



# snippets

---

**Issue 18**

**November 2008**

---

## **Contents**

1. Maximiliano Guimarães. *A note on the strong generative capacity of standard Antisymmetry Theory.*
2. Justin Kelly. *Yet as a negative perfect marker in English.*
3. Marlies Kluck & Mark de Vries. *The interaction of Right Node Raising and extraposition.*
4. Eric McCready. *Expressive content and logophoricity.*
5. Nagarajan Selvanathan and Chonghyuck Kim. *The anaphor agreement effect in Tamil.*
6. Guillaume Thomas. *Proxy counterfactuals.*
7. Ed Zoerner. *A partial antecedent.*



7.

**Ed Zoerner** – *California State University, Dominguez Hills*  
***A partial antecedent***

ezoerner@csudh.edu

---

Normally, we think of deletion as targeting an entire phrase (as in VP Ellipsis) or a single word (as in simple Gapping examples). The following, though, give examples of what we might call a “partial antecedent” :

- (1) The food at Burger King is pretty unspectacular. But then again, it isn't supposed to be ~~spectacular~~ / \*~~unspectacular~~
- (2) Fans of The Three Stooges are unsophisticated. But then again, they never claimed to be ~~sophisticated~~ / \*~~unsophisticated~~
- (3) Dana's promotion is unlikely. But then again, no one thinks it should be ~~likely~~ / \*~~unlikely~~

Note that only parts of the antecedents *unspectacular*, *unsophisticated*, and *unlikely* seem to “copy and delete” in the second clause. This requires a polarity contrast of sorts between the two clauses; loosely put, the negative markers *not*, *never*, and *no one* appear to take the place of the negative prefix *un-*. Without a polarity contrast, we do not find partial antecedents of this type:

- (4) The food at Burger King is pretty unspectacular, though admittedly one expects it to be ~~unspectacular~~ / \*~~spectacular~~
- (5) Fans of The Three Stooges are unsophisticated, and they claim to be ~~unsophisticated~~ / \*~~sophisticated~~

Even with a polarity contrast across clauses, though, neither various Class I negative prefixes nor the Class II morpheme *non-* pattern with *un-* in this way:

- (6) The puzzles in this book are impossible, but they're really not supposed to be \*~~possible~~ / ~~impossible~~
- (7) That juggler was particularly maladroit, but nobody thought that he would be \*~~adroit~~ / ~~maladroit~~
- (8) My syntax students are disenchanting, but I never expected them to be \*~~enchanted~~ / ~~disenchanted~~
- (9) The workers are noncompliant, but the boss didn't expect them to be \*~~compliant~~ / ~~noncompliant~~

So only *un-* appears to allow for a partial antecedent. However, it does not seem to occur when material in addition to the affected adjective attempts to delete (thanks to a *Snippets* reviewer for this observation):

(10) Some say the food at Burger King has become unspectacular, and it really hasn't ~~become unspectacular~~ / \*~~become spectacular~~

In sum, then, we have an interesting observation: “copy and delete” can apparently target part of an antecedent. We also have at least two puzzles: why such a phenomenon should require the prefix *un-* rather than any other negative prefix, and why it does not occur when material in addition to the affective adjective deletes.