

# snippets

---

Issue 24

November 2011

---

## Contents

1. Theresa Biberauer and Johan Oosthuizen. *More unbearably light elements? Silent verbs demanding overt complementizers in Afrikaans.*
2. Alex Drummond. *The ban on rightward P-stranding is a global constraint.*
3. Giorgio Magri. *The plurality inference of object mass nouns.*
4. Jacopo Romoli. *Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions.*
5. Philippe Schlenker. *Generalized bishop sentences.*
6. Carson Schütze. *There does not undergo predicate inversion.*
7. Michelle Sheehan. *A note on case assignment to CP.*
8. Gary Thoms. *P-stranding diagnoses A'-movement in tough constructions.*
9. Honglei Wang, David Potter and Masaya Yoshida. *Cross-conjunct binding in nominal gapping.*



## 6.

**Carson Schütze – UCLA**

***There does not undergo predicate inversion***

[cschutze@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:cschutze@humnet.ucla.edu)

---

Moro (1997, 2006) proposes that existential sentences containing *there* (and Italian counterparts with *ci*) are derived from a structure in which *there* originates as a predicate of the “associate” DP and moves to surface subject position by a process of predicate inversion:

(1) [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> There are [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>V</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [many copies of the book] *t*<sub>there</sub> ] ] ] [in the studio] ]

This view, coupled with the assumption that *there* can acquire the agreement features from the associate via predication, could allow a non-ad hoc explanation for long distance agreement in this construction (which has otherwise invoked the machinery of Agree (Chomsky 2000)). The structure and movement in (1) are claimed to be required independently, to account for inverse copular sentences:

(2) [<sub>IP</sub> [The cause of the riot] is [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>V</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [a picture of the wall] *t*<sub>pred</sub> ] ] ]

Moro’s central argument is that (1) patterns sufficiently similarly with (2) to pursue a unification. I disagree.

Moro focuses on two environments where existentials and inverse copulars are purported to parallel each other. The first involves *which-NP* phrases. Inverse copular sentences disallow their extraction:

(3) \*Which picture of the wall do you think the cause of the riot was *t* ?

Moro claims the same is true for existentials:

(4) \*Which girls do you think that there are *t* in the room?

I contend that (4) does not generalize the way (3) does. Specifically, the examples in (5) are grammatical:

- (5) a. Which magazines did you say there were *t* in the waiting room?  
b. Which eco-friendly options do you think there will be *t* on the new Lexus?

An obvious difference between (4) and (5) lies in the interpretation of the WH-phrase: (5) naturally invokes a reading where the answer set contains kinds rather than particular tokens. This is unavailable in (4). Crucially, however, extraction from inverse copulars cannot be saved by this “trick”: (6a,b) should allow the same sorts of answers as (5a,b), but they are ungrammatical.

- (6) a. \*Which magazines did you say the cause of the riot was *t* ?  
b. \*Which options do you think the cause of the recall was *t* ?

Moro's second argument is based on the observation that existentials (8), like inverse copulars (7), are disallowed in small clauses:

(7) \*Mary considers [the cause of the riot a picture of Stalin].

(8) \*The District Attorney considers [there insufficient evidence to prosecute].

In fact, when we consider passive examples, it seems that the parallel breaks down again: the contrast between (9) and (10) for some (but not all) speakers demonstrates another context where existentials are fine but inverted copular constructions are not. (Note that Heycock 1995 uses (9) to suggest that the problem with (7) is plausibly not the lack of a landing site for the inverted predicate, contra Moro.)

(9) \*The cause of the riot is considered a picture of Stalin.

(10) There is considered insufficient evidence to prosecute.

Thus, the two environments that were meant to provide independent evidence for (1) being analogous to (2) in fact militate against that conclusion.

### References

- Chomsky, N. (2000). "Minimalist inquiries: the framework," in *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–155.
- Heycock, C. (1995). "The internal structure of small clauses: new evidence from inversion," in *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 25*, vol. 1, ed. J. N. Beckman. Amherst, MA: GLSA, 223–238
- Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moro, A. (2006). "Existential sentences and expletive *there*," in *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 2, ed. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 210–236.