CGSW 16

Conference report

by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, University of Leiden

The sixteenth Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop (May 5-6, 2001) was hosted by McGill University in Montréal and was organised by Susi Wurmbrand and Jonathan David Bobaljik. Amidst an abundance of muffins, noodle soup and bagels with cream cheese, and under a scorching summer sun, 14 talks were given, including two invited talks (by Ellen Prince and Henk van Riemsdijk). The atmosphere was relaxed and friendly, the discussion in-depth and stimulating (with Ken Safir as an unexpected guest star).

Marcel den Dikken (CUNY Graduate Center) opened the conference with a talk on 'Direct and parasitic polarity item licensing'. He focused on the (previously undiscussed) negatively polar use of Dutch *heel* 'whole'. Den Dikken argued that 'polar-*heel*' can be licensed either under an overtly established Spec-Head-agreement with the negative head Neg° or parasitically via overtly established connectedness to the licensing chain of another NPI, thus making polar-*heel* a non-empty analogue to an A'-bound gap. On a comparative note, Den Dikken pointed at a possible correlation between the presence of polar-*heel* and the absence of negative concord.

Joanna Blaszczak (University of Potsdam) and Hans-Martin Gärtner (ZAS, Berlin) presented a paper on 'Intonational phrasing, discontinuity, and the scope of negation'. They addressed some open questions in the theory developed in Kayne (1998) and argued that a quantifier Q can only extend its scope over a region á if á is linearly continuous and realized as a single prosodic unit. On the one hand this allowed them to do away with Kayne's constraint on long particle preposing, while on the other hand it enabled them to link wide scope of quantifiers to the possibility of restructuring, a link which they claimed to be empirically motivated on the basis of German and English data.

Uli Sauerland (Tübingen University) presented a case study 'On the syntax of antidistributivity markers'. He studied the syntactic properties of the Q-bound reading of 'different' (and its German counterpart), of German *je* and of English *each*. Sauerland proposed that the syntax of *different* and *anders* involves comparative ACD, analogous to that found in elliptical degree comparatives (cf. Bresnan 1973), while German *je* has the syntax of inverse linking constructions. With respect to binominal *each*, he presented two possible analyses, one involving a rule of trace conversion and the other analysing *each* as a distributivity operator over VPs.

Peter Ackema (Utrecht University) and Kriszta Sendrõi (University College London) analysed 'Determiner sharing as an instance of dependent ellipsis'. They argued against Lin (1999) and Johnson (2000), claiming that determiner sharing does involve coordinate ellipsis. Ackema and Sendrõi then expounded a theory of dependent ellipsis, in which the 0-head in a coordinate ellipsis structure can license the heads of its dependents to be 0. This enabled them to account for the properties of D°-sharing noted by McCawley (1993) and others. Furthermore, their theory made a number of predictions (a.o. with respect to object-D°-sharing) which were borne out by English and Dutch data.

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes (University of Bergen) gave a talk entitled 'Passing by numbers: on phrasal movement in the Icelandic noun phrase (and related issues)'. He argued there to be phrasal movement of an AP past a numeral in the Icelandic DP (contra Sigurässon 1993). He identified the morphological richness of the Icelandic adjectival paradigm as the trigger which made this movement possible. Due to the absence of such morphological richness, the other Scandinavian varieties cannot resort to XP-movement when there is an adjective present, and insertion of a lexical article is the generalized strategy. The choice between the two strategies is free, however, in the context of a universal quantifier since the universal quantifier may itself

raise to identify D°.

Jason Liley (University of Delaware) discussed 'The syntax of Germanic post-adjectival articles'. He argued against Kennedy & Merchant's (2000) movement analysis of this construction and claimed that the correct analysis involved a recursive DP-structure. Combining Corver's (1997) distinction between Deg-words and Q-words with Higginbotham's (1985) theory of theta-binding, Liley then argued that Deg-words block theta-binding of an N by its Det, while Q-words do not. As a result only the former trigger the recursive DP-structure. Independent evidence in favour of this analysis came from constructions involving dummy articles in Northern Scandinavian dialects.

The closing lecture of day one of the workshop was the first invited talk. Ellen Prince (University of Pennsylvania) focused 'On 'odd coordinations' in Yiddish, from a discourse perspective'. She argued that so-called odd coordinations in Yiddish are best analysed as conjoined sentences with subject pro-drop in the second conjunct. Her arguments included the absence of sequence-of-tense-effects in odd coordinations (showing that they are not a case of subordination), the behaviour of the indefinite pronoun *men* 'one' and the restrictions on pro drop from the point of view of centering theory.

Day two began with the second invited talk. Henk van Riemsdijk (Tilburg University) discussed 'The unbearable lightness of GOing: phonetically empty light motion verbs in Continental West Germanic'. He analysed constructions whereby modal verbs take directional complements as involving a phonetically empty motion verb GO. Arguments in favour of this analysis came from Swiss German extraposition and verb doubling data. Barbiers's (1995) arguments against PF-deletion of verbs in the complement of modals forced van Riemsdijk to assume that the empty motion verb was stored as such in the lexicon. After extending the empirical coverage of his proposal to include Dutch, German and West Flemish, he concluded that all Continental West Germanic languages have the phonetically empty superlight motion verb GO, but that they differ with respect to its licensing conditions.

Marit Julien (University of Tromsø) addressed 'Optional *ha* in Swedish and Norwegian'. She argued that *ha*-deletion cannot be accounted for by a single principle. In the complement of modals *ha* can only be deleted if the entire sentence is monoclausal, i.e. if the past tense marker on the modal indicates counterfactuality (cf. Kayne 1993, Iatridou 2000). In Swedish embedded clauses, *ha* is only optional if the [+ FINITE] feature of the subclause is identified by an overt subject, whereas in Norwegian this feature is always identified by the finite verb and *ha*-deletion is never an option. With respect to embedded infinitival *ha* in control, raising and ECM-constructions, Julien noted a lot of inter-speaker variation. The analyses she proposed made use of Cinque's (2000) account of restructuring and of Frampton and Gutmann's (2000) notion of feature sharing.

Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (Leiden University) and Marjo van Koppen (Leiden University) examined 'The left periphery in three southern Dutch dialects'. They argued that, given Kayne's (1994) antisymmetric framework, the higher functional domain of (at least) three southern Dutch dialects is more articulated than is assumed by e.g. Haegeman (1992) and De Geest (1995), i.e. that the left periphery of these dialects contains a FinP and an FP (cf. Uriagereka 1995). Their arguments were based on data pertaining to object clitic placement and subject clitic doubling in these three dialects. The postulation of these extra projections allowed van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen to give a straightforward account for a strange doubling effect in constructions involving subject topicalisation.

Milan Rezac (University of Toronto) analysed 'NP-movement in Icelandic'. He showed that object shift and nominative associate movement behave alike with respect to parasitic gaps, weak crossover, binding condition A, the semantic effects they induce and their being related to structural case. On the basis of these similarities, Rezac proposed that both types of NP-

movement target the Spec of T°, whereby object shift can only take place after *v*-to-T°-movement. From this analysis Holmberg's generalisation, the only remaining difference between the two types of movement, followed naturally. In order to account for the differences between English and Icelandic with respect to A-movement, Rezac proposed the T°-parameter: only in Icelandic does T° allow multiple specifiers and does it trigger V-raising.

Ken Hiraiwa (MIT) gave a talk on 'EPP: object shift and stylistic fronting in Scandinavian'. He tried to derive several parametric differences between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian from the Split EPP/Agree-parameter, which states that in Icelandic EPP is not contingent on the operation Agree, whereas in Mainland Scandinavian it is. This explains why object shift is only allowed in the former: the shifted object in Spec,*v*P moves on to Spec,T to satisfy the EPP, thus no longer blocking the Agree-relation between T° and the subject. In Mainland Scandinavian this is not an option and as a consequence full DP object shift is not allowed. The same parameter also explains why only Icelandic allows stylistic fronting: as the EPP-feature of T° is not dependent on Agree, it can be satisfied by any category. Throughout the talk Hiraiwa furthermore argued in favour of a strictly derivational approach to locality and against the phase-based approach of Chomsky (2001).

Joan Maling (Brandeis University) and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir (University of Iceland) reported on 'The 'new passive' construction in Icelandic'. They argued that the so-called 'new passive' construction in Icelandic should be analysed as an active impersonal construction with a phonologically null *pro*-subject. This predicts that binding of anaphors should be possible (as there is a thematic subject), that subject control of participial adjuncts should be possible, that an agentive *by*-phrase should be excluded (as it would be a violation of the theta-criterion) and that unaccusative verbs should be able to occur in this construction. Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir then presented the results of an extensive study of the use of the new passive construction amongst young Icelandic speakers, which showed that their predictions are borne out. Furthermore, they pointed at some geographical variation in their data.

The last talk of the conference was given by Peter Svenonius (University of Tromsø), who, after – quite rightfully – congratulating the organisers with a very successful workshop, focused on 'Case and event structure'. Svenonius argued object case to be the reflex of an uninterpretable aspect-feature on D° (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2000 on nominative case). Structurally, this means that the case of the object-DP is checked in an aspectual head above VP. Svenonius's proposal predicts that the availability of accusative case may vary with the Aktionsart of the verb, a prediction borne out not only by Burzio's generalisation, but also by object case marking in Icelandic. Svenonius showed that the choice between accusative and dative objects in Icelandic is not so irregular and unpredictable as it has been argued to be. He claimed that the dative is used when the DP which is licensed by the Aktionsart of the verb is not a measure of the progress of the event (in the sense of Tenny 1994).

References

Barbiers, S. (1995). *The syntax of interpretation*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
Bresnan, J. (1973). Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 275-343.
Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In: *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge, MA: the MIT-press.
Cinque, G. (2000). *'Restructuring' and functional structure*. Ms. University of Venice.
Corver, N. (1997). *Much*-support as a last resort. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 119-164.
Frampton, J. & S. Gutmann (2000). *Agreement is feature sharing*; Ms. Northeastern University.
Geest, W. de (1995). Cliticisation and clitic doubling in East Flemish. In: *The Berkeley Conference on Dutch Linguistics 1993, Dutch Linguistics in a Changing Europe*. Lanham: University Press of America. 151-170.
Haegeman, L. (1992). *Theory and description in generative grammar: a case study of West Flemish*. Cambridge: CUP.
Higginbotham, J. (1985). On semantics. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 547-594.
Iatridou, S. (2000). The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 231-270.
Johnson, K. (2000). Gapping determiners. In: K. Schwabe & N. Zang (eds). *Ellipsis in conjunction*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

95-115.

Kayne, R.S. (1993). Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. In: *Studia Linguistica* 47, 3-31.

Kayne, R.S. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge: the MIT-press.

Kayne, R.S. (1998). Overt vs. covert movement. In: *Syntax* 1, 128-191.

Kennedy, C. & J. Merchant (2000). Attributive comparative deletion. In: *Natural language and linguistic theory* 18, 89-146.

Lin, V. (1999). Determiner sharing. In: *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33, 241-277.

McCawley, J. (1993). Gapping with shared operators. In: J. Guenter et al. (eds). *Proceedings of BLS 19*. Berkeley: BLS. 245-253.

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2000). T to C movement: Causes and consequences. In: *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge, MA: the MIT-press.

Sigurässon, H.A. (1993). The structure of the Icelandic NP. In: *Studia Linguistica* 47, 177-197.

Tenny, C. (1994). *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Uriagereka, J. (1995). Aspects of clitic placement in western Romance. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79-124.