

La linguistique formelle en quête d'un objet : esquisse d'une épistémologie de la «grammaticalité»

Nick Riemer, University of Sydney
nick.riemer@sydney.edu.au

- (1) a. * Tout homme_p il_i est mortel.
b. * Chaque potager_p il_i a son robinet (De Cat 2007, (39))
- (2) a. i. *la fille *laquelle* tu connais
ii. *rien *quoi* tu connais
b. i. *la fille *laquelle* connaît ton nom
ii. *rien *quoi* te plaît (Sportiche 2011: 86)
- (3) *Each other's supporters attacked the candidates. (Lasnik, 1998; quoted in Boeckx, 2001, p. 517, (8))
- (4) *What subject was the student hoping to pass the examination on? (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 17, (35))
- (5) *The taller John is than Mary, the happier I am. (Leung, 2003, p. 18; quoted in den Dikken, 2005, p. 523, (34))
- (6) *Which church did Ashley describe the café near? (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 1, (2))
- (7) *Who did Ashley read the/that/her book about? (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 2, (3b))
- (8) *Who were the Phillies hoping for the/that victory over? (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 16, (32b))
- (9) *Who did you describe this picture as a successful caricature of? (Grosu, 2003, p. 296, (92d))
- (10) *The first letter says that you should pay tax and the second letter V.A.T. (Han and Romero, 2004, p. 534, (21a))
- (11) *These books are hard for Bill to decide when to read. (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 64, (97))
- (12) *Which book did you leave the library without finding? (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 280, (78))
- (13) *The more you think about it, the problem worsens/broadens (den Dikken, 2005, p. 513, (35b))
- (14) *The more you think about it, the problem compounds (den Dikken, 2005, p. 513, (35c))
- (15) *The more you think about it, the problem drives you crazy (den Dikken, 2005, p. 513, (35d))
- (16) *John revised either his decision to cook rice or beans. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 693, (6b))
- (17) *To only Bill have they spoken the truth. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 700, (20a))
- (18) Q: Did John say that he had either FRIED it or BAKED it?
A: *No! John DENIED that he either had fried it or baked it. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 706, (31). Capitals for contrastive focus)
- (19) *This sentence is from either NORWEGIAN or from SWEDISH. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 735, (72b). Capitals for contrastive focus)
- (20) *John was reading from either a BOOK or from a MAGAZINE. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 735, (73b). Capitals for contrastive focus)
- (21) *John was reading from either a BOOK or reading from a MAGAZINE. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 735, (73c). Capitals for contrastive focus)

- (22) *John was reading from either a BOOK or he was reading from a MAGAZINE. (den Dickken, 2006, p. 735, (73d). Capitals for contrastive focus)
- (23) *Mary_i said that Joe liked these pictures of herself_i. (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 248, (4a))
- (24) *There seems to be many people in the room. (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 299, (20b))
- (25) *The DA made out the defendants to be guilty during each other's trials. (Boeckx, 2001, p. 507, (11a))
- (26) *Each other's supporters asked the candidates to be more honest. (Lasnik, 1998; quoted in Boeckx, 2001, p. 517, (ix))
- (27) *When propping open their desks, which presidents do children usually use books about? (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 8, (18b))
- (28) *They_i started the rumor that pictures of them_i were hanging in the post office. (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003, p. 32, (79))
- (29) *Although I wouldn't introduce them to Tom and Sally, I would to each other. (Baltin, 2003, p. 229, (28))
- (30) *the kind of doctor that the more he wants to be, the less able he will be to actually become (den Dikken, 2005, p. 508, (29a))
- (31) *Joan believes him_i to be a genius even more fervently than Bob_i's mother does. (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 135, (55b))
- (32) *Which book did you leave the library without finding? (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 280, (78))
- (33) *She said John is probably coming tomorrow, and probably coming tomorrow he is. (Fitzpatrick, 2005, p. 405, (14a))
- (34) *She wanted everyone to be aware of the problem, and now aware of it they are. (Fitzpatrick, 2005, p. 405, (14b))
- (35) *The boys seem both all to have gone out and to have left their coats behind. (den Dikken, 2006, p. 742, (80b))
- (36) *Max said that he was going to return to the library yesterday, each of the books that he checked out last week. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 350, (2b))
- (37) *Josh edited a review of an article for Jamie, about verb-movement. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 350, (2d))
- (38) *Josh promised that he would give to Jamie, and Joss claimed that he was going to give to Sue, all of the answers to the final exam. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 351, (4b))
- (39) *Josh described for Jamie drunk, and Joss reenacted for Maria sober, a popular Broadway musical. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 355, (11a))
- (40) *Joss said that he was going to donate to the library yesterday, and Jamie claimed that she would donate to the museum last week, a large collection of ancient texts. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 355, (11b))
- (41) *Joss said that he was going to fire, and insisted that no one would ever consider rehiring on the same day, the crazy guy from accounting. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 358 (16a))
- (42) *From which city did you meet a man? (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 372, (47b); question of e.g. 'I met a man from London')
- (43) *Every man ordered an appetizer, and every boy ordered a main dish, (which was from his native country. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 373, (52a); both the appetizer and main dish are 'from his native country')
- (44) *No man can read every book, and no woman can read every magazine, which is on this table. (Sabbagh, 2007, p. 373, (52b))
- (45) *Mary admires John_i, but he, doesn't. (Hornstein *et al.*, 2005, p. 308, (38))

If you go back to the time of Galileo, and you looked at the array of phenomena that had to be accounted for, it was *prima facie* obvious that the Galilean theory, the Copernican

theory could not be supported. That is, there were just masses of refuting data. And, Galileo sort of plowed his way through this, putting much of the data aside, redefining what was relevant, and what was not relevant, formulating questions in such a way that what appeared to be refuting data were no longer so, and in fact, very often just disregarding the data that should have refuted the system, and did this, not simply with reckless abandon, but because of a recognition that explanatory principles were being discovered that gave insight into at least some of the phenomena. (Chomsky, 1978b, p. 14; quoted in Botha, 1989, p. 176)

Si vous remontez au temps de Galilée, en regardant toute la gamme de phénomènes dont il fallait rendre compte, il était évident de prime abord que la théorie de Galilée, la théorie Copernicienne, n'était pas soutenable. C'est-à-dire qu'il y avait des tas de données qui la réfutaient. Galilée s'est donc frayé un chemin là-dedans, écartant beaucoup des données, redéfinissant ce qui était pertinent et ce qui ne l'était pas, posant des questions de telle manière que les données apparemment réfutantes ne l'étaient plus et, en l'occurrence, ne pas tenant compte des données qui auraient dû réfuter sa théorie, et tout ça non pas de façon téméraire, mais parce qu'il reconnaissait qu'on découvrirait des principes explicatifs qui éclairaient au moins une partie des données.

Repères bibliographiques

- Andor, J. 2004. The master and his performance: an interview with Noam Chomsky. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 1, 93-111.
- Baltin, M. 2003. The interaction of ellipsis and binding: implications for the sequencing of Principle A. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 21, 215-246.
- Bobaljik, J. 2002. A-chains at the PF-Interface: copies and 'covert' movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 20, 197-267.
- Boeckx, C. 2001. Scope reconstruction and A-movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19, 503-548.
- Boeckx, C. 2006. *Linguistic Minimalism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Boeckx, C., Piattelli-Palmarini, M. 2005: Language as a natural object; linguistics as a natural science. *The Linguistic Review* 22:447-466
- Botha R 1982. On the 'Galilean style' of linguistic inquiry. *Lingua*, 58, 1-50.
- Botha, R. 1989. *Challenging Chomsky. The Generative Garden Game*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Cann, R., Kaplan, T., Kempson, R. 2005. Data at the grammar-pragmatics interface: the case of resumptive pronouns in English. *Lingua*, 115, 1551-1577.
- Carr, P. 2003. Innateness, internalism and input: Chomskyan rationalism and its problems. *Language Sciences* 25, 615-635.
- Cartwright, N. 1983. *How the laws of physics lie*. OUP, Oxford.
- Chomsky, N. 1955 [1975]. *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- Chomsky, N. 1972. *Language and Mind* [Enl ed]. Harcourt Brace, New York.
- Chomsky, N. 1978a. A theory of core grammar. *Glottol*, 1, 7-26.
- Chomsky, N. 1978b. Interview with Sol Saporta. *Working papers in linguistics, supplement no. 4*. Department of Linguistics, University of Washington.
- Chomsky, N. 1980. *Rules and Representations*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Chomsky, N. 1982. *The Generative Enterprise: a Discussion with R. Huybregts and H. van Riemsdijk*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. 1983. On cognitive structures and their development: a reply to Piaget. In Piattelli-Palmarini M. (Ed.), *Language and Learning: the Debate Between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language: its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. 1991. Linguistics and adjacent fields: a personal view. In Kasher, A. (Ed.), *The Chomskyan Turn*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Chomsky, N. 1995a. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1995b. Language and nature. *Mind*, 104, 1-61.
- Chomsky, N. 1998. *Minimalist inquiries: the framework*. ms. MIT. Published as: Chomsky, N. 2000. *Minimalist inquiries: the framework*. In R. Martin, D. Michael and J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. *New Horizons in the Study of Mind and Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Clifton, C., Fanselow, G., Lyn F. 2006. Amnestying superiority violations: processing multiple questions. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 37, 51-68.

- Collins, J. 2007. Meta-scientific eliminativism: a reconsideration of Chomsky's review of Skinner's verbal behavior. *British Journal of the Philosophy of Science*, 58, 625–658.
- Culicover, P., Levine, R. 2001. Stylistic inversion in English: a reconsideration. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19, 283–310.
- Davies, W., Dubinsky, D. 2003. On extraction from NPs. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 21, 1-37.
- De Cat, Cécile 2007. French dislocation without movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25:485–534
- den Dikken, M. 2005. Comparative correlatives comparatively. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 497–532.
- den Dikken, M. 2006. Either-float and the syntax of co-ordination. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 24, 689–749.
- Devitt, M. 2006. *Ignorance of Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Drake, S. 1978. *Galileo at Work: his Scientific Biography*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Featherston, F. 2007. Data in generative grammar: the stick and the carrot. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33, 269–318.
- Feyerabend, P. 1993. *Against Method* [3rd edn]. Verso, London.
- Fitzpatrick, J. 2006. Deletion through movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 24, 399–431.
- Gordon, P., Hendrick, R. 1997. Intuitive knowledge of linguistic co-reference. *Cognition* 62, 325 – 370
- Grosu, A. 2003. A unified theory of 'standard' and 'transparent' free relatives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21, 247–331.
- Han, C.H., Maribel, R. 2004. The syntax of whether/Q...or questions: ellipsis combined with movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 22, 527–564.
- Henry, A. 2005. Non-standard dialects and linguistic data. *Lingua*, 115, 1599–1617.
- Hinzen, W. 2006. *Mind Design and Minimal Syntax*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hornstein, N., Nunes, J., Grohmann, K. 2005. *Understanding Minimalism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Horrocks, G. 1987. *Generative Grammar*. Longman, London.
- Johnson, K. 2007. The legacy of methodological dualism. *Mind and Language*, 22, 366–401.
- Kusch, M. 2006. *A Sceptical Guide to Meaning and Rules: Defending Kripke's Wittgenstein*. Acumen, Chesham.
- Lasnik, H. 1998. Some reconstruction riddles. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 83-98.
- Laurence, S. 2003. Is Linguistics a branch of psychology? In A. Barber (Ed.), *Epistemology of Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Leung, T.C. 2003. Comparative correlatives and parallel occurrence of elements. Ph.D. Screening Paper, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Love, N. 1989. Language and the science of the impossible. *Language & Communication*, 9, 269–287.
- Ludlow, P. 2011. *The Philosophy of Generative Linguistics*. OUP, Oxford.
- Nowak, L. 2000. Galileo-Newton's model of free fall. In I. Nowakowa and L. Leszek Idealization X: the Richness of Idealization. Rodopi, Amsterdam.
- Pitt, J.C. 1992. *Galileo, Human Knowledge and the Book of Nature*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Riemer, N. 2009a. Grammaticality as evidence and as prediction in a Galilean linguistics. *Language Sciences* 31, 612–633.
- Riemer, N. 2009b. On not having read Itkonen: empiricism and intuitions in the generative data debate. *Language Sciences* 31, 649–662.
- Sabbagh J. 2007. Ordering and linearizing rightward movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 25, 349–401.
- Sampson, G. 2007. Grammar without grammaticality. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 3, 1–32.
- Schlesewsky, M. 2009. Linguistische Daten aus experimentellen Umgebungen: Eine multiexperimentelle und multimodale Perspektive. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 28, 169–178
- Schütze, T.C. 1996. *The Empirical Base of Linguistics: Grammaticality Judgments and Linguistic Methodology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Sharratt, M. 1994. *Galileo: Decisive Innovator*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Smolin, L. 2007. *The trouble with physics. The rise of string theory, the fall of a science, and what comes next*. Allen Lane, London.
- Spencer, N. 1973. Differences between linguists and nonlinguists in intuitions of grammaticality-acceptability. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 2, 83–98.
- Sportiche D. 2011. French Relative *Qui*. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Volume 42: 83–124
- Stokhof and van Lambalgen 2011 Abstractions and idealisations: The construction of modern linguistics *Theoretical Linguistics* 37, 1–26
- Wasow, T., Arnold, J. 2005. Intuitions in linguistic argumentation. *Lingua*, 115, 1481-1496.
- White, R. 2003. The epistemic advantage of prediction over accommodation. *Mind*, 112, 653–683.
- Woit, P. 2006. *Not even wrong. The failure of string theory and the search for unity in physical law*. Jonathan Cape, London.