

Conference report

CGSW 17

Conference Report by Anna Cardinaletti (University of Venice)

The seventeenth Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop (August 9-10, 2002) was hosted by the University of Iceland, Reykjavík, and was organised by Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. Sixteen talks were given, including two invited talks by Hubert Haider and Luigi Rizzi. (On August 8th, Ken Safir, Rutgers University, gave an opening talk on “Person, perspective and anaphora”).

Hubert Haider (University of Salzburg) opened the conference with a talk on “How to turn German into Icelandic – OV/VO contrasts”. The title question is answered by assuming that head-final structures, which are right-branching structures with regressively licensing heads, are a more basic option than head-initial structures, which contain progressively licensing heads that require head-chaining. A number of properties that differentiate German from Icelandic (scrambling vs. object shift, absence vs. presence of quirky subjects, pro-drop phenomena, and edge effects with adjuncts) correlate with the directionality value of verb licensing: verb licensing to the right provides functional layers whose spec positions can contain object shifted DPs, quirky subjects, and expletive subjects. The system excludes the assumption of both head-initial and head-final Middle-field functional projections in German.

Gereon Müller (IDS, Mannheim) presented a paper on “V/2 = vP/1”. After showing the theoretical inadequacies of the current approaches to verb second, Müller analyses verb second as an instance of remnant movement, eliminating head movement altogether. Contrary to current assumptions, verb second is taken to be the movement of vP to the (unique) specifier of an empty C. The XP in first position thus builds one single constituent with the finite verb in second position. The Edge domain Pied piping Condition, according to which a moved vP contains only the edge domain of its head, guarantees that all non-edge constituents undergo non feature-driven movement to specTP. Those constituents, such as weak object pronouns and some object clauses, that cannot undergo feature-driven movement to specvP, cannot be fronted together with the verb.

Carlos F. de Cuba (SUNY, Stony Brook) gave a talk on “CP-recursion revisited: Limited embedded V2 in Swedish”. An analysis of embedded V2 in terms of CP-recursion is put forward that is however not interpreted as free recursion. In embedded V2, the matrix bridge verb selects a CP*, which in turn selects a CP (bridge and non-bridge verbs therefore differ in their selectional properties: CP* and CP, respectively). Contrary to what is assumed in Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1971), the complement to bridge verbs is associated with more structure in the CP field with respect to the complement to non-bridge verbs. C* hosts a Volunteer-stance operator (see Cattell 1978 and Hegarty 1992), that signals that the truth of the lower CP is not essential to the truth of the whole sentence. Further properties of the construction (such as its optionality, the obligatory presence of the complementizer, and the island effects) follow from the interaction of selectional properties and feature checking.

Eric Mathieu (University College London & University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne) discussed “Partial WH movement and the WH-copy construction in German: a unified approach”. Contrary to Sternefeld (2002), Mathieu argues for a unified account of partial wh-movement (*Was glaubt Uta wen Karl gesehen hat?*) and the wh-copy construction in German (*Wen glaubt Uta wen Karl gesehen hat?*).

The two constructions exhibit inner, wh and adjunct island effects and have identical interpretations. They are split constructions whereby an operator is separated from its semantic restrictor. In a comparative perspective, Mathieu shows that partial wh-movement is not one and the same process in German and Hungarian. In Hungarian, islands effects are different from those exhibited by German, and the WH copy construction is not present. He concludes that no split configuration is instantiated in Hungarian.

Marit Richardsen Westergaard and Øystein Alexander Vangnes (University of Tromsø) examined “WH-questions, V2, and the left periphery of three Norwegian dialect types”. In a microcomparative perspective, they analysed language variation in the position of the finite verb in wh-questions, which in some Norwegian dialects occurs in third position and covaries with the type of wh-element involved (monosyllabic vs. plurisyllabic) and the type of subject (pronoun/familiar DP vs. new information DP). In some dialects, V3 is only exhibited with monosyllabic wh-words. Assuming that monosyllabic wh-words occur in the Force head, V3 is obtained by lack of verb movement to Force. In other dialects, V3 is also found with wh-phrases occurring in specForceP. In these dialects, the Force head is taken not to undergo the requirement of being obligatorily filled, and V3 is also obtained by lack of verb movement to Force. If the verb does not move to Force, the Fin head is not activated. In order to activate it, AgrSP is taken to move to specFinP. Assuming that new information subjects occur in specTP, they are not able to activate AgrSP in order for it to move to specFin. This accounts for the fact that new information subjects never precede the verb in V3. Acquisition data show that children learn V3 orders slightly later than V2 orders, which confirms the proposal that the former are syntactically more complex than the latter.

Ralf Vogel (University of Potsdam) gave an OT talk entitled “Recoverability”. On the basis of examples from German, Icelandic and Korean, Vogel shows that recoverability of the underlying structure from the surface form is crucial for grammaticality. In particular, recovery of some word orders (such as object – subject) is blocked if the surface form could correspond to a less marked word order (such as subject – object). To account for this property, Vogel assumes the bidirectional OT model introduced in Smolensky (1996), for which both the production and the comprehension perspective are necessary. The standard syntactic optimisation is followed by a second step of feedback optimisation, where the surface Phonetic Form is taken as input and the [Logical Form, Semantic representation] pairs are taken as output. Word order freezing is an instance of failure to recover the underlying syntactic structure from a PF. Vogel also shows that ungrammaticality by feedback optimisation is much more sensitive to external factors than ungrammaticality by first optimisation.

Eric Haeberli (University of Reading) addressed “Clause type asymmetries in Old English and the syntax of verb movement”. In Old English, as in modern West Germanic languages such as Dutch and German, the verb occurs in different positions in main and subordinate clauses. The accounts of verb placement developed for Dutch and German cannot however be extended to Old English: they cannot account for the interaction of verb movement with the type of subjects involved, for variable verb placement in subordinate clauses, and for mostly final placement in conjoined structures. Assuming a split INFL structure in Old English, the verb is assumed to move to AgrS in main clauses and to T in subordinate clauses. T has variable directionality, with a higher frequency of head-final T with respect to head-initial T. In subordinate clauses, the AgrS feature is taken to be checked in the local configuration “head-complement”, pace Chomsky (1995). As for conjoined clauses, Haeberli assumes that main clauses can be conjoined either at the CP level or below Fin. In the latter case, Fin features are checked by the finite verb in the first conjunct. Given the above assumption above checking of the AgrS features, movement to T by the verb in the second conjunct is sufficient to also check the features of AgrS, and accounts for the word order properties of coordinate clauses.

Sten Vikner (Århus Universitet) presented a paper “On complex verbs in Germanic that refuse to undergo verb movement”, namely on verbs such as German *uraufführen* ‘to put on a play for the very first time’ and Swiss German *zwüschelände* ‘to have a stopover’ that cannot appear in the V2 position (see also Dutch *herinvoeren* ‘to reintroduce’). Departing from Haider (1993) and Koopman (1995), whose analyses in terms of conflicting prefixes and blocking of overt checking by the outermost prefix, respectively, only account for verbs with two prefix-like particles such as German *uraufführen* and Dutch *herinvoeren*, Vikner suggests that these verbs do not move because they have to fulfill both the requirements imposed on complex verbs of the V^o type (non-separable particle verbs) and the requirements imposed on complex verbs of the V* type (separable particle verbs). These complex verbs can only occur in contexts that are compatible with both analyses, such as the clause-final position. If the restriction is to be interpreted in syntactic terms (restriction on movement), a consequence of the proposed analysis is that German, Swiss German and Dutch do not have V-to-I movement: the clause-final position of finite verbs in embedded clauses must be the same as the position occupied by non-finite verbs in all clauses. In the comparative perspective, the absence of such immobile verbs in Germanic VO-languages has to do with the different order displayed in these languages by V^o verbs (particle-verb) and V* verbs (verb-particle).

Jaume Mateu Fontanals (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) presented a talk on “The DOR regained: Evidence from English and Dutch”. Contra Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001), he argued that the Direct Object Restriction on English resultatives is correct and a syntactic account of resultatives is possible. Resultatives derive from the conflation of two different I-syntactic structures: an unergative argument structure, which is typically associated to an activity, is conflated into the null verb of a transitive argument structure (the resulting complex argument structure is associated to an accomplishment).

Day two began with the second invited talk. Luigi Rizzi (University of Siena) discussed “Cartography and some asymmetries in the theory of locality”. The theory of locality expressed in terms of Relativized Minimality requires an extremely detailed typology of syntactic positions. Concentrating on A’ movements, Rizzi discusses the properties of different occupants of the left periphery (such as topics, foci, adverbs) in terms of a feature system that differentiates argumental features (person, number, gender, case), quantificational features (Q, Neg, measure, focus), modifier features, and topic features. Intervention effects are only expected between elements sharing features of the same class.

Marcel den Dikken (CUNY Graduate Center) reported on “Lexical Integrity, Checking and the Mirror: A checking approach to syntactic word formation”. By suggesting a feature checking approach to derivational morphology, he succeeds in both reconciling the hypothesis of syntactic formation of morphologically complex words with the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis and resolving bracketing paradoxes of the *unhappier* and *ungrammaticality* type. Nominalizations such as *ungrammaticality* are formed in the lexicon and enter the syntactic derivation as adjectives that contain an uninterpretable nominal feature to be checked against the feature of a functional head D. Complex words such as *unhappier* and *ungrammaticality* contain projections for negation, degree, and adjective, whose syntactic activity can be empirically motivated (polarity item licensing, adverbial modification, *so*-anaphora). Although in *unhappier*, affixation of *-er* occurs earlier than affixation of *un-*, Deg is higher than Neg in the syntactic structure, which derives the semantic properties of this type of adjective. A partial reformulation of Baker’s (1985) Mirror Principle derives this result.

Seiki Ayano (Mie University) discussed “The layered internal structure of spatial PP in English and Dutch”. In the spirit of Jackendoff’s (1987, 1990), van Riemsdijk’s (1990), Emonds’ (2000) and Koopman’s (2000) analyses, PPs are decomposed into a [+/-directional] PP embedding a [locational] PP, where the directional P can be covert. Correlating with the head parameter, the directional P is head-

initial in English and head-final in Dutch and German. To account for the fact that directional prepositions can follow the selected DP, movement of the lexical locational P to the functional directional P is assumed. Due to the HMC, this intermediate step is a necessary condition in order for P-to-V incorporation to occur. This accounts for the fact that only directional prepositions can appear separated from the DP, i. e., between the finite auxiliary and the past-participle.

Hedde H. Zeijlstra (University of Amsterdam) addressed the question as to “What the Jespersen Cycle reveals about Multiple Negation: a Dutch study”. After having shown that the history of Dutch negation took place along the lines of the Jespersen cycle (Old Dutch: negative head > Middle Dutch: negative head + negative adverb > Modern Dutch: negative adverb), Zeijlstra discusses the concomitant loss of Negative Concord in Modern Dutch. He suggests that Negative Concord depends on the fact that the negative head only denies the element that it attaches to, and that negative elements after the negation are necessary to deny the complete clause. On the contrary, negative adverbs, which occur in the specifier of NegP, deny the full complement of Neg, hence every negative element in the complement cancels out negation, and double negation languages are obtained. Given this analysis, diachronic changes can be accounted for by a reanalysis of the position of the negative element in NegP.

Maaike Schoorlemmer (Utrecht University), who was the second woman to give a talk at the conference, analysed “Dutch subjective partitives as mixed categories”. Distinguishing subjective partitives as in *hij heeft iets leuks* ‘there is something nice about him’ from objective partitives as in *hij heeft iets leuks* ‘he has a nice thing with him’, Schoorlemmer shows that the former display very clear predicative properties, while the latter include a prenominal adjective. Among other properties, subjective partitives designate a property of a (usually human) entity, do not allow addition of *wat voor*, are only adjectives that occur in predicative position, and only allow quantifiers that occur with both AP and NP. These properties derive from the mixed category status of subjective partitives, which are DPs embedding an AP (which can be modified by degree quantifiers or Deg^o elements). With subjective partitives, the quantifier is taken to lexicalise the features of the head D, which nominalises the adjectival projection.

Jan-Wouter Zwart (University of Groningen) discussed “Right-dislocation vs. extraposition in Dutch”. While extraposition takes place inside CP and involves an in situ complement, Right Dislocation involves generation of the RD-constituent in the specifier of a Background Phrase (BP) above CP and left-ward movement of CP to the specifier of an even higher functional projection, called Foreground Phrase (FP) (cf. Cardinaletti 2002 for a similar analysis for Italian). Both intonational (accented vs. deaccented complement) and syntactic (presence of anticipatory pronoun, type of anticipatory pronoun, Right Roof effects, pied-piping vs. stranding) properties are discussed that distinguish the two types of complements. The different syntactic account of the two constructions also explains why categorial restrictions are only active on extraposed material (CP or PP), why the respective order is fixed (extraposed material precedes right-dislocated material), and why scope is fixed (right-dislocated material have scope on the remainder of the clause).

Øystein Alexander Vangnes (University of Tromsø) closed the conference by talking about “Scandinavian bi-nominal constructions: Evidence for a DP-internal analysis”. Mainland Scandinavian have two binominal constructions: one, similar to English, in which the quantifier *each* follows the share-DP (*the boys got an apple each*), the other in which the quantifier precedes the DP containing a reflexive possessive (*the boys got each his apple*). The latter construction provides evidence that the quantifier and the possessive both occur inside the DP, merged in specDP and D, respectively. Since the quantifier scopes over the possessive, which in turn gets its reference from the subject DP through binding, a straightforward explanation is thus provided for the fact the quantifier is semantically related to the subject DP *the boys*. The analysis of the former construction is only partially different, the main

difference consisting in the fact that the possessive element is empty and forces movement of the complement of D, namely CardP, to the specifier of the highest functional projection in the noun phrase, namely KP (this explains the word order). Crossdialectal differences within Scandinavian are also discussed and reduced to lexical differences among the dialects.

The conference was delighted by a reception at the residence of the German ambassador, a delicious dinner at a fancy fish restaurant, a final banquet at a University residence, and a conference trip to the most famous sight-seeings in Iceland (The Golden Circle), which made all the participants hope for another soon-coming conference in Reykjavík.

References

- Baker, M. (1985) The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation, *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 373-415.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2002) Against optional and zero clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization, *Studia Linguistica* 56.1, 29-57.
- Cattell, R. (1978) On the source of interrogative adverbs, *Language* 54.1, 61-77.
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- Emonds, J. (2000) The flat structure economy of semi-lexical heads. In N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Semi-lexical categories. On the function of content words and the content of function words*, Berlin, Mouton, 1-45.
- Haider, H. (1993) *Deutsche Syntax Generativ*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hegarty, M. (1992) Familiar complements and their complementizers: on some determinants of A'-locality. Ms., University of Pennsylvania.
- Jackendoff, R. (1987) The status of thematic relations in linguistic theory, *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 369-411.
- Jackendoff, R. (1990) *Semantic Structures*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- Kiparsky, P. and C. Kiparsky (1971) Fact. In M. Bierwisch and K. Heidolph (eds.) *Progress in Linguistics*, The Hague, Mouton.
- Koopman, H. (1995) On verbs that fail to undergo V-second, *Linguistic Inquiry* 26.1, 137-163.
- Koopman, H. (2000) *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads. Collected Essays of Hilda J. Koopman*, London, Routledge.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2001) An event structure account of English resultatives, *Language* 77, 766-797.
- van Riemsdijk, H. (1990) Functional prepositions. In H. Pinkster and I. Genee (eds.) *Unity in Diversity: Papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday*, Dordrecht, Foris, 231-241.
- Smolensky, P. (1996) On the comprehension/production dilemma in child language, *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 720-731.
- Sternefeld, W. (2002) Wh-expletives and partial wh-movement. Two non-existing concepts? In W. Abraham and J.-W. Zwart (eds.) *Issues in Comparative German(ic) Typology*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.