

Contents

Acknowledgments — VII

General introduction — 1

- 1 Why study *il y a* clefts? — 1
- 1.1 Using more structure when you could do with less — 1
- 1.2 A (less well-known) member of the cleft family — 4
- 2 Terminology — 7
- 3 *Il y a* clefts in a nutshell — 7
- 3.1 A definition of *il y a* clefts? — 8
- 3.2 Semantics and discourse functions — 8
- 3.3 Similar *il y a* sentences (not considered in this monograph) — 10
- 4 Goals and structure of the monograph — 11

Part I: Delimitation of *il y a* clefts

Introduction — 17

- 1 Criteria for clefthood in previous studies — 21
- 1.1 The decleftability criterion — 21
- 1.2 Diagnostics: type of relative clause — 24
- 1.2.1 Restrictive relative clauses (RRCs) vs. cleft relative clauses — 24
- 1.2.2 Syntactic constituency tests: RRC or not? — 27
- 1.2.2.1 Pronominalisation — 28
- 1.2.2.2 Dislocation — 29
- 1.2.2.3 Omission of the relative clause — 30
- 1.2.2.4 Adjectival/prepositional equivalent — 31
- 1.2.2.5 Interim conclusion — 32
- 1.2.3 Appositive relative clauses — 33
- 1.3 Semantico-pragmatic diagnostics — 36
- 1.3.1 Semantic classifications of *il y a... qui* sentences — 36
- 1.3.2 Two properties that distinguish between stative & eventive *il y a... qui* sentences — 38
- 1.3.3 Linguistic tests — 39
- 1.3.3.1 “What’s happening?” — 39
- 1.3.3.2 The interpretation of *il y a*: reformulation test — 40
- 1.3.3.3 Negation of *il y a* — 41

- 1.3.4 Specificational *il y a* clefts — 44
- 1.4 Overview of the diagnostics — 46

- 2 Corpora and extraction — 48**
- 2.1 Description of the corpora — 48
- 2.2 *Il y a... qui* sentences: extraction of the data — 49
- 2.2.1 *Le Monde* — 49
- 2.2.2 YCCQA — 51
- 2.2.3 CFPP — 52
- 2.2.4 Overview and comparability across the corpora — 53
- 2.2.5 Frequency of *il y a... qui* sentences across the corpora — 54
- 2.3 *Il n'y a que* 'there is only': extraction of the data — 56

- 3 Application of criteria to the corpus data — 58**
- 3.1 Quantitative overview — 58
- 3.2 *Il y a* clefts — 61
- 3.2.1 Eventive *il y a* clefts — 61
- 3.2.2 Specificational *il y a* clefts — 63
- 3.3 *Il y a* cleft lookalikes — 65
- 3.3.1 Cleft lookalikes with RRCs — 66
- 3.3.2 Cleft lookalikes with appositive relative clauses — 68
- 3.4 Unclear case 1: type of relative clause underspecified — 69
- 3.4.1 Corpus data: aspectually underspecified *il y a... qui* sentences — 70
- 3.4.2 About the non-discrete boundaries between relative clause types — 75
- 3.4.3 Hypotheses about processing *il y a... qui* sentences with ambiguous relative clauses — 76
- 3.5 Unclear case 2: decleftable + RRC — 79
- 3.6 Possible ways of defining *il y a* clefts — 83
- 3.7 My definition of *il y a* clefts — 86
- Part I: Conclusion — 89

- Part II: Distribution, morphosyntactic and semantic properties**
- Introduction — 93

- 4 *Il y a* clefts: two semantic types (eventive vs. specificational) — 95**
- 4.1 Distribution — 95
- 4.1.1 *Il y a* clefts in general — 96

- 4.1.2 Eventive vs. specificational *il y a* clefts — 97
- 4.2 Type of clefted constituent — 98
- 4.2.1 Grammatical category & frequency of proper nouns — 98
- 4.2.2 (In)definiteness of the clefted constituent — 100

5 *Il n'y a que* clefts — 104

- 5.1 *Il n'y a que*: clefts vs. cleft lookalikes — 104
- 5.2 Distribution of *il n'y a que* clefts — 106
- 5.3 Properties of the constituent introduced by *il n'y a que* — 107
- 5.3.1 Grammatical category — 107
- 5.3.2 (In)definiteness — 109
- Part II: Conclusion — 110

Part III: Functions of *il y a* clefts

Introduction — 113

6 The function of avoiding “bad” preverbal subjects — 115

- 6.1 Previous studies: motivations of *il y a* clefts/*il y a... qui* sentences — 115
- 6.2 The hypothesis evaluated in this chapter — 118
- 6.3 Some subjects are better than others — 119
- 6.3.1 Factors that influence subject acceptability — 119
- 6.3.2 Underlying reasons for (in)acceptability — 121
- 6.4 Corpus data — 125
- 6.4.1 Basic requirements for successful declefting — 126
- 6.4.2 Corpus data: degrees of decleftability — 127
- 6.4.3 Declefting is possible: eventive/specificational semantics — 128
- 6.4.4 Declefting is possible due to other properties — 130
- 6.4.5 Declefting is possible, but requires a lexical adjustment — 132
- 6.5 Confirmation of the hypothesis — 135
- 6.6 Demystifying decleftability — 138
- 6.7 Conclusion — 139

7 The information structure of *il y a* clefts — 140

- 7.1 Background: information structure terminology — 141
- 7.1.1 Information Structure, Common Ground and QUDs — 141
- 7.1.2 The “referential” and the “relational” dimension of information structure — 142
- 7.1.3 Focus & background — 144

- 7.1.4 Topic & comment — 145
- 7.1.5 Thetic/“all-focus”/“all-comment” sentences — 149
- 7.2 Previous studies: the information structure of *il y a* clefts — 150
- 7.2.1 Information structure articulations of *il y a* clefts — 150
- 7.2.2 Clefts in general: markers of non-topicality and/or focality — 151
- 7.3 Corpus data: different information structure articulations — 154
- 7.3.1 Quantitative overview — 154
- 7.3.2 All-focus (with/without light relative clause) — 155
- 7.3.3 Focus + background — 158
- 7.3.4 Ambiguous focus (multiple focus?) — 160
- 7.3.5 Contrastive topic + comment — 162
- 7.3.5.1 Contrastive spatiotemporal topic + comment — 162
- 7.3.5.2 Contrastive aboutness-topic + contrastive comment — 164
- 7.4 The non-topic marking hypothesis: evaluation — 167
- 7.5 Comparison with existential *il y a* sentences — 169
- 7.5.1 All-focus — 170
- 7.5.2 Focus + background — 170
- 7.5.3 Topic + comment (double contrast) — 173
- 7.5.4 Summary — 175
- 7.6 Hypothesis: the link between “non-topics” and “suboptimal subjects” — 175
- 7.7 Psycho-linguistic evidence about related constructions — 179
- 7.8 Conclusion — 182

- 8 Information structure: *c’est* clefts vs. *il y a* clefts — 186**
- 8.1 Information structure: same articulations, different distribution — 187
- 8.1.1 All-focus — 187
- 8.1.2 Focus-background — 188
- 8.1.3 Multiple focus — 189
- 8.1.4 Spatiotemporal topic + comment — 189
- 8.1.5 Aboutness-topic + comment — 190
- 8.1.6 Distribution — 190
- 8.2 Differences between *il y a* clefts and *c’est* clefts — 191
- 8.2.1 Formal difference: prepositional & adverbial clefted elements — 191
- 8.2.2 All-focus *il y a/c’est* clefts: text type/genre — 193
- 8.2.3 Focus-background *il y a/c’est* clefts: exhaustiveness — 194
- 8.2.4 Spoken vs. written French — 196
- 8.2.5 Markers of non-topicality — 197
- 8.3 Conclusion — 198

- 9 Other pragmatic functions of *il y a* clefts — 199**
- 9.1 Discourse coherence — 200
- 9.2 Signaling that a singular indefinite does not refer to a single referent — 203
- 9.3 Reinforcing negation — 206
- 9.4 Pragmatic functions of the cleft relative clause — 209
- 9.4.1 Previous accounts: pragmatic functions of appositive relative clauses — 209
- 9.4.2 Functions of the relative clause in *il y a* clefts — 211
- 9.5 Conclusion — 213
- Part III: Conclusion — 215

Part IV: Italian *c'è* clefts (vs. French *il y a* clefts)

- 10 Italian *c'è* clefts (vs. French *il y a* clefts) — 219**
- 10.1 Introduction — 219
- 10.2 Previous analyses — 221
- 10.2.1 Semantic and functional classifications of *c'è* sentences — 221
- 10.2.2 An instance of the cleft category? — 223
- 10.2.3 My definition of *c'è* clefts — 224
- 10.2.4 Information structure — 226
- 10.2.5 Frequency: French clefts vs. Italian clefts — 227
- 10.3 Corpus and extraction — 228
- 10.4 Delimitation ambiguities — 229
- 10.4.1 Ambiguous relative clauses — 229
- 10.4.2 Decleftable + RRC — 232
- 10.5 Frequency: Italian vs. French — 235
- 10.6 Information structure — 236
- 10.6.1 All-focus — 237
- 10.6.2 Focus + background — 239
- 10.6.3 Contrastive/partitive topic + comment — 241
- 10.6.4 Interim conclusion: *c'è* clefts and information structure — 246
- 10.6.5 *C'è* clefts and existential sentences: the same articulations — 247
- 10.7 Additional functions of *c'è* clefts — 249
- 10.7.1 Reinforcing negation — 249
- 10.7.2 Signaling that a singular indefinite does not refer to a single referent — 251
- 10.8 The nature of the cross-linguistic label “existential clefts” — 254
- 10.8.1 “Comparative concepts” vs. “cross-linguistic categories” — 255

- 10.8.2 Existential clefts as a “comparative concept” — 257
- 10.9 Conclusion — 258

Part V: *Il y a* clefts: compositionality and status as a construction

- 11 The compositionality of *il y a* clefts — 263
 - 11.1 Introduction — 263
 - 11.2 Compositionality: previous analyses of *il y a* clefts — 264
 - 11.2.1 *Il y a* clefts are non-compositional (Lambrecht) — 264
 - 11.2.2 The “Presentational Relative Construction” — 268
 - 11.2.3 *Il y a* clefts are compositional (Jullien) — 270
 - 11.3 *Il y a* clefts: further evidence for a compositional analysis — 272
 - 11.3.1 Discourse functions — 272
 - 11.3.2 Expressing a single proposition/deleftability — 274
 - 11.3.3 No inherent semantics — 275
 - 11.4 Conclusion — 276

- 12 No evidence (yet) for *il y a* clefts as a construction — 277
 - 12.1 Introduction — 277
 - 12.2 What are constructions? — 278
 - 12.2.1 Narrow definition: constructions as necessarily non-compositional — 278
 - 12.2.2 Broad definition: constructions that allow compositionality — 280
 - 12.3 Clefts as compositional constructions: previous analyses — 283
 - 12.3.1 Compositional constructions: *there* clefts and *it* clefts — 283
 - 12.3.2 A compositional construction: *that* clefts — 284
 - 12.3.3 A compositional construction: *il y a* clefts — 286
 - 12.4 *Il y a* clefts: a construction or not? — 288
 - 12.5 *Il y a* clefts as an instance of a higher-level (cross-linguistic) “cleft construction”? — 289
 - 12.6 Conclusion — 292

General conclusion — 294

Appendix — 309

Bibliography — 331

Index — 355