

Denis Bouchard

THE **SEMANTICS**
OF **SYNTAX**

A Minimalist Approach to Grammar

THE **UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS** • Chicago & London

Contents

Acknowledgments xiii

PART I: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FORM AND MEANING

- 1 The Semantics of Syntax: Defining the Object of Inquiry 3**
 - 1.1 Global Approaches to Meaning 5
 - 1.1.1 The Linking Problem 8
 - 1.1.2 The Effect of Globality on Polysemy: Generalized Homonymy 11
 - 1.1.3 Descriptive Adequacy in Lexical Semantics 11
 - 1.1.4 Summary of Global Approaches to Meaning 15
 - 1.2 A Selective Approach to Meaning 16
 - 1.3 A Minimalist Approach to Grammar 20
 - 1.4 Effects on Autonomy 25
 - 1.5 Effects on the Relationship between Form and Meaning 28
 - 1.5.1 Fuzziness and Categorization 28
 - 1.5.2 Selective Semantics and Choice of Primitives 37
 - 1.5.2.1 General Guidelines 38
 - 1.5.2.2 The Inadequacy of Theta Theory 41
 - 1.5.2.2.1 Sense and Reference 42
 - 1.5.2.2.2 The Substantive Content of Theta Roles is Situational 44
 - 1.5.2.2.3 The Paraphrase Methodology 46
 - 1.5.2.3 The Inadequacy of Theories of Centrality of Space 47
 - 1.5.2.4 The Pervasiveness of Polysemy 52
 - 1.5.2.5 Three Arguments for Theta Theory 54
 - 1.5.2.6 Consequences for the Choice of Primitives 59
 - 1.5.3 Formal Differences between G-Semantics and S-Semantics 60
 - 1.5.4 The Meaningful Content of the Formalism 64
 - 1.6 Appendix: Newton, the Ancients, and Grammar 68
 - 2 Selective Semantics and Syntactic Correspondence 72**
 - 2.1 Syntax and Compositionality 74
 - 2.1.1 Syntactic Nodes and Compositionality 75

- 2.1.1.1 No Vacuous Projection 77
- 2.1.1.1.1 Testing Nodes for Content: Pragmatic Anaphora 79
- 2.1.1.1.2 Evidence for the Content of Intermediate Nodes 80
- 2.1.1.1.3 Projection in Syntax 82
- 2.1.1.2 A Comparison with Standard X-bar 85
- 2.1.1.2.1 The Notion of Maximal Projection 88
- 2.1.1.2.2 Specifiers, Complements and Semantic Combination 89
- 2.1.2 Syntactic Structures and Compositionality 91
- 2.2 Correspondence and Identification 93
- 2.2.1 Chunking 94
- 2.2.1.1 Constraints on Chunking 97
- 2.2.1.2 Deriving the Constraints on Chunking 98
- 2.2.1.3 The Origins of Chunking 101
- 2.2.2 Realization as Syntactic Constituents 102
- 2.2.3 Binding in Semantic Representations 103
- 2.3 Minimalism and G-Semantics 108
- 2.3.1 A Constrained Class of Transformations 109
- 2.3.2 Constraining the Formulation of Ts vs Their Application 110
- 2.3.3 Modularity Does Not Further Constrain Rule Formulation 110
- 2.3.3.1 Move α and Wh-Question Formation 111
- 2.3.3.2 Traces Do Not Constrain the Theory 113
- 2.3.3.3 Triggers in Modular Grammar are Not More General 113
- 2.3.4 Minimalist Syntax, Semantics and Mapping 114

PART II: SELECTIVE SEMANTICS AND THE LEXICON 117

- 3 A Case Study of Six French Verbs 119**
 - 3.1 Six Verbs of Movement in French 121
 - 3.1.1 Venir 121
 - 3.1.1.1 Use 1 of Venir: Movement 121
 - 3.1.1.2 Use 2 of Venir: "Progredience" with an Infinitival Phrase 129
 - 3.1.1.2.1 Two Constraints on Progredience 130
 - 3.1.1.2.2 The Structure of the Progredience Construction 132
 - 3.1.1.2.3 Explaining the Constraints 133
 - 3.1.1.3 Use 3 of Venir: Origin 136
 - 3.1.1.4 Use 4 of Venir: Extension 138
 - 3.1.1.5 Use 5 of Venir: Expressing Time 139
 - 3.1.1.6 Use 6 of Venir: End-reaching (venir à) 144

- 3.1.1.7 Use 7 of Venir: Involvement 145
- 3.1.1.8 Use 8 of Venir: Availability 147
- 3.1.1.9 Use 9 of Venir: Measure, Comparison 147
- 3.1.1.10 Conclusion on the Uses of Venir 148
- 3.1.2 Aller 149
 - 3.1.2.1 Use 1 of Aller: Movement 149
 - 3.1.2.2 Use 2 of Aller: Progredience 151
 - 3.1.2.3 Use 3 of Aller: Extension 152
 - 3.1.2.4 Use 4 of Aller: Expressing Time 152
 - 3.1.2.5 Use 5 of Aller: Involvement 158
 - 3.1.2.6 Use 6 of Aller: Attributive 159
 - 3.1.2.7 Use 7 of Aller: Evaluative 160
 - 3.1.2.8 Conclusion on the Uses of Aller 163
- 3.1.3 Arriver 166
 - 3.1.3.1 Use 1 of Arriver: Movement 170
 - 3.1.3.2 Use 2 of Arriver: Happening 171
 - 3.1.3.3 Use 3 of Arriver: Continuance 171
 - 3.1.3.4 Use 4 of Arriver: No Internal Development 171
 - 3.1.3.5 Use 5 of Arriver: Existence 172
 - 3.1.3.6 Use 6 of Arriver: Expectation and Accessibility 173
 - 3.1.3.7 Use 7 of Arriver: Stativity 174
 - 3.1.3.8 Use 8 of Arriver: Incompatibility with the Origin Use 175
 - 3.1.3.9 Summary of Arriver 175
- 3.1.4 Partir 175
- 3.1.5 Entrer 180
- 3.1.6 Sortir 183
- 3.1.7 Strict Compositionality and Movement 189
 - 3.1.7.1 Summary of Strict Compositionality and Movement 196
- 3.2 Transitivity 199
- 3.3 Choice of AUX 207
 - 3.3.1 General Properties of Choice of AUX 207
 - 3.3.1.1 Previous Analyses 207
 - 3.3.1.2 A General Account of the Distribution of ETRE and AVOIR 211
 - 3.3.1.3 AUX Choice in Ten Constructions 213
 - 3.3.2 Choice of AUX and Past Participle Agreement 223
 - 3.3.2.1 Spec-Head Agreement and Scientific Reductionism 223
 - 3.3.2.2 Agreement as a Derivative Property of Coindexation 225

- 3.3.2.3 Past Participle Agreement and Coindexation 227
- 3.3.2.4 Sylleptic Agreement as Empirical Support for a Coindexation Analysis 230
- 3.3.2.5 A Correlation between Choice of AUX and Participle Agreement 233
- 3.3.2.6 Conclusion of Choice of AUX and Past Participle Agreement 236
- 3.3.3 Summary of Choice of AUX 236
 - 3.4 Stative Reading of the Participle 236
 - 3.5 Impersonal Constructions 243
 - 3.6 The Residue of Tier Theory 252
 - 3.7 Conclusion 253

PART III: SELECTIVE SEMANTICS AND SYNTAX 255

4 Psych Verbs 259

- 4.1 Psych Verbs and Constrained Movement: the Problem 259
- 4.2 Two Problems with Treating EO Verbs as Special 265
 - 4.2.1 Productivity 265
 - 4.2.2 The Thematic Analysis of Psych Predicates 269
- 4.3 What a Psych Construction Is 272
 - 4.3.1 A Psy-chose in Contact with an Intentional Subject 272
 - 4.3.2 Classes of Psych Constructions 275
 - 4.3.3 An Intentional Concept as a Psy-chose 278
 - 4.3.4 Agentivity in Terms of Intentionality 280
 - 4.3.5 Summary of the Psych Construction 284
- 4.4 Syntactic Properties of Psych Constructions 284
 - 4.4.1 Binding of Direct Object Anaphors 285
 - 4.4.2 Backward Binding of a Reflexive 295
 - 4.4.3 Passivization 302
 - 4.4.4 Progressive 310
 - 4.4.5 Nominalization 313
 - 4.4.5.1 Two Unsatisfactory Analyses of Psych Verb Nominalization 314
 - 4.4.5.1.1 Grimshaw's Analysis and External Argument R 314
 - 4.4.5.1.1.1 R and Nonthematic Argument E 318
 - 4.4.5.1.1.2 R and NPs as Predicates 323
 - 4.4.5.1.1.3 R and Adjectival Modification 324
 - 4.4.5.1.2 Pesetsky's Analysis—Zero Affix CAUS 329
 - 4.4.5.2 A Better Analysis: The Status of Affectedness in the Grammar 332

- 4.4.5.3 Zero Morpheme SUG 340
- 4.4.5.4 Summary 343
- 4.4.6 Compounding 345
- 4.4.7 Imperative 352
- 4.4.8 Proarb as Subject 354
- 4.4.9 Embedding in a Causative 357
- 4.4.10 Interaction with Adverbs like "Personally" 360
- 4.4.11 Extraction from the Direct Object 363
- 4.5 Conclusion 382
- 4.6 Appendix: Lexical Redundancy Rules 385

5 Verb Movement 387

- 5.0 Introduction: Verb Movement and Selective Semantics 387
- 5.1 The Data: The Agr Account 388
- 5.2 Problems with Agr 394
 - 5.2.1 The Structure 395
 - 5.2.2 The Agr Node 397
 - 5.2.3 The Position of the Adverb 398
 - 5.2.4 The Position of NEG 400
 - 5.2.5 The Binding of the E Variable by a Tense Operator 404
 - 5.2.6 DO-Support as a Language-Specific Rule 405
- 5.3 Strong/Weak: A Morpho-syntactic Distinction 406
 - 5.3.1 A Proposal 406
 - 5.3.1.1 Tense as the Most Prominent Projection of the Sentence 407
 - 5.3.1.2 Two Factors That Determine the Position of Adverbs and Negation 408
 - 5.3.2 Adverbs in Tensed Clauses 411
 - 5.3.3 Adverbs in Infinitival Clauses 419
 - 5.3.4 Negation in Tensed Clauses 422
 - 5.3.5 Negation in Infinitival Clauses 425
 - 5.3.5.1 Dialectal Variation in the Distribution of French *pas* 427
 - 5.3.5.2 Diachronic Change in the Status of *ne* and *pas* 429
- 5.3.6 Summary of the Morpho-syntactic Analysis 434
- 5.4 Inversion in Interrogatives 435
 - 5.4.1 Some Theoretical Assumptions 436
 - 5.4.1.1 Inversion as T in COMP 436
 - 5.4.1.2 Complex Inversion as Double Case Marking 437
 - 5.4.2 Inversion in English 438

5.4.3 Inversion in French 440

5.5 Conclusion 448

Afterword 449

Notes 451

References 503