

New paper by Elodie Winckel @abeilleanne @thebarb51 and me examining subject islands @cognitionjourn

we compare it-clefts to relative clauses in French and English; Open Access



In our previous work (Abeillé et al., 2020,) on French and English, we found that subject subextra lower (interaction effect) for relative clauses (with pied-piping). We However, it was in wh-questio 2/12tedlab_mit.edu/tedlab_website...

Building on this, we hypothesized that subject extraction should be degraded in wh-questions and discourse clash: a conflict between focus and background. **2** 3/12

The new paper presents 4 acceptability rating experiments comparing two constructions with diffe structure statuses: relative clauses vs. clefts, in both French and English. We predicted a contrast hand clefts.

4/12

The that-clause in an it-cleft is structurally similar to a relative clause. However, clefts are inherent not relative clauses. This creates a discourse clash in clefts only, since subjects are default topics.

Experiment 1 first showed that the subject of the that-clause in clefts is more backgrounded than t test to measure this (e.g., It was the train that the teenager boarded \rightarrow No, it was the old lady).

To test subject islands, we varied the syntactic function (subject/direct object) and extraction type of NP) while including ungrammatical controls. For English, we examined extractions using prepopied-piping. 7/12

P Key results: Subject subextraction is rated lower only in clefts (i.e., superadditive). No lower ra except English preposition stranding. This suggests the issue lies with preposition stranding, not v

We tested several prepositions in English relative clauses (to, over, against) to ensure that, even we proper extraction was being tested—not hanging topics (cf. Broekhuis 2006; Uriagereka 2006).

The difference found in 2020 between wh-questions and relative clauses could be explained by cyc (Cinque, 1996). $\stackrel{\triangle}{=}$ Such an explanation is not available for the difference between RC & clefts. Inf valid alternative. $\stackrel{\triangleright}{=}$ 10/12

Our results confirm the Focus-Background Conflict Hypothesis, with different outcomes for clodespite their syntactic similarities. This difference, we argue, is due to information structure, not s

For more on the Focus-Background Conflict Hypothesis, check out our earlier work (Abeillé et al., @cognitionjourn

):

doi.org/10.1016/j.cogn... tedlab.mit.edu/tedlab_website...



FYI Elodie Winckel is GREAT