5.0. Introduction: the three *Is* orders

In this chapter, I examine the different word orders found with *Is* constructions in Modern Irish. These orderings are seen in the following sentences. In the following sentences the notional **subject** is indicated in **bold**. The **property** being assigned to that subject is indicated in **italics** (see Stenson (1981) and Ó Siadhail (1989) for descriptions of these orders)

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'

   c) Is é **an dochtúir** é
   Cop him the doctor him
   'he is the doctor'

   d) Is **Clingeán** é
   C Klingon him
   "He is a Klingon"

*Many of the ideas in this chapter have been the result of a great deal of discussion and analysis with Heidi Harley. To her, I owe a special debt of thanks for this chapter.*
At first glance, there appears to be almost random ordering of the notional subject and the property being attributed to it. In sentences (1a) and (1d), which are predicative *Is* constructions (discussed above in chapter 4), we have the notional predicate preceding the notional subject. When the subject is a full NP it can optionally\(^1\) be preceded by a pronominal which agrees with the subject as in (1a). In (1b), we have an equative *Is* construction with a full NP subject, with this construction we have the subject, preceded by the agreeing pronominal (obligatory here), which in turn precedes the predicate. Finally in (1c), we have an equative with a pronominal subject. In this, the subject is separated from the agreeing pronominal by the predicate. As seen in (1d) the subjects of both predicative and equative *Is* constructions are in the accusative case. These facts all need resolution.

In this chapter, I claim that the differences between the predicative and equative word orders follows from a complex interaction of argument structure, the head-movement of indefinite nominal predicates discussed above in chapter 4, and a rule of rightward movement motivated elsewhere in the grammar of Irish.

I claim that the difference between the two types of sentences (equatives and predicatives) follows from the type of the predicate involved. I claim that the indefinite nominals are all true one place predicates. They take a single argument, and since they can bear inflectional features, as discussed in chapter 4, they raise though the inflectional complex to the highest inflectional node, just like the tense verbs. In the equative cases where the attributed property seems to be a definite NP on the other hand, I claim that this NP is not a predicate at all (see chapter 7 for a discussion of alternative views of equatives). Rather, I claim it is an argument of a null two place predicate 'COP'. Since the definite NP is not a predicate, it will not undergo head-raising and will surface in its case position. In these cases, the null predicate is the element which undergoes head-raising. I correlate the

\(^1\)There seems to be a fair amount of dialect variation over the presence of this optional pronoun. It seems to be mostly localized in the Conamara dialect.
presence of the extra pronoun with presence of agreement features on the null copula. The order shown in (1c) follows from the rule of pronoun postposing. Finally, I claim that the so-called accusative case seen on the subjects is not true morphological or abstract case marking but is a reflex of lack of adjacency to a tensed verb.

This analysis of different kinds of copular constructions flies in the face of much recent work on copular constructions, which presents a so-called "unified account" of copular constructions, as in Heggie (1988), Moro (1991, 1993) and Heycock (1991, 1992). In these works, it is argued that there is only one structure for both equative and predicative uses of the copula. I will not be arguing against this approach in this chapter, saving such arguments for chapter 7. Instead, in this chapter I will present a modified version of the older analysis of copular constructions which uses two different copular constructions. In passing the reader will note that this older style "non-unified" account provides a more than adequate analysis of the different syntactic types of copular clauses in Irish.

This chapter will be organized as follows. The first six sections of this chapter are devoted to deriving the correct word order facts of Irish copular constructions. The last two deal with problems that Doherty (1992, forthcoming) has offered as evidence in favor of an alternative analysis of these facts. First, I discuss my version of the hypothesis that there are two different constructions for copular constructions, with different theta properties. I then extend this analysis to the facts of Irish word order. Later, in section 5.5, I show how the third word order is derivable from the equative construction by a simple and otherwise motivated rule of light pronoun postposing. In sections 5.3 and 5.4, I explain the presence and distribution of the agreement morpheme and discuss the status of accusative case on the subject. Finally, in the last two sections, I turn to some facts discussed in Doherty (forthcoming): those of reciprocal binding and the apparent exceptions to the *Highest
Subject Restriction of McCloskey (1990). At first these may seem problematic for the approach presented here. I show, however, that these problems are easily resolved within my framework.

5.1 Two Types of Nominal Predicates

Consider the following facts about the reversability of elements in sentences where a nominal property is being attributed to another noun. In English definite properties and notional subjects are usually reversible in position:

2) a) The ensign (who fired the phasers) is the doctor  
b) The doctor is the ensign (who fired the phasers).

When the attributed property is indefinite however, this is not true, the property must follow the verb to be:

3) a) The ensign is a doctor  
b) *A doctor is the ensign

The standard account of such alternations (e.g. Akmajian 1970, Rothstein 1987, Higgins 1973, Vinet 1993, Zaring 1994 and Rapoport 1987) holds that this contrast follows from the types of predicates found in these sentences. According to this set of analyses, there are two different base-generated structures for the sentences in (2) and (3). Sentence (2) is an equative sentence where both the NPs are arguments. Sentence (3), on the other hand is a predicative; the first NP is an argument, the second is a predicate. Rapoport (1987) summarizes the difference as follows:

4) | Type       | Pre-copular NP | Post-copular NP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equative</td>
<td>argument</td>
<td>argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>argument</td>
<td>predicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2Instead of the two types of copular clauses posited here, Higgins (1973) actually claims there are four types: specificational, identity, identificational and predicational. Rapoport (1987) quite effectively shows that these types can really be collapsed into the two types discussed here; see that work for more discussion.

3For a discussion of what it means to be a predicate or an argument see Williams (1994, 1995), see also Napoli (1987)
I propose, modifying slightly proposals of Rapoport (1987) and Rothstein (1987), that equatives are small clauses headed by an abstract two place COP predicate. This COP predicate assigns two theta roles to its two arguments:

\[
\theta_2 \quad \theta_1
\]

\[
\text{COP (NP1, NP2)} \\
\theta_1
\]

For the purpose of this work I will assume that the theta role assigned to the internal argument is the 'attribute' (\(\theta_2\)), whereas that assigned to the external argument (\(\theta_1\)) is the 'attribute recipient', (AR) for short. The evidence for having two different theta roles for the two different arguments follows from the fact that the two sentences in (2) are not exactly equivalent in meaning. See also the discussion in chapter 7, where I discuss certain structural asymmetries between the two NPs.

Let us now consider the predicative structures, which have indefinite attributed properties. I treat these, following Rapoport (1987), as one place predicates. In these, the attributed property functions directly as the predicate on a single Attribute Recipient argument:

\[
\theta_1 \\
\text{NP (NP)} \\
\text{AR}
\]

\(\)\(^4\)There are three differences between this and Rapoport's proposal. First, Rapoport posits that her "=" predicate is base generated in INFL. In an attempt to provide a parallel between equatives and predicatives and to provide an account of its theta properties, I have placed COP as the head of the small clause that contains its arguments. Second, Rapoport's analysis has a true equative nature—both NPs are equivalents with no differences between them. Finally, with respect to predicatives (see below and chapter 4), I believe that the small clause always surfaces with an inflectional complex, thus accounting for the apparent head-movement of the predicate to initial position. Rapoport suggests that small clauses in Hebrew can surface without inflectional complexes. Note as well that COP is not isomorphic to Heggie's \(\lambda\), which is found in both equative and predicative constructions (cf. chapter 7 below).

\(\)\(^5\)I use the terms "indefinite" and "definite" only as mnemonics here. As Doherty (1995) shows the relevant distinction in Irish is probably one of referentiality rather than definiteness; see Doherty for more discussion.
Since the attributed nominal property is not an argument, it cannot fill the subject argument slot, thus accounting for the ungrammaticality\(^6\) of (3b) (repeated here as (7b)):

7) a) The ensign is a doctor  
   b) *A doctor is the ensign

This analysis is consistent with the semantics of these two types of properties as well. Indefinites, in general, are not referring expressions (following Higginbotham 1989); thus they can function predicatively. Definite NPs, on the other hand, are referring expressions. They have a reference and their argument structure is saturated and complete. Because of this, they are inherently arguments, thus participate in the equative construction, rather than the predicative one.

We thus have two different types of attributed nominal properties. One where the property behaves directly like a predicate, and one where the property is an argument and is linked to the AR by the abstract predicate COP.

As noted above, a series of recent analyses (Heggie 1988, Moro 1991, 1993, Heycock 1991, 1992) have all argued that the equative construction is really simply a sub-kind of predicative clause, with specific kinds of interpretive properties. Under these accounts, the reversability of the NPs seen in (2&3) follows from other facts (like subjacency). For reasons that will become obvious below from the word order facts of Irish copular clauses\(^7\) and from the discussion in chapter 7, I will not adopt this approach here.

5.2 The Predicative and Equative Constructions in Irish.

\(^6\)Again an alternative analyses of these facts are found in Heggie (1988), Moro (1991) and Heycock (1991) See also chapter 7 of this thesis for more discussion.

\(^7\)To clarify, Irish has word order alternations as seen below in 5.2 that can only be accounted for if there is a clear syntactic difference between equatives and predicatives.
In this section, I sketch out the analysis of the various Irish copular word order facts first presented in Carnie (1994) and Carnie and Harley (1994a&b). I show that these two types of nominal predicate constructions discussed above provide a straightforward account of the word order alternations in Modern Irish copular clauses. I claim that in the cases where an indefinite NP is functioning as a predicate it raises past the subject to adjoin to the highest inflectional head. With definite attributes, on the other hand, it is the abstract COP predicate which undergoes the raising (contra Carnie 1993). The attribute NP argument is thus left behind and is found to the right of the subject.

Let us see how the differences in predicate types derive the differences in word order. Let us first consider an example with an indefinite predicate (a predicative construction) and a subject of any sort:

8) PREDICATE SUBJECT
   Is Clingeán {é/an dalta/Worf}
   C Klingon him/the ensign/Worf
   'He/The ensign/Worf }is a Klingon'

In this case the attributive NP appears to the left of the subject. This follows if the predicate NP (Clingeán) has undergone head-movement to the highest inflectional category, around the surface subject position (just like in normal VSO sentences). This is the analysis sketched in chapter 4:

9).

For definite attribute NPs, on the other hand, it is the abstract predicate COP which does the movement, thus leaving the attribute NP to the right of the subject:

10) SUBJECT ATTRIBUTE
    Is é {Worf/an dalta} an Clingeán
    C agr Worf/the ensign the Klingon
    'Worf/the ensign is the Klingon'
The evidence for this analysis comes from the relative placement of agreement morphology in the two kinds of copular clause. In sentences with verbal predicates, we consistently have the order where agreement morphology\(^8\) precedes the subject NP:

12) \[
\text{Rith+eann Cathal}
\]
\[
\text{run+3s Charles}
\]
"Charles runs"

Let us make the null assumption, then, that the order in (13) always obtains in Irish, and that the presence of agreement morphology before a noun in Irish is a clear diagnostic for the subjecthood of that noun. We can also claim that the position preceding agreement morphology (immediately following any particle) is the position reserved for predicates:

13) \[
\text{Particle + Predicate + Agreement + Subject}
\]

In equative clauses the agreement morphology (see section 5.4 below for more discussion on the distribution of agreement morphology) precedes both the subject and the object NP:

14) \[
\text{AGR SUBJ ATTRIBUTE}
\]
\[
\text{Is é Seán an platapas}
\]
\[
\text{C agr John the platypus}
\]
"John is the platypus"

This is also true if you reverse the two NPs:

15) \[
\text{Is é an platapas Seán}
\]
\[
\text{C agr the platypus John}
\]
"The platypus is John."

---

\(^8\)This is a bit of an oversimplification since overt agreement morphology is generally disallowed with overt nominals (with the exception of third person default agreement. For more discussion see McCloskey and Hale (1984)
In predicatives, on the other hand, the agreement morpheme when present\(^9\) appears between the predicate and the subject NP

16) \[
\text{ATTRIBUTE AGR SUBJECT} \\
\text{Is platapas } \checkmark \text{ Seán} \\
\text{C platypus } \text{ agr John} \\
\text{"John is a platypus"}
\]

As predicted by the discussion above, the reverse of this sentence is ungrammatical (under the appropriate reading where John is a referring expression and not a label or role in a play):

17) *Is Seán é platapas \\
C John agr platypus \\
"*A platypus is John"

Taking a preceding agreement morpheme to be a diagnostic for the subjecthood of a following NP and assuming that the position preceding agreement is reserved for predicates, we see that in equatives, no NP is in the predicate position (between the particle and agreement heads), and both NPs (AR and attribute) are in argument positions. In contrast, in predicatives, the predicate NP appears between the particle and the agreement head (and has thus undergone head movimiento). The subject follows the agreement morpheme. These facts are summarized in the chart in (18)

18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>particle</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>Ní</td>
<td>rith</td>
<td>+eann</td>
<td>+3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>platapas</td>
<td>(é)</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Platypus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equative</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>é</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the platypus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By adopting the distinction between predicative and equative sentences, we have a straightforward account of the placement of this agreement morpheme. In the predicative construction, the predicate NP raises to the highest inflectional position, thus landing between agreement and the particle, in a manner exactly parallel to verbs. With equatives,

\(^9\)Again, the appearance of the agreement morphology is dialect dependent.
on the other hand, both NPs are arguments. Thus neither of them raise to predicate position.

With this in mind, let us flesh out the proposal by discussing exactly what movement, both A-movement and head-movement, occurs in copular constructions. In doing so, I must still explain why the subject of copular clauses appears to take accusative case, explain the word order in (1c), and explain why the agreement morpheme is obligatory in equative constructions, but is optional in predicatives. These questions will be the focus of the next few sections.

5.3 Case

Let us now consider the status of case in these different kinds of nominal clauses. In Irish, the subjects of nominal clauses show up, surprisingly, with what appears to be accusative case:

19) Is dochtúir é (cf. *Is dochtúir sé (nom))
   C doctor him.acc
   He is a doctor.

This is a very puzzling feature of Irish nominal clauses. Why should the subject show up with accusative case? I claim that surface phonology to the contrary, these NPs are not, in fact showing up with accusative case (for an alternative view see Carnie 1993). Overt phonological case marking in Modern Irish is only seen on third person pronouns. For all other NPs, there is no morphological case difference between nominative and accusative case. Nominative case pronouns are simply the accusative forms preceded by an <s> (/S/):

20) sé 'he'  
    sí 'she'  
    siad 'they'
    é 'him'
    í 'her'
    iad 'them'

Ken Hale (p.c.) has pointed out to me that this marking is not necessarily a reflex of syntactic case. He points out that the <s> forms are never found anywhere except to the
immediate right of a tensed verb (a fact also noted in Christian Bros (1960) and McCloskey and Hale (1984)). For example, in coordinate NP subjects, a pronominal subject does not show up with <s>, even though it is in a nominative case position:

21) Chuir Luacsana Troí agus éisean an ríomhaire sa réaltlong
Put.past and him.emph the computer in.the starship
'He and Lwaxana Troi put the computer in the starship'

He claims, then, that the <s> forms are only a feature of the basic 'é/i/iad' set being cliticized to the right of a tense verb:

22) Chuir sé an ríomhaire sa réaltlong
Chuir+s+é
Put.past he the computer in.the starship
He put the computer in the starship

Recall also, from our discussion in chapter 2, that Chung and McCloskey (1987) note that there is a strong adjacency requirement between s-grade pronouns and verbs; no adverbial material may intervene between the verb and these pronouns:

23) a) Fuair, cinnte, Taisia Eár bás
Got, certainly, Tasha Yar death
"Tasha Yar, certainly, died"

b) *Fuair, cinnte, sí bás
Got, certainly, she death
"*She, certainly, died"

No such constraint holds on the é/i/iad class of pronouns. This supports the idea that the so-called "nominative" pronouns are not a real morphological realization of nominative case. Rather, they simply show a phonological marking\(^\text{10}\) of their clitic status to the verb. Pronouns in Irish, then, do not really show an overt morphological realization of their structural case, paralleling its close neighbour Scots Gaelic in this regard\(^\text{11}\).

If this account is accurate then the case marking on the subjects of copular clauses is not puzzling at all. Nominative case is assigned to the subjects (AR) of copular clauses, just

\(^\text{10}\)See Ahlqvist (1976) for some speculation on the origins of this marker.

\(^\text{11}\)Interestingly, according to Ahlqvist (1976) the emergence of the s-grade of pronouns, and the cliticization of them did not become fully productive until the Early Modern Irish period, about the time that Irish and Scots Gaelic diverged.
as in normal verbal clauses, in the specifier of AgrSP. The lack of the \(<s>\) is attributable to the fact that these pronouns are not adjacent to a tensed verb, but to an inflected noun (or abstract COP). The movement of elements, and their case is thus in (24) and (25).

(24) represents a predicative construction where the attribute recipient role is directly predicated of the indefinite NP. The nominal predicate raises through the inflectional heads checking its inflectional features. The subject pronoun raises to the specifier of AgrSP to check its nominative case. The equative construction, on the other hand is represented in (25).
In this structure, the COP predicate bears inflectional features which it checks by head moving through the functional heads to the highest position. The arguments move to their case positions, in a manner parallel to normal VSO order.

Given these two different predicate types then, and the assumption that the <s> forms of the pronouns do not reflect syntactic accusative case, I have a nice account of the different word orders of the definite and indefinite attributes. They are due to different head-movement and case properties resulting from their different argument structures; in a manner strikingly similar to the derivation of words with verbal predicates.
5.4 The Agreement Morpheme

In this section, I discuss the distribution of the agreement morpheme\(^1\). Consider the structure in (26), an equative; an agreement morpheme\(^2\) is obligatorily found between the *Is* proclitic and the third person subject NP. This agreement morpheme takes the form of a third person pronoun:

\[26) \begin{align*}
& a) \quad \text{Is} + \text{pronoun} + \text{subject} + \text{attribute} \\
& b) \quad \text{Is} \; \text{é} \; \text{Ceannasaí Radhcár} \; \text{an t-amadán} \\
& \quad C \; \text{agr} \; \text{Commander Riker} \; \text{the fool} \\
& \quad '\text{Commander Riker is the fool}'
\end{align*}\]

In sentences with indefinite predicates (predicatives), this agreement pronoun may optionally appear between the predicate and a full NP subject:

\[27) \begin{align*}
& a) \quad \text{Is} \; \text{ríomhaire} \; \text{é} \; \text{leifteanantcheannasaí} \; \text{Data} \\
& \quad C \; \text{computer} \; \text{agr} \; \text{Lieutenant-Commander Data} \\
& \quad '\text{Lieutenant Commander Data is a computer}'\(^4\) \\
& b) \quad \text{Is} \; \text{ríomhaire} \; \text{leifteanantcheannasaí} \; \text{Data} \\
& \quad C \; \text{computer} \; \text{Lieutenant-Commander Data} \\
& \quad '\text{Lieutenant Commander Data is a computer}’
\end{align*}\]

The presence of the extra pronoun is very puzzling. We must account for the facts of its co-occurrence with various types of predicates and subjects—as well as accounting for the fact that it appears at all.

Interestingly, such pronouns show up in other languages that don’t use a verbal copula. For example, in Hebrew an agreeing pronoun is required in equative sentences (Rapoport 1987:65):

\[28) \begin{align*}
& \text{Ha-melex hu} \; \text{david} \\
& \quad \text{the-king} \; \text{3.sing.masc David} \\
& \quad '\text{David is the King/The king is David}' \text{Hebrew}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{12}\)For an alternative view of this morpheme see Doherty (1995) who views it as an "unsaturator" rather than an agreement morpheme. I do not adopt his analysis here, because he is forced to claim that in sentences like "John is the doctor", "John" functions like the predicate, contra the predicate hierarchy found in Heggie (1988).

\(^{13}\)The Gaoth Dobhair dialect of Co. Donegal differs from other dialects in its use of agreement pronouns; see Ó Siadhail (1983) for a discussion of equatives in this dialect.

\(^{14}\)For the information of readers who may not be familiar with the television show *Star Trek* (which provides the bulk of topics for my examples), Lt. Cmdr Data is a robot.
but not in predicatives:

29) Dani more  
   Dani teacher  
   'Dani is a teacher'

Similarly a demonstrative 'eto' is obligatory in Russian equatives, but not in predicatives (Data from Rapoport 1987):

30) Ivan eto tot samyj çelovek  (*Ivan tot samyj çelovek)  
    this-n this-m very-m man-m  
    'Ivan is this very man'

31) Ivan student  
    'Ivan is a student'

What we have here then is a cross-linguistic property of languages with non-verbal copular constructions. Why should this be the case?

After Doron (1986), I suggest that this morpheme is the phonological realization of the agreement features on the COP head. It is obligatorily present when the predicate is the abstract (null) predicate COP. Following the analysis found in Rapoport (1987) it surfaces in order to indicate (or identify) the presence of this null predicate. When we have an indefinite predicate, however, the presence of the morpheme is not required to indicate the presence of a predicate, since that predicate is overt. Thus the agreement morpheme is optional in these cases.

One piece of evidence in favour of this approach lies in the morphological shape of the pronoun. This pronoun agrees in number and gender with the subject NP. This is seen in (32) below, where the pronoun agrees in grammatical gender with the subject NP.

32)a) Is í an leabharlann an teach mór  
     C agr.fem the library.fem the house.masc big  
     The library is the big house

b) Is é an teach mór an leabharlann  
    C agr.masc the house.masc big the library.fem

Heggie (1988, 1990) and DeGraff (1992) provide alternative accounts of the appearance of these morphemes using the ECP as a motivator. See chapter 8 below for discussion.
The big house is the library

In (32a) the pronoun agrees in gender with the feminine word for 'library'; in (32b) it agrees with the masculine word for 'big house'. Since the pronoun agrees with the subject, it follows that it is simply the reflex of subject agreement features showing up on the abstract COP morpheme.

If agreement morphology is simply a realization of the abstract agreement features on the null COP head, why is it allowed to show up in predicatives, which lack such a head? A related question is why is it optional in predicatives. I have no definite answers to these questions, but will offer some brief speculation. My answer to the first question is the startlingly obvious one: predicative NPs bear agreement morphology, which can surface as this agreement morpheme. The answer to the question of its optionality is more difficult. I suggest that it may well have to do with the morphological fact that nominals do not normally show overt agreement morphology. When the morphology is presented with a verb that bears agreement features it maps this onto a verb plus verbal agreement suffix:

33)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{V} \ + \ \text{Agr} \\
\{\text{run}\} \ + \ \{3s\}
\end{array} \rightarrow \quad \text{Rith+eann} \]

\[ \text{run} \quad 3s \]

The situation with nominal predicates in Irish, however, is different. Nouns in Irish do not take agreement morphology, there are no agreement suffixes for nominals. Thus when morphology is presented with a syntactic head like that in (33), it has a problem!

\[16\text{For a discussion of why this surfaces as a separate morpheme rather than as an agreement suffix, see the discussion of syntax-morphology mapping in chapter 6.}\]
When presented with such a structure, the morphology is faced with a dilemma. It would like to create a nominal head with a third person agreement suffix. Such suffixes are not present in the lexicon for nouns and (adopting the terminology of Noyer 1992), Irish nouns have no position of exponence (or slot) for agreement suffixes. When put in this position, the morphology has two choices, it can either realize the agreement as a separate agreement morpheme (taking the form of a third person pronoun) or, alternately, it can delete (or ignore) those features, thus resulting in the construction without the agreement pronoun. This, at least tentatively, accounts for the optionality of the pronoun in predicatives. I will articulate this view of morphology in more detail in chapter 6.

A related problem lies in the fact that the agreement pronoun cannot surface when the subject is a pronoun in predicative constructions:

35) *Is dochtúir é é
   C doctor agr he.
   "He is a doctor"

Rapoport (1987) notes similar facts in Hebrew:

36) hu *hu student(cf. Dani hu student)
   He agr student
   "he is a student"

Note that in neither language is this attributable to a ban on adjacent pronouns, since adjacent pronouns are in fact found in other constructions.

37) a) dá mba mise túsa
    if C.irrl I.emph you.eph
    "If I were you"

   b) An seanbhuachaill ab é é

17This sentence is an example of a a cleft of the attribute NP in an equative construction. Unfortunately for
Rapoport (1987) suggests that this fact is due to some kind of prodrop phenomena, when the subject NP features matches the features of the agreement morpheme identically, the pronoun is deleted (or its features absorbed); when additional features (like those found with full NPs) are present in the subject NP, then such absorption or deletion cannot occur. Note however that this prodrop differs from other pro-drop in Irish in that it is limited only to pronominals. In verbal clauses, overt agreement and overt nominal subjects of any kind are in complementary distribution (McCloskey and Hale 1984). With nominal predicates, only pronominal subjects are in complementary distribution with overt agreement. I, unfortunately, have no account for this fact, and will leave it open for future research. It is obvious that much more research needs to be done on this issue, but given the goals of the current discussion, I will adopt Rapoport's analysis as a sufficiently explanatory one for the time being.

5.5 Pronominal Subjects of the Predicate 'COP': Rightwards movement.

Thus far, I've attempted to present a concise theory of predicate movement and case theory that accounts for the word order in Irish copular clauses. This nice picture appears to break down in the face of sentences like (1b) (repeated here as (39), however:

39) Is é a' n dochtúir é
   C agr the doctor him
   'he is the doctor'

This sentence is problematic in several ways. Firstly, the subject pronoun is appearing not to the left of the definite attribute (as we would predict with the abstract predicate 'COP'),

---

reasons of space and time I will be unable to discuss this kind of construction; it is however, entirely consistent with everything I have said here.
but to its right. The Agr morpheme is showing up not adjacent to the subject, but next to the predicate. Further this Agr morpheme is showing up with a pronominal subject. This would appear to be direct counter-evidence to the proposal I've presented above.

I claim, however, that this sentence is directly predictable given the behaviour of other pronouns in the language. Chung and McCloskey (1987) point out that there is a rule of Irish grammar, whereby pronouns of the é/í/iad grade postpose around obliques and adverbials to the end of the sentence. Consider the following paradigm where the object NP and pronouns are bolded:

40)a) Scaoil an Captaen na féasair ar na Clingeánaí
    Fired the Captain the phasers on the Klingons
    'The Captain fired the phasers at the Klingons'

     b)??Scaoil an Captaen iad ar na Clingeánaí
        Fired the Captain them on the Klingons
        'The Captain fired them at the Klingons'

     c) Scaoil an Captaen ar na Clingeánaí iad
        Fired the Captain on the Klingons them
        'The Captain fired them at the Klingons'

There thus seems to be a rule of pronoun post-posing in Irish. We can formulate this in rule in (41)

41) Move a é/í/iad-grade pronoun to the end of its clause.

I refer the reader to Ó Siadhail (1989) and Duffield (1994)\(^\text{18}\) for more discussion of this phenomenon.

Given this rule then it is not surprising that the pronominal subject of a COP predicate postposes around the attribute to final position:

\(^{18}\)Duffield (1994) proposes that the positioning of this pronoun follows not from rightward shift of a light pronoun, but from raising the pronoun leftwards to a "wackernagladian" second position head, and subsequent topicalization of all other clausal material to the left of that pronoun in a manner similar to V2. This approach is equally consistent with the facts of Irish copular constructions presented here to the simpler postponing analysis presented in the text.
This, then, gives us the final word order of Irish. A complete summary of all the word order types and their derivation will be given in 5.8.

5.6 Reciprocal Binding

Doherty (1992) presents some evidence that, at first glance, seems problematic for the approach outlined here. In Irish, like English, the subject of nominal predicate can bind a reciprocal within that predicate:

43)  

a) [John and Mary] are each other’s bosses

b) Is cosúil lena chéile iad
   “They are like one another” (From Doherty 1992)

On the bases of this data he argues that the subject of a nominal predicate in Irish must c-command (and thus be higher) than the predicate into which it binds. He proposes the following structure:

44)  

These facts appear problematic for the approach outlined in this paper, since the subject NP is c-commanded by the predicate head. The exact reverse of what the data predicts.

---

19 I am not going to argue against such a structure here, as the model which Doherty presents is based upon fundamentally different assumptions about case assignment, functional categories, and head movement than the one here. See chapter 8 for further discussion of Doherty’s model.

20 The predicate in this construction is phrasal, thus it may appear strange to claim it is in a head position. This issue will be dealt with in the next chapter.
The situation is not as dire as it first appears, however, considering recent proposals about the theories of movement and reconstruction. Huang (1993) claims that, for wh-moved constituents at least, VPs (and by extension all predicate phrases) are subject to reconstruction. I propose that we extend this notion to predicates which have undergone head movement\textsuperscript{21}. This extension follows naturally from the copy theory of movement found in Chomsky (1993). Under the copy theory, elements are not “moved” \textit{per se}. Rather a copy of the constituent is adjoined at the “moved to” position. Traces under this theory are not just placemarkers, but are structurally complete — but phonologically null — copies of the moved element. Under this conception of movement, the usual c-command requirement on reciprocal binding is met even when a predicate has undergone head movement. Consider the following abstract tree. The phonologically null elements (“traces”) are represented as boxed in and shaded:

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{ZP} \\
\text{Z} \quad \text{X} \\
\text{Z}'
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Z}_i
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\ldots
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{21}Noting that Williams (1980) suggests that subjects must c-command their predicates, we might speculate that the cause of this reconstruction is the requirement that subjects c-command their predicates at LF; this is true for both verbal and non-verbal predicates.
In this configuration, the head A c-commands one part of the chain of Zs. Let us assume that for the theory of binding of reciprocals the following condition must be met.

47) Reciprocal Binding Condition:
The antecedent of reciprocal R must c-command some segment of the chain containing R at LF.

This simple condition nicely accounts for the facts given in (43). The complex head containing the reciprocal has a phonologically null, but structurally complete trace below the surface subject position:

48)

This trace is c-commanded by the antecedent head at LF, thus the condition on reciprocal binding is met.

5.7 The Highest Subject Restriction.

Doherty (1992) also claims that his analysis nicely accounts for the strange behaviour of copular subjects with respect to a restriction on the distribution of resumptive pronouns in Irish. McCloskey (1979, 1990) notes that the subject of the highest relative clause in an NP does not allow resumptive pronouns in Irish. Leaving a gap is the only strategy of wh-extraction allowed from this position, resumptive pronouns are disallowed:

49) a) *an fear a raibh sé breoite

But not Doherty (forthcoming), the revision of Doherty (1992).
the man who was him ill
"The man that he was ill"  (McCloskey 1990)

b) an fear a bhí __ breoite
the man who was __ ill
"The man that was ill"

This is referred to in the literature as the *Highest Subject Restriction*. (HSR). What is of interest to us here is that the subjects of copular clauses of both kinds do not seem to be subject to this restriction:

50) a) an fear ar dochtúir é
the man C.rel doctor he
"The man who he is a doctor"

b) an fear arbh é an dochtúir é
the man C.rel agr the doctor he
"The man who he was the doctor"  (Doherty 1992)

Doherty claims that the HSR follows from an i-within-i violation, caused by the positioning of clitics relative to complementizers in Irish clauses. Doherty is assuming that VSO order is derived by the movement of verbs through INFL to COMP. He notes that if you adjoin a resumptive clitic to a V+INFL+C complex in a relative construction, the following structure results:

51)

Doherty assumes the following about resumptive pronouns:
"McCloskey (1990) provides convincing evidence that resumptive pronouns are interpreted as syntactic variables and that unbounded dependencies utilizing resumptive pronoun strategies contain a null operator in the specifier of CP which is coindexed with the resumptive. Adopting this proposal, the mechanism of Spec-Head agreement will ensure that in an unbounded dependency, the index of the operator in the specifier of CP will be realized on the C head. … [T]his leads to the C head bearing the same index as the [pronoun] which it contains. I claim that this results in an i-within-i violation."

This means that since the clitic pronoun in (51) is dominated by a complementizer head that bears an identical index, the whole structure will be ruled out. With respect to copular structure, recall from section 5.6 above, that for Doherty the subjects of copular clauses are in the specifier of IP which in copular constructions lies to the right. Pronouns in this position are not adjacent to the inflectional complex, and do not cliticize to them. This results in the structure given in (52):

52)

```
CP
  XP
    C'
      Op_j
        C_j
          ar+ INFL_k
            t_k
              I' pronoun_j
                  I'
                          NomPred
```

This is not an i-within-i violation, since the pronoun is not cliticized under the C head.

Perhaps the largest problem with this account lies in the nature of one of its basic assumptions, that the verb is in C at SPELLOUT in Modern Irish. As discussed at length above in chapter 2, McCloskey (forthcoming) presents extensive evidence that the verb in Irish raises no higher than the left edge of the inflectional complex; the fact that the complementizer is clitic to the verb is due to complementizer lowering, rather than raising the verb. Given McCloskey's facts, Doherty's account of the HSR restriction falls apart. If
verbs are not in C, then pronouns adjoined to those verbs cannot trigger i-within-i violations with that C:

53)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{Op}_j \\
\text{C}_j \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{j} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{pronoun}
\end{array}
\]

If Doherty's account of HSR falls apart, it follows that so does his account of the copular exceptions to the principle.

How then are we to account for the fact that copular structures do not obey the HSR? I suggest that Doherty's basic intuition that the reason subject pronouns in verbal clauses are subject to the HSR, whereas ones in nominal clauses are not, is due to the fact that subject resumptives are clitics in modern Irish verbal clauses, but not in nominal ones. The solution\textsuperscript{23} I suggest, however, does not make use of i-within-i violations or raising of the verb to C. Instead, I will follow McCloskey (1990) and Déprez and Hale (1986) in assuming that the HSR is the result of an A-bar application of Principle B of the binding theory. I will show that the adjunction of a clitic to a verb+Infl head results in a different CFC (complete functional complex) for determining domains, than the non-adjunction found in clauses with nominal predicates. The difference between HSR violations and non-violations is a function of whether the resumptive pronoun is a clitic to Agr or not\textsuperscript{24}.

---

\textsuperscript{23}For a completely different view of the HSR, see Fox (1994).

\textsuperscript{24}In a remarkable coincidence, Doherty (forthcoming), but not Doherty (1992)m independently comes up with a very similar analysis to the one presented here. Both works were prepared at approximately the same time.
For the purposes of this exercise, I will be assuming a simplified form of binding theory, one which is based in part on the work of Aoun and Li (1989). The basic principles of this simplified theory are that the domain of application of a principle of the binding theory is determined by finding, relative to a given nominal, the complete functional complex (in the sense of Chomsky 1986) which contains a subject different from that nominal. I will differ from Chomsky (1986) in assuming that all c-commanding [+N] categories, including Agr, may serve as a subject for this purpose. Aoun and Li propose the following principle to account for pronominal binding in A-bar structures:

A pronoun must be A-bar free in the least CFC containing the pronoun and a subject distinct for the pronoun. (Aoun and Li 1989, modified by McCloskey 1990)

With this in mind consider the following structure, created by cliticizing a pronoun to verbal head in T (irrelevant details omitted):

54)

---

25It is not entirely clear to me how this would translate into terminology compatible with the bare theory and the minimalist program, so I will use the terminology associated with older assumptions. I am thus assuming that there is some straightforward correspondence between the notion "category" and the behaviour of nodes in the bare theory.

26For an alternative theory of binding that would get the same results, without allowing Agr as the subject, but making reference to T instead see Richards (in progress).
In this structure, the least CFC containing the pronoun is the CP itself. The nearest subject is the operator Op. Since Agr doesn't c-command\textsuperscript{27} the pronoun, it cannot serve as the subject. This means that the smallest CFC containing both a subject and the pronoun is the CP. In this structure, the pronoun violates Aoun and Li's A-bar version of principle B. It is bound by the operator within the CP. If this approach is correct then other pronominal elements which appear within the verbal head should be ungrammatical in the same context.

This is true for overt agreement seen in the following pro-drop construction:

\begin{align*}
55) \text{*na daoine a rabhadar breoite} & \quad \text{(cf. na daoine a bhí breoite)} \\
& \quad \text{the people who were-3pl ill} \\
& \quad \text{"The people who they were ill"} \\
& \quad \text{(McCloskey 1990:214)}
\end{align*}

Let us consider now what would happen if the pronoun were not cliticized to the verb. This configuration would arise when the pronoun is not in subject position, or when it is in subject position and in a conjunction like that in (57)

\begin{align*}
56) \text{✓duine ar bith a mbeadh Tóm agus é féin mór lena chéile} \\
& \quad \text{anyone who be.cond T and he-emp great with-each other} \\
& \quad \text{'Anybody that he and Tom would be very fond of one another''}
\end{align*}

When the pronoun does not adjoin to the verbal complex, the following configuration arises:

\begin{align*}
57)
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{27}If we wish to avoid introducing c-command into the notion of subject for determining binding domain, then we can also note that since Agr and the pronoun are part of the same complex head, the Agr node cannot serve as its subject.
In (57) the Agr\(^28\) head (or the T head containing the Agr head) c-commands the pronoun thus can serve as a subject for determining the least CFC containing both a subject and the pronoun. This CFC is thus the TP, not the CP. The pronoun in these constructions is not bound within its CFC, the Operator is outside the CFC. In constructions with a non-cliticized subject pronoun then, resumptive pronouns are allowed. To summarize the basic insight I am trying to capture here, if you cliticize a pronoun to a head containing a potential subject, you increase the size of the binding domain. In practice this means that the HSR will only ever apply to pronouns that have cliticized to the T+V+Agr complex\(^29,30\). This then, like Doherty’s approach, but without his analysis of copular constructions, accounts for the fact that the subjects of copular clauses are not subject to the HSR. These subjects

\(^{28}\)I assume that non-overt agreement does not bear indices linking it to the syntactic subject NP. For this reason it does not trigger a principle B violation itself. Overt agreement, on the other hand, like that found in (56) must bear such an index, to account for the ungrammaticality of that sentence. Similarly, the traces of Operator movement do not trigger violations, accounting for why it is only the highest subject, but not lower subject positions, which disallow resumptives.

\(^{29}\)Of course, with the further restriction that the binding Operator be in the CP immediately dominating the V+T+Agr complex. We need this qualification to account for the grammaticality of the following sentence where the operator is in the CP of the clause dominating the clause containing the resumptive:

\[\text{An fear Op C' said I that come.cond he}\]

"The man said that he would come"

\(^{30}\)Similarly, in languages like Hebrew where the subject position is higher than Agr, resumptive pronouns are disallowed in the highest specifier of the inflectional complex (ie. Spec, TP).
are not clitics, thus are not adjoined to the Tense/Agr complex, and thus in turn are not locally A-bar bound.

5.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, I've accounted for a wide variety of word order facts with respect to the copula in Irish. I've shown that the two main word orders of Irish copular clauses follow directly if you assume that equative and predicative constructions have different theta marking properties. As discussed in chapter 4, in predicatives, the predicative N directly theta marks the attribute recipient NP. This predicate, like all inflected predicates in Irish, undergoes head movement to the highest inflectional position. The subject moves to the specifier of AgrS where it receives case. In equatives, on the other hand an abstract COP predicate appears. COP takes two arguments: an attribute and an attribute recipient. COP undergoes head movement to the highest position, and the two NPs move to argument positions. This accounts for the two main orders of Irish copular clauses. I have also shown that a third order, that of an equative with a pronominal subject follows directly if we extend Chung and McCloskey's (1987) analysis of rightward pronoun postposing to copular subjects. These orders, along with a verbal sentence for comparison are summarized in the chart in (58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C (Particle)</th>
<th>T (Predicate)</th>
<th>Spec,AgrS (Subject)</th>
<th>Spec,AgrO (Object)</th>
<th>R-adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ní Neg fhaca</td>
<td>saw Seán John</td>
<td>an dochtúir the doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ní Neg dochtúir</td>
<td>doctor Seán John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indef N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ní Neg hé COP</td>
<td>Séan John</td>
<td>an dochtúir the doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Def NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ní Neg hé COP</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>an dochtúir the doctor</td>
<td>éí he</td>
<td>Def NP pron. subj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I also argued that the so called "accusative" case showing up on the subjects of copular clauses is not a true morphological realization of a structural case, but is rather an artifact of the fact that the pronouns are not clitic to a tensed verb. I then argued that the extra agreement pronoun which surfaces in both Irish and Hebrew obligatorily in equatives and optionally in predicatives, is simply an overt realization of Agr. I claimed that the reason it must be present in equatives is because it identifies the otherwise abstract COP morpheme. In predicatives, on the other hand, the agreement features are on the predicate nominal. Since nominals normally do not bear agreement morphology, the morphological component is forced to either realize these features as the agreement pronoun, or to delete them entirely, thus resulting in the optionality of these forms. Finally, I showed how two of the pieces of evidence that Doherty (1992, forthcoming) uses in favor of his analysis of copular constructions can be easily accounted for under the present account. First, I showed that the fact that reciprocals in the predicate nominal can be bound by the subject, does not necessarily mean that the predicate nominal is c-commanded by the subject if we allow head-to-head movement to undergo reconstruction. Second, I showed that the fact that copular subjects are not subjected to the HSR is simply do to the fact that they are not clitic to the inflectional complex, thus are not included in the same binding domain as the HSR-inducing operator.

One major problem with the analysis sketched so far remains. In chapter 4, I claimed that predicate nominals undergo head movement through the inflectional heads. Unfortunately, however, phrasal predicates can appear in this position. This is highly surprising if the process involved is in fact head-movement rather than phrasal movement. In the next chapter, I will explore this issue in more detail and come to the surprising conclusion that, indeed, phrasal predicates in Modern Irish, undergo head-movement.