

TWELFTH COMPARATIVE GERMANIC SYNTAX WORKSHOP  
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 9-10 January, 1997

by Kleantes K. Grohmann

(from the Germanic Generative Syntax Newsletter, Vol. 13)

The Free University of Amsterdam (VU) hosted the twelfth Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop at the beginning of January, during the coldest winter Europe has seen in over two decades. But the warm reception all participants enjoyed from the organizers made it seem like summer. As usual, the talks were of high quality and the topics varied on a number of interesting aspects in Germanic syntax, synchronically as well as diachronically.

ANS VAN KEMENADE (VU/HIL) opened the workshop with a novel proposal for the change from VO to OV order in the history of English ('`Negation Positions as Word Order Triggers in Older West-Germanic'). Contrasting developments in Old and Middle English (as well as comparing data from older stages of Dutch), she claimed that NEGATION plays a crucial role in fixing the word order. Assuming that Old English was a negative concord language, sentential negation was expressed by a HIGH NEGATIVE PARTICLE (to the left of the finite verb) and in addition by a LOW NEGATION ADVERB, \*na\*. This entered the English language a few centuries before Dutch and German. Following the proposal that negation is in NEGP, DOMINATING TP, and considering that only subject and object clitics can immediately precede na (marginally nominal subjects but never nominal objects, unlike in modern West Germanic cases of scrambling), van Kemenade argued that there might be evidence for a second NegP, lower in the structure, possibly adjoined to VP. There might thus be a cue for the language learner with respect to possible verb and object positions.

KRISTIN EIDE AND TOR AAFARLI (Trondheim) jointly presented the first talk on PREDICATION at CGSW 12 ('`A Predication Operator: Evidence and Effects.'). Looking at \*AS\*-CONSTRUCTIONS in German and Norwegian, they offered semantic and syntactic support for Bowers' (1993) proposal of the existence of PREDP, hosting a predication operator. Eide and Aafarli then went on to argue that VERBS INCORPORATE THIS OPERATOR by virtue of the operator being inherent to the category V, presenting evidence from Scandinavian ergative and passive constructions and considering the status of the EPP (in particular, that PredP plays a role in explaining the EPP). They argued in favor of a parametrized typology of expletive subjects in the Germanic languages.

The second presentation on predication came from DOROTHEE BEERMANN AND LARS HELLAN (Tilburg and Trondheim, '`Prepositional Predicates in German and Norwegian'). Comparing \*FUER/ALS\*-PREPOSITIONAL PREDICATES in German and Norwegian, they concluded that only the former constructions force an INTENSIONAL INTERPRETATION of the nominal. The semantic readings of prepositional predicates can be captured syntactically by different levels of adjunction: above the VP-level (rationale reading), or embedded in VP (such as adjunction to VP (stage reading), AP (function reading), V (confirmative reading) as well as adjunction inside the V-shell (specificational reading)); \*fuer\*-predicates solely receive a scaling reading which corresponds to adjunction to VP. There is a crucial difference with respect to PREDICATION AND NEXUS such that the set of constellations for predication is included in the set of nexal configurations (binary relation).

The first invited speaker, ANTHONY KROCH (UPenn), subjected the V2 PHENOMENON to the minimalist principle of MOVE-F(eature) ('`V2, Empty Expletives, and Attract F'). Arguing that the EPP-feature must be more general than just a D-feature (predication requirement), Kroch proposed

that the V2-constraint can be satisfied in IP. TP as the highest projection within IP thus hosts the subject and bears the EPP-FEATURE. Furthermore, as INFL in Old English may be MEDIAL OR FINAL (IOV vs OVI), the verb moves to I° when in second position and not at all when final-CP does not need to be activated for the V2-constraint. Topics find their spot in CP, as do preposed elements in true V3-constructions. These do not interfere with V2 as the V2-constraint will be satisfied at the IP-level. Attract F, then, ensures that the subject need not move higher than SPEC,TP and at the same time may attract any appropriate element (EPP) in which case the verb may raise from T. The approach nicely takes care of the problem of apparent and true V3-phenomena and shows the need to extend the notion of the EPP.

FRANK DRIJKONINGEN (Utrecht) looked at Kayne's (1994) ANTISYMMETRY hypothesis and investigated its possible implementation in morphology ('`Antisymmetry and the Lefthand Side in Morphology)'). Faced with the problem that category-preserving affixation (\*improper\*: \*proper+im\* vs \*im+proper\*) seems dubious, and category-changing prefixation (\*ennoble\*: \*noble+en\* vs \*en+noble\*) impossible under Kaynes theory, Drijkroningen presented an analysis of Dutch participles (which involve CIRCUMFIXATION) and showed that alternative theories (Williams 1981, Selkirk 1982) cannot account for them. The analysis presented here makes use of the X'-structure of PARTP by V-movement to the head of PartP and can be extended to the above cases. Drijkroningen also proposed a proper balance between syntax and morphology based on the notion MAXIMAL ZERO-LEVEL PROJECTION. Category-changing prefixation is then analogous to circumfixation (with a phonetically empty suffix) while category-preserving affixation is affix-movement to a specifier position within the maximal zero-level projection.

OLAF KOENEMAN (Utrecht) opened the debate on V-TO-I MOVEMENT in the Scandinavian languages ('`On V-to-I Movement and Flexible Syntax)'). Trying to reconcile the syntactic differences with respect to V-to-I movement among Scandinavian languages with minimalist assumptions, he proposed to give subject-verb agreement some semantic content in order to account for the asserted differences. Based on Rohrbacher's (1994) observations, Koeneman advanced a definition of (minimal) REFERENTIALITY which relates the verbal paradigm to movement based on THETA-ASSIGNMENT. In line with Chomsky's (1995) recent abolition of AgrP, Koeneman analyzed V-to-I as a richer VP-structure for these referential/theta- assigned verbs (FLEXIBLE SYNTAX).

The Friday session began with ELISABET ENGDAHL (Goeteborg) and an interesting proposal for object shift in the Scandinavian languages ('`Object Shift and Information Structure in Scandinavian)'). She correlated OBJECT SHIFT and INFORMATION STRUCTURE, arguing that information status and referential status predict whether an object moves or not. As weak pronouns (the only kinds of object to move) in a WIDE VP-FOCUS may be shifted, although unstressed, a deeper structure of the information component seems to be supported. Relevant in this context are weak pronouns (even clitics?) and a syntactic ordering of adverbs. Information structure might then account for the difference between "Kalle [HAEMTADE dem] inte utan [stannade HEMMA]" `Kalle didn't collect them but stayed home' vs "Kalle haemtade inte [HENNE] utan [HONOM]" `Kalle didn't collect her but him' and "Kalle haemtade dem inte" `Kalle didn't collect them' vs "\*Kalle haemtade DEM inte" (capitals denote stress, brackets indicate the focal domain).

In turn, ANDERS HOLMBERG (Tromso) presented a different tackle on the issue, based on PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES ('`Object Shift and Phonological Features)'). He proposed an OBJECT SHIFT FILTER which says: \*[Obj Adv X] unless X is phonologically empty. Thus, in Swedish, when the shifted object and its trace are separated by a preposition, another argument, or a particle, the constellation is rendered ungrammatical. The phonological part (Hellan 1994 proposed a PF-rule

for object pronoun shift) interacts with semantics/information structure, expressed by the feature [+focus]. Holmberg argued that [+focus]-elements must be checked VP-internally, while [-focus] needs to be checked in the IP-domain. By BUNDLING FOCAL AND PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES together, Holmberg's analysis appears to account well for the data across the Scandinavian languages.

Semantic and syntactic RECONSTRUCTION in German was the topic of WINFRIED LECHNER's talk (UMass, ``On Semantic and Syntactic Reconstruction''). In an extensive paper, Lechner argued that (only) weak quantifiers may leave behind A TRACE OF A HIGHER SEMANTIC TYPE which serves to interpret quantifier scope ambiguity by semantic reconstruction based on the type of trace (see Cresti 1995, Kratzer 1995, Rullmann 1995) and hence dispenses with quantifier raising. A RESTRICTED COPY THEORY correctly predicts that scrambled NPs and CPs do not syntactically reconstruct. It also forces a strong interpretation for scrambling, so that scrambling of one QP over another feeds ambiguity via semantic reconstruction but bleeds the non-presuppositional reading of the scrambled QP (following Heim 1992). Lechner's analysis also accounts for asymmetries arising in OPAQUE CONTEXTS (Zimmermann 1992).

The second invited speaker, Hoskuldur Thrainsson (Iceland), gave an inspiring presentation of syntactic research in VERB MOVEMENT AND OBJECT SHIFT in the Scandinavian languages (``Verbs, Adverbs, and Objects''). Asking himself and the audience what the past decade aimed at explaining with respect to a) facts from one language, b) the difference between facts from two languages and c) the reason for the difference, and whether the attempts were successful, Thrainsson concluded that the fruitful discussions and debates indeed showed significant progress. He presented a clear and extensive history of past and present analyses before sharing some ideas of a very recent paper (Bobaljik and Thrainsson 1997): assuming the SPLIT IP PARAMETER (Thrainsson 1996) and some minimalist extensions of feature checking (head-complement configuration as a relevant local relation), Mainland Scandinavian was claimed to lack V-to-I movement because I° can check the relevant features of V directly (no split IP, head-complement relation between T and VP); Case is checked VP-internally (head-complement relation between V and DP). The optionality of object shift in Icelandic may be connected to a specificity feature while apparently non-moved definite DP objects move VACUOUSLY.

OYSTEIN ALEXANDER VANGSNES (Bergen) presented a detailed analysis of DEMONSTRATIVE AND POSSESSIVE constructions in the Scandinavian languages (``On Demonstrative and Possessive Constructions in Scandinavian''). The Scandinavian languages collectively allow for a wide variety of demonstrative and possessive constructions in conjunction with definite articles, but no dialect allows every possible construction. The aim of this paper then was to give a TYPOLOGICAL account of what is possible in which dialect, coupled with an explanation and a PARAMETRIZED analysis. A detailed structure of the DP (including AgrP, NumP, AP, and an additional FP) and MOVEMENT WITHIN DP account for all possibilities in the respective dialects, and the differences can then be captured by parametrizing some of these movement operations.

The final talk of CGSW 12 was presented by TEUN HOEKSTRA (Leiden/HIL, ``Word Order in Nominal Constructions''). The proposal forwarded here aimed at reanalyzing \*OF\*-INSERTION: such nominal constructions then resemble small clauses in being CPs, with *of* as the head of CP. Hoekstra's motivation involves NOMINAL INFINITIVES in Dutch which, when bare, never take a determiner ("(\*het) roken" `smoking' vs "het roken van sigaren" `the smoking of cigars') and whose structure is clausal. One possible implication of Hoekstra's proposal is a further argument in favor of OVERT OBJECT MOVEMENT IN ENGLISH,

analogous to that of the other West-Germanic languages.

The entire workshop was well prepared and organized; hence it was no wonder that all talks started on time and were well moderated with plenty of time for interesting discussions afterwards. A good number of coffee breaks ensured that one could join all talks and still be alive in the evening. This was important on Friday, of course, when CGSW and HILP (the phonology conference taking place at the same time, also at VU) jointly celebrated the new year, great talks and whatever reasons we could find to down a few beers, talk about language and the world, and experienced an awesome presentation of a bunch of phonologists: the HILP-Band to everyone's delight played great music from 9pm to 1am (piano, guitars, drums, bongos and harmonica with mixed vocals). This party was a nice round-up for a successful workshop and I am sure to speak for everyone else that we were all looking forward to CGSW 13 at Cornell on July 18-20, 1997.

This Conference Report was published previously in *Glott International* 2.5, and is reprinted here by permission of the publisher.