue content of the cleft construction.

Exhaustivity is a salient aspect of the meaning of clefts in Scottish Gaelic. With no preceding discourse context (*i.e.* in an elicitation context), one of my consultants volunteered that the cleft in (2.5) is roughly equivalent to ‘only’: the offered interpretation of the cleft here is that Anna is the only person the speaker will see.³

(2.5) ’S e [Anna] a chi mi.

’S e Anna a chi mi.
COP 3MSG Anna C.REL see.FUT 1SG

‘It’s Anna that I will see.’

GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

³I do not include this as part of the translation in (2.5) because, like their English counterparts, the meaning of clefts in Scottish Gaelic overlap with the meaning of ‘only’, but are not equivalent to it.

CHAPTER 2. THE MEANING OF CLEFTS IN SCOTTISH GAELIC

As expected if clefts convey exhaustivity, certain types of phrases are incompatible with the clefted position: universal quantification (2.6) and existential quantifiers (2.7) are typically ill-formed in this position.⁴

- (2.6) a. *'S e [na h-uabhlan gu leir] a chuir mi dha na bucais.
 *'S e na h-uabhlan gu leir a chuir mi dha na
 COP 3MSG the.PL apple.PL all C.REL put 1SG to the.PL
 bucais.
 box.PL
 ‘It’s all the apples that I put in the boxes.’ GLA__SM1__31MAY2013__CMS
- b. *'S e [a h-uile duine] a bha aig a’ phartaigh.
 *'S e a-h-uile duine a bha aig a’ phartaigh.
 COP 3MSG all people C.REL be.PAST at the party
 ‘It’s everyone who was at the party.’ GLA__GMM__24MAY2013__CMS__02

- (2.7) *'S e [cuidigean] a th’ aig an doras.
 *'S e cuidigean a th’ aig an doras.
 COP 3MSG someone C.REL be.PRES at the door
 ‘It’s someone who’s at the door’ GLA__GMM__24MAY2013__CMS__02

It is also infelicitous to use a cleft construction to identify additional members of the set, as in (2.8) (cf. Lyon (2013: 304-5), Percus (1997: 340-42)).

- (2.8) 'S e [an leanabh] a tha a’ dannsa.
 'S e an leanabh a tha a’ dannsa.
 COP 3MSG the child C.REL be.PRES PROG dance.VN
 ‘It’s the child who is dancing’
- #'S e [am boireannach] a tha a’ dannsa cuideachd.
 'S e am boireannach a tha a’ dannsa cuideachd.
 COP 3MSG the woman C.REL be.PRES PROG dance.VN also
 ‘It’s the woman who is dancing too.’ GLA__JN__02JUN2014__CMS

In (2.8) the use of a cleft with the additive *cuideachd* is infelicitous. The meaning of clefts is such that the clefted constituent exhausts all members of the set, and this clashes with the meaning of additives.

Thus Scottish Gaelic clefts are associated with an exhaustive interpretation. The exhaustive component of the cleft meaning, however, is not part of the at-issue content (in the sense of Potts (2005), where at-issue content is essentially the content that contributes semantic meaning, versus what is presupposed or implied (Potts 2014: 2)).

⁴All but one of my consultants rejected universal quantification in clefted position. I assume that the consultant was being particularly accommodating, but the status of quantifiers in clefts, and the discourse contexts that may license them, is clearly an area for further work.

Scottish Gaelic clefts are found in contexts where exhaustivity is presupposed in the discourse. This suggests that exhaustivity is not at-issue based on the assumption that at-issue content should be relatively informative (cf. Velleman et al. (2012: 13), Stalnaker (1978)). In (2.9), one woman (Alan’s wife) is identified as the winner of the gold ring.

(2.9) Agus cha do charaich Ailean gu ’n tàinig a bhean ’s dh’ inns i dha gun robh e beò ’s gum faodadh e gluasad.
 ‘But Alan didn’t move until his wife came and told him that he was alive and able to move.’

’S e [bean Ailean] a choisinin am fàinne òir.

’S e bean Ailean a choisinin am fàinne òir.
 COP 3MSG woman Alan C.REL win.PAST the ring gold

‘It was Alan’s wife who won the gold ring.’

LG: 285

The preceding narrative identifies a handful of women who were competing to win a gold ring (the premise of the story is that this is a town with very clever women and extremely gullible men, and a gold ring is promised as a prize to the woman who was best able to trick her husband). Because there can presumably be only one winner, the exhaustive component of the cleft’s meaning is uninformative in this context, suggesting that exhaustivity is not at-issue in clefts (the same can be said for the English cleft in the translation; for this native speaker, the English cleft is felicitous). Hard evidence for this comes from two diagnostics which test for the presence of exhaustivity in the at-issue content of the cleft.

The first diagnostic involves contradicting a previous cleft utterance. If exhaustivity is part of the assertion of the cleft uttered by one speaker, the other speaker should be able to take issue with this exhaustive component of the meaning. In (2.10), speaker A asserts that Mary bought a ring. If exhaustivity is part of the at-issue content, the assertion is that she bought only a ring, and so speaker B should be able to felicitously correct this assertion with ‘No, she also bought a hat’ (cf. Kiss (1998: 251)). This exchange is infelicitous in Scottish Gaelic, indicating that exhaustivity is not part of the at-issue content of clefts.

(2.10) A: ’S e [fàinne] a cheannaich Màiri.

’S e fàinne a cheannaich Màiri.
 COP 3MSG ring C.REL buy.PAST Mary
 ‘It’s a ring that Mary bought.’

B: #Chan e. Cheannaich i ad cuideachd.

Chan e. Cheannaich i ad cuideachd.
 NEG 3MSG buy.PAST 3FSG hat too
 ‘No. She bought a hat too.’

GLA_GMM_24MAR2016_CMS

Similarly, (2.11) shows that Scottish Gaelic clefts fail another diagnostic for at-issue exhaustivity (diagnostic from Zimmerman and Onea (2011: 1666)). If exhaustivity is part of the at-issue content of a cleft, it should be a natural continuation of an utterance where the propositional content is fully given, so that the only thing that the cleft contributes is the

exhaustivity. In such a context, a cleft is infelicitous (2.11a). This contrasts with ‘only’ (2.11b) and with a more periphrastic copula clause (2.11c).

(2.11) Tha fios agam gun do dh’ith Iain pizza ach an-drasta fhuair mi a-mach...
 Tha fios agam gun do dh’ith Iain pizza ach an-drasta
 be.PRES knowledge at.1SG C eat.PAST.DEP Ian pizza but just
 fhuair mi a-mach
 find.PAST 1SG out
 I know that John ate pizza but I just found out...

a. ...#gur e [pizza] a dh’itheadh e

gur e pizza a dh’itheadh e
 that.COP 3MSG pizza C.REL eat.COND 3MSG
 ‘...#that it was pizza that he ate.’

b. ...nach itheadh e ach pizza.

nach itheadh e ach pizza
 C.NEG eat.COND 3MSG but pizza
 ‘that he only ate pizza’ (lit. that he didn’t eat but pizza)

c. ...gur e pizza an aon rud a dh’itheadh e.

gur e pizza an aon rud a dh’itheadh e
 C.COP 3MSG pizza the one thing C.REL eat.COND 3MSG
 ‘that pizza was the one thing he ate.’

GLA_AF_30MAY2014_CMS

I conclude that exhaustivity in Scottish Gaelic clefts is presuppositional, and not part of the at-issue content. Similar conclusions have been reached for clefts in other languages, such as Okanagan Salish (Lyon 2013) and English (Percus (1997), Velleman et al. (2012), *a.o.*).

2.3 Analysis of Cleft Meaning

In this section I give an analysis of the meaning of Scottish Gaelic clefts. There are two essential components of cleft meaning: a focal structure and the CLEFT operator which contributes the cleft meaning. The focal structure determines the question to which the utterance is congruent. The focal structure is also a prerequisite for the CLEFT operator. I adopt Velleman et al.’s (2012) characterization of CLEFT as a focus-sensitive operator: CLEFT presupposes the maximality of the utterance as an answer to the QUD, and this gives the exhaustive interpretation associated with clefts. Before going into the details of the CLEFT operator and how it accounts for the properties of clefts seen above, I first introduce the Question under Discussion framework, which posits a discourse structured

around questions and their answers. This introduction will be relatively informal, with the aim of introducing the basic notions and the understanding of focus that the framework provides; a more technical discussion will come in Chapter 3.

2.3.1 A Structured Discourse

The Question under Discussion (QUD) framework (Roberts (1996), Büring (2003), *a.o.*) provides a formalization of discourse structure, which is useful in understanding the distribution of focus constructions such as clefts in the discourse. The focal structure of an utterance functions to identify a question (via the background) and provide an answer to that question (via the focus). In a well-formed or felicitous discourse, the question identified by the focal structure may have been explicitly posed in the discourse, or may be an implicit question evoked by a previous question or assertion.

All discourse has a hierarchical structure, with different nodes in the structure corresponding to questions, sub-questions, and answers to these questions. The over-arching goal of any discourse is to determine the way things are—this is the Big Question—and cooperative interlocuters attempt this by asking and answering smaller questions, such as “What are you doing today?” or “What did you have for lunch?” Answers to each question bring the interlocuters one step closer to the larger goal.

Answers are proposals as to what propositions should be considered true, and these true propositions are included in the Common Ground. Propositions may also be included in the Common Ground simply by virtue of being common knowledge or part of a shared background between the interlocuters.

(2.12) **Common Ground:** the set of propositions which are assumed to be true, where a proposition is a set of possible worlds. (cf. Roberts (1996: 3), Stalnaker (1978))

Taking all the propositions in the Common Ground to be true, we can triangulate a set of worlds—the Context Set—which contains the world we are in. The goal of discourse is to determine which world we are in, by selecting smaller and smaller subsets of the Context Set, the set of worlds we might possibly be in (e.g. “Are we in a world where you’re doing yoga later?” or “Are we in a world where you had pizza for lunch?”). The ultimate, if unachievable, goal is to reduce this set to a singleton one: the world we are in.

(2.13) **Context Set:** the set of worlds where all propositions in the common ground are true, arrived at via intersection of the common ground (Roberts 1996: 3)

Questions function to divide the Context Set, *i.e.* set up partitions on the Context Set, with the goal of eliminating one of these cells.

This is the effect of questions and their answers on the discourse. Questions and their answers are related such that a coherent discourse proceeds in a somewhat logical fashion. This means, practically, that interlocuters will commit to addressing a particular question until it is answered (or they find it cannot be answered). The interlocuters might introduce smaller, related questions—sub-questions—a means of addressing the original one. We can

schematize this relationship among questions as a hierarchical “stack” of questions, following Roberts (1996) and related work, such that each subsequent question addresses, or is a sub-question of, a previous question. When a question is answered it is removed from the stack. The question at the top of the stack is prioritized for being answered.

Two types of questions will be relevant for the discussion of clefts in this chapter and of the propositional cleft in the next chapter. I will distinguish between the Immediate Question under Discussion (IQUD) and the Current Question (CQ). Both terms will be used relative to a discourse context. I will also use the term QUD as a generalized term to refer to the question which an utterance provides an answer to.

(2.14) **QUD**: the question which an utterance provides an answer to.

The IQUD is the question which the interlocuters have most recently committed to answering. It may be explicit, and proposed in the discourse as a question, or it may be implicit.

(2.15) **Immediate Question under Discussion (IQUD)**: the QUD at the top of the stack (cf. Roberts (1996: 4)).

The CQ is the question proffered by an interlocuter; if accepted it will supersede the IQUD and take its place at the top of the stack.

(2.16) **Current Question (CQ)**: the QUD evoked by the current utterance.

Crucially, the CQ evoked by an utterance need not be identical to the question at the top of the stack (the IQUD), but may introduce a new question (typically a sub-question of the IQUD), which takes the place of the IQUD as occupying the top of the stack.

A question may be explicit in the discourse (*i.e.* they may take the form of an interrogative asked by an interlocuter), but may also be implicit. QUDs are evoked by the focal structure of a sentence, and specifically by the backgrounded (non-focus) portion of the sentence (Büring (2003), Roberts (1996)). The relation between the focal structure of an utterance and the QUD it addresses is constrained by focus-congruence.

(2.17) **F(ocus)-Congruence**: an utterance is f-congruent to a particular question if its focal alternatives are the Q-alternatives of that question (cf. Roberts (1996: 24)).

Focus alternatives are calculated by replacing all focus-marked constituents in the utterance with variables and plugging in possible values for those variables (cf. Roberts (1996: 23)). This variable structure is essentially a question structure, and the question to which the utterance is congruent is read off the variable structure.

In (2.18), the IQUD is the question posed by A. The focal structure of B’s response—with focus as stress indicated by small caps—evokes this same question.

(2.18) A: Who brought the quiche?

B: TAMMY brought it/the quiche.

In (2.19), A’s utterance introduces the topic, the quiche, and invites additional information about it. The IQUD, then, is ‘what about this quiche?’. The focal structure of B’s response

evokes an implicit sub-question as the CQ, ‘who brought the quiche?’ and simultaneously answers this question.

(2.19) A: Wow, this quiche is really good!

B: TAMMY brought it/the quiche.

To sum up, all focus utterances have a focus structure which evokes a QUD, which in a given discourse is the proposed CQ. The relationship between this CQ and the preceding discourse (i.e. if it addresses the IQUD either by answering it directly or answering a sub-question) contributes to the felicity, or well-formedness, of an utterance in a given context. In the next section I introduce Velleman et al.’s (2012) CLEFT operator, which operates over the alternative answers to the QUD in cleft constructions.

2.3.2 The CLEFT Operator

Recall that the exhaustivity expressed in Scottish Gaelic clefts is not part of the at-issue content of the utterance. In this section I introduce the CLEFT operator, adopting the analysis for English clefts in Velleman et al. (2012), whose main claims are i) that exhaustivity in clefts comes from their status as Inquiry-Terminating constructions and ii) that the CLEFT operator which introduces this meaning is focus-sensitive.

Velleman et al.’s analysis begins with the observation that the clefted constituent is not necessarily coextensive with the constituent in focus, but may be contained within the clefted constituent. They show that the focus (as expressed by prosodic prominence), and not the bipartite structure *per se*, determines the scope of exhaustivity (2.20).

- (2.20) a. It was [John’s eldest daughter]_F who liked the movie.
 → No other people liked the movie.
- b. It was John’s [eldest]_F daughter who liked the movie.
 → None of John’s other daughters liked the movie (Velleman et al. 2012: 1)

For this reason, cleft meanings which assume equivalence of focus and exhausted constituent, such as that in (2.21), cannot explain the full range of facts.

- (2.21) ’S e [α]_{FOC} a has property Π
 ASSERTS: $\Pi(\alpha)$
 PRESUPPOSES: $\forall x [\Pi x \rightarrow x=\alpha]$ (Lyon 2013: 302), (Percus 1997: 340)

In (2.21) the presupposition states that for all individuals for which the property expressed in the relative clause holds, the identity of the individual(s) is given by the constituent in the clefted position. There is no straightforward way to derive the focus-sensitive interpretation in (2.20b).

To get the exhaustive component of cleft constructions, Velleman et al. adopt Coppock and Beaver’s (2011) account of exclusives. Clefts and exclusives share an exhaustive component to their meaning, characterized as an “inquiry-terminating” effect (Velleman et al. 2012: 3). Coppock and Beaver’s analysis of exclusives is largely a pragmatic one, with exhaustivity

coming from implications about the strength of the answer relative to the Current Question (the question evoked in the focal structure of the utterance). There are two operators which contribute to the meaning of exclusives: MIN, which claims the existence of a true answer to the question, and MAX, which says the utterance provides the strongest answer to this question.

$$(2.22) \text{MIN}_S(p) = \lambda w. \exists q \in \text{CQ}_S [q(w) \wedge (q \geq_S p)]$$

There is a true answer to the CQ at least as strong as the prejacent p
(Velleman et al. 2012: 451)

$$(2.23) \text{MAX}_S(p) = \lambda w. \forall q \in \text{CQ}_S [(q >_S p) \rightarrow \neg q(w)]$$

There is no true answer to the CQ strictly stronger than the prejacent p
(Velleman et al. 2012: 451)

The notion of strength is relative to the discourse (this is what the subscripted S indicates), and may be best understood as an ordering on what is newsworthy (Coppock and Beaver 2011: 210).

Clefts differ from other exclusives such as ‘only’ in which of these operators is at-issue. Exclusives have as part of the at-issue content the MAX_S operator, with MIN_S presupposed. In clefts, the exhaustive operator MAX_S is presupposed, and the truth of the answer is at-issue. Velleman et al. propose a formal meaning for the CLEFT operator, given in (2.24).

$$(2.24) \text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$$

In clefts, exhaustivity is presupposed, with the assertion essentially just the unclefted version. The definition in (2.24) is roughly equivalent to the definition in (2.21) with the important distinction that (2.24) relativizes exhaustivity to the CQ. This is guaranteed by the S subscript, which indexes the current context. This means that we expect clefts to show focus-sensitive behavior. We also expect clefts to be interpreted roughly equivalent to ‘only’ in some contexts, but that clefts and ‘only’ will show different behavior in other contexts (Velleman et al. 2012: 453); we will see what this means for the Gaelic data in the next section.

2.3.3 An Analysis of Scottish Gaelic Clefts

My proposal is that the CLEFT operator proposed in Velleman et al. (2012) captures the meaning of Scottish Gaelic clefts. The presence of the CLEFT operator explains the status of clefts as focus constructions, since CLEFT operates over answers to a QUD. The CLEFT operator analysis is superior to a simplistic analysis which burdens the relative clause of the cleft construction with evoking the QUD, such as (2.25).

$$(2.25) \text{'S e } [\alpha]_{\text{FOC}} \text{ a } \lambda x. \Pi(x)$$

Relative clause presupposition: The current QUD is $\lambda p \exists \alpha [p = \Pi(\alpha)]$
(cf. Barros (2014: 80), a.o.)

(2.25) reflects the traditional analysis that clefts are focus constructions—that they presuppose congruence to the QUD—by virtue of their bipartite structure. Evidence against an analysis of Scottish Gaelic clefts along the lines of (2.25) comes from the fact that Scottish Gaelic clefts show the same focus-sensitivity of English clefts (cf. Velleman et al. (2012)). The cleft in (2.26) can be interpreted in several ways, depending on stress (2.27).

(2.26) 'S e [an nighean as sine aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.

'S e an nighean as sine aig Iain a sheinn oran a-raoir
 COP 3MSG the daughter eldest at Ian C.REL sing.PAST song last-night
 'It was John's eldest daughter who sang a song last night.'

GLA_IC_15SEP2016_CMS

A subpart of the clefted constituent in (2.26) may be interpreted as the exhaustive focus (2.27). In (2.27a) the entire clefted constituent is interpreted as in focus, with the implication that no one else sang. For (2.27b and c), however, focus falls on a subpart of the clefted constituent, and the implication is that no one from the relevant set sang (John's daughters in (2.27b) or people's eldest daughters in (2.27c)).

(2.27) a. 'S e [an nighean as sine aig Iain]_f a sheinn oran a-raoir.

→ No one else sang last night.

b. 'S e an nighean [as sine]_f aig Iain a sheinn oran a-raoir.

→ None of John's other daughters sang; although someone else may have.

c. 'S e an nighean as sine [aig Iain]_f a sheinn oran a-raoir.

→ No one else's eldest daughter sang; others may have.

GLA_IC_15SEP2016_CMS

I conclude that the exhaustivity expressed in Scottish Gaelic clefts is focus-sensitive, and propose that the CLEFT operator, with the denotation in (2.28) holds for Scottish Gaelic clefts.

(2.28) $\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$

Presupposes: there is no true answer to the CQ stronger than p

Asserts: there is a true answer to the CQ at least as strong as p

A focal structure is a necessary prerequisite for the CLEFT operator to apply, as this focal structure gives the QUD of the utterance, and the focal structure may or may not be identical to the syntactic bipartite structure. The QUD of the utterance is the proposed CQ, and the CLEFT operator makes reference to this question, with exhaustivity evaluated as relative to the alternative answers to the CQ.

Because clefts have the same components—MIN and MAX—as exclusives such as 'only', the meaning in (2.28) explains the interpretation ascribed to clefts by speakers in elicitation contexts, namely that they are roughly equivalent to 'only'. (cf. discussion surrounding (2.5) above). This similarity to exclusives explains the infelicity of clefts with additive particles like *cuideachd* 'too' (2.8), since additives contradict the presupposition that the utterance was the best possible answer.

The denotation for the CLEFT operator in (2.28) accounts for two important aspects of cleft constructions: the focus-sensitivity of exhaustivity and the behavior of clefts in certain contexts. In (2.27) above, we saw that the constituent interpreted as exhaustive focus need not be identical to the clefted constituent. This is straightforwardly derived from the semantics of CLEFT, since the focus-marked constituent, and not the syntactically displaced one, is what gives us the QUD whose alternative answers are the input for the MIN and MAX operators.

The MIN and MAX components of the CLEFT operator, which it shares with exclusive particles, give it a similar interpretation to exclusives, but these components are inverted, with MAX as a presupposition and MIN as the assertion. This difference explains the different behavior of cleft constructions in certain contexts, namely the contexts which show that the exhaustive component of clefts is not part of the at-issue content ((2.10) and (2.30) above; see also Velleman et al. (2012)).

In (2.10), repeated here, we saw that the exhaustive meaning of clefts cannot be felicitously denied or contradicted.

(2.29) A: 'S e fàinne a cheannaich Màiri.
'It's a ring that Mary bought.'

B: #Chan e. Cheannaich i ad cuideachd.
'No. She bought a hat too.'

GLA__GMM__24MAR2016__CMS

The presupposed, or not at-issue, status of the MAX operator, which contributes the exhaustive interpretation in clefts, derives the infelicity of clefts in this context. Only at-issue content can be denied or contradicted, and so the presupposed status of MAX precludes the exhaustivity in clefts from being denied in (2.29).

The presupposed status of the MAX operator is also responsible for the infelicity of clefts in contexts where the assertion has already been given, and so only the exhaustive component could be informative, as in (2.11) above, repeated here for convenience.

(2.30) Tha fios agam gun do dh'ith Iain pizza ach an-drasta fhuair mi a-mach...
I know that John ate pizza but I just found out...

...#gur e pizza a dh'itheadh e.
'...that it was pizza that he ate.'

GLA__AF__30MAY2014__CMS

The at-issue content of the cleft comes only from the MIN operator, which serves only to assert the truth of the proposition as an answer to the QUD. This content is uninformative in a context where the proposition is already given, thus giving rise to the infelicity of clefts in such a context. The MAX operator, which contributes exhaustivity, is not at-issue and so cannot be informative in that context (Velleman et al. 2012: 13).

The infelicity of universal and existential quantifiers in clefted position is less clearly derived. Velleman et al. (2012) are not interested in explaining this infelicity, and so are silent on the issue. In fact, apart from Kiss (1998), any interest in the felicity of quantifiers in clefted position lies in the contexts where those quantifiers *are* allowed. Kiss's claim is that identificational focus (i.e. exhaustive focus) is interpreted as exclusion by identification.

Neither universal quantifiers or existential quantifiers pick out a set such that another set can be excluded. However, under the analysis in (2.28), the alternatives over which CLEFT operates come from the QUD in the focal structure of the utterance. This means that what's excluded are answers, not sets of individuals. To take the universal quantifier as an example, the semantically/pragmatically odd cleft 'It's everyone who came to the party' *should* be licit because the claim that the cleft makes is that of all the answers to the QUD 'who came to the party?', the best one is 'everyone'. Similarly for existential quantifiers, we predict that 'It's someone who's at the door' is fine, since the claim is only that of all the possible answers, the strongest one that can be made is that someone is at the door. It is possible that these predictions are welcome, because although the majority of my consultants consistently rejected them outright, occasionally a consultant would accept them.⁵

So what are we to make of the data in §2.2, which showed the unavailability of clefting universal and existential quantifiers? There is clearly a bias against accepting universal and existential quantifiers in clefted position. The answer to this question unfortunately must await further research, but I will outline some thoughts on the matter before concluding. It is possible that the marked use of the cleft construction in an elicitation (i.e. contextless) context allows a sort of unformativity-as-infelicity effect. That is to say, existential quantifiers are notably weak, and contribute nothing more than a reaffirmation of the existence presupposition inherent in clefts (cf. Percus (1997), Hedberg (2000), and plausibly derived from the QUD Velleman et al. (2012)). In an elicitation context, this may be enough for the consultant to raise their eyebrows and reject the utterance. As for the universal quantifier, it makes the strongest claim possible, making the MAX presupposition superfluous. Again, this isn't enough to categorically rule out the utterance given the denotation in (2.28), but may be enough for speakers to reject it without additional context.

In sum, the CLEFT operator gets us the focus congruence of clefts: clefts are focus constructions by virtue of providing an answer to the QUD evoked by the focal structure, which may or may not be identical to the syntactic bipartite structure. The exhaustive component of clefts is presupposed by the CLEFT operator, which is a claim regarding the strength of the asserted proposition as an answer to the QUD relative to alternative answers. This analysis captures important aspects of the meaning and distribution of clefts in Scottish Gaelic, and adopting Velleman et al.'s CLEFT operator will prove to be particularly beneficial in accounting for the Propositional Cleft, since focus is independent from the syntactic division of the sentence.

2.4 Summary

In this chapter I showed that Velleman et al.'s CLEFT operator accounts for the meaning of Scottish Gaelic clefts. Clefts in Scottish Gaelic are identificational focus constructions with an exhaustive interpretation, but the exhaustivity is not part of the at-issue content. Exhaustivity instead is part of the presupposition in clefts, repeated in (2.31).

⁵Others working on Scottish Gaelic have also been able to elicit universal quantifiers in clefted position in Scottish Gaelic (Gary Thoms, p.c.).

- (2.31) 'S e [α]_{FOC} a has property Π
 CLEFT_S = $\lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than $\Pi(x)$
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as $\Pi(x)$
 (cf. Velleman et al. (2012))

This denotation incorporates the focus-sensitivity of clefts and crucially does not require that the clefted constituent be coextensive with the exhaustive meaning. This will provide us with a means of understanding how the Propositional Cleft (2.32) can fit into the cleft paradigm. Recall that the PC has all the cleft morphosyntax, but lacks the division of the proposition into focus and background.

- (2.32) 'S ann a chaidh am bata fodha.

'S ann a chaidh am bata fodha
 COP in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST the boat under.3MSG
 'The boat sunk.' (lit. 'the boat went under') GLA__AWE__05JUN2013__CMS

Under analyses which do not allow a decoupling of what is clefted and what is in focus, the PC is truly surprising: for those analyses, it is crucial that there be a clefted constituent which can be interpreted as the maximal element for which the property in the relative clause holds. It is the clefted constituent which provides the identity of the element for which that property holds. With no constituent in the clefted position, it is unclear how the PC could take on a cleft meaning. Under Velleman et al.'s CLEFT analysis, however, there is the possibility of the syntax masking the focus structure which serves as input to the CLEFT operator.

In the next chapter, I will argue that the PC is indeed a member of the cleft paradigm, and that it conveys identificational focus. While regular clefts convey narrow focus on a subpart of the sentence, the PC conveys broad focus over the whole proposition. That is, the only difference between the PC and regular clefts is a difference in the size of the focus-marked constituent.

Chapter 3

The Propositional Cleft

In the last chapter I laid the groundwork for understanding the Propositional Cleft as part of the cleft paradigm in Scottish Gaelic. In this chapter I provide a positive characterization of the PC's meaning and distribution. My analysis of the PC is couched in the QUD framework, and represents a novel look at broad focus within that framework. I argue that the PC conveys broad-sized identificational focus, and that the pragmatic effect of this is typically a non-congruence to the Immediate QUD, and the PC is often used as a means of signaling a revision to the line of inquiry (an alternative strategy to answering a super-question). While this characterization of the PC captures a number of examples, we will see that the effect of the PC is more subtle than this. I argue that the PC's pragmatics can be best understood if the PC is a member of the cleft paradigm: we can derive the meaning of the PC via the interaction of the CLEFT operator and broad focus-marking. I argue that broad focus differs from narrow focus in failing to establish a partition on the Context Set, and that this partition (and not the CQ *per se*) is a prerequisite to the CLEFT operator. This means that for the CLEFT operator to apply to a broad-focus constituent, there must be a pre-existing partition on the Context Set, and this is typically provided by a super-question in the discourse.

3.1 The Propositional Cleft as a Cleft Construction

This section serves the important purpose of laying the descriptive basis for the pragmatic characterization of the PC in §3.3 below. The PC has not been studied in-depth, that I am aware of, and so this section provides a much-needed overview of naturally-occurring examples and a discussion of the contexts they occur in. I first show that the contexts where we find the PC are consistent with the claim that the PC is an identificational focus construction—specifically, the PC tends to be found in contrastive contexts. I will then discuss some initially surprising aspects of the PC. The apparent position of focus in the PC is variable, and may even be absent. Furthermore, the PC typically cannot provide a direct and neutral answer, although we will see that under specific discourse conditions, the PC may function as an answer to a question.

The generalizations reached in this section, as well as the QUD framework recapped in §3.2, will form the basis of the pragmatic analysis of the PC in §3.3, and in §3.4 I will show how the pragmatic effect of the PC can be derived from the interaction of the CLEFT operator and a broad focus-marking.

3.1.1 Contrast in the Propositional Cleft

In this section I discuss examples of the PC in contrastive contexts, with the aim of giving initial support to the claim that the PC is a member of the cleft paradigm, and as such conveys identificational focus. The PC is often found in contrastive contexts, and may have an exhaustive interpretation.

(3.1) provides an example of an exhaustive interpretation of the PC. The preceding discourse makes salient a question of ‘What can be done with the devil?’, and the PC, underlined here and throughout the chapter, asserts that one can feel the devil. The interpretation, reflected in the English translation with ‘only’, is exhaustive: of all the things that may be done with the devil, it is only possible to feel him.

- (3.1) “An do ghlac thu duine an raoir, Eoghainn?”
 “Did you catch anyone last night, Eoin?”

“Cha do ghlac. Chan fhaca duine an donas a riamh—’s ann a bhios e ‘ga fhaireachdainn.’”

Cha	do	ghlac.	Chan	fhaca	duine	an	donas	a	riamh	’s
NEG	catch.PAST.DEP		NEG	see.PAST.DEP	person	the	devil	ever		COP
ann	a	bhios	e	‘g	a					fhaireachdainn.”
in.3MSG	C.REL	be.FUT	3MSG	PROG	3MSG.POSS	feel.VN				

“No. Nobody ever saw the devil: he only feels him.”

LG: 293

A more literal translation of the proposition contained in the PC is ‘he feels him.’¹ The exhaustive interpretation, then, can only come from the cleft morphosyntax associated with the PC.

The PC is also found in contexts where there are two opposing elements. In (3.2), feeding the cat (thus making the cat feel welcome) is in opposition to chasing after the cat (signalling that the cat is not welcome anymore).

¹The use of the future tense is likely part of an irrealis sense here. The exact interpretation of the future tense in Scottish Gaelic does not fully align with that of the future tense in more well-studied languages; see Lamb (2003: 55-58), Macaulay (1996) for discussion.

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (3.2) An àite dha biadh a thoirt sìos chun a' chait, 's ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fheòir.

An àite dha biadh a thoirt sìos chun a' chait, 's ann
 instead of food OPTCL give.VN down to.DEF the cat COP in.3MSG
 a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fheòir
 C.REL go.PAST 3MSG PTCL 3MSG.POSS after with.DEF the hayfork

Instead of taking food down to the cat, he went after him with the hayfork. LG: 271

Similarly, in (3.3), the PC contrasts the expected action of a king's son giving out help and advice with what the king's son is actually doing (seeking help).

- (3.3) Chan àbhaist do mhac rìgh a bhith 'g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach 'sam bith.
 It's not usual for a son of a king to be asking for help from anyone.

'S ann is àbhaist dha bhith 'toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad.

'S ann (a) is àbhaist dha bhith 'toir cuideachadh
 COP in.3MSG C.REL COP usual for.3MSG be.VN give.VN help
 is comhairlean seachad.
 and advice out

He usually gives out help and advice.*

TB: 10

The PC is also used to correct statements. In (3.4), the question to which the PC responds contains the presupposition that the speaker has eaten the fields. The speaker takes issue with this, and the PC contains the correction, that the sheep have eaten the fields.

- (3.4) “Cìod thuige dh'ith thu na pàircean.”
 “Who art thou? Thou hast eaten the fields?” (lit. ‘Through whom have you eaten the fields?’)

“Cha mhis' a dh'ith eud idir, 's ann a dh'ith na caoraich eud.”

“Cha mhis' a dh'ith eud idir, 's ann a
 NEG 1SG.EMPH C.REL eat.PAST 3PL at.all COP in.3MSG C.REL
 dh'ith na caoraich eud.”
 eat.PAST the.PL sheep.PL 3PL

“It was not I that ate them at all; it was the sheep that ate them.” TWHv2: 173

Another type of contrastive context that the PC is found in is counter-expectational contexts. In these contexts, the PC contains an unexpected occurrence. This is illustrated in (3.5), where the expectation is that the women will stay awake to keep watch, since that seems to be their only job. This is not what happened; instead, the women slept, and the PC contains this proposition.

- (3.5) Thugadh boireannaich a-steach a choimhead as deaghaidh an leanabh 's a mhàthair.

Women were brought in to watch after the child and his mother.

Ach 's ann a chaidil na boireannaich.

Ach 's ann a chaidil na boireannaich.

but COP in.3MSG C.REL sleep.PAST the.PL woman.PL

'But the women slept.'*

AM: 23

(3.6) also shows a counter-expectational use of the PC, although in this instance the surprise is limited to the character in the narrative.

- (3.6) 'Air a dh' éirich an Sionnach anns a' mhaduinn, chaidh e mach do 'n bhàthaich a thoirt biadh do 'n each;

When the Fox rose in the morning, he went to the byre to feed the horse,

's ann a chunnaic e an stàla falamh.

's ann a chunnaic e an stàla falamh.

COP in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3MSG the stall empty

'and he found the stall empty.'

LG: 269

In many of the above examples the predicate can be interpreted as the identificational focus (in fact, all of the above except (3.4)), and it would be tempting to analyze the PC as a species of predicate focus. In the next section, I show that the locus of contrast may fall on a range of subparts of the sentence and that there is no restriction on what may be contrasted in the relative clause. Because any subpart of the sentence may be contrasted, there are well-formed instances of the PC where a regular cleft is grammatically available. That is, the PC cannot be explained away as a means of clefting a non-displaceable constituent. Instead, the PC conveys a distinct, if related, meaning. This observation will lead us to look at the discourse context of these examples more closely, and I will arrive at a pragmatic analysis of the PC where the PC does not directly answer or address the Immediate QUD, unlike regular clefts. I then show that this can be derived from the interaction of the CLEFT operator and broad focus-marking in the PC.

3.1.1.1 Variability in Location of Contrast

The location of contrast in the proposition in a PC utterance is variable. Arguments, adjuncts, and even aspectual phrases may all be contrasted. This is puzzling on two counts: first, that the PC does not convey contrastive focus on a fixed part of the sentence (e.g. as we might expect if it were *verum focus* or *verb focus*, etc.); second, many of these constituents can otherwise be clefted.

Verbs may be contrasted. In (3.7) a contrast is set up between asking for and giving away help (the contrasted elements are bolded here and throughout this section).

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

(3.7) “Chan àbhaist do chlann rìgh a bhith ’g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach ’sam bith,” as esan.

“Children of a king don’t usually **ask for** help from anyone,” he said.

“S ann a bhios iad a’ toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad ’na rìgheachd.”

“S ann a bhios iad a’ toir cuideachadh is
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.REL.FUT 3PL PROG give.VN help and
comhairlean seachad ’na rìgheachd”
advice out in-3MSG.POSS kingdom

‘They **give away** help and advice in the kingdom.’

TB: 10

Full predicates may be contrasted. In (3.8) there is contrast between leaving town and attacking the enemy.

(3.8) “Cha leig sinn a leas dad fhulang o na slaightirean ud. **Bheir sinn ionnsaigh orra ’s marbhaidh sinn iad.**”

“We don’t need to suffer a thing from those rogues. We will **attack them and kill them.**”

“Cha toir idir. Chluinneadh Caswallon ’s a dhaoine mu dheidhinn sin, ’s chuireadh sin crìoch oirne. ’S ann a thèid sinn gu baile eile.”

Cha toir idir. Chluinneadh Caswallon ’s a dhaoine
No hear.COND Caswallon and 3MSG.POSS men
mu dheidhinn sin, ’s chuireadh sin crìoch oirne. ’S ann
about DEM and put.COND DEM end on.1PL COP in.3MSG
a thèid sinn gu baile eile.
C.REL go.FUT 1PL to town other

“Not at all. Caswallon and his men would hear about that, and would put an end to us. We will go to another town.”*

AM: 48

Arguments can be contrasted. In (3.9) the speaker denies his own involvement in the fields having been eaten, and uses the PC to identify the sheep as the grass-eaters.

(3.9) Cha **mhis’** a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith na caoraich eud.

Cha mhis’ a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith
NEG 1SG.EMPH C.REL eat.PAST 3PL at.all COP in.3MSG C.REL eat.PAST
na caoraich eud
the.PL sheep.PL 3PL

‘It was not **I** that ate them at all; it was the sheep that ate them.’ TWHv2: 173

Adverbs can be contrasted. In (3.10) a giant has been keeping a woman captive, and she is trying to find where his soul is located. She believes it is in the Bonnach stone, and he tells her it is not there, but in the threshold. The PC identifies this location.

(3.10) “Cha-n ann **an sin** a tha m’ anam ’s ann a tha e ’sa starsaich.”

Cha-n ann an sin a tha m’ anam; ’s ann
 NEG in.3MSG there C.REL be.PRES 1.SG.POSS soul COP in.3MSG
 a tha e ’sa starsaich
 C.REL be.PRES 3MSG in.DEF-the threshold

“It is not **there**,” said he, “my soul is; it is in the threshold.” TWHv1: 17

Thus we have seen that a range of constituents may be contrasted in the PC. Many of these constituents are not otherwise barred from being clefted in regular clefts. This means that the PC cannot be analyzed as a strategy for focusing otherwise uncleftable constituents. It instead must be viewed as a focus construction in its own right. The reader will also likely have noticed that I have not provided an example of contrast on the proposition itself. As we will see shortly, the PC requires a particular discourse configuration, such that there will always be a shared sub-propositional element. That is to say, the sense in which the PC conveys contrast on the proposition itself requires an investigation into the discourse context and cannot be fully disentangled from contrast on a particular sub-part. The position where contrast appears to fall within the PC is a reflection of the shape of the discourse in which the PC occurs. Below I will show that the PC is licensed in a discourse where there is an unresolved or unaddressed question, and the PC functions in this context to revise the line of inquiry in the discourse, either providing an answer to the unresolved or unaddressed question. This means that there is typically a shared component among the sentences in the discourse, including in the PC itself, and so where the PC has a contrastive interpretation, it will appear to involve a sub-part of the sentence. It is only through a detailed look at many instances of the PC, including ones where there is no apparent contrast, that we arrive at a characterization of the discourse function of the PC: a revision to the line of inquiry, with contrast arising from context rather than from the meaning of the PC itself.

3.1.1.2 Absence of Contrast

Not only can the position of contrast vary, but there are also instances of the PC which convey no clear sense of contrast at all. These non-contrastive instances of the PC are common in narratives and seem to be used as a sort of narrative device. There are at least two effects associated with the non-contrastive PC: helping to propel the story forward (3.12) and signaling the conclusion of a story or sub-plot (3.11).²

A clear example of a non-contrastive use of the PC is given in (3.11), where the PC introduces all-new information, and nothing is contrasted. The effect of the PC here is the introduction of a character who brings the information which resolves the issue of the cat (who had been eating the chickens).

²I use the terms ‘narrative device’ and ‘sub-plot’ in a relatively non-technical way to convey the idea that the PC has an effect on the narrative or story being told. While the PC does seem to fall under the notion of ‘narrative device’ as broadly construed, it bears little resemblance to canonical examples of narrative devices.

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (3.11) (A gypsy suggests a song for Calum to sing, as a means of getting rid of the cat who has been eating his chickens).

Thòisich Cailean air an òran, ach chan robh e a' faighinn air adhart glé mhath leis, bha a' chas aige cho goirt.

Calum began on the song, but he didn't get very far along with it, his leg was so sore.

'S ann a thàinig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e ris: "Tha an cat marbh shìos aig a' bhàthach agad."

'S ann a thàinig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e
 COP in.3MSG C.REL came boy in and say.PAST 3MSG
 ris: "Tha an cat marbh shìos aig a' bhàthach agad."
 to.3MSG be.PRES the cat dead down at the byre at.2SG
Then a boy came in and said to him: "The cat is dead down by your byre."

LG: 273

No contrastive reading can be construed in (3.11).

Similarly, in (3.12) the PC simply introduces a character. The arrival of this character is crucial to a new development in the narrative (this new character asks a favor of Pwyll, and tricks him into giving his bride-to-be, Rhiannon, to him).

- (3.12) Agus bha iad ag ithe 's a' còmhradh is an gnothach a' còrdadh riutha.
 And they were eating and conversing and enjoying the occasion.

Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach, is aodach sìoda air.

Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's
 at start the.GEN entertainment after the.GEN feast COP
 ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt
 in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL young.man big princely with hair
 buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach
 yellow-red PROG come.VN in

At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall princely young man with reddish-blond hair coming in, and with silk clothes on.*

AM:18

Such non-contrastive instances of the PC are often found in narratives, where the PC functions as a narrative device, progressing the plot or signalling a resolution to the plot or sub-plot. Because it doesn't involve contrast, it seems, at first glance, to be distinct from the contrastive function of the PC. However, I will pursue a unified analysis, and show that these non-contrastive instances of the PC share a similar discourse context to contrastive instances of the PC.

3.1.2 The Propositional Cleft as a Focus Construction

Although the Propositional Cleft can convey contrast, it need not, and furthermore where there is contrast, the constituent which is contrasted is variable. In this section I look in greater detail at the discourse contexts in which the PC is licensed (or not), and show that the PC cannot answer a question directly without an additional (i.e. counter-expectational) interpretation arising. Question-answer congruence is the gold standard for identifying a focus constituent, and the non-congruence of the PC is initially surprising given my claim that the PC is a focus construction. I will argue, however, that this non-congruence can be derived from the combination of broad focus-marking and the meaning of the CLEFT operator.

The PC cannot be used to felicitously answer an unrestricted, broad-focus *wh*-question (3.13).

(3.13) A: Dè a tha a' tachairt?
'What's happening?'

B: #'S ann a tha an leanabh a' dannsa.

'S ann a tha an leanabh a' dannsa.
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the child PROG dance.VN

'The child is dancing.'

GLA_JN_02JUN2014_CMS

Without additional assumptions or context about what might be expected (one consultant offered that (3.13) might be felicitous in a context where the child is not expected, or perhaps is not allowed, to be dancing), the PC is infelicitous as an answer.

Examples of the PC as an answer to a *wh*-question can be found, however, as in (3.14), with the *wh*-question italicized.

(3.14) Dh'fhoighneachd an Gréidheir dheth *dé bha 'ga chumail anochd cho fìor-fhada seach mar a b' àbhaist dha bhith.*

The Grieve asked him *what was keeping him so long tonight instead of how he usually was.*

“O,” ars esan, “is ann a tha bàl mòr againn ann an Ormaclait anochd.”

“O,” ars esan, “is ann a tha bàl mòr againn
Oh said 3MSG.EMPH COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES ball big at.1PL
ann an Ormaclait anochd.”
in Ormaclait tonight

“Oh,” he said, “we have a large ball in Ormaclait tonight.”*

SIA: 25

The *wh*-question ‘what is keeping him so long?’ is paired with the comment that this is unusual: the *wh*-question is partially restricted, and sets up a contrast between the character being late tonight as opposed to the usual state of affairs. In this context, the PC is in fact congruent to the question in the discourse, but we will see below that it is the additional restriction in the *wh*-question which is responsible for licensing the PC here. That is, the PC

appears to be congruent to the *wh*-question, but is in fact congruent to the whole complex question: ‘what is keeping you?’ and ‘this is not usual’.

Similarly, the PC can be used as an over-informative answer to a polar interrogative, along with a negative response to that polar interrogative, as in (3.15).

(3.15) “An ann a’ dol a dheanamh cleas nan cearc a tha thu,” as esan, “an gràn ithe?”
 “Are you acting like a hen,” he asked, “eating grain?”

“Chan ann,” asa mise, “ach ’s ann a tha mi ’do a dheanamh brochan is aran air.”

“Chan ann,” asa mise, “ach ’s ann a tha mi
 NEG in.3MSG say 1SG.EMPH but COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES 1SG
 ’do a dheanamh brochan is aran air.
 go.VN INF make.VN porridge and bread on.3MSG

“No,” I said, “but I am going to make porridge and bread of it.”* TB: 86

Notice that the polar interrogative in (3.15) contains a cleft construction, and as such it contains a focus constituent, *a’ dol a dheanamh cleas nan cearc* ‘acting like a hen’. Such polar interrogatives have been argued to imply the *wh*-question corresponding to the focus (Kiefer (1980), Yadugiri (1986)). In (3.15), the polar interrogative ‘Are you acting like a hen?’ (literally, ‘is it acting like a hen that you are?’) implies the *wh*-question ‘What are you doing?’. It is to this implied question that the PC responds. Such uses of the PC, then, are not strictly congruent to the polar interrogative, despite being informative and coherent.

I propose that the non-congruence of the PC in (3.15) and elsewhere is linked to the broad size of focus in the PC. Because it does not convey focus on a particular subpart of the sentence, the PC cannot directly answer a (simple) *wh*-question or a polar interrogative (which presumably is a question about the polarity of the sentence), and it follows that the PC does not have a narrow size of focus. However, broad focus utterances (e.g. sentence focus) have been argued to be congruent to the Big Question, and so may answer questions which stand in for this question, such as ‘what’s happening?’ The PC cannot answer this question (cf. (3.13) above) either, although we saw above that it can answer a complex *wh*-question. In the remainder of this chapter I argue that the particular combination of the CLEFT operator and the broad size of focus in the PC requires a particular discourse context, and that this discourse context is not provided in broad-sized focus questions or simple *wh*-questions. The PC is not congruent to a single question but rather to a larger discourse structure.

3.1.3 Summary: What must be explained

The PC may or may not appear in a contrastive context, and there is no consistent subpart of the sentence that receives contrast in contrastive contexts. In fact, constituents that are otherwise available for clefting may be interpreted contrastively in the PC. The PC is not

felicitous as an answer to simple questions, whether *wh*-questions or polar interrogatives. If the question sets up a contrast of some sort, or if the polar interrogative can be interpreted as a *wh*-question, the PC is felicitous as a response (although in the case of the polar interrogative, the polar interrogative must be answered to the negative first). All this suggests that the discourse context is a crucial component of the PC's pragmatic function. The PC is best understood as a broad identificational focus construction, with identificational focus operating at the discourse level.

In the next section I review the QUD framework and introduce some new concepts which are relevant to the analysis of the PC proposed in §3.3. As a preview, the PC, in the canonical case, is congruent to a super-question of the Immediate QUD and represents a distinct answer to one that has already been proposed. I refer to this effect as a Revision to the Line of Inquiry. I then show that with an appropriate formalization of this effect, non-canonical instances of the PC (e.g. non-contrastive or congruent instances) can be understood as a slight deviation from the canonical case.

3.2 QUD Redux


In this section I expand on the Question under Discussion (QUD) framework introduced in the last chapter. The core of the QUD framework nicely captures the felicity of narrow-sized focus constructions, which can be described through congruence to the immediate QUD. The PC, however, cannot be described in similar terms, but seems to be non-congruent to the immediate QUD. Recall that the PC was only felicitous as an answer in certain contexts, specifically where there was a contrast set up as part of the question or where a polar interrogative evoked a more general *wh*-question. Thus it appears that the PC requires a larger chunk of discourse than a simple question. This requirement is reminiscent of Büring's (2003) analysis of contrastive topic constructions, which he argues requires a larger chunk of discourse. Büring's terminology and expanded QUD framework will be useful in understanding the discourse requirement on the PC.

Recall that the core claim of the QUD framework is that discourse can be represented as a hierarchical structure of questions and their answers. The QUD framework also provides a means of understanding what makes utterances pragmatically well-formed. Büring (2003) expands this framework, and represents discourse with a hierarchical tree structure.

Büring (2003: 516) distinguishes between *utterances*, which are syntactic objects and which include focus-marking, and *moves*, which are pragmatic objects representing declarative or interrogative utterances. The felicity of an utterance is determined by the well-formedness conditions under which it can be mapped onto a particular move in the discourse structure. A move, as the pragmatic counterpart to an utterance, can be represented formally as a node in a hierarchical structure called a *d(iscourse)-tree*.

(3.16) **d(iscourse)-tree** - a hierarchical ordering of utterances (questions and their answers) in a discourse. (Büring 2003: 516)

D-trees consist of questions, sub-questions, and answers, schematized in (3.17).




The hierarchical ordering of moves in a d-tree reflects the linear sequence of the corresponding utterances. This mapping from linear order to hierarchical structure is constrained by Precedence.

(3.18) **Precedence:**

For any moves M1 and M2, M1 *precedes* M2 in D if

- a. M1 dominates M2, or
- b. there are moves M3 and M4 which are sisters in D, M3 is to the left of M4, and M3 dominates or equals M1 and M4 dominates or equals M2 (Büring 2003: 540)


(3.18) describes three configurations between moves M₁ and M₂, represented in the partial d-trees in (3.19). Dominance is represented in (3.19a); sisterhood is represented in (3.19b) and (3.19c).



The d-tree reflects the linear sequencing of utterances in a top-to-bottom, left-to-right fashion.

Thus, given a discourse represented by the d-tree in (3.17), we can infer a sequence of utterances as indicated by the numbered nodes in (3.20).³

³This presentation is taken from Constant (2014: 34).



Precedence concerns the position of the move in the d-tree which a particular utterance is mapped onto, but tells us nothing about the felicity of that utterance. The wellformedness of the move, or the felicity of an utterance in the discourse, is calculated based on *Coherence* (a notion corresponding to the intuitive concept of coherence, e.g.. ‘be informative’ (Büring 2003: 518)) and *Relevance*. I follow Roberts (1996) and Constant (2014) in viewing Relevance as a constraint on moves, such that a move must address the Immediate QUD.

Recall that in Chapter 2 I distinguished between the Immediate QUD, which was the question at the top of Roberts’ (1996) QUD stack, and the Current Question, which was the QUD evoked by the focal structure of the utterance. This distinction will be useful in talking about the discourse context of the PC, and so I modify Büring’s terminology accordingly. A technical definition for Immediate QUD is given in (3.21).

(3.21) **Immediate QUD** - For any move M , the IQUD is the Move M' immediately dominating it (cf. Büring (2003: 517)).

The Current Question is the QUD proposed to be investigated by a given utterance. Its relation to the IQUD—the QUD currently being investigated—is constrained by Relevance

(3.22) **Relevance**

- a. an assertion A is relevant iff A addresses the IQUD; i.e. the QUD presupposed in A is the IQUD or is a sub-question of the IQUD.
- b. a question Q is relevant iff at least one answer to Q addresses the IQUD; i.e. if Q introduces a sub-question of the IQUD

(cf. Constant (2014: 34), Büring (2003: 518))

Relevance governs the well-formedness of the d-tree, such that all moves, representing both declarative and interrogative utterances, dominated by a given question Q serve to (collectively, perhaps) provide an answer to Q .

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

The focus-marking of a declarative utterance gives us the QUD to which that utterance provides an answer: this is the notion of *Congruence* in Roberts' (1996) system, updated in (3.23).⁴

(3.23) **Congruence:**

An utterance U containing a focus can map onto a move M_U within a d-tree D only if U presupposes (indicates) a QUD (the CQ) which is Relevant to the IQUD.

Congruence is a constraint on the felicity of an utterance given its focus alternatives; it is a constraint on the syntax-pragmatics mapping. The definition of congruence in (3.23) also reflects the assumption that there is a QUD for any given move in the discourse, and that every utterance has a focal structure from which we can derive the CQ.

The CQ evoked by a focus-marked utterance is determined by calculating the focus-value of that utterance. The availability of a focus-value is determined by the focus-marking in the utterance.

(3.24) **Focus-value formation:**

$[[U]]^f$ is a function which yields a *focus - value*.

Replace the focus with a *wh*-word and front the *wh*-word (i.e. form a question)
(cf. Büring (2003), Rooth (1996))

The formation of a focus value creates a question which evokes the focus alternatives from among which the focus utterance selects a member (cf. Roberts (1996: 23)). It is through this question—the CQ—that we derive the felicity of an utterance in a given discourse.

Thus in Büring's system, a well-formed focus utterance is built from three components: a grammatical (syntactic or prosodic) focus-marking, from which the semantic focus value is formed, Congruence, a constraint on the mapping from utterances to moves, and Relevance, the pragmatic constraint on a well-formed discourse. The combination of these components gives us a well-formed discourse. The focus-value of an utterance gives us a question, which is mapped onto a QUD. This QUD (the CQ evoked by the utterance) must be Relevant to the Immediate QUD, such that it either *is* the IQUD or addresses it.

The focal structure of an utterance can also evoke a larger chunk of discourse than a simple QUD, as is the case for contrastive topics (3.25). The utterance in (3.25) is felicitous in a discourse where there is a complex *wh*-question such as 'which person likes what food?' Small caps indicates stress, interpreted as focus, although the two foci in (3.25) are not pronounced identically; (3.25), given the complex question 'who likes what?' will be pronounced with a falling accent on *Phaedra* and a rising one on *bananas* (see Jackendoff (1972), Büring (2003), Constant (2014) for discussion).

(3.25) PHAEDRA likes BANANAS

Because contrastive topics are felicitous where a complex question is salient, they may be analyzed as being congruent to a *strategy (of inquiry)*, defined in (3.26).

(3.26) **Strategy** - a sub-tree of a d-tree rooted in an interrogative move (Büring 2003: 518)

⁴Büring does not formally give definitions of focus, so I recreate them here, modeling the definitions on the ones he gives for contrastive topic and building off the definitions given in Roberts (1996).

A strategy of inquiry is a d-tree representation of a complex question which has been broken down into smaller and more manageable sub-questions. Because contrastive topic utterances are congruent to a strategy, they answer a sub-question, and furthermore indicate that the provided answer is a partial answer to the more complex question (cf. Constant (2014: 88 *ff*)).

Constant (2014) derives the congruence of contrastive topics to a strategy through the interaction of focus-marking and a semantic CT (Contrastive Topic) operator (Constant 2014: 94). The CT operator functions to create a complex question from an utterance’s multiple focus-marked phrases. The exact details will not concern us here, but rather the precedent of a focus-like construction which makes reference to something larger than a QUD, and that this can be derived from the interaction of an operator and focus-marking. What I will propose is that the effect of the PC comes from the interaction of the CLEFT operator and broad focus-marking.

The representation of a discourse through a d-tree allows us to refer to groupings of questions like strategies, and this view of discourse opens us up to the possibility that focus-marking may make reference to more than a single QUD. In the next section I show that we can understand the Propositional Cleft in a similar way, as making reference to something larger than a QUD.

3.3 The Pragmatic Effect of the Propositional Cleft

In this section I give a pragmatic analysis of the Propositional Cleft, and show how this accounts for both the contrastive focus function of the PC and the non-contrastive function as narrative device. The intuition that I will formalize in this section is that the PC is used to signal that the question it is answering is not Congruent to the Immediate QUD. To illustrate this, let us return to the example above where the PC functioned as an over-informative answer to a polar interrogative.


- (3.27) “An ann a’ dol a dheanamh cleas nan cearc a tha thu,” as esan, “an gràn ithe?”
 “Are you acting like a hen,” he asked, “eating grain?”
 “Chan ann,” asa mise, “ach ’s ann a tha mi ’do a dheanamh brochan is aran air.”
 “Chan ann,” asa mise, “ach ’s ann a tha mi
 NEG in.3MSG say 1SG.EMPH but COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES 1SG
 ’do a dheanamh brochan is aran air.
 go.VN INF make.VN porridge and bread on.3MSG
 “No,” I said, “but I am going to make porridge and bread of it.”* TB: 86

The PC is felicitous as an answer in contexts where a greater discourse context is evoked, for instance in the context where a polar interrogative is interpreted as a *wh*-question. We can understand the felicity of the PC in such contexts, and its infelicity as an answer otherwise,⁵ as a requirement of the PC to pursue and provide an alternative answer to a super-question of the preceding move. In (3.27), the discourse makes salient a *wh*-question and a sub-question. The PC answers the super-question.

(3.27) can be represented by the d-tree in (3.28). The PC functions as an over-informative answer to the polar interrogative. Over-informative answers are not strictly congruent to the QUD, but

⁵I will return to the example of the PC as an answer to a restricted *wh*-question below.

serve to answer a super-question of the explicit question. In (3.27) the super-question ‘what are you doing?’ is not explicit but is evoked by the focal structure of the polar interrogative (cf. Kiefer (1980), Yadugiri (1986)). The implicitness of the super-question is indicated by parentheses in the d-tree in (3.28).



Here, the PC responds to the higher question and is not strictly congruent to the explicit polar interrogative.

The effect of answering the super-question is to end the pursuit of the line of inquiry represented by IQUD. A line of inquiry is a hierarchical notion, like that of strategy; it is essentially a non-branching strategy, a unique path down the d-tree.

(3.29) **Line of Inquiry** - a branch of discourse ending in the Current Question (IQUD).

I propose that the PC is felicitous in contexts where a new line of inquiry is created. The creation of new line of inquiry implies the shape of the d-tree in (3.28) above.

(3.30) **PC Congruence:**

The PC maps onto a move M_U in a d-tree only where a new line of inquiry is created.

(3.30) captures the infelicity of the PC as an answer to the Immediate QUD, and predicts that the PC cannot introduce a sub-question of the IQUD. The PC may, however, answer or introduce a sub-question of a super-question of the IQUD (i.e. a sister question of the IQUD). The degree to which the PC allows backtracking to a super-question (i.e. whether a super-(...)-super-question of the QUD can be answered by the PC) is presumably constrained by general pragmatic principles (e.g. Relevance) and the extent to which such questions remain salient in the minds of the discourse participants.

In the next section I show that the PC Congruence constraint can account for both the contrastive and non-contrastive functions of the PC. In §3.4 I derive the PC Congruence constraint from the combination of broad focus marking and the requirements of the CLEFT operator. The formal implementation will lead to a revision of the PC Congruence constraint, which is currently too restrictive.

3.3.1 Creating a New Line of Inquiry

Recall that the PC is often found in contrastive contexts. If the PC functions to signal a new line of inquiry, there will often be an implicit sense of contrast in the discourse, because the speaker is signaling that the line of inquiry terminating in the Immediate QUD will no longer be pursued.


CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

The contrast found in the PC, then, is a contrast in what sub-question is pursued. Contrastive instances of the PC are often paired with a negative answer to the IQUD, but need not be. As for non-contrastive instances, which are found in narratives, the creation of a new line of inquiry has the effect of moving the plot along, and introducing a new sub-plot.⁶

In (3.31) the PC functions as part of a response which rejects a suggested line of inquiry. The super-question revolves around the choice of craft, and Pryderi suggests that the choice be limited to the crafts that they already know. Manawydan rejects this suggestion and proposes that they become cobblers, a craft which they know nothing about.

- (3.31) “Dè a’ chèaird a bhios againn an seo?” dh’fhaighnich Manawydan.
 “What craft will we have here?” asked Manawydan.
 “Cèaird sam bith a thogras tu as na ’s aithne dhut,” thuirt Pryderi.
 “Any craft you acquire from what you know.” said Pryderi.
 “Chan e,” ars’ esan, “S ann a dh’fheuchas sinn cèaird na greusachd.”
 “Chan e,” ars’ esan, “S ann a dh’fheuchas sinn cèaird
 NEG 3MSG said he.EMPH COP in.MSG C.REL try.FUT.REL 1PL craft
 na greusachd.
 the.GEN cobbler.GEN
 “No,” he said, “We’ll go for the craft of the cobbler”* AM: 48

The d-tree for (3.31) is given in (3.32). The line of inquiry is rooted in the initial question, ‘what craft will we have here?’ Pryderi’s response suggests that the line of inquiry go in the direction of ‘what craft do we know?’ The PC, along with the negation of the previous move, signals a change in the line of inquiry, pursuing the alternative set of propositions ‘what craft don’t we know?’, and providing the answer ‘the craft of the cobbler.’



The PC is used to pursue an alternative line of inquiry, via the implicit question ‘what don’t we know?’. This example is essentially corrective focus, but it corrects the sub-question to be pursued, rather than a subpart of a sentence.

In (3.33), the PC is part of a larger complex utterance, which first identifies what is *not* done to the cat. It is not the case that he fed the cat; he chases after the cat.

⁶See Onea (2013), (2016) for the idea that narratives license the (potential) question of ‘and then what?’ The claims in this section are compatible with Onea’s proposal, in that the PC may answer a potential question, since a potential question is, by necessity, an unaddressed question. Answering a potential question entails the creation of a new line of inquiry.


CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

(3.33) An àite dha biadh a thoirt sìos chun a' chait, 's ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fheòir.

An àite dha biadh a thoirt sìos chun a' chait, 's ann
 in place for food OPTCL give.VN down to.DEF the cat COP in.3MSG
 a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fheòir
 C.REL go.PAST 3MSG PTCL 3MSG.POSS after with.DEF the hayfork
 Instead of taking food down to the cat, he went after him with the hayfork. LG: 271

The PC marks this new line of inquiry, which answers the implicit super-question ‘what does he do to the cat?’

The d-tree for (3.33) is given in (3.34). The subordinate *an àite dha* clause introduces the lefthand branch, which is negated,⁷ and the super-question is implicit. The PC answers this question.



Note that because the PC directly answers the super-question, the notion of ‘revising the line of inquiry’ need not create a new line of inquiry, but rather requires the creation of a sister-node to the IQUD.

Again, in (3.35), the PC answers an implicit super-question. The IQUD posed to Eoin is whether he caught anyone (i.e. any devils) last night; this question is answered negatively, and he then goes to answer a super-question of ‘what is done with the devil?’.

(3.35) “An do ghlac thu duine an raoir, Eoghainn?”
 “Did you catch anyone last night, Eoin?”
 “Cha do ghlac. Chan fhaca duine an donas a riamh—’s ann a bhios e ‘ga fhaireachdainn.”
 Cha do ghlac. Chan fhaca duine an donas a riamh 's
 NEG catch.PAST.DEP NEG see.PAST.DEP person the devil ever COP
 ann a bhios e 'g a fhaireachdainn.”
 in.3MSG C.REL be.FUT 3MSG PROG 3MSG.POSS feel.VN
 “No. Nobody ever saw the devil: he only feels him.” LG: 293

The d-tree for (3.35) is given in (3.36).


⁷I assume that ‘instead of’ can be modeled with negation.

“Cha mhis’ a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith na caoraich eud.”

“Cha mhis’ a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith
 NEG 1SG.EMPH C.REL eat.PAST 3PL at.all COP in.3MSG C.REL eat.PAST
 na caoraich eud.”
 the.PL sheep.PL 3PL

“It was not I that ate them at all; it was the sheep that ate them.” TWHv2: 161

We can understand this example as, yet again, the creation of a new line of inquiry; the PC signals a change in the question being answered. The speaker takes issue with the presupposition of the IQUD, which is that he ate the fields. He negates this proposition, and then uses the PC to answer the implicit question raised by this negation: who ate the fields? Note the use of a cleft here, which introduces the QUD ‘who ate the fields?’. This exchange creates a complex d-tree (3.40).



The Immediate QUD is left unanswered; the speaker instead addresses the presupposed assertion that he ate the fields (I model this here as a question-answer pair, with ‘Yes’ as the answer to a polar interrogative), and answers this negatively instead. His utterance raises the question of who ate the fields, and the PC is used to answer this question. Note that while there is a rightward movement in the d-tree, the discourse is working backwards, i.e. up the d-tree, and counter to the usual rules of tree traversal (cf. Büring (2003)). For our purposes, what is important is the shape of the d-tree in (3.40), whereby there is an unanswered question which has already been partially addressed: of all the people/things that could have eaten the fields, we know that the speaker has not.

The PC as a means to signal a new line of inquiry allows us to capture the basic function of the PC, and the circumstances under which it is licensed. The PC will be well-formed wherever a super-question is being answered. This has the structural effect of creating a new branch in the d-tree. Although the PC often co-occurs with negative utterances, it need not. Negation inherently creates the kind of structure that the PC occurs in, but other contexts can create a similar structure. In the next section I will show that non-contrastive instances of the PC can also be explained as revising the line of inquiry.

3.3.2 The Non-contrastive Propositional Cleft

In this section I argue that when the PC is non-contrastive it is also functioning to revise the line of inquiry. Recall that the non-contrastive instances of the PC occurs in narrative contexts. The

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

PC's effect of revising the line of inquiry in narratives arises in answering the ever-salient question of 'what happens (in this story)?' or 'what happens (next)?' See also Onea (2013), (2016) for the idea that narratives license the 'potential question' of 'and then what?'

Where the PC's narrative function is to progress the story, the revised line of inquiry begins a new sub-plot. This exemplified by the PC in (3.41). Here, the PC introduces a new character; it is this character who heralds in a new development to the story (he tricks the king into giving away his wife; they then must try and get her back).

- (3.41) Agus bha iad ag ithe 's a' còmhraidh is an gnothach a' còrdadh riutha.
 And they were eating and conversing and enjoying the occasion.
- Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach
- Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's
 at start the.GEN entertainment after the.GEN feast COP
 ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt
 in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL young.man big princely with hair
 buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach
 yellow-red PROG come.VN in
 At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall princely young man with reddish-blond hair coming in.* AM:18

The discourse structure for (3.41) is along the lines of the d-tree in (3.42).

- (3.42)
-
- ... (What happens in the story?)
 (What happened (next)?)
 Did they feast (etc)? [PC They saw a tall princely young man coming in.]
 Y

Where the PC signals a resolution to the story, it is signalling the final answer to the narrative's implicit question of 'what happened (in this story)?'. The resolution function of the PC is exactly parallel to the progression case, with the exception that there is little or no plot action after the PC.

Thus non-contrastive instances of the PC can be understood in exactly the same way as contrastive instances: for all instances of the PC, the PC functions to create a new line of inquiry, i.e. answers a super-question in the discourse. In narratives, the super-question that the PC answers is 'what happens (next)?'. As support for this, consider the rather frequent use of 'then' in translations of the PC. In (3.43), as an example, the translation includes a temporal pronoun, 'then' which is missing from the Gaelic original.

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

(3.43) ’Nuair a lion na fir a bha gu h-àrd iad féin làn do bhiadh, ’s do dheoch, ’s ann a smaoinich an rìgh fios a chur a nìos air Conal Cròbhi, a dh’ innseadh sgeulachd.

’Nuair a lion na fir a bha gu h-àrd iad féin làn
 when C.REL fill.PAST the.PL men C.REL be.PAST above 3PL self full
 do bhiadh, ’s do dheoch, ’s ann a smaoinich an rìgh
 of food and of drink COP in.3MSG C.REL thought the king
 fios a chur a nìos air Conal Cròbhi, a dh’ innseadh sgeulachd.
 knowledge OPTCL put now on Conal Crovi INF tell story

When the men who were above had filled themselves full of meat and drink, it was then that the king thought of sending word down for Conal Crovi to tell a tale.

TWHv1: 138

I propose that such translations of the PC are an attempt to capture the interpretation of the PC as a new branch in the narrative d-tree. While this is not solid evidence for the claim that the non-contrastive instances of the PC also function to create a new line of inquiry, it is suggestive. In fact, the use of ‘then’ in translations of the PC is independent of the presence of contrast. This is to be expected if contrast comes from the relation of the PC in relation to other utterances, while the ‘then’ interpretation arises from the super-question being answered (i.e. ‘what happens (next)?’). Nothing prevents the interpretation of both contrast and ‘then’. This is shown in the rather gruesome (3.44), where there is implicit contrast between the knife going in the sack and the knife going in Prabusg (i.e. him stabbing himself), but the PC also functions to signal a resolution in the narrative: after Prabusg is dead, Mac Rùislig gets the farmer’s daughter as his wife.

(3.44) (Whoever eats the most meat will marry the farmer’s daughter. MacRùislig was full, and put a sack of meat in front of him)

Chuir Mac Rùislig sgian anns a’ phoca, agus thubhairt e, “Is fheairrde mi fhéin siud.”
 Mac Rùislig then cut through the sack with a knife, and said “That makes me feel better.”

Is ann a chuir Prabusg ann fhéin i, agus bhàsaich e,

Is ann a chuir Prabusg ann fhéin i, agus
 COP in.3MSG C.REL put.PAST Prabusg in.3MSG self 3FSG and
 bhàsaich e,
 die.PAST 3MSG

Then Prabusg cut himself with the knife (lit. ‘put it [the knife] in himself’) and died,
 agus fhuair Mac Rùislig gach uile dad dhà fhéin agus nighean an tuathanaich ’na bean.
 and Mac Rùislig got everything to himself and he got the farmer’s daughter as his wife.

SKRS: 151

The function of the PC as signalling a new line of inquiry offers a unified analysis of both contrastive and non-contrastive instances of the PC. Contrast may be a reason for creating a new line of inquiry, but is not necessary: a new line of inquiry is also useful in progressing and resolving the overall plotline in a narrative.

3.4 Pragmatic Effect via CLEFT and Broad Focus

Thus far I have shown that the PC signals a revision of the line of inquiry and have claimed that this is an effect of broad identificational focus. But I have not addressed why or how this comes about: why is it that broad identificational focus should have the pragmatic effect of revising the line of inquiry? In this section I derive this pragmatic effect of the PC from the interaction of broad focus and the semantic requirements of the CLEFT operator. I amend the denotation of the CLEFT operator, such that it requires a partitioning on the Context Set. In the case of regular clefts, which convey narrow focus, the partitioning is provided by the focal structure, which indicates a QUD. Broad focus, on the other hand, fails to make any partition on the Context Set, but certain discourse configurations can provide the relevant partitioning. In particular, where there is an existing line of inquiry, there is an unanswered question which can provide the requisite partitioning of the Context Set for the CLEFT operator. Such contexts are found where a speaker wishes to return to a super-question or in narratives when the narrator wishes to signal a shift in the plot (i.e. address what happens next). It may also be provided in a context where the speaker wishes to highlight the unexpected content of the PC, in which case the relevant partitioning is one which is presumably a default one, dividing the Context Set into plausible and implausible worlds.

3.4.1 CLEFT Recap

In Chapter 2 I derived the identificational focus associated with clefts via the CLEFT operator, whose denotation is repeated in (3.45).

- (3.45) $\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$
 Requires a question of the form $P(x)$
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than p
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as p

The denotation in (3.45) is appropriate for a cleft formed on narrow focus-marking because narrow focus-marking evokes a QUD and provides the alternative answers which CLEFT operates over.

We predict that a cleft formed on broad focus-marking will have a meaning as in (3.46). The difference between the two is a difference in the QUD, derived from the focus-marked constituent.

- (3.46) $\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$
 Requires a question of the form “What’s happening?” (etc.)
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than p
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as p

The semantic meaning provided by the CLEFT operator in (3.46) is extremely strong, and, intuitively, cannot be the way the PC is interpreted. For the broad-focus cleft utterance in (3.46) to ever be a well-formed utterance, it would require that i) a single proposition can fully answer the Big Question and ii) that the speaker presume to have the knowledge of the exact world we are in.

There is, however, an alternative way of looking at the prerequisite in the CLEFT operator’s denotation, which amounts to a difference in how we talk about and understand the effect of questions on the discourse. In the next section I will discuss in more detail the Context Set, and argue that the prerequisite for the CLEFT operator is not a question *per se* but rather the appearance of a question prerequisite is a consequence of narrow focus-marking. The effect of questions is to create a partition on the Context Set, and this division of the possible worlds we are in creates the alternatives familiar in discussions of focus. My claim will be that in the case of broad focus, no partition is created. This lack of a partition in turn will explain the contexts in which the PC is licensed: where there is a pre-existing partition (i.e. question) in the discourse, the combination of the CLEFT operator and broad focus can be licensed.

3.4.2 The Context Set

In this section I discuss in detail the effect of posing a question on the Context Set. This will illuminate the difference between broad and narrow focus, and will motivate an amendment to Velleman et al.’s (2012) CLEFT denotation. My main claim will be that while narrow focus, by indicating *wh*-questions and polar interrogatives, establishes a partition on the Context Set (cf. Roberts (1996), Groenendijk and Stokhof (1984)), broad focus does not. This is *contra* the understanding of broad focus in Roberts (1996), who sees broad focus as creating a nearly infinite partitioning, by evoking as alternatives singleton sets of worlds (Roberts 1996: 4). I argue that the lack of a partition is what allows broad focus constructions (e.g. Sentence Focus) to be used discourse-initially and as answers to questions like “What’s happening?” (used as proxies to the Big Question), and it is also responsible for the particular pragmatic effect of the PC.

The effect of focus is traditionally understood as the evocation of a set of alternative propositions, where each proposition in the set differs in the value for the focus constituent (cf. Rooth (1985), Rooth (1992), Féry et al. (2007: 5)). In the QUD framework we can understand this as equivalent to the creation of a question (cf. Büring (2003)). I follow Roberts (1996) in understanding the effect of posing a question as an effect on the Context Set. Recall that the Context Set is the set of worlds for which the aim of discourse is the reduction to a singleton set: the world we are in. The effect of a question, whether explicitly posed or implicit in the focal structure of an utterance, is to create a partition on the Context Set. This partitioning constrains the way we can address the question. For instance, when I ask “Who is the President?” I create groupings of worlds organized around the different values for who the president is. It is this grouping that creates the alternatives which the focus utterance selects from, thereby narrowing down the Context Set, or the set of worlds we may possibly be in.

As an illustration, let’s pose the question “Who is the president?” and assume our domain of individuals consists of only four people, Donald, Hillary, Gary, and Jill. Our Context Set is then partitioned as in Figure 3.4.2. The effect of asking ‘Who is the president?’ is to organize the Context Set such that we have four sets of worlds: a set where Donald is the president, a set where Hillary is the president, a set where Gary is the president, and a set where Jill is the president. A declarative utterance which answers this question, such as ‘Hillary is the president’, narrows down the Context Set by discarding the sets which are incompatible with the assertion. In the example at hand, the interlocuters will discard all worlds where Donald is president, where Gary is president, and where Jill is president.

Broad focus can only be congruent to the Big Question (Roberts 1996: 26). The Big Question is




Figure 3.1: Partition on the Context Set: Narrow Informational Focus

simply ‘what world are we in?’, and Roberts assumes that this is equivalent to a partitioning on the Context Set such that the groupings correspond to each individual proposition in the Context Set. This is too specific, and predicts the wrong effect of broad (informational) focus utterances. I argue that if it were the case that the Big Question or broad focus had the effect of creating a nearly infinite partitioning on the Context Set, we predict that an answer to the Big Question would assert that we are in a particular world. This cannot be the case, because it would follow that any Sentence Focus utterance would entail the end of the conversation, since the utterance would positively identify the world we are in. But canonical broad focus (i.e. Sentence Focus) does not have this effect; rather, it is a means of introducing topics of discussion and setting the stage for a discourse to occur (cf. Lambrecht (1994)). For example, an utterance out of the blue, such as ‘A man came in’, simply asserts that we are in a world where a man has entered the relevant place. The effect on the Context Set is a division into worlds where a man has come in and worlds where a man has not come in. I therefore conclude that broad focus has no partitioning effect on the Context Set. Any apparent effect that a broad focus utterance may have on the Context Set comes from domain goals and general pragmatic reasoning, such as the discarding of the group of worlds inconsistent with the utterance.

The failure of broad focus to induce a partition on the Context Set is consistent with the claim by Constant (2014: 135) that the effect of broad focus in Contrastive Topic utterances is congruence to a set of formally unrelated questions. The lack of a partitioning allows for a formal variation of propositions (i.e. there need be no shared content, unlike in narrow focus). While this variation is also predicted if broad focus, being congruent to the Big Question, creates a partition of all the singleton sets of worlds, my proposal that broad focus fails to establish a partition crucially provides a major difference between broad and narrow focus that can be used to explain the pragmatic effect of the Propositional Cleft.

Thus, while narrow focus creates a partition on the Context Set, broad focus fails to do so. In narrow focus, the partition corresponds to the QUD indicated by the focal structure. The lack of a focal structure (i.e. lack of a backgrounded component) in broad focus means that no QUD is indicated, and thus no partition is created. This lack of a partition allows broad focus utterances to be felicitous in contexts where there is no context, and where the Immediate QUD also makes no partition (e.g. ‘what’s happening?’).

3.4.3 The CLEFT Operator and Broad Focus

In this section I argue that the CLEFT operator requires a partitioning of the Context Set. This is roughly equivalent to saying it requires a QUD but additionally allows us to understand the effect of broad focus-marking in cleft constructions. It allows us to make sense of the Propositional Cleft. Broad focus-marking fails to create the canonical focus-background structure which most analyses of focus assume.

Recall from (3.46) above that if the CLEFT operator only requires a QUD, obtained from the focus structure, then we get a meaning of broad identificational focus such that the utterance makes the claim that there is no stronger or better answer to the Big Question. Thus a broad-focus cleft utterance would have to make an extremely strong claim. It also makes the prediction that a broad-focus cleft construction can only presuppose the Big Question, and thus only occur in out-of-the-blue contexts or as answers to questions like ‘What’s happening?’. This is clearly the wrong prediction for the PC, which requires a rich context and cannot provide an answer to simple questions like ‘what’s happening?’.

If, however, what the CLEFT operator requires is a partitioning on the Context Set rather than a QUD, the pieces start to fall into place. The revised denotation of CLEFT is given in (3.47). The prerequisite for CLEFT to apply is not a QUD, but is instead a partition on the Context Set.

- (3.47) $\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$
 Requires a partition on the Context Set
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than p
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as p

In a canonical narrow focus cleft, the partition on the Context Set comes from the QUD evoked by the focal structure of the cleft. In the case of broad focus, however, the question evoked by the focal structure (the Big Question) fails to create a partition on the Context Set. Alone, this means that a broad-focus cleft is semantically ill-formed.

We might then expect that CLEFT is simply incompatible with broad focus marking. But notice that there is a logical independence between a partition on the Context Set and the QUD which the cleft provides an answer to. That is, there is no requirement that the partitioning originate within the utterance (come from the focal structure of the utterance). In out-of-the-blue contexts, the QUD evoked by the focal structure is what gives us the partition. My claim is that the partition may also be provided by the context, and that this is the case for broad-focus clefts like the PC.

Thus out-of-the-blue instances of the PC are predicted to be ill-formed. However, if the PC occurs in a sufficiently rich discourse context, where there is a partition already on the Context Set, it is predicted to be well-formed. Specifically, in discourse contexts where there is a yet-to-be-answered super-question, this super-question is able to provide the requisite partition on the Context Set for the CLEFT operator.

Because the PC involves broad focus, it does not allow for congruence to a (narrow-focus) question, and thus it cannot occur as a response (either answering or addressing) directly to any such question, implicit or explicit in the discourse. It cannot answer the big question either, and this derives from the semantic requirement of the CLEFT operator and the effect of broad focus on the Context Set, because the Big Question fails to establish a partition.

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

We can thus understand the infelicity of the PC as an answer to questions evoking the Big Question, whether it is meant to answer the question directly (3.48) or via contrast with an already-provided answer (3.49).

(3.48) A: Dè a tha a' tachairt?

‘What’s happening?’

B: #’S ann a tha an leanabh a’ dannsa.

’S ann a tha an leanabh a’ dannsa.
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the child PROG dance.VN

‘The child is dancing.’

GLA_JN_02JUN2014_CMS

(3.49) A: Dè tha a' tachairt?

‘What’s happening?’

B: Tha a' chlann a' cluiche aig a' phairc.

The children are playing in the park.

C: # Chan eil. ’S ann a tha na nabaidean ag ithe am bracaist.

Chan eil. ’S ann a tha na nabaidean ag ithe
No COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the.PL neighbor.PL PROG eat.VN
am bracaist.
3PL.POSS breakfast

No, the neighbors are eating breakfast.

GLA_GMM_15SEP2016_CMS

For both of the above discourses, the PC appears in a context where it answers a question which its focal structure is congruent to. In both contexts, the PC is infelicitous. The PC can neither answer the Big Question nor correct and thereby provide an answer to the Big Question. This infelicity derives not from the broad focal structure of the PC but from the meaning of the CLEFT operator. In (3.48) there is no partition on the Context Set because the Big Question does not impose one. In (3.49) the Immediate QUD, being the Big Question, does not impose a partitioning, and although we might expect the negation of B’s utterance to create the requisite partitioning, it doesn’t. This is because negation of an utterance re-evokes the question which the negated utterance was meant to answer. The re-evoked question in (3.49) is the Big Question, and so no relevant partitioning is available for the well-formedness of the CLEFT operator. B’s utterance also does not create a partition on the Context Set. This is because it is in answer to a broad focus question and presumably has a broad focus itself. That is, B’s utterance fails to evoke a sub-question which might partition the Context Set and therefore license the PC. Broad focus simply does not provide a complex-enough discourse structure—i.e. a partition on the Context Set—to license the PC.

Recall, however, that the PC can be used to answer a restricted *wh*-question (3.50).

(3.50) Dh’fhoighneachd an Gréidheir dheth dé bha ’ga chumail anochd cho fìor-fhada seach mar a b’ àbhaist dha bhith.

The Grieve asked him what was keeping him so long tonight instead of how he usually was.


“O,” ars esan, “is ann a tha bàl mòr againn ann an Ormaclait anochd.”

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

“O,” ars esan, “is ann a tha bàl mòr againn
 Oh said 3MSG.EMPH COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES ball big at.1PL
 ann an Ormaclait anochd.”
 in Ormaclait tonight
 “Oh,” he said, “we have a large ball in Ormaclait tonight.”* SIA: 25

In (3.50), the Grieve’s question is complex, and provides the question of ‘what’s been keeping him?’ as well as the assertion that this is not usual; the assertion can be modeled as a negative answer to the polar interrogative ‘Is this usual?’ This gives a partial d-tree as in (3.51).

(3.51) Are we in the expected set of worlds?



The use of the PC, while answering the *wh*-question, does so in a context where the answer is perhaps unexpected. This is already set up in the discourse, but I believe it is on par with the reported potential interpretation of a PC as answer to a *wh*-question, whereby the PC signals an unusual or unexpected proposition (cf. (3.13) above). Thus the presence of the super-question in (3.51) is essential to the well-formedness of the PC. What is interesting about (3.50) is that the PC is in fact answering the Immediate QUD, but it does so in the context where there is a super-question of whether this is a usual occurrence.

We find a similar context in (3.52), where the PC appears to be used in an out-of-the-blue context.

(3.52) Ò, dh’fhalbh e, thug e ’n éigheamh air a’ chrew uile, “Nach Dia a bhith troimh uile, ’s ann bha boirionnach fasta anns am buicead, anns am t-ìm agaibh, an t-ìm a tha sibh a’ dol a dh’ithe—tha i ann.”

Oh, he went and gave the shout to the whole crew. “Isn’t God in everything. There was a woman stuck in the bucket, in your butter, the butter you’re going to eat—she’s in it!”

’s ann bha boirionnach fasta anns am buicead,
 COP in.3MSG (C.REL) be.PAST woman stuck in.DEF the bucket
 anns am t-ìm agaibh, an t-ìm a tha sibh a’ dol
 in.DEF the butter at.2PL the butter C.REL be.PRES you.PL PROG go.VN
 a dh’ithe—tha i ann.”
 INF eat.VN be.PRES 3FSG in.3MSG

There was a woman stuck in the bucket, in your butter, the butter you’re going to eat—she’s in it!” ROSS: 79

Our world knowledge is such that we would automatically rule out a woman getting stuck in a tub of butter. This is sufficient to create the requisite partition on the Context Set required by the PC: there is a super-question along the lines of ‘are we in the usual set of worlds?’ which licenses the PC here.

In light of this, we can return to the claim that the PC revises the line of inquiry, and replace it with the requirement that the PC address a super-question. It is the super-question which provides the partition required for the CLEFT operator. The partition created by a simple *wh*-question is not enough to license the PC, and this is presumably because the broad focus of the PC prevents congruence to a simple *wh*-question, which I assume to involve narrow focus-marking.

(3.53) PC Congruence (final):

The PC maps on to a move M_U in a d-tree only where there is a super-question to be addressed.

The PC congruence constraint in (3.53) is rather general, but it is the combination of this constraint and the meaning of the PC that together gives the distribution of the PC. That is, while at any given point in a discourse, there will likely be a super-question that can be addressed, the meaning of the CLEFT operator makes it so that the PC is used only where this discourse constraint is met and where the PC provides the best answer to that super-question. Such contexts are where an interlocuter wishes to contradict or correct a proffered answer to that question (thus the contrastive examples of the PC), or where a particularly important event occurs in a narrative (thus the non-contrastive narrative device examples of the PC), or where the speaker wishes to highlight the unexpected nature of the proposition, as in (3.50).

By revising the prerequisite of the CLEFT operator to not require a QUD *per se* but rather a partitioning on the Context Set, we derive the particular pragmatic effect of the PC. The PC is licensed by a complex discourse structure: a discourse structure where there is an unresolved question which provides the partitioning required by the CLEFT operator. This revision has no major effect on regular clefts, since regular clefts, by virtue of their (narrow) focus structure, will always evoke a QUD, and the major effect of questions is to partition the Context Set (Roberts 1996).

3.5 Summary

The pragmatic effect of the propositional cleft is typically to signal a revision to the line of inquiry. For this reason the PC is often contrastive, and is often paired with negation, since this is a natural context for pursuing a new line of inquiry in the discourse. It also allows us to understand the non-contrastive effect of the PC in narratives, where the PC answered a question along the lines of ‘what happens next?’ This characterization accounted for the vast majority of examples of the PC, but there were exceptions.

I derived the pragmatic effect of the PC from the interaction of broad focus marking and the semantics of the CLEFT operator. I argued that the basic difference between broad and narrow focus is that broad focus fails to create a partition on the Context Set. I then revised Velleman et al.’s (2012) denotation of the CLEFT operator, such that the prerequisite for CLEFT is not a QUD but a partition on the Context Set. This makes the same predictions for narrow focus, since narrow focus will establish a partitioning on the Context Set by virtue of the QUD evoked by its focal structure. For broad focus, however, because the Big Question fails to create a partition on the Context Set, it predicts that broad-focus cleft utterances can occur only in contexts where a partition has already been created, such as where there is an unresolved question in the discourse. These unresolved questions are typically super-questions of the Current Question, asked but not

CHAPTER 3. THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

yet answered, and may also be evoked by, e.g., polar interrogatives interpreted as *wh*-questions. The relevant question may also be licensed by the type of discourse, for instance in narratives where there is an implicit ‘What happened next?’ question. I also argued that the few instances of the PC which were exceptions to the claim that the PC revises the line of inquiry could be understood if we assumed a higher question regarding the expectedness of the answer. In these contexts the PC appeared to be answering a *wh*-question, but I argued that it was simultaneously answering the question of whether or not the proposition is part of the normal state of affairs.

Thus the pragmatic effect of the PC is to answer a super-question, and this can be derived from the semantics of the CLEFT operator and broad focus marking. Now that I have characterized the semantics and pragmatics of clefts, and made a case for including the PC as part of the cleft paradigm based on its meaning, I turn to the structure of clefts. I first look at the syntax of A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic and then propose a structure for Scottish Gaelic clefts. I then return to the PC and its syntactic structure.

Chapter 4

Scottish Gaelic A-bar Dependencies

This chapter is devoted to establishing the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic, and how they are derived. Because clefts are built from a relative clause, it is essential that we understand A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic as whole. It is additionally crucial for understanding the Propositional Cleft, since the PC involves a relative clause with no gap. I first present some relevant morphosyntactic facts about the Scottish Gaelic complementizer system. I then discuss an influential non-movement analysis of Scottish Gaelic proposed in Adger and Ramchand (2005), along with the data that support it. Under Adger and Ramchand's analysis, the derivation of A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic is fundamentally different from the default assumption regarding the formation of A-bar dependencies: Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are argued to be derived via agreement rather than movement. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to arguing for a movement account of Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies. In §4.2 I present a range of evidence which indicates that Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are in fact derived by movement, *contra* the conclusions reached in Adger and Ramchand (2005). I then present a movement account of A-bar dependencies where movement is driven by features on the C^0 head.

4.1 The Complementizer System

In this section I lay out the morphosyntactic facts of the Scottish Gaelic complementizer system relevant for the discussion of A-bar dependencies that follows. Scottish Gaelic has a rich complementizer system, with complementizers encoding interrogative force, negation, and the presence of A-bar dependencies (cf. also Adger and Ramchand (2005), and McCloskey (2002) for Irish).

Matrix declarative clauses in Scottish Gaelic are verb-initial, with a rather strict ordering of VSOX, where X is typically an adverbial (4.1).

(4.1) [_V Bhual] [_S esan] [_O am bell] [_{Adv} nuair a bha sinn shìos dh’a h-ionnsaigh].

Bhual esan am bell nuair a bha sinn shìos
 strike.PAST 3MSG.EMPH the bell when C.REL be.PAST 1PL down
 dh’a h-ionnsaigh.
 towards her

‘He rang the bell when we were down towards her.’*

ST:79

Elements of the complementizer system precede the finite verb (e.g. *nuair a* ‘when’ in the adverbial clause in (4.1)). Traditionally, all pre-verbal particles are treated as part of the same system, which I refer to as the complementizer system.

Embedded declarative clauses are introduced by the plain embedding complementizer *gun* (4.2).¹ *Gun* introduces the CP complement of verbs (e.g. *thuirt* ‘say’ in (4.2a)) and nouns (*duil* ‘expectation’ in (4.2b)).

(4.2) a. Thuirt e riutha [gum] b’ fheàrr dhaibh fuireachd air tìr].

Thuirt e riutha gum b’ fheàrr dhaibh fuireachd air tìr.
 say.PAST 3MSG to.3PL C COP better for.3PL stay.VN on land

‘He told them that they would be better to stay on land.’*

SAS: 17

b. Cha robh duil aice [gu] faiceadh i Tormod beò tuileadh].

Cha robh duil aice gu faiceadh i Tormod beò
 NEG be.PAST.DEP expectation at.FSG C see.COND 3FSG Normal alive
 tuileadh.
 anymore

‘She was afraid that she would never see Norman again’ (lit. She had no expectation that she would see Norman alive again.)

SAS: 9

Polar interrogatives are formed with the question particle *an*, which is used for both matrix (4.3a) and embedded polar interrogatives (4.3b).

(4.3) a. [An] robh iad fada bhuainn?

An robh iad fada bhuainn?
 Q be.PAST.DEP 3PL far from.1PL

‘Were they far from us?’

FSS: 130

b. Bha gach fear a’ faighneachd [an] robh na Gearmailtich seo dona dhuinn].

Bha gach fear a’ faighneachd an robh na Gearmailtich
 be.PAST each one PROG ask.VN Q be.PAST.DEP the.PL German.PL
 seo dona dhuinn.
 DEM bad to.1PL

‘Each one asked if these Germans had mistreated us.’

FSS: 132

¹Scottish Gaelic orthographic convention reflects nasal place assimilation in certain circumstances, such as with *gum* in (4.2a), triggered by the initial labial in the copula *bu*. Colloquial and dialectal pronunciation may also be reflected in the spelling, as with *gu* in (4.2b), where the final nasal is dropped altogether.

CHAPTER 4. SCOTTISH GAELIC A-BAR DEPENDENCIES

Complementizers are also used to signal the presence of an A-bar dependency. The relative complementizer *a* heads a range of clauses in which a gap appears, such as restrictive (4.4a) and non-restrictive relative clauses (4.4b), *wh*-questions (4.4c), and clefts (4.4d). In (4.4) the head of the dependency is underlined

- (4.4) a. Agus cha robh e ach a' pàigheadh air son a h-uile mart [a] chumadh e ____].
 Agus cha robh e ach a' pàigheadh air son a h-uile mart
 and NEG be.PAST.DEP 3MSG but PROG pay.VN for every cow
 a chumadh e
 C.REL keep.PAST 3MSG
 'He had to pay for every cow that he kept'*
 (lit. He wasn't but paying for every cow that he kept) ST: 5
- b. Thug Alasdair Uilleam a-mach pìos aran èorna [a] bha ____ aige ann am poc].
 Thug Alasdair Uilleam a-mach pìos aran èorna a bha
 take.PAST Alasdair William out piece bread barley C.REL be.PAST
 aige ann am poc.
 at.3MSG in bag
 'Alasdair Ban took out a piece of barley bannock that he had in a bag' SAS: 19
- c. Dè am biadh [a] bheir mi ____ do 'n asal]?
 Dè am biadh a bheir mi do 'n asal?
 what the food C.REL give.PRES 1SG to the donkey
 'What food shall I give to the donkey?' LG: 267
- d. 'S e fear cnagach ban [a] cheasnaich ____ mise]
 'S e fear cnagach ban a cheasnaich mise.
 COP 3MSG man stern-faced blond C.REL question.PAST 1SG.EMPH
 'It was a stern-faced blond man who questioned me.' FSS: 46

The relative complementizer is also found in comparatives (4.5a) (see also (Adger 2005: 6)) and with certain adverbial elements, such as *o'n* 'since' in (4.5b). These are called 'subordinators' in McCloskey (2001: 84), but, following Haegeman (2007), (2010), a.o., I call these adverbial clauses 'hidden relatives' to highlight the underlying A-bar structure signaled by the presence of the relative complementizer *a*. This will be important for understanding the syntactic puzzle posed by the Propositional Cleft, as we can assume an A-bar dependency wherever we find *a*.

- (4.5) a. An gille [a]s òige na mise
 An gille as òige na mise
 the boy C.REL+COP young.COMP than 1SG.EMPH
 'The boy younger than me' (Adger 2005: 5)
- b. Tha còrr is dà chiad bhliadhna o'n [a] dh'fhalbh iad sin.
 Tha còrr is dà chiad bhliadhna o'n a dh'fhalbh iad sin.
 be.PRES more and two ten year since C.REL leave.PAST 3PL DEM
 'It was more than twenty years since they left there.*' ST: 1

CHAPTER 4. SCOTTISH GAELIC A-BAR DEPENDENCIES

Scottish Gaelic has another relative complementizer *an*, which is best understood as a secondary relativization strategy along the lines of Keenan and Comrie (1977), since it is used in a subset of A-bar dependencies: *an* is used when relativizing out of a prepositional phrase (4.6a). It is also used with certain *wh*-words such as *càite* ‘where’ in (4.6b), and is used in some ‘hidden relative’ adverbial clauses, such as *far* ‘where’ (4.6c).²

- (4.6) a. gu àite [anns an] tiormaich i].
 gu àite anns an tiormaich i
 to place in.DEF C.REL dry.FUT.DEP 3FSG
 ‘to a place where it [the peat] will dry’ (lit. ‘in which it will dry’) LG: 271
- b. Ach càit [an] robh oifigeach beag na litreach a-nis]?
 Ach càit an robh oifigeach beag na litreach a-nis?
 but where C.REL be.PAST.DEP officer little the.GEN letter now
 ‘But where was the little officer of the letter now?’ FSS: 126
- c. Bha Iain air tilleadh à Canada far an] robh e air a bhith ‘g obair ann a Hudson Bay.
 Bha Iain air tilleadh à Canada far an robh
 be.PAST Ian PERF return.VN from Canada where C.REL be.PAST.DEP
 e air a bhith ‘g obair ann a Hudson Bay
 3MSG PERF PTCL be.VN PROG work.VN in Hudson Bay
 ‘Ian had returned from Canada where he had been working in Hudson Bay.’* SAS: 13

Negation is also part of the complementizer system; the expression of negation comes in the form of *cha* for matrix declarative clauses, and *nach* elsewhere. All elements of the complementizer system are in complementary distribution with negation. This is shown in (4.7). The non-negated counterpart is provided in parentheses for comparison.

- (4.7) a. Cha] tuiirt sinne diog. (cf. *Thuiirt sinne...*)
 Cha tuiirt sinne diog.
 NEG say.PAST.DEP 1PL.EMPH thing
 ‘We said nothing.’ FSS: 62
- b. Thubhairt i rithe nach] do rug ise air asal a riamh. (cf. *thuiirt i gun do rug...*)
 Thubhairt i rithe nach do rug ise air asal
 say.PAST 3FSG to.3FSG C.NEG get.PAST.DEP 3FSG.EMPH on donkey
 a riamh.
 ever
 ‘She said to her that she had never handled a donkey before.’ LG: 267

²Although certainly related to Irish *aN* (cf. McCloskey (1990) *et seq.* for discussion of *aN*), Scottish Gaelic *an* is remarkably different in its syntax. Irish *aN* is associated with resumption structures, but Scottish Gaelic does not have a productive resumption strategy (Adger and Ramchand 2005). Rather, both *an* and *a* are used in gapping structures, with the only apparent difference being the site of extraction: *an* is used with prepositional phrases whereas *a* has an elsewhere distribution. In hidden relatives, the generalization seems to be that *an* is used with locatives, suggesting that a prepositional structure is or was important in the choice between the two complementizers.

CHAPTER 4. SCOTTISH GAELIC A-BAR DEPENDENCIES

- c. C'airson nach eil thu *ride*-igeadh an asal? (cf. *C'airson a tha...*)
 C'airson nach eil thu *ride*-igeadh an asal?
 why C.REL.NEG be.PRES.DEF 2SG ride.VN the donkey
 'Why aren't you riding the donkey?' LG: 267
- d. Nach e sibh a bh' aig an Ròdha shuas? (cf. *An e sibh...*)
 Nach e sibh a bh' aig an Ròdha shuas?
 Q.NEG 3MSG 2PL C.REL be.PAST at the Rodha up
 'Wasn't it you that was up at the Rodha?' ST: 195

Matrix negation precedes the finite verb (4.7a), and takes the place of overt complementizers, shown for plain embedded clauses (4.7b), relative clauses (4.7c), and interrogative clauses (4.7d). The expression of negation neutralizes the expression of clause type and A-bar dependency found in the Scottish Gaelic complementizers.

The reader may have noticed in the preceding examples that the form of the verb varies depending on the complementizer that precedes it (for instance *tuirt* vs. *thuir* in (4.7a) or *eil* vs. *tha* in (4.7c). All complementizer particles condition the form of the finite verb.³

The INDEPENDENT form of the verb is the form found on the finite verb in positive declarative matrix clauses (i.e. typically clauses with no preceding complementizer, with the exception of the relative complementizer, (4.9b,c) below).

- (4.8) Bha cù mór coilearach dubh agamsa
 be.PAST dog big white-necked black at.1SG.EMPH
 'I had a big black white-necked dog.'* ST: 194

The RELATIVE form of the verb occurs on future tense verbs following the relative complementizer *a* (4.9a). In the present and past tenses, there is no distinct relative form, and the finite verb appears in the independent form following *a* (4.9b,c).

- (4.9) a. a h-uile biadh a bhios sinn a' gabhail anns an taigh
 all food C.REL be.FUT.REL 1PL PROG eat.VN in.DEF the house
 'all the food that we'll be eating in the house' LG: 277
- b. 'S e tidsear a tha annam
 COP 3MSG teacher C.REL be.PRES in.1SG
 'I am a teacher (lit. It's a teacher that is in me)' GLA_SM1_31MAY2013_CMS
- c. duin' òg a bha coimhead airson cosnadh
 man young C.REL be.PAST look.VN for employment
 'a young man [who was] seeking employment' NBG: 6

The DEPENDENT form of the verb follows all other complementizers: after matrix negation (4.10a), the polar interrogative particle (4.10b), the plain embedding complementizer *gun* (4.10c), the relative complementizer *an* (4.10d), and embedding negation (4.10e).

³This is quite productive in Scottish Gaelic, unlike in Irish, where the independent-dependent distinction is restricted to a handful of irregular verbs (McCloskey 2001: 78). See also Lamb (2003: 50-51) and Ostrove (2015) for discussion of the Scottish Gaelic facts.

- (4.10) a. **Chan** robh càil aca air a fhàgail ach asal.
 NEG be.PAST.DEP thing at.3PL left but donkey
 ‘They had nothing left but a donkey.’ LG: 265
- b. **An** robh sibh a’ faicinn dad eile?
 Q be.PAST.DEP 2PL PROG see.VN anything other
 ‘Did you see anything else?’* AM: 37
- c. Chaidh sgeul timchioll a’ bhaile **gun** robh Roddy air a
 go.PAST story around the town C be.PAST.DEP Roddy PERF 3MSG
 iompachadh
 convert.VN
 ‘The story went around the village that Roddy had converted himself.’ LG: 265
- d. Bha dùsgadh anns na h-eaglaisean ann seo air **an**
 be.PAST awakening in.DEF the.PL church.PL here on C.REL
robh “an tuiteam” aca.
 be.PAST.DEP the falling at.3PL
 ‘There was a revival in the churches here which they called ‘the falling’.’ LG: 265
- e. C’airson **nach** eil thu *ride*-igeadh an asal?
 why C.NEG be.PRES.DEP 2SG ride.VN the donkey
 ‘Why aren’t you riding the donkey?’ LG: 267

The effect that each complementizer has on the finite verb is summarized in Table 4.1.

FUNCTION	COMP	VERB FORM
Matrix	-	independent
Relativizing	<i>a</i>	independent, relative
Relativizing	<i>an</i>	dependent
Plain Subordinating	<i>gun</i>	dependent
Negative	<i>nach</i>	dependent
Polar Interrogative	<i>an</i>	dependent
Negative Matrix	<i>cha</i>	dependent

Table 4.1: Complementizers’ Effect on Verb Form

There does not seem to be any deep difference underlying the various verb forms, and I assume Ostrove’s (2015) analysis that the variation in the form of the finite verb in Scottish Gaelic is an instance of contextual allomorphy, conditioned by a hierarchical locality with elements in C^0 (i.e. complementizers).

4.2 The Case Against A-bar Movement

I now turn to Adger and Ramchand’s (2005) proposal for Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies. The empirical focus of Adger and Ramchand’s analysis is on clauses headed by the relative complementizer *a* and the characteristics of these clauses. Adger and Ramchand propose an alternative

to movement in the derivation of A-bar dependencies. They propose that Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies involve a static feature-sharing relation between a null element in the position of the ‘gap’ and the relative complementizer. This static relation is empirically distinguishable from a movement-based relation only in so-called ‘identity effects’ between the head of the dependency and the gap. These identity effects are expected to arise under a movement account, since movement is assumed to create two exact instances of the moved element. Thus we expect the ‘gap’ to behave as if it were simply a deleted instance of the head of the dependency. Where the gap does not behave like this—where we find ‘non-identity’ effects—Adger and Ramchand argue that the dependency is not formed by movement, but rather by a static agreement relation between two independent syntactic elements.

Adger and Ramchand present evidence that Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are characterized by non-identity effects, and propose a non-movement analysis, with a null pronominal element in the gap position which enters into an agreement relation with the relative complementizer *a*. I first review these non-identity effects which are problematic for a movement account of A-bar dependencies before turning to the mechanics of Adger and Ramchand’s analysis.

4.2.1 Non-Identity Effects

Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies show a number of properties which are at the least surprising, and at times quite troubling, for a movement analysis. These properties are termed ‘non-identity effects’, and their cumulative weight provides support for a non-movement account of A-bar dependencies. Syntactic properties—such as selection, agreement, and case—show that a straightforward movement account is inadequate, as do tests regarding the semantic properties of the gap, such as idioms and Condition C effects. These properties indicate that the ‘gap’ is best analyzed not as a copy left behind by movement, but as a base-generated null pronoun.

4.2.1.1 Failure of Selection

The basic assumption of a movement analysis is that the displaced constituent originates in a lower position. A prediction, therefore, of a movement analysis is that there is a position to which the displaced constituent can be ‘returned’. What is not predicted is the existence of A-bar constructions for which this is impossible. Scottish Gaelic nominal predication structures present exactly this scenario (4.11). The pivot *tidsear* (bolded) in (4.11a) cannot appear in the position of the apparent gap—thus the ungrammaticality of (4.11b).

- (4.11) a. Dè an seòrsa **tidsear** [a tha ___ annad]?
 Dè an seòrsa tidsear a tha annad
 what the sort teacher C.REL be.PRES in.2SG
 ‘What sort of teacher are you?’ (lit. ‘What sort of teacher is in you?’)
- b. *Tha **tidsear** math annad.
 *Tha tidsear math annad
 be.PRES teacher good in.2SG
 for ‘You are a good teacher’ (lit. ‘A good teacher is in you’)

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 167-68)

There does exist a non-A-bar dependency counterpart to (4.11a), given in (4.12).⁴ I present this as a means of completing the partial paradigm in (4.11), and further driving home the point that the ‘basic’ sentence is substantially different from the A-bar derived one.

- (4.12) a. Tha thu ‘nad **thidsear**.
 Tha thu ann do thidsear.
 be.PRES 2SG in 2SG.POSS teacher
 ‘You are a teacher.’ (lit. ‘You are in your teacher.’)
- b. ‘S e **tidsear** [a th’ annad].
 ‘S e tidsear a tha annad.
 COP 3MSG teacher C.REL be.PRES in.2SG
 ‘You are a teacher.’ (lit. ‘It’s a teacher that is in you.’)

GLA_SM1_31MAY2013_CMS

(4.12b) is included to make the comparison particularly clear. For both sentences, there are two key parts: the verb *tha* and the preposition *ann*. In (4.12a), the postverbal subject position is occupied by the pronoun *thu*, and the complement to the preposition *ann* is the predicate *tidsear*, obligatorily possessed by the subject. In the A-bar derived version (4.12b), however, there is no postverbal subject, and the complement to the preposition *ann* is the pronoun *thu* (which here shows up as agreement inflection on the preposition).

Assuming that the relative complementizer *a* indicates an A-bar dependency derived by movement, we expect the sentences in (4.11a) and (4.12b) to have a non-movement counterpart. This is not straightforwardly the case, and although it is possible that (4.12b) could be derived from (4.12a), without such an analysis these pairs present a challenge for movement-based accounts of A-bar dependencies.

4.2.1.2 Anti-Agreement

Another non-identity effect comes in the form of anti-agreement. When forming an A-bar dependency on the object of a preposition, the preposition surfaces with an invariant 3MSG inflection. This is the case when the moved element would otherwise trigger inflection (as is the case with definite inflection (4.13)), and when the moved element would trigger no inflection (as with ϕ inflection (4.14)).

Prepositions in Scottish Gaelic have a ‘definite’ form which is triggered by the presence of certain determiners in their complement. This ‘definiteness’ inflection is triggered, for instance, by the definite article (4.13a) (cf. discussion in Adger (2000), Robinson (2009)). When the definite DP is extracted (4.13b), the preposition no longer inflects for definiteness, but instead surfaces in the 3MSG form.

⁴I use the term ‘counterpart’ loosely here, as reflecting a basic shared meaning and morphosyntax. It is not clear that the two sentences in (4.12) can be fruitfully treated as deriving from the same underlying syntactic structure; this, of course, is the point of this section.

- (4.13) a. Chuir thu am peann anns a' bhocsa.
 Chuir thu am peann anns a' bhocsa
 put.PAST 2SG the pen in.DEF the.DAT box
 'You put the pen in the box.'
- b. Dè am bocsa a chuir thu am peann ann/*anns ___ ?
 Dè am bocsa a chuir thu am peann ann/*anns?
 which the.NOM box C.REL put.PAST 2SG the pen in.3MSG/*in.DEF
 'Which box did you put the pen in?' (Adger and Ramchand 2005: 169)
- c. *Dè am bocsa a chuir thu am peann anns ~~dè am bocsa~~? (*Predicted*)

A simple movement-based account does not predict such anti-agreement effects. If the gap were a deleted copy of *am bocsa* we would expect the ungrammatical *anns* (4.13c).

Similarly, 3MSG inflection surfaces even where there would be no inflection otherwise (4.14). Indefinite nominals such as *caileag bheag* trigger no inflection *in situ* (4.14a), but inflection shows up on the preposition in the A-bar dependency (4.14b).

- (4.14) a. Bha thu a' bruidhinn ri caileag bheag.
 Bha thu a' bruidhinn ri caileag bheag.
 be.PAST 2SG PROG speak.VN to girl small
 'You were talking to a small girl.'
- b. 'S e caileag bheag a bha thu a' bruidhinn *rithe/ris/*ri ___ .
 'S e caileag bheag a bha thu a' bruidhinn
 COP 3MSG girl small C.REL be.PAST 2SG PROG speak.VN
 *rithe/ris/*ri.
 to.3FSG/to.3MSG/to
 'It was a small girl that you were talking to.' (Adger and Ramchand 2005: 178)

The invariant inflection on the stranded preposition is surprising, and requires explanation, on a movement account of A-bar dependencies. Adger and Ramchand argue that such invariant inflection is actually predicted on a static agree-based account (§4.2.2).

4.2.1.3 Case Mismatches

Another prediction of a movement-based account is that the pivot will surface with the case marking it receives in its original (argument) position inside of the relative clause. This expectation is not borne out. When extracting the object of a progressive verbal noun, as in (4.15), the extracted DP does not retain the genitive case (4.15b), but instead appears in the nominative case (4.15c).

- (4.15) a. Bha thu a' geàrradh **na craoibhe**.
 Bha thu a' geàrradh na craoibhe.
 be.PAST 2SG PROG cut.VN the.GEN tree.GEN
 'You were cutting the tree.'

- b. *Dè **na craoibhe** a bha thu a' geàrradh ____ ?
 *Dè na craoibhe a bha thu a' geàrradh?
 which the.GEN tree.GEN C.REL be.PAST 2SG PROG cut.VN
 'Which tree were you cutting?'
- c. Dè **a' chraobh** a bha thu a' geàrradh ____ ?
 Dè a' chraobh a bha thu a' geàrradh?
 which the.NOM tree.NOM C.REL be.PAST 2SG PROG cut.VN
 'Which tree were you cutting?'

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 169)

This is also somewhat surprising on a movement account of A-bar dependencies, and requires an additional explanation.

4.2.1.4 Idiom Interpretation Failures

Another prediction of a movement account is that the moved constituent will semantically reconstruct into its base position. Idioms provide one means of testing this prediction. Idiomatic meaning requires a very local interpretation. Under a movement account, when part of an idiom is displaced, the idiomatic interpretation should remain; a loss of idiomatic meaning under extraction suggests that the displaced constituent has not moved, but has been base generated in the higher (non-local) position.

The Scottish Gaelic facts show a loss of idiomatic meaning in A-bar dependencies. The idiomatic interpretation in (4.16a) is not available when part of the idiom has been clefted (4.16b).

- (4.16) a. Bidh e a'toirt sop às gach seid.
 Bidh e a' toirt sop às gach seid.
 be.FUT 3MSG PROG take.VN whisp out-of.DEF each bundle
 'He's not a very concentrated or focused person'
- b. *'S ann às **gach seid** [a bhitheas e a'toirt sop ____].
 'S ann às gach seid a bhitheas e a'
 COP in.3MSG out-of.DEF each bundle C.REL be.FUT.REL 3MSG PROG
 toirt sop
 take.VN whisp
for: 'He tries his hand at EVERYTHING'
ok: 'It's from every bundle that he has taken a whisp'

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 169-170)

The unavailability of an idiomatic interpretation in (4.16b) means that the prepositional phrase *às gach seid* fails to reconstruct. This failure is a challenge for a movement account of A-bar dependencies, but not so for a base-generation account.

4.2.1.5 Condition C (Non-)Reconstruction

Possibly the most problematic non-identity effect found in Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies is the lack of Condition C effects. In (4.17a), the pronoun *e* ‘he’ c-commands the R-expression *Iain* and cannot co-refer. But when the R-expression is extracted, as in (4.17b), coreference is possible.

- (4.17) a. Cheannaich $e_{i/*j}$ an dealbh de dh’Iain $_j$ an dè.
 Cheannaich *e* an dealbh de dh’Iain an dè.
 buy.PAST 3MSG the picture of Iain yesterday
 ‘He bought the picture of Iain yesterday.’
- b. Dè an dealbh de dh’Iain $_j$ [a cheannaich $e_{i/j}$ — an dè]?
 Dè an dealbh de dh’Iain a cheannaich *e* an dè?
 what the picture of Iain C.REL buy.PAST 3MSG yesterday
 ‘Which picture of Iain did he buy yesterday?’

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 171)

Under a movement account, the R-expression *Iain* should be interpreted in the gap position as bound; coreference should not be possible even when *Iain* is extracted. The fact that coreference becomes possible in an A-bar dependency is striking, and strongly suggests that these dependencies are not derived via movement.

4.2.1.6 Summary

Five non-identity effects found in Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies—failure of selection, anti-agreement, case mismatches, loss of idiomatic interpretation, and failure of reconstruction for Condition C effects—suggest that Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are not derived through movement. Adger and Ramchand (2005) argue that Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are instead derived via an Agree relation which crucially involves the specialized relative complementizer *a* and a null pronominal which occupies the apparent gap.

4.2.2 A Base-Generation Analysis

Adger and Ramchand use the above non-identity effects as the starting point for revisiting theoretical assumptions regarding the possible ways a language may form A-bar dependencies. In a theory that assumes a null *pro* and the operation Agree (on which movement itself is based), there exists the theoretical possibility that A-bar dependencies might be established without movement at all, but simply with agreement. In particular, Adger and Ramchand argue, a movement-based A-bar dependency is distinguishable from an agreement-based A-bar dependency only by the properties of the gap. Assuming that movement leaves behind an exact copy (Chomsky (2001), a.o.), in a movement-based A-bar dependency, the gap should have the same morphosyntactic and semantic effects as the pivot. In an agreement-based A-bar dependency, however, the gap might behave differently, because nothing forces the element in the gap to be identical to the pivot.

	[PIVOT]	...	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\phi]$
via MOVE	[PIVOT]	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\phi]$...
SYN-SEM CORRESPONDENCE	[PIVOT]	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\phi]$...
at LF	[PIVOT]	λx	...

Table 4.2: Derivation of A-bar dependency via Move

	[PIVOT]	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\text{dep}]$...	[ID:]
via AGREE	[PIVOT]	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\text{dep}]$...	[ID: dep]
SYN-SEM CORRESPONDENCE	[PIVOT]	$[\Lambda, \text{ID}:\text{dep}]$...	[ID: dep]
at LF	[PIVOT]	λx	...	x

Table 4.3: Derivation of A-bar dependency via Agree

4.2.3 Summary

Adger and Ramchand (2005) propose an analysis of A-bar dependencies which makes sense of the existence of a specialized relative complementizer (because it bears the feature $[\Lambda]$, crucial to the formation of A-bar dependencies) and the absence of identity effects in Scottish Gaelic. In the next section, however, I will present data showing the existence of identity effects in Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies, and argue against Adger and Ramchand’s conclusion about Scottish Gaelic. Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies are in fact derived via movement, with very few exceptions.

4.3 Identity Effects in A-bar Dependencies

In this section I argue that A-bar dependencies in Scottish Gaelic are formed via movement. Evidence comes from identity effects: selection of prepositional arguments in cleft constructions, the retention of agreement under extraction, reconstruction for three types of binding phenomena, and the interpretation of bare NPs in clefts.

4.3.1 Selection

The first argument for movement in A-bar dependencies is that argument prepositional phrases may be clefted. These phrases are selected for by the main verb (or its corresponding functional structure). Selection requires a local relationship between the selecting head and its complement or specifier. As an example, the verb *radh* ‘speak’ selects as an argument a prepositional phrase headed by *ri* ‘to’. Substituting a similar preposition (e.g. *do* ‘to, for’, (4.24b)) results in ungrammaticality.

- (4.24) a. 'S ann ri mo bhràthair [a bha mi a' bruidhinn —]
 'S ann ri mo bhràthair a bha mi a' bruidhinn
 COP in.3MSG to 1SG.POSS brother C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG speak.VN
 'It's to my brother that I was speaking.'
 cf. Bha mi a' bruidhinn ri mo bhràthair.
- b. *'S ann dha mo bhràthair [a bha mi a' bruidhinn —]
 'S ann dha mo bhràthair a bha mi a'
 COP in.3MSG to 1SG.POSS brother C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG
 bruidhinn.
 speak.VN

GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS

Such examples follow straightforwardly from a movement-based account. A non-movement based account, however, must incorporate additional machinery to force the selected form of the preposition, while at the same time preventing the identity effects discussed in §4.2.1.

A similar argument comes from the cleftability of predicative prepositional phrases. In predicate position, such prepositions have a somewhat idiomatic meaning. For example, the use of *air* 'on' with the auxiliary *bi* 'to be' is used to express various experiences (e.g. thirst, drunkenness, fear, sadness) as well as disadvantage. In (4.25), the prepositional phrase *orm* 'on me' is extracted, with no change in the interpretation of the speaker as experiencer.

- (4.25) 'S ann orm [a tha an droch luck —]
 'S ann orm a tha an droch luck
 COP in.3MSG on.1SG C.REL be.PRES the bad luck
 'I certainly have bad luck' (lit. it is on me that the bad luck is) LG: 297
 cf. Tha an droch luck orm.

This again follows straightforwardly from a movement account of A-bar dependencies: the interpretation of 'me' in (4.25) as an experiencer (rather than a location) comes from the reconstruction of the prepositional phrase *orm* in its base position as predicate. It is unclear how a non-movement account could achieve this.

4.3.2 Agreement

Although prepositional inflection is invariant in A-bar dependencies (and thus a 'non-identity' effect), there exists an agreement pattern which retains full ϕ -agreement under extraction. This agreement pattern is found in an aspectual construction with positional verbs (4.26). In this positional verb construction, the nominalized verb, *sheasamh* in (4.26), is headed by the prepositional/aspectual particle *ann* and is obligatorily possessed by the subject (see also Reed (2012: 202-4, 246-52)). The particle and possessive pronoun typically fuse, creating the form '*nam* from *ann mo* in (4.26).

CHAPTER 4. SCOTTISH GAELIC A-BAR DEPENDENCIES

(4.26) Tha mi 'nam sheasamh anns a' chidsin.

Tha mi ann mo sheasamh anns a' chidsin
 bePRES 1SG in 1SG.POSS stand.VN in.DEF the kitchen
 'I am standing in the kitchen.'

GLA_AWE_05JUN2013_CMS

The agreement pattern with positional verbs is atypical of Scottish Gaelic ϕ -agreement more generally in that it reflects the ϕ -features of an overt argument (both full DPs and pronouns). Agreement on a preposition, by contrast, only reflects the ϕ -features of an obligatorily covert pronominal argument (cf. McCloskey and Hale (1984) for Irish, Robinson (2009), Adger (1997) for Scottish Gaelic). While prepositional agreement can be analyzed as morphological incorporation of the pronominal complement into a prepositional head (cf. Robinson (2009), Adger (1997)), the agreement in (4.26) cannot. This suggests that if any agreement inflection is a reflex of syntactic Agree, the positional verb agreement pattern is (see also Reed (2012: 274-75) for an argument that this is true agreement).

Agreement with positional verbs also contrasts with prepositional agreement in its behavior in A-bar dependencies. Recall from §4.2.1.2 above that agreement on prepositions show non-identity effects, with invariant 3MSG inflection surfacing on the stranded preposition. By contrast, in the positional verb construction, when either the subject or the predicate is extracted, full agreement remains. In (4.27a) the subject *mise* is extracted and the predicate retains 1SG agreement. Similarly, in (4.27b), the extracted predicate retains the 1SG agreement with the subject inside of the relative clause.

(4.27) a. 'S mise [a tha ___ 'nam sheasamh anns a' chidsin]

'S mise a tha 'nam sheasamh anns a' chidsin
 COP 1SG C.REL be.PRES in-1SG.POSS stand.VN in.DEF the kitchen
 'It's me who's standing in the kitchen'

b. 'S ann 'nam sheasamh [a tha mi ___ 'sa chidsin]

'S ann 'nam sheasamh a tha mi 'sa chidsin
 COP in.3MSG in-1SG.POSS stand.VN C.REL be.PRES 1SG in.DEF-the kitchen
 'It's standing that I am in the kitchen'

GLA_AWE_05JUN2013_CMS

To explain the agreement between the subject and predicate in both (4.27a) and (4.27b), it must be the case that the clefted constituent originates inside of the relative clause.

On a non-movement account of A-bar dependencies, (4.27) is surprising. Recall that Adger and Ramchand's non-movement analysis posits a null *pro* occupies the gap, and that this null *pro* is responsible for the 3MSG inflection on the stranded preposition. The prediction, then, is that all agreement inflection will surface as 3MSG inside of the relative clause. Adger and Ramchand predict (4.28) instead of the attested (4.27a): the null *pro* is in the position which controls agreement, and should therefore trigger 3MSG inflection on the positional predicate.

(4.28) *'S e mise [a tha *pro* **na**_{3msg} sheasamh anns a' chidsin]

Likewise, for (4.27b), how the extracted constituent manages to get 1SG inflection requires explanation; no explanation is needed on a movement account.

4.3.3 Condition C

R-expressions, such as *Calum* in (4.29), cannot be bound in their local clause (thus the ungrammaticality of (4.29)).

(4.29) *Dh'eist e_i ris an sgeulachd mu **Chalum_i**.

Dh'eist	e	ris	an	sgeulachd	mu	Chalum	
listen.PAST	3MSG	to.DEF	the	story	about	Calum	
*He _i listened to the story about Calum _i .'							GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

Extracting the phrase containing the R-expression does not ameliorate the ungrammaticality: the question formed on (4.29) is not grammatical (4.30).

(4.30) *Dè an sgeulachd mu **Chalum_i** [ris an do dh'eist e_i —]?

Dè	an	sgeulachd	mu	Chalum	ris	an	do	dh'eist	e?
what	the	story	about	Calum	toDEF	C.REL	listen.PAST.DEP	3MSG	
*Which story about Calum _i did he _i listen to? (<i>ok</i> if he \neq Calum)									

GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

The ungrammaticality of (4.30) follows on a movement account since the copy left behind by movement (the gap) is bound by the pronominal subject.⁵ It is not clear how a non-movement account can derive this ungrammaticality: if a null pronoun occupies the gapped position, the locality of binding relations cannot be responsible for the ungrammaticality of (4.30).

4.3.4 Variable Binding

Variable binding phenomena also show that the head of the dependency reconstructs into the position of the gap. Quantified noun phrases, such as *a h-uile mathair* 'every mother' in (4.31a), can bind a pronominal variable, such as the possessive pronoun *a* 'her' in (4.31a). Following Reinhart (1983: 112ff.), quantified noun phrases cannot be coindexed with a variable without also c-commanding that variable. Thus there is a syntactic requirement on the interpretation of the variable *a* as covarying with *a h-uile mathair*.⁶ This syntactic requirement is met in (4.31a) but not (4.31b).

⁵Adger and Ramchand (2005) report that coreference is possible with a similar example (see (4.17b) above). I am not sure what to make of this; speaker variation or dialect variation is possible, and is worth investigating further.

⁶My consultant dispreferred the version of (4.31) without *fhèin* 'self'. I believe *fhèin* clarifies the appropriate interpretation (i.e. the covarying interpretation), but does not otherwise affect the coindexation relationship.

- (4.31) a. Chunnaic a h-uile mathair_i a_i nighean fhèin.
 Chunnaic a h-uile mathair a nighean fhèin.
 see.PAST every mother 3FSG.POSS daughter self
 ‘Every mother saw her own daughter.’
- b. *Chunnaic a_i mathair fhèin a h-uile nighean_i.
 *Chunnaic a mathair fhèin a h-uile nighean.
 see.PAST 3FSG.POSS mother self every daughter
 ‘*Her own mother saw every daughter.’

GLA_IC_28NOV2016_CMS

The covarying interpretation is available when the DP containing the variable is extracted (4.32), suggesting that the pivot reconstructs into the position of the gap, where it is bound by *math-air*.

- (4.32) ‘S e a_i nighean fhein a chunnaic a h-uile mathair_i ____.

‘S e a nighean fhein a chunnaic a h-uile mathair.
 COP 3MSG 3FSG.POSS daughter self C.REL see.PAST every mother
 ‘It’s her own daughter that every mother saw.’

GLA_IC_28NOV2016_CMS

The variable binding facts in Scottish Gaelic follow naturally from a movement account, where the extracted variable is interpreted in its original position. On a non-movement account, we expect (4.32) to be ungrammatical, since the quantified NP does not c-command the variable in clefted position.

4.3.5 Reciprocals

Reciprocal binding facts reinforce the conclusions indicated by the Condition C and variable binding effects above. Reciprocals such as *a cheile* ‘each other’ must be bound by a local antecedent. This is the case in (4.33a).

- (4.33) a. Tha [Anna is Mairi]_i a’ coinneachadh ri a cheile_i an-diugh
 Tha Anna is Mairi a’ coinneachadh ri a cheile an-diugh
 be.PRES Anna and Mary PROG meet.VN to each other today
 ‘Anna and Mary are meeting each other today’
- b. ‘S ann ri a cheile_i [a tha [Mairi agus Anna]_i a’ coinneachadh ____ an-diugh]
 ‘S ann ri a cheile a tha Mairi agus Anna a’
 COP in.3MSG to each other C.REL be.PRES Mary and Anna PROG
 coinneachadh an-diugh
 meet.VN today
 ‘It’s each other that Mary and Anna are meeting today’

GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

When the prepositional phrase containing *a cheile* is clefted, as in (4.33b), the result is still grammatical, indicating, again, that the pivot reconstructs to a position bound by the subject.

4.3.6 The Interpretation of Bare NPs

The final piece of evidence for movement in Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies comes from the availability of an existential interpretation of bare NPs in clefts. Adger and Ramchand (2003) show that an existential interpretation is unavailable for the subject of a copula clause (4.34). Bare NPs in Scottish Gaelic are typically interpreted as indefinite, but this interpretation is unavailable in structures headed by the copula. In (4.34), the bare NP subject *duine* cannot have an existential interpretation.

- (4.34) *Is mòr duine.
 COP big man
 ‘A man is big’ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 338)

Adger and Ramchand (2003) argue that the unavailability of an existential interpretation is tied to the semantics of the copula *is*.⁷

In cleft structures there is no such restriction on the interpretation of bare NPs. In (4.35) a bare NP, *leabhar* ‘a book’, is clefted. This is clearly interpreted existentially, since it introduces a referent and is referred to in the next sentence (*air* ‘on it’). The clefted constituent is underlined, as is the subsequent mention and the corresponding English translation.

- (4.35) Agus is è leabhar [a fhuair mi ____].
 Agus is è leabhar a fhuair mi.
 and COP 3MSG book C.REL get.PAST 1SG
 ‘And it was a book I got [for a prize].’
 Bha sgrìobhadh air bho Marquis of Tuilibardine
 Bha sgrìobhadh air bho Marquis of Tuilibardine
 be.PAST write.VN on.3MSG by Marquis of Tullibardine
 ‘There was writing on it by the Marquis of Tullibardine.’ EPG: 215

The availability of an existential interpretation of the bare NP in the cleft construction in (4.35), and the corresponding unavailability in (4.34), suggests that the pivot in (4.35) cannot be base-generated in the clefted position. If it were, we would expect it to behave exactly as a bare NP in non-cleft copular sentences (i.e. we expect an existential interpretation to be unavailable). Since the bare NP can be interpreted existentially, it must be interpreted inside of the relative clause, where an existential interpretation is always available.

4.3.7 Summary

In this section I surveyed a range of effects in Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies, all pointing clearly to the conclusion that A-bar dependencies are actually derived by movement in Scottish

⁷Briefly, bare NP arguments possess an individual variable which must be bound. In the normal case (i.e. in non-copular structures), this variable is bound as a side effect of existential closure triggered by the presence of an eventuality variable. The copula fails to introduce an eventuality variable, avoiding the need for existential closure, and thus making unavailable the existential interpretation of bare NPs (more on this in Chapter 5).

CHAPTER 4. SCOTTISH GAELIC A-BAR DEPENDENCIES

Gaelic. Facts from clefted prepositions require that the gap be occupied by the extracted preposition for purposes of selection (in the case of argument prepositions) and interpretation (in the case of predicative prepositions). Agreement between the subject and positional verbs require that the ϕ -features of the subject be available inside of the relative clause when the subject is extracted, and similarly when the positional verb is extracted. Condition C, variable binding, and reciprocals—which are widely understood to require a local c-command relation—all reconstruct, providing strong evidence that A-bar dependencies are created via movement. Finally, evidence from the availability of an existential interpretation of bare NPs in clefts (unavailable in non-cleft copular structures) suggests that the clefted NP reconstructs into the base position, where it is existentially interpreted. The weight of this evidence is, I believe, stronger than the evidence surveyed in Adger and Ramchand (2005). These facts cannot be derived from a base-generation *pro*-based account. My conclusion is that A-bar dependencies are formed via movement in Scottish Gaelic.

There remains, however, the question of what to make of the non-identity effects reported in Adger and Ramchand (2005). The full range of identity and non-identity effects are summarized in Table 4.4.

	NON-IDENTITY	IDENTITY
SYNTACTIC	Selection (predicate nominal, §4.2.1.1) Agreement (prepositions, §4.2.1.2) Case (§4.2.1.3)	Selection (prepositions, §4.3.1) Agreement (positional verbs, §4.3.2)
SEMANTIC	Idioms (§4.2.1.4) Condition C (§4.2.1.5)	Variable Binding (§4.3.4) Condition C (§4.3.3) Reciprocal Binding (§4.3.5) Interpretion of Bare NPs (§4.3.6)

Table 4.4: Summary of (Non-)Identity Effects in Scottish Gaelic A-bar Dependencies

Regarding the argument from selection (§4.2.1.1), the predicate nominal construction in question is essentially a copula clause, and it is possible that the construction truly does not involve synchronic movement. While it remains an explanandum, it is not obvious that conclusions can be drawn from this one construction given the existence of A-bar dependencies for which selection is an identity effect (§4.3.1). The evidence from agreement is similarly contradictory, with anti-agreement arising in prepositional inflection (§4.2.1.2) and full agreement arising with positional verbs (§4.3.2). There is reason to believe that prepositional inflection is morphological (cf. Robinson (2009), Adger (2000), and Adger (1997) for a morphological analysis of similar patterns in verbal inflection). We can then interpret the initially contradictory agreement facts as support for that analysis of prepositional inflection: the mechanism responsible for prepositional agreement is post-syntactic (thus anti-agreement is not surprising when the element has moved). The final syntactic non-identity effect, case (§4.2.1.3), could be explained if the pivot’s surface position is an argument position, rather than spec,CP. There is evidence for this from relative clause extraposition (4.36).

(4.36) Bha dùsgadh anns na h-eaglaisean ann seo [air an robh “an tuiteam” aca ____].

Bha dùsgadh anns na h-eaglaisean ann seo air an robh
 be.PAST awakening in.DEF the.PL church.PL here on C.REL be.PAST.DEP
 “an tuiteam” aca.
 the falling at.3PL
 ‘There was a revival in the churches here which they called ‘the falling’.’

LG: 276

In (4.36), the relative clause has been postposed to a sentence-final position. The pivot *dùsgadh* does not postpose with the relative clause, but remains in the matrix subject position. This indicates that the pivot does not form a constituent with the relative clause. Together with the case non-identity effect, it seems reasonable to conclude that the pivot is always external to the relative clause. This suggests a matching analysis.⁸

Turning finally to the semantic (non-)identity effects, the evidence from idioms (§4.2.1.4) should be further substantiated with a wider range of idioms, as well as their behavior under other forms of movement (e.g. passivization).⁹ The Condition C effects are puzzling, since for Adger and Ramchand (2005) it is a non-identity effect (§4.2.1.5) but for my consultants it is an identity effect (§4.3.3). The remainder of the semantic identity effects—variable binding, reciprocals, and the interpretation of bare NPs—support the availability of reconstruction more generally, and thus I am inclined to disregard the unavailability of Condition C reconstruction reported in Adger and Ramchand (2005). In any case, further work is needed to determine the extent of variation among individuals or dialects in the availability of Condition C reconstruction.

4.4 A Movement Account of A-bar Dependencies

In this section I provide a movement-based account of Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies, based on McCloskey’s (2002) proposal for Irish. McCloskey (2002) (see also McCloskey (2001), (1990)) proposes that the Irish relative complementizer *aL* forces movement to its specifier, and has the featural makeup in (4.37).

(4.37) *aL* [uWH, EPP]

McCloskey shows, using long-distance A-bar dependencies and islands, that relative clause formation is crucially dependent on the features of the relative complementizer (for Irish this is made particularly clear through the comparison between the movement-based relative complementizer *aL* and the resumption-based relative complementizer *aN*).

For Scottish Gaelic as well, the case can be made that the relative complementizer contains features crucial to creating A-bar dependencies (cf. also Adger and Ramchand (2005) for a similar

⁸A matching analysis, however, is supposedly distinguishable from a raising analysis (with the pivot remaining in spec,CP, Kayne (1994), Bianchi (1999)), in that binding effects are available only in raising structures (cf. Hulseley and Sauerland (2006) and references therein). Binding effects are available generally in A-bar dependencies; further research is needed to determine if binding effects are present in extraposed relative clauses, and what this means for the external syntax of relative clauses.

⁹Thanks to Rajesh Bhatt for pointing this out to me.

intuition) based on long-distance A-bar dependencies. A-bar dependencies formed on the complement of a preposition involve pied-piping of the preposition to a position preceding the relative complementizer (which then obligatorily takes the form *an*).

(4.38) dè am bocsa [**anns** an do chuir thu an uabhal ___]?

dè am bocsa anns an do chuir thu an uabhal?

what the box in.DEF C.REL put.PAST.DEP 2SG the apple

‘Which box did you put the apple in?’

GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

In long-distance A-bar dependencies, the preposition preferably pied-pipes to a position preceding the highest complementizer (4.39a), but may also be stranded in the specifier of the lower complementizer (4.39b).¹⁰

(4.39) a. na boireannaich [**bhon** robh mi a’ smaoinichadh [gun d’fhuair mi am preasant ___]]

na boireannaich bhon (an) robh mi a’
the.PL woman.PL from.DEF C.REL be.PAST.DEP 1SG PROG

smaoinichadh an d’fhuair mi am preasant

think.VN C.REL get.PAST.DEP 1SG the present

‘the women who I thought I got the present from’

b. na boireannaich [a bha mi a’ smaoinichadh [**bhon** d’fhuair mi am preasant ___]]

na boireannaich a bha mi a’ smaoinichadh bhon
the.PL woman.PL C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG think.VN from.DEF

(an) d’fhuair mi am preasant

C.REL get.PAST.DEP 1SG the present

‘the women who I thought I got the present from’

GLA_SM1_31MAY2013_CMS

This pair parallels McCloskey’s (1990) argument for successive cyclic movement in Irish. In Scottish Gaelic, each specifier is occupiable by the pied-piped preposition.

The existence of islands also provides evidence that it is the relative complementizer which is responsible for the formation of A-bar dependencies. In (4.40b), we see that clauses headed by *ma* ‘if’ are islands for movement.

(4.40) a. Olaidh sinn uisge beatha [ma thig do charaid].

Olaidh sinn uisge beatha ma thig do charaid
drink.FUT 1PL whisky if come 2SG.POSS friend

‘We will drink whisky if your friend comes.’

b. *Cò (a) dh’olas sinn uisge beatha [ma thig ___]?

*Cò (a) dh’olas sinn uisge beatha ma thig?

who (C.REL) drink.FUT.REL 1PL whisky if come

‘*Who will we drink whisky if they come?’

GLA_GMM_24MAY2013_CMS

¹⁰The relative complementizer *an* is typically dropped following prepositions whose definite form is suffixed with *-n*. For discussion of the form of the complementizer, see Adger and Ramchand (2005), McCloskey (1990), (2002).


The ungrammaticality of (4.40) is explainable if *ma* is a complementizer (cf. also McCloskey (2001: 82-84) for this conclusion about *ma* in Irish), and as such controls the presence of a specifier. That is, we find A-bar dependencies only in clauses headed by the relative complementizer because only the relative complementizer co-occurs with a specifier (credit goes to McCloskey (2002) for this logic).

My conclusion, based on the successive-cyclic pied-piping in (4.39) and the presence of islands, is that the relative complementizer in Scottish Gaelic is responsible for i) introducing a specifier and ii) filling that specifier via movement. This makes the Scottish Gaelic relative complementizer identical in features to Irish *aL* (4.41).¹¹

(4.41) *a, an* [uWH, EPP]

This derives a structure like (4.42) for the *wh*-question in (4.38). The [WH] feature originates on the NP *boireannaich* and is percolated up to the PP projection. This phrase then enters into an agreement relation with the complementizer, and moves into its specifier to check its [EPP] feature.

(4.42)



¹¹Both *a* and *an* seem to behave identically with respect to identity effects. There are three obvious differences: i) *an* is used primarily when relativizing out of a preposition; ii) *an* triggers the dependent form of the verb, while *a* triggers the relative or independent form; and iii) in long-distance A-bar dependencies involving *an*, the lower CP is headed by *gun*, the plain embedding complementizer. Despite this, I consider the distinction between *a* and *an* as largely superficial. The first two differences seem relatively unproblematic. As for the third, there are two possible explanations. While it is possible to treat *gun* in A-bar dependencies as a syntactic fossil, I would suggest that *gun* is actually able to head A-bar dependencies. *Gun* is used to head clausal complements of nominals (e.g. *Chaidh sgeul timchioll a' bhaile gun robh Roddy air a iompachadh*. 'The story went around the village that Roddy had converted himself.' (LG: 265)). Assuming the proposals in Haegeman (2010) and Aboh (2005) that clausal complements of nominals are actually relative clauses, this means that *gun* is compatible with A-bar dependencies. The details of the actual analysis, however, I leave to future work.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter I reviewed Adger and Ramchand's (2005) arguments against a movement analysis of Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies in the form of non-identity effects: failure of selection in predicate nominal cleft constructions, anti-agreement on prepositions, case mismatches, the loss of idiom interpretation, and the loss of condition C effects. I then presented evidence for a movement analysis based on selection of prepositions, full agreement with positional verbs, the preservation of condition C, variable binding, and reciprocal binding, as well as the existential interpretation of bare NPs available in clefts. Comparing the initially contradictory (non-)identity effects, I concluded that the non-identity of case and agreement can be explained away by independently establishing the properties of case and agreement in Scottish Gaelic, and that the argument from idioms and selection await further probing. The range of semantic identity effects strongly pointed to a movement analysis of A-bar dependencies, and I proposed an analysis of these dependencies following McCloskey (2002), where movement is driven by the features on the relative complementizer.

Chapter 5

The Structure of Clefts

In this chapter I provide a syntactic structure for Scottish Gaelic clefts. In doing so, I provide a theory of how cleft meaning is read off of the cleft structure, and this in turn paves the way for an analysis of the Propositional Cleft as a member of the cleft paradigm. Specifically, I propose that the copula occupies T^0 and selects for a nominalized structure headed by the augment *pro*-form. The augment in turn selects for a predicational structure, supplied by the relative clause. The clefted constituent, in the specifier of the relative CP, enters into an Agree relation with the augment. I then extend this structure to copula clauses, and discuss Adger and Ramchand's (2003) analysis of Scottish Gaelic copula clauses. I compare my analysis and Adger and Ramchand's with respect to a range of morphological and syntactic data: morphological interactions between the copula and complementizers and between the copula and copular subjects, the absence of the copula and the augment in small clause predicational structures, the distribution of the augment in small clauses and copular structures generally, and the effect that the clefted constituent has on the form of the augment. The analysis provided here captures these data in a straightforward way. For Adger and Ramchand to capture the same facts requires additional explanation, and possibly the rejection of a key assumption about the position of the copula.

Before turning to the task at hand, however, I first provide an overview of the morphosyntax of copular structures in Scottish Gaelic, pointing out the relevant differences and similarities across these structures.

5.0.1 The Morphosyntax of Copular Structures

I use the term COPULAR STRUCTURE to refer to any structure involving the copula *is*, often shortened to 's (5.1). Copular structures include clefts (5.1a) and two types of copula clause: the Augmented Copula Clause (ACC) (5.1b) and the Inverted Copula Clause (ICC) (5.1c), following terminology in Adger and Ramchand (2003).

- (5.1) a. 'S e fear cnagach ban [a cheasnaich mise]. CLEFT
'S e fear cnagach ban a cheasnaich mise.
COP 3MSG man stern-faced blond C.REL question.PAST 1SG.EMPH
'It was a stern-faced blonde man who questioned me.' FSS: 46

- b. **'S** e **Calum** [an tidsear]. ACC
 'S e Calum an tidsear.
 COP 3MSG Calum the teacher
 'Calum is the teacher.' (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)
- c. **'S** [ainneamh] **taigh nach robh brà ann.** ICC
 'S ainneamh taigh nach robh brà ann.
 COP rare house NEG.C.REL be.PAST quern in.3MSG
 'Rare was a house that didn't have a quern.' ST: 10

To facilitate comparison across these structures, I use the same terms as much as possible. COPULA refers to, of course, the copula, boxed in (5.1). AUGMENT refers to the pronominal element following the copula in clefts and ACCs (5.1a,b). (COPULAR) SUBJECT is used to refer to the subject of copular structures, either the subject of a copula clause or to the clefted constituent in clefts, bolded in (5.1).¹ I use the term RELATIVE CLAUSE to refer to the clause introduced by the relative complementizer in clefts; and the term PREDICATE refers to the constituent which functions as the predicate in copular structures, including the relative clause in clefts, bracketed in (5.1).

In all copular structures the copula is in initial position, as expected for a verb-initial language. Clefts and ACCs pattern together in the use of the augment, whose presence correlates with a subject-predicate order (cf. the order of bolded and bracketed constituents in (5.1). ICC's, on the other hand, exhibit a predicate-subject order. I will propose that these differences in word order derive from a difference in structure, and in particular that the augment itself is the key point of variation, reflecting an additional functional projection present in the structure of clefts and ACCs on the one hand but lacking in the structure ICCs.

5.1 Cleft Syntax

In this section I propose a structure for Scottish Gaelic clefts. I assume that the copula is in T^0 . This is the default assumption given i) the initial position of the copula, given the verb-initial nature of Scottish Gaelic and ii) that the form of the copula reflects a tense-like distinction. In §5.2.3.1 I will defend this assumption in greater detail. The bulk of this section, however, concerns the augment. I first survey a variation in its form and a semantic analysis of this variation proposed in Adger (2011). I argue that a semantic analysis fails to account for the variation, and then introduce an apparently a null form of the augment, which occurs only with pronominal subjects. This supports a morphosyntactic account of the form of the augment, and I provide an Agree-based analysis of the augment and a structure for Scottish Gaelic clefts which captures the close relationship between the augment, the relative clause, and the clefted constituent in §5.1.2.

¹The use of the term 'subject' is in contrast to the notion 'predicate', and is not meant to reflect the argument status of the constituent.

5.1.1 The Augment

An understanding of the augment is crucial to understanding the structure of Scottish Gaelic clefts. Recall that the augment *pro*-form is found only with a subset of copular structures: clefts and the Augmented Copula Clause (ACC). In these structures the augment serves something of a dual purpose. Its distribution in copular structures is such that it appears only when the predicate is a DP (in ACCs) or a CP (in clefts). Thus the generalization emerges that the augment appears in contexts where the predicate is headed by functional structure (CPs and DPs), and is absent where the predicate is not (APs, PPs, NPs). Clefts additionally provide a unique perspective into the function of the augment because it is in clefts that the form of the augment covaries with properties of the copular subject (5.2).² In (5.2a) we find the *e* ‘him/it’ form of the augment in the context of a DP subject. In (5.2b) we find the *ann* ‘in him/it’ form of the augment in the context of a PP subject.

- (5.2) a. 'S e [_{DP} an cat] a thug Calum do Mhàiri.
 'S e an cat a thug Calum do Mhàiri.
 COP 3MSG the cat C.REL give.PAST Calum to Mary
 'It's the cat that Calum gave to Mary.'
- b. 'S ann [_{PP} do Mhàiri] a thug Calum an cat.
 'S ann do Mhàiri a thug Calum an cat.
 COP in.3MSG to Mary C.REL give.PAST Calum the cat
 'It's to Mary that Calum gave the cat.' (Adger 2011: 1)

That the augment is not a reflex of agreement targeting the copula is suggested by the fact that the copula has a wider distribution than the augment: the copula appears in other contexts (e.g. ICCs) without the augment. That is, the augment is present only in a subset of structures that we find the copula in. Preminger's (2009) work on the nature of agreement shows that a morphemic slot that is filled as a result of an agreement process will always surface, even when there is no controller of agreement available (in such cases the morpheme is shown to surface with default ϕ features, typically 3MSG). For our purposes, if the augment reflects an agreement process with the copula, we expect the augment to surface every time we see the copula.³

A full account of the augment has to explain the following observations. First, the presence of the augment correlates with a non-lexical (CP or DP) predicate and a subject-predicate word order. Second, the variation in the form of the augment reflects something about the constituent in copular subject position. In the next several sections I survey the variation in the form of the augment. In §5.1.1.1 I show where we find the *e* form and where we find the *ann* form. I then discuss and

²The reason why ACCs do not provide insight into the status of the augment is because in copula clauses such as the ACC we only find nominal subjects, and I will propose that it is precisely the nominality of the constituent in copular subject position which has an effect on the form of the augment.

³One might wonder whether there is a null form of the augment which represents the default agreement, and that this is the form present in the ICC. I reject this analysis on the following basis. First, the *e* form of the augment instantiates 3MSG ϕ features, and we would expect this form to surface as a default (cf. Adger and Ramchand (2005) for the claim that 3MSG is the default feature combination in Scottish Gaelic). Second, we would lose the above generalization regarding the correlation of the augment with a difference in word order, since a covert augment would then be associated with the predicate-subject word order of ICCs (cf. Adger and Ramchand (2003) for this argument against analyzing the augment as agreement).

critique a previous analysis of the *e* versus *ann* variation proposed in Adger (2011). In §5.1.1.3 I discuss an initially puzzling alternation with pronominal subjects, where the augment appears to be optional. Then, in §5.1.2 I argue for an analysis whereby the augment heads its own projection in the structure, selects for the predicational structure instantiated by the relative clause, and undergoes agreement with the subject of the copular structure. This captures the observation that the augment is crucial in structures where the predicate is non-lexical, as well as its agreement behavior. The apparent optionality of the augment with pronominal subjects will be shown to comply with a more general constraint on the co-occurrence of ϕ -features and pronouns.

5.1.1.1 Variation in the Form of the Augment

In this section I focus on the variation in the form of the augment, an agreement-like property of the augment. The generalizations reached in this section and the next will provide a background for understanding the structural impact that the augment has on copular structures.

Clefts in Scottish Gaelic allow for a wide range of categories to be clefted, and it is in clefts that we find variation in the form of the augment, whether *e* or *ann*. This variation is conditioned by the properties of the clefted constituent in copular subject position, but the properties aren't quite ones typical of agreement phenomena. The generalization is that nominals and nominalized elements require the *e* form of the augment. Prepositional phrases, adjectives, adverbs, aspectual verb phrases, and comparatives—typically, non-nominals—require the *ann* form (see also Lamb (2003: 90-91) for this descriptive generalization, and Adger (2011)).

All nominal copular subjects, regardless of their function inside the relative clause require the *e* form of the augment. This is the case whether the noun is a predicate (5.3a), indefinite argument (5.3b), or definite argument (5.3c). The augment is bolded and the clefted constituent is bracketed here and throughout this section.

- (5.3) a. 'S **e** [_N duine fuathasach crosda] a bh' ann.
 'S e duine fuathasach crosda a bh' ann
 COP 3MSG man terribly cross C.REL be.PAST in.3MSG
 'He was a very cross man.' ST: 5
- b. 'S **e** [_N aon stobh] a bh' anns a' bhàirdse
 'S e aon stobh a bh' anns a' bhàirdse
 COP 3MSG one stove C.REL be.PAST in.DEF the barge
 'There was only one stove on the barge.' FSS: 40
- c. Dh'inns e gur **h-e**⁴ [_N'm fiabhras] a bh' air a' ghille.
 Dh'inns e gur h-e 'm fiabhras a bh' air a' ghille.
 say.PAST 3MSG C.COP 3MSG the fever C.REL be.PAST on the boy
 'He said that the boy had the fever.' ST: 14

⁴Following the plain embedding complementizer *gur*, the augment sometimes is preceded by *h-*. This is possibly dialect variation, and in any case does not signal any difference in meaning and I consider it irrelevant to our discussion here.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

Selected clauses, both finite (5.4a) and nonfinite (5.4b), also co-occur with *e*. In (5.4a) the matrix verb *thuirt* ‘say’ selects for a clause headed by the plain embedding complementizer *gu(n)*. In (5.4b) the matrix verb *dh’iarr* ‘ask’ selects a nonfinite clause. Both clauses, when clefted, trigger the *e* form of the augment.

- (5.4) a. ’S e [_C gu robh e tinn] a thuirt mi.
 ’S e gu robh e tinn a thuirt mi.
 COP 3MSG C be.PAST.DEP 3MSG sick C.REL say.PAST 1SG
 ‘What I said was that he was ill.’ (Adger 2011: 2)
- b. ’S e [_C an leabhar ud a leughadh] a dh’iarr e orm.
 ’S e an leabhar ud a leughadh a dh’iarr e
 COP 3MSG the book DEM OPTCL read.VN C.REL ask.PAST 3MSG
 orm.
 on.1SG
 ‘What he asked me to do was to read that book.’ (Adger 2011: 2)

Nonfinite verbs (a.k.a. ‘verbal nouns’) (5.5a) and adjectival phrases (5.5b) may be clefted with *e*. This is not noted in Adger’s (2011) discussion of the form of the augment. In (5.5), these phrases occur as arguments of the verb in the relative clause. In (5.5a) *smiaradh* ‘smearing’ is the subject of the relative clause verb. In (5.5b), *glé bheag do sgoil* ‘very little schooling’ is the direct object of *fhuair* ‘got’.

- (5.5) a. Agus ’s e [_V smiaradh] a bha ___ dol an uair sin, cha robh guth air dipeadh idir.
 Agus ’s e smiaradh a bha dol an uair sin, cha
 and COP 3MSG smear.VN C.REL be.PAST go.VN then NEG
 robh guth air dipeadh idir.
 be.PAST.DEP breath on dip.VN at.all
 ‘Sheep used to be smeared then, dipping them hadn’t been heard of.’ ST: 15
- b. ’S e [_A glé bheag do sgoil] a fhuair mise ___.
 ’S e glé bheag do sgoil a fhuair mise.
 COP 3MSG very little of school C.REL get.PAST 1SG.EMPH
 ‘I got very little schooling.’ ST: 5

Both the nonfinite verb in (5.5a) and the adjectival phrase in (5.5b) are clearly mixed categories of some sort. In (5.5b) in particular, there is arguably a nominal projection involved, as evidenced by the prepositional complement *do sgoil*. The head, however, is a lexical adjective, and is modified by the adverb *glé*. In what I propose below, a nominal structure is projected in argument positions, and this nominal structure is what triggers the *e* form of the augment.

To summarize, the *e* form of the augment occurs with nominals (5.3), selected clauses (5.4), and other selected phrases (5.5). We will see below that non-nominal predicates, prepositional phrases, and adjuncts pattern together. The picture that emerges is that for the *e* form of the augment, the relevant status is something along the lines of *argument* and *nominal*. Below I will argue that it is nominality, i.e. the category of the phrase, that determines the *e* form of the augment, and that non-prepositional arguments are nominal in the relevant way.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

All prepositional phrases require the *ann* form of the augment. This is regardless of their function in the sentence: arguments (5.6a), adjuncts (5.6b), and predicates (5.6c) all co-occur with *ann*. In (5.6a) the prepositional phrase introduces the goal argument; in (5.6b) the prepositional phrase is an adjunct; and in (5.6c) the prepositional phrase is a predicate (this is supported by the lack of a contentful verb in the relative clause).

- (5.6) a. 'S **ann** [_P ri mo bhràthair] a bha mi a' bruidhinn.
 'S ann ri mo bhràthair a bha mi a' bruidhinn
 COP in.3MSG to 1SG.POSS brother C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG speak.VN
 'It's to my brother that I was speaking.' GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS
- b. 'S **ann** [_P le eagal] a bha an duthaich air a riaghladh.
 'S ann le eagal a bha an duthaich air a
 COP in.3MSG with fear C.REL be.PAST the country on 3MSG.POSS
 riaghladh.
 rule.VN
 'The country was ruled by fear.' (*lit.* It was with fear that the country was on its
 ruling.) FSS: 48
- c. 'S **ann** [_P còmlha rium fhìn as an tent] a bha e.
 'S ann còmlha rium fhìn as an tent a bha e
 COP in.3MSG with to.1SG self in.DEF the tent C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 'He was with me in the tent.' (*lit.* It was with me in the tent that he was.) ST: 24

Clefted predicative adjectives require *ann* (5.7).

- (5.7) 'S **ann** [_A bochd] a tha i.
 'S ann bochd a tha i.
 COP in.3MSG poor C.REL be.PRES 3FSG
 'She's poor' (*lit.* It's poor that she is) (Gillies 1993: 211)

When clefted, aspectual verb phrases also require *ann* (5.8).⁵

- (5.8) 'S **ann** [_{Asp} a' dèanamh dàim] a bha e.
 'S ann a' dèanamh dàim a bha e
 COP in.3MSG PROG do.VN dam C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 and he was building a dam. LG: 275

All adverbs require *ann*. This includes regular adverbials, which are morphologically comprised of an adverbializing particle *gu* and an adjective (5.9a), nouns functioning as adverbials (5.9b), and adverbial clauses, such as the temporal clause in (5.9c) and the reason clause in (5.9d).

⁵While the aspectual heads are historically derived from prepositions, e.g. the progressive *a'* or *ag* is related to *aig* 'at', it is not clear that these aspectual heads are synchronically prepositions. See Reed (2012) for a more detailed discussion of aspectual phrases in Scottish Gaelic.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

- (5.9) a. 'S **ann** [_A gu slaodach] a tha i a' ruith.
 'S ann gu slaodach a tha i a' ruith.
 COP in.3MSG slowly C.REL be.PRES 3FSG PROG run.VN
 'She's running slowly.' (Adger 2011: 1)
- b. Bha i gu math toilichte nach b' **ann** [_N an uair sin] a bha i a' deanamh a slighe à Steòrnabhagh.
 Bha i gu math toilichte nach b' ann an uair sin a
 be.PAST 3FSG quite happy C.NEG COP in.3MSG then C.REL
 bha i a' deanamh a slighe à Steòrnabhagh.
 be.PAST 3FSG PROG make.VN 3FSG.POSS way from Stornoway
 'She was quite happy that it wasn't then that she was making her way from Stornoway.* SAS: 25
- c. 'S **ann** [_C 'air a sguireas sinn de'n àiteach] a tha sinn a' dol chuice.
 'S ann 'air a sguireas sinn de'n àiteach a
 COP in.3MSG when C.REL finish.FUT.REL 1PL of-the farming C.REL
 tha sinn a' dol chuice.
 be.PRES 1PL PROG go.VN to.3FSG
 'It is when we have finished the spring-work that we go to it [removing and cutting up the peat].* LG: 269
- d. An **ann** [_C air son a' bhata bhuaileadh orm as a' ranc an diu] a tha thu dol dha m' chur gu pack drill?
 An ann air son a' bhata bhuaileadh orm as a' ranc
 Q.COP in.3MSG for the cane hit.VN on.1SG in.DEF the rank
 an diu a tha thu dol dha m' chur gu pack drill?
 today C.REL be.PRES 2SG go.VN to 1SG.POSS put.VN to pack drill
 'Are you going to send me to pack drill because your cane struck me while I was in the ranks?*' ST: 26

Comparative phrases can be clefted, and co-occur with *ann* (5.10).

- (5.10) 'S **ann** [_A a b' fhàide] a bhiodh ise bhuaithe
 's ann a b' fhàide a bhiodh ise bhuaithe
 COP in.3MSG C.REL COP far.COMP C.REL be.COND 3FSG.EMPH from.3MSG
 'It was further that she would be from him.* AM: 15

To summarize, the *ann* form of the augment occurs with prepositional phrases (5.6), adjectives (5.7), aspectual verb phrases (5.8), adverbs (5.9), and comparative phrases (5.10). Aside from argument prepositional phrases (5.6a), these are all non-arguments. ANd aside from the adverbial nominal in (5.9b), all are non-nominal.

Table 5.1 summarizes the constituents which require the *e* versus the *ann* form of the augment. There is no clean generalization that can be made regarding the constituents that occur with *e* versus *ann*. Descriptively, nouns and non-prepositional arguments (i.e. clauses, nonfinite verbs,

<i>e</i>	<i>ann</i>
nominals	prepositional phrases
finite clause	adverbials (AP, CP, NP)
non-finite clauses	aspectual phrases
nominalized verbs and adjectives	adjectives and comparative phrases


Table 5.1: The Form of the Augment and Type of Clefted Constituent

adjectives used as nouns) occur with *e* and prepositions, non-nominal predicates, and adjuncts occur with *ann*. In the next section I will review a semantic account of the facts summarized in Table 5.1, and argue that the observed division is incompatible with a purely semantic account. Instead, the semi-categorical and somewhat messy facts observed in this section suggest a morphosyntactic analysis, which I propose in §5.1.2.

5.1.1.2 A Semantic Account of the Augment: Adger (2011)


Adger (2011) proposes a semantic analysis of the variation in the form of the augment. The choice between *e* and *ann*, he argues, is sensitive to the semantic type of the clefted constituent. When the constituent is ‘about’ individuals the *e* form of the augment surfaces, and when it is ‘about’ situations the augment surfaces as *ann*. Adger’s empirical description of the range of constituents with which *e* versus *ann* appear is a subset of what I presented in the previous section. In particular, Adger does not include comparative phrases, adverbial nominals, or nominalized verbs and adjectives in his description.

Adger assumes Adger and Ramchand’s (2003) predicational copula clause structure for clefts. In Adger and Ramchand’s analysis, the augment is in the complement of PredP (5.11), and functions as a predicative pronoun (their analysis is discussed in more detail in §5.2.2 below).




Pred⁰ is an identity function. Because a predicative structure underlies clefts, and the augment is the predicate, the augment must be of the right semantic type to combine with the subject. This means that when the subject is a nominal argument (type *e*), the augment is necessarily type $\langle e, t \rangle$. This is illustrated in (5.12a) for (5.3c) above. When the subject of the copular structure is a prepositional phrase, it is plausibly a predicate of events; Adger (2011: 7) equates events with situations, and this gives a type $\langle s, t \rangle$ for prepositional phrases.⁶ In this case, the augment is necessarily type $\langle \langle s, t \rangle, t \rangle$. This is illustrated in (5.12b) for (5.6b) above. In the former case we find the form *e* and in the latter, *ann*.

⁶This type, $\langle s, t \rangle$, is the semantic type of propositions. It is unclear if Adger means to imply that all predicates of events are essentially propositional, or how he means for these phrases to combine with the functional superstructure of the clause.



In the case of nominal predicates, illustrated in (5.13) for (5.3a) above, the augment must be type $\langle \langle e, t \rangle t \rangle$, since the nominal predicate is presumably of type $\langle e, t \rangle$.



Adger proposes that the variation in the form of the augment reflects the semantic type of the augment itself. To account for nominal predicates, which are arguably type $\langle e, t \rangle$, Adger claims that the form of the augment reflects the variable—individuals or situations—that the predication is about. The e form of the augment, then, is used for predication of (predicates of) individuals; the *ann* form of the augment, for predication of situations. This is summarized in Table 5.2.

e	ann
$\langle e, t \rangle$	
$\langle \langle e, t \rangle t \rangle$	$\langle \langle s, t \rangle t \rangle$

Table 5.2: Form and Semantic Type of the Augment

As interesting as the analysis is, it cannot capture the full range of facts. While nominals, whether functioning as predicates or arguments, are indeed plausibly about individuals, finite and nonfinite clauses are not. Adger proposes that because these clauses are selected, their denotations are more entity-like (Adger 2011: 9); this explanation would also extend to the selected adjectives and verbs in (5.5) above. While this explanation does capture an intuition about the data, it is not clear that this is a semantic distinction: while selected clauses may be more ‘entity-like’ this should not change what they are fundamentally about (i.e. they are still ‘about’ situations). Instead, the relevant notion seems to be a syntactic one: selected clauses are like nominals in being arguments of verbs (I set aside the predicate nominal for the moment, returning to this issue in more detail in §5.1.2.2).

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

Turning to the *ann* form of the augment, we find a similar problem with the semantic account. The logic Adger applies to selected clauses (that, being selected, they are more entity-like) seems to make the wrong predictions for prepositional arguments. Prepositional arguments are plausibly ‘about’ individuals more than situations, but these require the *ann* form of the augment. If selection of a clause makes that clause more entity-like, it is not clear why selection of a preposition does not do so. That is, prepositions cannot be treated as a homogeneous semantic class.

Prepositions in Scottish Gaelic can denote either properties of events or properties of individuals, but the difference in semantic type does not correlate with a difference in the form of the augment. In (5.14a), the preposition *do Cheann-Phàdruig* represents the goal of the going event, and in (5.14b) the preposition *air an tràna* is the manner of Mary’s going home. In both examples in (5.14), the preposition is of type $\langle s, t \rangle$, a property of events, and occurs with the *ann* form of the augment, as predicted if *ann* reflects predication of situations.

- (5.14) a. Agus ’s ann [do Cheann-Phàdruig] a chaidh e
 Agus ’s ann do Cheann-Phàdruig a chaidh e
 and COP in.3MSG to Peterhead C.REL go.PAST 3MSG
 ‘and it was to Peterhead he went.’ LG: 273
- b. Is ann [air an tràna] a tha Màiri a’ dol dhachaidh an nochd.
 Is ann air an tràna a tha Màiri a’ dol dhachaidh
 COP in.3MSG on the train C.REL be.PRES Mary PROG go.VN home
 an nochd.
 tonight
 ‘It’s on the train that Mary is going home tonight.’ (Gillies 1993: 211)

In (5.15), repeated from (5.6c), however, the preposition is plausibly of type $\langle e, t \rangle$, and still we find the *ann* form of the augment, *contra* the predictions of the semantic account.⁷

- (5.15) ’S ann [còmlha rium fhìn as an tent] a bha e.
 ’S ann còmlha rium fhìn as an tent a bha e
 COP in.3MSG with to.1SG self in.DEF the tent C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 ‘He was with me in the tent.’ (*lit.* It was with me in the tent that he was.) ST: 24

Furthermore, prepositional phrases which function only as case-markers—making them of semantic type *e*—we still find the *ann* form of the augment (5.16).

- (5.16) ’S ann [ri mo bhràthair] a bha mi a’ bruidhinn.
 ’S ann ri mo bhràthair a bha mi a’ bruidhinn
 COP in.3MSG to 1SG.POSS brother C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG speak.VN
 ‘It’s to my brother that I was speaking.’ GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS

⁷In Adger and Ramchand’s (2003) analysis of clauses headed by the auxiliary, the preposition is proposed to contribute a situation variable. The basic assumption, however, is that the preposition in examples like (5.15) represents a property of individuals.

Adger’s treatment of the form of the augment relies on the uniformly non-individual predication status of prepositions. The fact that prepositions of all semantic types pattern together in co-occurring with the *ann* form of the augment is sufficient to reject a purely semantic account of the augment. I argue for a morphosyntactic account in §5.1.2 below, but first I discuss another pattern involving the augment: an optional complementarity between the augment and a pronominal subject.

5.1.1.3 Pronominal Subjects of Copular Structures

A pronominal copular subject is optionally in complementary distribution with the augment. In (5.17a) we find the augment *e* with a pronominal subject *sinn*; but in (5.17b) the augment is absent. The augment, or its expected position, is boxed in (5.17) and (5.18), and the pronominal subject is bolded.

- (5.17) a. 'S e **sinn** a bha air ar doigh.
 'S e sinn a bha air ar doigh
 COP 3MSG 1PL C.REL be.PAST on 1PL.POSS manner
 ‘We were very happy.’ ST: 194
- b. Is i a tha bochd.
 Is i a tha bochd.
 COP 3FSG C.REL be.PRES poor
 ‘It is she who is poor.’ (Gillies 1993: 211)

Pronominal subjects of copular structures can also appear in the emphatic form, appearing with the emphatic suffix *-se* or *-sa*, which is often used to mark contrast (Lamb 2003: 88-89). The paradigm is given in Table 5.3, with the emphatic portion bolded. With emphatic pronouns too,

	SG	PL
1	<i>mise</i>	<i>sinne</i>
2	<i>thusa</i>	<i>sibhse</i>
3	M <i>esan</i>	<i>iadsan</i>
	F <i>ise</i>	

Table 5.3: Emphatic Pronouns

the augment is optional ((5.18a) versus (5.18b)).⁸

- (5.18) a. 'S e **mise** Aonghus Beag.
 'S e mise Aonghus Beag
 COP AUG 1SG.EMPH Angus Little
 ‘I am “Young Angus”.’ ST: 5

⁸I am not sure what drives this optionality, but it may well be pragmatic. Without a context (i.e. in elicitation contexts), it seems that non-emphatic pronouns are dispreferred in copular structures, and non-emphatic pronominals with no augment are only weakly acceptable. Such examples are, however quite common in texts and narratives. Further research will investigate what drives this optionality. For present purposes, the optionality is what’s important.

- b. 'S \square **mise** a' fear a thànaig a bhruch ur bìdh dhuibh.

'S mise a' fear a thànaig a bhruch ur bìdh
 COP 1SG.EMPH the one C.REL come.PAST INF cook.VN 2PL.POSS food
 dhuibh.
 for.2PL

'I am the one who has come to cook your food for you.'

NBG: 36

My account of these facts is that the optional complementarity comes from the mechanics of Agree and the spell-out of pronouns in the context of ϕ -inflection. Before I get into the details of the analysis, however, I first establish that the apparently augment-less (5.17b) and (5.18b) are both instances of the ACC (augmented copula clause) and not the ICC (inverted copula clause). This latter analysis is assumed by Adger and Ramchand (2003: 350), where the pronoun immediately following the copula is analyzed as a pronominal predicate. To illustrate, for the sentence in (5.19), I will argue against the ICC analysis (5.19a), and for an ACC analysis (5.19b).

- (5.19) Is iadsan na h-oileanaich.

Is iadsan na h-oileanaich.
 COP 3PL.EMPH the.PL student.PL

'They are the students.'

(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 350)

- a. Is iadsan **na h-oileanaich**. (cf. ICC structures)
 b. Is \emptyset **iadsan** na h-oileanaich. (cf. ACC structures)

To reiterate, our options in analyzing these pronominal copula clauses are a) to assume the pronoun is in fact the predicate in an ICC structure (5.19a); or b) to assume the pronoun is the subject of an ACC structure.⁹ The analyses differ in what is considered the subject (bolded in (5.19)) and in what is considered the predicate. The data that will help us determine the correct analysis will rely on i) the distribution of referential nominals in copula clauses and ii) a demonstration that the pronouns in these pronominal copula clauses are truly referential. In what follows I argue that the pronoun in immediate post-copular position (e.g. in *iadsan* in (5.19)) is indistinguishable from pronouns in subject position in copular clauses. Additionally, the immediate post-copular position is, aside from the examples in question, barred from hosting referential elements. The pronoun in this immediately post-copular position in (5.19) behaves like a referential pronoun in all relevant respects. Thus it cannot be analyzed as the predicate, *contra* the analysis in (5.19a), but rather is a true subject, supporting the analysis in (5.19b).

Below I show that the immediately post-copular pronoun in, e.g. (5.19) above can be interpreted referentially. This means that such structures are not instances of the ICC, but rather suggests that the augment is in fact present in such examples, contrary to appearances. But it is first crucial to establish that the immediately post-copular position cannot host a referential DP in the ICC.

The ICC cannot host a referential element in post-copular position. Neither definite descriptions (5.20a) or proper names (5.20b) are grammatical in this position.

⁹Or, alternatively, that the pronoun is null and the augment is what spells out the ϕ -features: Is iad \emptyset -**san** na h-oileanaich.

- (5.20) a. *Is an tidsear Calum.
 *Is an tidsear Calum
 COP the teacher Calum
 ‘Calum is the teacher.’
- b. *Is Calum an tidsear.
 *Is Calum an tidsear.
 COP Calum the teacher
 ‘Calum is the teacher.’ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 337)

The ICC structure is incompatible with a definite predicate.¹⁰ Where a definite noun is to be interpreted as the predicate, the alternative copular structure, the ACC, must be used (5.21), with the augment occupying the immediate post-copular position.

- (5.21) ‘S e Calum an tidsear.
 ’S e Calum an tidsear
 COP 3.MSG Calum the teacher
 ‘Calum is the teacher.’ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)

For our purposes, then, definite nouns, including proper names and definite descriptions, are ungrammatical in the immediately post-copular position. This is given informally in (5.22), in the spirit of the generalization reached by Adger and Ramchand (2003: 337).

(5.22) **The ICC Predicate Generalization**

The predicate position in an ICC cannot be definite.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to arguing that if we are to maintain this generalization, the pronominal copula structures cannot be analyzed as instances of the ICC. We will see evidence from clefts showing that the immediate post-copular pronoun cannot always be analyzed as the predicate. The distribution of the emphatic suffix *-sa* and the tracking of phi-features by the immediate post-copular pronouns indicate that the pronoun is referential, and thus cannot be the predicate. This suggests that pronominal copula structures are hidden ACCs: the correct analysis of (5.19) above is the structure in (5.19b).

The first piece of evidence for an ACC analysis comes from cleft constructions. In (5.23), repeated from (5.17b) above, we see an immediate post-copular pronoun (bolded) functioning as the copular subject in a cleft construction.

- (5.23) agus ‘s **e** [a chuir a mach as an taigh mi].
 agus ’s **e** a chuir a mach as an taigh mi
 and COP 3MSG C.REL put.PAST out from.DEF the house 1SG
 ‘It was he who sent me out of the house’ ST:14

¹⁰This is part of Adger and Ramchand’s (2003) generalization for Scottish Gaelic predicates, that referential DPs cannot occur in predicate position.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

I assume that the relative clause in a cleft construction is a predicate (Jespersen (1937), Chomsky (1977), Delahunty (1982), Heggie (1988), Hedberg (1990), a.o.). Assuming this, there is only one option for analyzing the pronoun in (5.23), and that is as the copular subject. Thus the cleft in (5.23) has the subject-predicate word order typical of structures involving the augment. This, in addition to the fact that clefts typically involve the augment, argues against an analysis which takes the word order in copular structures at face value, and suggests that at least in some instances there is a complementarity between the augment and the subject pronoun. Pronouns in immediate post-copular position are not necessarily the predicate of the copular structure (i.e. are not always in an ICC structure), but at least in some cases are the copular subject (i.e. are found in ACC structures).

I now turn to the referentiality of the post-copular pronoun. The post-copular pronoun behaves as if it were referential; here, again, pronominal copular clauses pattern with ACCs and clefts rather than with ICCs. I take this as support for an ACC analysis of pronominal copula clauses.

Recall that the emphatic form of the pronoun can occur in immediate post-copular position ((5.19) above). The emphatic suffix is used to convey contrast and emphasis (Lamb 2003: 89), and attaches to referential DPs.¹¹ In (5.24), the emphatic suffix is ungrammatical on the indefinite noun *cat*. (5.24b) is a helpful minimal pair offered by my consultant, with a possessed nominal (in speech the possessive pronoun *a* is elided, leaving only the lenition on *cat*).

- (5.24) a. *'S toil le cat-sa bainne
 COP pleasing with cat-EMPH milk
 ‘A cat likes milk’
- b. 'S toil le (a) chat-sa bainne
 COP pleasing with 3MSG.POSS cat-EMPH milk
 ‘His cat likes milk’

GLA_DM_2FEB2016_CMS

Non-generic indefinite nouns are also ungrammatical with the emphatic suffix (5.25).

- (5.25) *Thainig cat-sa a-steach.
 come.PAST cat-EMPH in
 ‘A cat came in.’

GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS

What (5.24) and (5.25) show is that the emphatic particle *-sa* has a restricted distribution, in that it must associate with a referential DP. The implication of this is that emphatic pronouns are referential DPs, and, crucially, in examples like (5.18b) above, the emphatic pronoun cannot be the predicate in an ICC structure.

Additionally, the post-copular pronoun tracks the phi-features of a referent in the discourse. This is shown in (5.26), where the affirmative answer to the polar interrogative contains an immediately post-copular pronoun (boxed).¹²

¹¹Gillies (1993: 182) refers to the emphatic suffix as a ‘deictic suffix’, since this suffix is derived from the demonstrative *seo* ‘this’, and this is likely the source of the restriction to referential DPs. Indeed, several of my consultants rejected the emphatic suffix on full nouns, replacing it with a demonstrative.

¹²Scottish Gaelic has no single word for yes (or no), and instead repeats the tensed element (finite verb, auxiliary, or, in this case, the copula). Additional material may sometimes be included; this seems to be

(5.26) “Nach e **sibh** a bh’ aig an Ròdha shuas?”

Nach e sibh a bh’ aig an Ròdha shuas?
 Q.NEG.COP 3MSG 2PL C.REL be.PAST at the Rodha up

“Wasn’t it you that was up at the Rodha?”

“O, ’s sinn.”

O, ’s sinn

Oh COP 1PL

“It was.” (literally: we were)

ST: 195

The immediately post-copular pronoun behaves as a normal referential pronoun in picking up the phi-features of the subject in the question.¹³

In pronominal copular structures, the immediate post-copular pronoun cannot be analyzed as the predicate. This is clear in the optionality of the augment in cleft structures, and also in the demonstrated referentiality of the pronoun. Given the ban on definite predicates in the immediate post-copular position, the pronoun, being a referential element, cannot be analyzed as occupying the predicate position. I conclude that the correct analysis for pronominal copula structures is an ACC structure, and this means that we have to explain the optional complementarity between the augment and a pronominal copular subject. I do this in the next section.

5.1.2 A Cleft Syntax


The augment plays a pivotal role in copular structures: it surfaces only with certain types of predicates (DP and CP predicates), and its form reflects the syntactic category of the copular subject. We want a structure that can help capture this generalization. I will pursue one which allows a close relationship with both the predicate and the copular subject. In this section I propose that the augment heads a functional projection which selects for a predicational structure instantiated by the relative clause, and undergoes agreement with the copular subject.

The structure for clefts that I propose is given in (5.27): the copula heads T^0 , and selects for a nominal functional projection headed by the augment. The augment in turn selects for a predicational structure, a relative clause with the relativized constituent in spec,CP. The D head then undergoes agreement with the clefted constituent.¹⁴

sensitive to something like a phonological word, and in (5.26) we see that the pronoun is included as part of the affirmative answer.

¹³Incidentally, the question in (5.26) has an ACC structure. If the answer in (5.26) were an ICC, the underlying structure would be the inverse of the question: whereas the pronoun is the subject in the question, it would have to be a predicate in the answer. This may not be problematic in the end, but seems like it would pose problems for theories of ellipsis, assuming that such responses involve ellipsis (cf. Thoms (2015) for discussion of Scottish Gaelic ellipsis in answers).

¹⁴This structure bears similarities to Kayne’s (1994) head-raising structure for relative clauses, and in particular with the external D which enters into an Agree relationship with the relativized constituent, argued for in Bianchi (1999), (2000).




The final surface order is derived by head movement of the augment to right-adjoin to T.¹⁵ I now turn to the syntax of the augment and agreement.

5.1.2.1 The Syntax of the Augment

The augment has an integral role in the syntax of copular structures: it surfaces where the predicate is a DP or CP; its form is sensitive to properties of the copular subject; it is optionally in complementary distribution with a pronominal subject; and finally, it precedes the subject of the copular structure. In the remainder of this section I address these aspects of the augment, and link them to the structure in (5.27).

I propose that the augment heads a nominal functional projection which selects for a relative clause as complement. My analysis bears some similarities to other proposals for clefts in the literature, such as Hedberg (2000) and Percus (1997), who both propose a structure where the cleft pronoun forms a constituent with the relative clause, with the relative clause postposing to a position following the clefted constituent, schematized in (5.28).¹⁶




¹⁵I consider the palatalization of the copula preceding the *e* form of the augment (*je:/ 's e*) to be evidence for a phonologically close relationship between the copula and the augment. Such palatalization effects are often morphophonologically driven, used to instantiate case morphology for instance (see Lamb (2003), Gillies (1993) for discussion). The generalization seems to be that cliticization feeds palatalization, presumably by creating something like a phonological word. I assume head-adjunction can also create a phonological word, thus explaining the palatalization of the sonorant of the copula preceding the front vowel of the *e* form of the augment.

¹⁶Hedberg's and Percus's analyses differ in several respects, including whether the copula ends up in T, whether there is subject movement, whether the CP is originally merged as an adjunct to DP or NP, and the target of the extraposition movement. I ignore those details here, as they are relatively minor.

It's Phaedra who likes bananas.

Both analyses are motivated by similarities of clefts with definite descriptions. Hedberg (2000) notes that the cleft pronoun and relative clause together have a pragmatic function as a definite description—that is, that the relative clause has a topical (old-information) status in the clause. Recall that in Chapter 2, I showed that Scottish Gaelic clefts are focus constructions, with the clefted constituent in focus and the relative clause conveying backgrounded information. Scottish Gaelic clefts are thus amenable to Hedberg's proposal, such that the augment and relative clause form a discontinuous definite description. However, my analysis (5.29) differs in that the augment is part of the clausal spine: it is the complement of the copula, not the subject. My analysis additionally proposes a constituency between the clefted constituent and the relative clause.



The augment undergoes agreement with the constituent in spec,CP, and is in optional complementary distribution with it if it is a pronoun. I provide an account of this in the next section which builds on the status of the augment as a D^0 head.

5.1.2.2 The Nature of Agreement with the Augment

Recall that overall, the *e* form of the augment correlates with nominals and non-prepositional arguments, with the exception of adverbial nominals (which occur with *ann*). The *ann* form of the augment surfaces with prepositions, adjuncts, and non-nominal predicates. This is summarized in Table 5.4, where specific functions are given when relevant.

<i>e</i>	<i>ann</i>
pronouns	PP
DP, NP	DP (adverbial)
CP (argument)	CP
AP (argument)	AP
V(P) (argument)	AspP

Table 5.4: The Form of the Augment and Category of the Subject

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

The idea I would like to pursue is that the class of elements which trigger the *e* form of the augment form a natural class by virtue of their status as nominals and nominalized phrases. The *ann* form of the augment is triggered by non-nominals, as something of an elsewhere case. The optional complementary distribution of the augment and pronouns will take advantage of the fact that pronouns have a full specification of ϕ features and are generally in complementary distribution with inflection elsewhere in the language (Robinson (2009), Adger (1997), and McCloskey and Hale (1984) for Irish). In the remainder of this section I outline my analysis of the agreement of the augment with the phrase in its specifier.

I assume a link between DP structure and argument licensing (cf. Chomsky (1981), Stowell (1989), Longobardi (1994), Massam (2001), a.o.), and specifically that arguments of all categories involve a nominalized structure, and conversely that non-arguments do not have a nominal maximal projection. This has the effect of picking out the elements that occur with *e* as a natural class to the exclusion of those which occur with *ann*, with the exception of predicate nominals and prepositional arguments. My proposal is that the variation in the form of the augment is a sensitivity to nominal structure: *e* reflects a nominal(ized) element and *ann* reflects a non-nominal (or perhaps denominalized) element.

The intuition, then, is that the appearance of *e* is a reflex of a nominal or nominalized element in its specifier. Selected clauses and other selected non-nominals, which are presumably nominalized as a result of their status as argument, occur with *e*. Nominal predicates, being nominals, also occur with *e*. I crucially assume that, despite appearances, predicate nominals are arguments of a relevant functional structure. This seems right, given that nominal predicates in non-cleft structures must be introduced by the preposition *ann* ‘in’ (5.30).

- (5.30) Tha Calum ’na thidsear.
 be.PRES Calum in-3MSG.POSS teacher
 ‘Calum is a teacher.’ (lit. Calum is in his teacher)
 cf. *Tha Calum tidsear. (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 332)

The form *ann*, on the other hand, surfaces when the constituent is not an argument, and I assume this correlates with a non-nominal maximal projection. Prepositional phrases, then, crucially are not nominalized when they occur as arguments.¹⁷ Prepositional phrases, aspectual phrases, clauses, adjectives, and adverbs occur with *ann*. As for adverbial DPs, I propose that these are denominalized and headed by a null adverbial head. Independent evidence for this comes from the distribution of these adverbial nouns: like adverbials, they can occur preceding the strict VSO ordering of DP arguments (5.31) (cf. also (5.78) below for an adverbial position preceding the nonfinite predicate).

¹⁷It strikes me as plausible that prepositional phrases may be resistant to nominalization. This, of course, is an empirical question, and, if true, provides support for this claim. As it stands, however, it is a stipulation that prepositional phrases are not nominalized when they occur as arguments, but such stipulations are often characteristic of morphosyntactic generalizations.

- (5.31) a. An oidhche seo bha mi fhìn agus Roddy shìos ach am faiceadh sinn am faigheadh sinn càil de na bha a' dol.
 An oidhche seo bha mi fhìn agus Roddy shìos ach am faiceadh
 the night DEM be.PAST 1SG self and Roddy down but Q see.COND
 sinn am faigheadh sinn càil de na bha a' dol.
 1PL Q get.COND 1PL thing of FREE.REL be.PAST PROG go.VN
 ‘One night I and Roddy were down [in the church] to see if we would get anything of what was going (i.e. if we would catch this “disease” [the revival called ‘the falling’]).’
 LG: 265
- b. Anns a' bhliadhna 1938 bha mòran bhalaich òga aig an taigh ann an Liùrbost.
 Anns a' bhliadhna 1938 bha mòran bhalaich òga aig an
 in.DEF the year 1938 be.PAST many boy.PL young.PL at the
 taigh ann an Liùrbost.
 house in Leurbost
 ‘In the year 1938 there were many young boys at home in Leurbost.’
 LG: 267

I conclude, then, that *e* co-occurs with nominals or nominalized phrases, and that this nominal structure tracks with arguments; *ann* co-occurs with non-nominals, i.e. phrases lacking the nominal structure associated with arguments.

Below I propose a syntactic Agreement relationship between the augment and the phrase in its specifier. To do this, we need to formalize the above generalization with morphosyntactic features. The necessary feature is related to something like category, an obvious choice being some relevant layer of the nominal structure. I assume the DP is the relevant nominal projection for licensing and nominalization, and furthermore that the category feature can be valued.¹⁸ I assume syntactic Agreement is essentially feature valuation (Chomsky (1993), a.o.). I also adopt Preminger’s (2011) proposal whereby the Agree relation can fail, with no adverse effects on the grammaticality of the structure. The proposal will be that the augment as a D^0 enters the derivation with an unvalued D-feature [D:]. Because unvalued features are allowed at the interfaces, if the augment’s D-feature does not get a value in the syntax, it has no effect on the grammaticality. The valuation, or lack thereof, does, however, have an effect on the spell-out of the augment.

Scottish Gaelic agreement inflection can be shown to be independently sensitive to features of D-heads: ϕ -inflection and ‘definite inflection’, triggered by a morphosyntactic class of determiners (cf. Adger (1997), Robinson (2009)). Both inflectional patterns are particularly robust in so-called inflecting prepositions, for instance *ann (an)* in (5.32a), whose morphological form is sensitive to the presence of ϕ -features on pronouns (5.32b) and a δ -feature present on some D^0 heads (5.32c), following the analysis of definite inflection in Robinson (2009).

¹⁸Another option would be to have the form of the augment sensitive to the presence of Case (e.g. KP), which the clefted constituent would have received in its base position in the relative clause. A potential problem with this is that case morphology is not retained in the pivot position in A-bar dependencies—it is not immediately clear how we can have both the presence of Case and the absence of the associated morphology. It is possible that the morphological reflex of licensing is distinct from licensing itself, so that it would allow this (see, e.g. Marantz (2000)), but the syntactic underpinnings of morphological case have to be sufficiently abstract. I propose a feature value for D below, which could function in the same way as Case in reflecting the need for (DP-)licensing.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

- (5.32) a. **ann an** dùnan beag
 in pile small
 ‘in a little pile’ ESG: 189
- b. **annad**
 in.2SG
 ‘in you’ (Gillies 1993: 183)
- c. **anns** na sean lathaichean
 in.DEF the.PL old day.PL
 ‘in the old days’ LG: 305

Definiteness inflection is contingent on ϕ inflection, in that we find definiteness inflection only where we also find ϕ -inflection but not *vice versa*. That is, the heads which participate in definiteness inflection are a subset of those which participate in ϕ -inflection processes. I conclude that the inflectional system of Scottish Gaelic is sensitive to the values of D^0 heads, with the following typology of valued [D:].

- (5.33) [D: δ] *an* ‘the’, *gach* ‘each’, *a h-uile* ‘all’...
 [D: ϕ] *mi* ‘1SG’, *thu* ‘2SG’,...

Because these elements (determiners and pronouns) both trigger the *e* form of the augment, as well as bare nouns and other phrases which do not trigger agreement inflection on inflecting prepositions, I propose a third super-feature value η , whose presence reflects a licensed nominal structure. The presence of ϕ and δ values for [D:] entail the value η (this will become important in accounting for the optional complementarity between the augment and pronominal subjects). This is schematized in the tree in (5.34).


- (5.34) η
 $\widehat{\phi \delta}$

With this in place, we can now provide an agreement analysis of the form of the augment.

The augment’s unvalued [D:] feature instigates the Agree operation to search for a value. The constituent in spec,CP in the relative clause is the first available constituent.¹⁹ Where the element in spec,CP is an argument, the Agree search operation finds a valued [D: η] feature, and copies this value. The augment with a valued [D: η] feature is spelled out as *e* (5.35).


¹⁹The CP itself, of course, could be the first constituent found, but being a non-nominal, it will never value the augment’s [D:] feature, and the search continues.

(5.35)



When the constituent in spec,CP is not an argument, it has no D-feature, and no value is copied to the augment. The augment, with an unvalued [D:] feature, is spelled out as *ann* (5.36).²⁰


(5.36)



Crucially, a denominalizing head, such as that introducing adverbial nominals such as *an uair sin* ‘then’ (literally ‘that time’) renders the interior of the phrase invisible for further probing. This is also presumably required for prepositional phrases, which have nominal complements.


Recall that the augment is in complementary distribution with pronoun subjects, and that pronouns have a valued [D: ϕ] feature. The ϕ valuation on D entails the presence of the η value. Because the presence of ϕ hinges on the presence of η , the Agree operation can choose either value to copy. Where it copies η we get an overt augment in the form of *e* and an overt pronoun, as in (5.35) above. Where it copies ϕ , however, we get complementarity. This is schematized in (5.37).

²⁰It is tempting to push this analysis to account for the fact that *ann* is what is used as a default spell-out of an unvalued [D:] head. A proposal might pursue the morphological similarities of the *ann* form of the augment with the existential *ann*. The existential locative pro-form is nominal-like in virtue of being a pro-form but does not have the distribution of a true argument, being a prepositional phrase. This status then could be what makes the existential *pro*-form a suitable spell-out of an unvalued [D:].



Implicit in this proposal is the notion of feature geometries (Preminger (2011) and Harley and Ritter (2002)). The assumption is that the probe ‘sees’ the higher value, η first, and can stop the search there or continue and find ϕ . Alternatively, it can ‘see’ the whole structure and copy either of the values. Under this proposal, the optional complementary distribution of the augment and pronominal subject essentially arises from feature competition, with η and ϕ competing to value the unvalued [D:] feature.²¹

When there is complementary distribution, which element is null, the augment or the pronominal subject? This pattern is reminiscent of a larger complementarity between argument pronouns and agreement inflection found across the Celtic languages (cf. McCloskey and Hale (1984), a.o.). Typically, the pronoun is null with the inflectional head remaining overt (akin to familiar *pro*-drop languages). To bring the augment in line with this inflectional pattern, I propose that the pronominal subject is null. I propose the spell-out rule in (5.37), given in (5.38). The language-general ban on pronouns and ϕ -inflection forces the null form of the pronoun.



Where we find complementary distribution between the augment and the pronominal subject, the pronoun is null, governed by a constraint on the appearance of pronouns in the context of an agreeing head. Because the augment is a D^0 head, when its [D:] feature is valued as ϕ it is spelled out as a pronoun. This makes sense of the instances where the pronominal subject appears in responses, as in (5.26) above: this is simply the augment, agreeing with a now-null pronominal subject.

²¹One might wonder why the same doesn’t occur with the δ feature. This could be an instance of morphological underspecification, so that *e* simply also spells out the δ feature. It may also be related to the fact that ϕ -inflection is much more robust in the language (occurring with all prepositions, verbal nouns, and a tiny corner of finite verbs), and definite inflection is restricted to simple prepositions. In any case, we would not expect complementarity with δ agreement.

5.1.2.3 Focus Movement in Clefts

In this section I address an outstanding issue in the derivation of clefts. Recall from Chapter 2 that the clefted constituent is not necessarily identical to the identificational focus. That is, there can be mismatches between the syntactic structure and the pragmatics of clefts. In this section I provide an analysis of movement in clefts which accounts for these mismatches, adopting Cable's (2010) proposal for obviating the need for a theory of pied-piping in *wh*-questions.

Recall that the semantics of clefts, via the CLEFT operator, requires a focused constituent inside of the relative clause. I assume that focus constituents are focus-marked, and propose that there is a syntactic reflex of focus-marking. Where the focus-marked constituent and only the focus-marked constituent moves, we get the classic bipartite structure of clefts. We saw in Chapter 2, however, that the focus-marked constituent may be contained in the moved constituent. The relevant data is repeated here in (5.39).

- (5.39) a. 'S e [an nighean as sine aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 'S e an nighean as sine aig Iain a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 COP 3MSG the daughter eldest at Iain C.REL sing.PAST song last-night
 'It's Iain's eldest daughter who sang a song last night.'
 → No one else sang last night.
- b. 'S e [an nighean AS SINE aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 → None of John's other daughters sang; although someone else may have.
- c. 'S e [an nighean as sine AIG IAIN] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 → No one else's eldest daughter sang; others may have. GLA__IC__15SEP2016__CMS

I interpret these data to mean that focus is not an effect of movement, but rather that movement is an effect of focus. Where possible, the focus-marked constituent is moved, but if the focus-marked constituent cannot (if it is inside of an island for movement, for instance), the smallest available constituent that contains the focus is moved.

To implement this idea in formal terms, I propose that the relative complementizer probes for a specific type of phrase, and the type of phrase it seeks is mediated by the operator in its specifier. In the case of clefts, the relative complementizer is looking for a focus-marked constituent, since focus-marking is what creates the partition on the Context Set, via evoking a QUD in the case of narrow focus. It is through focus-marking that the CLEFT operator derives the alternatives over which it claims truth and maximality. The relative complementizer, in the context of CLEFT, has the feature specification in (5.40). The relevant type of constituent will necessarily be different for relative clauses and other A-bar dependency types (focus is not relevant for, e.g. relative clauses or *wh*-questions).

- (5.40) a_{CLEFT} [C, uFOC, EPP]


Upon finding the focus-marked constituent in its c-command domain, an Agree relation obtains between the relative complementizer and the focus-marked phrase.

Notice that I have conflated focus-marking with having a [FOC] feature in the syntax. This is not a benign assumption, especially if features are part of the lexical specifications of heads. Focus-marking can be found not only on words, but also subparts of words, and phrases. In other words,

focus is not restricted to syntactic heads and so is not, at first glance, a plausible syntactic feature (see, for instance, Fanselow and Lenertová (2011: 184)). However, it is clear that focus-marking feeds various aspects of form in natural language, whether the expression is phonological, morphological, or syntactic (for the reflex of f-marking in the phonology, see Selkirk (1984), Schwarzschild (1999), a.o.). Focus marking also acts as input into various semantic operators (e.g. the CLEFT operator; see also Rooth (1992)).

I assume, then, that focus-marking feeds the syntactic derivation. To implement this, I adapt Cable's (2010) QP analysis of *wh*-questions (discussed below) to focus movement in clefts. My claim will be that focus-marking has an effect on the syntactic structure, such that it introduces a Focus Phrase into the derivation. The Focus Phrase acts as a syntactic mediator between semantic-pragmatic focus-marking and morphosyntactic processes such as movement. This means that lexical items do not bear a [FOC] feature; only the FocP head does.


The basic idea of a functional mediator between a head in C and a moving phrase comes from Cable (2010), who is concerned with pied-piping in *wh*-questions. In particular, it is theoretically troubling that a phrase larger than the *wh*-phrase can move to spec,CP in *wh*-questions if the only relevant phrase is the *wh*-phrase. Cable's main claim is that *wh*-dependencies are mediated by a Question Phrase (QP), which selects for the *wh*-phrase (Cable 2010: 567). It is the QP that bears the [WH] feature probed by C, not the *wh*-phrase, and the entire QP moves to spec,CP. This is illustrated in (5.41).



The complementizer probes for and finds a [WH] feature on the Q head; because Q projects to QP, Q and everything contained within it moves to spec,CP as a result. This explains the apparent pied-piping effect of, e.g., *book* in (5.41), without stipulating *wh*-feature percolation.

Returning to clefts, I extend Cable's analysis and propose that the syntactic feature [FOC] gets into the derivation via FocP, the focus counterpart to Cable's QP. Where QP introduces a [WH] feature into the derivation, FocP introduces a [FOC] feature. This allows us to understand rather elegantly and simply the pied-piping of non-focus material seen in (5.39) above. Both FocP and QP are involved in A-bar dependencies and are a syntactic reflex of certain types of constituents. I provide a derivation for (5.39c) in (5.42)

(5.42)



FocP can be projected anywhere, and is transparent for the usual selectional processes (i.e. *vP* selecting for a DP argument). The requirement on the distribution of FocP is that the complement of FocP contain focus-marking. This may be the whole complement of FocP, or it may be a subpart of it, as in (5.42), with focus-marking represented by brackets.

An Agree relationship obtains between the relative complementizer bearing a $[uFOC]$ (recall that this feature specification comes from the CLEFT operator) and the Foc^0 head bearing $[FOC]$, which c-commands the focus-marked phrase. This is schematized in (5.43).

(5.43) $[_{CP} \underset{\substack{| \\ \text{---}}}{a} [uFOC] [_{TP} \dots [_{FocP} Foc [FOC] [_{XP} XP]] \dots]]$

This agreement relation is a prerequisite for the possibility of movement, under the assumption that movement is a complex operation involving Agree and (Re)Merge (cf. Adger and Ramchand (2005), Chomsky (2001), a.o.). For now I assume that movement is driven by a need for a specifier-head structural relationship; we will revisit this in our discussion of the PC in Chapter 6.²² The FocP ends up in the specifier of CP.

FocP is a syntactic reflex of pragmatic focus-marking, and as such reference to FocP does not mean that the whole of the FocP has a focus interpretation. This gives the possibility for mismatches between the syntactic bipartite structure in clefts and the interpretation of exhaustivity. I assume that focus-marking is a feature of all sentences. This is a pragmatic constraint on the well-formedness of a sentence, that utterances contribute something new to the discourse. I further assume that focus-marking, or a FocP in the syntax, which does not co-occur with a binding operator (e.g. CLEFT), is interpreted as Kiss's (1998) informational focus, which is found in all sentences and is characterized by an unmarked syntactic structure (cf. Constant (2014) for the idea that different types of focus arise from an interaction between focus-marking and different operators).

So while focus-marking is necessary for the semantic well-formedness of the CLEFT operator, the FocP itself is what the syntactic component manipulates. In particular, it is the FocP that undergoes movement and which bears the feature needed for the syntactic well-formedness of the


²²As a preview, the PC will provide evidence that the feature-checking relation for $[uFOC]$ requires a sufficiently local relationship, and this is typically provided by a spec-head relationship, although it need not be. This view of feature-checking movement is argued for in Abels (2003).

relative complementizer in the context of the CLEFT operator. The syntactic counterparts of focus-marking and the CLEFT operator are FocP and the relative complementizer, respectively.

5.1.3 Summary

In this section I developed a structure for clefts where the copula occupies T^0 and the augment heads a DP which selects for the relative CP predicational structure. The form of the augment comes about via a fallible Agree operation (Preminger 2011) with the clefted constituent. Crucially, the FocP layer is transparent for probing by the augment. The augment has an unvalued [D:] feature, and may be valued as ϕ or η . When valued as η , the augment surfaces as *e*, and when valued ϕ we get the same complementary distribution of pronoun and agreement inflection seen elsewhere in the language. This complementarity is explained by the feature-geometric relation of the values of η and ϕ : η dominates ϕ at the relevant level, and so the search for a value for D may terminate upon finding η . If the search stops, we get an overt pronoun surfacing with the *e* form of the augment. If the search continues, it find ϕ , and the augment is spelled out as the relevant pronoun and the more general constraint on the appearance of multiple ϕ features applies: the clefted pronoun is deleted, leaving only the augment as the spell-out of those ϕ -features.

The augment undergoes head movement and adjoins to T, yielding the surface word order (5.44).



In the next section I discuss the implications that this analysis has for the other copular structures: the Augmented Copula Clause, which shares with clefts the presence of the augment, and the Inverted Copula Clause.


5.2 Implications for Copula Clauses

Clefts are only one of three structures which involve the copula (5.45). Aside from clefts (5.45a), recall that there are also Augmented Copula Clauses (ACCs) (5.45b), and Inverted Copula Clauses (ICCs) (5.45c).

- (5.45) a. **'S** e [fear cnagach ban] **a cheasnaich mise.** CLEFT
 'S e fear cnagach ban a cheasnaich mise.
 COP 3MSG man stern-faced blond C.REL question.PAST 1SG.EMPH
 'It was a stern-faced blonde man who questioned me.' FSS: 46
- b. **'S** e [Calum] **an tidsear.** ACC
 'S e Calum an tidsear.
 COP 3MSG Calum the teacher
 'Calum is the teacher.' (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)
- c. **'S** **ainneamh** [taigh nach robh brà ann]. ICC
 'S ainneamh taigh nach robh brà ann.
 COP rare house NEG.C.REL be.PAST quern in.MSG
 'Rare was the house that didn't have a quern' ST: 10

5.2.1 Structure of the Augmented Copula Clause

Extending the structure proposed for clefts to the ACC, we get the structure in (5.46) for the ACC in (5.45b). Recall that the augment selects for a predicational structure. In clefts, this was supplied by the relative clause. In the ACC this is supplied by a predicative DP structure.²³



That the ACC involves an underlying predicational structure is proposed by Adger and Ramchand (2003), based on interpretational asymmetries between the first and second DP.

I first present Adger and Ramchand's (2003) analysis before returning to the above ACC structure in a more detailed discussion and comparison with the structure for the ACC proposed in Adger and Ramchand (2003). Whereas I model the ACC on clefts, Adger and Ramchand model the ACC (and, consequently, clefts) on the ICC, with some interesting differences resulting in the proposed structures. After this discussion, I propose a structure for the ICC in §5.2.4.

²³The DP predicate structure in (5.46) is reminiscent of the DP predicate structure in Stowell (1983: 297-99).

5.2.2 Adger and Ramchand (2003)

Adger and Ramchand (2003) present an analysis of copula clauses in Scottish Gaelic, illustrated in (5.47) with the subject bolded and the predicate bracketed. They include in their discussion a predicative construction which does not involve the copula *is*, but rather the auxiliary *bi*—this is the Substantive Auxiliary Construction (SAC) (5.47a).


- (5.47) a. Tha **Calum** [anns a' bhùth]. SAC
 Tha Calum anns a' bhùth.
 be.PRES Calum in.DEF the shop
 'Calum is in the shop.' (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 330)
- b. Is [le Calum] **an cù**. ICC
 Is le Calum an cù.
 COP with Calum the dog
 'The dog belongs to Calum' (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 335)
- c. 'S e **Calum** [an tidsear]. ACC
 'S e Calum an tidsear
 COP 3MSG Calum an tidsear
 'Calum is the teacher.' (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)

The SAC (5.47a) utilizes the auxiliary *bi*, and allows for a wide range of predicates: prepositions, nominals (albeit with extra morphosyntactic structure, see discussion surrounding (5.51) below), and verbs. The ICC (Inverted Copula Clause) (5.47b) is relatively formal and archaic (Adger and Ramchand (2003: 334), Lamb (2003: 67-68)). In the ICC the copula *is* is immediately followed by the predicate, which may be a preposition, adjective, or a bare nominal. The ACC (Augmented Copula Clause) (5.47c) also uses the copula *is*, and is characterized by a DP predicate and the presence of the augment which immediately follows the copula.

Adger and Ramchand (2003) propose an underlying predicational structure for all clauses in Scottish Gaelic, with the syntactic differences between the SAC in (5.47a) on the one hand and the ICC and ACC in (5.47b,c) on the other coming from what heads the predicational structure. In the SAC Pred^0 is null, while in the ICC and ACC the copula heads Pred^0 .

5.2.2.1 The Inverted Copula Clause (ICC)

Adger and Ramchand propose the structure in (5.48) underlying the ICC in (5.47b).



CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

The copula introduces a *holds* relation between the predicate and the subject.

$$(5.49) \quad [[is]] = \lambda\pi\lambda x [\text{holds}(\pi, x)]$$

Clauses headed by the copula are associated with a restricted interpretation of the subject and the absence of additional morphosyntax with nominal predicates. Adger and Ramchand propose that these properties come from the copula, the head of the predicational structure. They derive this by proposing that clauses headed by the copula are characterized by the lack of an eventuality variable, while clauses headed by the auxiliary are characterized by the presence of an eventuality variable.

Clauses headed by the copula disallow existentially interpreted bare nominal subjects. While bare nominals are grammatical in copula clauses, they must be interpreted generically. Thus (5.50) is ungrammatical with the meaning ‘a man is big’. An existential interpretation of bare nominals is otherwise available in non-copular clauses, such as the SAC.

(5.50) *Is [m̀òr] duine. ICC

*Is m̀òr duine.

COP big man

‘A man is big.’

(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 338)

A second characteristic of ICCs is that nominal predicates do not need additional functional structure; bare nominals are legitimate predicates on their own (5.51a). This is in contrast with nominal predicates in non-copular predicative structures, such as the SAC. Nominal predicates in SAC structures need additional morphosyntactic structure, provided by the preposition *ann* (5.51b). No such structure is needed in the ICC, and the bare NP can appear in the post-copular predicate position.

(5.51) a. Is [tidsear] Calum ICC

Is tidsear Calum

COP teacher Calum

‘Calum is a teacher.’

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 335)

b. Tha Calum [’na thidsear] SAC

Tha Calum ’na thidsear

be.PRES Calum in.3MSG.POSS teacher

‘Calum is a teacher’ (lit. ‘Calum is in his teacher’) (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 332)

To recap, we find an asymmetry in the interpretation of bare NP arguments in the ICC versus SAC and an asymmetry in the morphosyntactic packaging of nominal predicates in the ICC versus the SAC. In SAC structures, bare NP subjects can be interpreted existentially and nominal predicates must be introduced by prepositional structure. In ICC structures, an existential interpretation of bare NP subjects is unavailable and bare nominals are grammatical in predicate position.


Adger and Ramchand (2003: 338) propose that the source of these asymmetries is in the obligatory presence or absence of an eventuality variable. The SAC must bind an eventuality variable, while

the ICC does not. This accounts for the morphosyntactic characteristics of nominal predicates in each of these constructions. NPs do not introduce eventuality variables, and can easily act as predicates in ICC structures, which have no requirement on the presence of an eventuality variable. In SAC structures, on the other hand, which require an eventuality variable, bare NP predicates are ungrammatical due to the lack of an eventuality variable. As something of a fix, a prepositional structure is inserted to introduce the eventuality variable: thus the use of the preposition *ann* to introduce NP predicates in the SAC.

The lack of an existential interpretation of NP subjects also derives from the absence of an eventuality variable in the ICC structure. The assumption is that existential closure makes available an existential interpretation, and furthermore that eventuality variables are what trigger existential closure. Because there is no eventuality variable in the ICC, no existential closure is triggered and bare (indefinite) NP subjects cannot receive an existential interpretation. The implication of this, Adger and Ramchand (2003: 338, fn. 8) note, is that non-nominal predicates must be nominalized in ICC structures.

Another major difference between the SAC and ICC—and where the ICC gets its name—is in the surface ordering of its constituents. Whereas the SAC has a subject-predicate order, the ICC has the inverse: a predicate-subject word order (e.g. (5.51) above). Because a predicational structure is assumed for both the SAC and the ICC—and so the ICC has an underlying subject-predicate order—Adger and Ramchand propose that the surface order of the ICC is derived by predicate inversion, driven by the phonological weakness of the copula.

The inverted structure of the ICC is proposed to be derived as follows. Adger and Ramchand assume that Scottish Gaelic T^0 has an EPP feature which is typically satisfied in one of two ways: either by head movement of the verb (deriving VSO word order), or by directly merging an element in T (e.g. the auxiliary of the SAC). Adger and Ramchand (2003: 336) further assume a phonological constraint on the satisfaction of T^0 's EPP feature: it may be satisfied only by an element which is not 'phonologically weak'. The copula, being typically proclitic to the following word (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 336), fails to meet this requirement. As something of a last resort effort to satisfy the EPP, the copula pied-pipes its complement and the entire Pred' raises and lands in spec,TP (5.52).



This is how the ICC is derived. In the next section we will see how this structure extends to ACC.

5.2.2.2 The Augmented Copula Clause (ACC)

Like the ICC, the ACC has an underlying predicational structure headed by the copula *is*. It differs from the ICC, however, in three major respects. First, the predicate (obligatorily a DP, and bracketed in (5.53) and referred to as the ‘second DP’ in the subsequent discussion, following Adger and Ramchand) does not immediately follow the copula in the ACC, but instead follows the subject (5.53a). Second is the presence of the augment. The augment is positionally parallel to the lexical predicate in the ICC, immediately following the copula.

- (5.53) a. 'S e Calum [an tidsear]. ACC
 'S e Calum an tidsear.
 COP 3MSG Calum the teacher
 ‘Calum is the teacher.’ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)
- b. Is [tidsear] Calum. ICC
 Is tidsear Calum.
 COP teacher Calum
 ‘Calum is a teacher.’ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 335)


Third, the ACC not only allows, but in fact requires, that the second DP be definite. Adjectives and bare nominals are ungrammatical in the ACC (5.54).

- (5.54) 'S e Daibhidh *tinn/*tidsear/an tidsear.
 COP 3MSG David sick/teacher/the teacher
 ‘David is *sick/*a teacher/the teacher.’²⁴ (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 354)

Conversely, definite DPs are disallowed in the predicate position of ICC and SAC structures (cf. discussion surrounding (5.20) above for the ungrammaticality of DP predicates in the ICC; for the ungrammaticality of DP predicates in the SAC, see Adger and Ramchand (2003: 333-34)).

Because definite DPs are otherwise disallowed in predicate position, because the augment surfaces exactly where we have an unfit predicate, and because the augment occupies a surface position equivalent to the predicate in the ICC, Adger and Ramchand (2003) propose that, in the ACC the augment is the predicate, such that the ACC and ICC have exactly the same underlying structure. Under this analysis, the augment originates in the complement of PredP, exactly where the predicate is proposed to originate in the ICC, and raises to spec,TP along with the copula. This gives us the partial structure in (5.55), with the copula and augment-predicate raising to spec,TP, and the first DP as the copular subject. The second DP, interpreted as predicate, has yet to be introduced into the structure.


²⁴Adger and Ramchand give as a translation ‘It’s David who is *sick/*a teacher/the teacher.’ I have taken the liberty of re-translating the example using a simple copula clause to avoid confusion with the clefts under discussion in this dissertation.



Because the augment is both a predicate and a pronoun, it functions to introduce a property associated with a discourse-salient individual. This is encoded in its denotation (5.56), where ι has the usual meaning (originally proposed in Russell (1905)), π is the type of simple properties, and x is an individual given in the syntax or discourse context.

(5.56) $[[e]] = [\iota\pi: \text{where } \pi \text{ is the relevant distinguishing property associated with } x]$


With this denotation, the partial structure in (5.55) is predicted to be well-formed and interpretable in a context with a salient individual with an identifiable and relevant property. This is the case, with ‘*S e Calum*, essentially a truncated cleft (5.57).



‘The relevant distinguishing property associated with some contextually salient individual x ’ *holds of* ‘Calum’

Alternatively, this property may be provided in the linguistic context, as with the second DP of the ACC. Adger and Ramchand propose that this second DP is in an adjoined position, reflecting its non-obligatory status. Additional evidence for the adjoined status of the predicate DP comes from the position of certain adverbs, extraction asymmetries, and stress placement. From the adjoined position, the second DP provides the individual from which the relevant property is deduced. Adger and Ramchand’s structure for the ACC in (5.53b) above is given in (5.58).

(5.58)



'S e Calum an tidsear.
 COP 3MSG Calum the teacher
 'Calum is the teacher.'

'The relevant distinguishing property associated with x' *holds of* 'Calum'.
 where x is described/replaced by the definite description 'the teacher'

(cf. Adger and Ramchand (2003: 354))

Recall that the second DP in the ACC is obligatorily definite; bare nominals are barred from this position ((5.54) above). Adger and Ramchand derive this definiteness requirement both from structural requirements on nominals in Scottish Gaelic as well as from the meaning of the augment pronoun. The denotation of the augment requires a salient individual to identify the variable x .²⁵ Assuming that only definite DPs can identify an individual variable, it follows that the second DP must be definite.

To prevent a definite interpretation of bare NPs (which outside of copular clauses may be interpreted existentially, introducing a referent into the discourse), Adger and Ramchand propose a syntactic source for the definiteness restriction. Their proposal is that the syntax of Scottish Gaelic DPs restricts adjoined nominals to definite descriptions. To do this, Adger and Ramchand adopt Zamparelli's (2000) nominal functional structure, specifically the SDP (Strong Determiner Phrase) and KIP (Kind Determiner Phrase) layers for Scottish Gaelic nominals. The SDP layer is associated with referentiality and argumenthood, and the KIP layer with nominalized properties or kinds.

Adger and Ramchand (2003: 345) argue from distributional evidence—specifically that definite descriptions are barred from appearing in canonical predicate position—that the definite article in Scottish Gaelic is obligatorily an SD head, and nominals headed by the definite article are obligatorily SDPs. This means that definite descriptions are always associated with a referential interpretation. Bare nominals, pronouns, and proper names, on the other hand, since they are not headed by an overt article, are not obligatorily SDPs, and project to SDP only in argument position. Because the SDP projection is associated with referentiality, this means that bare nominals,

²⁵Note, however, that in truncated clefts it is a property that is identified in the discourse context, not an individual. If we were to amend Adger and Ramchand's proposal, and have the augment stand in for a contextually salient property, it would follow that the second DP in the ACC is a property (i.e. a predicate). However, we would then lose the motivation for adjoining the second DP, since the assumption is that definite DPs cannot be predicates.

pronouns, and proper names cannot be interpreted referentially if they are not in an argument position.

Thus, it is the adjoined status of the second DP in the ACC that forces the definiteness requirement. Because the second DP is not in an argument position, the only nominals which can be interpreted as referential are definite descriptions (DPs headed by the definite article). Bare nominals, pronouns, and proper names cannot be interpreted as referential in this position, since it is not an argument position, and therefore cannot provide the identity of the individual variable in the denotation of the augment. Thus only nominals that are independently and obligatorily SDPs—definite descriptions—can be adjoined and interpreted as the predicate in the ACC.

5.2.2.3 Summary

Adger and Ramchand's analysis is a unified analysis of Scottish Gaelic copula clauses: copula clauses are underlyingly predicational, and the copula heads a predicational structure which uniformly disallows DP predicates. The augment is what functions as the predicate in the ACC, allowing the second, adjoined, DP to be interpreted as predicate without occupying the syntactic predicate position. All structures built from the copula have a derived predicate-subject order driven by the phonological weakness of the copula.

Adger and Ramchand's (2003) analysis of copula clauses makes sense of the differences in word order, the interpretation associated with the copula, the function and position of the augment, and the definiteness restriction on the predicate DP in the ACC. In the next section I will compare Adger and Ramchand's analysis with the one proposed in §5.1. The two analyses differ in the position of the copula, the status of the augment, and the position of the predicate DP. I will discuss evidence that bears on the position of the copula, and show that the distribution of the copula is best understood if it is base-generated in T^0 . Adger and Ramchand's analysis needs additional mechanisms to explain the variation in the form of the augment, and their evidence for an adjoined position of the predicate DP is ambivalent. Because under my analysis the augment plays a crucial role in the structure, the ICC looks quite a bit different from the ACC; I will argue that this is not necessarily a weakness of the analysis, since the ICC is a relatively archaic and idiomatic construction.


5.2.3 Comparison

In this section I compare my proposed analysis for clefts (and by extension the ACC) with Adger and Ramchand's proposed analysis for the ACC (and by extension, clefts). I break down the analyses piecewise, discussing first the copula, then the augment, then inversion, and finally Adger and Ramchand's predictions about the predicate DP in the ACC.


(5.59) shows the competing structures for the ACC, Adger and Ramchand's in (5.59a) and my own in (5.59b). For ease of reference I will refer to Adger and Ramchand's analysis as the INVERSION ANALYSIS of the ACC and mine as the D^0 -AUGMENT ANALYSIS.

(5.59) a.

INVERSION ANALYSIS



b.

D⁰-AUGMENT ANALYSIS

What these structures share is a constituency of the copula and the augment, and a TP and a PredP layer. They differ in their proposals regarding the status of the copula and the augment, and the position of the second DP. In the Inversion analysis in (5.59a) the copula heads the predicational structure, and ends up in a clause-initial position via movement. In the D⁰-Augment analysis in (5.59b) the copula is base-generated in T⁰. In the Inversion analysis the augment is a predicate, and phrasal, and as such originates as the complement of Pred⁰. In the D⁰-Augment analysis the augment heads a functional projection which selects for a predicational DP structure. In both analyses the copula and the augment form a constituent, but in the Inversion analysis they form a constituent by virtue of the Pred' node; in the D⁰-Augment analysis they form a complex head. As for the positions of the DPs, in both analyses the subject DP remains in its base position, inside the predicational structure. The second DP is adjoined in the Inversion analysis, but is in the predicate position in the D⁰-Augment structure.

5.2.3.1 The Copula and Inversion

Adger and Ramchand propose an inversion analysis of the copula: the copula originates low, in Pred⁰ and moves to the specifier of TP, forcing predicate inversion by virtue of its proclitic status. In the D⁰-Augment analysis, the copula originates high, base-generated in T⁰ as a default assumption. In this section, I examine relevant data and argue that, while the Inversion analysis and the D⁰-Augment analysis have minimal differences in the surface syntax, the facts presented here follow straightforwardly from the D⁰-Augment structure and not from the Inversion analysis. The evidence that I will bring to bear on the differences in these structures centers on the behavior of elements in T⁰ (namely, the behavior of finite verbs) and tenseless predicational structures. A range of data support the assumption of the D⁰-Augment analysis, that the copula is in T⁰. The

first pieces of evidence are morphosyntactic: elements of the complementizer system have an effect on the form of the copula, and this is reminiscent of a pattern associated with finite verbs; additionally, the copula patterns with elements in T^0 and C^0 in its effect on the form of the second person singular pronoun. A third piece of evidence concerns the clausal status of comparative and superlative adjectives, which are formed with the copula. Overall, the pattern that emerges is that the copula behaves like a finite verb, and is best understood as being merged in T^0 , as in the D^0 -Augment analysis and *contra* the Inversion analysis of copula clauses.

The Copula and Complementizer Particles

The present tense form of the copula is in complementary distribution with several elements of the complementizer system. We will see that the complementizer particles which force a null form of the copula are the same complementizer particles which trigger the dependent form of finite verbs. The dependent-independent distinction is pervasive for finite verbs, and by extension, elements which occupy T^0 . This provides support for the D^0 -Augment analysis because under that analysis the copula heads T^0 and thus this pattern conforms with the generalization that elements in T^0 participate in the dependent-independent verb form alternation. As for the Inversion analysis, because the copula is in spec,TP and not T itself, the observation that the null form of the copula is found in exactly the same contexts where we find the dependent form of finite verbs can only be a coincidence.

The present tense form of the copula *is* is in complementary distribution with several elements of the complementizer system. This is shown with the polar interrogative particle *an* (5.60a) and the negative embedding complementizer *nach* in (5.60b), with the complementizer boxed. Beneath each sentence is the matrix declarative version, with an overt copula, for comparison.

- (5.60) a. An ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e?
 An ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e?
 Q in.3MSG after you C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 ‘Was he after you?’ ST: 24
cf. ’S ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e. ‘He was after you.’
- b. Thubhairt mo bhean rium nach e mi fhìn a bh’ ann.
 Thubhairt mo bhean rium nach e mi fhìn a bh’
 say.PAST 1SG.POSS woman to.1SG C.NEG 3MSG 1SG self C.REL be.PAST
 ann
 in.3MSG
 ‘My wife said that it wasn’t myself.’ LG: 283
cf. ’S e mi fhìn a bh’ ann. ‘It was myself.’

In the cleft question in (5.60a) the polar interrogative particle *an* is followed immediately by the augment *ann*; the copula is missing. Similarly in the negated embedded cleft in (5.60b), the negative complementizer is followed immediately by the augment *e*.

The present tense form of the copula is also null following the plain embedding complementizer *gu(n)*, but in this case it also affects the realization of the complementizer, yielding *gur* (5.61).²⁶

²⁶The *h-e* form of the augment seems to be a dialect variant of *e*.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

(5.61) Dh'inns e gur h-e 'm fiabhras a bh' air a' ghille.

Dh'inns e gur h-e 'm fiabhras a bh' air a' ghille
 said 3MSG C.COP 3MSG the fever C.REL be.PAST on the boy
 'He said that it was the fever that the boy had.' ST: 12

cf. 'S e 'm fiabhras a bh' air a' ghille. 'It was the fever that the boy had.'
 Dh'inns e gun robh 'm fiabhras air a' ghille. 'He said that the boy had the fever.'

It is not the case, however, that the copula is null with all complementizers. The copula is overt following the relative complementizer *a* (5.62a)²⁷ and the conditional complementizer *ma* 'if' (5.62b).

(5.62) a. An mise an gin as docha leat a chunna tu riamh?

An mise an gin as docha leat a chunna tu
 Q 1SG.EMPH the kind C.REL-COP likely with.2SG C.REL see.PAST 2SG
 riamh?
 before
 'Am I one who is more likely for you to have seen before?' SIA: 41

b. Ma's ann a caoineadh a tha thu nis.

ma 's ann a caoineadh a tha thu nis.
 if COP in.3MSG PROG cry.VN C.REL be.PRES 2SG now
 'If you are crying now.'* (lit. if it is crying that you are now) TWHv1: 17

The present tense copula is overt in matrix declarative clauses and in clauses headed by the relative complementizer and *ma* 'if'. It is null following the plain embedding complementizer, matrix and embedding negation, and the question particle *an*. This pattern is reminiscent of the independent-dependent alternation found in finite verbs (this observation is also made in Gillies (1993: 206); the independent-dependent verb alternation is discussed in Chapter 4.1; see also Lamb (2003: 67), Ostrove (2015)).

While the independent-dependent distinction is traditionally associated with irregular verbs, the pattern itself is fully generalized in Scottish Gaelic (see Ostrove (2015)). In regular verbs the distinction is reflected in the form of the tense suffix itself. This is illustrated in (5.63). In the matrix clause in (5.63a), the form of the finite verb is *chuir*, the independent form. In the negated clause in (5.63b) the form of the finite verb is *do chuir*, the dependent form.

(5.63) a. **Chuir** mi an t-usige-beatha 'san fhuaradair.

Chuir mi an t-usige-beatha 'san fhuaradair.
 put.PAST.INDEP 1SG the whisky in.DEF-the refrigerator
 'I put the whisky in the refrigerator.'

²⁷For the decomposition of the comparative particle *as* into relative complementizer and copula, see Adger (2005).

b. Cha **do chuir** mi an t-uisge-beata ‘san fhuaradair.

Cha do chuir mi an t-uisge-beata ‘san fhuaradair.
 NEG put.PAST.DEP 1SG the whisky in.DEF-the refrigerator

‘I did not put the whisky in the refrigerator.’ (Ostrove 2015: 6)

My proposal is that the overt present tense form of the copula *is* is the independent form; the null form of the copula is the dependent form. This is schematized in Table 5.5 for the copula and the regular verb *cuir*.²⁸ I assume that relevant property of the elements which undergo this independent-

	INDEP (MATRIX, REL C)	DEP (EMBED, NEG & PI)
COP	‘ <i>S</i> ’	∅
CUIR ‘put’	<i>chuir</i>	<i>do chuir</i>

Table 5.5: Independent-Dependent Pattern and the Null Form of the Copula

dependent form alternation is that they are in T^0 (cf. Ostrove (2015)). Under the D^0 -Augment analysis, we can understand the null form of the copula as part of a broader pattern whereby complementizer particles affect the form of the element in T^0 . Under the Inversion analysis, however, the similarities are coincidental, and an alternative explanation is needed. Because the Inversion analysis require a low copula to derive inversion, the appearance of an independent-dependent distinction in the copula cannot have the same (synchronic) source as the independent-dependent distinction found in finite verbs. Instead, a proponent of the Inversion analysis would have to argue against the parallels discussed here, perhaps arguing that the similarities are morphological fossils.

The form of the 2SG pronoun

The copula participates in another morphological pattern found with finite verbs: it is one of a subset of elements which trigger the *tu* /tu/ form of the second person singular pronoun. This form is opposed to the *thu* /u/ form found elsewhere (e.g. (5.62) above).²⁹ The form *tu* surfaces when preceded by the elements listed in Table 5.6 (see also Byrne (2004), Adger (2000)). These are all elements associated with a relatively high position in the structure, namely T^0 or C^0 . Illustrative examples follow in (5.64)-(5.67).

The form *tu* is found immediately after the copula, as in the copula clause in (5.64).

(5.64) ’S **tu** ’m fear mu dheireadh a gheobhadh as
 COP 2SG the man last C.REL get.COND out-of.3MSG
 ‘You are the last man who will escape’ ST: 24

²⁸For purposes of comparison, I focus on the form of verb, and ignore the effect that the copula has on the plain embedding complementizer *gu(n)*, for which I currently have no explanation. I also leave out of the comparison the fact that the relative complementizer *a* triggers the relative future form of the verb. The copula is defective in tense, and lacks a distinct future form (see Gillies (1993) for discussion). This defective nature of the copula is perhaps unsurprising under the analysis proposed here, which has the copula selecting for a DP rather than a VP complement.

²⁹The *tu-thu* distinction is historically derived from contexts where lenition processes were blocked: *tu*, the non-lenited form, occurred following homorganic consonants (Gillies 1993: 167-68).

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS

- The copula *is* (5.64)
- Complementizer particles (*gu(n)*, *an* (5.65a), *nach* (5.65b), *cha*)
- Coordination *agus* (5.66)
- Conditional verbs (5.67a), and future verbs ending in *-aidh* (5.67b) or *-eas* (5.67c)
- The irregular verbs *faca* and *chuala*

Table 5.6: Environments for *tu*

Tu also occurs immediately following elements of the complementizer system. The context for this seems to typically be copula clauses; recall that the copula is null following these elements. This is shown in the polar interrogative in (5.65a) and the negative polar interrogative in (5.65b), both formed on copula clauses. The emphatic form of the pronoun (*tusa* in (5.65a)) does not affect the *tu-thu* distinction; compare the emphatic form *thusa* following the auxiliary in (5.66) below.

- (5.65) a. An **tusa** Mire-gath-gréine?
 Q 2SG.EMPH Play-Sunbeam
 ‘Are you Play of Sunbeam?’ FTFL: 210
- b. Nach **tu** Tómas Sheochd?
 Q.NEG 2SG Thomas Jock.GEN
 ‘Are you not Thomas, son of Jock?’ FTFL: 172

The form *tu* is also found immediately following *agus* ‘and’, often shortened to *is* or even ‘s. This is shown in the small clause construction underlined in (5.66).³⁰

- (5.66) Tha *thusa* an sin, a Mhurchaidh Bhuidhe nam Fiadh, is **tu** air fàs liath ad shuidhe air sliabh Beinn an Oir.
 Tha thusa an sin, a Mhurchaidh Bhuidhe nam Fiadh, is tu air
 be.PRES 2SG.EMPH there VOC Yellow Murdoch of the Deer and 2SG on
 fàs liath ad shuidhe air sliabh Beinn an Oir.
 grow.VN gray 2SG.POSS sit.VN on side Ben-an-Or
 ‘There you are, Yellow Murdoch of the Deer, grown grey sitting on the side of Ben-an-Or.’
 (lit. ‘and you grown gray sitting on the side of Ben-an-Or’) FTFL: 202

Tu also follows future verbs ending in *-(a)idh* (5.67a) or *-(e)as* (5.67b) (i.e. the independent or relative future forms), and conditional verbs (5.67c).

³⁰That (5.66) clearly involves *agus* and not the copula is indicated by i) its function as a modifier (typical of such tenseless clauses headed by *agus*; cf. discussion of the Irish facts in Chung and McCloskey (1987)), and ii) the predicate *air fàs liath...* ‘grown gray...’, being a prepositional predicate, would be expected to follow the copula (i.e. invert) if this were a copula clause.

- (5.67) a. B' fhearr leam gu 'n **cuireadh** **tu** crùidhean air an each
 COP better with.1SG C put.COND.DEP 2SG horseshoe.PL on the horse
 agam
 at.1SG
 'I wish you would shoe my horse' FTFLL: 26
- b. **Feumaidh** **tu** falbh dhachaidh leam
 must.FUT 2SG go.VN home with.1SG
 'You must go home with me' LG: 265
- c. Ach so an ni a **dh' fheumas** **tu** a dheanamh
 but DEM the thing C.REL must.FUT.REL 2SG OPTCL do.VN
 'But this is what you must do' FTFLL: 310

The form *tu* of the second person singular pronoun is conditioned by a class of elements which include the copula, complementizers (this group may involve the null form of the copula), the coordinator *agus*, and a subset of finite verbs. That is, the choice of *tu* versus *thu* is a morphological distinction based on the morphosyntactic context of the 2SG pronoun (cf. Adger (2000: 97) for a similar claim that the *tu-thu* variation is morphological). I am unaware of a detailed discussion of the syntax of *agus* 'and' in Scottish Gaelic, but it would likely be in C, although in the small clause contexts discussed above it is possible that it is in fact in T, selecting for a PredP. Whatever the correct analysis of *agus*, I would like to propose that these items form a natural class of syntactically high elements which sit in T or C.³¹ For our purposes, the generalization may be stated as follows: it is a prerequisite that the elements which trigger the *tu* form of the pronoun be in T or C. For the D⁰-Augment analysis, nothing more needs to be said since the copula is proposed to occupy T⁰. For the Inversion analysis, because the copula is in spec,TP, the fact that it patterns with syntactically higher elements has to remain a stipulation on the class of elements which condition the *tu* form of the verb. In particular, one would have to argue that the elements triggering the form *tu* are simply a morphological class of triggers with no underlying syntactic similarities. As with the above argument from the parallels with finite verbs and the independent-dependent distinction, the support for categorizing the copula as a T⁰ head comes from the range of phenomena which subsequently receive a more explanatory analysis.

The Clausal Status of Comparative Adjectives

The morphosyntax of comparative (and superlative) adjectives constitutes a third area in which the Inversion analysis must provide an additional explanation but where the D⁰-Augment analysis extends to the facts straightforwardly. The relevant data comes from comparative adjectives—and their particular morphosyntactic makeup—in small clauses, which are essentially PredP structures. Small clauses, being tenseless structures, provide a means of distinguishing between an analysis where the copula heads PredP from an analysis where the copula selects for (a head that selects for) such a structure.

Small clauses in Scottish Gaelic, as in Irish (cf. Chung and McCloskey (1987)), can be used adverbially in constructions headed by *agus* 'and'. An example of this adverbial small clause is


³¹That T and C are a reasonable basis for a natural class finds support in the Old Irish 'verbal complex', which was made up of complementizers and the finite verb as well as clitic pronouns (cf. Thurneysen (1980)). Alternatively, the coordinator might be proposed to be in T⁰ in small clause constructions. This, along with the null form of the copula in T, makes for a very neat generalization whereby the elements which trigger the *tu* form are in T⁰.

given in (5.68). The predicational constituent is underlined in both the Gaelic and the English translation. The structure for the small clause is provided in (5.69) for clarity.

(5.68) “S dé tha ‘n seo?” ars esan, ‘s e cur a làimh’ air a ghualainn.

“S dé tha ‘n seo?” ars esan, ‘s e cur a
 and what be.PRES here said 3MSG.EMPH and 3MSG put.VN 3MSG.POSS
 làimh’ air a ghualainn.
 hand on 3MSG.POSS shoulder
 “And what’s this?” he asked, putting his hand on his shoulder.

ST: 29



In adverbial small clauses, the coordinator *agus* ‘and’ selects for a PredP structure (5.69).³² Under the inversion analysis, the PredP structure in (5.69) is the base of a SAC, with a null element heading Pred⁰.

In predicational structures which form the base of an ICC or ACC, the copula heads PredP in the Inversion analysis. The prediction made by this is that, where such structures are used as adverbial small clauses, we should find the copula, and that nothing more than the predicational structure headed by the copula will surface. Below I show that this is the wrong prediction, based on comparative adjectives in adverbial small clauses. I first briefly outline the syntax associated with comparative adjectives before turning to comparative adjectives in adverbial small clause structures.

The prediction of the Inversion analysis is that because comparative adjectives involve a PredP headed by the copula, no additional morphosyntax should be needed when the comparative adjective appears in small clauses. That is, where comparative adjectives are found in adverbial small clauses, just the PredP, consisting of the copular subject, the copula, and the adjective, should surface. This prediction is not borne out, and we find that even in adverbial small clauses the comparative adjective involves a fully clausal (i.e. tensed) structure. This is surprising if the copula is no higher than Pred⁰. By contrast, the D⁰-Augment analysis, which posits that the copula heads T⁰, extends easily to these facts. If the copula is a T⁰ element, then wherever it surfaces we expect to find a full clause.

Comparative adjectives require additional morphosyntactic structure ((*n*)*as*) to function either predicatively (5.70c) or attributively (5.71c).

³²I remain agnostic as to the exact category of *agus* in these constructions, using &P as a descriptive term only.

CHAPTER 5. THE STRUCTURE OF CLEFTS


- (5.70) a. Tha an gille òg
 be.PRES the boy young
 ‘The boy is young.’
 b. *Tha an gille òige
 be.PRES the boy young.COMP
 ‘The boy is younger.’ (Adger 2005: 3)
 c. Tha an gille nas òige
 be.PRES the boy NAS young.COMP
 ‘The boy is younger.’ (cf. Adger (2005: 4))

- (5.71) a. an gille òg
 the boy young
 ‘the young boy’
 b. *an gille òige
 the boy young.COMP
 ‘the younger boy’ (Adger 2005: 4)
 c. an gille as òige
 the boy AS young.COMP
 ‘the younger boy’ (Adger 2005: 5)

Adger (2005: 5-8) argues that this additional morphosyntactic structure is comprised of the copula and the relative complementizer. He shows that the structure underlying comparative adjectives is essentially an ICC, given in (5.72).

- (5.72) Is òige mise.
 COP young.COMP 1SG.EMPH
 ‘I am younger.’ (Adger 2005: 5)

Comparative adjectives, then, are essentially relative clauses built from an ICC structure. The additional morphosyntactic pieces required for comparatives are the relative complementizer *a* and the copula *is*. Thus the underlying structure of comparatives is given in (5.73) for (5.72).³³ For the Inversion analysis, the ICC structure is the TP constituent of the tree in (5.73).



³³Adger (2005) argues that the *n* in *nas* in (5.70) is the preposition *ann*. This is the same *ann* found with nominal predicates of the SAC.

Because the string *mise is òige* is a PredP constituent, we might expect it to be available in an adverbial small clause. While comparative adjectives can occur in small clauses, the predicted string is not what surfaces. Comparative adjectives obligatorily involve extraction, whether in predicative position, attributive position, or small clauses. We see this in (5.74a) in the appearance of the relative complementizer *a*. When the relative complementizer is omitted (5.74b), the result is ungrammatical.

- (5.74) a. Agus bha an teaghlach a staigh air fad an uair sin, 's mi fhìn a b'òige dha na gillean.
 Agus bha an teaghlach a staigh air fad an uair sin, 's mi fhìn
 and be.PAST the family inside length then and 1SG self
 a b' òige dha na gillean.
 C.REL COP young.COMP of the.PL boy.PL
 'And the family was there the whole time then, myself being the youngest of the
boys.'* ST: 6
- b. ...*'s mi fhìn b'òige dha na gillean. GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS

In small clause (i.e. PredP) structures involving the copula, the bare PredP structure posited in the Inversion analysis does not surface. Instead, we find a fully clausal structure involving an A-bar dependency. That there is a fully clausal structure in (5.74) is also suggested by the past-tense form of the copula *b'*.

While it may be possible to provide an explanation for the fact that we do not find bare PredP structures in adverbial small clauses (perhaps there is some incompatibility in the semantics which relativization fixes), and thus maintain the Inversion analysis, under the D⁰-Augment analysis, the clausal structure in (5.74) is predicted. The copula requires a fully clausal structure. Thus, where a copular structure appears in small clauses structures such as (5.74), a predicative structure must be created, and relativization does this.

Summary


In this section we saw a range of evidence that suggests the copula occupies T⁰. The complementarity of the copula with certain complementizers is strikingly similar to the independent-dependent distinction associated with finite verbs (i.e. associated with T⁰).³⁴ The copula belongs to a class of elements that condition the *tu* form of the second person singular pronoun, and these elements form a natural class if we assume they are high in the structure (in T⁰ or possibly C⁰). Evidence from small clauses indicates that the copula is not base-generated low in the structure, but must originate higher than the small clause. I conclude that the copula is base-generated in T (cf. Acquaviva (2014) for a similar conclusion regarding the Irish copula).

Before continuing the comparison of the Inversion and D⁰-Augment structures, I would like to briefly address how the Inversion analysis might be saved by relocating the copula to T⁰. Recall that it is the low position of the copula which provides the means for Adger and Ramchand to derive the predicate-subject word order in the ICC and ACC from the subject-predicate order in the underlying predicational structure. It is through the phonological weakness of the copula that the predicate inverts, and the pied-piping of Pred' serves to satisfy the EPP feature on T⁰. If the

³⁴One may be curious about other elements which may be assumed to occupy T. Modals in Scottish Gaelic come in two types: verbal modals, such as *faod(aidh)* 'must', which behave like finite verbs, and copular modals, such as '*s urrainn* 'can', whose structure is reminiscent of the ICC.

copula is not base-generated in a low position, it cannot pied-pipe the predicate, and the predicate-subject order of the ICC (and ACC) is underived. To maintain Adger and Ramchand's analysis, but have the copula in T^0 , we need an alternative way of deriving inversion.

It is tempting to pursue a parallel with copula clause inversions attested cross-linguistically, and motivate inversion through information-structural considerations (cf. Mikkelsen (2005), a.o.), specifically by having spec,TP associated with topical information. The resulting structure would look like the tree in (5.75) (the copula in T , being a proclitic, would surface to the left of the element in spec,TP).



This, however, is problematic, at least for the ACC (ICCs are relatively rare in texts): no clear pattern emerges whereby the predicate is consistently old, or even new.³⁵ This is shown in (5.76), where the copular subject is bolded and the predicate bracketed; old information is italicized and new information is boxed.

- (5.76) a. B' e *ainm a' bhaile seo* [St. Valery-en-caux]
 B' e ainm a' bhaile seo St. Valery-en-caux.
 COP 3MSG name the town DEM St. Valery-en-caux
 'This was St. Valer-en-caux.' (the name of this town was St. Valery-en-caux) FSS: 18
- b. 'S e **Tormod MacIlleathain agus Eairdsidh Mor Mac-a-Phi a Uibhist a Deas**
le cheile [*a' chiad dithis a theich as a' champa seo*]
 'S e Tormod MacIlleathain agus Eairdsidh Mor Mac-a-Phi a
 COP 3MSG Norman Maclean and Archie Big Macphee from
 Uibhist a Deas le cheile a' chiad dithis a theich
 Uist South with each.other the first two C.REL escape.PAST
 as a' champa seo.
 from.DEF the camp DEM
 'Norman Maclean and Big Archie Macphee from South Uist were the first two to
 escape from this camp.' FSS: 60

³⁵Unsurprisingly, clefts do show a clear pattern whereby the relative clause signals old information.

In (5.76a) the predicate *St. Valery-en-caux* aligns with new information, but in (5.76b) the predicate *a' chiad dithis a theich as a' champa seo* ‘the first two to escape from this camp’ instead aligns with old information. There is no clear information structural pattern in ACCs, and so inversion cannot be driven by information-structural considerations.

Alternatively, it would be possible to derive predicate inversion via a stipulatory syntactic bundling of EPP on T with a [*uPred*] feature (thus the feature specification of the copula would be [T, *uPred*, EPP]). While such an account does capture an intuition regarding verb-initial languages (i.e. that they tend to be predicate-initial), this occurs only in copula clauses: predicates otherwise follow the subject in predicational structures (e.g. in the SAC).

5.2.3.2 The Augment

In Adger and Ramchand’s Inversion analysis, the augment is a phrasal complement of PredP; in the D⁰-Augment analysis, the augment heads a nominal functional structure which selects for a PredP. The result of the Inversion analysis is the correlation of the augment with a certain type of predicate: the augment does not appear with non-DP predicates because it is itself a predicate, and competes with non-DP predicates for this position. The D⁰-Augment structure captures this same intuition through selection: the augment selects for a non-lexical predicate (i.e. one headed by a functional projection).

Recall, however, that another major characteristic of the augment is that it agrees with the subject in nominal status, and that furthermore it is optionally in complementary distribution with a pronominal subject. Under the D⁰-Augment analysis the full range of facts were accounted for via feature valuation of the [D:] feature on the augment. Adger and Ramchand (2003) do not deal with the variation of the form of the augment in their analysis, though it is possible to assume something similar to what was proposed as part of the D⁰-Augment analysis. However, there are two reasons to disprefer the Inversion analysis. First, the Inversion analysis proposes that definite descriptions are barred from predicate position; this means that there is no available functional structure associated with the augment which can be valued in the same way as in the D⁰-Augment analysis. Second, and relatedly, the Agree operation would obligatorily probe upwards from the augment in predicate position to find the copular subject. While upwards Agree has been argued for with other languages (e.g. Zeijlstra (2012), Wurmbrand (2012)), its existence is under debate (cf. Preminger (2013), a.o.). Additionally, the only other context where an agreement-like morpheme surfaces in a position below the controller of agreement is in nominal predication and passive structures, both of whose syntax is understudied, but both of which involve additional functional structure, and so could conceivably be analyzed as involving movement of the subject from a position below the agreement morpheme.

The D⁰-Augment analysis, because it takes clefts and the corresponding variation in the form of the augment as the starting point for copular structure, can account for the connection between the augment and certain types of predicate (via selection) and for the variation in form (feature-valuation of a functional head). The Inversion analysis, on the other hand, while it captures the complementarity between the augment and certain types of predicates, does not easily extend to the variation in the form of the augment.

5.2.3.3 Position of the Predicate DP

In the Inversion structure, the second DP of the ACC is adjoined, and is interpreted as providing the relevant individual for the property being ascribed to the subject. The adjoined position was argued to derive the restriction of the second DP to definite descriptions. Recall that Adger and Ramchand’s proposal was that only phrases headed by the definite article could independently denote individuals; all other nominals, including proper names and pronouns, may be interpreted as individuals only in argument position. The account, however, is overly restrictive: the second DP in an ACC can in fact be a proper name (5.77).

(5.77) ’S e Calum [Hamlet]

’S e Calum Hamlet

COP 3MSG Calum Hamlet

‘Calum is (playing) Hamlet’

(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 353)

Proper names, because they are not headed by the definite article, are not supposed to be independently referential, and thus should not be able to provide an individual reference in a non-argument position. This means that at least one of the claims in the Inversion analysis is incorrect: the second DP is not adjoined, or the claim about the distribution of referentially-interpreted nouns is wrong.

The distribution of nouns in Scottish Gaelic provided the basis for the claim that the second DP is adjoined, and Adger and Ramchand claim that the adjoined position of the second DP explains some additional facts about ACCs. These are that the second DP is destressed, that the second DP cannot provide the new information in an answer to a *wh*-question, and that adverbs can precede the second DP (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 354). Adger and Ramchand note that the first two—the destressed and non-focus status of the second DP—can be derived from information structural considerations, namely that the second DP conveys given or backgrounded information.³⁶ This can presumably be achieved without adjunction.

As for the positioning of adverbs, Adger and Ramchand point to the examples in (5.78) as evidence against an equative structure underlying the ACC: the adverbs in (5.78) cannot precede objects in transitive constructions, and an equative structure is essentially a transitive construction, meaning that the second DP is in object position. (5.78) provides evidence against a structure where the second DP is the complement to an equative Pred⁰.

(5.78) a. B’ e Mairi **an uair sin** [an tidear].

B’ e Mairi an uair sin an tidear

COP 3MSG Mary then the teacher

‘Mary was the teacher then’

b. ’S e Calum **gu fortanach** [Hamlet] a-nochd.

’S e Calum gu fortanach Hamlet a-nochd.

COP 3MSG Calum fortunately Hamlet tonight

‘Fortunately Calum is Hamlet tonight’

(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 341)

³⁶However, as noted above, a survey of naturally-occurring ACCs indicates that the information structure of the two DPs in ACCs is not seem fixed in this way. This is clearly a point for further research.

Because these adverbs can precede the second DP, the second DP cannot be in object position; Adger and Ramchand (2003) conclude that the second DP is adjoined.

However, while such adverbs cannot precede the object, they can precede an *in-situ* predicate (5.79).³⁷

(5.79) Bha sinn **an latha seo** [a' dol tro Yvetot].

Bha sinn an latha seo a' dol tro Yvetot
 be.PAST 1PL the day DEM PROG go.VN through Yvetot
 ‘One day (lit. this day) we were passing through Yvetot’

FSS: 28

Recall that in the D⁰-Augment structure, the second DP is an *in-situ* predicate. Thus the D⁰-Augment analysis is compatible with the adverbial placement data in (5.78). The other two properties can be accounted for with the D⁰-Augment structure as well. The tendency for the second DP to be associated with given information could come from forming the augment forming a definite description of sorts with the predicative DP, as it does with clefts however, the information structure of the ACC is not fixed). The definiteness requirement on the second DP in the ACC could be viewed as feeding the function of the augment: the augment signals the presence of a non-canonical predication relationship.³⁸

The properties of the second DP in the ACC require further research; in the meantime, I maintain that the facts surrounding the second DP provide no convincing evidence either for the Inversion analysis, nor against the D⁰-Augment analysis.

5.2.3.4 Summary

In this section I compared my proposal for the ACC—the D⁰-Augment analysis—with the Inversion analysis proposed in Adger and Ramchand (2003). The D⁰-Augment analysis easily made sense of the fact that the copula patterns with other elements in T⁰ and that it is consistently found in fully-clausal structures and not sub-clausal ones. The Inversion analysis, as it stands, must make

³⁷Incidentally, these adverbs can also precede the relative clause in clefts *’S e Màiri, gu fortanach, a thainig dha’n taigh a-raoir* ‘It was Mary, fortunately, who came to the house last night’ (GLA_GMM_20OCT2016_CMS). This isn’t as definitive as the ACCs in (5.78), however, because CPs, including relative clauses, have a tendency postpose to the end of the clause.

³⁸In fact, there is precedent for this sort of a relationship in the literature: Geist (2007) in particular argues for Russian that the pronoun that occurs in equative structures is a reflection of a type-shifted copula, required precisely in the context of a referential DP predicate. The parallels to the Scottish Gaelic case are clear (and noted by Geist herself). In particular, we could view the function of the augment in Scottish Gaelic as a means of reflecting this type-shifting of a null predicational head. The only caveat is that for Geist the pronoun in Russian is the type-shifted predicate, and in this way is more parallel to Adger and Ramchand’s (2003) proposal. In fact, under the D⁰-augment analysis, the augment occurs in the wrong position to apply just to a predicational head. If the augment in Scottish Gaelic were to reflect the type-shifting operation required for a DP predicate, it would scope over the whole predicational structure. I’m not sure if this is semantically prohibited, or what the resulting meaning would be. I do, think, however, that this is perhaps a place for further research regarding the use of copular morphosyntax in clefts. Namely, it strikes me that the idea that the cleft pronoun and relative clause in clefts form a discontinuous definite description might be parallel to the idea that a type-shifting operator, reflected by the presence of a pronoun, must apply in copular clauses with a definite predicate (i.e. in equative structures).

additional claims or explanations to account for this. The D⁰-Augment analysis also accounts for the agreement facts of the augment. The Inversion analysis, however, must at the very least assume upwards-probing Agree. A comparison in the claims regarding the position of the second DP of the ACC seem ambivalent. The proposal for the second DP in the Inversion analysis was overly restrictive, but without a fuller understanding of which DPs can occur in second position, and when, it is unclear how problematic this is; a similar issue remains for the D⁰-Augment analysis. Further research is needed to fully understand the ACC.

In the next section I turn to the ICC. The structure of the ICC, because it lacks the augment, is slightly divergent from that of the ACC. This makes sense of the fact that the ICC is relatively archaic and seems to be increasingly less productive (Lamb 2003: 68).

5.2.4 Structure for the Inverted Copula Clause

I turn now to the structure of the ICC (5.80). Recall that the ICC utilizes the copula, has a lexical (NP, VP, or AP) predicate which immediately follows the copula, and, crucially, lacks the augment pronoun.

(5.80) Is [tidsear] Calum. ICC

Is tidsear Calum.

COP teacher Calum

‘Calum is a teacher.’

(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 335)

Additionally, the ICC is relatively formal and archaic in the language (Lamb 2003: 68). Examples such as (5.80) are attested, and accepted by speakers, but the preferred way of expressing ‘Calum is a teacher’ seems to be the predicate nominal cleft in (5.81).

(5.81) ‘S e tidsear a th’ ann an Calum.

‘S e tidsear a th’ ann an Calum

COP 3MSG teacher C.REL be.PRES in Calum

‘Calum is a teacher.’

Where the ICC structure is still frequent in the language is in idiomatic expressions (5.82). In (5.82) the predicate is the adjectival phrase *beag orm*.

(5.82) Is [beag orm] marag.

Is beag orm marag


COP little on.1SG blood-pudding

‘I dislike blood pudding’ (lit. ‘Blood pudding is little on me.’)

(Lamb 2003: 73)

I propose that the ICC structure is similar to the ACC in that the copula selects for a nominal structure, but that the nominal structure in the ICC is not headed by the augment. Furthermore,

the nominal structure selects for a lexical complement, whereas in the ACC the predicate is a DP.³⁹



This nominal structure has a rightward specifier, obviating the need for movement, which is otherwise unmotivated (see §5.2.3.1).⁴⁰ While it is possible to have the DP in (5.81) select for a predicational structure, just like the augment, I hesitate to propose this. The reason for this is that the predicates which occur in the ICC are most productively nominal, with a restricted set of prepositions and adjectives. With a PredP structure underlying the ICC, it would be difficult to prevent any possible predicate from occurring in the ICC.

5.3 Summary

In this chapter I argued for a cleft structure where the copula is a T^0 head, and selects for a particular kind of DP headed by the augment, which in turn selects for a predicational structure instantiated by the relative clause. The augment has an unvalued [D:] feature, whose valuation (or lack thereof) conditions the spell-out of the augment. I extended this structure to the ACC, and compared it to a structure proposed in Adger and Ramchand (2003). I argued that my proposal covers more empirical ground. I then proposed a structure for the ICC, which differs from the ACC in the absence of the augment and a lack of a predicational structure.

³⁹See also Lash (2011: 248) for a deverbal structure in Old Irish copula clauses, although for Lash the copula selects for a PredP structure.

⁴⁰This structure also makes natural an corollary of Adger and Ramchand's analysis that adjectives and prepositional phrases in the ICC are nominalized (Adger and Ramchand 2003: 338, fn. 8). Adger and Ramchand (2003: 347) derive this nominalized status of the predicate by proposing that the complement to the copula is Zamparelli's (2000) KIP projection, which nominalizes the (lexically restricted) AP or PP. In this analysis, the nominalization is built into the selectional requirement of the copula.

Chapter 6

The Syntax of the Propositional Cleft

In this chapter I extend the structure proposed for regular clefts in the last chapter to the Propositional Cleft. I then show that this structure derives the particular pragmatics of the PC. The relative complementizer reflects the presence of the CLEFT operator. While the CLEFT operator typically triggers movement of the focus-marked constituent to its specifier, I argue that the broad focus-marking in the PC prevents movement. This means for Scottish Gaelic that the presence of the relative complementizer is not necessarily a diagnostic for movement, but rather signals the presence of an operator. While operators typically involve movement, this is not part of the featural specification of the relative complementizer. Instead the [*uFoc*] feature on the relative complementizer must be checked in a sufficiently local relationship. This is typically achieved by moving the FocP to spec,CP, but in the case of the PC the feature can be checked *in situ*. I then argue that the broad focus-marking in the PC also explains the restrictions on questioning and negation in the PC, and discuss instances of embedded PCs before concluding.

6.1 Cleft Meaning and Structure

Clefts in Scottish Gaelic are focus constructions which utilize a copular structure to convey the focus meaning. In this section I briefly recap the content of Chapters 2 and 5 before turning to how the meaning of the PC—as broad identificational focus—is derived syntactically.

6.1.1 The Meaning of Clefts

In Chapter 2 I presented evidence that regular clefts convey identificational (i.e. exhaustive, contrastive) focus. The exhaustive meaning of clefts was shown not to be part of the at-issue content, and furthermore we saw evidence that the clefted constituent is not necessarily identical to the focus part of the utterance. The relevant data is repeated in (6.1)-(6.2). (6.1) shows a cleft, with a complex nominal as clefted constituent (bracketed).

(6.1) 'S e [an nighean as sine aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.

'S e an nighean as sine aig Iain a sheinn oran a-raoir
 COP 3MSG the daughter eldest at Ian C.REL sing.PAST song last-night
 'It was John's eldest daughter who sang a song last night.'

With a relatively neutral prosody,¹ the cleft in (6.2) behaves as expected, with the clefted constituent interpreted as exhaustive. However, a subpart of this clefted constituent can be stressed (6.2b,c), in which case the stressed constituent, and not the entire clefted constituent, is interpreted as exhaustive. Given the cleft sentence in (6.1), what is interpreted as exhaustively focused may vary depending on stress placement. This is illustrated in (6.2), where the constituent in small caps is perceived as being more prominent.

- (6.2) a. 'S e [an nighean as sine aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 → No one else sang last night.
- b. 'S e [an nighean AS SINE aig Iain] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 → None of John's other daughters sang; although someone else may have.
- c. 'S e [an nighean as sine AIG IAIN] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
 → No one else's eldest daughter sang; others may have. GLA__IC__15SEP2016__CMS

What (6.1) shows is that the interpretation of focus is not limited to the clefted constituent. The syntactic displacement of a constituent and the interpretation as focus are independent, and the interpretation of exhaustivity in clefts is sensitive to the focus-marked constituent, and this is not necessarily the clefted constituent.

Given the focus-sensitivity of clefts, I adopted the CLEFT operator in Velleman et al. (2012) to derive the exhaustivity in clefts. The CLEFT operator, presupposes the maximality of the proposition expressed in the cleft relative to other possible answers to the QUD. The *S* subscript indicates an indexation to the current context; this is what allows focus sensitivity (Velleman et al. 2012: *fn.* 1).

- (6.3) $\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w). \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)$
 Requires a question of the form $\lambda x. p(x)$
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than p
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as p (Velleman et al. 2012)

In Chapter 3 I proposed an amendment to the QUD requirement, such that, instead of requiring a question *per se*, the CLEFT operator requires a partitioning on the Context Set, which is interpreted as the QUD which is necessary for evaluating alternative answers. This partitioning is typically provided by the question evoked in the focal structure of a narrow-focus utterance, but must be provided by the context in the case of broad focus.


¹A comprehensive study of the prosodic nature of stress and focus is beyond the scope of this dissertation. For some comments on Scottish Gaelic prosody, and particularly the fact that stress may be employed to mark focus, see Gillies (1993: 166), Nance (2013: 161).

- (6.4) $CLEFT_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: MAX_S(p)(w).MIN_S(p)(w)$ (final version)
 Requires a partition on the Context Set.
 Presupposes: there is no true answer to the QUD stronger than p
 Asserts: there is a true answer to the QUD at least as strong as p

The presence of the CLEFT operator is responsible for the focus contribution of clefts as well as the exhaustive interpretation.

6.1.2 Cleft Syntax

In Chapter 5 I proposed the structure in (6.5) for Scottish Gaelic clefts. The CP headed by the relative clause is selected for by a DP headed by the augment, which is in turn selected directly by the copula in T.



The relationship between the focus-marked constituent and the CLEFT operator is reflected in the syntax by a FocP and the relative complementizer. The clefted constituent moves from its base position inside of the relative clause to spec,CP. This movement is necessary to create a spec-head relationship for checking C's $[uFOC]$ feature. The augment is merged, taking the relative CP as its complement. The augment probes downwards, searching for a value for its unvalued $[D:]$ feature. The value it is searching for is a nominal value, found on nouns and nominalized phrases. It finds the complement of FocP in spec,CP, and undergoes agreement with (the head of) this phrase, if the phrase is nominal. If the augment fails to find a nominal in its domain, the feature remains unvalued. The resulting (non)valuation conditions the spell-out of the augment as either e or ann . The augment then right-adjoins to the copula in T.

6.1.3 Summary

The meaning of clefts is computed via the structural configuration of focus-marking (syntactically represented by FocP) and the CLEFT operator. The CLEFT operator sits in spec,CP and requires that an Agree relation be set up between the Focus Phrase and the relative complementizer. FocP then moves to spec,CP, where it may value the [η :] feature of the augment.

6.2 The Propositional Cleft

In this section I extend the above cleft structure to the PC after recapping the proposed meaning of the PC. The basic assumption that the FocP always moves to spec,CP makes the wrong prediction for the PC. I will argue that the FocP in the PC, being the complement of the C^0 head bearing [$u\text{Foc}$], is able to check that feature without movement. I then discuss how this structure derives the interpretation of the PC.


6.2.1 The Meaning of the Propositional Cleft

In chapter 3 I argued that the PC conveys broad identificational focus. One striking characteristic of the PC is its non-congruence: it cannot felicitously answer a *wh*-question, nor can it directly answer a polar interrogative. It may, however, be used in response to a polar interrogative when it answers a super-question of the polar interrogative, where the answer to the polar interrogative is negative. From these data, I proposed that the function of the PC is to revise the line of inquiry. As such, the PC requires a discourse context where there are not only competing propositions (this is essentially true for all focus constructions, cf. Rooth (1992)), but also competing (or multiple) questions. Assuming a hierarchical structure of discourse, this amounts to a minimum requirement that there be a current question and a super-question in the preceding discourse. This effectively rules out the PC in normal out-of-the-blue contexts. If this discourse shape is met, and the content within the discourse is such that a move to a different line of inquiry is reasonable, and that the PC provides the answer to the super-question, then the PC is predicted to be felicitous and meaningful.

I derived this pragmatic function of the PC via the interaction of broad focus-marking and the CLEFT operator. In particular, the CLEFT operator requires a partitioning on the Context Set for semantic well-formedness (cf. (6.4) above). I argued that broad focus-marking fails to provide this requisite partitioning, and so the PC can only occur in contexts where there is an outstanding partitioning, in the form of an unanswered super-question.

6.2.2 The Predicted Structure for the Propositional Cleft

Based on the structure proposed for clefts above, we arrive at the predicted but ungrammatical structure for the PC in (6.6). The use of the relative complementizer reflects the presence of the CLEFT operator, and broad focus-marking corresponds to a FocP with a TP complement.




*'S ann thòisich is' air caoineadh a.
 COP in.3MSG begin.PAST 3FSG.EMPH on cry.VN C.REL
 for 'It was then she began crying'

The relative complementizer, with the CLEFT operator in its specifier, searches for a [FOC] feature, borne by the Foc^0 head. Recall that we assumed movement to spec,CP is driven by a need for a specifier-head structural relationship. Presumably, the checking of C's [uFOC] feature requires this structural proximity. However, this derives the wrong structure for the PC.

While the presence of the CLEFT operator is sufficient to explain the use of the relative complementizer, we have not successfully explained the lack of movement in the PC. In the next section I argue that this structure is not derived because what is needed to check the [uFoc] feature on C is not a spec-head relationship *per se*, but a sufficiently local relationship. The FocP of the PC, being in a complement position to C, counts as being local enough. This idea regarding the locality of feature-checking is proposed in Abels (2003) to account for similar structures where movement fails to apply.


6.2.3 The Syntax of the Propositional Cleft

The base-generated structure of the PC (6.7) is such that the [uFOC] feature on C can be checked without movement.



The $[uFOC]$ feature on C is checked *in situ*, and no movement applies. This is essentially Abels' (2003) theory of Anti-Locality, where the relationship between the head and its complement is as local as the relationship between the head and its specifier. Because movement to the specifier from complement position fails to create a closer relationship to the head, such movement is blocked due to Last Resort considerations (Abels 2003: 92).

This gives the complete, and grammatical structure for the PC in (6.8). The structure is nearly identical to that of regular clefts; the only difference is that movement to spec,CP has not occurred.



In the PC the FocP thus stays *in situ*, inside the relative clause. When the augment probes for a goal to value its $[\eta:]$ feature, it finds no relevant value and is spelled out as *ann*.²

Thus we explain the use of the relative complementizer, the form of the augment as *ann*, as well as the absence of movement in the PC. The relative complementizer betrays the presence of the CLEFT operator because the PC is a member of the cleft paradigm (cf. McCloskey (2002: 203) for a similar conclusion regarding Irish *aL* as indicative of an operator-variable structure, and Rooth (1992) with respect to focus specifically). Movement fails to apply. Broad focus-marking is syntactically realized by a FocP taking a TP complement. Because the FocP bears the $[FOC]$ feature which checks the $[uFOC]$ feature on C is merged as complement of C, it can check this feature *in situ*, and further movement is unnecessary.

²I assume the phasal status of CP makes the complement of C inaccessible to further operations.

6.2.4 Summary

The broad focus marking in the PC has an effect both on the meaning of the PC and on its syntax. For the semantics and pragmatics of the PC, the broad focus-marking means that no partition is created on the Context Set, and the meaning of the CLEFT operator is such that the PC must appear in a context where there is already a partition on the Context Set, beyond the Immediate QUD. Broad focus-marking also has an effect on the syntax of the PC, in that the syntactic reflex of broad focus-marking prevents movement to the specifier of CP.

In regular clefts, the focus-marked constituent—FocP in the syntax—is a sub-constituent of TP. The relative complementizer, mediated by the CLEFT operator, searches for a [FOC] feature in its domain and finds the FocP. The FocP then moves to spec,CP to check the feature on C. The augment is then merged, and searches for a value for its [D:] feature. It finds the element in spec,CP, and if the element in spec,CP is nominal or bears a nominal feature, the augment is spelled out as *e*. If the [D:] feature remains unvalued, the augment is spelled out *ann*. In the case of the PC, the FocP, containing the TP is the complement of CP, so the [*u*FOC] feature is checked without movement. The augment is merged, and only the head of the CP is accessible to the probe. The search turns up empty and the augment is spelled out *ann*.

The structure of the PC follows from the broad-sized focus, syntactically realized at the TP level, and the assumption that movement occurs to check features, and that features can be checked by complements *in situ*, following the proposal in Abels (2003). In the next section I will argue that the broad-sized focus marking is also responsible for the restrictions on the PC, in particular its inability to be negated or questioned.

6.3 Restrictions on the Propositional Cleft

There are pragmatic and morphosyntactic restrictions on the propositional cleft which do not hold for regular clefts: the PC cannot be questioned or negated. For both restrictions on the PC I argue that the pragmatics of broad focus-marking is responsible.

The PC revises the line of inquiry and answers a question other than the Immediate QUD, and this is a marked pragmatic move (cf. Rojas-Esponda (2014a) and her discussion of the pragmatics of German *überhaupt*). Intuitively, this sort of a move should not be done unless the speaker has a positive direction to go in (i.e. new information which supports a new direction in the d-tree). Questions do not provide this sort of positive direction, and neither do negative utterances. For a speaker to propose pursuing a different line of inquiry, they had better have a good reason to do so (i.e. they should have an answer). Questions are not answers, and negative utterances are not good enough either. More formally, the broad focus of the PC is what prevents it from being well-formed in interrogative and negative contexts. Both these contexts, I argue, require narrow focus and are incompatible with the broad focus of the PC.

Negation

While regular clefts can be negated, the PC cannot. The difference between the two, recall, is simply in the size of focus: while regular clefts are narrow focus constructions, the PC is a broad focus construction. At first glance this is a surprising difference in behavior. When we understand the PC as a broad focus construction, however, we can make sense of this difference. My claim is

that negation is incompatible with broad focus. Negation is felicitous only when there is something in the context, i.e. something given, which can be negated.

- (6.9) a. Cha b' ann a' coimhead roimhe a bha esan.
 Cha b' ann a' coimhead roimhe a bha
 NEG COP in.3MSG PROG look.VN before.3MSG C.REL be.PAST
 esan.
 3MSG.EMPH
 'He wasn't looking ahead of him.'* ST: 32
- b. *Chan ann a thuit e dhan allt.
 *Chan ann a thuit e dhan allt.
 NEG.COP in.3MSG C.REL fall.PAST 3MSG to-the burn
 'He didn't fall into the burn.' GLA_IC_03JUN2014_CMS

Negation requires that the negated proposition be salient in the discourse, whether uttered or inferrable (Krifka 2006: 14). That is, a constituent must be given in the context for negation to apply. The PC, being a broad focus construction, has no appropriately given constituent. While a subpart of the PC may of course be discourse-old, I propose that the broad focus-marking in the PC masks this for the purposes of negation.³

If this explanation is on the right track, we expect to find negation within the PC, where it has a smaller scope. This prediction is borne out: Scottish Gaelic allows negation of VP with the particle *gun*.⁴ This particle can be found within the relative clause of the PC.

- (6.10) Context: The addressee is about to hang a mouse.
 'S ann a b' fhèarr dhut gun [dad a dhèanamh air a' chreutair] agus a leigeil air falbh.
 'S ann a b' fhèarr dhut gun dad a dhèanamh air a'
 COP in.3MSG C.REL COP best to.2SG NEG thing do.VN on the
 chreutair agus a leigeil air falbh.
 creature and let.VN alone
 'It would be best for you to not do a thing to the creature and to let it alone.'* AM: 56

In (6.10) the negated phrase *dad a dhèanamh air a' chreutair* is contextually available, since the addressee is clearly doing something to the mouse. I take this as evidence that it is the combination of broad focus and the scope of negation in Scottish Gaelic that creates the infelicity of matrix negation with the PC.

Questions and the PC

The PC cannot occur in interrogative clauses. The unavailability of *wh*-question formation in the PC is derived rather straightforwardly from the fact that the PC is a broad focus construction.

³Interestingly, corroborating evidence might come from the infelicity of lone Contrastive Topic marking in negative answers (Constant 2014: 145). In Constant's analysis, focus-marking underlies Contrastive Topic, and lone Contrastive Topic involves broad focus-marking.

⁴Like the aspectual particles, *gun* is likely derived from the preposition *gun* 'without'. I assume that VP negation and the preposition are lexically distinct, just as assumed for aspectual particles.

The *wh*-question correlate of a narrow focus cleft is simply the *wh*-question (Adger and Ramchand 2005: 165). This is unsurprising, given the assumption that *wh*-words correlate with focus in the answer (cf. the question-answer congruence test, Roberts (1996)) We can furthermore make sense of this if we assume a single spec,CP position available for A-bar dependencies, such that FocP and *wh*-phrases are in complementary distribution, because the relative complementizer can probe for one or the other feature, and not both.

What is perhaps more of a mystery is that the PC is incompatible with the question particle *an*, used to form polar interrogatives. This particle is available to create polar interrogatives out of regular clefts.

- (6.11) a. **An** ann as do dheoghaidh [a bha e]?
 An ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e?
 Q in.3MSG after you C.REL be.PAST 3MSG
 ‘Was he after you?’ (lit. ‘Was it after you that he was?’) ST: 24
- b. ***An** ann [a thachair e gun bhàsaich am beothach a nochd]?
 *An ann a thachair e gun bhàsaich am beothach a nochd?
 Q in.3MSG C.REL happened 3MSG C die.PAST the beast tonight
 ‘Did it happen that the beast died tonight?’ GLA__TS__02JUN2014__CMS

I assume, following Karttunen (1977) and work building off that, that the denotation of a question is a set of propositions. The effect of the question particle, as a means of forming a polar interrogative, then, is to create a set of propositions, {p, ¬p}. This set is part of the denotation of the questioned cleft, and is unproblematic for regular clefts, but the PC is incompatible with negation. I derived this in the previous section by recourse to the broad-sized focus in the PC. Since ¬p is ill-formed in the PC, and since ¬p is part of the denotation of a polar interrogative, then it follows that the PC is ill-formed in interrogative contexts.

6.3.1 Embedding

The PC can be embedded. The exact pragmatic effect of embedding the PC is unclear, and it is additionally unclear what the difference is between instances of the embedded PC and instances where the embedding clause is in the scope of the PC. Whatever turns out to dictate the choice, and what the exact effect of embedding is, it is a benefit of the analysis that the syntax does not prevent embedding of the PC. In this section I discuss the naturally-occurring instances of the PC in the context of proposition-embedding verbs. We will also see that the PC is often associated with the matrix clause but may be embedded.

The PC can be embedded under verbs of cognition: *tha fios aig* ‘know’ (6.12a); *rinn suas ‘nainntinne* ‘make up one’s mind’ (6.12b); *saoil* ‘think’ (6.12c). The PC is underlined here and throughout the section.

CHAPTER 6. THE SYNTAX OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (6.12) a. Cha robh fhios gu dé an call a bha iad a' deanamh air an tuathanach; agus gur h-ann a bha iad a' deanamh feum dha!

Cha robh fhios gu dé an call a bha iad a'
 NEG be.PAST.DEP knowledge what the loss C.REL be.PAST 3PL PROG
 deanamh air an tuathanach; agus gur h-ann a bha iad
 do.VN on the farmer and C.COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST 3PL
 a' deanamh feum dha!
 PROG do.VN use to.3MSG

'The farmer didn't know what they were doing; and that they were helping him!'*

ST: 9

- b. Ach rinn iad suas 'nan inntinne gura h-ann a theicheadh iad as an arm.

Ach rinn iad suas 'nan inntinne gura h-ann a
 and make.PAST 3PL up in.3PL.POSS mind C.COP in.3MSG C.REL
 theicheadh iad as an arm.
 escape.COND 3PL from the army

'But they decided that they would desert from the army.'

NBG: 32

- c. Shaoil na saighdearan gu 'm b' ann a thug se rudaiginn air falbh orra

Shaoil na saighdearan gum b' ann a thug se
 think.PAST the.PL soldier.PL C COP in.3MSG C.REL take.PAST 3MSG
 rudaiginn air falbh orra
 something away on.3PL

'The soldiers thought that it was so, that he had taken something away from them'

TWHv1: 347

For both *rinn suas* 'na inntinn 'make up one's mind' and *saoil* 'think', there are naturally-occurring instances of the PC in the matrix clause, so there is a choice available to the speaker, whether to embed the PC or not. There is presumably a pragmatic difference, likely related to whether the embedding verb is to be interpreted as part of the revised QUD or not.

- (6.13) a. Agus 's ann a rinn iad suas 'nan inntinn fhèin gur e chailleach bheag a rinn an cron agus gur ann fo gheasaibh a bha triuir ghillean an uachdarain.

Agus 's ann a rinn iad suas 'nan inntinn fhèin
 and COP in.3MSG C.REL make.PAST 3PL up in.3PL.POSS mind self
 gur e chailleach bheag a rinn an cron agus gur
 C.COP 3MSG old woman small C.REL do.PAST the crime and C.COP
 ann fo gheasaibh a bha triuir ghillean an
 in.3MSG under spell C.REL be.PAST three boys the.GEN
 uachdarain.
 landlord

'And they made up in their own minds that it was a small old woman who had done the crime and that the three boys of the landlord were under a spell.'* TB: 19

b. 'S ann a shaoil mi roimh riamh, nach cridhe feola 'bha'nn a' m' chliabh.

'S ann a shaoil mi roimh riamh, Nach cridhe feola
COP in.3MSG C.REL think.PAST ISG before ever NEG heart flesh

'bha 'nn a' m' chliabh.

be.PAST in my breast

'So it was that I ever thought no fleshly heart was in my breast.'

TWHv3: 27

The PC is also attested embedded under *céill* 'rumor'.

(6.14) An sin chaidh e cho luath as a b' urrainn da o thigh gu tigh far an robh na saighdeirean air cheithearnan, agus chuir e an céill do mhuintir nan taighean, gu'm b' ann a chaidh na saighdearan, a chuir a mach air feagh na duthca, gu iad a dh'eiridh air feadh na h-oidhche, agus an sluagh a mharbhadh anns na leapaichean aca

agus chuir e an céill do mhuintir nan taighean, gu 'm b'
and put 3MSG the rumor to people the.GEN.PL house.PL C COP
ann a chaidh na saighdearan, a chuir a mach air feagh
in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST the.PL soldier.PL INF put out throughout
na duthca,
the.GEN country.GEN

'Then he went as fast as he could from house to house, where the soldiers were at free quarters, and he set the rumour afloat amongst the people of the houses, that the soldiers had been sent about the country to rise in the night and kill the people in their beds'

TWHv1: 349

Determining the exact pragmatic contribution that embedded vs. matrix instances of the PC has is unclear at the moment, and further research is needed to probe the differences, if any exist. The analysis provided in this dissertation, however, does not categorically rule out embedded instances of the PC. The PC is expected to be embedded wherever a proposition can be embedded, and wherever the answer to the revised QUD comes from a reported thought.

6.4 Summary

The combination of the CLEFT operator and broad focus-marking in the PC comes together to create the unique pragmatic force of the PC. This analysis conforms to recent proposals regarding the source of pragmatic differences in different information structural relations (e.g. Constant (2014)). The difference in the pragmatics of the PC versus that of regular clefts amounts to a difference in the focus-marking under the scope of the CLEFT operator. The broad focus marking in turn derives the syntactic structure of the PC, whereby movement does not occur in an otherwise movement-derived structure. Broad focus-marking was also argued to underlie the infelicity of the PC with negation and questioning.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1 Dissertation Summary

The focus of this dissertation has been an understanding of the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of Scottish Gaelic clefts, and the status of the Propositional Cleft (PC), and whether it is amenable to an analysis as a cleft. My claim was that the PC is a member of the cleft paradigm, conveying identificational focus, but that the PC differed from regular clefts in the size of focus: whereas regular clefts are narrow focus constructions, the PC is a broad focus construction. I provided a semantics for clefts, with the cleft meaning coming from Velleman et al.'s (2012) CLEFT operator, with the slight amendment that rather than the CLEFT operator requiring a QUD for well-formedness, it is a partition on the Context Set. I argued that broad-focus constructions fail to impose a partition on the Context Set, and that this created a requirement on the distribution of the PC, such that it must occur in a discourse context where there is a higher question to be answered. For the syntax of clefts, I provided evidence that A-bar dependencies are movement-based. I then proposed a structure for clefts, such that the augment *pro*-form is part of the clausal spine and undergoes Agreement with the clefted constituent. This analysis, along with the assumption that Agree is fallible, elegantly accounted both for the variation in the form of the augment, and the optional complementarity between the augment and a clefted pronoun. The analysis for clefts implies a particular structure for copula clauses, and I compared my structure with another proposal for Scottish Gaelic in Adger and Ramchand (2003). As part of the structure proposed for clefts I proposed a syntax of focus, adopting Cable's QP and proposing a FocP counterpart to pragmatic focus-marking. It is this FocP that undergoes syntactic feature checking and movement. Because I propose that focus movement is syntactic, we found a simple explanation for the non-movement in the PC. Movement in regular clefts occurs to create a local relationship between the two heads bearing [Foc] and [*u*Foc]. In the PC, broad focus marking means that the FocP bearing the [Foc] feature is the complement of the relative complementizer whose [*u*Foc] feature needs checking. This head-complement relation is already a local relationship, and the feature is checked without movement. Because movement need not apply, it does not.

7.2 Implications for Focus and the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface

Identificational focus, and clefts more generally, have been dominated by narrow-focus examples, and very little attention has been paid to broad-sized focus. In fact, the PC is the first focus construction, to my knowledge, to be analyzed as broad identificational focus. The PC, as a broad-focus cleft construction, supports a semantics of clefts which involve a focus-sensitive operator. This is because what is interpreted as focus in the PC is not in clefted position. It is the focus-marked constituent, and not the constituent in clefted position, which is interpreted exhaustively. I further argued that broad focus is incompatible with the CLEFT operator in out-of-the-blue contexts: only in certain discourse configurations can the combination of CLEFT and broad focus be interpreted. The analysis of the PC also provides another instance of variation in type of focus (i.e. identificational) as the outcome of focus-marking in the scope of a particular operator (as claimed in Constant (2014)).

7.2.1 The Syntax of Focus

The derivation of the PC as a focus construction was made possible by assuming that focus-marking has a syntactic realization. I proposed an extension of Cable's (2010) QP, which mediates *wh*-dependencies in the syntax. Specifically, the relative complementizer enters into a syntactic relationship with a Focus Phrase, which may not neatly map from a focus-marked constituent. I see this non-one-to-one mapping from pragmatics to syntax as a boon of the analysis, however, due to the fact that syntax-pragmatic mismatches are found in clefts, and additionally because a similar structure is argued to underlie another A-bar dependency: *wh*-dependencies. This general idea of an indirect link between syntax and pragmatics is also found in Prince (1978) and Lambrecht (1994).

The PC has a non-canonical information structural mapping; instead of the relative clause providing background information, as it does in regular clefts, in the PC the relative clause is associated with new information. This is derived from a syntax for the PC whereby the Focus Phrase fails to move. The PC provides clear evidence that the focus constituent need not appear in a canonical focus position in the syntax, and furthermore supports a theory of focus whereby focus movement is driven by syntactic feature-checking.

The analysis of the PC also has language-internal implications regarding the relative complementizer. It has long been assumed, following McCloskey (1991)'s work on Irish A-bar dependencies, that the presence of the relative complementizer is indicative of movement. In the general case, this is true. What the PC shows is that the link between movement and the relative complementizer is indirect. The presence of the relative complementizer in fact is indicative of an operator, and movement tends to apply in operator-variable structures. Movement can, however, be blocked syntactically, as it is in the PC. This means that the relative complementizer, at least in Scottish Gaelic, is not bundled with an edge feature. Whether this conclusion can be extended to other Celtic languages, and beyond, is a question for future research. Another question raised by this conclusion is what the range of operators are that co-occur with the relative complementizer, and if the plain embedding complementizer can co-occur with operators, and under what circumstances.

7.2.2 Broad Focus

The analysis proposed for the PC has implications for our understanding of broad focus. Broad focus is not simply an answer to the Big Question (contra Roberts (1996)) but rather is an utterance which imposes no partitioning on the Context Set. This allows broad focus constructions to appear in out-of-the-blue contexts as well as answers to broad-focus questions. Thus the connection between broad focus and congruence to the Big Question is best understood as a failure to create a partition on the Context Set.

I additionally made the claim, based on evidence from the PC, that broad focus is incompatible with negation and polar interrogatives. Thus it is predicted that Sentence Focus utterances cannot be negated or questioned either. A counterpart of this prediction is that negative utterances and questions are not felicitous out-of-the-blue utterances: any question or negated utterance which occurs discourse-intially is predicted to imply some shared knowledge between the interlocuters.

Furthermore, the semantic incompatibility of broad focus and CLEFT—in the failure of broad focus to create a partitioning on the Context Set—may go some ways towards explaining why broad focus cleft constructions are rare cross-linguistically. That is, languages may not uniformly allow for the discourse context to provide the requisite partition on the Context Set for the CLEFT operator to apply.

7.2.3 A Cross-Linguistic Look at Broad Identificational Focus

There are two aspects to the question of the cross-linguistic picture of broad identificational focus. The first is, to what extent does broad identificational focus exist in the pragmatic conventions of other languages (i.e. do other languages make systematic use of broad identificational focus)? The second is, how is this derived from the syntax (is it a syntactic phenomenon, or can it be marked with, e.g. a discourse particle)? The notion of broad identificational focus is very rare indeed; this dissertation is the first look at the phenomenon that I am aware of. In this section I briefly identify constructions in other languages that have a similar pragmatic effect as the PC. A more in-depth comparison awaits further work.

7.2.3.1 Propositional Assertion in East Asian Languages

In several East Asian languages there is a construction which uses cleft morphosyntax and which is described as having some sort of broad emphasis on the proposition, and may have a similar narrative device effect.¹ In Mandarin there is the *shi...de* propositional assertion pattern (7.1a), in Japanese *no da* (7.1b) and in Tibetan *S deh*.

- (7.1) a. Ta shi gen ni kai wanxiao de. *Mandarin*
 Ta shi gen ni kai wanxiao de.
 3SG be with 2SG open joke DE
 ‘(It is the case that) he was joking with you.’ (Paul and Whitman 2008: 419)

¹Many thanks to Mitscho Erleweine for bringing this to my attention.

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

- b. Yamada sensei ga joodan o ossyata no desu. *Japanese*
 Yamada sensei ga joodan o ossyata no desu.
 Yamada teacher SUBJ joke OBJ said(HONORIFIC NO is
 ‘(It is the case that) Prof. Yamada told a joke.’ (Paul and Whitman 2008: 439)

I focus here on the Mandarin construction, but further points of comparison need to be made with Japanese (7.1b) and Tibetan.

The Mandarin *shi...de* construction is largely identified as a cleft construction, and associated with identificational focus (cf. Paul and Whitman (2008), Cheng (2008)). The constituent immediately following the copula *shi* is in focus.

- (7.2) Ta shi zai Beijing xue yuyanxue de.
 3SG be at Beijing learn linguistics DE
 ‘It’s in Beijing that he studied linguistics.’ (Paul and Whitman 2008: 415)

In the Propositional Assertion pattern (term from Paul and Whitman (2008)), we find cleft morphology (*shi, de*), but there is no constituent in the focus position. The construction “conveys the speaker’s certainty that the proposition holds in a given situation” (Paul and Whitman 2008: 419).

- (7.3) Ta shi gen ni kai wanxiao de.
 3SG be with 2SG open joke DE
 ‘(It is the case that) he was joking with you.’ (Paul and Whitman 2008: 419)

Unlike the PC, Propositional Assertion constructions are felicitous in cases where the hearer may already know the information (i.e. this is not sentence focus); these constructions signal that the “truth of this proposition is relevant to the discourse context” (Paul and Whitman 2008: 419). This is reminiscent of verum focus Cheng (2008) notes that the propositional assertion pattern must have a canonical word order, cannot occur with certain types of predicates, and can answer questions like “how come the cup is broken?” (Cheng 2008: 25). This latter characterization is reminiscent of sentence focus. This implies that the Propositional Assertion pattern is indeed a higher-level focus construction, and it is striking that it bears similarities to broad-focus utterances (like sentence focus) and emphatic utterances.

Interestingly, the Propositional Assertion pattern has restrictions on negation (only available when the VP is negated), and is incompatible with questioning (Paul and Whitman 2008: 422). This is striking, considering that similar restrictions are in place for the Scottish Gaelic PC.

- (7.4) a. *Qishi, ta bu shi mingbai de.
 in.fact 3SG NEG be understand DE
 ‘It’s not the case that he understands you.’
 b. *Ta shi bu shi mingbai de?
 3SG be NEG understand DE
 ‘Is it the case that he understands you?’

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

- c. *Ta shi dao si dou hui xiang-zhe ni de ma?
3SG be until death all will think-DUR 2SG DE PART
'Is it the case that he will think of you until he dies?'

However, the propositional assertion pattern can be used to answer a polar interrogative positively, which the PC cannot do.

- (7.5) A: Ni yiqian hui bu hui xie?
2SG formerly can NEG can write
'Did you know how to write in former times?'
- B: Wo yiqian (shi) hui xie de.
1SG formerly be can write DE
'(It is the case that) I knew how to write in former times.' (Paul and Whitman 2008)

While the Propositional Assertion construction is clearly not identical in pragmatic function to the PC, an in-depth comparison might be illuminating. This is especially true considering Cheng's (2008) analysis of the Mandarin *shi...de* construction, whereby she claims that *de* marks the presence of an Assertion operator.

7.2.3.2 Discourse Particles

Marked pragmatic effects such as non-congruence are documented for discourse particles, especially German *doch* and *überhaupt* (Rojas-Esponda (2014b), Rojas-Esponda (2014a)). That the PC is reminiscent but not identical to the effect of these discourse particles is intriguing, and a question that arises is whether these discourse particles may be analyzed as involving an obligatory broad-sized focus and operators which bear a similar meaning to CLEFT.

7.3 Summary

This dissertation represents the first in-depth look at the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of clefts in Scottish Gaelic, as well as the first thorough discussion of the Propositional Cleft. It further makes the claim that identificational focus is not incompatible with broad focus, and that cleft constructions need not divide the proposition into focus and background. In the literature, both typological and theoretical, on clefts, there is no discussion of even the possibility of broad focus clefts. The formal implementation of the syntax of clefts proposes that focus is present in the syntax, in the form of a FocP. This FocP differs from that assumed in the cartographic approach of, e.g., Rizzi (1997), in that FocP does not have a fixed position in the structure, and is not part of an expanded CP. Instead, FocP is the focus counterpart to Cable's (2010) QP, and is restricted only to containing a focus-marked phrase. This in turn allowed us to understand the lack of movement in the PC. The non-movement of a focus constituent in the PC was argued to be a syntactic effect, borne from the assumption that movement occurs to check features, and only occurs to check features. In this way the PC falls under the purview of Abels' (2003) theory of Anti-Locality. The picture that emerges is that clefts are focus-sensitive in that focus-marking helps to determine

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

the QUD which the utterance addresses. Syntactic mismatches are possible because while focus-marking may fall on any phrase, word, or sub-word, the syntax is constrained to the phrase level because the A-bar dependency found in clefts is mediated by a Focus Phrase. The analysis of the PC ties together the QUD framework and the Minimalist Program's basic feature-driven syntax to create a picture of the syntax-pragmatics interface which is mediated by a mapping from f-marking to FocP.

Bibliography

- Abels, K. (2003). *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Aboh, E. (2005). Deriving relative and factive clauses. In L. Brugè, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert, and G. Turano (Eds.), *Contributions to the Thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Venezia*, pp. 265–285. Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.
- Acquaviva, P. (2014). The categories of Modern Irish verbal inflection. *Journal of Linguistics* 50(3), 537–586.
- Adger, D. (1997). VSO Order and Weak Pronouns in Celtic. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 9–31.
- Adger, D. (2000). Feature Checking under Adjacency and VSO Clause Structure. In R. Borsley (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics: The Nature and Function of Syntactic Categories*, Volume 32. Academic Press.
- Adger, D. (2005). Fracturing the Adjective: evidence from Gaelic Comparatives.
- Adger, D. (2011). Clefted situations: a note on expletives in Scottish Gaelic clefts. In A. Carnie (Ed.), *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics*, pp. 3–16. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Adger, D. and G. Ramchand (2003). Predication and Equation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(3), 325–359.
- Adger, D. and G. Ramchand (2005). Merge and Move: *Wh*-Dependencies Revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(2), 161–193.
- Barros, M. (2014). A theory of copula clauses. unpublished ms.
- Bianchi, V. (1999). *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bianchi, V. (2000). The raising analysis of relative clauses: A reply to borsley. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(1), 123–140.
- Büring, D. (2003). On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26, 511–545.
- Byrne, M. (2004). *Gràmar na Gàidhlig*. Stòrlann Nàiseanta na Gàidhlig.
- Cable, S. (2010). Against the Existence of Pied-Piping: Evidence from Tlingit. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:4, 563–594.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. (2008). Deconstructing the *shì...de* construction. *The Linguistic Review* 25.
- Chomsky, N. (1977). On *wh*-movement. In P. W. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian (Eds.), *Formal Syntax*, pp. 71–132. Academic Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, pp. 1–52. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press.
- Chung, S. and J. McCloskey (1987). Government, Barriers, and Small Clauses in Modern Irish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(2), 173–237.
- Constant, N. (2014). *Contrastive Topic: Meanings and Realization*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Coppock, E. and D. Beaver (2011). Sole sisters. In *Proceedings of SALT 21*, pp. 197–217.
- Declerck, R. (1992). The inferential *it is that*-construction and its congeners. *Lingua* 87, 203–230.
- Delahunty, G. P. (1982). *Topics in the syntax and semantics of English cleft sentences*. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Dorian, N. (1978). *East Sutherland Gaelic: the dialect of the Brora, Golspie and Embo fishing communities*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Fanselow, G. and D. Lenertová (2011). Left peripheral focus: mismatches between syntax and information structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(1), 169–209.
- Féry, C., G. Fanselow, and M. Krifka (Eds.) (2007). *The notions of information structure*, Volume 6 of *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure*. Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Geist, L. (2007). Predication and Equation in Copular Sentences: Russian vs. English. In I. Comorovski and K. von Stechow (Eds.), *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*, pp. 79–105.
- Gillies, W. (1993). *The Celtic Languages*, Chapter Scottish Gaelic, pp. 145–227. Routledge.
- Groenendijk, J. and M. Stokhof (1984). *Studies on the Semantics of Questions and the Pragmatics of Answers*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Gutzmann, D. and E. Castroviejo Miró (2011). The Dimensions of Verum. In O. Bonami and P. C. Hofherr (Eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 8, pp. 143–165.
- Haegeman, L. (2007). Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41(3-4).
- Haegeman, L. (2010). The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120, 628–648.
- Harley, H. and E. Ritter (2002). Person and Number in Pronouns: A Feature-Geometric Analysis. *Language* 78(3), 482–526.
- Hedberg, N. (1990). *Discourse pragmatics and cleft sentences in English*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Minnesota.
- Hedberg, N. (2000). The referential status of clefts. *Language* 76(4), 891–920.
- Heggie, L. A. (1988). *The syntax of copular structures*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Southern California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Höhle, T. (1992). Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. In *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, pp. 112–141. Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Hulsey, S. and U. Sauerland (2006). Sorting out relative clauses. *Natural Language Semantics* 14, 111–137.
- Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press.
- Jespersen, O. (1937). *Analytic Syntax*. Allen and Unwin.
- Karttunen, L. (1977). Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1(1), 3–44.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Keenan, E. and B. Comrie (1977). Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:1, 63–99.
- Kiefer, F. (1980). Yes-no questions as wh-questions. In J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer, and M. Bierwisch (Eds.), *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, pp. 97–119. Dordrecht: D. Riedel.
- Kiss, K. E. (1998). Identificational Focus versus Informational Focus. *Language* 74:2, 245–273.
- Krifka, M. (2006). Basic notions of information structure. In *The Notions of Information Structure*. Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Lamb, W. (2003). *Scottish Gaelic*. Lincom Europa.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, K. (2000). When subjects behave like objects: an analysis of the merging of S and O in sentence-focus constructions across languages. *Studies in Language* 3, 611–682.
- Lash, E. (2011). *A Synchronic and Diachronic Analysis of Old Irish Copular Clauses*. Ph. D. thesis, Queens' College.
- Leonetti, M. and V. Escandell-Vidal (2009). Fronting and *verum focus* in Spanish. In A. Dufter and D. Jacob (Eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*, Volume 112 of *Studies in Language Companion Series*, pp. 155–204. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Longobardi, G. (1994). Reference and proper names: A theory of n-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25(4), 609–665.
- Lyon, J. (2013). *Predication and Equation in Okanagan Salish*. Ph. D. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Macaulay, D. (1996). Some thoughts on time, tense, and mode, and on aspect in Scottish Gaelic. *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 14, 193–204.
- Marantz, A. (2000). Case and Licensing. In *Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization*.
- Massam, D. (2001). Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 153–197.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- McCloskey, J. (1990). Resumptive Pronoun, A'-binding, and Levels of Representation in Irish. In R. Hendrick (Ed.), *The Syntax of Modern Celtic Languages*, Volume 23 of *Syntax and Semantics*. Academic Press.
- McCloskey, J. (1991). Clause structure, ellipsis and proper government in Irish. *Lingua* 85, 259–302.
- McCloskey, J. (2001). The Morphosyntax of Wh-Extraction in Irish. *Journal of Linguistics* 37, 67–100.
- McCloskey, J. (2002). Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In S. D. Epstein and T. D. Seeley (Eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pp. 184–226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McCloskey, J. and K. Hale (1984). On the Syntax of Person-Number Inflection in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 487–533.
- Mikkelsen, L. (2005). *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication, and Equation*. John Benjamins.
- Nance, C. (2013). *Phonetic variation, sound change, and identity in Scottish Gaelic*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Glasgow.
- Onea, E. (2013). *Potential Questions in Discourse and Grammar*. Habilitation Thesis. University of Göttingen.
- Onea, E. (2016). *Potential Questions at the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*, Volume 33 of *Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface*. Brill.
- Ostrove, J. (2015). Non-linearly conditioned contextual allomorphy in Scottish Gaelic.
- Otake, Y. (2002). Semantics and Functions of the *It is that*-Construction and the Japanese *No da*-Construction. In *Proceedings of HUMIT 2001*, Volume MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, pp. 143–157.
- Paul, W. and J. Whitman (2008). *Shi...de* focus clefts in Mandarin Chinese. *The Linguistic Review* 25(3/4), 413–451.
- Percus, O. (1997). Prying open the cleft. In K. Kusumoto (Ed.), *NELS 27*, pp. 337–51.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press.
- Potts, C. (2014). Presupposition and implicature. In *Semantics*. Blackwell.
- Preminger, O. (2009). Breaking agreements: Distinguishing agreement and clitic doubling by their failures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(4), 565–599.
- Preminger, O. (2011). *Agreement as a Fallible Operation*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Preminger, O. (2013). That's not how you agree: a reply to Zeijlstra. *The Linguistic Review* 30, 491–500.
- Prince, E. (1978). A Comparison of Wh-Clefts and it-Clefts in Discourse. *Language* 54(4), 883–906.
- Reed, S. (2012). *The Semantics of Grammatical Aspect: Evidence from Scottish Gaelic*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Arizona.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Reinhart, T. (1983). *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. University of Chicago Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, pp. 281–337. Kluwer.
- Roberts, C. (1996). Information Structure in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Formal Theory of Pragmatics. In *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 49: Papers in Semantics*.
- Robinson, C. (2009). Agreement in Scottish Gaelic: A Distributed Morphology Analysis. Master's thesis, University College Dublin.
- Rojas-Esponda, T. (2014a). A discourse model for *überhaupt*. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 7, 1–45.
- Rojas-Esponda, T. (2014b). A QUD account of German *doch*. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 18*.
- Romero, M. and C.-H. Han (2004). On negative *Yes/No* questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 609–658.
- Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts.
- Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Rooth, M. (1996). Focus. In S. Lappin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, pp. 271–298. London: Blackwell.
- Rosenkvist, H. (2005). An introduction to the South Swedish Apparent Cleft (SSAC). In K. Bentzen and Øystein Alexander Vangnes (Eds.), *Scandinavian Dialect Syntax*, Volume 34 of *Nordlyd*, pp. 239–250.
- Russell, B. (1905). On denoting. *Mind* 14, 479–493.
- Samko, B. (2016). *Syntax and Information Structure: The Grammar of English Inversions*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California Santa Cruz.
- Schwarzschild, R. (1999). GiVENness, Avoid-F and Other Constraints on the Placement of Accent. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Selkirk, E. (1984). *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. MIT Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (1978). Assertion. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Pragmatics*, Volume 9 of *Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 315–332. Academic Press.
- Stowell, T. (1983). Subjects across categories. *The Linguistic Review* 2(3), 285–315.
- Stowell, T. (1989). Subjects, specifiers, and X-bar theory. In M. Baltin and A. Kroch (Eds.), *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*, pp. 232–262. University of Chicago Press.
- Thoms, G. (2015). Short answers in Scottish Gaelic and their theoretical implications. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34, 351–391.
- Thurneysen, R. (1980). *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Velleman, D. B., E. Destruel, E. Onea, D. Beaver, D. Bumford, and L. Coppock (2012). It-clefts are IT (inquiry terminating) constructions. *Proceedings of SALT 22*, 441–46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wurmbrand, S. (2012). The syntax of valuation in auxiliary-participle constructions. In J. Choi (Ed.), *Coyote Working Papers: Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- Yadugiri, M. A. (1986). Some pragmatic implications of the use of *yes* and *no*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10, 199–210.
- Zamparelli, R. (2000). *Layers in the Determiner Phrase*. Garland.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2012). There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29, 491–539.
- Zimmerman, M. and E. Onea (2011). Focus marking and focus interpretation. *Lingua* 121, 1651–1670.

Source Abbreviations

- AM Thomas, G. and I. MacDhòmhnaill (1984). *Am Mabinogi: Seann Sgeulachdan as a' Chuimrigh*. Club Leabhar.
- DSR Borgstrøm, C. H. J. (1941). *The Dialects of Skye and Ross-shire*. A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland. Lochlann. Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap.
- EPG Ó Murchú, M. (1989). *East Perthshire Gaelic*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- ESG Dorian, N. (1978). *East Sutherland Gaelic: the dialect of the Brora, Golspie and Embo fishing communities*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
- FSS MacDhòmhnaill, D. I. (2011). *Fo Sgàil A' Swastika: Under the Shadow of the Swastika*. Acair Earranta.
- FTFL MacDougall, J. (1910). *Folk Tales and Fairy Lore*. John Grant: Edinburgh.
- HEB Borgstrøm, C. H. J. (1940). *The Dialects of the Outer Hebrides*. A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland. Lochlann. Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap.
- LG Oftedal, M. (1956). *The Gaelic of Leurbost, Isle of Lewis: A Linguistic Survey of the Dialects of Scotland*. Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap. Aschehoug.
- NBG Shaw, J. (ed.) (2007). *Na Beanntaichean Gorma agus Sgeulachdan Eile à Ceap Breatainn*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- ROSS Watson, J. (1974), A Gaelic dialect of N. E. Ross-shire: the vowel system and general remarks. *Lochlann: a Review of Celtic Studies* 6: 9-90. Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap supplementary volume XI.
- SAS Lawson, C. and B. Lawson (1990). *Sgeulachdan a Seisiadar*. Bill Lawson Publications.
- SIA Campbell, J. L. (ed.) (1939). *Sia Sgialachdan*. T. and A. Constable Limited.
- ST MacLellan, A. (1972). *Saoghal an Treobhaiche*. Lochlann.
- TB Moireasdan, P. (2007). *Thugam agus Bhuam* (2nd ed.). Grimsay Community Association.
- TWH Campbell, J. F. (1860). *Popular tales of the West Highlands*, volumes 1-4. Edmonston and Douglas.

A Corpus of the Propositional Cleft

- (1) (Iain has killed a giant, and the cattle he's looking after are producing plenty of milk. The places he's been taking them have been inhabited by giants.)

Agus co-dhiubh dh'fhalbh esan mar a b'abhast leis a' chrodh ach cha robh e riaraichte idir gu fuirgheadh e air n-ais; 's ann a rachadh e gu àite a b' fheàrr,

Anyway Iain left as usual with the cattle, but he was not at all satisfied with staying back; He was going to a better place,

's ann a rachadh e gu àite a b' fheàrr,
COP in.3MSG C.REL go.COND 3MSG to place C.REL COP better

He was going to a better place,

agus chum e air n-aghaidh an turas seo. Rànaig e àit' agus dh'fhosgail e cachaileith 's chuir e astaigh an crodh.

so this time he pressed on further. He arrived at a place, opened the gate and drove in the cattle. NBG: 10

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Would Iain stay back? (No)

QUD_{PC} Where was Iain going?

NOTE This example is also possibly counter-expectational, since with all the trouble Iain has had with giants, we might expect him to stay back with the cattle; but no, he continues to go to places inhabited by giants.

- (2) (There were three soldiers, a Lowlander, a Gael, and an Irishman, who were comrades in the army, and close friends.)

Agus tha mi cinnteach gur e cùis neònach bhiodh ann gum biodh Gall agus Gàidheal cho mór sin aig a chéile. Thachair dhaibh a bhith anns an arm agus tha mi cinnteach nuair a tha feadhainn 'san aon suidheachadh gum bi iad a'falbh car air a réir. Ach rinn iad suas 'nan inntinne gura h-ann a theicheadh iad as an arm,

Now I'm sure it would be a strange thing to see a Lowlander and a Gael so friendly, but as it happened they were in the army and I'm sure when people find themselves in the same situation they adjust to it [being unlikely friends]. But they decided that they would desert from the army,

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Ach rinn iad suas 'nan inntinne gura h-ann a
 but make.PAST 3PL up in.3PL.POSS mind C.COP in.3MSG C.REL
 theicheadh iad as an arm,
 escape.COND 3PL from the army

But they decided that they would desert from the army,

agus nuair a fhuair iad an cothrom, thog iad rithe.

so when they saw their chance they took off.

NBG: 32

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD Would they adjust to it?

QUD_{PC} Would they desert from the army?

- (3) (The Irishman meets an enchanted princess, and breaks the spell. She promises to come back and get him, but he is tricked into sleeping when she comes. She promises to come back once more, but when she does, but he is again asleep. She leaves and will not return. He awakens the people left in the castle, and they all leave out the door.)

Agus nuair a dh'fhalbh iad uile gu léir bha e smaointeachadh gu dé bha e dol a dheanamh; 's ann a dh'fheumadh e a dhol a shiubhal an t-saoghail feuch idir an amaiseadh nighean a' rìgh ris.

When they had all left he began to consider what he would do: he would be obliged to wander through the world to see if he would possibly come across the princess.

's ann a dh'fheumadh e a dhol a shiubhal an
 COP in.3MSG C.REL need.COND 3MSG INF go.VN INF travel.VN the
 t-saoghail feuch idir an amaiseadh nighean a' rìgh ris.
 world.GEN try at all Q find.COND daughter the.GEN king to.3MSG
 he would be obliged to wander through the world to see if he would possibly come across the princess.

Agus ghabh e null gu stàball a bha thall an cùl a' chaisteil agus bha eich mhath' anns a' stàball a'sin agus thagh e leis fhéin am fear a b'fheàrr dhe na h-eich a bh'anns a' stàball.

So he went over to a stable that was behind the castle where there were good horses, and he chose the best horse there.

NBG: 44

CONTRAST none

IQUD What will he do?

QUD_{PC} Will he search for the princess?

NOTE It is possible that this example is counter-expectational; there is little for him to go on, searching for the princess. It is also possible that the IQUD is 'Where is everyone going?', since this is unanswered in the discourse, and the PC is picking up on the choice between finding the princess and following everyone out of the castle.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (4) (Son trades cow for spittle)

Dh' fhalbh éis' dhachaidh, an t-amadan, gus an d' thàinig e gu sruth. 'S dar a thàinig e gus an sruth a tha seo, bha aig - [ch]a robh droit tarsuinn a - an allt. 'S ann a thuit e anns an allt.

He went home, the fool, until he came to a stream. And when he came to this stream—there was no bridge across the burn. And he fell into the burn.

'S ann a thuit e anns an allt.
COP in.3MSG C.REL fall.PAST he in.DEF the burn
And he fell into the burn.

'S dh'fhoisg an làimh réisd', chaill e na—smugaid bha làimh. ESG: 183
And the hand opened then, he lost the—spittle [that] was [in his] hand.

CONTEXT counter-expectation

IQUD How would he cross the stream?

QUD_{PC} Would he cross the stream?

- (5) (A man joins the boy in searching for the something, and the man claims to have found something)

D' thàinig am brogach a nis a mach, bheir e [air] an duin', 's 'Thoir dhomhais an rud-eigin a fhuair thu.' '[Ch]a doir.' Agus 's ann do rinn e an duine a mharbh.

The lad came out now, he caught the man, and: 'Give me the something that you found!' 'I won't!' [said the man] And with that he killed the man.

Agus 's ann do rinn e an duine a mharbh.
and COP in.3MSG do.PAST 3MSG the man OPTCL kill.VN
And with that he killed the man.

Tholl e toll aig cliathaich ann allt, 's dhiodhlaig e an duin'. ESG: 185
He dug a hole at the side of the burn, and he buried the man.

CONTEXT counter-expectation

IQUD Will the man give him what he found?

QUD_{PC} Does he kill him? / What happens next?

NOTE East Sutherland Gaelic has many differences in the morphosyntax; notice the verb is in the dependent form; I believe this is typical of the loss of traditional morphological distinctions. See Dorian (1978) for discussion.

- (6) Duine àraid aig a' dh'fhàgadh beagan airgid, mu'n robh bancaichean ann; agus bha e air son a chur am falach, agus bha eagal air, na'm bàsaicheadh e, nach fhaigheadh a chàirdean an t-airgiod. 'S ann a smaoinich e gu'n doireadh e coimhearsnach gus gu'm biodh fhios aige bhar an robh an t-airgiod.

There was a certain man who had been left some money, before there were any banks; he wanted to hide it, but feared that his friends might not find the money if he died. Then he thought that he would bring with him a neighbour, that he might know where the money was.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

'S ann a smaoinich e gu'n doireadh e
 COP in.3MSG C.REL thought 3MSG that bring.COND 3MSG
 coimhearsnach gus gu'm biodh fhios aige bhar an
 neighbor so that be.COND knowledge at.3MSG where C.REL
 robh an t-airgiod.
 be.PAST.DEP the money

Then he thought that he would bring with him a neighbour, that he might know where the money was.

Dh'fhalbh an coimhearsnach còmhla ris, agus chuir iad am falach e.
 The neighbour came with him, and they hid it.

HEB: 253

CONTEXT emphatic

IQUD Will he hide the money?

QUD_{PC} Does he bring along a neighbor to see where the money is hidden? (super-Q: What will the man do/how will he solve this dilemma?)

- (7) Thadhail e do dh'fhaicinn an airgid, agus cha robh aige ach àite falamh. Cha robh fhios aige ciod é dhéanamh e; ach 's ann a smaoinich e gu'n canadh e ris (a' choimhearsnach) gu'n robh tuilleadh airgid aige.

He went to look after the money, and there was nothing there but the empty place. He did not know what to do; but then he thought that he would tell his neighbour that he had more money.

ach 's ann a smaoinich e gu'n canadh e ris
 but COP in.3MSG C.REL thought he that say.COND 3MSG to.3MSG
 (a' choimhearsnach) gu'n robh tuilleadh airgid aige.
 (the neighbor) that be.PAST more money at.3MSG

but then he thought that he would tell his neighbour that he had more money.

'Se sin a roinn e, agus dh'fhalbh iad le chéile a rithist.

So he did, and they went off together again.

HEB: 253

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Does he know what to do?

QUD_{PC} Does he decide to tell his neighbor he has more money? (super-Q: What will the man do/how will he solve this dilemma?)

- (8) Nuair a rànaig iad an t-àite, bha an t-airgiod ann siud air tilleadh, agus 's ann a thubhairt am bodach: "Is iongantach thu fhèin, airgid, falbhaidh tu agus thig thu; air eagal gu'm falbh thuagus nach dig thu, bheir mi leam thu an dràsda."

When they reached the place, the money was there once more, and then the old man said: "Wonderful art though, O money, thou goest away and thou comest back; for fear that though shalt go away and not come back, I shall take thee with me now."

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

agus 's ann a thubhairt am bodach: “Is iongantach thu
and COP in.3MSG C.REL said the man COP wonderful 2SG
fhèin, airgid, falbhaidh tu agus thig thu; air eagal gu'm falbh
self money go.FUT 2SG and come.FUT 2SG on fear C go.FUT
thu agus nach dig thu, bheir mi leam thu
2SG and C.NEG come.FUT.DEP 2SG bring.FUT 1SG with.1SG 2SG
an dràsda.”

now

and then the old man said: “Wonderful art though, O money, thou goest away and
thou comest back; for fear that though shalt go away and not come back, I shall take
thee with me now.”

end of story

HEB: 253

CONTRAST none

IQUD Would the money be there?

QUD_{PC} What will the man do/how will he solve this on-going issue?

- (9) An oidhche so bha mi fhìn agus Roddy shìos ach am faiceadh sinn am faigheadh sinn
càil de na bha a' dol. Agus mu mheadhon an t-searmoin 's ann a chunnaic mi droch
dhath a' tighinn air Roddy,

One night I and Roddy were down to see if we would get anything of what was going
[of the revival]. And in the middle of the sermon I saw a bad colour coming on
Roddy,

Agus mu mheadhon an t-searmoin 's ann a chunnaic
and PTCL middle the.GEN sermon COP in.3MSG C.REL saw
mi droch dhath a' tighinn air Roddy,
1SG bad color PROG come.VN on Roddy

And in the middle of the sermon I saw a bad colour coming on Roddy,

agus e ag iarraidh orm a chollair fhosgladh, agus gun e faireachdainn gu math.
and he asked me to open his collar, that he wasn't feeling well.

LG: 265

CONTRAST none; counter-expectational (for narrator)

IQUD Would they get anything of the revival?

QUD_{PC} What are the signs of getting anything of the revival?

- (10) An ath-oidhche a rithisd chruinnich na h-eilltearan' do 'n taigh aige a chumail
coinneamh, ach 's ann a thubhairt e riutha: “Faibhaidh dhachaidh, a dhaoine, tha
mise mar a bha mi roimhe.”

The next night again, the elders gathered at his house to hold a meeting, But
he said to them: “Go home, folks, I am [just] as I was before.”

ach 's ann a thubhairt e riutha: “Faibhaidh dhachaidh,
but COP in.3MSG C.REL say.PAST 3MSG to.3PL go home
a dhaoine, tha mise mar a bha mi roimhe.”
VOC people be.PRES 1SG.EMPH as C.REL be.PAST 1SG before.3MSG

But he said to them: “Go home, folks, I am [just] as I was before.”

end of story

LG: 265

CONTRAST counter-expectational (for the elders, audience)

IQUD What happened at the meeting?

QUD_{PC} Was Roddy converted?

NOTE There is an implicit assumption in the fact that the elders were holding a meeting at Roddy's house, namely that Roddy had been converted. The PC marks a correction to that assumption.

- (11) 'Air a dh' éirich an Sionnach anns a' mhaduinn, chaidh e mach do 'n bhàthaich a thoirt biadh do 'n each;
- 's ann a chunnaic e an stàla falamh.

When the Fox rose in the morning, he went to the byre to feed the horse, and he found the stall empty.

's ann a chunnaic e an stàla falamh.

COP in.3MSG C.REL saw 3MSG the stall empty

and he found the stall empty.

Thill e steach agus thubhairt e ri Cuirsti: "Chan eil lorg air an each."

He went in again and said to Christina: "There is no trace of the horse."

LG: 269

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD Did he feed the horse?

QUD_{PC} Was the horse even there?

NOTE This seems to be another instance of the PC correcting a presupposition; namely that the horse is in the stall.

- (12) Dh' éigh fear aca: "Iain, an e seo an t-each agad?" "Ó, ma 's e," ors' esan, "chunnaic mise e an diugh mu thràth, agus
- 's ann a chuir e feagal mo bheatha orm,
- ach tha fhios agam a nise cò rinn sin air."

One of them shouted: "John is this your horse?" "O, I should say so," he said, "I have seen him to-day already, and then he gave me the fright of my life, but now I know who did that to him."agus 's ann a chuir e feagal mo bheatha orm,
and COP in.3MSG C.REL put.PAST 3MSG fear 1SG.POSS life on.1SG
ach tha fhios agam a nise cò rinn sin air."but be.PRES knowledge at.1SG now who (C.REL) do.PAST DEM on.3MSG
and then he gave me the fright of my life, but now I know who did that to him."*end of story*

LG: 269

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD Is this your horse?

QUD_{PC} Did I recognize him as mine? or Would I have known the answer to that question earlier today?

- (13) Thòisich daoine ag éigheachd gun robh iad a' call nan iseanan. Ach
- 's ann a thòisich Iain fhèin ag ionndrainn iseanan,

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

People began to complain that they were losing the[ir] chickens. But then John himself began to miss chickens,

Ach 's ann a thòisich Iain fhèin ag ionndrainn iseanan,
but COP in.3MSG C.REL begin.PAST John self PROG miss.VN chickens
But then John himself began to miss chickens,

agus dh'aithnich e gur e an cat a bha a' falbh leo.

and he understood that it was the cat that was taking them away.

LG: 271

CONTRAST contrastive/emphatic

IQUD Who was losing their chickens?

QUD_{PC} Was John losing chickens?

- (14) Agus anns a' mhaduinn seo, an àite dha biadh a thoirt sìos chun a' chait, 's ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fheòir.

And one morning, instead of taking food down to the cat, he went after him with the hayfork.

's ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis
COP in.3MSG C.REL gp.PAST 3MSG PTCL 3MSG.POSS back with.DEF

an fhorc fheòir.

the hayfork

he went after him with the hayfork.

'Air a fhuair an cat air falbh pìos bhuidhe, thug e sùil air Iain, agus thubhairt e ris:

“Feumaidh e bhith nach eil thu 'gam iarraidh tuilleadh.

When the cat got a little distance away from him, he gave John a look and said to him: “It must be that you don't want me anymore.”

LG: 271

CONTRAST contrastive/counter-expectational

IQUD Would he feed the cat? (N)

QUD_{PC} What did he do to the cat?

- (15) Thòisich Cailean air an òran, ach chan robh e a' faighinn air adhart glé mhath leis, bha a' chas aige cho goirt. 's ann a thàinig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e ris: “Tha an cat marbh shìos aig a' bhàthach agad.”

Calum began on the song, but he didn't get very far along with it, his leg was so sore. Then a boy came in and said to him: “The cat is dead down by your byre.”

's ann a thàinig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e
COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST boy in and said 3MSG

ris: “Tha an cat marbh shìos aig a' bhàthach agad.”

to.3MSG be.PRES the cat dead down at the byre at.2SG

Then a boy came in and said to him: “The cat is dead down by your byre.”

“Ó,” orsa Cailean “'s math a bha fios aig a' cheàrd dé dhèanadh a chùis air a' chat.”

“O,” said Colin, “the thinker knew well enough what would make an end to the cat.”

(*end of story*)

LG: 273

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST contrastive/counter-expectational

IQUD Would Calum finish the song?

QUD_{PC} What happened to the cat/next?

NOTE It is unclear whether the coordination is under the scope of the PC here.

- (16) 'S a cheud oidhche bha dannsa aca ann an taighean Gordon, 's ann a thuit na clachan as an fhàinne.

And the first night they had a dance in Gordon's houses, the stones fell out of the ring.

's ann a thuit na clachan as an fhàinne.
COP in.3MSG C.REL fall.PAST the.PL stone.PL out.of the ring

the stones fell out of the ring.

“Ó,” *ors' ise*, “*s ann orm a tha an droch luck.*

“O,” said she, “I certainly have bad luck.”

LG: 275

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD What happened at the dance?

QUD_{PC} Did the stones fall out of the ring? (technically a sub-question of the IQUD)

NOTE The PC technically answer the IQUD in this example, but this is an unexpected answer. That is, it seems reasonable to assume that there is a partitioning on the Context Set, such that worlds where the stones fall out of the ring have been excluded.

- (17) “Chan eil nighean an seo,” *ors' esan*, “*ach a' bhean agamsa, ach chan fhaigh thusa i. Fhalbh dhachaidh, air neo cuiridh mise policeman as do dhéidh.*” *Anns na facail a bh' ann, 's ann a chuala an nighean, 's i 'n a cadal anns an ath-thaigh, an còmhradh aige.*

“There is no girl here,” said he, “except my wife, and you won't get her. Go home, or else I'll send a policeman after you!” At these words the girl, who was sleeping in the next house, heard him speaking.

Anns na facail a bh' ann, 's ann a
in.DEF the.PL word.PL C.REL be.PAST in.3MSG COP in.3MSG C.REL
chuala an nighean, 's i 'n a cadal anns an
hear.PAST the girl and 3FSG in 3FSG.POSS sleep.VN in.DEF the
ath-thaigh, an còmhradh aige.
next-house the conversation at.3MSG

At these words the girl, who was sleeping in the next house, heard him speaking.

Dh'aithnich i gur e Tormod a bh' ann.

She understood that it was Tormod.

LG: 275

CONTRAST counter-expectational?

IQUD Will Tormod go home (without finding the girl)?

QUD_{PC} Where is the girl (is she nearby?)

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (18) An oidhch' a chaidh mi chéilidh ort / Thubhairt thu gun robh an déideadh ort, /
'S ann a smaoinich mi gun trèiginn thu

The night I went to visit you / You said that you were leaving / And I thought I would deceive you

'S ann a smaoinich mi gun trèiginn thu
COP in.3MSG C.REL thought 1SG that deceive.COND.1SG 2SG

And I thought I would deceive you

'S gu léir gun dèanainn d' fhàgail.

And leave you altogether.

LG: 285

CONTRAST counter-expectational?

IQUD Are you leaving me?

QUD_{PC} Who will leave who?

NOTE Poem

- (19) An oidhch' a chaidh mi dh' Òidreabhal / An dùil 's gum faighinn còmhradh ort, /
'S ann a bha Murchadh Mòr agad an còrnair anns an àiridh.

The night I went to Oidreval / Expecting to get a talk with you / You had Big Murdo [hidden] in a corner of the shieling.

'S ann a bha Murchadh Mòr agad an còrnair anns an
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST Big Murdo at.2SG the corner in.DEF the
àiridh.

shieling

You had Big Murdo [hidden] in a corner of the shieling.

end of poem

LG: 287

CONTRAST counter-expectational?

IQUD Would I get a talk with you?

QUD_{PC} Where you with Big Murdo?

NOTE Poem

- (20) “An do ghlac thu duine an raoir, Eoghainn?” “Cha do ghlac. Chan fhaca duine an donas a riamh—'s ann a bhios e 'g a fhaireachdainn.”

“Did you catch anyone last night, Eoin?” “No. Nobody ever saw the devil: he only feels him.”

's ann a bhios e 'g a fhaireachdainn.
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.FUT 3MSG PROG 3MSG.POSS feel.VN

he only feels him.

end of story

LG: 293

CONTRAST contrast, exhaustive

IQUD Has anyone seen the devil?

QUD_{PC} What can one do with the devil?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (21) Tha an caisteal air a thoirt seachad do bhuill a' bhaile, ris an can iad an trust. Agus chan eil càil ann an diugh, 's ann tha mise a' cluinntinn gum bheil e air a—gu bhith air a thoirt seachad airson sgoil a bhios ag ionnsachadh balaich òga air ceàrdan agus air rudan eile, airson am bith-beò a dhèanamh.

The castle has been given away to the citizens of the town, whom they call the trust. And there is nothing in it to-day, and I hear that it has been – that it is going to be handed over for a school which will teach young lads to be artisans, and other things in order to make their living.

's ann tha mise a' cluinntinn gum
 COP in.3MSG (C.REL) be.PRES 1SG.EMPH PROG hear.VN C
 bheil e gu bhith air a thoirt seachad airson
 be.PRES.DEP 3MSG PROSP be.VN PERF 3MSG.POSS give.VN out for
 sgoil a bhios ag ionnsachadh balaich òga air ceàrdan
 school C.REL be.REL.FUT PROG learn.VN boys young on artisans
 agus air rudan eile, airson am bith-beò a dhèanamh.
 and on things other for 3PL.POSS living OPTCL make.VN
 and I hear that it has been – that it is going to be handed over for a school which will teach young lads to be artisans, and other things in order to make their living.

Tha—tha an cat fiadhaich, cuideachd, bha sin—còrr fhear ann, ach chan eil móran aca.

There's the wild cat, too, there were many of them, but there aren't many (now).

LG: 295

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Is there anything in the castle today? (N)

QUD_{PC} What will be in the castle?

NOTE Interview

- (22) Dé 'n rud a dh' fheumas sibh dèanamh an thoiseach leis a' chlàimh?
 'S e snìomh na clòimhe, snìomh agus càrdadh na clòimhe, 's e sin a' cheud obair a thathas a' dèanamh a thaobh a' chlà-mhóir idir. Ach tha an diugh—'s ann a thathas a' dèanamh an obair sin anns na muilnean.

What is the first thing you must do with the wool?

O, well, it's spinning the wool, spinning and carding the wool, that's the very first work that is to be done concerning the tweed. But today that work is done in the mills.

Ach tha an diugh— 's ann a thathas a' dèanamh an
 but be.PRES today— COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PASS PROG do.VN the
 obair sin anns na muilnean.
 work DEM in.DEF the.PL mill.PL

But today that work is done in the mills.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Ach a' cheud chuimhne a th' agamsa tha cuimhne agam air na cailleachan anns na bailtean a bha mu 'n cuairt agus anns a' bhaile anns an dho thogadh mi fhìn, a' bhith a' snìomh agus a' càrdadh.

But my first recollection, I remember the old wives in the villages around and in the village where I was brought up, spinning and carding. LG: 301

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD What's the first work to be done? (answered)

QUD_{PC} How is this work done today? (i.e. is the wool still made by hand? (N))

NOTE Interview

(23) (Two kings are switching places, and one is telling the other about his kingdom)

“Bidh aithne aig a h-uile duin' ort an sin. Agus mar a ch' thu mar a tha rudan gan dèanamh sa chùirt, 's ann a dh'fhàsas tu cleachdte ris an àite.”

“Everyone will know you there. And as you see how things are done in the court, you will grow accustomed to the place.”

's ann a dh'fhàsas tu cleachdte ris an àite.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL grow.FUT.REL 2SG accustomed to.DEF the place
 you will grow accustomed to the place.

Chum Pwyll air chun na cùrtach.

Pwyll continued towards the court.* AM: 11

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What can I expect at your court?

QUD_{PC} Will you get used to it?

(24) Agus bha iad ag ithe 's a' còmhradh is an gnothach a' còrdadh riutha. Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, 's ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach, is aodach sìoda air.

And they were eating and conversing and enjoying the occasion. At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall young princely man with reddish-blond hair coming in, and with silk clothes on.

's ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt
 COP in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL young.man big princely with hair
 buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach, is aodach sìoda air.
 yellow-red PROG come.VN in and clothing silk on.3MSG

they saw a tall princely young man with reddish-blond hair coming in, and with silk clothes on.

Agus nuair a ràinig e am bad a b' inbhiche san talla, chuir e fàilte air Pwyll 's air a chàirdean.

And when he came into the hall, he greeted Pwyll and his friends.* AM: 18

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What happened at the feast?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

QUD_{PC} What happened at the start of the entertainment?

- (25) Agus air an oidhche a rugadh e thugadh boireannaich a-steach a choimhead as deaghaidh an leanaibh 's a mhàthair. Ach 's ann a chaidil na boireannaich, agus chaidil Rhiannon, màthair an leanaibh, cuideachd.

And on the night that he was born, women were brought in to watch after the child and his mother. But the women slept, and Rhiannon, the mother of the child, slept also.

Ach 's ann a chaidil na boireannaich.
but COP in.3MSG C.REL sleep.PAST the.PL woman.PL

But the women slept.

Seo mar a thachair. Bha sia boireannaich ann, agus rinn iad faire airson cuid dhen oidhche; ach, leis an fhìrinn, mun tàinig meadhan-oidhche bha a h-uile tè dhiubh 'na cadal.

This is how it happened. There were six women, and they kept watch for one part of the night; but in fact before midnight came each one of them was asleep.* AM: 23

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What happened that night?

QUD_{PC} Did the women sleep (i.e. not keep watch like they were supposed to?)

- (26) Aig an àm sin, 's e fear dham b' ainm Teyrnon Twrf Liant a bu tighearna air Gwent Is Coed, agus 's e am fear a b'fheàrr air an t-saoghal. Agus bha làir anns a' chùirt aige. Agus cha robh dad san rìoghachd—each no làir—a bu bhrèagha na i. Gach oidhche ro Latha Buidhe Bealltainn, bheireadh i searrach, ach cha bhiodh fhios aig duine air dad mun t-searrach sin. Agus 's ann a bhruidhinn Teyrnon ri bhean aon oidhche.

At that time, the lord of Gwent Is Coed was a man by name of Teyrnon Twrf Liant, and he was the best man in the world. And there was a mare in his court. There was nothing in the kingdom—horse or mare—prettier than she. Each night before Bealtainn, she would give birth to a foal, but no one would know anything about it. And Teyrnon spoke to his wife one night.

Agus 's ann a bhruidhinn Teyrnon ri bhean aon oidhche
and COP in.3MSG C.REL speak.PAST Teyrnon to (3MSG.POSS) woman
one night

And Teyrnon spoke to his wife one night.

“Bheil fhios agad,” ars' esan, “the e leibideach dhuinn a bhith leigeil le searraich na làrach againn falbh, gun ghin aca a chumail.”

“Do you know,” he said, “that we have let the foal of our mare disappear, without a trace left.”* AM: 24

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What about the mare?

QUD_{PC} Where is the foal?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

NOTE Given that no one knows anything about the mare, and that she gives birth every Bealtain, we do not expect the foal to be gone

- (27) Agus 's e duine math a bh'ann am fear dhe na bràithrean òga seo; dhèanadh e an t-sìth eadar dà fheachd nuair a bu nàimhdeile a bhiodh iad ri chèile. 'S e Nisiean a bh' airsan. Ach airson an fhir eile, 's ann a bheireadh esan air sabaid tòiseachadh fiù 's eadar an dà bhràthair, Bendigeidfran is Manawydan, agus sin nuair a bu chòrdte a bhiodh iad.

And this younger one of the brothers was a good man; he made peace between two armies when there was bad blood between them. He was called Nisiean. But for the other one, he would start a fight between the two brothers, Bendigeidfran and Manawydan, even if they were getting along.

Ach airson an fhir eile, 's ann a bheireadh esan
 but for the man other COP in.3MSG C.REL carry.COND 3MSG.EMPH
 air sabaid tòiseachadh fiù 's eadar an dà bhràthair, Bendigeidfran is
 on struggle begin even between the two brother Bendigeidfran and
 Manawydan, agus sin nuair a bu chòrdte a bhiodh iad.
 Manawydan and DEM when C.REL COP dear C.REL be.COND 3PL
 But for the other one, he would start a fight between the two brothers, Bendigeidfran
 and Manawydan, even if they were getting along.

'S e Efnisien a bh' airsan.
 His name was Efnisien.*

AM: 30

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Who are the two brothers?

QUD_{PC} Who is the younger brother (answered)

NOTE The discourse sets up a larger question *Who are the two brothers?*, implicitly sub-divided into *Who is the younger brother?* and *Who is the older brother?*

- (28) “Agus sin a rinn iad le nighinn leithid mo pheathar-sa? Thug iad seachad i gun chead bhuamsa! Cha b'urrainn dhaibh tàmailt na bu mhiosa thoirt dhomh.” ars' esan. Leis a sin, 's ann a rinn e air far an robh na h-eich,

“And they did that with a girl the like of my own sister? They gave her away without my permission! They cannot have given me a worse offense.” he said. With that, he made for where the horses were,

Leis a sin, 's ann a rinn e air far
 with.DEF the DEM COP in.3MSG C.REL make.PAST 3MSG on where
 an robh na h-eich,
 C.REL be.PAST.DEP the.PL horse.PL

With that, he made for where the horses were,

agus gheàrr e am bilean sìos gu ruige na fiaclan; agus an cluasan sìos gun cinn.
 and he cut their lips down to the teeth; and their ears down to their heads.*

AM: 31

CONTRAST no contrast

IQUD Could they have done anything worse? (N)

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

QUD_{PC} What will he do?

- (29) “Aig Dia tha brath, a thighearna,” thuirt iad, “nach ann le deòin an Rìgh, no deòin duine dhe chomhairlichean, a chaidh do mhaslachadh mar seo. Agus ged as e tàmailt mhòr a th’ ann dhutsa, ’s ann a tha a’ chùis-nàire ’s an droch cleas seo ’na mhasladh dona buileach do Bhendigeidfran.”

“God knows, O lord,” they said, “it isn’t the will of the king, or the will of the advisors, that your disgrace goes thus. And although it is a great shame for you, the shameful matter and this bad exploit is an especially bad disgrace for Bendigidfran.”

’s ann a tha a’ chùis-nàire ’s an droch cleas seo
 COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the affair-shame and the bad exploit DEM
 ’na mhasladh dona buileach do Bhendigeidfran.
 in.3MSG.POSS disgrace.VN bad completely for Bendigeidfran
 the shameful matter and this bad exploit is an especially bad disgrace for
 Bendigidfran.

“Gu dearbha, creididh mi sin,” thuirt esan, “ach chan eil sin a’ toirt na tàmailt dhìomsa.”

“Indeed, I believe that,” he said, “but that doesn’t take away my disgrace.”* AM: 33

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Why is the king disgraced?

QUD_{PC} Who else is disgraced?

- (30) Agus ’s e seo a rinn Efnisien: dh’fheuch e a’ ‘mhin’ gus an d’fhuair e greim air a cheann, agus dh’fhàisg e sin gus an do dh’fhairich e a chorragan a dol tron chlaigeann dhan eanchainn. An uair sin dh’fhàg e am fear sin agus chuir e a làmh air fear eile agus dh’fhaighnich e, “Dè tha seo?” “Min,” ars’ an t-Eireannach. Agus ’s ann a rinn Efnisien an aon chleas air a h-uile fear dhiubh, gus nach robh air fhàgail beò dhen dà cheud ach aon duine.

And this is what Efnisien did: he tested the ‘meal’ until he got hold of his head, and he squeezed it until he felt his fingers go through the skull to the brain. Then he left the man and he put his hand on another one and asked, “What’s this?” “Meal,” said the Irishman. And Efnisien did the same trick to every one of them, until only one man was left out of the two hundred.

Agus ’s ann a rinn Efnisien an aon chleas air a h-uile
 and COP in.3MSG C.REL do.PAST Efnisien the same feat on every
 fear dhiubh, gus nach robh air fhàgail beò dhen dà cheud
 man of.3PL until C.NEG be.PAST on leave.VN alive of-the two hundred
 ach aon duine.
 but one man

And Efnisien did the same trick to every one of them, until only one man was left out of the two hundred.

Thàinig e chun an fhir sin is dh’fhaighnich e, “Dè tha seo?”

He came to that man and asked, “What’s this?”*

AM: 41

CONTRAST emphatic?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

IQUD How does Efnisien escape?

QUD_{PC} Does he do the same thing to everyone?

- (31) Thàinig iad chun na cùrtach: cha robh anam beò an sin. Chaidh iad dha na seòmraichean cadail: cha robh sgeul air duine. Ann an seilear an fhìon, anns a' chidsin—cha robh dad ach falamhachd annta sin. An ceann treis 's ann a thòisich an ceathrar aca air biadh na cuirm ithe, 's air sealg 's rudan a chòrdadh riutha a dhèanamh.

They came to the court: there wasn't a soul there. They went to the bedrooms: there wasn't a trace of anyone. In the wine cellar, in the kitchen – there was nothing but emptiness. After a while, the four of them began to eat the food and to hunt and to do things they enjoyed.

An ceann treis 's ann a thòisich an ceathrar aca air biadh
after time COP in.3MSG C.REL began the four at.3PL on food
na cuirm ithe, 's air sealg 's rudan a chòrdadh riutha
the.GEN meal eat.VN and on hunt.VN and things C.REL enjoy to.3PL
a dhèanamh.

OPTCL do.VN

After a while, the four of them began to eat the food and to hunt and to do things they enjoyed.

Agus thòisich iad air siubhal tron rìoghachd feuch an robh taigh no àite-còmhnaidh air fhàgail innte, ach cha robh innte ach beathaichean fiadhaich.

And they began to travel throughout the kingdom to see if there was a house or dwelling-place left, but there was nothing but wild animals.* AM: 47

CONTRAST none?

IQUD Where is everyone?

QUD_{PC} Did life go back to normal?

- (32) “Cha leig sinn a leas dad fhulang o na slaughtirean ud. Bheir sinn ionnsaigh orra 's marbhaidh sinn iad.” “Cha toir idir,” arsa Manawydan, “Chluinneadh Caswallon 's a dhaoine mu dheidhinn sin, 's chuireadh sin crìoch oirne. 'S ann a thèid sinn gu baile eile.”

“We don't need to suffer a thing from those rogues. We will attack them and kill them.” “Not at all,” said Manawydan, “Caswallon and his men would hear about that, and would put an end to us. We will go to another town.”*

'S ann a thèid sinn gu baile eile.”
COP in.3MSG C.REL go.FUT 1PL to town other

We will go to another town.”*

Agus sin a rinn iad.

And that they did.* AM: 48

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Will we attack and kill them?

QUD_{PC} Will we go to another town? (What will we do?)

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (33) “Dè a’ chèaird a bhios againn an seo?” dh’fhaighnich Manawydan. “Cèaird sam bith a thogras tu as na ’s aithne dhut,” thuirt Pryderi. “Chan e,” ars’ esan, “S ann a dh’fheuchas sinn cèaird na greusachd.

“What craft will we have here?” asked Manawydan. “Any craft you acquire from what you know.” said Pryderi. “No,” he said, “We’ll go for the craft of the cobbler.

“Chan e,” ars’ esan, “S ann a dh’fheuchas sinn cèaird
 NEG 3MSG said he.EMPH COP in.3MSG C.REL try.FUT.REL 1PL craft
 na greusachd.
 the.GEN cobbler.GEN

“No,” he said, “We’ll go for the craft of the cobbler.

Cha bhi de mhisneachd aig greusaichean na nì sabaid ’nar n-aghaidh no a chuireas stad oirnn.”

Cobblers don’t have courage to fight against us or to stop us.”*

AM: 48

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD What craft do we know?

QUD_{PC} Will we try the craft of the cobbler? (What craft don’t we know?)

- (34) (The main character, a king, is stuck in an enchanted kingdom, and is trying to hang a small mouse.)

“S beag an t-iongnadh, a thighearna!” thuirt i. “....Ach an deaghaidh sin, chan eil e ro chiatach duine leis an inbhe a th’agadsa fhaicinn a’ crochadh chreutair mar sin. ’S ann a b’ fhèarr dhut gun dad a dhèanamh air a’ chreutair agus a leigeil air falbh.

“It’s a small surprise, lord!” she said “But after that, it isn’t so pleasant seeing people with the rank that you have hanging creatures like that. It would be best for you to do nothing to the creature and to let it alone.”

‘S ann a b’ fhèarr dhut gun dad a dhèanamh
 COP in.3MSG C.REL COP best to.2SG without thing OPTCL do.VN
 air a’ chreutair agus a leigeil air falbh.
 on the creature and 3MSG.POSS let.VN alone

It would be best for you to do nothing to the creature and to let it alone.”

“Bhiodh e nàr dhòmhsa.” thuirt e

“That would be disgraceful for me.” he said.*

AM: 56

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Is it pleasant or fitting for people of your rank to be hanging mice? (N)

QUD_{PC} What should someone like you do?

- (35) Chuir iad an oidhche seachad an sin, agus an uair sin thàinig iad do sgìre Rhos, far an do chuir iad seachad oidhche ann an àite air a bheil Mochdref e fhèin. “A, fhearaihb,’ arsa Gwydion, “s ann a nì sinn air daingneachdan Ghwynedd le na beathaichean seo.

They spent the night there, and then they came to the district of Ros, where they spent a night in the place where Mochdref himself was. “O, men,” said Gwydion, “We will make for Gwynedd’s fortresses with these animals.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

“A, fhearaihbh,” arsa Gwydion, “s ann a nì sinn air
 VOC men said Gwydion COP in.3MSG C.REL make.FUT 1PL on
 daingneachdan Ghwynedd le na beathaichean seo.
 fortresses Gwynedd with the.PL animal.PL DEM

“Oh, men,” said Gwydion, “We will make for Gwynedd’s fortresses with these animals.

Tha sluagh mòr dhiubh a’ tighinn as ar deaghaidh.”

A great army of them is coming behind us.”*

AM: 66

CONTRAST none? counter-expectation?

IQUD Will they stay at Mochdref’s fortress?

QUD_{PC} What will they do?

- (36) Bu bheag an t-iongnadh: bha iad air an tighearna a chall, agus mòran dhe na daoine a b’fheàrr a bh’aca, ’s an cuid each, agus a’ chuid a bu mhotha dhen armachd. Ach fir Ghwynedd—’s ann a ghabh iadsan rompa le toileachas is le luathghair.

The surprise was small: they had lost their lord, and many of the best men that they had, and horses, and a large part of the weapons. But the men of Gwynedd—they went their way with gladness and laughter.

Ach fir Ghwynedd— ’s ann a ghabh iadsan rompa
 but men G. COP in.3MSG C.REL took 3PL.EMPH before.3PL
 le toileachas is le luathghair.
 with gladness and with swift.laughter

But the men of Gwynedd—they went their way with gladness and laughter.

“A thighearna,” thuir Gwydion ri Math, “nach b’fheàrr dhuinn an daoine’-uaisle a leigeil as do dh’fhir a’ Chinn a Deas?”

“O lord,” said Gwydion to Math, “Isn’t it best for us to leave the noblemen from your men at South Head?”*

AM: 68

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD What about the other side?

QUD_{PC} What about the men of Gwynedd? (What was the aftermath of the battle?)

- (37) Dè bha air a bhàn aig cas a’ leabaidh ach cùdainn beag le ìm, agus leum i air sin airson dhol an àirde còmhla rium-sa—well bha i cho beag. Ì, Thighearna! ’s ann a chaidh i fasta anns—chaidh a’ bhròg aice a bhàn anns an t-ìm ’s cha b’ urrainn dith a thighinn as.

What was down at the foot of the bed but a little tub with butter, and she jumped on that to go up along with me—well she was so small. Lord! she got stuck in—her shoe went down into the butter and she couldn’t come out of it.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Ì, Thighearna! 's ann a chaidh i fasta anns— chaidh a'
 lord COP in.3MSG C.REL went she stuck in.DEF goPAST the
 bhròg aice a bhàn anns an t-ìm 's cha b' urrainn dith
 shoe at.3FSG down in.DEF the butter and NEG COP ability to.3FSG
 a thighinn as.

INF come.VN out

Lord! she got stuck in—her shoe went down into the butter and she couldn't come out of it.

'S thànaig aon de na daoine 'n àirde, 'Ì Thighearna, dè tha thu ' dèanamh sin?' Ò, dh'fhalbh e, thug e 'n éigheamh air a' chrew uile,

And one of the men came up. 'Lord! what are you doing there?' Oh, he went and gave the shout to the whole crew.

ROSS: 79

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What happened?

QUD_{PC} Did she get stuck in the tub of butter?

NOTE Our world knowledge is such that we would automatically rule out a woman getting stuck in a tub of butter.

- (38) 'S thànaig aon de na daoine 'n àirde, 'Ì Thighearna, dè tha thu ' dèanamh sin?' Ò, dh'fhalbh e, thug e 'n éigheamh air a' chrew uile, "Nach Dia a bhith troimh uile, 's ann bha boirionnach fasta anns am buicead, anns am t-ìm agaibh, an t-ìm a tha sibh a' dol a dh'ithe—tha i ann."

And one of the men came up. 'Lord! what are you doing there?' Oh, he went and gave the shout to the whole crew. "Isn't God in everything. There was a woman stuck in the bucket, in your butter, the butter you're going to eat—she's in it!"

's ann bha boirionnach fasta anns am buicead,
 COP in.3MSG (C.REL) be.PAST woman stuck in.DEF the bucket
 anns am t-ìm agaibh, an t-ìm a tha sibh a' dol
 in.DEF the butter at.2PL the butter C.REL be.PRES you.PL PROG go.VN
 a dh'ithe— tha i ann."
 INF eat.VN be.PRES 3FSG in.3MSG

There was a woman stuck in the bucket, in your butter, the butter you're going to eat—she's in it!"

ROSS: 79

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What happened?

QUD_{PC} Did she get stuck in the tub of butter?

NOTE Our world knowledge is such that we would automatically rule out a woman getting stuck in a tub of butter.

- (39) Bha an sgoil ann an Togh Mòr. 'S ann a bha bràthair mo mhàthar ann an Togh.
 The school was in Togh Mòr. My mother's brother lived there.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

'S ann a bha bràthair mo mhàthar ann an Togh.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST brother 1SG.POSS mother in Togh
 My mother's brother lived there. (My mother's brother was in Togh).

ST: 5

CONTRAST none

IQUD Where was the school?

QUD_{PC} Who lived in Togh?

NOTE It is also possible that this is not truly the PC, but is an example of *ann* as a locative, e.g. 'It was there that my mother's brother lived, in Togh'. If so, we expect there to be a pause before *ann an Togh*.

- (40) Bha an t-àite fàs gann orra 'n sin iad fhéin air son àitich; agus bha eilein mu choinneamh an taigh againn, àite dha'n can iad Calbhaidh, tha suas mu thrì fichead acair' ann. 'S ann a chaidh iad dha'n eilein sin a a dheanamh bhuntàta.

The place had grown scarce then for farming; and there was an island behind their house, a place called Calbhaidh, there was more than 60 acres there. They went to the island to grow potatoes.

'S ann a chaidh iad dha'n eilein sin a dheanamh
 COP in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST 3PL to-the island DEM INF do.VN
 bhuntàta.
 potatoes

They went to the island to grow potatoes.*

ST: 9

CONTRAST none

IQUD Where would they grow potatoes?

QUD_{PC} Would they grow potatoes on the island?

NOTE Growing potatoes on the island might be unexpected?

- (41) Bha 'n Land Lìog ag obair as an amm, agus cha ghabhadh iad tilleadh, 's cha ghabhadh iad comhairle; cha robh fhios gu dé an call a bha iad a' deanamh air an tuathanach; agus gur h-ann a bha iad a' deanamh feum dha!

The Land League was at work, and people were making land raids then. The farmer didn't know about the lost land (lit. what loss they were making) and that they were helping him!

agus gur h-ann a bha iad a' deanamh feum dha!
 and C.COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST 3PL PROG do.VN use to.3MSG
 and that they were helping him!*

ST: 9

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Did the farmer know about the loss of his land? (i.e. that he was getting full production?)

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

QUD_{PC} Did the farmer know that they were (actually) helping him?

- (42) Chaidh i latha bh' ann a ' sheo gu ruige taigh Dhòmhnail Fhearghustain ri taobh a deas Loch Baghasdal, agus nuair a thànaig i as a sin, air feadh na h-oidhche, 's ann a dh'fheumadh iad falbh leis na beothaichean gu ruige Beinne bhFadhla

She went one day to Donald Ferguson's house on the south side of Loch Baghasdal, and when she got there, during the night, they had to go with the animals as far as Benbecula

's ann a dh'fheumadh iad falbh leis na beothaichean
 COP in.3MSG C.REL must 3PL go.VN with.DEF the animal.PL
 gu ruige Beinne bhFadhla
 as far as Beinne bhFadhla

they had to go with the animals as far as Benbecula

agus gu mi-fhortanach dé rinn an nighean bhochd ach fàs bochd ann am Beinne BhFadhla, agus ghabh i 'm fiabhras as a sheòl fhéin, agus bhàsaich i ann am Beinne bhFadhla.

and unfortunately what did the poor girl do but grow ill on Benbecula, and she got the fever from the ship itself, and she died on Benbecula.* ST: 13

CONTRAST counter-expectation?

IQUD What did she do at Donald Ferguson's house??

QUD_{PC} Did they have to leave and go to Benbecula (pretty far away)?

- (43) (He saw a phantom funeral)

Cha do ghabh e sian a dh'eagal, ach gu robh e 'g innse, nuair a thànaig e dhachaigh, an ceann seachdainn an déidh dha fhaicinn, 's ann a dh'inns e.

He did not get a whisp of fear, but that he said, when he came home, the weekend after seeing it, he recounted [the story].

's ann a dh'inns e.
 COP in.3MSG C.REL told 3MSG

He recounted [the story].*

ST: 19

CONTRAST counter-expectation?

IQUD Was he afraid?

QUD_{PC} Did he say that?

- (44) “A Dhia m'anam” arsa mise “an ann a staigh an seo a tha i tighinn?” “O, cha n-ann,” ars ise, “'s ann a tha i dol dha'n rùm eile.”

“O Lord of my soul” I said, “Is it in here that she's coming?” “O, no,” she said, “She's going to the other room.”

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

“O, cha n-ann,” ars ise, “’s ann a tha i dol
 NEG in.3MSG said 3FSG COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES 3FSG go.VN
 dha’n rùm eile.”
 to-the room other
 “O, no,” she said, “She’s going to the other room.”

ST: 22

CONTRAST correction?

IQUD Is she coming in here?

QUD_{PC} Is she going to the other room? (Where is she going?)

NOTE Yes-no question interpreted as indirect wh-question.

- (45) Sheas mise ’gan coimhead, agus bha fear Dòmhnallach ann, ’s ann còmhla rium fhìn as an tent a bha e, Dunchadh Dòmhnallach. Bha dà chois air agus ’s ann a bha iad collach ri dà bhàt’ iasgaich leis a’ mhìodachd a bh’unnta.

I stood watching them, and the man Donald was there, and it was with myself in the tent that he was, Duncan Donaldson. There were two feet on him and they were like two fishing boats with the size of them.

Bha dà chois air agus ’s ann a bha iad
 be.PAST two feet on.3MSG and COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST 3PL
 collach ri dà bhàt’ iasgaich leis a’ mhìodachd a bh’unnta
 similar to two boat fishing with.DEF the size C.REL was-in.3PL

There were two feet on him and they were like two fishing boats with the size in them (lit. with the size that was in them).*

ST: 24

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What about Donald(‘s feet)?

QUD_{PC} Were they enormous?

NOTE Presumably, the PC functions to highlight a ‘no, really!’ factor in the size of his feet; perhaps the effect is something like: think about the normal range of foot size, and consider a size of foot even bigger than that (i.e. the size of his feet are not considered normal)

- (46) Gheall e mo choinneachadh aig seachd uairean air an Sguaibhear, agus Dhia! cha deach, ach ’s ann a rinn sinn suas ri chéile, mi fhìn is feadhainn eile, gun gabhamaid an treun mu ’n cuairt Pheairt dha’n Òban,

He promised to meet me at 7:00 on the Sguaibhear [train?] and God! no, but we made up to each other, myself and the other one, that we would get the train around Peart to Oban,

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

ach 's ann a rinn sinn suas ri chéile, mi fhìn is
 but COP in.3MSG C.REL make.PAST 1PL up to each.other 1SG self and
 feadhainn eile, gun gabhamaid an treun mu 'n cuairt Pheairt dha'n
 one other C get.COND.1PL the train around Peart to-the

Òban,

Oban

but we made up to each other, myself and the other one, that we would get the train
 around Peart to Oban,

agus nam biomaid móran ann, gura dòcha gu faigheamaid air air leath-faradh dhi
 and if we were many there, that hopefully we would get a half-fare. ST: 30

CONTRAST correction?

IQUD Would he get on the Sguaibhear?

QUD_{PC} Would he get on the train to Oban? (Where would he go?)

(47) (Alasdair Uilleam is known for his strength and courage at sea. When they are out at
 sea a strong wind arises.)

Thug Alasdair Uilleam a-mach pìos aran eòrna a bha aige ann am poc agus thòisich e
 dha ith. Nuair a chunnaic Alasdair Dhomhnaill Bhàin am fear eile ag ithe a phìos cha
 chreideadh e shùilean. Cha thuigeadh e ciamar a b'urrainn dha ith agus iad ann an
 cunnart am beatha! Ach 's ann a bha e na èiginn nuair a thug Alasdair dha pìos
bonnaich.

Alasdair Ban took out a piece of barley bread that he had in a bag and he began to
 eat it. When Alasdair MacLeod saw the other man eating the piece he couldn't
 believe his eyes. He couldn't understand how he could eat when they were in danger
 for their lives! But he was at his wit's end when Alasdair gave him a pios of bannock.

Ach 's ann a bha e na èiginn nuair
 but COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST 3MSG in.3MSG.POSS distress when
 a thug Alasdair dha pìos bonnaich.
 C.REL give.PAST Alasdair to.3MSG piece bannock

But he was at his wit's end when Alasdair gave him a pios of bannock.

Cha dhiùltadh e am pìos mus sealladh e gu robh eagal a' bheath' air ach cha robh
 duine beo a bheireadh air am pìos ith!

He wouldn't refuse the piece because it would seem that he was scared for his life but
 there isn't a man alive who would have eaten it!* SAS: 19

CONTRAST emphatic

IQUD How could someone eat in this situation?

QUD_{PC} What could be even more unbelievable in this situation?

NOTE Possible that *nuair a...* has been postposed: 'it was when Alasdair gave him a piece of
 bannock that he was at his wit's end'.

(48) Bhiodh Iain Dubh, mac Thormoid Thormoid air lota 24, ag obair comhla ri Bidean
 Narrow, buidsear ann an Brocair. 'S ann a' coiseachd a bhiodh e gu math tric sios
 rathad na h-Airde. Latha bha seo 's ann a bhid ù a' chas.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

John Black, son of Tormod Tormod on lot 24, was working with Bìdean Narrow, the butcher in Brocair. He would often be walking down the Aird road. One day, a dog bit him on the leg.

Latha bha seo 's ann a bhìd ù a' chas.
day be.PAST DEM COP in.3MSG C.REL bite.PAST dog the leg

One day, a dog bit him on the leg.

Bha Iain a' fuireach na aonar agus bha h-uile duine cho truasail ris airson an tubaist. John lived on his own, and everyone felt very sympathetic towards him after the accident.*

SAS: 27

CONTRAST none, or possibly, counter-expectation

IQUD What happened next?

QUD_{PC} Did a dog bite him?

- (49) Dh'fhalbh sinn air an rathad dhachaigh ach stad sinn an taigh Doileag; mise leis an t-slait fhathast air mo ghualainn ach a-nis bha breac crochait' rithe! Cha robh mise coimhead dè bha dol air adhart air mo chulaibh. 'S ann a mhothaich m' athair gu robh Buster, an cù aca, dìreach gus am breac ithe!

We went on the road home but we stopped at Dollag's house; me with the rod still on my shoulder but now with a trout hanging from it! I wasn't watching what mischief was going on behind me. But my father warned me that Buster, their dog, was about to eat the trout!

'S ann a mhothaich m' athair gu robh Buster, an COP in.3MSG C.REL warn.PAST 1SG.POSS father C be.PAST Buster the cù aca, dìreach gus am breac ithe!
dog at.3PL just PROSP the trout eat.VN

But my father warned me that Buster, their dog, was about to eat the trout!

Ràinig sinn dhachaigh, co-dhiubh, agus chaidh am breac a ghlandadh agus a bhrùich. We arrived home, anyway, and the trout was cleaned and cooked.*

SAS: 53

CONTRAST contrast (her vs. her father paying attention)

IQUD What was happening behind her?

QUD_{PC} Did my father tell me about it (and so nothing happened)?

- (50) (A trawler has wrecked on the Dun Dubh headlands.)

Dh'fhalbh e fhèin agus m' athair, agus air na Leacan, pìos a-mach bho Chùl a' Ghàrraidh, thachair iad ri trìuir de sgiobadh an tràlair. Bha aon dhiubh ann an droch staid, bodach ceithir fichead bliadhna, an còcair a bha air am Ferrol. 'S ann le cuideachadh a bha e coiseachd agus nuair a ràinig iad taigh Iain Alasdair 's ann a chunnaic iad nach robh bròg na stocainn air!

He left with my father, and at the Leacan, a ways past Cul a' Ghàrraidh, they met three crew members from the trawler. One of them was in a bad state, 80 years old, the cook on the Ferrol. It was only with help that he walked home and when they arrived at Iain Alasdair's house only then did they realize that the man was barefoot!

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

's ann a chunnaic iad nach robh bròg na stocainn
 COP in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL C.NEG be.PAST.DEP shoe or sock
 air!
 on.3MSG

only then did they realize that the man was barefoot (lit. they saw that he didn't have a shoe or sock on him!)

Chaidh aodach tioram agus biadh a thoirt dhaibh uile, 's dh'fhuirich iad an sin gu madainn.

Dry clothes and food were passed out to all of them, and they stayed there till morning.*

SAS: 93

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What is the condition of the old man?

QUD_{PC} Did he have any shoes?

- (51) Bha fear a bha gu h-ard a' tuiteam leis a' chreig, agus an t-inchinn air a dhol as fo bhonn na creige. Agus 's ann tha ainm an duine sin aig a' chreig gus a' là an diu,
 The man who was highest fell from the rock, and the brain went out of him below the base of the rock. And the rock has the name of that man to this day.

Agus 's ann tha ainm an duine sin aig a' chreig
 and COP in.3MSG (C.REL) be.PRES name the man that at the rock
 gus a' là an diu,
 to the day today

And the rock has the name of that man to this day.

cha chan duine rithe ach Creag Ghropaidh.
 People call it nothing but Gropaidh's Rock.*

SIA: 20

CONTRAST emphatic?

IQUD What happened to the man??

QUD_{PC} What is the name of the rock (or, why is the rock called Creag Ghropaidh)?

- (52) agus nuair a thànaig e dh'fhoighneachd an Gréidheir dheth dé bha 'ga chumail anochd cho fìor-fhada seach mar a b' àbhaist dha bhith. "O," ars esan, "is ann a tha bàl mòr againn ann an Ormaclait anochd."

and when he came the Grieve asked him what was keeping him so long tonight instead of how he usually was. "Oh," he said, "we have a large ball in Ormaclait tonight."

"O," ars esan, "is ann a tha bàl mòr againn
 oh said 3MSG.EMPH COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES ball big at.1PL
 ann an Ormaclait anochd."
 in Ormaclait tonight

"Oh," he said, "we have a large ball in Ormaclait tonight."

"Ach," ars esan, "an dug thu idir ugainn sian a b' annsaiche na b' àbhaist dhut a thoirt?"

"But," he said, "did you give anything to us at all than is usual for you to give?!"*

SIA: 25

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST contrastive/counter-expectation

IQUD_{PC} What's keeping him?

QUD_{PC} Did we have a large ball tonight?

NOTE The PC answers the IQUD_{PC} here, but the IQUD_{PC} includes an explicit contrast with the usual state of affairs.

- (53) Bhuail e air foighneachd gu dé an cor a bha air. Thuirt Ruaridh ris “tha mi beo co dhiu. 'S ann as fhèarr dhu'sa a' sgoth thoirt dhomh agus gu falbh mi taobh air choireigin as a' seo.”

He asked what sort of condition he was in. Ruaridh said to him “I'm alive anyway. It is better for you to give the skiff to me and leave me on some side or another out here.”

'S ann as fhèarr dhu'sa a' sgoth thoirt dhomh
COP in.3MSG C.REL-COP better for.2SG.EMPH the skiff give.VN to.1SG
agus gu falbh mi taobh air choireigin as a' seo.”
and C leave 1SG side some out here

It is better for you to give the skiff to me and leave me on some side or another out here.”

“Gheobh thu sin, 's tusa gheobh sin.

“You will get that, and you will get that.”*

SIA: 26

CONTRAST none

IQUD What sort of condition are you in?

QUD_{PC} What's better for you to do?

- (54) ach nuair a nochd Tòmas astaigh, thòisich e air gàireachdaich, agus bha e sìor-ghàireachdain, agus cha chumte gàireachdaich agus dibhearsain ris; agus ma bha nàire mhòr air athair an oidhche reimhe sin, 's ann a bha nàire buileach air anochd,

but when Tomas appeared inside, he began to laugh, and he was ever-laughing, and one couldn't keep up with him laughing and having fun; and if a great shame was on his father the night before that, a shame was also on him tonight,

's ann a bha nàire buileach air anochd,
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST shame also on.3MSG tonight
a shame was also on him tonight,

esan sìor-ghàireachdaich a miosg muinntir an taighe, agus càch cho muldach ag ionndrainn an duine.

he ever-laughing among the people of the house, and the rest so sad longing for the man.*

SIA: 33

CONTRAST emphatic

IQUD What happened when Tomas came in??

QUD_{PC} Was his father ashamed?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (55) Tha thu smaointinn gur h-e sagart tha bruidhinn riut, ach cha n-e, ach an t-Amadan, a bhràthair.” “Dà” ors an t-Uachdaran, “s ann a tha mise ’nam amadan, ’s cha b’ e thusa;
 You think that it was a priest who is talking to you, but no, but the Fool, his brother.” “Yes,” said the Laird, “I am a fool, and you wouldn’t be;
 “Dà” ors an t-Uachdaran, “s ann a tha mise
 yes said the laird COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES 1SG.EMPH
 ’nam amadan, ’s cha b’ e thusa;
 in.1SG.POSS fool and NEG COP 3MSG 2SG.EMPH
 “Yes,” said the Laird, “I am a fool, and you wouldn’t be;
 agus mar sin tha na ceistean fuasgailte air fad
 and like that the questions are resolved at last.* SIA: 38

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Who do you think is talking to you?

QUD_{PC} Have I been fooled (Who has been fooled?)

- (56) agus cha mhór nach eil e cheart cho dona bhith as aonais na leapadh fhéin agus a tha e bhith as aonais a’ bhìdh. Ach ’s ann a dh’fhalbhas sinn pìos eile,
 and he nearly wasn’t right how bad it was to be without his own bed and without food. But we will go another piece,
 Ach ’s ann a dh’fhalbhas sinn pìos eile,
 but COP in.3MSG C.REL go.REL.FUT 1PL piece other
 But we will go another piece,
 fiach a’ faic sinn àite saoire na seo, agus a’ faigh sinn biadh agus leabaidh air leath-chrùn.”
 we will try to see a place more free than this, and to get food and bed for half-crown.”* SIA: 39

CONTRAST none

IQUD How bad is it to be without bed and food?

QUD_{PC} Will we keep going?

- (57) Bha a rithis, am fear bu mhotha dh’itheadh de fheòil dhiubh, dol do fhaighean nighean tuathanaich gu’ pòsadh. Mharbh iad bó agus shìn iad air ithe na feòla. Nuair a bha gu leòr aig Mac Rùislig chuir e poca bhàn air a bheulaibh, is bha e cur na feòla anns a’ phoca, is bha Prabusg aig ithe. Chuir Mac Rùislig sgian anns a’ phoca, agus thubhairt e, “Is fheairrde mi fhéin siud.” Is ann a chuir Prabusg ann fhéin i, agus bhàsaich e,
 Another time, he who could eat the biggest quantity of meat was going to get a farmer’s daughter to marry. They killed a cow and began to eat the meat. When Mac Rùislig had got enough, he put a sack down before him and put the meat into the sack, while Prabusg was eating. Mac Rùislig then cut through the sack with a knife, and said “That makes me feel better.” Then Prabusg cut himself with the knife and died,

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Is ann a chuir Prabusg ann fhéin i, agus bhàsaich
 COP in.3MSG C.REL put Prabusg in.3MSG self 3FSG and die.PAST
 e,
 3MSG

Then Prabusg cut himself with the knife and died,

agus fhuair Mac Rùislig gach uile dad dhà fhéin agus nighean an tuathanaich 'na bean.
 and Mac Rùislig got everything to himself and he got the farmer's daughter as his
 wife.

DSR: 151

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD What will happen next?

QUD_{PC} Does Prabusg stab himself?

- (58) (A boy takes cattle to pasture on land belonging to giants. He tricks and kills two giants, and returns to meet a third. The boy offers to share a meal with the giant, and a dance, before leaving and not bothering the giant again.)

Thug e dhà am botul 's am bonnach eòrna 'sa' robh 'm puinnsein agus cha robh e fad'
 'sam bith air an òl 's air an ithe 'nuair a dh'éirich e, 's cha b'e sùil a thoir air a' ghille
 rinn e idir, ged a bha 'feadan aig a' ghille 'na laimh deiseil airson teannadh air cluic[h]
 nan toireadh a' fuamhaire tàbadh air. 'S ann a thug e aghaidh air an uamhaidh 's cha
 deach e ach pìos air adhart 'nuair a thuit e.

He [the boy] gave him [the giant] the bottle and the barley bannock which was
 poisoned and he hadn't long been drinking and eating them when he got up, and he
 didn't look at the boy who did it at all, although the boy had whistles in his hand
 ready for starting to play a pursuit of the clever giant. He took a face on the cave and
 he made it only a little forward when he fell.

'S ann a thug e aghaidh air an uamhaidh 's cha
 COP in.3MSG C.REL took 3MSG face on the cave and NEG
 deach e ach pìos air adhart 'nuair a thuit e.
 do.PAST 3MSG but piece forward when C.REL fall.PAST 3MSG

He took a face on the cave and he made it only a little forward when he fell.

Bha 'n gill' os a chionn leis an t-saighead agus dh'iarr a' fuamhaire mathanas air.

The boy was over him with the arrow and the giant asked him forgiveness.* TB: 5

CONTRAST none

IQUD What will happen next?

QUD_{PC} Does the giant fall down?

- (59) (The boy kills the beast early in the morning. A soldier tries to take credit for killing the beast so he can marry the landlord's daughter.)

"Ciamar a ni thu mach sin," as an t-uachdaran, "nuair nach do mharbh thu 'm
 beothach?" "Sann air mo shàilleabh," as esan, "a chaidh an cruinneachadh a
 dheanamh agus 'sann air mo shàilleabh," as esan, "mi ràdha," as esan, "gun
 còmhragainn ris a' bheothach, 's ann a thachair e gu bheil am beothach marbh
a nochd

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

“How did you make out,” said the laird, “when you didn’t kill the beast?” “It is because of me” he said, “that the deed was done and it is because of me” he said, ‘me saying,’ he said, “without fighting the beast, it happened that the beast died tonight

's ann a thachair e gu bheil am beothach marbh
 COP in.3MSG C.REL happened 3MSG that be.PAST the beast dead
 a nochd
 tonight

it happened that the beast died tonight

's nach cuir e 'n corr dragh 'sa' bhaile seo gu bràch. Agus mur a bithinn-s' air sin a dheanamh,” as esan, “bha 'm beothach air tighinn mar a b'abhàist agus dh'fheumadh e do nighean-s' fhaighinn.”

and he will not be bothering this town anymore. And if it wasn't for me doing that, he said, the beast would be coming as usual and he would need to take your daughter.”*

TB: 7

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD How did you get out without killing the beast?

QUD_{PC} Did the beast die tonight (without me fighting him)?

NOTE Possible topicalization of a clefted constituent (*gun còmhragainn ris a' bheothach?*)

- (60) “Chan àbhaist,” as an gille, “do mhac rìgh a bhith 'g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach 'sam bith. 'S ann is àbhaist dha bhith 'toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad.”

“Its not usual,” said the boy, “for a son of a king to be asking for help from anyone. Usually he gives out help and advice.”

'S ann is àbhaist dha bhith 'toir cuideachadh
 COP in.3MSG (C.REL) COP usual for.3MSG be.VN give.VN help
 is comhairlean seachad.”
 and advice out

Usually he gives out help and advice.

Leis a sin dhealaich iad.

With that they separated.*

TB: 10

CONTRAST correction, contrast

IQUD Is it usual for a king’s son to be asking for help? (N)

QUD_{PC} Is it usual for the king’s son to give help? (What is usual for a king’s son to do?)

- (61) “Chan àbhaist do chlann rìgh a bhith 'g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach 'sam bith,” as esan. “'S ann a bhios iad a' toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad 'na rìgheachd.”

“Children of a king don’t usually ask for help from anyone,” he said. “They give away help and advice throughout the kingdom.”

'S ann a bhios iad a' toir cuideachadh is
 COP in.3MSG C.REL PROG be.REL.FUT PL give.VN help and
 comhairlean seachad 'na rìgheachd
 advice out in-3MSG.POSS kingdom

They give away help and advice in the kingdom.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Leis a sin dhealaich iad.
With that they separated.*

TB: 10

CONTRAST correction, contrast

IQUD Is it usual for the king's children to be asking for help? (N)

QUD_{PC} Is it usual for the king's children to give help? (How do the king's children usually behave?)

- (62) Agus 'nuair a thanaig a companach dhachaidh dh'innis i dha mar a dh'innis a' chailleach dhi. "O", as esan, "'s ann a tha mise ro thoilicht' a' chlann a thoir dhachaidh.

And when her companion came home she told him what the old woman said to her [to ask him to bring the children home]. "Oh," he said, "I would be very happy to bring the children home.

"O", as esan, "s ann a tha mise ro
Oh said 3MSG.EMPH COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES 1SG.EMPH very
thoilicht' a' chlann a thoir dhachaidh.
happy the children PTCL bring.VN home

"Oh," he said, "I would be very happy to bring the children home.

Bidh mi fhìn 'ga faicinn a chuile lath'," as esan, "'nuair a bhios iad a staigh.
I myself watch them every day," he said, "when they are inside.*

TB: 17

CONTRAST counter-expectation?

IQUD Would he bring the children home?

QUD_{PC} Would I be happy to do so?

NOTE The PC here seems to be used as an affirmative answer to a polar interrogative, but this is only inferred by the preceding discourse. In any case, it seems that the woman expects that the man won't agree to it.

- (63) Theann feadhainn ri bonnach arain a chur air tobhtaichean nan taighean agus bhiodh na bonnaich air falbh 'sa' mhaduinn. Bha dithis ghillean òg' ann a bha na bu tapaidh 'san inntinn 's na bu sgairteile na'n fheadhainn eile bh' air feadh an àite agus 's ann a rinn iad uas 'nan inntinn fhèin gur e chailleach bheag a rinn an cron agus gur ann fo gheasaibh a bha triuir ghillean an uachdarain.

Some people began to put bannock of bread on the ruins of houses and the bannocks would be gone in the morning. Two young boys were there who were more active in their minds and more energetic than the others there and they made up in their own minds that it was a small old woman who had done the crime and that the three boys of the landlord were under a spell.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

agus 's ann a rinn iad uas 'nan inntinn fhèin gur
 and COP in.3MSG C.REL made 3PL up in.3PL.POSS mind self C.COP
 e chailleach bheag a rinn an cron agus gur ann
 3MSG old.woman small C.REL do.PAST the crime and C.COP in.3MSG
 fo gheasaibh a bha triuir ghillean an uachdarain.
 under spell C.REL be.PAST three boys the landlord
 and they made up in their own minds that it was a small old woman who had done
 the crime and that the three boys of the landlord were under a spell.

Rinn iad suas 'nan inntinn gu falbhadh iad ann am beul oidhcheadh agus gun toireadh
 iad leotha aran is botuil bhainne 's gu ruigeadh iad an uamha 's gun dearbhadh iad
 dhaibh fhéin a robh comh-cheanghal 'sam bith eadar na fithich agus an uamha.
 They made up their minds that they would leave at dusk and that they would bring
 with them bread and a bottle of milk and that they would arrive at the cave and that
 they would prove to themselves who were tied up at all between the ravens and the
 cave.*

TB: 19

CONTRAST counter-expectation? none?

IQUD What was happening to the bannocks?

QUD_{PC} What was responsible for both the bannocks and the behavior of the boys???

NOTE Embedded PC

(64) Thugnaibh suas,” as esan, “s rannsaichibh a’ chiste ’s rannsaichibh m’aodach.” O,
 bha siod uamhasach math le Ruairidh an Tuathanaich: ’s ann a dh’fheum-te falbh ’s
seo a dheanamh ’s ruithte ’nuairsin air a chuile cùil is cial a bha ’san taigh.

“Give up,” he said, “and search for the chest and search for my clothes.” Oh, that was
 terribly good with Roddy the Farmer: one would need to go and do this and then run
to every corner and side of the house.

’s ann a dh’fheum-te falbh ’s seo a dheanamh ’s
 COP in.3MSG C.REL need.PASS.COND go.VN and this PTCL do.VN and
 ruithte ’nuairsin air a chuile cùil is cial a bha ’san
 run.PASS.COND then on every corner and side C.REL was in.DEF.the
 taigh.
 house

One would need to go and do this and he ran then to every corner and side of the
 house.

Dh’fhalbhadh suas.

He went out.*

TB: 41

CONTRAST emphatic

IQUD (imperative) Would you go and search for the chest and my clothes?

QUD_{PC} How would one go about doing this?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (65) Sgeulachd a seo a chuala mi aig caraide dhomh, agus 's ann a dh'fhaighneachd e dhomh 'n cuala mi roimh' i gus gun chluinneadh e fhéin bhuam i feuch a robh i agam na b' fhearr,

Here's a story that I heard from a friend of mine, and he asked me whether I had heard it before so that if he had heard it from me he would see if my version was better,

agus 's ann a dh'fhaighneachd e dhomh 'n cuala mi
and COP in.3MSG C.REL asked 3MSG to.1SG Q hear.PAST 1SG
roimh' i gus gun chluinneadh e fhéin bhuam i
before.3MSG 3FSG so that C hear.COND 3MSG SELF from.1SG 3FSG
feuch a robh i agam na b' fhearr,
try Q be.PAST.DEP 3FSG at.1SG COMP COP better

and he asked me whether I had heard it before so that if he had heard it from me he would see if my version was better,

ach bha mi duilich innse dha nach cuala mise riamh i. "Seo ma-tà," as esan, "innsidh mise dhut na tha agam fhìn dhi,

but I was sorry to tell him that I hadn't heard before. "Here then," he said, "I'll tell you what I have of it,"*

TB: 50

CONTRAST counter-expectation?

IQUD What about the story?

QUD_{PC} Who heard the story from who?

NOTE Perhaps a way of emphasizing the origin of the story??

- (66) Ach bha aige ri falbh co-dhiùbh dhan Eilean Sgitheanach gu MacLeòid. Ach a' chuid seo dhi, tha mi 'smaoineachadh gur ann a thanaig MacLeòid fhéin 'ga choimhead gu taigh a mhàthair am Beinne Fadhla agus chòrd an duine ris 's chòrd a shealladh ris.

But he had to go anyway to the Isle of Skye to MacLeod. But this part of it, I think that MacLeod himself came to see him at his mother's house at Benbecula and the man liked him and liked seeing him.

Ach a' chuid seo dhi, tha mi 'smaoineachadh gur ann
but the part this of.3FSG be.PRES 1SG think.VN C.COP in.3MSG
a thanaig MacLeòid fhéin 'ga choimhead gu taigh
C.REL come.PAST MacLeod self PROG.3MSG.POSS see.VN to house
a mhàthair am Beinne Fadhla
3MSG.POSS mother in Benbecula

But this part of it, I think that MacLeod himself came to see him at his mother's house at Benbecula

's bha e 'smaoineachadh gu robh duine cho tréin aige 's a ghabhadh lorg 'sna h-Eileinan.

and he thought that a man as brave as he should take a search in the islands.* TB: 51

CONTRAST none

IQUD Why did he have to go to Skye to see MacLeod?

QUD_{PC} Did MacLeod come to see him at his mother's house?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (67) Ach a' chuid seo dhi, tha mi 'smaoineachadh gur ann a thanaig MacLeòid fhèin 'ga choimhead gu taigh a mhàthair am Beinne Fadhlaid agus chòrd an duine ris 's chòrd a shealladh ris. 'S bha e 'smaoineachadh gu robh duine cho tréin aige 's a ghabhadh lorg 'sna h-Eileinean agus 's ann a chuir e mu dheaghainn gu falbhadh Dòmhnall còmhla ris dhan Eilean Sgitheanach agus rinn e seo.

But this part of it, I think that MacLeod himself came to see him at his mother's house at Benbecula and he thought that a man as brave as he should take a search in the islands and he made it so that Donald would leave with him to the Isle of Skye and he did this.

agus 's ann a chuir e mu dheaghainn gu falbhadh
and COP in.3MSG C.REL put.PAST 3MSG about it that leave.COND
Dòmhnall còmhla ris dhan Eilean Sgitheanach agus rinn e seo.
Donald with.3MSG to.the Isle of Skye and did 3MSG this
and he made it so that Donald would leave with him to the Isle of Skye and he did this.

Ach mun do dhealach iad, co-dhiùbh, a taigh na bantraich, thug Mac Leòid dhi ceud not.

But before they left, anyway, from the house of the widow, MacLeod gave her 10 pounds.*

TB: 51

CONTRAST emphatic?

IQUD Did MacLeod think that Donald should go on a tour? of the islands?

QUD_{PC} Did MacLeod set it up for this to happen?

- (68) Ghabh iad a chomhairle ged nach robh iad deònach. Cha robh ùine 'sam bith ag iomradh 'sa' cheò: 'nuair a thanaich an ceò 's ann a nochd iad ri fearann.

They took his advice although they were unwilling. It was no time to be rowing in the fog: when the fog came they came in sight of land.

's ann a nochd iad ri fearann.
COP in.3MSG C.REL appear 3PL to ground
they came in sight of land.

Dh'fhaighneachd e: "A bheil sibh a mach as a' cheò fhathast, 'illean?"

He asked: "Are you still out in the fog, boys?*"

TB: 55

CONTRAST counter-expectation?

IQUD What would happen to them in the fog??

QUD_{PC} Did they come to land then?

- (69) "An ann," as esan, "a' dol a dheanamh cleas nan cearc a tha thu," as esan, "an gràn ithe?" "Chan ann, a Ruairidh," asa mise, "ach 's ann a tha mi 'do a dheanamh brochan is aran air."

"Are you acting like a hen," he asked, "eating grain?" "No, Roddy," I said, "but I am going to make porridge and bread of it."

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

“Chan ann, a Ruairidh,” asa mise, “ach ’s ann a
 NEG in.3MSG VOC Roddy said 1SG.EMPH but COP in.3MSG C.REL
 tha mi ’do a dheanamh brochan is aran air.”
 be.PRES 1SG go.VN make.VN porridge and bread on.3MSG
 “No, Roddy,” I said, “but I am going to make porridge and bread of it.”

“Ciamar a nì thu e?” as esan.

“Why will you do that?” he asked.*

TB: 86

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD Are you eating the grain?

QUD_{PC} Am I making porridge and bread? (What am I doing with the grain?)

NOTE Answer to a polar interrogative; the polar interrogative is built off a cleft (is it acting like a hen that you are?), and is accordingly able to be interpreted as a wh-question.

- (70) Rinneadh brochan—libinn math brochain. ’S ann a thanaig a chuile duine riamh ’s
 chuireadh sìos a mhess-tin air an ùrlar ’s chuireadh mu chuairt ann a shin gus ’n do
 ruitheadh air.

He would make porridge—a good quarter peck of porridge. Everyone always came
 and would put down his mess-tin on the floor and would put it around there so that it
 would flow upon it.

’S ann a thanaig a chuile duine riamh ’s chuireadh sìos
 COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST every man always and put.COND down
 a mhess-tin air an ùrlar ’s chuireadh mu chuairt ann a shin
 the mess-tin on the floor and put.COND around there so.that
 gus ’n do ruitheadh air.
 C.REL PAST run.PAST.IMP on.3MSG

Everyone always came and would put down his mess-tin on the floor and would put it
 around there so that it would flow upon it.*

TB: 88

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD What would he do with the porridge?

QUD_{PC} Would everyone come?

- (71) Bha ’muileann air a chur as a chéile ’s air a chaith air feadh an talmhanna ’na
 phàirtean. ’S ann a thionndaidh Coles le party a’ lorg mu chuairt.

The mill had put an end to each other and had thrown it throughout the earth in
 pieces. Coles went around with a party looking for it.

’S ann a thionndaidh Coles le party a’ lorg
 COP in.3MSG C.REL wind.PAST Coles with party PROG search.VN
 mu chuairt.
 around it

Coles went around with a party looking for it.

Fhuair iad a chuile *bit* a bhuineadh dha.

They found each bit that belonged to it.*

TB: 88-89

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST none

IQUD What would happen to it?

QUD_{PC} Did Coles lead a party to look for it?

- (72) Dh'fholbh an rìgh gus an d' ràinig e creag, 's dh' amhairc e sìos ann an glomhas a bha 's a chreig, 's aig a ghruind chunnaic e a bhean agus a dhà each, 's cha robh fios aige demur a gheobheadh e far an robh iad. Ghabh e mu 'n cuairt gus an d' thàinig e gu bun na creige, 's bha rathad ciatach a dhol a stigh. Chaidh e stigh, 's ma chaidh, 's ann a thòisich is' air caoineadh.

The king went till he reached a rock, and he looked down into a chasm that was in the rock, and at the bottom he saw his wife and his two horses, and he did not know how he should get where they were. He went round till he came to the foot of the rock, and there was a fine road for going in. He went in, and if he went it was then she began crying.

Chaidh e stigh, 's ma chaidh, 's ann a thòisich
go.PAST 3MSG in and if go.PAST COP in.3MSG C.REL begin.PAST
is' air caoineadh.
3FSG.EMPH on weep.VN

He went in, and if he went it was then she began crying.

“Ud! Ud!” ars' esan, “ 's olc seo, mi féin adh' fhaotainn na h-uibhir de dhragh a tighinn ma d' thuairam, ma 's ann a caoineadh a tha thu nis.”

“Ud! Ud!” said he, “this is bad! If thou art crying now when I myself have got so much trouble coming about thee.”

TWHv1: 17

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Will the king get to his wife? or Will the king save his wife?

QUD_{PC} When he got there, did she start crying? or What happened when he got there?

- (73) (A queen is kept captive by a giant. She hides the king near the horses, and the giant goes to feed them, they nearly kill him. He does not die because his soul is hidden elsewhere. The queen says she will take good care of it, and the giant tells her that it is in the Bonnach Stone. The queen sets it in order, the giant goes to feed the horses and again is mangled by them. He asks why she set the Stone in order.)

“Chionn gu bheil d' anam innte.” “Tha mi 'g aithneachadh nam bitheadh fios agad c'aite 'bheil m' anam, gun d'thugadh thu tàire mhaith dhà.” “Bheireadh.” “Cha-n ann an sin a tha m' anam 's ann a tha e 'sa starsaich.”

“Because thy soul is in it.” “I perceive that if thou didst know where my soul is, thou wouldst give it much respect.” “I would give (that),” said she. “It is not there,” said he, “my soul is; it is in the threshold.”

Cha-n ann an sin a tha m' anam; 's ann
NEG in.3MSG there C.REL be.PRES 1.SG.POSS soul COP in.3MSG
a tha e 'sa starsaich
C.REL be.PRES 3MSG in.DEF threshold

“It is not there,” said he, “my soul is; it is in the threshold.”

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Chuir ise an ordugh an starsach gu gasd' an la 'r na mhàireach.
She set in order the threshold finely on the morrow.

TWHv1: 17

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD If you knew where my soul was, would you respect it? (Y) or Is my soul there? (N)

QUD_{PC} Is my soul in the threshold? (Where is my soul?)

- (74) (A poor old fisherman meets a sea-maiden one day and she offers to show him where the fish are if he gives her his first son. He agrees, thinking he is too old for a son. She gives him grains to give his wife, and says she will have three sons. When the first son is three years old, he is to return with him. However, he does not take his son with him on the agreed-upon day. The sea-maiden comes to his boat, and asks if he brought his son.)

“Ach! cha d’-thug, dhi-chuimhnich mi gu ’mi b’e so an latha.” “Seadh! seadh! mata,” ars’ a mhaighdean-mhara, “gheibh thu cethir bliadhn’ eile dheth; faodaidh gur ann is usa dhuit dealachadh ris;

“Och! I did not bring him. I forgot that this was the day.” “Yes! yes! then,” said the sea-maiden; “thou shalt get four other years of him, to try if it be easier for thee to part from him.

faodaidh gur ann is usa dhuit dealachadh ris;
may that.COP in.3MSG (C.REL) COP easy to.2SG separate to.3MSG
to try if it be easier for thee to part from him.

so agad a chomh-aoise, ’s i togail suas leanabh brèagha sultmhor, “am bheil do mhac-sa cho brèagha ris?”

Here thou hast his like age,” and she lifted up a big bouncing baby. “Is thy son as fine as this one?”

TWHv1: 85

CONTRAST contrastive??

IQUD What happens if I forgot to bring my son?

QUD_{PC} Maybe it will be easier in a few years?

NOTE PC embedded; the structure of this sentence is unclear, the clause itself may be the subject?

- (75) Lean e air a bhuachailleachd air an dòigh so rè uine; ach oidhche ’s e air tighinn dhachaidh, an àite do ’n bhanaraich furan, ’s fàilte ’chur air, ’s ann a bha iad air fad ri cumha ’s ri bròn.

He followed herding in this way for a time, but one night after he came home, instead of getting “all hail” and “good luck” from the dairymaid, all were at crying and woe.

’s ann a bha iad air fad ri cumha ’s ri
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST 3PL altogether to lament.VN and to
bròn.

sorrow.VN

all were at crying and woe.

Dh’fhoighneachd e, de ’n t-aobhar bròn a bha’ so an nochd.

He asked what cause of woe there was this night.

TWHv1: 88

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Was he greeted by the dairymaid? (N)

QUD_{PC} Was everyone crying?

(76) (Conal Crovi has just been tied up.)

Nuair a lìon na fir a bha gu h-àrd iad féin làn do bhiadh, 's do dheoch, 's ann a smaoinich an rìgh fios a chur a nìos air Conal Cròbhi, a dh'innseadh sgeulachd.

When the men who were above had filled themselves full of meat and drink, it was then that the king thought of sending word down for Conal Crovi to tell a tale.

's ann a smaoinich an rìgh fios a chur a nìos air
 COP in.3MSG C.REL think.PAST the king message INF put.VN up on
 Conal Cròbhi, a dh'innseadh sgeulachd.
 Conal Crovi INF tell.VN story

it was then that the king thought of sending word down for Conal Crovi to tell a tale.

Cha bu ruith do mhac mòr an rìgh ach leum sìos, g'a iarraidh.

'T was no run for the king's big son, but a leap down to fetch him. TWHv1: 138

CONTRAST none

IQUD What happens next? (What happens to Conal Crovi?)

QUD_{PC} Does the king think to have Conal Crovi tell a story?

(77) Dh'iarr e 'thead orra 'staigh a dh' fhaicinn Fear Chuigeamh Mhumha. Thog fear dhiu a thuadh gus an ceann a chur dheth, ach 's ann a bhuaill e air a chompanach i.

He asked their license in to see Fear Chuigeamh Mughha. One of them raised his axe to drive his head off, but so it was that he struck it on his own comrade.

ach 's ann a bhuaill e air a chompanach i.
 but COP in.3MSG C.REL hit.PAST 3MSG on 3MSG.POSS companion 3FSG
 but so it was that he struck it on his own comrade.

Dh' éirich iad air a chéile, gus an do mharbh iad a chéile.

They arose on each other till they killed each other; TWHv1: 317

CONTRAST counter-expectation, contrastive

IQUD Will one of them cut off his head?

QUD_{PC} Will they actually strike their comrade?

(78) Thainig an gille-carach seachad orra, agus chunnaic se iad, chaidh e agus fhuair e each, agus chuir e buideal uisge-bheatha, air gach toabh do' n each, ann an sachd, 's chaidh e seach na saighdearan leis, 's e mar gu 'm bitheadh e a' fuireachd am falach orra. Shaoil na saighdearan gum b' ann a thug se rudaiginn air falbh orra, na gu 'n robh rudaiginn aige nach bu chòir d'a a bhith aige,

The Shifty Lad came past them, and he saw them; he went and he got a horse, and he put a keg of whisky on each side of the horse in a sack, and he went past the soldiers with it, as though he were hiding from them. The soldiers thought that it was so, that he had taken something away from them, or that he had something which he ought not to have;

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Shaoil na saighdearan gum b' ann a thug se
 think.PAST the.PL soldier.PL that COP in.3MSG C.REL take.PAST he
 rudaiginn air falbh orra, na gu 'n robh rudaiginn aige
 something away on.3PL or C be.PAST.DEP something at.3MSG C.NEG
 nach bu chòir d'a a bhith aige,
 COP proper to.3MSG INF be.VN at.3MSG

The soldiers thought that it was so, that he had taken something away from them, or that he had something which he ought not to have;

agus ruith cuid dhiubh air a dheigh, 's bheir iad air an t-seann each s air an uisge-bheatha, ach theich an gille-carach, 's dh fhàg e an seann each 's an t uisge-beatha aca.

and some of them ran after him and they caught the old horse and the whisky; but the Shifty Lad fled, and he left the old horse and the whisky with them. TWHv1: 347

CONTRAST emphatic

IQUD Will he trick the soldiers?

QUD_{PC} What will the soldiers think?

- (79) An sin chaidh e cho luath as a b' urrainn da o thigh gu tigh far an robh na saighdeirean air cheithearnan, agus chuir e an céill do mhuinntir nan taighean, gu'm b' ann a chaidh na saighdearan, a chuir a mach air feagh na duthca, gu iad a dh'eiridh air feadh na h-oidhche, agus an sluagh a mharbhadh anns na leapaichean aca,

Then he went as fast as he could from house to house, where the soldiers were at free quarters, and he set the rumour afloat amongst the people of the houses, that the soldiers had been sent about the country, to rise in the night and kill the people in their beds;

agus chuir e an céill do mhuinntir nan taighean, gu'm
 and put.PAST 3MSG the rumor to people the.GEN.PL house.PL that
 b' ann a chaidh na saighdearan, a chuir a mach
 COP in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST the soldiers PTCL put out
 air feagh na duthca, gu iad a dh'eiridh air feadh na
 throughout the country.GEN to 3PL INF rise.VN during the.GEN
 h-oidhche, agus an sluagh a mharbhadh anns na leapaichean
 night and the people PTCL kill.VN in.DEF the.PL bed.PL
 aca,
 at.3PL

that the soldiers had been sent about the country, to rise in the night and kill the people in their beds;

agus fhuair e a thoirt air muinntir na duthcha chreidsinn, gun do mharbh muinntir gach tìghe, na bha do shaighdeirean 'nan cadal anns na sabhailean aca.

and he found (means) to make the people of the country believe him, so that the people of each house killed all the soldiers that were asleep in their barns.

TWHv1: 349

CONTRAST counter-expectational

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

IQUD Why were the soldiers there? or What would he do?

QUD_{PC} Were the soldiers sent to kill the people?

NOTE embedded PC

- (80) Agus an uair nach d' thainig na saighdeirean dachaidh aig an tiom bu chòir doibh, chaidh feadhainn a shealltuinn cia-dé a thainig riutha. Agus tra rainig iadsan is ann a fhuair iad na saighdeirean marbh anns na saibhlean, far an robh iad 'nan cadal.

and when the soldiers did not come home at the time they should, some went to see what had happened to them; and when they arrived, it was so that they found the soldiers dead in the barns where they had been asleep;

Agus tra rainig iadsan is ann a fhuair iad na saighdeirean
and time arrive they.EMPH COP in.it C.REL got they the soldiers
marbh anns na saibhlean, far an robh iad 'nan
dead.VN in.DEF the barns where C.REL be.PAST 3PL in.3PL.POSS
cadal.
sleep.VN

and when they arrived, it was so that they found the soldiers dead in the barns where they had been asleep;

Agus dh' aicheidh muinntir gach tìghe, gu 'n robh fios aca cia mar a chaidh na saighdeirean a chuir gu bàs, na cò a rinn e.

and the people of each house denied that they knew how the soldiers had been put to death, or who had done it. TWHv1: 349

CONTRAST counter-expectational?

IQUD What happened to the soldiers?

QUD_{PC} Did they find the soldiers dead in the barns?

- (81) Nur chunnaic an rìgh esan a tìgh 'n a mach, lig e as an t-srian, thug e ada dheth go làr, 's rinn e modh dha. “Le 'r cead cha ruig sibh a leas a leithid sin de mhodh a dhianadh dhomhsa, 's ann a bu chòir dhomhsa dhianadh dhuibh fhìn.”

When the king saw him coming out he let go the rein; he took his hat off to the ground, and he made manners at him. “By your leave, you need n't make such manners at me. “It is I that should make them to yourself.””

's ann a bu chòir dhomhsa dhianadh dhuibh fhìn.”
COP in.3MSG C.REL COP right to.1SG.EMPH do.VN to.2PL self

“It is I that should make them to yourself.”

“Na 'm b'e 'ur toil gon rachadh sibh leinn a ghabhail dinnear do 'n phaileas.”

“If it were your will that you should go with me to the palace to take dinner.”

TWHv2: 137

CONTRAST contrastive, corrective

IQUD Should you be making manners at me? (N)

QUD_{PC} Should I be making manners at you? (Who should make manners at who?)

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (82) Nur a thàinig eud bha esan an déigh na pàircean a ligeil itheadh leis na caoraich.
 “Ciod thuige dh’ith thu na pàircean.” “Cha mhis’ a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith na caoraich eud.”
 When they came, he had let the fields be eaten by the sheep. “Who art thou? Thou hast eaten the fields?” “It was not I that ate them at all; it was the sheep that ate them.”
 “Cha mhis’ a dh’ith eud idir, ’s ann a dh’ith
 NEG 1SG.EMPH C.REL eat.PAST 3PL at.all COP in.3MSG C.REL eat.PAST
 na caoraich eud.”
 the.PL sheep.PL 3PL
 “It was not I that ate them at all; it was the sheep that ate them.”
 “Cha bhi sinn a’ bruidhinn ris idir, cha ’n ’eil ann ach amadan, ruige sinn Caomhag fiach an leathaise na caoraich.”
 “We will not be talking to him at all; he is but a fool. We will reach Caomhag to see if the sheep are hers.” TWHv2: 173-74

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Did I eat the fields? (N)

QUD_{PC} Did the sheep eat the fields? (Who ate the fields?)

- (83) (The Mischief appears and addresses John. John asks who it is, and the Mischief introduces himself.)
 “Ai! Ai!” ars’ Iain, “’s fada bho na chuala mi iomradh ort, ach cha n’ fhaca mi riamh roimhe thu: ’s ann a tha spleùmas air mo shuilean;
 “Ai! ai!” said John, “it’s long since I heard tell of thee, but I never saw thee before. There is glamour on my eyes,
 ’s ann a tha spleùmas air mo shuilean;
 COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES affected.surprise on 1SG.POSS eyes
 There is glamour on my eyes,
 cha chreid mi gur tu th’ ann idir; ach dean nathair dhiot fhein, agus creididh mi thu.”
 I will not believe that it is thou at all; but make a snake of thyself, and I will believe thee.” TWHv2: 297

CONTRAST counter-expectational? emphatic?

IQUD Have I seen thee before? (N)

QUD_{PC} Am I surprised?

- (84) (The men of Sgire mo Chealag are incredibly stupid. A visitor sees a boat with a dozen men going out to fish, but when they return they can count only eleven. The visitor sees that the one doing the counting is forgetting to count himself and offers to find the one that’s lost. To count them, he hits them hard with a stick, and counts twelve men.)
 agus ged a bha iad pronnte agus leòinte cha robh comas air, bha iad toilichte air son gu ’n d’ fhuarag an duine bha air chall, agus air chùl paigheag ’s ann a rinn iad cuirm d’ on duine a fhuair a’ fear a bha air chall.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

And though they were pounded and wounded, it was no matter, they were pleased, because the man who was lost was found, and after the payment they made a feast for the one who had found the man who was lost.

's ann a rinn iad cuirm d'on duine a fhuair
 COP in.3MSG C.REL make.PAST 3PL feast for-the man C.REL find.PAST
 a' fear a bha air chall.
 the one C.REL bePAST PERF lose.VN
 they made a feast for the one who had found the man who was lost.

Bha loch aig tuath Sgìre mo Chealag air am bitheag iad a' cur iasg, agus 'ars esan "s ann bo chòir dhuibh a' loch a' thràig gus am faigheag iad iasg ùr dhon na cuirme;"

The tenants of Sgìre mo Chealag had a loch on which they used to put fish, and so it was that they needs must drain the loch, to get fresh fish for the feast; TWHv2: 395

CONTRAST none

IQUD What happens next?

QUD_{PC} Do they make a feast?

- (85) Bha loch aig tuath Sgìre mo Chealag air am bitheag iad a' cur iasg, agus 'ars esan "s ann bo chòir dhuibh a' loch a' thràig gus am faigheag iad iasg ùr dhon na cuirme;"

The tenants of Sgìre mo Chealag had a loch on which they used to put fish, and so it was that they needs must drain the loch, to get fresh fish for the feast;

agus 'ars esan "s ann bo chòir dhuibh a' loch
 and said 3MSG.EMPH COP in.3MSG (C.REL) COP proper to.3PL the loch
 a' thràig gus am faigheag iad iasg ùr dhon na cuirme;"
 PROG drain.VN so.that C.REL get 3PL fish fresh for.DEF the Feast
 and so it was that they needs must drain the loch, to get fresh fish for the feast;

agus dar a thraog an loch cha d' fhuarag diarg éisg air an loch ach aon Easgann mhor.
 and when the loch was drained, there was not a single fish found on the loch but one great eel. TWHv2: 395

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD How will they get the fish (for the feast)?

QUD_{PC} Will they have to drain the loch?

- (86) An deis a bhith tabhairt a' bhlaire, / 'S ann thainig cobhair gu laoch arm-ghil.

After he had given the war, / Came succour to the hero of bright arms.

'S ann thainig cobhair gu laoch arm-ghil
 COP in.3MSG (C.REL) come.PAST to hero bright-arms
 Came succour to the hero of bright arms.

Oir rachadh, roimh thollaibh nan sleagh, / Na còrran roimh dhriom Osgair.
 For through the spear-holes there might go / The sickles through the back of Osgair.

TWHv3: 141

CONTRAST none

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

IQUD What happens next?

QUD_{PC} Did succour come to the hero?

NOTE Poem

- (87) Siud an rud a ghon mo chridhe. / 'S ann a shaoil mi roimh riamh, / Nach cridhe feola 'bha 'nn a' m' chliabh;

These were the things that pierced my heart-strings. / So it was that I ever thought / no fleshly heart was in my breast;

'S ann a shaoil mi roimh riamh, Nach cridhe feola bh'
 COP in.3MSG C.REL thought 1SG before ever NEG heart flesh be.PAST
 ann a' m' chliabh;
 in 1SG.POSS breast

So it was that I ever thought no fleshly heart was in my breast;

Ach cridhe de ghuin na cuilinn / Air a chomhdachadh le stailinn.

But a heart of the holly spikes, / all over-clad with steel.

TWHv3: 327

CONTRAST none

IQUD What pierced your heartstrings? (answered)

QUD_{PC} Did I thus think that no fleshly heart was in my breast? (What were my conclusions from this?)

NOTE Poem

- (88) Chruadhaich e a cheum an dùil gu'm beireadh e air an duineachan iongantach a bha roimhe, ach an àite a bhi a' buidhinn, b' ann a bha e ag call leis gach ceum a bheireadh e.

The tailor hardened his step, hoping to overtake the curious manikin before him, but instead of gaining, he was losing ground at every step he took.

ach an àite a bhi a' buidhinn, b' ann a bha
 but instead of C.REL be.FUT PROG gain.VN COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST
 e ag call leis gach ceum a bheireadh e
 3MSG PROG lose.VN with.DEF each step C.REL take.COND 3MSG

but instead of gaining, he was losing ground at every step he took.

Cho luath 's a thug e so fa-near, thòisich e air ruith le a uile neart; ach a dh' aindeoin a bhoicinn cha b' urrainn e an t-astar eatorra a ghiorrachadh.

As soon as he noticed this, he began to run with all his might; but in spite of his skin, he could not shorten the distance between them.

FLTFL: 142

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Would the tailor overtake the manikin?

QUD_{PC} Did he lose ground?

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

- (89) An uair a ràinig e an tigh, bha gach duine a' feòraich c'àite an d'fhàg e a chompanach. Dh'innis e dhoibh gach ni a thachair, agus mar dh'fhàg e a chompanach a' dannsadh anns an t-Sithean. Ach cha robh aon aca a thug creideas d'a sgeul. An àite sin is ann a thubhairt iad gu'n do mharbh e a choimhearsnach agus gu'n d'rinn e suas an sgeul a dh'innis e a thionndadh an amharuis dheth fhéin.

When he arrived at the house, every one asked him where he had left his companion. He told them everything that had happened, and how he had left his companion dancing in the Fairy Knoll. But there was not one of them that credited the story. Instead of that they maintained that he had killed his neighbour, and that he had invented the story he told to turn away suspicion from himself.

An àite sin is ann a thubhairt iad gu'n do mharbh e
 instead of DEM COP in.3MSG C.REL say.PAST 3PL C kill.PAST 3MSG
 a choimhearsnach agus gu'n d'rinn e suas an sgeul
 3MSG.POSS companion and C make.PAST 3MSG up the story
 a dh'innis e a thionndadh an amharuis dheth fhéin.
 to/C.REL tell 3MSG to turn.VN the suspicion from.3MSG self

Instead of that they maintained that he had killed his neighbour, and that he had invented the story he told to turn away suspicion from himself.

B' ann an dìomhain a bhóidich e gu'n robh e neo-chiontach.

In vain did he protest his innocence.

FLTFL: 164

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Was anyone convinced?

QUD_{PC} What did they think happened?

- (90) Air là sònraichte chuir i le a conas a leithid de fheirg air Raonull is gu'n do leig e leis an abhag dol an sàs innte. Ghlaodh Gilleasbuig ris an cù a chasg agus e leigeil leatha. Thug Raonull cluas bhodhar dha so; agus an àite na h-abhaige a chasg, is ann a stuing e innte an cù glas mar an ceudna.

On a certain day she, by her teasing, put Ronald in such a passion that he suffered the terrier to attack her. Gillesbick cried to him to stop the dog and let her alone. Ronald turned a deaf ear to this; and instead of stopping the terrier he incited the grey hound also to attack her.

agus an àite na h-abhaige a chasg, is ann a stuing
 and instead of the.GEN stop? the? dog COP in.3MSG C.REL incite?
 e innte an cù glas mar an ceudna.
 3MSG in.3FSG the dog gray

and instead of stopping the terrier he incited the grey hound also to attack her.

Las so suas a corraich gu mór.

This greatly kindled her wrath.

FLTFL: 244

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Would Ronald stop the dog attack? (N)

QUD_{PC} Did he even get another dog to attack her?

- (91) Chuir an sealladh iongantach m'a choinneamh a leithid de dh' eagail air is gu 'n do ghuidh e air a' Phortair an t-àite neo-chneasda fhàgail gun dàil. Cha d' thug am Portair umhail air bith dha. An àite sin is ann a ghlaodh e le guth àrd ris na sìthichibh: “Na'n cuireadh a' bhó mhaol odhar aca dragh tuilleadh air buaile Odhanaich, gu'n tugadh e gach ni 'san t-Sithean as, agus gu'n tilgeadh e mach iad air Rudha na h-Oitire.”

The wonderful sight before him put him in so great fear that he besought the Ferryman to leave the uncanny place without delay. The Ferryman paid him no attention whatever. Instead of that, he called in a loud voice to the fairies, saying: “If their dun polled cow should ever again trouble Onich fold, he would take out everything in the Knoll and throw it out on Rudha na h-Oitire.”

An àite sin is ann a ghlaodh e le guth àrd
 instead of DEM COP in.3MSG C.REL call.PAST 3MSG with voice high
 ris na sìthichibh
 to.DEF the.PL fairy.PL

Instead of that, he called in a loud voice to the fairies

Air dha so a ràdh tharruing e a bhiodag as an ursainn, agus air bhall dhruid an dorus air féin agus air a bhràthair.

Having said this he drew his dirk out of the jamb, and straightway the door shut against him and his brother.

FLTFL: 282

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Would they leave this place? (N)

QUD_{PC} Did the ferryman call attention to their presence there?