7.0 Introduction

In part two of this thesis (chapters 4-6) we looked at the kinds of be sentences in Modern Irish. In particular, we have seen that Irish has both a verbal be, which is found primarily with stage level predicates, and a non-verbal construction, which is found primarily with individual level predicates. In chapter 4 I showed that, contra Doherty, the stage/individual level distinction does not suffice for distinguishing the verbal from the non-verbal constructions. Instead, I suggested that the distinction lies in what elements are allowed to bear inflectional features and undergo head movement. In chapters 5 and 6, I looked at the word order alternations shown in (1)

1) a) Is dochtúir (í) **Beverly Crusher**
   C doctor (her)
   'Beverly Crusher is a doctor'

   b) Is é **Jean Luc Picard** an captaen
   C him the captain
   'Jean Luc Picard is the captain'

There, I claimed that the word order alternation seen here reflects an underlying difference in argument and predicatehood. In particular, I claimed that the order in (1a), which is predicative, has the attributive NP functioning directly as a predicate and raising to
highest inflectonal position for feature checking. This is evidenced by the placement of the agreement morpheme, which follows the predicative NP, just as it would follow a tensed verb. As discussed in chapter 6, this raising occurs independent of whether or not the nominal predicate is complex. In contrast, I claimed that (1b), an equative, has a different structure, where both the overt NPs in the sentence are functioning as arguments, as evidenced by the fact that they both follow the agreement morpheme. I claimed that the predicate in such clauses is a head-moving abstract predicate COP, the realization of which is expressed in the obligatory agreement morphology.

The alternation seen above is, at first glance, very similar to an alternation found in modern English. Consider (2):

2) a) John is a doctor  
b) *A doctor is John  
c) John is the doctor  
d) The doctor is John

Many authors working on copular constructions have noted the strong asymmetry seen between predicative and equative NPs in (2). In equative constructions (like 2c&d) the two NPs are reversible in order; in predicatives (2a&b), on the other hand, the two NPs cannot be reversed. There are two schools of thought on how to approach these facts. One view which we will call the Multiple Be Analysis (MBA), is like that discussed above for Irish in chapters 4-6. That is, there are two kinds of "be" constructions, one for equatives and one for predicatives, and these two differ in their argument structure. This view was proposed in philosophical works like Russell (1919) in the Fregean tradition, and is the approach adopted by Akmajian (1970), Higgins (1973), Vinet (1993), Zaring (1993), Rothstein (1987) and Rapoport (1987). This is schematized using my notation in (3):
3) **Multiple be Analysis (MBA)**

There are two kinds of copular structures:

1) **Predicative Structures** (where NP2, the attribute, is predicated of NP1, the subject. NP1 is thus attributed as the recipient of the property represented by NP2.) These are semantically represented as follows:

   \[
   \text{NP2(NP1)}
   \]

2) **Equative Structures** (where two NPs are related as being approximately equal) These are represented as follows:

   \[
   \text{COP (NP1, NP2)}
   \]

In recent work several authors including Partee (1986), Longobardi (1983), Heggie (1988), Moro (1991, 1993), Heycock (1991, 1992, 1994), Guéron (1993), Rouveret (forthcoming), Déchaine (1993), DeGraff (1992) and Zwart (1992) have denied the existence of equative constructions, following observations of Jespersen (1924), Montague (see Dowty, Wall and Peters (1981)) and Ruwet (1968). They all claim that there is no natural language equivalent to the logical '=' (EQUALS) relation. They claim that both predicatives and equatives show asymmetries between the two NPs in copular constructions. These asymmetries are assumed to follow from an underlying subject/predicate distinction to be found in both equative and predicative constructions.

This is the **Unified Be Analysis**:

4) **Unified Be Analysis (UBA)**

   There is only one kind of be construction:

   \[
   \text{NP2(NP1)}
   \]

Proponents of the UBA claim that the facts above in (2) (concerning reversibility) do not reflect an underlying distinction between equatives and predicatives, but rather follow from other facts. They claim, in particular, that the apparent reversibility of arguments in equative sentences is illusory; there is a strong asymmetry between the two NPs with

---

1 In much of the literature the UBA is often called the **Predicate Raising** analysis (e.g. in Heycock 1991, 1992, 1994) and in Moro (1991, 1993). I have chosen to adopt the term **Unified Be Analysis** (following Heggie 1988) for two reasons. First, terminology is immediately more reminiscent of the crucial difference between the two approaches; the **Unified Be Approach** has only one "to be" construction, whereas the MBA has more than one "be". Second, the term "predicate raising" could equally apply to the head-movement of non-verbal predicates that I discuss in chapters 4-6 as to the movement of predicates to specifier positions as proposed by the proponents of the UBA. To avoid this ambiguity, then, I have adopted this somewhat non-standard terminology.
respect to extraction. Consider two sentences in (5): (5a) is typical of what Moro calls a canonical order (where the notional subject is in first position); (5b) is an example of a reverse (or inverse) order where what he calls the "predicate" is in initial position:

5) a) A picture of the wall was the cause of the riot canonical
   b) The cause of the riot was a picture of the wall inverse

Heycock defines inverse copular constructions as follows:

The inverse copular construction is characterized by the occurrence of an initial DP being used attributively and a postcopular DP used referentially.

Moro (1991, 1993) notes that extraction out of the second NP in these two constructions is not symmetrical:

6) a) Which riot do you think a picture of the wall was the cause of
   b) *Which wall do you think the cause of the riot was a picture of

To account for these facts, he claims that the underlying structure for both these sentences is (7):

7)  
   IP
   /  
  /    
is SC
/      
subject

where "cause of the riot" is the head of a small clause with "A picture of the wall" serving as its subject. In canonical structures, the subject raises like a normal subject NP to its case position in the specifier of IP:

8) [IP[ A picture of the wall]i [ INFL was] [SC ti [the cause of the riot]]]]

---

2I would like to point out at this stage that not all English speakers agree on these judgments. I and a number of native speakers I have talked to only consider(6b) to be questionable rather than ungrammatical. Speakers seem to vary wildly with respect to their judgements on these sentences. In an informal poll of 5 linguists no one was able to agree on what was grammatical and what was not. For the purposes of this chapter, and for the sake of argument, I will adopt Moro and Heycock's judgements on these kinds of sentences. I do so, however, only for the sake of consistency with established literature and only under protest.
In reverse constructions, however, it is the predicative head of the small clause that undergoes head movement to the specifier of IP.

9) \[ IP [ The cause of the riot \_i [ [INFL was] [SC [a picture of the wall] \_t ] ] ] \]

The cause of the extraction asymmetries is due to the fact that any extraction out of a subject NP will result in a subjacency violation (this claim will be discussed below in more detail).

The UBA, then, is an account of copular word order alternations that makes use of movement to specifier positions rather than head movement. The reductionist or minimalist might want to use this to account for the Irish word order alternations. However, while this approach may seem particularly attractive in light of its relative simplicity, I show in this chapter that it simply does not refer to the same phenomenon as the Irish copular alternations seen in this thesis. I claim that the inverse/canonical distinction is found in Irish, but only as a subcase of the construction I have described as "equative". The predicative/equative split is simply a word order alternation of a greater order than the canonical/inverse order discussed in the UBA literature. I show that the kind of asymmetries that proponents of the UBA have used as evidence for their approach can be simply reduced to subject/object asymmetries reflected in the theta marking properties of the abstract COP rather than being reflective of a predicate/subject asymmetry. This allows me to account for the various orderings of the Irish predicate/equative distinction while still explaining the behaviour of inverse and canonical structures in languages like English.

7.1 "Unified" theories of copular constructions

7.1.1 Heggie (1988)

The first generative syntactician to propose that there is no equative/predicative distinction was Heggie (1988). She noted that in many ways the "attributive" NP in equative constructions\(^4\) behaves more like a predicate than like other referring NPs. She

\(^3\)more discussion of Heggie (1988) can be found in Chapter 8.

\(^4\)or "pseudo equatives" as Heggie calls them.
presents evidence from French predicate clitics, reflexive intensifiers, discourse and control to support this contention. In order to account for this, she suggests that the structure of inverse construction involves the raising of the subject NP to the specifier of IP and the raising of the predicate into the specifier of CP, with raising of the copula into $C^°$ as an instantiation of subject-aux inversion:

10)

```
CP
  DP
    C
      is_v
      IP
        DP
          subject
t_v
  ....
```

In the canonical construction, like the inverse, the subject DP occupies the specifier of IP. The predicate DP, on the other hand, remains in its D-structure position as the head of a small clause. The copula remains in INFL.

Rather than pursuing this approach and seeing how this approach accounts for the inverse/canonical asymmetries, I will simply turn to the extensive evidence against Heggie's analysis. As noted by Heycock (1992), having the predicate raise to the specifier of CP and the verb raising to $C^°$ makes certain predictions not borne out by the data. For example we predict that we will not be allowed the inverse copular structure in indirect questions. This is false:

11) People are speculating about whether the culprit is John

We also predict that we will never be allowed inverse orders when subject-aux inversion has occurred. Again, this is false:

---

5These predictions are all based on the assumption that CP recursion (see Iatridou and Koch 1992) is not available to the grammar.
12) Was the culprit John?

Finally, we predict that only one auxiliary in multiple auxiliary constructions will occur between the two DPs. Once again, this is false:

13) The culprit may have been John

Heycock concludes then, that Heggie's analysis suffers from serious empirical flaws.

Irish copular constructions also bear on this issue. Irish has no subject-aux inversion. Instead, yes-no questions are indicated with a complementizer particle. Given a raising to CP analysis of inverse/canonical alternations, we predict that "inverse" orders should only occur with DPs preceding the Is particle. This is a false prediction. Inverse constructions in Irish have both NPs following the complementizer particle:

14) a) Is é Seán an Clingeán
   C agr John the Klingon
   "John is the Klingon"

   b) Is é an Clingeán Seán
      C agr the Klingon John
      "The Klingon is John"

Given this fact, we can easily reject a raising to C(P) analysis of the inverse/canonical distinction. Other UBA proposals are not so easily dismissed; these are the accounts of Moro (1991, 1993) and Heycock (1991, 1992)


Moro (1991), as mentioned above, was the first to note that inverse and canonical copular structures differ in their extraction properties. He noted that extraction of (15) and extraction from (16) the inverse construction demonstrates that the two NPs in equatives are not necessarily "equal", since they show asymmetries (data from Heycock 1993). Extraction from the post-copular NP of canonical structure (i.e. from a predicate) is grammatical, as in (15a &16a), but extraction from a post-copular NP in an inverse sentence (i.e. from a subject) is ungrammatical (15b, 16b):
15) a) Which of the themes do you think that phrase of music was?  
   b) *Which phrase of music do you think one of the themes was?

16) a) What do you think the photograph of the president may have been the cause of?  
   b) *What do you think the cause of the riot may have been the photograph of?

He also notes that the inverse order is almost never found in small clauses:\textsuperscript{6}:

17) a) I consider John the culprit  
   b) *I consider the culprit John

To account for these facts he proposes (as does Heycock 1991, 1992 in related work) that
the structure of a canonical sentence involves straightforward raising of the subject to the
specifier of IP\textsuperscript{7}, leaving the attributive NP in the small clause. In the inverse construction,
on the other hand, the predicate NP raises to the specifier of IP, and the subject NP remains
in the small clause:

18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical</th>
<th>Inverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP\textsubscript{j} subject</td>
<td>DP\textsubscript{j} predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I is SC</td>
<td>I is SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_{t_i} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots predicate</td>
<td>\ldots \text{DP} \ldots subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This provides a straightforward account of why the inverse order is disallowed in small
clauses. Small clauses contain no inflectional material, so there is no place for the predicate
to raise to; it must stay in its base position in the small clause. An account of the extraction
asymmetries follows from his definition of barriers and subjacency, which we need not
detail here. Roughly speaking, his account is that since the subject DP will never be theta
marked by a governing head, it is an island for extraction. Thus any attempt to extract out

\textsuperscript{6}See Heycock (1994) for a discussion of the limited set of cases where inversion does seem to occur in
small clauses, and for an account thereof.

\textsuperscript{7}Heycock (1991, 1992) gives a very similar analysis to Moro, differing from him in that the movement
of the predicate to the specifier of IP is A movement, rather than A' movement as Moro claims. In order to
account for the lack of subjacency violations in predicate movement, the predicate must land in the specifier
of VP before raising to the specifier of IP.
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of the post-copular subject position will result in a subjacency violation. This kind of account is unavailable under a story that holds the two DPs in equative clauses to be equals.

7.2 Against a UBA account of Irish

With the relative simplicity and explanatory adequacy of Moro and Heycock's story in mind, we can ask whether such an account is easily extended to the Irish word order alternations discussed in chapter 4-6. Moro's account is especially intriguing since the evidence he presents for his analysis, the extraction asymmetries, are strongly reminiscent of the extraction facts I have used to argue for the X° status of complex nominal predicates.

It is an obvious question as to whether these two phenomena are really one and the same. In this section, I argue that they are most definitely not the same. I then argue that by slightly modifying Moro and Heycock's analysis — so that we have two "be" verbs, one for predicative constructions and one for equatives — but claiming that the two arguments are asymmetric, we can account for the extraction facts discussed above. In particular, I claim that the two NPs in equative constructions do not differ in terms of their argument/predicate status (they are both arguments), but differ in terms of their theta role assignment and underlying argument position. Attributive NPs will be generated as complements to the COP head, and attribute recipients will appear in the specifier. The thematic distinction here — reflected in the structural positions of the two NPs — will yield the same structural asymmetries captured by Moro and Heycock's accounts, without resorting to the empirically problematic UBA.

There are really three issues at stake here. First, we must see if the English canonical/inverse alternations are really of the same type as the Irish word order alternations. If they are not, then does the solution lie in a MBA type analysis? Finally, if there is evidence for the MBA, we must then account for the structural asymmetries that
opponents of the MBA have posited to argue against it. This is the approximate organization of this section.

7.2.1 Why the Irish word order alternations are not canonical /inverse distinctions

There is overwhelming evidence that the word order alternations in Irish cannot be reduced to the canonical/inverse alternations. First, we have issues of headedness. As argued in chapters 2 and 3, Irish is a strictly left-headed language and its specifiers are always to the left. This is confirmed by the structure of small clauses in Irish which are consistently Subject then Predicate in word order:

19) agus é i gCeannada
and him in Canada
"and him in Canada"

Were we to adopt a canonical/inverse approach to Irish copular word orders, we would be forced to claim that Irish allowed rightwards specifiers (this is the approach taken in Doherty (1992, forthcoming); see chapter 8 for more discussion). Recall that the word order in Irish predicative clauses — the order that unambiguously does not allow reversal — is Predicate-Subject. If this reflected an underlying order, as is predicted by the canonical/inverse approach to word order alternations, then Irish would have to allow rightwards specifiers in copular constructions:

20) 

This is inconsistent with all we know about other aspects of Irish syntax and would be highly stipulative. To make matters worse, as we saw in chapter 3, nothing in Irish ever
occupies the specifier of the highest inflectional head, thus to have the subject appearing in this position in copular clauses would be highly unlikely.

Next we have the problem of positioning the agreement morpheme. Recall from chapter 5 that in the predicative order (21), the optional agreement morpheme appears between predicate and the subject. In equative constructions (22), on the other hand, the agreement morpheme appears before both NPs:

21)  
   a)  Is + predicate +agr₁ + subjectᵢ  
   b)  Is  riomhaire é leifteanantcheannasaí Data  
       C  computer agr Lieutenant-Commander Data  
       'Lieutenant Commander Data is a computer'

22)  
   a)  Is + agr₁ + subjectᵢ + attribute  
   b)  Is  é Ceannasaí Radhcár an t-amadán  
       C  agr Commander Riker the fool  
       'Commander Riker is the fool'

The position between complementizer head and agreement morphology, as discussed extensively in previous chapters, is a privileged one in Irish syntax. Only tensed predicational material may appear there. Arguments always follow agreement morphology. The account given above, where nominal predicates head-raise to an inflectional head, accounts easily for these facts. In predicative constructions, the nominal predicate undergoes raising to the highest inflectional head, just like a verb. In equatives, both NPs are arguments, thus remain lower than the agreement morpheme. Any account given in terms of NP movement of predicates has trouble accounting for the fact that in Irish nominal predicates, but not nominal attributes, precede the agreement morpheme.

An inverse/canonical approach to Irish copular word order alternations also can't account for the special behaviour of complex predicates with respect to extraction and the responsive system. Recall that in predicative constructions subconstituents of a nominal predicate may not be extracted.
23)*Cén Piobairej arb [NP amhránj [CPaL-bhuailfeadh séj tL]](é) "Yellow Sub"
   \( \text{Which piper rel song COMP play.cond he agr} \)
   \( "*\text{Which Piper is 'Yellow Submarine' a song which he/tL is going to play}" \)

At first glance this looks very similar to the extraction data presented by Moro (1991, 1993) in favor of his approach. However, closer examination shows that his account simply cannot deal with this extraction fact. First, the extraction in (23) is movement from a predicate (under anybody’s definition), not extraction from a subject. Moro's account only explains the lack of extraction out of subjects. Second, Moro's account of ungrammaticality of extraction follows from subjacency. Recall from chapter six, however, that Irish regularly allows subjacency violations, \textit{modulo} a change in complementizer and the presence of a resumptive pronoun:

24) Cén Piobairej [CPaN mbíonna fios agat i gconaf [CPcaidéj aL-bhuailfidh séj tL]]
   \( \text{Which piper COMP be.hab know at.2.s always whatj COMP play.fut. he} \)
   \( "\text{Which piper do you always know what he will play}" \)

Subjacency, then, cannot be an account of the ungrammaticality of (23). For these two reasons, it is thus clear that Moro's extraction facts and the ones discussed in chapter 6 are different phenomena. Further, his account cannot account for the ungrammaticality of these forms or the behaviour of the responsive system.

The final piece of evidence that the predicative/equative alternation in Irish is not the same thing as the canonical/inverse alternation is the simple fact that Irish also has an inverse/canonical alternation, but only as a subset of the equative construction (26):

25) a) Is captaen (é) Séamus
       C captain agr James
       "James is a captain"
       \( \text{predicative} \)

   b) *Is Séamus (é) captaen
       C James agr captain
       "*A captain is James"

26) a) Is é Séamus an captaen
       C agr James the captain
       "James is the captain"
       \( \text{equative} \)

   b) Is é an captaen Séamus
       C agr the captain James
"The captain is James"

Since Irish has a clear equivalent to the canonical/inverse construction, it thus follows that this alternation cannot be the same as the Irish predicative/equative alternation.

7.2.2 Evidence in favor of the MBA\(^8,\)\(^9\)

We have now seen that the predicative/equative alternation of Irish cannot be reduced to Moro's inverse/canonical alternations. Given this we can ask if there is a UBA account of the equative/predicative alternation independent of the canonical/inverse facts. I believe that there isn't, and that the simpler analysis of Irish copular constructions involves more than one "be" construction. Let us recall the basic fact:

Irish has two distinct word orders for predicatives and equatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicatives:</th>
<th>C pred agr subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equatives:</td>
<td>C agr subject attribute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This alone is reason enough to adopt the MBA. There are two very different constructions for the two readings in Irish. It thus follows that there are two distinct underlying argument structures. This is straightforwardly supported by the fact that the order corresponding to direct predication by the NP (i.e. NP(NP)) has an order exactly equivalent to tensed verbal clauses (with the NP predicate appearing in the privileged position between the complementizer and agreement).

Zaring (1993, 1994) presents evidence from Welsh pseudoclefts against the UBA. She claims that predicational readings are allowed with any of the following constructions\(^10\) (where focus is the distinguishing characteristic among them):

---

\(^8\)For a comprehensive survey of kinds of copular clauses in the various Celtic languages see Hendrick (1994 and forthcoming)

\(^9\)See Rothstein for arguments in favor of the MBA from English and for arguments in favor of the approach to theta marking in copular clauses taken in this thesis

\(^10\)See also Rouveret (forthcoming) and Hendrick (1994, forthcoming) for discussions of both these constructions and the related ones in Breton.
27) a) **Mae** Subject Predicate (no contrastive focus)

Mae [lle mae Siôn] [yn Llundain]
be    where is John in London
"Where John is is in London"

b) **PREDICATE[-N] mae** subject (focus on [-N] predicate)

[Yn Llundain] mae [lle mae Siôn]
in London    be    where is John
"Where John is is IN LONDON"

c) **PREDICATE [+N] ydy** subject (focus on [+N] predicate)

[Niwsans iddo] ydy [beth ydy Siôn]
Nuisance to-him be    what is John
"What John is is A NUISANCE TO HIM"

d) **SUBJECT sydd** Predicate (focus on the subject)

[lle mae Siôn] sydd yn Llundain
where is John be    in London
"WHERE JOHN IS is in London"

However, equative readings are only found in the following construction:

28)  **XP i ydy**  **XP i** (where the XPs can be in either order)

[Yn Llundain] ydy [lle mae Siôn]11
in London    be    where is John
"Where John is is in London"
(=John is in London)
(≠The place where John is has the property of being in London)

Since there is a special construction for equative structures12, Zaring concludes that some version of the MBA is correct (see Rouveret forthcoming for a contrasting view of these facts).

The MBA then, provides a simple, straightforward account of the different constructions used in equative and predicative constructions, facts which cannot be accounted for using the UBA.

---

11To clarify, this construction is crucially different from (27b) in that the form ydy is used instead of *mae*, and is different from (27c) because the predicate is [-N].

12She differs from me, however, in believing that this relation is identical to the logical "=" relation.
7.2.3 Accounting for the English inverse/canonical asymmetries

If we adopt the MBA, we might well ask how we can account for the asymmetries brought to light by proponents of the UBA. I will propose that these asymmetries follow from an asymmetry in argument structure rather than from a predicate/subject distinction.

Let us first examine the underlying assumptions of Proponents of the UBA. They all make the assumption that an equative construction must necessarily and by definition be the equivalent of the logical "=" EQUALS relation. In other words, they assume that an equative construction must have a structure like that in (29):

29)

\[
\text{NP} = \text{NP}
\]

The two NPs are not distinguished structurally, thus are predicted to behave alike. They then make the (somewhat strange) assumption that an asymmetry between two NPs is necessarily encoded in a predication relation between them. For those authors (e.g. Stowell (1981), Moro (1991, 1993) Heycock (1991, 1992)) who believe predication to be linked to argument structure and projection, this distinction is encoded in a small clause structure:

30)

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP} \uparrow \text{DP} \\
\text{subject} \downarrow \text{predicate}
\]

There is a strong structural asymmetry between the two NPs in (30). This structural difference explains the asymmetrical behavior of the two NPs. I believe, however, that an error has been made in conflating two separate issues: i) the predicate/subject relation and
ii) the structural asymmetries between the two NPs in equative clauses. It is not necessarily
the case that the structural asymmetries are a result of a predicate/subject distinction.
Rather, it is entirely possible that these follow from a difference in argument structure. If
we take the view of equatives described above in chapter 5, there is a structural asymmetry
between the subject NP and the attribute NP: the subject NP is generated in the specifier of
COPP, and the attribute is the complement\(^{13}\). (This is presumably correlated with the
different theta roles these two NPs bear.)

31) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{COPP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{subj} \\
\text{COP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{predicate}
\end{array}
\]

Notice that this view of equatives does not make the claim that the two NPs are "equals" in
the logical sense, but instead distinguishes a reading where one NP is predicated of another
(predicative constructions) from one where two NP arguments are linked to each other in
approximate equivalence by the COP morpheme. This account provides a straightforward
analysis of the distribution of Irish copular constructions.\(^{14}\)

7.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I’ve attempted to provide evidence that the word order alternations
found in Irish copular clauses are not reducible to the inverse/canonical distinction of Moro
and Heycock. I further showed that a "single be" analysis (UBA) of Irish fails to account
for the distribution of Irish copular constructions. I then claimed that the asymmetries

\(^{13}\)Notice, however, that this analysis cannot account for some of the asymmetries discussed in Heggie
(1988), such as the distribution of intensive reflexives and the behaviour of predicate clitics in French.
Accounting for these facts will be the subject of future research.

\(^{14}\)which, in some ways, resembles that of Guérôn (1993) who claims that quantificational NPs, not
predicates, undergo the canonical/inverse alternation
discussed in the UBA literature can follow from a structural asymmetry reflecting an argument structure (i.e. a specifier/complement) distinction, rather than the distinction between predicates and subjects.