

THIRTEENTH COMPARATIVE GERMANIC SYNTAX WORKSHOP
Cornell University, Ithaca, 18-20 July, 1997

by Kleantes K. Grohmann

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

In the heat of the summer, the 13th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop took place at Cornell University. We coped with the temperatures in an air-conditioned auditorium that despite its size gave the event a family atmosphere, having plenty of cold refreshments. There were seven talks scheduled for the workshop (on Friday and Saturday afternoons) and we all had the opportunity to attend the four Germanic talks of the HPSG-conference that took place at the same time on Saturday morning. In the following, I will just review the CGSW-talks.

After a warm reception, Norvin Richards (MIT) presented his proposal of the "AgrEverythingPhrase" (which looks shorter in a proper typeset, replacing the lexical item with logical notation!). Implementing the idea of multiple specifiers (Kuroda 1988, Chomsky 1995) into a minimalist framework that also distinguishes nesting and crossing paths (Pesetsky 1982), Richards' proposal yields interesting results for a variety of syntactic constructions. In particular, he looked at Germanic object shift and multiple Wh-movement and showed that movement to multiple specifiers takes place if (i) the paths obligatorily cross and (ii) the highest available mover moves first; otherwise, (iii) movement targets the specifiers of distinct heads if the paths nest. In short, points (i), (ii) and (iii) follow from featural Cyclicity and Shortest Move (Kitahara 1994). Interaction of these principles and a formalized theory of multiple specifiers could account for object shift (crossing paths of argument-movement resulting in movement to multiple specifiers of one projection: AgrEverythingP) as well as multiple Wh-movement (Bulgarian Wh-elements cross their paths too and target multiple specifiers of a single head).

Next were Artemis Alexiadou (ZAS Berlin) and Elena Anagnostopoulou (Tilburg/MIT) with an investigation of the behaviour of "Postverbal Subjects" in Germanic as opposed to Celtic and Romance. The different patterns that are observed (either subject or object or both raising out of VP) can be accounted for by postulating that in the presence of an object, arguments must raise overtly to check formal features. The cross-linguistic differences can be seen as interaction of different requirements of the LF- or PF-component, the TP-parameter and object shift. In particular, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou propose a ban on multiple covert movement for case-checking. Potential counter-evidence coming from Greek, Romanian and Spanish can be explained by the presence of clitic-doubling in these languages.

The Friday session ended with a double-bill on multiple interrogatives in German. Martina Wiltschko (British Columbia/Vienna) started off on the topic "Superiority in German" arguing against the standard claim that German lacks superiority effects. As is well-known, D-linking (Pesetsky 1987) can counter such effects, and Wiltschko's proposal is that scrambling in German serves as an additional trigger for D-linking. Evidence that superiority effects do obtain in German comes from 'was-fuer NPs' that are inherently non-D-linked; secondly, 'wer' or 'was' (which can be either D-linked or not) show superiority effects just in case they appear in a scrambled position (using adverbs as diagnostics where a Wh-argument following the adverb indicates non-D-linking). In short, superiority effects arise if the Wh-element is not D-linked; furthermore, non-D-linking can be forced for testing. Thus scrambling triggers D-linking which in turn counters superiority effects.

Kleanthes K. Grohmann (Maryland) in contrast, defended the standard claim that there is no "German Superiority". It became apparent in discussion before, during and after both talks, that there is a crucial difference in German dialects which may be split into north and south: southern dialects (including or predominantly Austrian) do indeed show superiority effects, while northern do not. Grohmann (from the north) judges basically all of Wiltschko's examples (based on Austrian judgements) as fine. Thus, while Wiltschko's analysis seems to be a fine approach to one variety of German, Grohmann tries to fill in the need to account for the other. Grohmann shares with Wiltschko the intuition that scrambling can counter superiority effects. In particular, he claims that the MLC--which is arguably the minimalist version of the original superiority condition (Kitahara 1994)--is never violated under his assumption (Grohmann 1996) that scrambling over the subject in German is related to topicalization. He also observes that the interpretation of multiple Wh-elements in German differs from single Wh-expressions in a restricted quantified reading. He thus claims that multiple Wh-phrases are topics, drawing from similar claims about Chinese Wh-topics (Wu 1996) and other cross-linguistic data.

The second session was opened by Elly van Gelderen (Arizona State) who presented an account for unexpected behaviour of "Anaphora in Middle English" which do not show the complementarity with respect to pronouns but act as pronominal objects; furthermore, when used, reflexives often appear only as objects of prepositions. The account is based on the feature content of pronouns (phi-features of simple pronouns are less specified) and on inherent Case coupled with the change of 'self' from adjective to noun (reflexives may not appear in a structurally Case-marked position).

Ken Safir (Rutgers) fittingly followed with some thoughts on the "Symmetry and Unity in the Theory of Anaphora", looking at Modern English. Safir set out to distinguish reflexivity from binding, justify principles of reflexive and local binding interpretation and eliminate principles A and B. In this respect, he proposes a symmetric system of binding as well as a unification of the interpretation of semantic reflexivity. He also reformulates the conditions under which an anaphor may be employed as a logophor. Safir proposes syntactic and semantic principles of binding encouraged by missed generalizations on the one hand and internal inconsistencies on the other as proposed by Reinhart and Reuland (1993).

Concluding the the 13th CGSW, Peter Svenonius (Tromsø) talked about "Particle-Verb Incorporation and Participle Agreement in Scandinavian". Extensive data from all Scandinavian languages (and a number of dialects) seem to support an analysis of particles as complements of verbs that incorporate (den Dikken 1995). Differences in behaviour, such as lack of incorporation in some dialects, follow from an intricate connection of A-movement and head movement. Overt participial agreement means that this language has an active Agr, forcing (possibly covert) specification of phi-features on Agr if NP is in SpecAgrP. Svenonius ties in possibilities of incorporation with participial agreement, predicting that active participial Agr makes overt incorporation more economical and hence the only grammatical option.

The small number of talks at the 13th CGSW was acceptable not only due to the option of listening to four more talks at the HPSG-conference but also because the content of all talks was very satisfying, and there were plenty of stimulating discussions during and after the talks. The team at Cornell did a good job organizing the workshop and deserve all our gratitude. We are all full of hopes that more abstracts of high quality will be submitted, allowing for more talks at the next workshop which will take place in January 1999 in Lund.

This conference report is published simultaneously in Glot International 3.1.