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This paper deals with a series of distributional and semantic contrasts between Hebrew copular sentences with two kinds of pronominal copulas: pronH and PronZ. I review three previous proposals regarding the underlying difference between the copulas in terms of the predication/equation relation they express (Heller 2002) the direction of agreement (Sichel 1997) and the presence or absence of a [–human] constraint (Berman 1978), and show that the full range of facts can be explained based on the interaction of Sichel’s and Berman’s proposals and the hypothesis that post-copular APs in pronZ sentences modify a null nominal expression. This latter hypothesis is motivated by applying Heller’s claims about pseudoclefts to simple copular sentences as well.
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1. Introduction

Present tense copular sentences in Hebrew can appear with two possible copulas. Following the terminology of Doron 1983 & Heller 2002, I will call the first pronH (H in the glosses), e.g., hu (masculine singular), and hi (feminine singular), and pronZ (Z in the glosses) e.g., ze (masculine singular) and zot (feminine singular).¹

(1) and (2) are examples of sentences containing the pronH and pronZ copulas:²

(1) dani hu /ze xaver tov Seli
Danny.msc h.msc/z.msc friend.msc good.msc mine
Both: ‘Danny is a good friend of mine’

¹. Heller 2002 takes pronH and pronZ to be the “personal” and the “impersonal” pronominal copulas, respectively. As seen in section 3.3, however, these terms are misleading.

². One may argue that (1) and (2) can be analyzed as left dislocation structures, where the pronominal element is a resumptive pronoun and not a copula. However, this analysis was rejected by Berman & Grosu 1976; Doron 1983 and Sichel 1997.
In the literature on copular constructions in Hebrew (e.g., Berman & Grosu 1976; Doron 1983; Rapoport 1987; Rothstein 1995) pronH and pronZ are considered “pronominal” copulas, since they are morphologically identical to noncopular pronominal elements.³ For example, the masculine form of the pronH copula is identical to the masculine form of the nominative personal pronoun, seen in (3):

(3) hu 'axal tapuax
    he ate apple
    'He ate an apple’

Similarly, the masculine form of pronZ is identical in form to the pronoun Z, which can function in Hebrew as a pleonastic (as in (4a)), or a demonstrative (as in (4b,c)):

(4) a. ze mamaS kar ha-yom
    Z really cold the-day
    'It is really cold today’

b. ha-‘iS ha-ze rac
    the-man the-Z running
    ‘This man is running’

c. kol ha-kis’ot kan yafim, ‘aval ‘ani roca ‘et ze
    all the-chairs here pretty but I want acc. Z
    ‘All chairs here are pretty, but I want this’.

In this paper I focus on the use of pronH and pronZ as copulas, and in particular on similarities and differences between minimal pairs of sentences with pronH and pronZ. Although in (1) and (2) above, and in many other similar minimal pairs in Hebrew, the alternation between the pronH and the pronZ form does not seem to make any grammatical or truth conditional difference, there are also cases where such an alternation can lead to three potential contrasts: in the grammaticality of the sentence, in its truth conditions and/or in the agreement behavior of elements in it. The purpose of this paper is to describe such contrasts, and to propose a unified analysis for explaining them.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2, the data section, is where the three types of contrasts between pronH and pronZ sentences are described. In

³ In addition, Doron 1983 shows that pronominal copulas are not the verbal present tense correlates of the past and future verbal copulas, but are a cluster of agreement features, located at INFL.
section 3 I examine three previously made proposals regarding the underlying
differences between the copulas concerning the semantic relation expressed by
them (Heller 2002), the direction of agreement (Sichel 1997) and the presence or
absence of a [–human] constraint on the denotation of the subject (a modified
version of Berman 1978). None of the proposals in isolation, however, can lead
to an account of the full range of facts described in section 2. In section 4 I show
that the full range of facts can be explained based on the interaction of Sichel’s
and Berman’s proposal and the hypothesis, motivated by Heller’s proposal, that
in pronZ sentences with post copular APs there is a null noun that the adjective
modifies. Section 5 summarizes the paper and examines some general implica
tions and directions for further research.

2. Puzzling contrasts between pronH and pronZ sentences

2.1 Grammaticality contrasts

Although many minimal pairs of pronH and pronZ sentences do not differ in their
grammaticality, there are also cases where the sentence is grammatical with one
copula but its minimally contrasting pair, with the other copula, is ungrammatical.
Berman & Grosu 1976 (B&G in the glosses), for example, cite the examples in (5)
and (6) with postcopular APs, which are grammatical with pronH, but ungram-
matical with pronZ. Similar examples can be seen in (7):

(5) moSe hu /*ze yafe
    Moshe.MSC h.MSC /z.MSC pretty.MSC
    ‘Moshe is pretty’

(6) bankay hu /*ze ‘aSir
    banker.MSC h.MSC/z.MSC rich.MSC
    ‘A banker is rich’ (B&G: p.268)

(7) a. student ca’ir hu /*ze ‘aclan
    studnet.MSC young.MSC h.MSC /z.MSC lazy.MSC
    ‘A young student is lazy’

    b. dani hu /*ze gavoha
    Danni.MSC h.MSC / z.MSC tall.MSC
    ‘Danni is tall’

4. The only way to get (7a) as grammatical is to analyze the pronominal element as a demonstrative pronoun, and interpret the whole sentence as “This young student is lazy” (where no copula is present).
Notice that the ungrammatical pronZ sentences in (7) become grammatical if the postcopular APs change to an NPs:

(8) student ca’ir hu /ze yecur ‘aclan
    student.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc creature.msc lazy.msc
    ‘A young student is a lazy creature’

(9) dani hu /ze baxur gavoha
    Dannimsc h.msc /z.msc guy.msc tall.msc
    ‘Danni is a tall guy’

One may hypothesize at this point that, unlike pronH sentences, pronZ ones cannot appear with postcopular APs. But this is wrong. In (10) and (11), for example, which differ minimally from (7a) and (7b) in the choice of the adjective and the choice of the subject, respectively, both pronH and pronZ versions are fine:

(10) student ca’ir hu /ze me’anyen
    student.msc young.msc h.msc/z.msc interesting.msc
    ‘A young student is interesting’

(11) har ha-’everst hu /ze gavoha
    mountain.msc the h.msc/z.msc high.msc
    ‘The Everest mountain is high’

2.2 Agreement contrasts

The second kind of contrasts between pronH and pronZ sentences has to do with agreement between subjects and post copular adjectives. Hebrew adjectives usually agree with the noun they modify. This is seen in (12), for attributive adjectives:

(12) a. zinuk mahir /*mehira
    jump.msc quick.msc/quick.fem
    ‘A quick jump’

b. tisa mehira /*mahir
    flight.fem quick.fem/quick.msc
    ‘A quick flight’

With adjectives in predicative position we find exactly the same pattern – as long as the copula is pronh. When the copula is pronZ the situation is more complicated. For example, whereas in (13a), with a masculine subject, the postcopular AP is indeed masculine with both pronH and pronZ, in (13b) with a feminine subject, a feminine AP is fine in the pronH version, but ungrammatical in the pronZ version:

(13) a. ‘iSun hu mesukan /ze mesukan
    smoking.msc h.msc dangerous.msc/z.msc dangerous.msc
    ‘Smoking is dangerous’
b. clila hi mesukenet /*zot mesukenet
diving.fem h.fem dangerous.fem /z.fem dangerous.fem

‘Diving is dangerous’

Notice that this difference between pronH and pronZ sentences disappears when the postcopular element is an NP (although, like APs, NPs are also marked for gender in Hebrew). For example, not only (14a), with a masculine postcopular NP, but also (14b), with a feminine one, are fine with both pronH and pronZ:

(14) a. ‘iSun hu /ze hergel mesukan
    smoking.msc h.msc /z.msc habit dangerous.msc
    ‘Smoking is a dangerous habit’

b. clila hi /zot pe’ilut mesukenet
diving.fem h.fem/z.fem activity.fem dangerous.fem

‘Diving is a dangerous activity’

Interestingly, the status of the ungrammatical pronZ version of (13b) can be improved if we change the gender of the copula and the AP to masculine, as in (15), so neither of them agrees with the subject. As seen in (16), such a nonagreeing adjective is impossible with pronH, no matter whether pronH is feminine or masculine:

(15) clila ze mesukan
diving.fem z.msc dangerous.msc

‘Diving is dangerous’

(16) *clila hu /hi mesukan
diving.fem h.msc/h.fem dangerous.msc

‘Diving is dangerous’

2.3 Semantic contrasts

Finally, there are also semantic contrasts between minimally contrasting pronH and pronZ sentences, originally noted in Heller 1999. Consider, for example, (17):

(17) video hu /ze yakar (Heller 1999: p. 113)
    VCR.msc h.msc/z.msc expensive.msc
    ‘A VCR is expensive’

Heller notes that whereas the pronH version of the sentence attributes the property of being expensive to VCRs themselves, the pronZ version can also mean that repairing a VCR, or even having a wedding taped on a VCR, is expensive. In the pronZ version, then, the original denotation of the subject is “widened” to some
contextually supplied property involving the original denotation. As a result, we also get a truth conditional difference between the pronH and pronZ version of (17): the latter, but not the former can be true although no VCR (or only a minority of VCRs) is expensive.

We find similar patterns with other copular sentences with postcopular APs. For example, although both the pronH and pronZ version of (10) above are grammatical, only the pronZ version can be true even if a minority of young students, or even none of them, is interesting, since the pronZ version seem to be paraphrased as e.g., “teaching/supervising a young student is interesting”.

Similar truth conditional differences and “denotation widening” of the subjects are found in (18), with a postcopular NP. The pronH version necessarily means that the student himself is a pain in the neck. In contrast, the pronZ version can also mean that merely having this student is a pain in the neck. As a support notice that while both versions can be continued by (19a), only the pronZ version can be also continued with (19b):

\[(18)\] ha-student Se-Salaxta li hu /ze
thestudent.msc that you-sent me h.msc/z.msc
cara crura
pain.in.the.neck.fem
’The student you sent me is a pain in the neck’

\[(19)\] a. … hu ‘aclan, gas ru’àx ve-‘oved le’at
he.msc lazy.msc, rude.msc, and-works.msc slowly
’He is lazy, rude, and works slowly’

b. … hu student mecuyan, ‘aval ha-dikan sone oto
he.msc student.msc excellent.msc, but the-dean hates him
’He is an excellent student, but the dean hates him’

3. Previously suggested underlying differences between the pronominal copulas

To understand the puzzling contrasts between pronH and pronZ sentences I examine in this section three proposals regarding the underlying difference between the copulas. We will see below that none of these proposals in isolation can lead to an account of the full range of facts described in section 2. Rather, it is the interaction

5. Thanks to Daphne Heller (p.c.) for this term.
of these three underlying differences which will be shown (in section 4) to lead to a unified analysis.

3.1 A semantic difference: Heller’s 1999, 2002 H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis

3.1.1 Heller’s analysis of pronH and pronZ in pseudoclefts

Heller 1999, 2002 investigates the nature of the pronH and pronZ copulas, respectively, in Hebrew pseudocleft copulars. Her main hypothesis, which I call the \textit{H-predication/Z-equative hypothesis}, is that pronH sentences express predication, namely set membership, while pronZ (either agreeing or nonagreeing) ones express equative structures, namely identity between two expressions of the same type (type e or higher types). Specifically, pronH acts as “be of predication” (namely, $\lambda Y \lambda x.(x)$, where $Y$ is of type $\langle x,t \rangle$), while pronZ acts as “be of identity” (namely $\lambda Y \lambda X. X=Y$, where $X$ and $Y$ have the same type, but not necessarily e).

The motivation for Heller’s claim is her observation that pronZ pseudoclefts behave like specificalional sentences (in the sense of Higgins 1973), while pronH ones pattern like predicational ones. This observation, in turn, is based on differences in the interpretation of pronZ and pronH pseudoclefts and on their behavior in Higgins’ tests for distinguishing specificalional from predicational sentences. To give just one interpretation contrast example, the pronH version of (20) unambiguously means that Dan’s job was helpful to the society whereas the pronZ version unambiguously means that Dan himself was helpful for the society:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(20)] ma Se\-dan haya hu /ze mo’il la-xevra
\end{enumerate}

what that-Dan was /z.msc/h.msc helpful for-the-society

‘What Dan was was helpful for society’ (Heller 2002: p. 248)

In addition, Heller shows that pronZ, but not pronH pseudoclefts exhibits connectivity effects, which, as Higgins shows, exist with specificalional, but not in predicational sentences. Two examples of this contrast are seen in (21). (21a) shows that reflexives are licensed across the copula when this copula is pronZ, but not pronH. (21b) shows a connectivity effect specific to Hebrew found with pronZ, but not with pronH, namely the licensing of the accusative marker \textit{et}, when the gap in the free relative is in object position, as seen in (21c), \textit{et} cannot appear after a pronH copula:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(21)] a. ma Se\-dan haya ze /*hu mesukan le\-’acmo
\end{enumerate}

what that-Dan was z.msc/h.msc dangerous to-himself

‘What Dan was was dangerous to himself’ (Heller 2002: p. 248)

6. Heller brings only the grammatical, pronZ version of the sentence.
b. ma Se-kaninu ba-Suk ze et
   What that-bought-we in-the market z.msc acc.
   ha-sveder ha-kaxol
   the-sweater the-blue
   ‘What we bought in the market was the blue sweater’
   (Heller 2002: p. 244)

c. ma Se-kaninu ba-Suk hu (*et)
   What that-bought-we in-the market h.msc acc.
   ha-sveder ha-kaxol
   the-sweater the-blue
   ‘What we bought in the market was the blue sweater’

Heller follows e.g., Partee 1986; Heycock & Kroch 1999 and Sharvit 1999 in assuming that specificational sentences express equative structures. Thus, the predicational/specificational distinction, which according to Heller is encoded in Hebrew through the pronH/pronZ distinction, is a subclass of the predicative/equative distinction. In addition, Heller follows Jacobson’s 1994 and Sharvit’s 1999 assumption that identity relations in specificational sentences are cross categorical and that connectivity effects in specificational sentences are due to their equative status (the “semantic approach” to connectivity).

3.1.2 Application of Heller’s H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis to nonpseudocleft copular constructions

Although Heller’s H-predication/Z-equative hypothesis concentrates on pseudocleft copular constructions, she suggests it should be carried over and applied to other, nonpseudocleft copulars as well. Initial support for such an application comes from the fact that the presence/absence of connectivity effects, reported by Heller for pronZ and pronH pseudoclefts respectively, and analyzed (following e.g., Sharvit 1999) as a by-product of semantic equation/predication, respectively, is found also with pronZ and pronH nonpseudocleft copular sentences. For example, only the pronZ nonpseudocleft (22a) and (22b), but not the pronH ones, are fine with a postcopular reflexive, and with a postcopular element marked with the accusative et:

(22) a. ha-davar Se-dani yilmad lihyot ze /hu
   the-thing that-Danni will-learn to-be z.msc /h.msc
   mesukan le-acmo
   dangerous to-himself
   ‘The thing that Danni will learn to be is dangerous to himself’
b. ha-davar S.e-kaninu ba-Suk ze/hu et the-thing that-bought-we in-the market Z.MSC/H.MSC ACC.
  ha- sveder ha-kaxol the-sweater the-blue
  ‘The thing we bought in the market was the blue sweater’

On the other hand, the application of Heller’s H-predication/Z-equative hypothesis from pseudoclefts to nonpseudoclefts is challenged by apparently equative pronH sentences as in (23), and apparently predicative pronZ sentences, as in (24): 7

(23) a. dani hu mar cohen
    Danny.MSC H.MSC Mr. Cohen.MSC
    ‘Danny is Mr. Cohen’
  b. ha-xaver ha-xi tov Seli hu yosi
    the-friend.MSC the most good.MSC mine H.MSC Yossi.MSC
    ‘My best friend is Yossi’

(24) a. yosi ze xaver tov Seli
    Yossi.MSC Z.MSC friend.MSC good.MSC mine
    ‘Yossi is a good friend of mine’
  b. maxSev nisa ze (maxSir)
    computer.MSC portable.MSC Z.MSC (instrument.MSC)
    SimuSi useful.MSC
    ‘A laptop is (a) useful (instrument)’

Despite these apparent counterexamples, I will claim that the H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis is indeed applicable to nonpseudoclefts. We can immediately see, though, that in some cases the application can be more easily achieved than in others.

For example, with apparently equative pronH sentences, like (23a), we can still argue that the sentence is predicative by exploiting the typal flexibility of NPs, and using standard type shifting principles, as already suggested by Heller, following

7. As (i) shows, the problem of apparently predicational pronZ sentences exists, in fact, for pseudocleft copulars as well:

(i) ma S.e- dani ‘asa ze lo musari
    what that- Danny did Z.MSC not moral
    ‘What Danny did is immoral’
Partee 1986. Applying Partee's IDNT operation to the postcopular NP “mar cohen”, we get the \( \langle e,t \rangle \) type expression \( \lambda \, x. \, x = Mr. \, Cohen \). We then get the meaning of (23a) by applying this property to John \( \langle \lambda \, x. \, x = Mr. \, Cohen \rangle (j) \), asserting that John is a member of the singleton set of individuals identical to Mr. Cohen. After lambda conversion we end up with the equative statement \( j = Mr. \, Cohen \).

Maintaining the Z-equative part of the hypothesis is also rather simple. For example, although on the surface the pronZ (24a) has a standard predicative structure, as in (25), it can nonetheless be interpreted as equative by assuming that both pre and postcopular elements are type-raised from their original types to type \( \langle \langle e \rangle, t \rangle \)\), i.e., the type of GQs. For the precopular element “rina”, type e, this is done using Partee's LIFT operation, resulting in (26a), and for the postcopular “a good friend of mine” type \( \langle e, t \rangle \) we use Partee's A, resulting in (26b), see also Partee 1987). Equating the two GQs we get the equative structure in (26c), asserting that the set of properties that Rina has equals the set of properties that some good friend of mine has:

\[
(25) \quad \text{good friend of mine (r)}
\]

\[
(26) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{LIFT } (r) \rightarrow \lambda P. P(r) \\
\text{b.} & \quad A(\text{good friend of mine}) \rightarrow \lambda P. \exists x \, \text{good friend of mine } (x) \land P(x) \\
\text{c.} & \quad \lambda P. P(r) = \lambda P. \exists x \, \text{good friend of mine } (x) \land P(x)
\end{align*}
\]

Similar operations can be used with the generic (24b). Following the spirit of Heim 1982 I take the indefinite subject in (24b) to introduce a variable which is bound by the generic quantifier Gen. Explicating the semantics of Gen is beyond the scope of this paper, but for simplicity I will assume, following e.g., Krifka et al. 1995, that Gen is a universal quantifier with modal force binding individuals in accessible and “most normal” words.\(^8\) As can be seen in (27a), the pronH version of (24b) has the usual quantificational structure, asserting roughly that every laptop in all, e.g., epistemically accessible and most normal words has the property of being a useful instrument. In contrast, the pronZ version asserts that the set of properties that every laptop has in all accessible and “most normal” worlds is the same as the set of properties that some useful instrument has. This is seen in (27b):

\[
(27) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Gen } x \, [\text{laptop}(x)] \, [\text{useful instrument } (x)] \\
\text{b.} & \quad \lambda P. \text{Gen } x \, [\text{laptop}(x)] [P(x)] = \lambda P. \exists x \, \text{useful instrument}(x) \land P(x)
\end{align*}
\]

For sentences with postcopular NPs, then, Heller's H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis can be rather easily maintained. It is more difficult, however, to maintain this hypothesis for pronZ sentences with postcopular APs, as in (28):

\[8. \quad \text{But see e.g., Cohen 1999; Asher & Morreau 1995; Greenberg 2003 for alternative views.}\]
Assuming that adjectives are type \( \langle e,t \rangle \), we could try and equate the indefinite subject (potentially also type \( \langle e,t \rangle \)) in (28a), getting, e.g., the equative structure \( \lambda x.\text{laptop}(x) = \lambda x.\text{light}(x) \) (“The set of laptops is identical to the set of light entities”). Similarly, we could turn the \( e \) type subject of (28b) into an \( \langle e,t \rangle \) type expression, namely \( \lambda x.\text{the Everest mountain}(x) \), and equate it with the \( \langle e,t \rangle \) type adjective “high”.

Such attempts, however, give us the wrong truth conditions for sentences like (28a) and (28b), both of them can true although many other things in the world are in the set of light entities (e.g., feathers, paper sheets, etc.) or high entities (sky scrapers, other high mountains, etc.). That is, both (28a) and (28b) seem indeed to assert set membership (asserting that the denotation of their subject is a member of the set denoted by the adjective), i.e., predication, and not equation.

Moreover, unlike NPs, postcopular APs are not standardly type-raised to the type of GQs, so turning (28a–b) to equative structures using the type shifting principles as in (26) above seems impossible as well.\(^9\)

---

9. A similar problem for Heller’s H-predicative/z-equative hypothesis is posed by pronZ sentences with post copular PPs like (i) and (ii):

(i) ha-magavot hen /ze ba-‘ambatya

‘the-towels.fem.pl h.fem.pl /Z.msc.sg. in-the-bathroom

‘The towels are in the bathroom’

(ii) pariz hi /ze be-carfat

Paris.fem h.fem /Z.msc in-France

‘Paris is in France’

An analysis of such sentences is beyond the scope of the present paper. Notice, though, that similar to some sentences with post copular AP, here too the pronH and the pronZ versions differ semantically. For example, while the pronH version of (i) is appropriate as a reply to e.g., a guest of mine asking where the towels can be found, the pronZ version is also appropriate in a context where I try to tell my son where he should put the towels. Crucially, the PronZ version can be true even if there are no, and have never been towels in the bathroom (despite my wishes). The pronH version will be false in such a scenario. In (ii) too, it is the pronH, and not the pronZ version which requires that Paris is \textit{actually} in France. This can be seen in (iii) (provided by Arik Cohen, p.c.). in an imaginary context where some giant is busy moving Paris to England (so Paris is not actually in France anymore) one can naturally protest by using the pronZ version of (19), whereas using the pronH version is infelicitous.
Nonetheless, in sections 4 below I claim that treating the pronZ versions of (28a–b) as equative (in accordance with Heller’s H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis) is not only possible, but in fact necessary. Specifically, I show that when combined with other properties of pronZ, such a treatment can lead to an explanation of some of the puzzling contrasts between pronH and pronZ sentences described in section 2 above.

3.2 Agreement patterns of the pronominal copulas, and the existence of a second pronZ – Sichel 1997

Sichel 1997 proposes that pronH and pronZ have different agreement patterns. Whereas pronH agrees to the left, i.e., with the subject, pronZ agrees to the right, i.e., with the postcopular element. This can be seen in (29) and (30):

(29) rica hi /"zot hergel mecuyan
  running.FEM H.FEM/Z.FEM habit.MSC excellent.MSC
  ‘Running is an excellent habit’

(30) ‘iSun *hi /zot peilut mesukenet
  smoking.MSC H.FEM/Z.FEM activity.FEM dangerous.FEM
  ‘Smoking is a dangerous activity’

In addition, Sichel points out in a footnote that besides the agreeing form of pronZ, there is also a nonagreeing form of the pronZ copula. This form can be seen, for example, in the perfectly grammatical (31a,b) (from Sichel 1997) and (32a,b), in both of which the pronZ copula is masculine singular although the post copular (and in (31) and (32a) also the pre copular) elements are not:

(31) a. yeladim ze simxa
    children.MSC.PL Z.MSC happiness.FEM
    ‘Children is happiness’

b. Stayim ve-‘od Stayim ze ‘arba
    Two.FEM and-more two.FEM Z.MSC four.FEM
    ‘Two and two is four’

(Sichel 1997: p. 295)

(iii) ma ‘ata meziz ‘et pariz le-’angliya ?! pariz ze/#hi be-carfat !
    what you move ACC Pariz to-England Paris.FEM Z.MSC/#H.FEM in-France
    ‘What are you doing moving Paris to England ?! Paris is in France !’

A potential direction for accounting for these facts is to assume that their pronZ version express the identity statement “the location of (Paris) = in France”, or “the location of (the towels) = in the bathroom”, where “the location of” is a function which can give not only the actual location of an object, but also its stereotypical location, its deontic location (where it should be), etc.
As can be seen in these sentences, the nonagreeing pronZ has a fixed form: ze, which is morphologically identical to the masculine singular form. Together with Heller 1999, I will assume that this pronZ copula is in fact neutral in terms of gender, and gets its masculine form because this is the default gender in Hebrew (I will continue, however, to mark it as “masculine” in the glosses).

Sichel 1997 does not further discuss constructions containing the nonagreeing pronZ, and claims that they “fall under a special class of “metalinguistic expressions”: mathematical formulae, dictionary definitions and metaphorical extensions of these” (p. 295). However, as Heller 1999 correctly points out, the distribution of nonagreeing pronZ is wider than predicted in Sichel characterization, as it can appear in other types of sentences, like (33) (from Heller 1999: p. 21). The generic sentences in (32) above, and in (34) are also examples of this wider distribution of the nonagreeing pronZ:

(33) ha-be'aya Se-hizkarta ze sugiya mefursemet
the problem.fem that-you-mentioned z.msc issue.fem famous.fem
‘The problem you mentioned is a famous issue’

(34) madpeset muzikalit ze hamca'a nehederet
printer.fem musical.fem z.msc invention.fem great.fem
‘A musical printer is a great invention’

Notice that whereas the copula in sentences like (31)–(34) is clearly the nonagreeing pronZ, the status of pronZ in sentences like (8) and (9) above, repeated here, is not clear:

(8) student ca'ir hu /ze yecur.msc aclan
student.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc creature lazy.msc
‘A young student is a lazy creature’

(9) dani hu /ze baxur gavoha
Danni.msc h.msc /z.msc guy.msc tall.msc
‘Danni is a tall guy’

It is unclear whether the pronZ in these sentences is the masculine singular form of the agreeing pronZ (agreeing with the masculine postcopular element), or the nonagreeing pronZ (which merely happens to occur with a masculine postcopular element). In the next section I discuss a limitation on the distribution of the
nonagreeing pronZ copula, which can in some cases distinguish between these two morphologically identical forms.

3.3 The [–human] constraint (A modified version of Berman 1978)

Berman & Grosu 1976 propose that pronH and pronZ sentences are compatible with a different range of subjects, and moreover that this difference results from the correlation of the pronH and pronZ copulas with the personal and the demonstrative pronouns, respectively. Specifically, the intuition is that, unlike pronZ, pronH is compatible with gender bearing subjects but not with sentential ones, which bear no gender (as seen in (35)). This, they claim is related to the fact that the personal pronoun H cannot take sentential expressions as antecedents, as seen in (36) (in which the H pronoun has an accusative form):

(35) Se-nitnaged lo *hu /ze meguxax
    that-we-object him H.MSC/Z.MSC ridiculous.MSC
    /raa’yon mesukan idea.MSC dangerous.MSC

    ‘That we object him is ridiculous/a dangerous idea’\textsuperscript{10}  (B&G: p. 269)

(36) rivka to’ enet Se- hu xaxam, ‘aval ‘ani lo mekabelet
    rivka claims that he smart.MSC, but I not accept
    *’oto /’et ze
    him.MSC ACC. this.MSC

    ‘Rivka claims that he ‘s smart, but I don’t agree with that’  (B&G: p. 268)

Berman and Grosu further claim that in contrast to pronH, the pronZ copula is incompatible with gender bearing expressions, as in (37), and that this is related to the fact that the pronouns in the “demonstrative set” cannot refer back to gender bearing elements, as in (38):

(37) moSe hu/ *ze yafe
    Moshe.MSC H.MSC/ Z.MSC pretty.MSC

    ‘Moshe is pretty’

(38) rivka xaxama ‘aval ‘ani lo ‘ohev *’et zot /’ota
    Rivka.FEM is smart.FEM but I not like ACC that.FEM /her.FEM

    ‘Rivka is smart, but I don’t like her’

\textsuperscript{10.} Although Berman & Grosu claim that pronH is incompatible with sentential subjects, while pronZ is compatible with them, their original example contains only the grammatical, pronZ version. I added here the ungrammatical pronH.
Berman 1978 maintains Berman & Grosu generalization, and adds that, in general pronZ is incompatible with human denoting subjects.

A closer examination of the data, however, reveals a somewhat different picture. Berman & Grosu’s claim about the incompatibility of pronZ with gender bearing expressions, and Berman’s 1978 claim about their incompatibility with human denoting subjects are undermined by the existence of grammatical pronZ sentences like (39) (with gender bearing subjects) and (40) (with human denoting subjects), respectively:

(39) a. maxSev ze maxSir SimuSi
    computer.msc z.msc instrument.msc useful.msc
    ‘A computer is a useful instrument’

    b. madpeset muzikalit zot hamca’a nehederet
        printer.fem musical.fem z.fem invention.fem great.fem
        ‘A musical printer is a great invention’

(40) a. danni ze xaver tov Seli
    Danni.msc z.msc friend.msc good.msc mine
    ‘Danni is a good friend of mine’

    b. ‘ima Seli zot ha-mora ha-xadaSa
        mother.fem mine z.msc the-teacher.fem the-new.fem
        ‘My mother is the new teacher’

Interestingly, however, Berman’s 1978 claim can be still maintained if it is applied to a subclass of the pronZ, namely to the nonagreeing pronZ, discussed in the section above. Unlike the sentences in (40), where pronZ can be considered agreeing (it has the same gender as the postcopular element), in (41), pronZ is clearly the nonagreeing one (it is masculine while both the pre and post copular elements are feminine). As can be seen in (41), such a nonagreeing pronZ is ungrammatical with a human denoting subject. It is fine, though, when the subject is nonhuman (as in (42)):

(41) a. rina hi /*ze xavera tova Seli
    Rina.fem h.fem /z.msc friend.fem good.fem mine
    ‘Rina is a good friend of mine’

    b. ‘ima Seli hi /*ze ha-mora
        mother.fem mine h.fem /z.msc the-teacher.fem
        ha-xadaSa the-new.fem
        ‘My mother is the new teacher’

(42) ha-madpeset Se- kanita li ze cara crura
    the-printer.fem that-you bought me z.msc pain.in.the.neck.fem
    ‘The printer you bought me is a pain in the neck’
It is the nonagreeing pronZ, then, which is incompatible with human denoting subjects. In contrast, the agreeing pronZ copula (just like pronH) can appear with both human, and nonhuman denoting subjects (as in (40), and (2) above, respectively).

Explaining this contrast between the agreeing and the nonagreeing pronZ is beyond the scope of this paper. However, following Berman & Grosu’s reasoning we can at least show that this contrast correlates with a similar contrast between noncopular pronominal forms. Specifically, the agreeing pronZ copula seem to share properties with the demonstrative pronoun. As seen in (43) and (44), the latter is similar to the agreeing pronZ copula in that (a) it can appear in both masculine and feminine form, and (b) its antecedent can be both human or non human denoting:

(43) a. kol ha-studentiyot Sela muxSarot, ‘aval zot haxi all the-student spacecraft hers talented spacecraft, but Z spacecraft most muxSeret spacecraft! talented spacecraft

‘All her students are talented, but this is the most talented’

b. kol ha-studentim Sela muxSarim, ‘aval ze haxi all the-student spacecraft hers spacecraft but Z spacecraft most muxSar spacecraft! muxSeret spacecraft! most spacecraft talented spacecraft’

‘All her students are talented, but this is the most talented’

(44) a. kol ha-sapot kan yafot, ‘aval zot haxi all the-sofa spacecraft here pretty spacecraft but Z spacecraft most yafa spacecraft! pretty spacecraft

‘All the sofas here are pretty, but this is the most pretty’

b. kol ha-kis’ot kan yafim, ‘aval ze haxi yafe spacecraft all the-chair spacecraft here pretty spacecraft, but Z spacecraft most pretty spacecraft

‘All the chairs here are pretty, but this is the most pretty’

Interestingly, there exists also a noncopular pronoun correlate of the nonagreeing pronZ copula. Sichel 2001 points out that besides the inflected form of the pronoun Z there is also a noninflected form, seen, for example in the right dislocation structures in (45).\footnote{Sichel (2001) claims that the noninflected Z pronoun cannot appear in left dislocation structures.} Crucially, this Z pronoun appears in a fixed masculine form, no matter whether its reference is masculine (as in (45a)) or feminine (as in (45b)).
As seen in (45c) even in the latter case the Z pronoun cannot appear in feminine form:

(45) a. ze 'oved mecuyan, ha-maxSev Selax
   z.msc works excellent the-computer.msc your
   'It works excellently, your computer'

b. ze nose'a mecuyan, ha-mexonit Selax
   z.msc drives excellent the-car.fem your
   'It drives excellently, your car'

c. *zot nose'at mecuyan, ha-mexonit Selax
   z.fem. drives excellent the-car.fem yours
   'It drives excellently, your car' (Sichel 2001: p. 25)

Similar occurrences of the uninflected Z pronoun can be seen in (46) and (47):

(46) a. haya li ra'ayon neheder. 'aval ha-yom ze lo 'oved
   had I idea.msc great.msc but the day z.msc not work
   'I had a great idea, but today it doesn't work'

b. hayta li te'orya nehederet 'aval hayom ze lo
   had I theory.fem, great.fem but today z.msc not
   'oved /*zot lo 'ovedet
   work.msc/z.fem not work.fem
   'I had a great theory, but today it doesn't work'

(47) a. badakti 'et ha-maxSev. 'ani 'ataken
   I-checked acc. the-computer.msc I will-fix
   et ze maxar
   ACC.Z.MSC tomorrow
   'I checked the computer. I will fix it tomorrow'

b. badakti 'et ha-televizya. 'ani 'ataken et ze
   I-checked acc. the-television.fem I will-fix ACC. Z.MSC
   /*zot maxar
   /Z.FEM tomorrow
   'I checked the television. I will fix it tomorrow'

What is crucial for us is that the reference of this noninflected Z pronoun is limited to nonhuman denoting expressions only. This is seen in (48) (from Sichel (2001; p. 27)), as well as in (49):

(48) *ze nose'a le-nu-york, ha-baxur Se-dibarti 'ito kodem
   z.msc goes to-New York, the-guy that-spoke-I with-him before

(49) "zot nose'at le-nu-york, ha-baxur Se-dibarti 'ito kodem
   z.fem. goes to-New York, the-guy that-spoke-I with-him before"
The noninflected Z pronoun discussed in Sichel’s 2001, then, is very similar to the nonagreeing pronZ copula, mentioned in her 1997 paper: in both cases whenever the Z form is fixed as masculine singular (even when the reference/argument is feminine), we find incompatibility with human denoting expressions. Notice that in light of this newly observed correlation, Heller’s 2002 terminology of pronZ as the “impersonal” pronominal copula, and of pronH as the “personal” one, is misleading: In fact, it is only the nonagreeing pronZ which can be truly called “impersonal”, while the agreeing pronZ can be thought of as “personal”, just like its pronH counterpart.

Combining the insights in this section with Heller’s H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis, we can say that while both the agreeing and nonagreeing pronZ sentences are equative structure, the arguments equated by the nonagreeing pronZ are limited to [–human] denoting expressions, whereas the agreeing pronZ can equate expressions freely.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) In her analysis of the copulas in pseudoclefts, Heller 2002 proposes another difference between the agreeing and the nonagreeing pronZ. She suggests that while both types of pronZ express equative statements, agreeing pronZ equate only “real world individuals”, while neutral pronZ equate only “non real world individuals”. Heller does not precisely define what a “real world individual” is, but claims that this notion covers a sort of type e individuals including concrete nouns like “giraffe”, as well as abstract nouns like “proof”, but excluding “abstract entities which correlate with predicates, propositions and events (Heller 2002: p. 259).

However, in addition to the unclarity of the “real/nonreal world individual” distinction, it does not seem to be relevant for the agreeing/nonagreeing pronZ copulas in nonpseudocleft sentences. Specifically, we find agreeing pronZ sentences as in (i), whose subjects denote “non real world individuals” like paths (as in (ia)), events or event types (as in (ib)), or colors (as in (i)), as well as neutral pronZ sentences as in (ii), with subjects denoting “real world individuals”:

(i) a. mi- tel aviv le-yeruSalayim zot derex ‘aruka
from-Tel Aviv to-Jerusalem z. fem way.fem long.fem
‘From Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is a long way’

b. le-hamer be-kazino zot ‘avera recinit me’od
to-gamble in-casino z. fem crime.fem serious.fem very
‘Gambling in the casino is a very serious crime’
3.4 Summary

Integrating all the observations and underlying contrasts between the three pro-
nominal copulas can be summarized now in the table in (50):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>pronH</strong></td>
<td>Predication</td>
<td>To the left – with the pre-copular element</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeing pronZ</strong></td>
<td>Equation</td>
<td>To the right – with the postcopular element</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonagreeing pronZ</strong></td>
<td>Equation</td>
<td>No agreement – appears in a fixed , neutral form (“ze”)</td>
<td>Cannot equate [+human] denoting expressions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The puzzling contrasts revisited

In section 2 we described three types of puzzling contrasts between pronH and
pronZ sentences, namely grammaticality, agreement and semantic contrasts. Inte-
grating the three suggested underlying differences between the copulas, described
in 3 section above, will help us now account for these contrasts.

4.1 The hypothesis: The postcopular adjective as modifying a null noun

Assuming Heller’s H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis, we would like to treat the
pronZ version of (28a) above (“A laptop is light”) as expressing equation. As explained
in section 3.1, however, unlike what happens with postcopular NPs, an equative
interpretation seems much more difficult to achieve with postcopular APs.

c. yarok zot bxira mecuyenet
   green z.fem choice.fem excellent.fem
   ‘Green is an excellent choice’

(ii) a. ha- kišôt kan ze be’aya bi’Svilenu
    the chairs here z.msc problem.fem for-us
    ‘The chairs here are a problem for us’

b. ha-maxSir Se-’atem ro’im kan ze madpeset leyzer
    the-instrument that-you see here z.msc printer.fem laser
    ‘The instrument you see here is a laser printer’
The hypothesis I suggest is that in order to get an equative interpretation for the pronZ (28a) a null noun is inserted into the semantic structure that the postcopular AP modifies. Put in other words, the postcopular element in this pronZ sentence is not predicative, type \((e,t)\), as it seems to be, but rather attributive, type \((<e,t>,<e,t>)\). Thus, whereas the syntactic structure of the postcopular AP “kal” (light) in the pronH version of (28a) is roughly (51a), the one of the pronZ version is (51b) (where \(N\) stands for the null noun. I ignore here the \(N''\) level):

\[
\begin{align*}
(51) \quad & \text{a. maxSev nayad hu [kal] AP (type \((e,t)\))} \\
& \quad \text{computer mobile } \underline{\text{light}} \\
& \quad \text{b. maxSev nayad ze [[kal AP(type }\langle e,t\rangle,\langle e,t\rangle)] N} \\
& \quad \quad \text{NP (type }\langle e,t\rangle)\] \\
& \quad \quad \text{computer mobile } \underline{\text{light}}
\end{align*}
\]

Once this step is made the pronZ version of (28a) can be analyzed as equative in the same way that sentences with overt postcopular NPs like (24a,b) above can, i.e., by using type shifting operations, and equating two GQs (seen in (26c)). Specifically, the pronZ (28a) will have the equative structure in (52), where \(N\) stands again for the nonovert NP, asserting that the set of properties that every laptops has in all accessible, most normal worlds is the same as the set of properties that some light thing has, and roughly paraphrased as “A laptop is a light thing”. As (53) shows, the pronH version of (28b) has a standard predicative structure, asserting that all laptops in all accessible, most normal worlds are in the set of light things:

\[
(52) \quad \lambda P. \text{Gen } x [\text{laptop}(x)] [P(x)] = \lambda P. \exists x (\text{light}) (N)) (x) \bigcup P(x)
\]

\[
(53) \quad \text{Gen } x [\text{laptop}(x)] [\text{light}(x)]
\]

Inserting a null noun into the semantic representation, then, can help us maintain Heller’s H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis with nonpseudocleft sentences with postcopular APs. But clearly, taking such a step should be better justified by more than such theory internal considerations. Luckily, we can present independent evidence supporting the null noun hypothesis. Specifically, assuming this move we can account for the puzzling behavior of pronH and pronZ sentences with postcopular APs, described in section 2 above.

Before turning to the evidence, notice that the claim about the attributive nature of the apparently predicative AP in the pronZ (28a) is not as far fetched as it may look like. Similar claims about postcopular APs have been made in the literature for various adjectival constructions cross linguistically. Babby 1973, Siegel 1976 and Bailyn 1994, for example, argue that long form adjectives in Russian are always attributive, involving a null nouns which they modify. More recently Matushansky 2004 has argued that cross linguistically, predicative superlative
adjectives are actually attributive (type \(\langle e, t \rangle, \langle e, t \rangle\)), and has supported this claim using syntactic and semantic facts about the behavior of superlatives in a variety of languages.

4.2 Explaining agreement contrasts

As described above, and seen again in (54), whereas in pronH sentences the gender of a postcopular AP varies depending on the gender of the subject (as in the pronH versions of (54a,b)), in pronZ sentences the gender of a postcopular AP can only be masculine, even if the subject is feminine (as in the pronZ versions of (54b,c)). This stands in sharp contrast to the gender of postcopular NPs in pronZ sentences, which, as seen in (55) can be feminine or masculine:

\[
\begin{align*}
(54) & \quad \begin{align*}
(54) & \quad \begin{align*}
 & \text{a. ‘iSun hu /ze mesukan} \\
 & \text{smoking.msc H.msc/z.msc dangerous.msc}
 & \text{‘Smoking is dangerous’}
 & \text{b. clila hi /zot /ze mesukenet} \\
 & \text{diving.fem h.fem / z.fem / z.msc dangerous.fem}
 & \text{‘Diving is dangerous’}
 & \text{c. clila ze mesukan} \\
 & \text{diving.fem z.msc dangerous.msc}
 & \text{‘Diving is dangerous’}
\end{align*}
\end{align*}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(55) & \quad \begin{align*}
 & \text{a. ‘iSun hu /ze hergel mesukan} \\
 & \text{smoking.msc H.msc /z.msc habit dangerous.msc}
 & \text{‘Smoking is a dangerous habit’}
 & \text{b. clila hi /zot pe’ilut mesukenet} \\
 & \text{diving.fem h.fem / z.fem activity.fem dangerous.fem}
 & \text{‘Diving is a dangerous activity’}
\end{align*}
\end{align*}
\]

Why do we find these agreement peculiarities with pronZ but not with pronH sentences? And why only with postcopular APs, but not with postcopular NPs? These facts can be explained if we assume, as we just did, that in order to allow for an equative status of pronZ sentences with postcopular APs, these APs should be taken as modifying a null nominal expression.

The crucial fact which links this assumption and the agreement facts in (54)–(55) is that the assumed nonovert nominal expression inserted in the pronZ versions of (54a–c) is, by virtue of being nonovert, an expression which lacks agreement features. It is not feminine, and, in fact, it is not masculine either. It is simply genderless. Consequently, assuming, as we did in section 2 above, that adjectives in Hebrew agree with the noun they modify, the adjective modifying the nonovert noun cannot be feminine. In fact, despite its masculine form, it is
not marked as masculine either. Instead, the adjective in the pronZ versions of (54a–c) receives default gender, which in Hebrew is morphologically equivalent to the masculine gender.

The situation is different with pronH sentences with postcopular APs (e.g., the pronH versions of (54)) and in pronZ sentences with postcopular NPs (as in (55)). In the former the adjective is not required to modify a nonovert noun, but is really predicative and thus agrees in gender with the subject, and can be feminine. In the latter the postcopular NP can be feminine since once it is overt it has agreement features, and can be marked as masculine or feminine.

4.3 Explaining semantic contrasts

In section 2 above we saw (following Heller 1999) that whereas in the pronH version of (10) and (17), repeated here as (56a,b), the subject refers to a young student and a VCR, respectively, in the pronZ sentences the subject undergoes some kind of “denotation widening”, and denotes a property involving the original referent, e.g., the property of supervising a young student or fixing a VCR, respectively.

(56) a. student ca’ir hu /ze me’anyen
    student.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc interesting.msc

b. video hu /ze yakar
    VCR.msc h.msc /z.msc expensive.msc

(Heller 1999: p. 113)

Consequently, the pronZ and the pronH versions of (56a,b) are truth conditionally different: the former, but not the latter can be true even if no VCR is expensive, and no young student is interesting. How can these semantic differences be explained?

4.3.1 Heller’s 1999 suggestion and its shortcomings

Heller 1999 suggest that such semantic contrasts are related to her H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis, so apparently predicative pronZ sentences like (56b) can be treated as equative once the special “widened” interpretation of their subjects is taken into consideration. Specifically she suggests that with this “widened” interpretation of the subject such sentences “may involve equation of the AP with an aspect of the subject NP’” (Heller 1999: p. 114).

This suggestion, however, cannot be right as it is, for two reasons. First, “widening” the denotation of the subject in (56) to some property/activity involving an individual is not enough to make them equative. Suppose, for example, that the subject in (56b) indeed means “fixing a VCR” (instead of “a VCR”). Even under this interpretation, (56b) does not assert that fixing a VCR and being expensive are one and the same thing, since the sentence can be perfectly true even if there
are many other properties/activities which are expensive, e.g., buying a Mercedes, going on a cruise, visiting Japan, etc. That is, the relationship between the adjective and the “widened” subject is not that of equation, but still that of set membership (fixing a VCR is in the set of expensive activities).

The second problem with Heller’s suggestion is that it cannot be extended to all those cases of pronZ sentences, as in (57a–b), whose subject do not seem to undergo “denotation widening” (although their status is just as predicative as that of the sentences in (56)):

(57) a. sukar hu /ze matok
   sugar.msc H.msc /z.msc sweet.msc
   ‘Sugar is sweet’

b. maxSev nisa hu /ze kal
   computer.msc portable.msc H.msc /z.msc light.msc
   ‘A laptop is light’

The lexical meaning of the subjects in the pronZ versions of (57) seem to be preserved: (57a) seem to talk about sugar, and (57b) about laptops (in general) and not about properties involving them. This observation is supported by the fact that, unlike the pronZ versions of (56a,b), the pronZ versions of (57a,b) are truth conditionally equivalent to their pronH counterparts in that they are false if sugar is not sweet and if no or a minority of laptops is light.

4.3.2 Obligatory and optional “denotation widening”

Unlike Heller’s 1999 suggestion, the null noun hypothesis can help us understand the denotation widening phenomena with pronZ sentences better.

Suppose indeed that in order to maintain the equative status of pronZ sentences with postcopular APs, these APs modify a null noun (so two GQs can be equated, as in (52) above). As claimed above, since this assumed null noun is genderless, the modifying AP is genderless as well, and receives default gender, which in Hebrew is morphologically identical to a masculine AP.

What is crucial to us, at this point, is that this assumed genderlessness of the postcopular element in (56a) and (56b), has direct consequences as to the nature of the pronZ copula in these sentences. Specifically, we can predict that pronZ in these sentences must be the nonagreeing pronZ, and cannot be the (morphologically identical) masculine agreeing pronZ. This is because the agreeing pronZ, which following Sichel 1997; agrees to the right, will be ungrammatical in (56a,b), as it will have no gender features to agree with.

A close examination of the denotation widening phenomena of the subjects of (56a) and (56b) can help us show that this prediction is borne out. Above we claimed that, given the truth conditions of these two sentences, denotation widening
seems to occur with both of them. A closer look, however, reveals that the status of this denotation widening phenomena is not equal in these two sentences. It is obligatory in (56a) but optional in (56b), as indicated by the contrast in conjunction possibilities in (58a) and (58b):

(58) a. student ca’ir hu /*ze me’anyen, ‘aval
    student.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc interesting.msc but
    ‘oved le’at me’od
    works slowly very
    ‘A young student is interesting, but works very slowly’

b. video hu /ze yakar ‘aval nimca
    VCR.msc h.msc /z.msc expensive.msc but present
    be-kol bayit
    in-every house
    ‘A VCR is expensive, but present in every house’

The conjoined VPs in both (58a) and (58b) denote properties of individuals only (of young students and VCRs, respectively), and cannot be predicated of (contextually supplied) properties involving such individuals (e.g., teaching a young student cannot be said to work very slowly and fixing a VCR cannot be said to be present in every house). Thus, although denotation widening is available with the pronZ versions of both (58a) and (58b), in the latter case the subject can still get its original denotation, whereas in the former it cannot and is thus necessarily widened into the (contextually supplied) property involving this denotation.

I suggest that the contrast in (58a,b) is directly related to the fact that in (58a) the subject is human denoting, while in (58b) it is not. We find the same difference in conjunction possibilities in (59a) and (59b), which also differ in the human/nonhuman denotation of the subject:

(59) a. tinok katan hu /*ze ma’yef, ‘aval
    baby.msc little.msc h.msc /z.msc tiresome.msc but
    lefaxot yaSen harbe
    at-least sleeps.msc a lot
    ‘A little baby is tiresome, but at least sleeps a lot’

b. DvaS hu /ze maSmin ‘aval mexil harbe
    honey.msc h.msc /z.msc fattening.msc but contains lot
    mineralim xaSuvim
    minerals important
    ‘Honey is fattening, but contains lots of important minerals’

“Denotation widening”, then, is obligatory in pronZ sentences with postcopular APs and human denoting subject, and optional in such pronZ sentences with
nonhuman denoting subjects. This contrast can be naturally explained now as a consequence of the fact that pronZ in these sentences is necessarily the nonagreeing pronZ, and not the masculine agreeing one (again, due to the insertion of a null, genderless noun into the semantic structure). In section 3.3 above we showed (following Berman’s original proposal) that the nonagreeing pronZ is incompatible with human denoting expressions. Thus, in (58a–59a) the human denoting subjects have to be “de-animated” in order to be compatible with the nonagreeing pronZ. In contrast, the original denotation of the nonhuman denoting subjects in (58b–59b) can be maintained, and denotation widening is optional.

Notice that if the null noun hypothesis is not being used, there is no way to rule out the possibility that pronZ in (56a,b) is the masculine agreeing one (instead of the nonagreeing pronZ), and thus no way to explain the contrast in conjunction possibilities between (58a) and (58b).

A crucial piece of evidence supporting this analysis comes from examining denotation widening possibilities in pronZ sentences with nominal (instead of adjectival) postcopular elements. Unlike what happens in (58a) and (59a), where denotation widening is obligatory, in the pronZ (60) and (61) whose subjects is also human denoting, but which differ from (58a) and (59a) in the presence of the overt noun “creature” in them, denotation widening need not (and in fact, does not) occur, as indicated by the grammaticality of the conjoined VP in them:

(60) student ca’ir hu /ze yecur
me’anyen, ‘aval ‘oved le’at
‘A young student is an interesting creature, but works slowly’

(61) tinok katan hu /ze yecur me’ayef,
‘aval lefxot ya’Sen harbe
‘A little baby is a tiresome creature, but at least sleeps a lot’

Our analysis can now explain this data. Unlike what happens with (58a) and (59a) the postcopular nominal in (60) and (61) is overt. Thus the sentence can be interpreted as equative (equating two GQs) with no need for a null, genderless element to be inserted. Consequently, the postcopular element has gender features, and thus the copula in (60) and (61) need not be the nonagreeing pronZ, but can be the masculine agreeing pronZ, which is compatible with both human and nonhuman denoting expressions.

We can now turn to the semantic structure of (56a). As just explained, the originally human denoting subject in (56a) is necessarily interpreted as a contextually
supplied property $P_C$, for example “teaching a young student” (though in other contexts $P_C$ can also be “kissing”, “dressing”, “meeting” etc.). $P_C$ can be taken to be a property of individuals (type $\langle e, t \rangle$), as in (62a), or alternatively as a property of events (type $\langle s, t \rangle$, where $s$ stands for “situations” or events), as in (62b):\(^\text{13}\)

\begin{align*}
(62) \quad & a. \lambda x. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land P_C(\langle x, y \rangle) \\
& b. \lambda e. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land P_C(e) \land \text{Th}(e) = y
\end{align*}

Suppose we take $P_C$ to be indeed “teaching a young student”; then the subject of (56a) is interpreted as in (63a) (“being a teacher of a young student), or (63b) (being a teaching event of a young student):

\begin{align*}
(63) \quad & a. \lambda x. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (\langle x, y \rangle) \\
& b. \lambda e. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (e) \land \text{Th}(e) = y
\end{align*}

Using Chierchia’s 1984; Chierchia & Turner’s 1988 nominalization operator $\cap$ we can type shift the properties in (63) into nominalized property, type $e$, as in (64a) and (64b), and then turn these nominalized properties into GQs, using Partee’s “A” operator, as in (65a) and (65b), yielding the set of properties that the nominalized property of being a teacher of/or being a teaching event of a young student has, respectively:

\begin{align*}
(64) \quad & a. \cap \lambda x. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (\langle x, y \rangle) \\
& b. \cap \lambda e. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (e) \land \text{Th}(e) = y
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(65) \quad & a. \lambda P. P (\cap \lambda x. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (\langle x, y \rangle)) \\
& b. \lambda P. P (\cap \lambda e. \exists y \text{ young student} (y) \land \text{teach} (e) \land \text{Th}(e) = y)
\end{align*}

Assuming, as before, that in order to interpret a pronZ sentences with a postcopular AP as equative a null nominal element is inserted, the pronZ version of (56a) has the semantic structure in (66a) or (66b). As before, $N$ stands for the nonovert nominal expression:

\begin{align*}
(66) \quad & a. \lambda P. P (\cap \lambda x. \exists y \text{ (young (student))} (y) \land \text{teach} (\langle x, y \rangle)) = \lambda P. \exists x \text{ (interesting (N))(x) \land P(x)}^{\text{14}}
\end{align*}

\text{13.} \quad \text{Thanks to a reviewer for this suggestion.}

\text{14.} \quad \text{Another possible interpretation for the pronZ (56a), is where the indefinite is bound by a generic quantifier which takes scope over the whole identity relation, as in (i), and which asserts, roughly, that for all individual young students in all accessible, most normal worlds it holds that the set of properties that teaching such an individual has is the same as the set of properties that some interesting thing has:}

\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & \text{Gen } x [\text{young student } (x)] [\lambda P. P (\cap \lambda y. \text{ teach } (\langle y, x \rangle)) = \lambda P. \exists z \text{ (interesting (N))(z) \land P(z)}]
\end{align*}
b. $\lambda P. \ P. (\exists y. \text{young student (y) } \land \text{teach (e) } \land \text{Th(e) = y}) = \lambda P. \exists e. \text{interesting (N))(e) } \land \text{P(e)}$

In (66a) N stands for a default property of individuals, and the sentence roughly asserts that “being a teacher of a young student is an interesting thing”. In (66) N stands for a default property of events, and the sentence roughly asserts that being a teaching event of a young student is an interesting type of event. This way the equative status of the Z sentence is preserved.

In contrast to (56a), the subject of the pronZ (56b) is nonhuman, and thus can, but need not be widened to a property involving the denotation of the subject. It can thus be interpreted as either (67), with the original denotation of the subject. In addition, it can also be interpreted as in (68a), with a widened nominalized property of individuals, or as (68b), with a widened property of events (e.g., fixing a VCR):

(67) $\lambda P. \text{Gen x [ VCR(x)] } [P(x)] = \lambda P. \exists x. (\text{expensive (N)) (x) } \land \text{P(x)}$

(68) a. $\lambda P. \text{P. (} \exists x. \text{VCR (y) } \land \text{fix (} \langle x,y \rangle \text{)} \text{)} =$
       $\lambda P. \exists x. (\text{expensive (N))(x) } \land \text{P(x)}$

b. $\lambda P. \text{P. (} \exists e. \text{VCR (y) } \land \text{fix(e) } \land \text{Th(e) = y}) =$
       $\lambda P. \exists e. (\text{expensive (N))(e) } \land \text{P(e)}$

4.4 Explaining distributional differences

Finally, our analysis can explain the grammaticality contrasts between the pronH and pronZ versions of (69) and (70) (originally (7a) and (10) above, respectively):

(69) student ca’ir hu /*ze ‘aclan
studnet.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc lazy.msc
‘A young student is lazy’

(70) student ca’ir hu /ze me’anyen
studnet.msc young.msc h.msc /z.msc interesting.msc
‘A young student is interesting’

The pronZ version of (69), with the post copular adjective “lazy”, is bad since, as just explained, due to the obligatory presence of the nonagreeing pronZ in the sentence the denotation of the subject must be widened from a human denoting individual into a nominalized property. This clashes with the AP “lazy”, which can denote a property of individuals only (John can be lazy, but talking with John cannot), but not with “me’anyen” – “interesting” as in (70), which can denote both a property of individuals and a property of nominalized properties (both John, and talking with John, can be interesting). The property “me’anyen” – “interesting”, then, is similar to the property “being fun”, which as claimed in Chierchia &
Turner 1988 can be predicated of both ordinary individuals (as in (71a)) and nominalized properties (as in (71b)):

(71) a. John is fun
   b. Reading principia is fun (Chierchia & Turner 1988: p. 293)

Notice that, unlike the pronZ version of (69), the pronH version grammatical. This is because the pronH version has a standard predicative structure, and is not subject to any sortal constraint forcing “denotation widening” of the subject to a nominalized property.

The contrast between the pronZ versions of (7b), (9) and (11) above, repeated here as (72), (73) and (74), can be naturally explained as well:

(72) dani hu /*ze gavoha
    Dannimsc h.msc/z.msc tall.msc
    ‘Danni is tall’

(73) dani hu /ze baxur gavoha
    Dannimsc h.msc/z.msc guy.msc tall.msc
    ‘Danni is a tall guy’

(74) har ha-ʼeverst hu /ze gavoha
    mountain.msc the-Everest h.msc/z.msc high.msc
    ‘The Everest is high’

(72) is ungrammatical for the same reasons that (69) is: the subject is human denoting, and thus incompatible with the copula, which, as explained above, must be the nonagreeing pronZ copula (due to the genderless of the null noun inserted into the semantic structure). As in (69) the postcopular AP (“tall”), can apply to individuals only, so subject cannot undergo “denotation widening” to a property involving the original denotation. In contrast, (74), which only differ from (72) in having a nonhuman denoting subject is grammatical. Finally, (73) is just like (72) in having a human denoting subject and a postcopular element which can apply to individuals only. However, since, unlike the assumed null noun in (72), the postcopular element here is overt, and thus bears gender features, the copula can be the masculine agreeing Z copula, which is not constrained to nonhuman denoting expressions only.

4.5 PronH and pronZ with postcopular NPs: Why “denotation widening” of the subject is blocked with pronH sentences

In the previous sections we have looked at various cases of optional and obligatory “denotation widening” of the subjects of pronZ sentences. Notice that denotation widening is not limited to cases where pronZ is nonagreeing, but is possible also...
with the agreeing pronZ. For example, in (18), repeated here as (75a), not only the nonagreeing pronZ version, but also the agreeing pronZ version (but not the pronH one) can be true even if the referred to student is excellent. I.e. it can be also continued with both (75b) and (75c):

(75) a. ha- student Se-Salaxta li hu /ze /zot
   the student.msc that you-sent me H.msc /Z.msc /Z.FEM
cara crura
   pain.in.the.neck.fem
   ‘The student you sent me is a pain in the neck’

b. … hu ‘aclan, gas.ru’ax ve- ‘oved le’at
   he.msc lazy.msc, rude.msc, and-works.msc slowly
   ‘He is lazy, rude, and works slowly’

c. … hu student mecuyan, ‘aval ha-dikan sone oto
   he.msc student.msc excellent.msc but the-dean hates him
   ‘He is an excellent student, but the dean hates him’

We have seen, however, that in contrast to pronZ sentences, “denotation widening” is completely avoided in pronH sentences. The question which we should answer now is why. Why, for example, must the subject of the pronH version of (75a) only be the student himself, so using the continuation in (75c) leads to infelicity? Similarly, why can’t the subject of the pronH version of (70) be widened to “teaching a young student”, just like its pronZ counterpart, so the sentence is true even if no young student is interesting?

One possible answer which comes to mind is that the existence of “denotation widening” cannot occur freely, but should be considered a “last resort” mechanism. The idea is that the original denotation should be maintained, and denotation widening avoided, unless this original denotation of the subject leads to some sort of ungrammaticality/infelicity. In a pronZ sentence like (70), for example, denotation widening is forced by the identity relation of the sentence (together with the constraints on nonagreeing pronZ). One may hypothesize that subjects of pronH sentences do not undergo “denotation widening” since there is no similar trigger for the widening: the sentence can receive an interpretation with their original denotation, so there is no “justification” for widening their meaning.

But this answer cannot be right, since along cases where “denotation widening” with pronZ sentences is triggered by the inability of to maintain an equative interpretation with the original denotation of the subjects, we also find pronZ sentences where “denotation widening” occurs freely although they easily receive an equative interpretation with the original interpretation of the subject. One example of such “free denotation widening” is (17) above. Here the original denotation of the subject is not human, and the sentence can be interpreted as equative even
without widening the meaning of the subject to “fixing a VCR”. Nonetheless, this widened meaning is possible with the pronZ version, as indicated by the fact that, unlike the pronH versions, it can be true even if no individual VCR is expensive.

A similar “non triggered” “denotation widening” can be found in (18) (repeated as (75a), with a postcopular NP. In the pronZ version of (18) the subject can be widened into a contextually supplied property involving the denotation of the subject (e.g., having this student). Here too, however, this “denotation widening” is not forced by the equative interpretation of the sentence. The sentence can be interpreted as equative by simply applying standard type shifting operations turning the pre and postcopular elements to GQs, type $\langle(e,t),t\rangle$, and equating them, as shown in section 3.1 above. The fact that the subject here is human denoting does not force the “denotation widening” either, since, unlike (17) with a postcopular AP, no genderless null noun has to be inserted, so the copula can be the agreeing pronZ, which, unlike the neutral pronZ, is perfectly compatible with human denoting expressions.

“Denotation widening” of pronZ sentences, then, can occur freely, with no trigger (i.e., it is not a “last resort” operation). This brings us back to its unexplained impossibility with pronH sentences.

Another potential explanation may focus on the abstract nature of “widened” properties. Perhaps there is a constraint on pronH sentences prohibiting them to have such abstract subjects.

This explanation too, however, is wrong. We have already seen in section 2 above several examples of perfectly grammatical pronH sentences with subjects denoting nominalized properties, e.g., (2). Moreover, if we simply express the widened nominalized properties or functions explicitly, as in (76), the pronH versions are fine:

(76) hadraxat student ca’ir hi me’anyenet supervising.FEM student young H.FEM interesting.FEM ‘Supervising a young student is interesting’

The reason pronH sentences cannot have “widened” subjects, then, is not the fact that such widening are not triggered enough, nor the abstract nature of functions and nominalized properties. Instead, I suggest that the real reason has to do with agreement, and more specifically, with the fact, noted in Sichel 1997, that the pronH copula has to agree to the left, i.e., with the subject.

When the subject bears agreement features, as in (76), pronH can indeed agree with it in gender, no matter how abstract its denotation is. However, when the denotation of the subject is widened, this widened denotation is not expressed explicitly, but is rather just a semantic entity, which is crucially morphologically and phonologically null and does not bear agreement features. In such a case, the pronH copula cannot agree in gender with such a “genderless” subject.
In contrast to pronH, pronZ agrees to the right, i.e., with the postcopular element (if this is the agreeing pronZ), or does not agree with any element in the sentence (if this is the neutral pronZ). This is why the genderlessness of the widened subject does not affect the grammaticality of pronZ sentences.

What supports this suggestion is the fact, partially observed already in Berman & Grosu 1976; that explicit expressions with bear no gender features, like pps and infinitivals are grammatical as subjects of pronZ sentences, but ungrammatical as subjects of pronH sentences. This can be seen in (77):\(^{15}\)

\[(77) \begin{align*}
    a. & \text{ mi- tel aviv le-ýeruSalyim } *\text{hi} & */\text{hu} & /\text{zot} \\
    & \text{from Tel Aviv to-Jerusalem H.FEM/H.MSC } /Z.FEM \\
    & \text{derex } \text{‘aruka} \\
    & \text{way.FEM long.FEM} \\
    & \text{‘From Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is a long way’} \\
    b. & \text{ le- hamer } *\text{hu} & /ze \text{ ma’ase } ‘\text{asur} \\
    & \text{to-gamble H.MSC /Z.MSC activity.MSC forbidden.MSC} \\
    & \text{‘Gamboling is a forbidden activity’}
\end{align*}\]

5. **Concluding remarks, general implications and directions for further research**

In this paper I showed how a wide variety grammaticality, agreement and truth conditional contrasts between minimally contrasting nonpseudocleft Hebrew copular sentences with pronH and (agreeing and nonagreeing) pronZ copulas can be naturally explained as resulting from the interaction of three underlying differences between the copulas, namely their predicative/or equative semantics (based on Heller’s 1999, 2002, proposal for Hebrew pseudoclefts), their direction of agreement (as suggested in Sichel 1997), and the presence/absence of a [–human] constraints on the denotation of the arguments of these copulas (a modified version of Berman 1978).

Though the analysis presented here attempts to solve a language specific puzzle, it raises implications, questions and directions for further research which are relevant for linguistic (and especially semantic) theory in general. I would like to finish this paper by briefly examining three such directions.

The first direction concerns the possibility of a unified analysis of pseudocleft and nonpseudocleft copular constructions. Above I claimed that Heller’s

---

\(^{15}\) (77a,b) are based on Partee’s (1986) examples.
H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis, originally proposed for Hebrew pseudoclefts, is applicable to Hebrew nonpseudoclefts copular constructions, and moreover, that adopting this kind of application is independently supported as it enables us to account for various contrasts between pronH and pronZ nonpseudoclefts.

One implication of this application from the pseudocleft to the nonpseudocleft data in Hebrew concerns the analysis of connectivity effects in specificalional sentences in general. As mentioned in section 3 above, Heller 2002 derives the presence of connectivity effects in pronZ pseudoclefts, and their absence in pronH pseudoclefts from (a) the claim that these pseudoclefts are specificalional and predicational, and hence are equative and predicative semantic structures, respectively, and (b) from Jacobson’s 1994, Sharvit’s 1999 claim that connectivity effects in specificalional sentences result from their equative semantic structure (the “semantic approach” to connectivity). Above we showed that connectivity effects exist also with nonpseudocleft pronZ copular sentences. In addition, however, we supplied independent evidence, unrelated to the issue of connectivity, to the claim that pronH and pronZ copulas in Hebrew encode the predicative/equative distinction in nonpseudocleft copular sentences. This seems to strongly support Jacobson 1994 & Sharvit’s 1999 approaches to connectivity as based on identity relations.

Notice, however, that although the H-predicative/Z-equative hypothesis seems to hold for the copulas in both pseudoclefts and nonpseudocleft sentences, these two constructions still differ in a variety of respects. As seen in (78) and (79), for example, pronZ pseudoclefts allow feminine postcopular APs and postcopular VPs, respectively, while nonpseudoclefts do not:

(78) a. ma Se-rut hayta ze mo’ila /*mo’il
what that-Ruth was.FEM Z.MSC helpful.FEM /helpful.MSC
la-xevra
to-the-society
‘What Ruth was was helpful to society’ (Heller 2002: p. 268)

b. hamca’a mekorit ze *mo’ila
invention.FEM original.FEM Z.MSC helpful.FEM
/mo’il la-xevra
/helpful.MSC to-the-society
‘An original invention is helpful to society’

(79) a. ma Se-rut ‘asta ze halxa ha-bayta
what that-Ruth did.FEM Z.MSC went.FEM to-the-home
‘What Ruth did was go home’ (Heller 2002: p. 257)

b. *dani ze halax habayta
Danny Z.MSC went to-the home

The differences in (78)–(79) seem to result from the syntactic contrasts between pseudocleft and nonpseudocleft copular constructions, e.g., the presence of a gap
in the former, and its absence in the latter. Further research should concentrate on developing a unified theory of the copular system in Hebrew – in both pseudocleft and nonpseudocleft sentences – which can account for both the similarities and differences between these two constructions.

A second direction for further research concerns the underlying differences in agreement patterns between pronH, the agreeing pronZ and the nonagreeing pronZ. One question which arises here is whether the correlations between the direction of agreement of the copulas (with the subject vs. with the postcopular element or with none), and their distinct semantics (predicative vs. equative, respectively) is accidental and specific to Hebrew or part of a more general pattern. Another question concerns the correlation between a nonagreeing pronominal element (i.e., the noninflected Z pronoun, and the nonagreeing pronZ) and the ban on having [–human] reference/arguments only. One may try to rephrase the second part of this correlation in terms of the more general [animate/inanimate] or the [+natural gender] instead of a [+human] distinction. But an examination of the data seems to indicate that the [+human] distinction is still the right one here. For example, while the noninflected Z pronoun, and the nonagreeing pronZ copula are ungrammatical with human denoting elements (see (48) and (41) above, respectively), they are much better when their reference/argument denote an animal, which is animate, and marked with natural gender marking, as in (80):

(80) a. ?ze mamaS me’acben ‘oti, ha-xatula Selxa z.msc really annoys me, the-cat.fem yours ‘It really annoys me, your cat’

b. ?pil afrikani ze gadol elephant.msc African.msc z.msc big.msc ‘An African elephant is big.’

A final question concerns agreement with null, genderless expressions. Above we saw that adjectives and the pronH copula differ in this respect: whereas the adjectives modifying a null, genderless noun have default gender in Hebrew, but are perfectly grammatical, forcing pronH copulas to agree with a genderless expression (a widened denotation of the original subject, or a genderless explicit expression like an infinitival subject) doesn’t work, and the result is ungrammatical. Further research should look more closely at whether this contrast is related to the concord vs. subject-verb agreement in Hebrew, or to the differences between the agreement properties of null elements vs. widened denotations.

The third direction for further research concerns the phenomenon of “denotation widening” found with pronZ sentences in Hebrew, which seems to closely resemble Nunberg’s 1995 “predicate transfer”, exemplified in (81a), but, according to him, not in (81b) (uttered when holding a car key).
Nunberg claims that whereas in (81b) it is the reference of the demonstrative which is transferred from the key to the car (what he called “deferred reference”), in (81a) the denotation of the subject is still “I”, and what is transferred is the meaning of the VP (from a property of cars to a property of car owners). This distinction is justified, among other things by the conjunction facts in (82): In (82a) the VP can be conjoined with a property of cars. In (82b) it cannot, but can be conjoined with a property of car owners:

\[(82)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{This is parked out back and may not start} & \text{(Nunberg 1995: #4)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{I am parked out back and have been waiting for 15 minutes/\*and may not start} & \text{(Nunberg 1995: #8,9)}
\end{align*}
\]

Nunberg further claims that deferred reference is limited to expressions involving demonstratives or indexicals. Predicate transfer, on the other hand, can be found not only with VPs (as in (81)), but also with common nouns in argument positions, as in (83), where “ham sandwich” has been transferred to “person ordering a ham sandwich”:

\[(83)\] The ham sandwich is at table 7  \text{(Nunberg 1995: #19)}

It is interesting in this perspective to compare Nunberg’s observations with the observations made in this paper concerning the “denotation widening” phenomena. Although in both cases we seem to replace an original meaning of an expression with another meaning, there are some important differences between the two cases. For example, Nunberg shows that in Italian, where adjectives are marked for grammatical gender, the gender of the adjective corresponds to the gender of the transferred, and not the original denotation. In the pronZ sentences, on the other hand, we have seen that when subjects undergo denotation widening they become genderless, so agreeing elements (e.g., pronH) cannot appear with them.

A second difference concerns the permissible syntactic constituents which can undergo predicate transfer. Nunberg claims that predicate transfer, as in (83), occurs at the common noun, and not the NP level. In the “denotation widening” cases in Hebrew, on the other hand, it is the denotation of the whole subject NP which seems to be widened. This is especially clear in pronZ sentences with proper name subjects:

\[(84)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dani cohen ze mecuyn} & \quad \text{Danni Cohen z.msc excellent.msc} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'Danny Cohen is excellent’

(84) is ungrammatical if the denotation of the subject is the original one, but becomes much better if it is widened into some contextually supplied property
involving the reference of “Danny Cohen”, e.g., hiring, fighting, meeting, or even marrying Danny Cohen. But clearly “Danny Cohen” is a full NP. And in fact, it is not even a predicate (unless you type shift it to be the property of being Danny Cohen). So, it seems that what Nunberg calls “predicate transfer” can be found with nonpredicates as well. This conclusion is further supported by the grammaticality of the conjunction in (85):

(85) Danny Cohen is parked out back, and has been waiting for 15 minutes

Further research should continue looking at the similarities and differences between the two phenomena.
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