

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