On a More Demanding Approach to Suppletion*

Richard S. Kayne
New York University

December, 2020


1.
     A familiar way of thinking about suppletive pairs such as English *go/went* is to think that the impossible *\*goed* is excluded as a consequence of the idiosyncratic availability of *went*.  In Kayne (2019a), I suggested that this way of thinking about *go/went* is not satisfactory.  We should instead look for an account of the impossibility of *\*goed* that is independent of *went*.  And then we should study the properties of *went* in a way that is at least in part independent of *\*goed*.
     This approach to *go/went*, which I will be pursuing in this paper, had as a precursor Postma's (1993) analysis of suppletion involving *be* and its counterparts in Romance and Germanic.  Of particular relevance is his saying: "The cross-linguistic defective nature of BE makes it probable that [was] is in the lexicon as a form of BE because of the *structural impossibility* of [I be-ed] or [I am-ed], rather than the other way around.  If this is true, the defective nature of BE does not stem from the lexicon, but must have an inherent morpho-syntactic origin...if two roots supplete each other within a paradigm, the complementary distribution of these roots reflect a complementarity of *syntactic* features".
     A second precursor of the present paper is Barbiers's (2007) study of the (cross-linguistic) absence of *\*oneth* as an ordinal.  Again of particular relevance is his saying: "...suppletion applies when a regular morphological process is blocked for independent reasons...".
     Postma (1993) and Barbiers (2007) both explicitly depart, then, from the familiar view that suppletion is merely an accidental replacement of an expected form by an unexpected one.
     Barbiers took the absence of ordinal *\*oneth* to follow more specifically from *one* not being a numeral like the others, from *one* being indefinite in a sense in which the other numerals are not.[1]  In much the same spirit, Kayne (2017) took *one* to be a combination of the indefinite article with a classifier.  (In effect, the term 'numeral' as applied to *one* is misleading.)  Barbiers took *first* to be a superlative form, not strictly speaking an ordinal at all.
     For Barbiers, *\*oneth* does not accidentally give way to *first*;  *\*oneth* is excluded for principled reasons (having to do with *one* not being an ordinary numeral) that have

_____

[1]In English this prohibition extends to:
  i)  the twenty-first/*twenty-oneth letter of the alphabet
(Why French differs from English here remains to be understood.)  Erik Zyman (p.c.) notes the additionally intriguing:
  ii)  We need to find the n-plus-first member of this ordered set.
  iii)  We need to find the n-plus-oneth member of this ordered set.
For him (ii) is perfect and (iii) acceptable though marked.

nothing to do with *first*; *first* in turn has its own properties, e.g. that of being a superlative. There is no sense in which the absence of *oneth* is due to the existence of *first*, no sense in which the absence of *oneth* is to be attributed to 'competition' from *first*. If anything, it is the existence of *first* that is due to the impossibility of *oneth*.[2]

As Barbiers discusses, the cross-linguistic absence of *twoth* is much less pronounced than that of *oneth*. For him, that is not surprising if *two* lacks the indefinite character of *one*. For Kayne (2017), that would correspondingly not be surprising if *two* is not built on an indefinite article. There remains that fact that *twoth* is excluded in English and in various other langugages. Possibly, its absence in English and in those languages is related to Kayne's (2019b) proposal that *two* is to be analyzed as minimal coordination.

The contrast between languages allowing an acceptable counterpart of *twoth* and those like English that do not (or those like French that have both *deuxième* ('two-th') and *second*) yields a challenge of the comparative syntax sort, where comparative syntax must now be understood as covering morphology, too. (In this case, we need to ask what other morphosyntactic properties that distinguish, say, English from French, might be correlated with the difference concerning *twoth* vs. *deuxième*.)

Comparative syntax, now interpreted to cover classical questions of 'morphology',[3] needs to attack differences in verbal (or nominal) paradigms, too. For example, the French counterpart of *go* has some *v*-initial forms only in the present indicative, whereas Italian has some in both the present indicative and present subjunctive. What might that difference be correlated with?[4] (I return to the French counterpart of *go* later on.)

2.

Generalizing from the discussion so far, suppletion should invariably be thought of in the way suggested by Postma and Barbiers. In every case of suppletion, we must ask why the non-occurring expected form is impossible. In no case of suppletion will it be satisfactory to say that the expected form is impossible merely because there exists an unexpected form able to 'take its place'. In every case of suppletion, the opposite will be closer to the truth; the existence of the unexpected form will be an indirect side effect of the impossibility of the expected one. There will be no direct competition between the two.

Kayne (2019a) explicitly took the above tack in the case of English *goed* and *went*. *Goed* is not impossible because of competition frm *went*. Rather *goed* is excluded as

_____

[2]This is assuming that languages must have a way of expressing what *first* expresses. As Chris Collins (p.c.) observes, though, we could imagine a language in which 'first' is expressed by some complex paraphrase.

[3]In this vein, there should in addition come into being in the future a (micro-) comparative syntax of idioms (which would bear directly on the question of Chomsky's (1986, 98; 1995, sect. 4.1) Full Interpretation proposal).

[4]Part of the answer may have to do with the fact that the Italian subjunctive forms (*vada(no)*) contain an *-ad-* that has no counterpart in French.

a subcase of a more general fact about English, namely that all English light verbs are incompatible with the regular -*ed*:[5]

(1) *\*beed, \*haved, \*doed, \*goed, \*comed, \*taked, \*bringed, \*putted, \*getted, \*gived, \*maked, \*letted, \*sayed, \*canned, \*willed, \*shalled, \*mayed, \*musted*.

*Went* in turn has its own properties. It is a form of *wend*, parallel to the pairs *send/sent* and *spend/spent* and *bend/bent* and *lend/lent*; in addition *went* makes a reduced semantic contribution as compared with *wend*. Thinking of van Riemsdijk (2002) on silent GO in Swiss German and of Collins (2007, 26) having taken *the way home* in English to be as in:

(2) the way GO home

I suggested in that paper that the proper analysis of *They went home* might well have a silent GO accompanying *went*, as shown in:

(3) they went GO home

with the manner interpretation associated with *wended* not present with *went*.

If *wend* minus its manner interpretation is interpretively equivalent to *go*, then (3) amounts to a kind of verb doubling. Instead, or in addition, it might be that (3) is to be seen as an instance of a serial verb construction, of the sort illustrated in the following:[6]

(4) Ekpe *fo* kɔpo yi xɔ-me. ('rock hit cup go room-in')

(5) Me a kplɔ Ama yi Lome. ('I fut. lead Ama go Lome')

with the difference that in these Ewe examples *yi* ('go') is overt, while in (3) it is silent.[7]

The presence of silent GO in (3) has a partial counterpart in Kayne's (2018) analysis of a certain question concerning Romance third person pronouns, which usually have an *l* (as in French *elle, la, il, lui...*). But third person possessive pronouns (of the sort that can agree) often show an unexpected *s-* (as in French *son, sa, ses, sien...*). The solution I proposed in that paper did not have *l-* in the relevant cases 'outcompeted' by *s-*.

Rather, as in the general case of suppletion, we must take there to be (at least) two substantially separate questions. Why is *l-* excluded from the relevant possessives (e.g. French *son père* ('his/her father') vs. *\*lon père*)? And then, what are the properties of this *s-*?

The *s-* that appears in these Romance possessives turns out to almost certainly be identical to reflexive *s-*, to reciprocal *s-*, to middle *s-*, to impersonal *s-*, to neuter *s-* and to the *s-* of Spanish 'spurious' *se*. Doubling of a certain sort is central to the syntax of this *s-*. As is the presence of silent elements, more specifically silent pronouns.

_____

[5]Why this generalization about English light verbs holds remains to be understood. Adriana Belletti (p.c.) suggests that the occurrence of *\*goed* in child English might reflect the absence in such child English of the distinction between light and non-light verbs. Further questions about child English now arise, along with questions about the comparative morphosyntax of light verbs.

[6]Examples from Collins (1997, 483, 487).

[7]A silent GO also seems called for in:

i) He limped into the room.

ii) Into the closet with those toys!

although as Edwin Williams (p.c.) notes, one needs to consider the possibility of GET, in particular for (ii); relevant to (ii) is the existence in some English of:

iii) Come in with you!

But what is more central to the present paper is the question of Romance third person pronominal *l-*.  Just as in the case of *oneth and in the case of *goed, the initially unexpected absence of possessive *lon (père)* is not to be understood as the result of competition (from *son (père)*).  If anything, the reverse is closer to true (though without any notion of competition); the existence of *son* as a possessive is a side effect, informally speaking, of the impossibility of *lon*.

The proposal I made in that paper was, thinking of the close relation between third-person pronouns and definite articles suggested by Postal (1966), that the prohibition against possessive *lon is akin to the prohibition against the appearance within English deverbal compounds of either pronouns or definite articles (e.g. *a Nixon-hater* vs. **a him-hater*; as well as *a real Brooklyn-lover* vs. **a real the Bronx-lover*).

This prohibition (which for principled reasons doesn't come into play with French possessive *leur* ('their') or with Italian possessive *loro* ('their')) is, in a way parallel to the discussion of *oneth and *goed, independent of the existence of Romance possessives in *s-*.

3.
Postma (1993, note 10) had already suggested that *good/better/best* might be at bottom syntactic.  Part of his idea was that *good* might be a noun (at DS), thinking of *That's no good/*big*.  If so, then **gooder* would be akin to **breader*.  In which case, the impossibility of **gooder* would not be due to the existence of *better*, or to any notion of competition.

Of course *good* doesn't look nominal in *very good, too good*, etc.  Possibly there's a link between *very good* and the French:
(6)  Nous avons très faim ('we have very hunger' = 'we're very hungry')
where what is almost certainly a noun (*faim*) is modified by a word *très* that normally does not modify nouns.  Possibly, there is some other account waiting to be discovered for **gooder*.  Whatever the correct account, the expectation is now that it will not be of the form 'outcompeted by *better*'.

If anything, the expectation is that *better* will have distinctive properties of its own that may to one extent or another depart from those of *good*.[8]  One such example is shown in:
(7)  You've written a good many papers this year.
(8)  *You've written a better many papers this year than I have.
where a certain use of *good* has no comparative counterpart.  Fairly close to (7) is:
(9)  It's going to take you a good two weeks to finish that paper.
Again there is no corresponding comparative:
(10)  *It's going to take you a better two weeks to finish that paper than this one.
Less close to (7) is:
(11)  You have a goodly sum of money now.
though also with no comparative:
(12)  *You have a betterly sum of money than you used to have.[9]
_____
[8]Cf. Gouskova and Bobaljik (2019, note 10).
[9]Although in this pair there might be a link to:
  i)  Mary solved the problem quickly/*quickerly than John.
If so, then *goodly* vs. **betterly* is not specific to *good/better*.

There are also cases where *better* is available, but not *good* (or *well*):

(13)  You had better/*good/*well work harder.

Another is:

(14)  You'd be better/*good/??well off confessing.

A third is given in:

(15)  You needn't be deferential toward your betters.

(16)  You needn't be deferential toward your equals/*goods/*wells.

In the realm of health, *better* has the very particular property illustrated in:

(17)  I'm all better/*bigger/*happier/*smarter now.

(18)  *I'm all better than I was yesterday.

where *better* does not seem comparative at all.[10]

That *better* (and similarly for *best*) has its own properties is further suggested by the fact that it is also a comparative of *well*.  Of course that fact is itself related to the fact that *good* and *well* have much in common.  One might even think of *well* as suppletive for adverbial *\*goodly*, as in:

(19)  They speak French very well/*goodly.

But again our expectation is that the deviance of adverbial *\*goodly* will ultimately find its own account (as will the deviance of adverbial *\*weller*), and that *well* will have properties of its own distinct from those of *good*.

On *well* itself, we can note:

(20)  It's well beyond its expiration date.

(21)  He's well into his fifties.

and the not surprising:

(22)  *This one is weller beyond its expiration date than that one.

(23)  *He's weller into his fifities than she is.

What is surprising is that *better* is also not possible here:

(24)  This one is further/*better beyond its expiration date than that one.

(25)  He's further/*better into his fifties than she is.

(With *better*, these examples are possible in a different, irrelevant sense.)  The *well* of (20) and (21) has no well-formed comparative.[11]

Another example of a discrepancy between *well* and *better* is seen in:

(26)  I may well have made a mistake here.

(27)  *I may better have made a mistake here than there.

That *better* does not systematically track *well* is also indicated by:

(28)  We might as well leave now.

(29)  *We might as better leave now than later.


4.  Anti-synonymy

The idea that suppletive pairs are independent lexical items that, despite overlap, nonetheless display discrepancies such as those mentioned in the previous section in

_____

[10]Unless *all better* is as in:

i)  all better THAN <all>

with *all* the 'complement' of silent THAN*,* and with *all* (somewhat) idiomatically interpreted as *everything*.

[11]The relation between *far* and *further* needs to be looked into.  Possibly, the *-th-* of *further* is the same as that of *other, rather*.

the case of *good, well, better* has something in common with the traditional idea that there are (virtually) no pairs of (monomorphemic) lexical items that are perfect synonyms.[12]

   An interesting test case in English is that of *whole* and *entire,* which yield pairs of sentences such as the following, with no discernible difference in interpretation that I can see:
   (30)  We spent the whole day working.
   (31)  We spent the entire day working.
Yet *whole* and *entire* diverge in various ways:
   (32)  That's a whole/*entire different question.
   (33)  It's hard to make a broken glass whole/*entire again.
   (34)  We're not interested in fractions here, just whole/*entire numbers.
   (35)  They have ?a whole/*an entire three students taking their seminar.
   (36)  On the whole/*entire, we agree.
   (37)  That's the whole/*entire of it.
   (38)  That's a whole/*entire lot of money you're spending there.
   (39)  They're always eating whole/*entire wheat bread.
   The question of perfect synonyms arises cross-linguistically, too.  Are there cases in which a lexical item from one language is a perfect synonym of a lexical item from another language?  If perfect cross-linguistic synonymy were common, translation would be much easier than it is.  If perfect cross-linguistic synonymy is (much) rarer than we might have thought (even in the functional vocabulary), that suggests that we're able to see linguistic primitives appreciably less often than we might have thought.


5.
   English *be* translates into Spanish as either *ser* or *estar*, depending on various factors discussed in detail by Gallego and Uriagereka (2016), who take *estar* to correspond to *ser* plus an incorporated (prepositional) X.  Myler (2018), on the other hand, treats the Spanish pair as an instance of allomorphy, which is incompatible with Postma (1993) and in particular with Postma's argument that "BE is in fact an inflected SE particle", with Postma taking the *ser* type of copula, but not the *estar* type, to be pronominal (of the *s-* type mentioned earlier).  (This distinction correlates with the appreciably greater morphological irregularity of *ser*, as compared to *estar*.)
   Italian *essere* and *stare* are fairly similar to the Spanish pair *ser* and *estar*.  French is more like English, in having only *être*.  Myler's (2018) suppletive approach to Spanish leads to the expectation that French *être* should appear in the union of contexts in which Spanish *ser* and *estar* appear.  But while Spanish and Italian both have a robust use of *estar/stare*+gerund that's close to English progressive *be*+gerund, French does not allow progressive *être*+gerund (despite having an *-ant* form that is gerund-like in sentences matching English *Having told the truth,...*).[13]


6.
_____

[12]Cf. Fowler (1946, 591), Ullmann (1975, 180).
[13]Relevant here, in a way that needs to be looked into, is the fact that French lacks the overt present participle (*-nte*) vs. gerund (*-ndo*) distinction that both Spanish and Italian have.

One might be tempted to think of English *many, much* as forming a suppletive pair sensitive to whether the syntactic context is count or mass. If, on the other hand, they are distinct lexical items, we are not surprised by:

(40)  A great/good many hours have been wasted on this project.

vs.

(41)  *A great/good much time has been wasted on this project.

(42)  *Great/good much time has been wasted on this project.

Neither *many* nor *much* has a regular comparative, as shown by *manier* and by *mucher*. One has instead *more*. From the present perspective, it is not satisfactory to simply say that *more* stands in for the expected *manier, *mucher*. One must ask why *manier* and *mucher* are impossible to begin with. (And it is not satisfactory to say that they are impossible simply because *more* is available.)

That one must look for a reason for the impossibility of *manier, *mucher* that is independent of the existence of *more* is clearly supported by Bobaljik's (2012, 124) cross-linguistic point that "Suppletive patterns for 'many, much' are in fact among the most common source of suppletive paradigms".

Barbiers's (2007, 869) proposed that "comparative and superlative formation on the basis of ONE, MANY and the cardinal numerals is blocked because these words are not adjectives". If *many* and *much* were to turn out to be nouns, then *manier* and *mucher* would not be expected in the first place, and similarly for other languages.

That *more* is to some extent independent of *many* and *much* is supported by the fact that *more* itself can modify adjectives in a way that *much* (and *many*) cannot:[14]

(43)  This question is more important than that one.

(44)  *This question is much important.

This suggests that taking *more* to be a substitute for *mucher* (or by extension *manier*) is less straightforward than it might have seemed. An alternative in the spirit of the preceding discussion might instead look toward the syntax of *enough*, and in particular toward the fact that *enough* cooccurs with silent/deleted MUCH, as in:

(45)  You've had enough coffee for today.

as argued for such sentences by Jackendoff (1977, 152), against the background of the impossible:

(46)  *You've had enough much coffee for today.

(47)  *You've had much enough coffee for today.

The analysis of *more* that now suggests itself is illustrated by the following (cf. (3) above on '...went GO...'):[15]

_____

[14]Cf. Bresnan (1973, 276) and Jackendoff (1977, 142)).

*So* is arguably not itself adjectival in:

i) *This question is important; too much so for us to ignore it*

For relevant discussion, cf. Corver (1997).

[15]*More* is plausibly '*mo*+comparative-*er*' (and *most* '*mo*+superlative-*est*'), in which case questions arise as to the exact relation between *mo-* and *much* and *many*, along with the question whether or not *m-* is a separate morpheme.

Possibly, the -*e*- of what we think of as superlative -*est* is also a separate morpheme (the same as the -*e*- of comparative -*en*), thinking of *best, worst, first, most, least, last*, and maybe *next*, which lack the -*e*- for reasons that cannot be simply phonological, given *dearest, crassest*.

(48)  ... more MANY papers ...
(49)  ... more MUCH time ...
(50)  ... more MUCH important ...

in which *more* is, parallel to *enough*, a modifier of *much* and *many* (which are here silent).[16]

   The impossibility of *mucher* (along with *more much*) in English is paralleled by:

(51)  *John has spent less much time there than you have.

despite the fact that *less much* (like *more much*) is not a synthetic form.  Instead we have:

(52)  John has spent less time there than you have.

to be understood as:

(53)  ...less MUCH time...

just as in (49).

   The impossibility of *manier*, seen in:

(54)  *They have manier friends than we do.

is again paralleled by the non-synthetic:

(55)  *They have less/fewer many friends than we do.

with the following:

(56)  They have fewer friends than we do.

(57)  ?They have less friends than we do.

again to be analyzed as containing:

(58)  ...fewer/less MANY friends ...

parallel to (53).

   The parallelism between *mucher* and *less much* and between *manier* and *less many*, combined with the common analysis indicated in (53) and (58), seems to indicate that the comparative suffix *-er* is not at the heart of things, and that *much/more* is not an instance of suppletion.


7.

   To my ear, *?the least many* and *?the least much*, though deviant, as in:

(59)  ??Of all the students, John's the one who writes the least many papers.

(60)  *?Of all the students, John's the one who drinks the least much beer.

are not quite as bad as *less many* and *less much*.  This recalls Gouskova's (2015) finding that in certain cases English speakers preferred superlatives to comparatives, as well as the fact that synthetic superlatives are clearly more acceptable than synthetic comparatives in phrasal cases like:

(61)  ?That one was definitely the off-the-wall-est of your three recent remarks.

(62)  *That one was definitely the off-the-wall-er of your two recent remarks.

and the same for:

(63)  ?That's definitely the up-to-date-est of your three papers.

(64)  *That's definitely the up-to-date-er of your two papers.

as well as:

(65)  ?the fast-talking-est of his three friends

───────────────────────

[16]Romanian has *mai mulţi* (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2013, 101)) which looks like an overt instance of 'more+much'.  And, as Adriana Belletti (p.c.) points out, so does Sienese Italian, with *più tanto*.

(66) *the fast-talking-er of his two friends

To my ear, the greater acceptability of superlative *-est* in (61)-(66), as compared with comparative *-er*, carries over to trisyllabic adjectives such as *important* and *unstoppable*:

(67) ?the importantest of these three papers

(68) *the importanter of these two papers

(69) ?the unstoppablest of the three basketball players

(70) *the unstoppabler of the two basketball players

as well as to:

(71) ?That door is the openest I've ever seen it.

(72) *That door is opener than it ever was before.

How the facts of (61)-(72) can be reconciled with Bobaljik's (2012) proposal to the effect that superlatives are built on comparatives remains to be determined.[17]

Returning to *better* vs. *\*gooder*, the position I have been taking amounts to saying that there is a root *bett-* that cooccurs with comparative *-er* in a way that is not directly dependent on *\*gooder* being impossible. This position may be comforted by the existence of roots that cooccur with what looks like comparative *-er* (though not with superlative *-st*), without ever otherwise occurring.

I have in mind the *rath-* of *rather*, as in:

(73) Rather than leaving immediately, we should wait a bit.

(74) We'd rather wait than leave.

with the presence of the *than*-clause supporting its comparative character,[18] in particular given the contrast with non-comparative *instead*:

(75) Instead of leaving immediately, we should wait a bit

(76) *Instead than leaving immediately,...

which holds despite the interpretive similarity between (73) and (75). Like *rather* in this respect is *other*, as in:

(77) Other than you, there was nobody we could ask.


8. French 'go'

A different (at first glance) kind of apparent suppletion is found in Romance languages with the verb corresponding to English *go*, which typically has more than one

_____

[17]Also remaining to be determined is how best to effect a link between the text asymmetries holding between *-est* and *-er*, and the following:

  i) leftmost, outermost, northernmost

  ii) *leftmore, *outermore, *northernmore

and similarly for the link between all this and the fact that superlatives move particularly high - for relevant discussion, cf. Kayne (2008, sect. 4) and Rohena-Madrazo (2007).

  Of additional interest is the contrast between (i) and the following:

  iii) *leftleast, *outerleast, *northernleast

with (iii) recalling Bobaljik's (2012, 214) observation that "No language has a synthetic comparative of inferiority"; again, how best to bridge between his observation and (iii) remains to be determined.

[18]Further support comes from Italian, which, as Adriana Belletti (p.c.) points out, has, for *rather*, *piuttosto*, which contains *più* ('more').

root.  Let's take French.[19]  The root for *go* in French is usually *all-*, as it is in the infinitive *aller*, past participle *allé*, gerund/present participle *allant*, imperfect *allais, allait, allions, alliez, allaient* and in the present tense indicative first and second person plural *allons, allez*.

   Whereas in the indicative present tense singular and third person plural, *all-* is absent and *v-* appears:

   (78)  je vais ('I go'); tu vas ('you go'); il/elle va ('he/she goes'); ils/elles vont ('they go')

Rather than having *all-* and *v-* competing with each other for the same 'spot', all of the preceding suggests that they cooccur, with the *vais* of (78) to be understood as:

   (79)  v ALL ais,

with ALL a silent version of *all-*.  In the same vein, *vous allez* ('you go') will have as its verb:

   (80)  V all ez

with V- a silent version of *v-*.

   The conditions that determine the choice of *all-* vs. *v-* will now be interpreted as conditions regulating the possible silence of one or the other (or both) of *all-* and *v-*. (The question why French (and other Romance counterparts of) *aller* is not entirely regular awaits an answer.[20])

   That French allows a pieces of its counterpart of *go* to be silent is reinforced by the future and conditional, which in French are normally built on the infinitive, e.g. we have infinitive *parler* ('to-speak') and future *vous parlerez* ('you will-speak').  But the future tense of 'go', with infinitive *aller*, is not *\*vous allerez*, but rather:

   (81)  vous irez

in which form it is likely that there is no pronounced root at all.  The *-r-* of *irez* is the usual infinitival *-r-*, and the *i-* is almost certainly either the expletive/locative clitic *y*, or else (as Chris Collins has suggested to me) the theme vowel *-i-*, so that *irez* in (81) should be thought of as:

   (82)  V ALL i r ez

with both *v-* and *all-* silent.[21]

9.  Conclusion

   In all cases of suppletion one needs to ask why the unavailable expected form is not well-formed, and one needs to look for an answer that is independent of the existence of the unexpected form.

   In a number of cases, or in perhaps all cases, suppletion can be seen to involve, not direct competition between two forms, but instead two structures that differ in that (at least) one contains a silent element lacking in the other.  If so, then the substitution intuition (e.g. '*went* substitues for *\*goed*') that underlies much work on suppletion must be wrong, in at least some non-negligeable set of cases.

———————————————

[19]On one aspect of Spanish 'go', see Kayne 2020.

[20]As does the question why *v-* and *all-* are never both pronounced at the same time. The restriction of *v-* to present tense (not found with the *v-* of *venir*) might be akin to the restriction to present tense of the *-y* of Spanish existential *hay*.

[21]It may be worth entertaining the possibility that French *v+all* corresponds, minus the -*k*, to English *walk*, with a possible link in that case to *tell/talk*, as suggested by Erich Groat (p.c.).

If so, we have the usual question of why an intuition that seemed natural would turn out not to match the workings of the language faculty.

This question brings to mind the fact that substitution was actually a part of syntactic theory in the 1960s and into the 1970s. A position vacated by postposing of the agent could in passives subsequently be filled by preposing of the object.[22] *There*-insertion sentences could be derived by moving the subject out of subject position and then replacing it with expletive *there*.[23]

Substitution in this old sense[24] is not, on the other hand, a viable option in bare phrase structure and its descendants. So it may be that that is what forces the language faculty away from a substitution approach to suppletion (including in the case of affixes), whether that approch were to be formulated in terms of late insertion or in some other way.[25]

*This paper, which closely follows a talk presented at the NYU workshop *Syntactic Approaches to Morphology* earlier this month, has benefited from many discussions over the years with Chris Collins.

References.
Barbiers, S. (2007) "Indefinite Numerals *One* and *Many* and the Cause of Ordinal Suppletion," *Lingua*, 117, 859-880.
Bobaljik, J.D. (2012) *Universals in Comparative Morphology. Suppletion, Superlatives and the Structure of Words*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Bresnan, J.W. (1973) "Syntax of the Comparative Clause Construction in English," *Linguistic Inquiry,* 4, 275-343.
Chomsky, N. (1986) *Knowledge of Language*, Praeger, New York.
Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Chomsky, N. (2019) "Some Puzzling Foundational Issues: The Reading Program," *Catalan Journal of Linguistics. Special Issue*, 263-285.
Chomsky, N. (2020) "The UCLA Lectures", lingbuzz/005485.
Collins, C. (1997) "Argument Sharing in Serial Verb Constructions," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28, 461-497.
Collins, C. (2007) "Home Sweet Home," *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics,* 1, 1-34. (http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001967)
Corver, N. (1997) "*Much*-Support as a Last Resort," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28, 119-164.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C. and I. Giurgea (eds.) (2013) *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, *Volume I, The Noun Phrase*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

───────────────────────

[22]Cf. Emonds (1976, 97).

[23]Cf. Emonds (1976, 105).

[24]See in particular Chomsky (2019, 266, 276; 2020, 41). Chomsky (1995, chap. 4, note 18) makes it clear that his chapter 4 was using the term differently: "The term *substitution,* borrowed from earlier theory, is now somewhat misleading because the position of substitution is "created" by the operation, but I continue to use it in the revised sense."

[25]For example, by having a more specific form (such as *bett-*) override an already merged more general form (such as *good*), in some context.

Emonds, J. (1976) *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax,* Academic Press, New York.

Fowler, H.W. (1946) *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, Oxford University Press.

Gallego, Á.J. and J. Uriagereka (2016) "Estar = Ser + X," *Borealis*: *An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 5, 123-156.

Giurgea, I. (2013) "The Syntax of Determiners and Other Functional Categories," in Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2013), 97-174.

Gouskova, M. and J.D. Bobaljik (2019) "Allomorphy and Vocabulary Insertion," ms., NYU and Harvard.

Gouskova, M. (2015) "Roots, affixes, and prosodic words in phonological selection. The case of the English comparative bracketing paradox," talk presented at Roots IV, NYU.

Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kayne, R.S. (2008) "Some Preliminary Comparative Remarks on French and Italian Definite Articles", in R. Freidin, C.P. Otero and M.L. Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 291-321 (reprinted in Kayne 2010).

Kayne, R.S. (2010) *Comparisons and Contrasts*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kayne, R.S. (2017) "English *One* and *Ones* as Complex Determiners" in G. Sengupta, S. Sircar, M.G. Raman and R. Balusu (eds.) *Perspectives on the Architecture and Acquisition of Syntax. Essays in Honor of R. Amritavalli*, Springer Nature, Singapore, 77-114 (reprinted in Kayne (2019c)).

Kayne, R.S. (2018) "Toward an Understanding of Apparent Suppletion in Romance Pronominal Possessives", *Probus*, 30, 251-276.

Kayne, R.S. (2019a) "What is Suppletion? On *\*goed* and on *went* in Modern English", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 117, 434-454.

Kayne, R.S. (2019b) "Some Thoughts on *One* and *Two* and Other Numerals", in L. Franco & P. Lorusso (eds.) *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation – Contributions in Honor of M. Rita Manzini,* De Gruyter Mouton (reprinted in Kayne (2019c)).

Kayne, R.S. (2019c) *Questions of Syntax*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kayne, R.S. (2020) "A Note on the Silent GO That Underlies an Instance of Apparent Suppletion in Spanish", *Isogloss*, 6/4, 1-12.

Myler, N. (2018) "Complex copula systems as suppletive allomorphy," *Glossa*: *a journal of general linguistics*, 3(1), 1-43.

Postal, P.M. (1966) "On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English," in F.P. Dineen, edl, *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 177-206 (reprinted in Reibel, D.A. and S.A. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English* (1969), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).

Postma, G. (1993) "The Syntax of the Morphological Defectivity of BE," HIL Manuscripts, 3, 31-67.

Riemsdijk, H. van (2002) "The Unbearable Lightness of Going. The Projection Parameter as a Pure Parameter Governing the Distribution of Elliptic Motion Verbs in Germanic", *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5, 143-196.

Rohena-Madrazo, M. (2007) "Superlative Movement in Puerto Rican Spanish and General Spanish," *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1,

Ullmann, S. (1975) *Précis de sémantique française*, Éditions A. Francke, Berne.