The MIT Press

Chance
Author(s): John Robert Ross
Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Apr., 1970), p. 261
Published by: The MIT Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177554
Accessed: 24/04/2013 23:32

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 129.2.19.102 on Wed, 24 Apr 2013 23:32:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

CHANCE

John Robert Ross,
MIT

This verb has mysterious selections pertaining to tense and auxiliary. Some are exemplified below.

(1) a. I chanced (*chance) to like Brussels sprouts.
b. You may (might, *will, ?*could, *must) chance to visit her.
(2) a. If you should (*shall) chance to reach Hoboken, . . .
b. *You should (shall) chance to reach Hoboken.
(3) a. Bill had (*has) chanced to write down the license number.
b. Bill may (might, ?could, ?can't, *will, must, *should) have chanced to write down the license number.
(4) a. ?Bill is unlikely to (*seems to, *is believed to) chance to meet her.
b. Bill is unlikely to (seems to, is believed to) have chanced to meet her.

What is going on? This distribution of auxiliary elements is unlike anything known to me elsewhere in English (or elsewhere).

A GRAMMATICAL FICTION

Joan Bresnan,
MIT

Suppose that governed rules exist and that semantic rules are defined over syntactic derivations. Then it is formally possible to derive all instances of predicate complementation from one d.s. type, the one produced by the base rules $V \rightarrow V\ NP$, $NP \rightarrow NP\ S$. This can be done by enriching the T-component.

Let us say that *force* differs from *believe* syntactically only in that it is subject to a governed transformation T_t, which removes the complement subject and daughter-adjoins it to the matrix S to the right of V. Subject-Raising (= It-Replacement), a not dissimilar operation, applies later to verbs like *believe*. One transformation that might be ordered after T_t and before Subject-Raising ($= T_f$) is Pseudo-Clefting. In this way one could capture the facts

*What I forced was . . .

What I believed was . . .

Now since semantic interpretation is defined over derivations, it is no problem that

I forced John to examine the doctor.

and

I forced the doctor to be examined by John.

This content downloaded from 129.2.19.102 on Wed, 24 Apr 2013 23:32:52 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions