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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.
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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
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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 sessions 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, so I have included a corpus of examples of the PC in Appendix A for the interested reader. This corpus contains all instances of the PC found in the text material. The PC is attested in Scottish

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

2 A caveat regarding one of the texts: Am Mabinogi is a translation from Welsh. I have included it in the discussion here anyway. 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.
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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). 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); 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 righeachd.
   cf. Bhois iad a’ toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad ’na righeachd.
   '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 righeachd.
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.
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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), (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.’

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.’)

(1.3) a. *An ann a thachair e gum bh` asaich am beothach a nochd?
*An ann a thachair e gum bh` asaich 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?’

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?’)

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: entence 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.
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(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 fhainne.

’n ann a thuit na clachan as an fhainne.
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 thainig am bus air deireadh.

’S ann a thainig am bus air deireadh.
COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST the bus late
‘It’s that the bus was late.’

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.
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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: 104ff.), 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.’
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B: #'S ann a thèid sinn dhan tràigh a-màireach.

'It’s true, we WILL go to the beach tomorrow.'

(1.11) A: Chan eil mi cinnteach gun do dh’fh` ag Se` onag an taigh an-d` e.

'I’m not sure that Se` onag left the house yesterday.'

B: #'S ann a dh’fh` ag i an taigh an-dè.

'She DID leave the house yesterday.'

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 glè 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.

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

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)
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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?”

(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.
    COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PRES the child PROG dance.VN
    ‘The child is dancing.’

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 ` aite a b’ fhe`arr.
    COP in.3MSG C.REL go.COND 3MSG to place C.REL COP better
    ‘He was going to a better place.’

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, bid ‘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.
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(1.16) Latha bha seo ’s ann a bhíd cù a’ chas.

Latha bha seo ’s ann a bhíd cù a’ chas.
\[\text{day be.PAST this COP in.3MSG C.REL bite.PAST dog the leg} \]
\[\text{‘One day a dog bit him on the leg.’}^{*} \quad \text{SAS: 27} \]

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.
\[\text{and COP in.3MSG do.PAST 3MSG the man OPTL kill.VN} \]
\[\text{‘And with that he killed the man.’}^{*} \quad \text{ESG: 185} \]

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 ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt buidh-ruadh a’ tighinn a-steach.
\[\text{at start the.GEN entertainment after the.GEN feast COP} \]
\[\text{ann a chunnaic iad òganach mòr prionnsail le falt in.3MSG C.REL see.PAST 3PL young.man big princely with hair} \]
\[\text{buidh-ruadh a’ tighinn a-steach.} \quad \text{yellow-red PROG come.VN in} \]
\[\text{‘At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall princely young man with reddish-blond hair coming in.’}^{*} \quad \text{AM: 18} \]

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.
The claim that I will develop in this dissertation is that the PC expresses the identifica-
tional 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.

Table 1.1: Summary of Interpretations Unavailable to the PC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory contexts</th>
<th>it’s that</th>
<th>Verum focus</th>
<th>Sentence focus</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>#  (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given propositional content</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>#  (1.10, 1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No context</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#  (1.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.

'\(\text{It's Mary who was in Barcelona with me.}\)'

(2.2) (Where was everybody?)

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

'\(\text{They were at the party} (\text{lit. It’s at the party that they were.})\)'

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)

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

\text{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 Bòrnish

‘His sister was keeping house for him at Bornish;’

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.

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

‘It was Donald Campbell who had the third fish-salting house.’

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.

‘It’s Anna that I will see.’

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.
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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 COP na h-uabhlan gu leir a chuir mi dha na COP 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.’

b. *'S e [ a h-uile duine ] a bha a’ phartaigh.
   *'S COP a h-uile duine a bha a’ phartaigh.
   COP 3MSG all people C.REL be.PAST at the party
   ‘It’s everyone who was at the party.’

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

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.’

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.’

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.’

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 COP 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 COP 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.’

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 interlocutors 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 interlocutors 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 interlocutors.

(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 interlocutors will commit to addressing a particular question until it is answered (or they find it cannot be answered). The interlocutors might introduce smaller, related questions—sub-questions—a 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 interlocutors 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
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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) $\textbf{S e} [\alpha]_{FOC} \text{ a has property } \Pi$
\text{ ASSERTS: } \Pi(\alpha)
\text{ PRESUPPOSES: } \forall x [\Pi x \rightarrow x=\alpha] \quad (\text{Lyon 2013: 302}, \text{ (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.

\[(2.22) \quad \text{MIN}_S(p) = \lambda w. \exists q \in \text{CQ}_S \left[ g(w) \land (q \geq_S p) \right] \]

There is a true answer to the CQ at least as strong as the prejacent \( p \)

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

There is no true answer to the CQ strictly stronger than the prejacent \( p \)

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 \( \text{MAX}_S \) operator, with \( \text{MIN}_S \) presupposed. In clefts, the exhaustive operator \( \text{MAX}_S \) 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).

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

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).

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

Relative clause presupposition: The current QUD is \( \lambda p \exists \alpha \left[ p = \Pi(\alpha) \right] \)

(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 Iain C.REL sing.PAST song last-night
'It was John’s eldest daughter who sang a song last night.’

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.

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.
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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 fainne a cheannaich M`airi.
    'It’s a ring that Mary bought.’

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

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 fhuir 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.’

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

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 uninformativity-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.

\section{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).
(2.31) \( \text{\textsc{'S } e [\alpha \text{]}_{FOC} \text{ a has property } \Pi} \)

\[ \text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w) \cdot \text{MIN}_S(p)(w) \]

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) \( \text{\textsc{'S ann a chaidh am bata fodha.} } \)

\( \text{\textsc{'S ann a chaidh am bata fodha} } \)

\( \text{COP in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST the boat under.3MSG} \)

\( \text{‘The boat sunk.’ (lit. ‘the boat went under’)} \)

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.
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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 fhaireachdaimn.”
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 fhaireachdaimn.”
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).

---

\(^1\)The 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.
(3.2) An às e dha biadh a thoirt sios chun a’ chait, ’s ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhorc fhèoir.

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

(3.3) Chan àbhaist do mhac righ 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.

He usually gives out help and advice.*

(3.4) “Ciod 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.”

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

(3.5) 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.
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(3.5) Thugadh boireannaich a-steach a choimhead as deaghaidh an leanaibh ’s a mhàthair.
Women were brought in to watch after the child and his mother.

Ach ’s ann a chaidil na boireannaich.

But the women slept.*

(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.

‘and he found the stall empty.’

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).
(3.7) “Chan àbhaist do chlann righ 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 righeachd.”

“They give away help and advice in the kingdom.”

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 crioich oirnne. ’S ann a thèid sinn gu baile eile.”

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

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.
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 unceleftable 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.
(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 thàinin balach a steach, agus thubhairt e ris: “Tha an cat marbh shios aig a’ bhàthach agad.”

'S ann a thàinin balach a steach, agus thubhairt e COP in.3MSG C.REL came boy in and say.PAST 3MSG ris: “Tha an cat marbh shios 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.”

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 sioda 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.*

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: D‘e a tha a’ tachairt?  
`What’s happening?’
B: #S ann a tha an leanabh a’ dannsa.  
‘The child is dancing.’

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 Gr´eidheir dheth dé bha ’ya chumail anochd cho fior-fhada seach mar a b’abhaist 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 b`al m`or againn ann an Ormaclait anochd.”

“The child is dancing.”

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 gr` an 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.”

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

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 Büiring’s (2003) analysis of contrastive topic constructions, which he argues requires a larger chunk of discourse. Büiring’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. Büiring (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. (Büiring 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).

(3.19) a. M₁
   \[ \begin{array}{c} \Downarrow \end{array} \]
   M₂

b. M₁ \hspace{1cm} M₂

c. M₃ \hspace{1cm} M₄
   \[ \begin{array}{c} \Downarrow \end{array} \]
   M₁ \hspace{1cm} M₂

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.
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).\(^4\)

\[(3.23) \textbf{Congruence:} \]
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.

\[(3.24) \textbf{Focus-value formation:} \]
\[\{[U]\}^f\] 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)
(c.f. 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 (c.f. 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).

\[(3.25) \text{PHAEDRA likes BANANAS} \]

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).

\[(3.26) \textbf{Strategy - a sub-tree of a d-tree rooted in an interrogative move} \quad \text{(Büring 2003: 518)} \]

\(^4\)Büring 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).
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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 gr` an 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.”

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, 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

\[\text{TB: 86}\]

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).

(3.28) (What are you doing (with the grain)?)

Are you eating the grain? [PC I will make bread and porridge]
\[
\]

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.
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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) "D`e 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'heuchas sinn cèaird na greusachd."
"'No," he said, "We'll go for the craft of the cobbler"*

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.’

(3.32) What craft will we take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What craft do we know?</th>
<th>(What craft don’t we know?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>[PC  We will become cobblers]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
(3.33) An àite dha biadh a thoirt sios chun a’ chait, ’s ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhòrc fheòir.

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, and the super-question is implicit. The PC answers this question.

(3.34) (What did he do to the cat?)

Did he take food to the cat? [PC He chases the cat]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Did he take food to the cat?} \\
\text{[PC He chases the cat]}
\end{array}
\]

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 fhaireachdaimn.”

“No. Nobody ever saw the devil: he only feels him.” LG: 293

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

\[\text{I assume that ‘instead of’ can be modeled with negation.}\]
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(3.36) (What is done with the devil?)

Do you catch the devil?  Do you see the devil?  [PC You feel the devil]

Here again, the PC signals the start of another branch in the d-tree. In (3.36), however, the start of a new line of inquiry is somewhat subtle, as it is the third branch in a series of polar interrogatives, all aiming to answer the super-question of what is done with the devil.

The previous examples have all had an explicit rejection of a previous assertion, or a negative answer to the IQUD. Although it is clear how rejection and negation may often go hand-in-hand with the creation of a new line of inquiry, it is crucially not part of the definition of the PC. Thus we expect to find instances of the PC where there is no explicit negation. We see this in (3.37), where the negation is implied by *ach ‘but’ as well as the incompatibility between keeping watch and sleeping.

(3.37) Thugadh boireannaich a-steach a choimhead as deaghaidh an leanaibh ‘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

The d-tree for (3.37) is given in (3.38).

(3.38) (What did the women do?)

They kept watch  [PC The women slept ]

(N)

In (3.39) the Immediate QUD is ‘by whose authority did you eat the fields?’—the interlocuter wishes to know why the fields have been eaten (e.g. because someone gave him permission). The speaker explicitly rejects the presupposition of this question, and The PC answers the implicit super-question of who actually ate the fields.

(3.39) Nur a thàinig eud bha esan an déidh na pàircean a ligeil itheadh leis na caoraich.
When they came, he had let the fields be eaten by the sheep.
“Ciod thuige dh’ith thu na pàircean.”
Ciod thuige (a) dh’ith thu na pàircean.
what toward.3MSG (C.REL) eat.PAST 2SG the.PL field.PL
“By whom [i.e. whose authority] did you eat the fields?”
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).

\[(3.40)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(Who ate the fields?)} \\
\text{(Did you eat the fields?)} \\
\left[PC: \text{The sheep ate them}\right] \\
\text{(Yes)} \hspace{1cm} \text{No, not me}
\end{array}
\]

By whose authority did you do eat the fields?

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
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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 ith 's a’ cómhradh 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 chunnachaidh iad òganach
mòr prionnsail le falt buidhe-ruadh a' tighinn a-steach
At the start of the entertainment after the feast, they saw a tall princely young man
with reddish-blond hair coming in.*

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.]

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 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.

45
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 Prabrusg (i.e. him stabbing himself), but the PC also functions to signal a resolution in the narrative: after Prabrusg is dead, Mac Rùislig gets the farmer’s daughter as his wife.

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.
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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).

\[(3.45) \text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w) \cdot \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)\]

- 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.

\[(3.46) \text{CLEFT}'_S = \lambda w. \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w) \cdot \text{MIN}_S(p)(w)\]

- 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.
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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. Büiring (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 interlocutors 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
simply ‘what world are we in?’
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Figure 3.1: Partition on the Context Set: Narrow Informational Focus

simply ‘what world are we in?’

simply ‘what world are we in?’

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.
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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.
‘The child is dancing.’

(3.49)  
A: Dè tha a’ tachairt?
‘What’s happening?’
B: Tha a’ chlann a’ chluiche aig a’ phairc.
The children are playing in the park.
C: # Chan eil. ‘S ann a tha na nabaidhean ag ithe am bracaist.
No, the neighbors are eating breakfast.

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’fh‘oighneachd an Gr´eidheir dheth dé bha ’ga chumail anochd cho fior-fhada seach mar a b’`abhaist 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,” said Esan, “is ann a tha bàrlòr againn ann an Ormaclait anochd.”

in Ormaclait tonight

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

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?

\[
\text{It appears not} \quad \text{What’s been keeping you?} \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{[PC We had a large ball]} 
\end{cases}
\]

The use of the PC, while answering the \textit{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 \textit{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 Dì a bhith troimh uile, ’s ann bha boirionnach fasta anns am buicead, anns am t-im agaibh, an t-im 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!”

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

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

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 \textit{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 \textit{wh}-question, which I assume to involve narrow focus-marking.

(3.53) \textbf{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 interlocutor 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 \textit{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).

\section{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
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).
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(4.1) \([v \text{ Bhuail}] [s \text{ esan}] [o \text{ am bell}] [Adv \text{ nuair a bha sinn shios dh`a h-ionnsaigh}].\)

\begin{align*}
\text{Bhuail esan} & \quad \text{am bell nuair a bha sinn shios} \\
\text{strike. PAST} & \quad \text{3MSG.EMPH the bell when C.REL be. PAST 1PL down} \\
\text{dh`a h-ionnsaigh.} & \quad \text{towards her} \\
\end{align*}

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 \(\text{[gum]}\) b` fhèarr dhaibh fuireachd air t`Ir].

\begin{align*}
\text{Thuirt e riutha} & \quad \text{gum b` fhèarr dhaibh fuireachd air t`Ir.} \\
\text{say. PAST} & \quad \text{3MSG to.3PL C COP better for.3PL stay.VN on land} \\
\text{He told them that they would be better to stay on land.}^* & \quad \text{SAS: 17} \\
\end{align*}

b. Cha robh duil aice \(\text{[gu]}\) faceadh i Tormod be` tuileadhl.

\begin{align*}
\text{Cha robh} & \quad \text{duil aice gu faceadh i Tormod be`} \\
\text{NEG be. PAST.DEP} & \quad \text{expectation at. FSG C see. COND 3FSG Normal alive} \\
\text{anymore} & \quad \text{tuileadhl.} \\
\text{She was afraid that she would never see Norman again} & \quad \text{lit. She had no expectation that she would see Norman alive again.}^* & \quad \text{SAS: 9} \\
\end{align*}

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. \(\text{[an]}\) robh iad fada bhuainn?

\begin{align*}
\text{An robh} & \quad \text{iad fada bhuainn?} \\
\text{Q be. PAST.DEP} & \quad \text{3PL far from. 1PL} \\
\text{Were they far from us?} & \quad \text{FSS: 130} \\
\end{align*}

b. Bha gach fear a` faighneachd \(\text{[an]}\) robh na Gearmailtich seo dona dhuinn.

\begin{align*}
\text{Bha gach fear a` faighneachd an robh} & \quad \text{na Gearmailtich} \\
\text{be. PAST each one PROG ask. VN Q be. PAST.DEP the. PL German.PL} \\
\text{seo dona dhuinn.} & \quad \text{DEM bad to. 1PL} \\
\text{Each one asked if these Germans had mistreated us.} & \quad \text{FSS: 132} \\
\end{align*}

\(^1\)Scottish 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.
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 pios aran eòrna [a] bha ___ aige ann am poc].
Thug Alasdair Uilleam a-mach pios aran eòrna 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] 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
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).

(4.6) a. gu àite [anns *an* tiormaich i].
   gu àite anns an tiormaich i
to place in.DEF C.REL dry.FUT.DEP 3SG
‘to a place where it [the peat] will dry’ (lit. ‘in which it will dry’)        LG: 271

b. Ach càit [an] roibh oifigeach beag na litreach a-nis?  
   Ach càit an roibh 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 â Canada far [an] roibh e air a bhith ‘g obair ann a Hudson Bay. 
   Bha Iain air tilleadh â Canada far an roibh  
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] tuirt sinne diog. (cf. *Thuirt sinne...*)
   Cha tuirt 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. *Thuirt i gun do rug...*)
   Thubhairt i rithe nach do rug ise air asal  
say.PAST 3SG to.3SG C.NEG get.PAST.DEP 3SG.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.

    C’airson nach eil tus ride-igeadh an asal?
    why C.REL.NEG be.PRES.DEP 2SG ride.VN the donkey

    ‘Why aren’t you riding the donkey?’

    LG: 267

d. Nach e sibh a bh’ aig an R`odha shuas? (cf. An e sibh...)

    Nach e sibh a bh' aig an Ròdhra 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. thuirt 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 be.PAST 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 simn 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 dusgadh 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>VERB FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativizing</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>independent, relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativizing</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Subordinating</td>
<td>gun</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>nach</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Interrogative</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Matrix</td>
<td>cha</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 C⁰ (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)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \text{Tha thu ‘nad \textit{thidsear}.} \\
& \quad \text{Tha thu ann do \textit{thidsear}.} \\
& \quad \text{be.PRES 2SG in 2SG.POSS teacher} \\
& \quad \text{‘You are a teacher.’ (lit. ‘You are in your teacher.’)} \\
\text{(b)} & \quad \text{‘S e \textit{tidsear [ a th’ annad ].}} \\
& \quad \text{‘S e \textit{tidsear a th a annad.}} \\
& \quad \text{COP 3MSG teacher C.REL be.PRES in.2SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘You are a teacher.’ (lit. ‘It’s a teacher that is in you.’)}
\end{align*}\]

(4.12b) is included to make the comparison particularly clear. For both sentences, there are two key parts: the verb \textit{tha} and the preposition \textit{ann}. In (4.12a), the postverbal subject position is occupied by the pronoun \textit{thu}, and the complement to the preposition \textit{ann} is the predicate \textit{thidsear}, 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 \textit{ann} is the pronoun \textit{thu} (which here shows up as agreement inflection on the preposition).

Assuming that the relative complementizer \textit{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.

\subsection*{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 \(\phi\) 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.

\footnote{I 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. D` e am bocsa a chuir thu am peann ann/*anns ?
   D` e 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 *D` e am bocsa a chuir thu am peann anns d` 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’ ge` arradh na craoibhe.
   Bha thu a’ ge` arradh 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’ 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\_\_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\_\_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.
Adger and Ramchand build up their Agree analysis of Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies by first identifying the necessary semantic pieces. A-bar dependencies are interpreted as predicate abstraction over a variable. This is schematized in (4.18).

\[
(4.18) \quad [\text{PIVOT}] \lambda x \ldots x
\]

Adger and Ramchand propose that this interpretation, with its two component parts (a variable and abstraction), can be straightforwardly derived from a syntactic structure containing a [Λ] feature and an [ID:] feature. The [Λ] feature is interpreted by the semantic component as predicate abstraction, and [ID:] as the variable. [ID:] must have a value to be interpreted at LF. This may be done either by inherent φ features (obtained via context or otherwise) or by a syntactic dependency, in which case the feature is valued [ID: dep]. This is summarized in (4.19).

\[
(4.19) \quad \text{i. } [\Lambda] \text{- interpreted as predicate abstraction} \\
\quad \text{ii. } [\text{ID}] \text{- referential dependence} \\
\quad \quad [\text{ID: φ}] \text{- pronouns} \\
\quad \quad [\text{ID: dep}] \text{- pronoun with referential dependence provided by syntactic context}
\]

Scottish Gaelic A-bar dependencies show non-identity effects, and an analysis which proposes that the element in the gap position is not in fact a copy left behind by movement goes a long way in explaining the non-identity effects. Adger and Ramchand argue that in Scottish Gaelic—and in fact, in all such Agree-based dependencies—a specialized pro occupies the position of the apparent gap and a specialized relative complementizer heads the dependency (4.21).

\[
(4.20) \quad [\text{DP pivot}_i] \quad [\text{CP } a \ldots \text{pro}_i]
\]

The specialized null pro found in A-bar dependencies is a pronoun whose [ID:] feature is unvalued, and must receive a value over the course of the derivation. It gets this value by entering into an Agree relation with the relative complementizer a, which spells out the features [Λ] and [ID:dep].

\[
(4.21) \quad [\text{DP pivot}] \quad [\text{CP } a[\Lambda, \text{ID:dep}] \ldots \text{pro}[\text{ID: }]]
\]

The particular distribution of these features produces an obligatory co-occurrence of a and pro. Intuitively, wherever we find the relative complementizer a we find a predicate-variable dependency (i.e., relative clause), so there must also be a variable. This is realized formally with the features [Λ] and [ID:], and their particular configuration in the structure. The specialized pro is syntactically restricted to clauses headed by a, as a is the only complementizer which has the means to value its unvalued [ID:] feature. As for the relative complementizer, it has both features necessary for establishing an A-bar dependency in a single syntactic position. To prevent the otherwise contradictory interpretation of both predicate abstraction and a variable in the same position, Adger and Ramchand (2005) propose the interpretive principle in (4.22).

\[
(4.22) \quad \text{Interpret Once under Agree} \\
\quad \text{Interpretable features in an Agree chain are interpreted only once.}
\]

(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 174)
The \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{ID:dep} \) features cannot be semantically interpreted on the same element, so the relative complementizer must be in an Agree relation with another element which shares one of these features (i.e. the \( \text{pro} \) variable). The Agree relation allows for the interpretation of \( \text{ID:dep} \) on \( \text{pro} \) rather than the relative complementizer \( a \). Without another \( \text{ID:dep} \) feature in the clause, the sentence would be uninterpretable. Thus \( a \) is restricted to clauses with this \( \text{pro} \) and \( \text{pro} \) is restricted to clauses headed by \( a \).

This means that the relative clause in (4.23a), despite the appearance of a gap, has a structure in which no movement has occurred (4.23b).

\[(4.23) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. an duine } & \left[ \text{a bhuaileas e } \right. \\
\text{an duine} & \text{ a bhuaileas e} \\
\text{the man} & \text{ C.REL hit.FUT.REL he} \\
\text{‘the man that he will hit.’} & \text{(Adger and Ramchand 2005: 175)}
\end{align*}
\]

The A-bar dependency is created via agreement between the relative complementizer \( a \) and \( \text{pro} \), which is interpreted as co-referential with the pivot.

The obligatory 3MSG inflection on stranded prepositions discussed in §4.2.1.2 above is a natural consequence of Adger and Ramchand’s proposal. This inflection is invariant, surfacing regardless of the properties of the pivot, and is arguably the default inflection. Under Adger and Ramchand’s non-movement proposal, the pivot does not originate in the gap position, so inflection is not predicted to be sensitive to its properties. The inflection is in fact is predicted to be invariant because the gap is always occupied by the same element. The null \( \text{pro} \) involved in the formation of A-bar dependencies has no inherent \( \phi \)-features, and so plausibly triggers default 3MSG inflection.

Furthermore, Adger and Ramchand’s analysis involving a null \( \text{pro} \) is harmonious with language-internal patterns. Only pronominal elements trigger agreement inflection on prepositions in Scottish Gaelic, so a pronominal element triggering \( \phi \) inflection is consistent with inflectional patterns elsewhere in the language. Additionally, inflection and overt pronouns are in complementary distribution (cf. McCloskey and Hale (1984) for Modern Irish), so the null form of \( \text{pro} \) in A-bar dependencies is unsurprising. Adger and Ramchand also point to the rich complementizer system in Scottish Gaelic (and Celtic more generally) as evidence that the specialized relative complementizer realizes a particular bundling of features (specifically, the \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{ID:dep} \) features).

Thus there are two strategies available to languages for creating A-bar dependencies: either via Agree or via Move. The choice comes down to how the two features crucial to forming A-bar dependencies (\( \Lambda \), \( \text{ID} \)) are bundled across lexical items. A language such as English, which does have identity effects, constructs its A-bar dependencies via movement of an element bearing both \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{ID:} \). Since both \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{ID:} \) are featured on a single element, movement must occur to prevent these semantically incompatible features from being interpreted in the same position. This is schematized in Table 4.2, where the bolded features indicate where they are interpreted.

A language such as Scottish Gaelic, on the other hand, constructs its A-bar dependencies via Agree. Because \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{ID:} \) are distributed across two lexical items, movement is not necessary, although agreement is. This is schematized in Table 4.3).
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 [Λ], 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.
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(4.24)  
a. 'S ann rí mo bhràthair [a bha mi a’ bruidhinn ___]  
'S ann rí 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  
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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)  
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).
The agreement pattern with positional verbs is atypical of Scottish Gaelic \( \phi \)-agreement more generally in that it reflects the \( \phi \)-features of an overt argument (both full DPs and pronouns). Agreement on a preposition, by contrast, only reflects the \( \phi \)-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’

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\textsubscript{i} ris an sgeulachd mu Chalum\textsubscript{i}.

Dh’eist e ris an sgeulachd mu Chalum
PAST 3MSG to.DEF the story about Calum
"He\textsubscript{i} listened to the story about Calum\textsubscript{i}."

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\textsubscript{i} [ris an do dh’eist e\textsubscript{i} ___]?

Dè an sgeulachd mu Chalum ris an do dh’eist e?
what the story about Calum to.DEF C.REL listen.PAST.DEP 3MSG
"Which story about Calum\textsubscript{i} did he\textsubscript{i} listen to? (ok if he ≠ Calum)"

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).

\(^{5}\) Adger 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.

\(^{6}\) My 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.
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(4.31)  a. Chunnaic a h-uile mathair\textsubscript{i} a\textsubscript{i} nighean fh`ein.

Chunnaic a h-uile mathair a nighean fh`ein.
see.PAST every mother 3FSG.POSS daughter self
‘Every mother saw her own daughter.’

b. *Chunnaic a\textsubscript{i} mathair fh`ein a h-uile nighean\textsubscript{i}.

*Chunnaic a mathair fh`ein a h-uile nighean.
see.PAST 3FSG.POSS mother self every daughter
‘*Her own mother saw every daughter.’

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 nighean fh`ein a chunnaic a h-uile mathair\textsubscript{i} ______

‘S e a nighean fh`ein 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.’

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]\textsubscript{i} a’ coinneachadh ri a cheile\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{i} [ a tha [Mairi agus Anna]\textsubscript{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’

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 fluair mi ].
Agus is è leabhar a fluair mi.
and COP 3MSG book C.REL get.PAST 1SG
‘And it was a book I got [for a prize].’
Bha sgriobhadh air bho Marquis of Tuillibardine
Bha sgriobhadh air bho Marquis of Tuillibardine
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).
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 $\phi$-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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-IDENTITY</th>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYNTACTIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection (predicate nominal, §4.2.1.1)</td>
<td>Selection (prepositions, §4.3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement (prepositions, §4.2.1.2)</td>
<td>Agreement (positional verbs, §4.3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case (§4.2.1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMANTIC</td>
<td>SEMANTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idioms (§4.2.1.4)</td>
<td>Variable Binding (§4.3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition C (§4.2.1.5)</td>
<td>Condition C (§4.3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocal Binding (§4.3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of Bare NPs (§4.3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 explanadum, 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).
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(4.36) Bha d` _ùsgadh_ anns na _h-eaglaisean_ ann seo [air an robh “an tuiteam” aca __].

Bha d` _ùsgadh_ 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’.’

In (4.36), the relative clause has been postposed to a sentence-final position. The pivot _d`ùsgadh_ 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

---

\(^8\)A 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. Hulsey 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.

\(^9\)Thanks to Rajesh Bhatt for pointing this out to me.
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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?’

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’ smaoineachadh [gun d’fhuairemi am preasant ____]]

na boireannaich bhon (an) robh mi a’
the.PL woman.PL from.DEF C.REL be.PAST.DEP 1SG PROG
smaoineachadh an d’fhuaire 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’ smaoineachadh [bhon d’fhuairemi am preasant ____]]

na boireannaich a bha mi a’ smaoineachadh bhon
the.PL woman.PL C.REL be.PAST 1SG PROG think.VN from.DEF
(an) d’fhuaire mi am preasant
C.REL get.PAST.DEP 1SG the present
‘the women who I thought I got the present from’

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. *C’ o (a) dh’olas sinn uisge beatha [ ma thig ____ ]?

*C’ o (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?’

---

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).\(^\text{11}\)

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

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.

\[(4.42)\]

---

\(^{11}\)Both *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’ bhailte* *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
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b. [S] e Calum [ an tidsear ].
   '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 br`a ann.
   'S ainneamh taigh nach robh br`a 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). 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)). 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.

5.1 Cleft Syntax

In this section I propose a structure for Scottish Gaelic clefts. I assume that the copula is in T⁰. This is the default assumption given i) the initial position of the copula, given the verb-initial nature of Scottish Gaelic and 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.
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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 Mh`airi.
   'S e an cat a thug Calum do Mh`airi.
   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 Mh`airi] a thug Calum an cat.
   'S ann do Mh`airi 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 $\phi$-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 \left[ N \text{ duine fuathasach crosda } \right] a bh’ ann.

\begin{align*}
'S e & \text{ duine fuathasach crosda a bh’ ann } \\
\text{COP 3MSG man terribly cross C.REL be.PAST in.3MSG}
\end{align*}

‘He was a very cross man.’

ST: 5

b. 'S e \left[ N \text{ aon stobh } \right] a bh’ anns a’ bhàirdse

\begin{align*}
'S e & \text{ aon stobh a bh’ anns a’ bhàirdse } \\
\text{COP 3MSG one stove C.REL be.PAST in.DEF the barge}
\end{align*}

‘There was only one stove on the barge.’

FSS: 40

c. Dh’inn e gur $h-e^4$ \left[ N \text{ ‘m fiabhras } \right] a bh’ air a’ ghille.

\begin{align*}
Dh’inn & e \text{ gur h-e ‘m fiabhras a bh’ air a’ ghille. } \\
\text{say.PAST 3MSG C.COP 3MSG the fever C.REL be.PAST on the boy}
\end{align*}

‘He said that the boy had the fever.’

ST: 14

\footnote{Following 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.}
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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)  
\[ \text{‘S e [C gu robh e tinn] a thuirt mi.} \]  
\[ ‘S e gu robh e tinn a thuirt mi. \]  
\[ \text{COP 3MSG C be.PAST.DEP 3MSG sick C.REL say.PAST 1SG} \]  
\[ ‘What I said was that he was ill.’ (Adger 2011: 2) \]

b. ‘S e [C an leabhar ud a leughadh] a dh’iarr e orm.  
\[ ‘S e an leabhar ud a leughadh a dh’iarr e \]  
\[ \text{COP 3MSG the book DEM OPTCL read.VN C.REL ask.PAST 3MSG} \]  
\[ orm. on.1SG} \]  
\[ ‘What he asked me to do was to read that book.’ (Adger 2011: 2) \]

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)  
\[ \text{‘S e [v smiaradh] a bha dol an uair sin, cha robh guth air dipeadh idir.} \]  
\[ Agus ‘s e smiaradh a bha dol an uair sin, cha robh guth air dipeadh idir. \]  
\[ \text{Agus COP 3MSG smear.VN C.REL be.PAST go.VN then NEG} \]  
\[ robh breath on dip.VN at.all} \]  
\[ ‘Sheep used to be smeared then, dipping them hadn’t been heard of.’ ST: 15 \]

b. ‘S e [A glé bheag do sgoil] a fluair mise  
\[ ‘S e glé bheag do sgoil a fluair mise. \]  
\[ \text{COP 3MSG very little of school C.REL get.PAST 1SG.EMPH} \]  
\[ ‘I got very little schooling.’ ST: 5 \]

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.
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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 bhr` athair ] a bha mi a’ bruidhinn.
'S ann ri mo bhr` athair 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.'

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
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 c` omlha rium fh` ın as an tent ] a bha e.
'S ann c` omlha rium flìn 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).

(5.8) 'S ann [Asp a’ d` eanamh d` am ] a bha e.
'S ann a’ d` eanamh d` am 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.
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.REF COP far.COMP C.REF 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,
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).

\[
\text{(5.11)}
\]

```
PredP
  
  Subject

  Pred^0

  Augment
```

Pred^0 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 \(< e, t >\). 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 \(< s, t >\) for prepositional phrases.\(^5\) In this case, the augment is necessarily type \(< < s, t >, t >\). This is illustrated in (5.12b) for (5.6b) above. In the former case we find the form e and in the latter, ann.\(^6\)

\(^{6}\)This type, \(< s, t >\), 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 
\(<< e, t > t >
\), since the nominal predicate is presumably of type 
\(< e, t >
\).

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 
\(< e, t >
\), 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Semantic Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(&lt; e, t &gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ann)</td>
<td>(&lt;&lt; e, t &gt; t &gt; &lt; s, t &gt;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
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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-Phàdraig* represents the goal of the going event, and in (5.14b) the preposition *air an trèana* is the manner of Mary’s going home. In both examples in (5.14), the preposition is of type *<s,t>* , 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-Phàdraig ] a chaidh e
   Agus ’s ann do Cheann-Phàdraig a chaidh e and COP in.3MSG to Peterhead C.REL go.PAST 3MSG
   ‘and it was to Peterhead he went.’
   (5.14) b. Is ann [ air an trèana ] a tha Màiri a’ dol dhachaidh an nochd.
   Is ann air an trèana 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 *<e,t>* , and still we find the *ann* form of the augment, *contra* the predictions of the semantic account.\(^7\)

(5.15) ’S ann [ còmhlha rium fhìn as an tent ] a bha e.
   ’S ann còmhlha 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.’

---

\(^7\)In 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.
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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\[3pt\]sinn a bha air ar doigh.

\[\text{COP 3MSG 1PL C.REL be.PAST on 1PL.POSS manner}\]

‘We were very happy.’

b. Is i a tha bochd.

\[\text{COP 3FSG C.REL be.PRES poor}\]

‘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,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>mise</em></td>
<td><em>sinne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>thusa</em></td>
<td><em>sibhse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>esan</em></td>
<td><em>iadsan</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Emphatic Pronouns

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

(5.18)  a. ‘S e\[3pt\]mise Aonghus Beag.

\[\text{COP AUG 1SG.EMPH Angus Little}\]

‘I am "Young Angus".’

---

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.
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b. ’S mise a’ fear a thànaig a bhruich ur bidh dhuibh.

’S mise a’ fear a thànaig a bhruich ur bidh
dhuibh.

for.2PL

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

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 \( \phi \)-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.

‘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.

\(^9\)Or, alternatively, that the pronoun is null and the augment is what spells out the \( \phi \)-features: Is iad \( \emptyset \)-san na h-oileanach.
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(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’

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

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.’

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

---

11 Gillies (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.

12 Scottish 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?”
Nachi   e sibh a bh’ aig an Ròdha shuas?
Q,NEG,COP 3MSG 2PL C,REL be,PAST at the Rodha up
“We 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. 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 T⁰, 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.

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

Incidentally, 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).

This 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.\footnote{I consider the palatalization of the copula preceding the $e$ form of the augment ($fe:/ 's e$) 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.} 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).\footnote{Hedberg’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.}
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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.
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\]

\['S e an cat a thug Calum do Mhàiri\]
\['It’s the cat that Calum gave to Mary.\]

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(ann)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP, NP</td>
<td>DP (adverbial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP (argument)</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP (argument)</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(P) (argument)</td>
<td>AspP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: The Form of the Augment and Category of the Subject
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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 $\phi$ 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)

$ann$ occurs, 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. 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).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17}It strikes me as plausible that prepositional phrases may be resistant to nominalization. This, of course, is an empirical question, and, if true, provides support for this claim. As it stands, however, it is a stipulation that prepositional phrases are not nominalized when they occur as arguments, but such stipulations are often characteristic of morphosyntactic generalizations.}\]
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.\(^\text{18}\) 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).

\(^{18}\)Another 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.
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(5.32)  a. **ann an dīman 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 D₀ 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
      \[φ \, δ\]

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. 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.
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).\(^{20}\)

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).

---

\(^{20}\)It 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 is 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 D0 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.’
   \rightarrow No one else sang last night.
(b) ‘S e [ an nighean AS SINE aig Iain ] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
    \rightarrow No one else’s eldest daughter may have.
(c) ‘S e [ an nighean as sine AIG IAIN ] a sheinn oran a-raoir.
    \rightarrow None of John’s other daughters sang; although someone else may have.

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).

(5.41)

```
CP
   /\     
 QP₁  CQ  TP
   / \
Q   DP
```

whose book

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)
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) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CP a [uFOC] [TP ... [FocP Foc [FOC] [XP XP ] ... ] ]]} \\
\end{array}
\]

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

\(^{22}\)As 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 T⁰ 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).

(5.44)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{T} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{t}_D \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{DP}_2 \\
\text{a thug Calum \underline{do Mhàiri}}
\end{array}
\]

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).
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(5.45)  a. $^S$ e [fear cnagach ban] a cheasnaich mise.  
\hspace*{2em} 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.  
\hspace*{2em} 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 br` a ann].  
\hspace*{2em} ICC

'S ainneamh taigh nach robh br` a 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

\[(5.46)\]

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.

\[\text{23The DP predicate structure in (5.46) is reminiscent of the DP predicate structure in Stowell (1983: 297-99).}\]
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 ].  
   Tha Calum anns a’ bhùth.  
   ‘Calum is in the shop.’  

b. Is [ le Calum ] **an cù**.  
   Is le Calum an cù.  
   ‘The dog belongs to Calum’

c. ’**S e** Calum [ an tidsear ].  
   ’S e Calum an tidsear  
   ‘Calum is the teacher.’

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 Pred⁰ is null, while in the ICC and ACC the copula heads Pred⁰.

5.2.2.1 The Inverted Copula Clause (ICC)

Adger and Ramchand propose the structure in (5.48) underlyng the ICC in (5.47b).

(5.48) 

```
PredP
  |   Subject
  |   an cù
  |   Pred'
    |   Pred₀
    |   is
     |   le Calum
```

Predicate
The copula introduces a *holds* relation between the predicate and the subject.

\[(5.49) \quad [[\text{is}]] = \lambda \pi \lambda x \ [\text{holds}(\pi, x)]\]

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.

\[(5.50) \quad *\text{Is } [\text{m\text{"o}r }] \text{ duine}.\quad \text{ICC}\]

\[
\text{Is } \text{m\text{"o}r } \text{duine.}
\]

\[
\text{COP } \text{big } \text{man}
\]

‘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.

\[(5.51) \quad \text{a. Is } [\text{tidsear }] \text{ Calum} \quad \text{ICC}\]

\[
\text{Is } \text{tidsear } \text{Calum}
\]

\[
\text{COP } \text{teacher } \text{Calum}
\]

‘Calum is a teacher.’ (Adger and Ramchand 2005: 335)

\[
\text{b. Tha Calum } [\text{’na thidsear }] 
\]

\[
\text{Tha } \text{Calum } \text{’na } \text{thidsear}
\]

\[
\text{be.PRES } \text{Calum } \text{in.3MSG.POSS } \text{teacher}
\]

‘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 an 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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{′} raises and lands in spec,TP (5.52).

\[(5.52)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{Pred}^{\prime} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{Pred}^0 \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{tidsear} \\
\text{T}_{\text{EPP}} \\
\text{PredP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Calum}
\end{array}
\]

This is how the ICC is derived. In the next section we will see how this structure extends to ACC.
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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 ].  
   COP 3MSG Calum the teacher  
   ‘Calum is the teacher.’  
(Adger and Ramchand 2003: 339)

   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.

---

24 Adger 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 \( \iota \) has the usual meaning (originally proposed in Russell (1905)), \( \pi \) 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).

(5.57) \( \text{PredP}=\text{holds}(\iota \pi, c) \)

\( \text{Pred'}=\lambda x. \text{holds}(\iota \pi, x) \)

\( \lambda \pi \lambda x. \text{holds}(\pi, x) \)

\( \iota \pi: \text{where } \pi \text{ is the relevant distinguishing property associated with } x \)

\( \text{is } e \)

‘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).
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,

\(^{25}\)Note, 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 T⁰. 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 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 T⁰ and C⁰ 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 T⁰, as in the D⁰-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 T⁰. This provides support for the D⁰-Augment analysis because under that analysis the copula heads T⁰ and thus this pattern conforms with the generalization that elements in T⁰ 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 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?’
   cf. **S** ann as do dheoghaidh a bha e. ‘He was after you.’

   b. Thubhairt mo bhean rium **nach** e mi fh` in a bh’ ann.
   Thubhairt mo bhean rium nach e mi fh` in 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.’
   cf. **S** e mi fh` in 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.
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(5.61) Dh’innse [gur] h-e ‘m fiabhras a bh’ air a’ ghille.

Dh’innse  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’innse 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 [a] 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.
past.PAST.INDEP 1SG the whisky in.DEF-the refrigerator
‘I put the whisky in the refrigerator.’

\(^{27}\)For 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.

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-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.

### Table 5.5: Independent-Dependent Pattern and the Null Form of the Copula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COP</th>
<th>DEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;is&quot;</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuir</td>
<td>do chuir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)  

\[
\text{S} \quad \text{tu} \quad \text{‘in fear of the last man who will escape’}
\]

\(\text{COP} \quad \text{2SG} \quad \text{the man last}
\]

\(\text{C.REL} \quad \text{get.COND} \quad \text{out-of.3MSG}
\]

\‘You are the last man who will escape’

\(\text{ST: 24}\)

\(^{28}\)For 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.

\(^{29}\)The *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).
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.  

| Q  | 2SG.EMPH | Play-Sunbeam |
| An | *tusa* | Mire-gath-gréine? |

‘Are you Play of Sunbeam?’  

FTFL: 210

b.  

| Q.NEG | 2SG. | Thomas | Jock.GEN |
| Nach | *tu* | Tómas | Sheochd? |

‘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 fás liath ad shuidhe air sliabh Beinn an Oir.

| be.PRES | 2SG.EMPH | there | VOC | Yellow Murdoch of the Deer and 2SG on fás liath ad shuidhe air sliabh Beinn an Oir. | 2SG.POSS | sit.VN | on side | Ben-an-Or |
| Tha | thusa | an | sin, | a Mhurchaidh Bhuidhe nam Fiadh, | *is* | tu | air fás liath ad shuidhe air sliabh Beinn an Oir. |

‘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 fás liath... ‘grown gray...’, being a prepositional predicate, would be expected to follow the copula (i.e. invert) if this were a copula clause.
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(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’ FTFL: 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’ FTFL: 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 co-ordinator 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. 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

\[31\text{That T and C are a reasonable basis for a natural class finds support in the Old Irish ‘verbal complex’, which was made up of complementizers and the finite verb as well as clitic pronouns (cf. Thurneysen (1980)). Alternatively, the coordinator might be proposed to be in T}^0\text{ in small clause constructions. This, along with the null form of the copula in T, makes for a very neat generalization whereby the elements which trigger the tu form are in T}^0.\]
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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 seò?’ ars esan, ‘s e cur a làimh’ air a ghualaimn.

“‘S dé tha ‘n seò?’ ars esan, ‘s e cur a
and what be.PRES here said 3MSG.EMPH and 3MSG put.VN 3MSG.POSS
làimh’ air a ghualaimn.
hand on 3MSG.POSS shoulder
“And what’s this?” he asked, putting his hand on his shoulder. ST: 29

(5.69)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\&P \\
\& \\
agus \\
PredP \\
\mid \\
DP \\
\mid \\
e \\
\mid \\
Pred \\
\mid \\
∅ \\
\mid \\
AspP \\
\mid \\
[a'] cur a làimh’ air a ghualaimn
\end{array}
\]

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 Pred\(^0\).

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 Pred\(^0\). By contrast, the D\(^0\)-Augment analysis, which posits that the copula heads T\(^0\), extends easily to these facts. If the copula is a T\(^0\) 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).

---

\(^{32}\)I remain agnostic as to the exact category of *agus* in these constructions, using &P as a descriptive term only.
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(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.
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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  
and  
be.PAST  
the family  
inside  
length  
then  
and  
1SG  
self  
a  
b’òige  
young. 
Comp  
dha  
of  
na  
the. 
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.’

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). 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.
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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).

(5.75)

\[\text{TP} \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{T} \rightarrow \text{PredP} \rightarrow \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{spec,TP} \rightarrow \text{NP}\]

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 \textit{ainm a’ bhaile seo} [St. Valery-en-caux]  
B’ e \textit{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 \textit{Tormod MacIlleathain agus Eairdsidh Mor Mac-a-Phi a Uibhist a Deas} le cheile \textit{a’ chiad dithis a theich as a’ champa seo}  
‘S e \textit{Tormod MacIlleathain agus Eairdsidh Mor Mac-a-Phi a Uibhist a Deas} le cheile a’ chiad dithis a theich  
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

\(^{35}\)Unsurprisingly, 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’ chiaid 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 D^0-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 D^0-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 D^0-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 D^0-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 D^0-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), Wurmbbrand (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 D^0-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 equitive 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.
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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 ].

\[
\text{Bha sinn an latha seo a’ dol tro Yvetot}
\]

be.PAST IPL the day DEM PROG go.VN through Yvetot

‘One day (lit. this day) we were passing through Yvetot’

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

37 Incidentally, these adverbs can also precede the relative clause in clefts ‘S e Máirí, 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.

38 In 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 \( \text{D}^0 \)-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 \( \text{D}^0 \)-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.

\begin{align*}
\text{(5.80) } \text{Is } [ \text{tidsear } ] \text{ Calum.} \\
\text{Is } \text{tidsear Calum.} \\
\text{COP} \text{ teacher Calum} \\
\text{‘Calum is a teacher.’} \\
\end{align*}

(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).

\begin{align*}
\text{(5.81) } & \text{‘S e tidsear a th’ ann an Calum.} \\
\text{‘S e tidsear a th’ ann an Calum} \\
\text{COP} \text{ 3MSG teacher C.REL be.PRES in Calum} \\
\text{‘Calum is a teacher.’} \\
\end{align*}

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 \textit{beag orm}.

\begin{align*}
\text{(5.82) } \text{Is } [ \text{beag orm } ] \text{ marag.} \\
\text{Is beag orm marag} \\
\text{COP little on.1SG blood-pudding} \\
\text{‘I dislike blood pudding’ (lit. ‘Blood pudding is little on me.’)} \\
\text{(Lamb 2003: 73)}
\end{align*}

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.\footnote{See also Lash (2011: 248) for a deverbal structure in Old Irish copula clauses, although for Lash the copula selects for a PredP structure.}

\begin{equation}
(5.83) \quad \text{TP} \\
\quad \text{T} \quad \text{is} \\
\quad \text{D} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \emptyset \quad \text{tidsear} \quad \text{Calum} \quad \text{DP}
\end{equation}

This nominal structure has a rightward specifier, obviating the need for movement, which is otherwise unmotivated (see §5.2.3.1).\footnote{This 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.} 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.
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 \textit{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).
CHAPTER 6. THE SYNTAX OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

(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.

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) \cdot \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 \textit{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).
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(6.4) \[\text{CLEFT}_S = \lambda w, \lambda p: \text{MAX}_S(p)(w).\text{MIN}_S(p)(w)\] (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.

(6.5)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TP} & \quad \text{T} & \quad \text{S} \\
& \quad \text{DP} & \quad \text{CP} \\
& \quad \text{D} & \quad \text{C} \\
& \quad \text{e} \quad \text{[D: } \eta'] \\
& \quad \text{FocP} & \quad \text{Foc} & \quad \text{DP} & \quad \text{A} \quad \text{[uFOC]} \\
& \quad \text{Foc} & \quad \text{DP} & \quad \text{C} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{'S} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{an cat a thug Calum to Mhàiri.}\]
\[\text{COP 3MSG the cat C.REL give.PAST Calum to Mary}\]
\[\text{‘It’s the cat that Calum gave to Mary.’}\]

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-adojoints 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 $\eta$ 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 $uFoc$, 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.
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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{ann}.\(^2\)

Thus we explain the use of the relative complementizer, the form of the augment as \textit{ann}, as well as the absence of movement in the PC. The relative complementizer betray 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 \textit{aL} as indicative of an operator-variable structure, and Rooth (1992) with respect to focus specifically). Movement fails to apply. Brod 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 \textit{in situ}, and further movement is unnecessary.

\(^2\)I 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 an 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 [uFOC] 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)  
\begin{align*}
a. \textbf{An} & \text{ ann } \text{ as do dheoghaidh } [a \text{ bha } e]? \\
& \text{An } \text{ ann } \text{ as do dheoghaidh } a \text{ bha } e? \\
& \text{Q } \text{ in.3MSG } \text{ after you } \text{ C.REL } \text{ be.PAST } 3\text{MSG} \\
& \text{‘Was he after you?’ (lit. ‘Was it after you that he was?’)} & \text{ST: 24}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b. *\textbf{An} & \text{ ann } [a \text{ thachair e gun bhàsaich am beothach a nochd}]? \\
*\text{An} & \text{ ann } a \text{ thachair e gun bhàsaich am beothach a nochd?} \\
& \text{Q } \text{ in.3MSG } \text{ C.REL } \text{ happened } 3\text{MSG } \text{ C die.PAST } \text{ the beast tonight} \\
& \text{‘Did it happen that the beast died tonight?’} & \text{GLA\_TS\_02JUN2014\_CMS}
\end{align*}

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, \neg 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 \neg p is ill-formed in the PC, and since \neg 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* ‘*na inntinne* ‘make up one’s mind’ (6.12b); *saoil* ‘think’ (6.12c). The PC is underlined here and throughout the section.
(6.12) a. Cha robh fhios gu d’e 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 d’e an call a bha iad a’ deanamh feum dha!
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!’*

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.’

TWHv1: 347

(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. ‘So it was that I ever thought no fleshly heart was in my breast.’

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 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 leadh 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’

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 [uFoc]. In the PC, broad focus marking means that the FocP bearing the [Foc] feature is the complement of the relative complementizer whose [uFoc] 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.
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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 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.

\[(7.1)\]
\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Ta shi gen ni kai wanxiao de.} \\
& \quad \text{Ta shi gen ni kai wanxiao de.} \\
& \quad 3SG be with 2SG open joke DE \\
& \quad ‘(It is the case that) he was joking with you.’ (Paul and Whitman 2008: 419)
\end{align*}\]

---

\(^1\)Many thanks to Mitscho Erleweine for bringing this to my attention.
I focus here on the Mandarin construction, but further points of comparison need to be made with Japanese (7.1b) and Tibetan.

The Mandarin 

\( \text{shi...de} \) construction is largely identified as a cleft construction, and associated with idetnificational focus (cf. Paul and Whitman (2008), Cheng (2008)). The constituent immediately following the copula 

\( \text{shi} \) is in focus.

\( \text{Ta} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{zai} \) 

\( \text{Beijing} \) 

\( \text{xue} \) 

\( \text{yuyanxue} \) 

\( \text{de} \). 

(7.2) 

\( \text{3SG} \) 

\( \text{be} \) 

\( \text{at} \) 

\( \text{Beijing} \) 

\( \text{learn} \) 

\( \text{linguistics} \) 

\( \text{DE} \) 

‘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 morphosyntax \( (\text{shi}, \text{de}) \), 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).

\( \text{Ta} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{gen} \) 

\( \text{ni} \) 

\( \text{2SG} \) 

\( \text{kai} \) 

\( \text{wanxiao} \) 

\( \text{de} \). 

(7.3) 

\( \text{3SG} \) 

\( \text{be} \) 

\( \text{with} \) 

\( \text{2SG} \) 

\( \text{open} \) 

\( \text{joke} \) 

\( \text{DE} \) 

‘(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.

\( \text{Ta} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{bu} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{mingbai} \) 

\( \text{de} \). 

(7.4) 

\( \text{3SG} \) 

\( \text{NEG} \) 

\( \text{be} \) 

\( \text{understand} \) 

\( \text{DE} \) 

‘It’s not the case that he understands you.’

\( \text{Ta} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{bu} \) 

\( \text{shi} \) 

\( \text{mingbai} \) 

\( \text{de} \). 

(7.4) 

\( \text{3SG} \) 

\( \text{NEG} \) 

\( \text{be} \) 

\( \text{understand} \) 

\( \text{DE} \) 

‘Is it the case that he understands you?’
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
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


BIBLIOGRAPHY


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Zeijlstra, H. (2012). There is only one way to agree. The Linguistic Review 29, 491–539.

Source Abbreviations


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’halbh esan mar a b’abhaisg leis a’ chrodh ach cha robh e riarachd idir gu fuirghheadh e air n-aíos; ’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 cachaleith ’s chuirt e aisthaigh 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

IQUĐ Would Iain stay back? (No)

QUDPC 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 suidheadadh 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 'n 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,
agan nuair a fhuaire iad an cothrom, thog iad rithe.
so when they saw their chance they took off.  NBG: 32

CONTRAST counter-expectational

QUD Would they adjust to it?
QUDPC 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’fhálbh iad uile gu léir bha e smaointeachadh gu dé bha e dol a dheanamh; 's ann a dh’hfeumadh e a dhol a shiubhal an t-saoghail feuch idir an amaiseadh nighean a’ righ 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'hfeumadh 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’ righ 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 fhèin am fear a b’heàrr 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

QUD What will he do?
QUDPC 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.
(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.

(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.

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.
Then he thought that he would bring with him a neighbour, that he might know where the money was.

Ds halbh an coimhearsnach c` omhla ris, agus chuir iad am falach e.

The neighbour came with him, and they hid it.

(7) Thadhail e do dh` flaicinn an airgid, agus cha ro bh aige ach `aite falamh. Cha ro bh fhios aige ciod ` dh`eanamh 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 neighbour) 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`halbh iad le ch`ile a rithist. So he did, and they went off together again.

(8) Nuair a r` anaig iad an t-` aite, bha an t-airgiod ann siud air tilleadh, agus `s ann a thubhairt am bodach: `Is iongantach thu fh`ein, airgid, falbhaidh tu agus thig thu; air eagal gu`m faibh thuagus nach dig thu, bheir mi leam thu an dr`asda.

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.”

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

CONTRAST none

IQUD Would the money be there?

QUDPC What will the man do/how will he solve this on-going issue?

(9) An oidhche so bha mi fhìn agus Roddy shíos 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 faireadhaiann gu math.

and he asked me to open his collar, that he wasn’t feeling well.

CONTRAST none; counter-expectational (for narrator)

IQUD Would they get anything of the revival?

QUDPC What are the signs of getting anything of the revival?

(10) An ath-oidhche a rithisd chruinnich na h-eiltearan’ 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

CONTRAST counter-expectational (for the elders, audience)

IQUD What happened at the meeting?

QUDPC 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 Sìonnach anns a’ mhaduinn, chaidh e mach do ‘n bhàthaich a thoirt biadh do ‘n each; ’s ann a chunnach 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 chunnach 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.”  

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD Did he feed the horse?

QUDPC 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, “chunnach mise e an diugh mu thr` ath, agus ’s ann a chuir e feagal mo bheatha orm, ach tha fhios agam a nise c` o 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 c` o 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

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQUD Is this your horse?

QUDPC 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,
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.

CONTRAST contrastive/emphatic

IQU D Who was losing their chickens?
QUDpC Was John losing chickens?

(14) Agus anns a’ mhaduinn seo, an àite dha biadh a thoirt sios chun a’ chait, ’s ann a chaidh e as a dhèidh leis an fhore 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 fhore fheòir.

the hayfork

he went after him with the hayfork.

’Air a fluair an cat air falbh pios bhuaidhe, 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.”

CONTRAST contrastive/counter-expectational

IQU D Would he feed the cat? (N)
QUDpC What did he do to the cat?

(15) Thòisich Cailean air an òran, ach chan robh e a’ faighinn air adhart glè mhath leis, bha a’ chas aige cho goirt. ’s ann a thàinnig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e ris: “Tha an cat marbh shios 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 thàinnig balach a steach, agus thubhairt e COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST boy in and said 3MSG
ris: “Tha an cat marbh shios 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 dè dhèanadh a chuís 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

IQU D 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.”

CONTRAST counter-expectational

IQU D What happened at the dance?

QUD_{PC} Did the stones fall out of the ring? (technically a sub-question of the IQU D)

NOTE The PC technically answer the IQU D 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 agamse, ach chan fhaigh thu s a 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 còmhraidh 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 còmhraidh 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.

CONTRAST counter-expectational?

IQU D 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 chéileidh ort / Thubhaírt 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 đeanann d’ fhàgail.
And leave you altogether.

CONTRAST counter-expectational?
IQUĐ Are you leaving me?
QUD\textsubscript{PC} Who will leave who?
NOTE Poem

(19) An oidhch’ a chaidh mi dh’ Òidreabhal / An dáil ’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
\[\text{[hidden]}\] 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 \[\text{[hidden]}\] in a corner of the shieling.
\textit{end of poem}

CONTRAST counter-expectational?
IQUĐ Would I get a talk with you?
QUD\textsubscript{PC} Where you with Big Murdo?
NOTE Poem

(20) “An do ghlac thu duine an raoir, Eoghairn?” “Cha do ghlac. Chan fhaca duine an
\[\text{donas a riamh—’s ann a bhios e ’g a fhaireachdàin.}’\]
“Did you catch anyone last night, Eoin?” “No. Nobody ever saw the devil: he only
\[\text{feels him.}\]
’s ann a bhios e ’g a fhaireachdàin. COP in.3MSG C.REL be.FUT 3MSG PROG 3MSG.POSS feel.VN
he only feels him.
\textit{end of story}

CONTRAST contrast, exhaustive
IQUĐ Has anyone seen the devil?
QUD\textsubscript{PC} What can one do with the devil?
(21) Tha an caisteal air a thoirt seachad do bhuill a’ bhaile, ris an can iad an trust. Agus chan eil cail ann an diugh, ’s ann tha mise a’ cluinntinn gum bheil e air a—gu bhith air a thoirt seachad airson sgòil 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.

(22) Dé ’n rud a dh’ fheumas sibh dèanamh an thoiseach leis a’ chlòimh?
’S e snìomh na clòimhe, snìomh agus càrdadh na clòimhe, ’s e sin a’ cheud obair a thathas a’ dèanamh a thaobh a’ chlò-mhòir 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.

APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Is there anything in the castle today? (N)
QUDPC What will be in the castle?
NOTE Interview

LG: 295

161
Ach a’ cheud chuimhne a th’ agamsa tha cuimhne agam air na cail leachan anns na bailtean a bha mu ’n cuairt agus anns a’ bhaile anns an dho thogadh mi fhìn, a’ bhith a’ smiòmh agus a’ còrdadh.

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.

**CONTRAST**

**corrective**

**IQUD** What’s the first work to be done? (answered)

**QUD** 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 déanamh 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** Will you get used to it?

(24) Agus bha iad ag ithe ’s a’ còmhraidh is an gnothach a’ còrdadh riutha. Aig toiseach an t-subhachais an deaghaidh na cuirm, ’s ann a chumnaic 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 chumnaic 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 mair a rèainig e am bad a b’ìnbhiche san talla, chuir e faìlte 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 choinhead 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 the women slept.

Seo mar a thachair. Bha sia boireannaich ann, agus rinn iad faire airson cuid dhen
oidhche; ach, leis an fhìrinn, mun tànig 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’ ainn Teyrnon Twrf Liant a bu tighearna air Gwent Is
Coed, agus ’s e am fear a b’heàrr air an t-saoghail. Agus bha làir anns a’ chùirt aige.
Agus cha robh dad san rìoghachd—each no làir—a bu bhrèagh 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 bruidhinn 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
Bealtain, 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 bruidhinn Teyrnon ri bhean

And Teyrnon spoke to his wife one night.

“Bheil fhios agad,” ars’ esan, “the e leibideach dhuinn a bhith leigeil le searrach na
láraich 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?
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 ògà seo; dhèanadh e an t-sìth eadar dà fheachd nuair a bu nàimhdeile a bhioidh iad ri chèile. ’S e Nisiean a bh’ airasan. Ach airson an fhìr eile, ’s ann a bheireadh esan air sabaid töiseachadh 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 fhìr eile, ’s ann a bheireadh esan but for the man other COP in.3MSG C.REL carry.COND 3MSG.EMPH air sabaid töiseachadh 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 bhuaansa! Cha b’urrainn dhaibh t` amailt na bu mhiosa thoirt d homh.” 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 sios gu ruige na fiaclan; agus an chuasan sios 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 do`in an R`ıgh, no do`in duine dhe chomhfar`ichean, a cha`dh do mhasladadh mar seo. Agus ged as e t`ama`ilt mh`or a th’ ann dh`utsa, ’s ann a th a’ ch`uis-n`aire ’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.”

INV P C 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 Bendigeidran the shameful matter and this bad exploit is an especially bad disgrace for Bendigidfran.

“Gu dearbha, creididh mi sin,” thuirt esan, “ach chan eil sina’ toirt na t` ama`ilt dh`ıomsa.”

“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’fh`aisg e sin gus an do dh’fh`airich e a chorr`agan a dol tron chlaigeann dhan eanch`aimh. An uair sin dh’fh`ag e am fear sin agus chu`r e a l`amh air fear eile agus dh’fh`aighmh`ich e, “D` e tha seo?” “Min,” ars’ an t-Eireannach. Agus ’s ann a rinn Efnisien an aon chleas air a h-uile fear dh`iubh, gus nach robh air fh`agail be`o dhen d`a 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 dh`iubh, gus nach robh air fh`agail be`o dhen d`a 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.

Th` ainig e chun an fhir sin is dh’fh`aighmh`ich e, “D` e 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?

QUdpC Does he do the same thing to everyone?


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 chòrdadhi 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 riogachd feuch an robhtaigh no aite-còmhnaidh air flàgail innte, ach cha robh innte ach beathaichean fiadhail.

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?

QUdpC Did life go back to normal?


’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 ot 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.”* AM: 48

Contrast corrective

IQUD Will we attack and kill them?

QUdpC Will we go to another town? (What will we do?)

“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.

“No,” he said, “We’ll go for the craft of the cobbler.

Cobblers don’t have courage to fight against us or to stop us.”

‘S beag an t-iongnadh, a thighearna!” thuirt i. “....Ach andeaghaidh sin, chan eil e ro chiatach duine leis an inbhe a th’agadsa fhaicinn a’ crochadh creutair 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.”

“It would be best for you to do nothing to the creature and to let it alone.”

“Bhiodh e n` ar dh` omhsa.” thuirt e

“That would be disgraceful for me.” he said.*

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.
“A, fhearaibh,” 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 dhinbh a’ tighinn as ar deaghaidh.”
A great army of them is coming behind us.”*

CONTRAST none? counter-expectation?

IQUD Will they stay at Mochdref’s fortress?

QUDPC What will they do?

(36) Bu bheag an t-iongnadh: bha iad air an tighearana a chail, agus mòran dhe na daoine a
b’fheàrr a bh’aca, ‘s an cuid each, agus a’ chuid a bu mhotha dh’hen 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,” thuirt Gwydion ri Math, “nach b’fheàrr dhuinn an dao’in-uishle a
leigeil as do dh’fhuir 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?”*

CONTRAST contrastive

IQUD What about the other side?

QUDPC What about the men of Gwynedd? (What was the aftermath of the battle?)

(37) Dè bha air a bhàin aig cas a’ leubaidh ach cùdaimh beag le ìm, agus leum i air sin
airson dhol an àirdè còmhla rium-sa—well bha i cho beag. Ì, Thighearna! ’s ann a
chaíd i fasta anns—chaídh a’ bhròg aice a bhàn anns an t-im ’s cha b’ urrainn dith a
thiginn 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.
‘I, Thighearna! ‘s ann a chaidh i fasta anns—chaidh a’ lord COP in.3MSG C.REL went she stuck in.DEF goPAST the bhòr aice a bhàn anns an t-im ’s cha b’ urrainn dìth 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, ‘I Thighearna, dè tha thu ’ dèanamh sin?’ Ò, dh’fhâlbh e, thug e ’n éigeamh 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?
QUDpc 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, ‘I Thighearna, dè tha thu ’ dèanamh sin?’ Ò, dh’fhâlbh e, thug e ’n éigeamh air a’ chrew uile, “Nach Dia a bhith troimh uile, ’s ann bha boirinn mach fasta anns am buiced, anns am t-im a ghaibh, an t-im 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 boirinn mach fasta anns am buiced, COP in.3MSG (C.REL) be.PAST woman stuck in.DEF the bucket anns am t-im a ghaibh, an t-im 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?
QUDpc 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

IQUĐ Where was the school?
QUDPC 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 thri fichead acair' ann. 'S ann a chaidh iad dha’n eilein sin a a dheanamh bhuntà.
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 a dheanamh
COP in.3MSG C.REL go.PAST 3PL to-the island DEM INF do.VN
toatoes
They went to the island to grow potatoes.*

ST: 9

CONTRAST  none

IQUĐ Where would they grow potatoes?
QUDPC 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 flios 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

IQUÐ 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**

Did the farmer know that they were (actually) helping him?

**QUD**

Did they have to leave and go to Benbecula (pretty far away)?

**QUD**

What did she do at Donald Ferguson’s house??

**QUD**

Did they have to leave and go to Benbecula (pretty far away)?

**QUD**

Was he afraid?

**QUD**

Did he say that?

**QUD**

“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.”
“O, cha n-ann,” ars is, “’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

“Oh, no,” she said, “She’s going to the other room.”

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 cómha rium fhin as an tent a bha e, Dunnchadh Dòmhnallach. Bha dà chois air agus ’s ann a bha iad collach ri dà bhàt’ iasgaich leis a’ mhiodachd 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’ mhiodachd 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).*

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 chèile, mi fhin is feadhann eile, gun gabhamaid an treun mu ’n cuairt Pheairt dha’n Oban.

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.
ach ’s ann a rinn sinn suas ri chéile, mi fhin 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 Óban, 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?

QUDPC 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 pios 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 phios cha chreideadh e shùilean. Cha thuigeadh e ciamar a b’urraimh dha ith agus iad ann an cunnart am beatha! Ach ’s ann a bha e na èiginn nuair a thug Alasdair dha pios bonnach.

Alasdair Ban took out a piece of barley bread that he had in a ba g 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 pios bonnach. 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 dhìultadh e am pios mus sealladh e gu robh eagal a’ bheath’ air ach cha robh duine beo a bheireadh air am pios 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?

QUDPC 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 Brocail. ’S ann a’ coiseachd a bhiodh e gu math tric sios rathad na h-Airde. Latha bha seo ’s ann a bhid i a’ chas.
John Black, son of Tormod Tormod on lot 24, was working with B`ıdean 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 bhid ù a’ chas.
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.*

CONTRAST none, or possibly, counter-.expectation

IQUD What happened next?

QUDPC 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 coinhead dè bha dol air adhart air mo chulaibh. ’S ann a mhothaich m’ athair gu robh Buster, an cù aca, direach 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 ISG.POSS father C be.PAST Buster the cù aca, direach 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 bhruich. We arrived home, anyway, and the trout was cleaned and cooked.*

CONTRAST contrast (her vs. her father paying attention)

IQUD What was happening behind her?

QUDPC Did my father tell me about it (and so nothing happened)?

(50) (A trawler has wrecked on the Dun Dubh headlands.)

Dh’fhalbh e fh’ ein agus m’ athair, agus air na Leacan, pìos a-mach bho Chùl a’ Ghàrraidh, thachair iad ri triùr de sgíobadh 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 chumnaic 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!
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?

QUDPC 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 a’ inm 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 a’ inm an duine sin aig a’ chreig 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??

QUDPC What is the name of the rock (or, why is the rock called Creag Ghropaidh?)?

(52) agus nuair a thànaig e dh’hoighneachd an Gréidheir dheth dé bha ’ga chumail anochd cho fior-fhada seach mar a b’abhaist 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.”

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

in Ormaclait tonight

“Ah,” ars esan, “an dug thu idir ugainn sian a b’ annsaiche na b’abhaist dhut a thoirt?”

“But,” he said, “did you give anything to us at all than is usual for you to give?”*
APPENDIX. A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST  contrastive/counter-expectation

IQUD_\text{PC}  What’s keeping him?

QUD_\text{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 Ruairidh ris “tha mi beo co dhiu. ’S ann as fhearr dhu’sa a’ sgoth thoir dhomh agus gu falbh mi taobh air choireigin as a’ seo.”

He asked what sort of condition he was in. Ruairidh 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 fhearr dhu’sa a’ sgoth thoir 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_\text{PC}  What’s better for you to do?

(54)  ach nuair a nochd T`omas astaigh, thóisich e air gàireachdaich, agus bha e sior-ghàireachdaich, agus cha chumte gàireachdaich agus dibhearsain ris; agus ma bha n`aire mh`or air athair an oidhche reimhe sin, ’s ann a bha n`aire 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 n`aire buileach air anochd,
COP in.3MSG C.REL be.PAST shame also on.3MSG tonight
a shame was also on him tonight,

esan s`ior-gh`aireachdaich a miosg muinntir an taigh, agus c`ach cho muiladach 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_\text{PC}  Was his father ashamed?
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?
QUDPC Have I been fooled (Who has been fooled?)

agus cha mhóir nach eile e cheart cho dona bhith as aonais na leapadh fhéin agus a tha e bhith as aonais a’ bhaidh. Ach ’s ann a dh’fhalbhas sinn píos 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 píos 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 biadhagus leabaidh air leath-chrùin.” 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?
QUDPC Will we keep going?

Bha a rithis, am fear bu mhotha dh’itheadh de dheòil dhiubh, dol do fhaghain nighean tuathanaich gu’ pòsadh. Mharbh iad bó agus shìin iad air ithe na feòla. Nuair a bha gu leòr aig Mac Rùislig chuir e poca bhàn air a bhenuaibh, is bha e cur na feòla anns a’ phoca, is bha Prábrusg aig ithe. Chuir Mac Rùislig sgian anns a’ phoca, agus thubh airt e, “Is fhéairrde mi fhéin siud.” Is ann a chuir Prábrusg 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 Prábrusg was eating. Mac Rùislig then cut through the sack with a knife, and said “That makes me feel better.” Then Prábrusg cut himself with the knife and died,
APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

Is a chuir Prabrusg ann fhéin i, agus bhásaich COP in.3MSG C.REL put Prabrusg in.3MSG self 3FSG and die.PAST e, 3MSG
Then Prabrusg cut himself with the knife and died,
agus fhuaire 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 Prabrusg 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 còrna 'sa' robh 'm puinmsein agus cha robh e fad' 'sam bith air an òl 's air an ìthe 'n uair a dh'èirich e, 's cha b'e sìul a thoir air a' ghille rinn e idir, ged a bha 'feadan aig a' ghille 'na laimh deiseil airson teannadh air chuin[hi] nan toreadh a' fuamhaire tàbadh air. 'S ann a thug e aghaidh air an uamhaidd 's cha deach e ach pios air adhart 'n uair a thuît 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 uamhaidd 's cha COP in.3MSG C.REL took 3MSG face on the cave and NEG deach e ach pios air adhart 'n uair a thuît 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'ìarr 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 nì thu mach sin," as an t-uachdar, "'n uair 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 ràdh," as esan, "gun còmhraighinn ris a' bheothach, 's ann a thachair e gu bheil am beothach marbh a nochd

178
“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. It is because of me that the deed was done and it is because of me the beast’s saying,” he said, “without fighting the beast, it happened that the beast died tonight. 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.”*

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 cómhragáin ris a’ bheothach?)

(60) “Chan àbhaist,” as an gille, “do mhac righ a bhith ’g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach ’sam bith. ’S ann is àbhaist dha bhith ’toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad.” “It’s 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.*

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 righ a bhith ’g iarraidh cuideachadh air neach ’sam bith,” as esan. “’S ann a bhios iad a’ toir cuideachadh is comhairlean seachad ’na righeachd.” “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 righeachd advice out in-3MSG.POSS kingdom

They give away help and advice in the kingdom.
(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 thoilicht’ a’ chlann a thoir dhachaidh.

“Oh,” he said, “I would be very happy to bring the children home.

Bidh mi fh` in ’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.*

(63) Theann feadhainn ri bonnach arain a chur air tobhtaichean nan taighean agus bhiodh na bonnach air falbh ’sa’ mhaduinn. Bha dithis ghillean òg’ ann a bha na bu tapaidh san inntinn ’s na bu sgairteile na’n fheadhaimh eile bh’ air feadh an àite agus ’s ann a rinn iad uas ’nan inntinn fh` eilin 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.
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 truir ghlilean 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 am beul oidcheheadh 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?

QUDDpC 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 ciúil 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 ciúil 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?

QUDDpC How would one go about doing this?
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.

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,

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."

Ach bha aige ri falbh co-dhi` ubh dhan Eilean Sgitheanach gu MacLe` oid. Ach a’ chuid seo dhi, tha mi’ smaoineachadh gu ann a thanaig MacLeòid fhèin ‘ga choimhead gu taigh a mhàthair am Beinne Fadhla agus chord an duine ris ‘s chord 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 bha e ‘smaoineachadh gu robh duine cho trein aige ‘s a ghabhadh lorg ‘sna h-Eileinean.

and he thought that a man as brave as he should take a search in the islands.
(67) Ach a’ chuid seo dhi, tha mi ’smaoineachadh gur ann a thanaig MacLeod fhèin 'ga choimhead gu taigh a mhàthair am Beinne Fadhla 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 Dòmhann 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 Dòmhann 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 dhealaich 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.*

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 ro bh’ uine ’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 not 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?”*

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

“How 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.”
“Chan ann, a Ruaidh,” 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 n`í thu e?” as esan.
“Why will you do that?” he asked.*

(70) Rinneadh brochan—l`íbinn math brochain. ’S ann a thanaig a chuile duine riamh ’s
chuireadh sios a mhess-tin air an ´urlar ’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 sios
COP in.3MSG C.REL come.PAST every man always and put.COND down
a mhess-tin air an ´urlar ’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.*

(71) Bha ’muileann air a chur as a chéile ’s air a chaith air feadh an talmhanna ’na
pháirtean. ’S ann a thionndaídh Coles le party a’ long 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 thionndaídh Coles le party a’ long
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 bhuneadh dha.
They found each bit that belonged to it.*
APPENDIX. A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST none

IQUD What would happen to it?
QUDPC Did Coles lead a party to look for it?

(72) Dh’fhölbh an righ gus an d’ràng e creag, ’s dh’ amhairc e sìos ann an glomhas a bha ’s a chreig, ’s aig a ghrunnad 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’空气 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’ fhaoiann na h-úbhir de dhragh a tighinn ma d’ thuaiream, 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.”

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Will the king get to his wife? or Will the king save his wife?
QUDPC 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’tuadh 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.”
Chuir ise an ordugh an starsach gu gasd’ an la ’r na mhàireach.  
She set in order the threshold finely on the morrow.  

CONTRAST corrective  

IQUD If you knew where my soul was, would you respect it? (Y) or Is my soul there? (N)  
QUĐPC 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-chhuimh nich mi ’m i b’e so an latha.”  “Seadh! seadh! mata,”  
ars’ a mhàighdean mhara, “gheibh thu cethir bliadhn’ eile dheth; faoidadh 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.”  

faoidadh 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?”  

CONTRAST contrastive??  

IQUD What happens if I forgot to bring my son?  
QUĐPC 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 dóigh so rè uine; ach oidheche ’s e air tighinn dhachaidh, an àite do ’n bhanaraich furan, ’s failte ’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’fhoghneachd e, de ’n t-aobhar bròin a bha’ so an nochd.  
He asked what cause of woe there was this night.  

TWHv1: 17  
TWHv1: 85  
TWHv1: 88
APPENDIX . A CORPUS OF THE PROPOSITIONAL CLEFT

CONTRAST  counter-expectation

 IQUD  Was he greeted by the dairymaid? (N)
 QUdPC  Was everyone crying?

(76)  (Conal Crovi has just been tied up.)
Nuair a l` ıon na fir a bha gu h-` ard iad féin l` an do bhiadh, `s do dheoch, `s ann a
smoínich an righ fios a chur a nios air Conal Cròbhì, 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 smoínich an righ fios a chur a nios air
COP in.3MSG C.REL think.PAST the king message INF put.VN up on
Conal Cròbhì, 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 m` or an righ ach leum sios, 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?)
 QUdPC  Does the king think to have Conal Crovi tell a story?

(77)  Dh`iarr e `chead orra `staigh a dh` fhaicinn Fear Chuigeamh Mhumha. Thog fear dhiu
a thuadh gus an ceann a chur dheth, ach `s ann a bhua`ıl e air a chompanach i.
He asked their license in to see Fear Chuigeamh Mugha. 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 bhua`ıl 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 mhanbh 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?
 QUdPC  Will they actually strike their comrade?

(78)  Thainig an gille-carach seachad orra, agus chunnaic se iad, chaidh e agus fluair e
each, agus chu`ir 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 ch`oirt d`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;
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 eachs air an uisge-bheatha, ach theich an gille-carach, 's dh flàg 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

QUD Will he trick the soldiers?

QUDPC 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 chèithearan, agus chuir e an cèill do mhùinnitéir nan tåighean, gu'm b' ann a chaidh na saighdearan, a chuir a mach air feadh na duthca, gu iad a dh'eòridh 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 cèill do mhùinnitéir nan tåighean, 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'eòridh 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 fluhair e a thoirt air muinntir na duthcha chreidsinn, gun do mharbh muinntir gach tighe, na bha do shaighdeirean 'nan cadal anns na sabhaillean 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

188
IQUD Why were the soliders there? or What would he do?

QUD<sub>pc</sub> Were the soldiers sent to kill the people?

NOTE embedded PC

(80) Agus an uair nach d' thainig na saighdeirean dachaídh aig an tiom bu chois doibh, chaith feadhaimn a shealtuinn cia-dé a thainig riutha. Agus tra rainig iadsan <em>is ann</em> a fluair iad na saighdeirean marbh anns na saibhelean, far an roh bh 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 <em>is ann</em> a fluair iad na saighdeirean and time arrive they.EMPHEMPCOP in.it C.REL got they the soldiers marbh anns na saibhelean, far an roh bh 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 tighe, gu 'n roh bh fios aca cia mar a chaith na saighdeirean a chuir gu bás, na có 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<sub>pc</sub> Did they find the soldiers dead in the barns?

(81) Nur chunnaic an righ esan a tigh 'n a mach, lig e as an t-srian, thug e ada dheth go lár, '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 chois dhomhsa dhianadh dhuibh fhin."

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 chois dhomhsa dhianadh dhuibh fhin.”

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<sub>pc</sub> Should I be making manners at you? (Who should make manners at who?)
(82) Nur a thàinnig eud bha esan an déigh na pàirccean a ligeil itheadh leis na caoraich. “Ciod thuige dh’ith thu na pàirccean.” “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 the.PL sheep.PL 3PL

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

“He bhi sinn a’ bruidhin 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.”

CONTRAST corrective

IQUD Did I eat the fields? (N)
QUDPc 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 spleìmas 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 spleìmas 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 creid didh mi thu.” I will not believe that it is thou at all; but make a snake of thyself, and I will believe thee.”

CONTRAST counter-expectational? emphatic?

IQUD Have I seen thee before? (N)
QUDPc 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’ fluarag an duine bha air chall, agus air chul paigheag ’s ann a rimn iad cuirm d’on duine a fluair a’ fear a bha air chall.
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.

Bha loch aig tuath Sgire mo Chealag air am bitheag iad a' cur iasg, agus 'ars esan “'s ann bo chòir dhui bh a' loch a' thràig gus am faigheag iad iasg ùr dhon na cuirme”;

The tenants of Sgire 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?
QUdpC Do they make a feast?

(85) Bha loch aig tuath Sgire mo Chealag air am bitheag iad a’ cur iasg, agus ’ars esan “’s ann bo chòir dhui bh a' loch a' thràig gus am faigheag iad ias g ùr dhon na cuirme;”

The tenants of Sgire 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 dhui bh a' loch and said COP in.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)?
QUdpC Will they have to drain the loch?

(86) An deis a bhith tabhairt a’ bhlair, / '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 Osgar. 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 ghiorrhachadh.

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?
(89) An uair a ràinig e an tigh, bha gach duine a’ feòraich c’âte an d’fhàg e a chompanach. Dh’innis e dhoibh gach ni a thachair, agus mar dh’fhàg e a chompanach a’ dannadh anns an t-Sìthean. 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 a choimhearsnach agus gu’n d’rinn e suas an sgeul a dh’innis e a thionndadh an amharuis dheth fhéin.

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 diomhain a bhòidich e gu’n robh e neo-chiontach.

In vain did he protest his innocence.

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 Gillesbick 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 stuig 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 stuig e innte an cù glas mar an ceudna.

This greatly kindled her wrath.

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 choinnemh a leithid de dh’ eagail air is gu ‘n do gluidh 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 sinhichibh: “Na’n cuireadh a’ bhó mhaol odhar aca dragh tuilleadh air buaille 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 sinhichibh 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 bhàithair.

Having said this he drew his dirk out of the jamb, and straightway the door shut against him and his brother.

CONTRAST counter-expectation

IQUD Would they leave this place? (N)

QUD<sub>PC</sub> Did the ferryman call attention to their presence there?