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1. Newsdesk

1.1 Announcements and Calls for Papers

a) CGSW 14  b) MORPHOLOGICAL CASE  c) ESSLLI X

a) CALL FOR PAPERS

THE 14TH COMPARATIVE GERMANIC SYNTAX WORKSHOP
January 8-9, 1999, Lund, Sweden

Invited speakers:
Kenneth J. Safir, Rutgers
Jan-Wouter Zwart, Groningen

Deadline for submission of abstracts:
August 1, 1998

The time allotted to each paper is 30 minutes, with an additional
10 minutes for discussion.

Send 3 copies of an anonymous two-page abstract, plus a
camera-ready original with authors name, address, and affiliation,
to

14th CGS
C/o Asa Wikstrom
Institutionen foer nordiska spraok
Helgonabacken 14
S-223 62 Lund
Sweden

Enquiries can be addressed to: christer.platzack@nordlund.lu.se

http://www.nordlund.lu.se/CGS

b) WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENT

EFFECTS OF MORPHOLOGICAL CASE, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics
OTS, Utrecht University, 28-29 August 1998.
Organizers: Helen de Hoop, Olaf Koeneman, Iris Mulders, and Fred Weerman

INVITED SPEAKERS: PAUL KIPARSKY, JOAN MALING, ALEC MARANTZ

The aim of this workshop is to bring together theoretical and empirical considerations on the effects of morphological case beyond its mere phonological characteristics. Issues for discussion involve the implications of morphological case for abstract case theory, the difference between structural and inherent case, agreement, word order phenomena, grammaticalization processes, discourse theory, and semantics.

PROGRAMME

FRIDAY, AUGUST 28TH:

9.00 Opening remarks

9.30 Invited speaker: Paul Kiparsky (Stanford University) Cases as complementizers'

10.30 Denis Bouchard (University of Montreal), `Fixed positions, functional markers and the concept of "universal"

11.15 BREAK

11.30 Inghild Flaate & Kristin M. Eide (Norwegian University of Science and Technology) `Interpretive effects of morphological case: Norwegian and German predicatives'

12.15 Marjon Helmantel (Leiden University) `On the relation between structural position and morphological case: adpositions in German'

13.00 LUNCH BREAK

14.15 Miriam Butt (University of Konstanz) & Tracy Holloway King (Xerox PARC) `Licensing semantic case'

15.00 Dieter Wunderlich (Heinrich Heine University, Duesseldorf) `On the interaction of structural and semantic case'

15.45 BREAK
16.00  Carson T. Schutze (UCLA), `On the nature of default case'

16.45  Josef Bayer, Markus Bader & Michael Meng (Friedrich-Schiller Universitaet Jena), `Morphological underspecification meets oblique case: syntactic and processing effects in German'

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29TH

9.15  Invited speaker: Alec Marantz (MIT) `In defense of "spell-out": why morphological case should indeed only have an indirect, reflective relation to the syntax'

10.15  Amanda Seidl (University of Pennsylvania) `Non-segmental morphological case: The case of consonant mutation in Kpa Mende'

11.00 BREAK

11.15  Sandra Joppen (Heinrich Heine University, Duesseldorf), `Structural arguments with semantic case: The case of causees and recipients in 4-place verbs'

12.00  Lynn Nichols (Harvard University), `Non-uniform effects of morphological case'

12.45 LUNCH BREAK

14.00  Angela Ralli (University of Patras) & Manuel Espanol-Echevarria (UCLA), `Feature mismatch in dislocated constituents'

14.45  Eric Haeberli (University of Geneva), `Deriving effects of morphological case by eliminating abstract case'

15.30 BREAK

15.45  David Lightfoot (University of Maryland), `Middle English split genitives and the loss of case'

16.30  Invited speaker: Joan Maling (Brandeis University), `Morphological case is NOT (always) to blame'
Alternate:

Diane Nelson (Leeds) ’Case realization and case splits: synchrony and diachrony in Finnish intransitives'

Further information: koeneman@let.ruu.nl (Olaf Koeneman)

c) WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENT

Workshop on "Current topics in constraint-based theories of Germanic syntax" at ESSLLI X (Section: Language), Saarbruecken, 17-21 August 1998.

Organizers: Tibor Kiss (IBM Heidelberg), Detmar Meurers (Univ. Tuebingen)

Accepted Presentations:

Judith Berman (Univ. Stuttgart):
   On the Syntax of Correlative 'es' and Finite Clauses in German - an LFG Analysis
Adam Bodomo (Univ. Hongkong):
   A lexical semantic analysis of causative complex predicates in Norwegian
Bob Carpenter (Lucent Tech, Bell Labs):
   A "Linearization" Approach to German Word Order in Type-Logical Grammar
Frank Van Eynde (K.U. Leuven):
   Functional Projections and Dutch Prepositions
Lutz Gunkel (FU Berlin):
   Kausativkonstruktionen im Deutschen
Jonas Kuhn (Univ. Stuttgart):
   Resource Sensitivity in the Syntax-Semantics Interface and the German Split-NP Construction
Kordula De Kuthy (DFKI, Saarbruecken):
   NPs occuring separate from their PP arguments -- An argument raising approach and its interaction with lexical semantics
Stefan Mueller (DFKI, Saarbruecken):
   Case in German - An HPSG Analysis
Frank Richter und Manfred Sailer (Univ. Tuebingen):
   Complementizers and Finite Verbs in German Sentence Structure
Peter Skadhauge und Per Anker Jensen (Southern Denmark Business School):
   Linearization and Diathetic Alternations in Danish
2. Lists

[entries marked with an asterisk (*) have a corresponding abstract in section 3]

2.1 Books and dissertations


Marga PETTER. Getting PRO under Control: A Syntactic Analysis of


Roos VOGEL. Aspects of Tense. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam. 1997. (*)


*******************************************************************************

2.2 From the Journals

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS 41.4 (1996)
Waltz, Heidi

FOLIA LINGUISTICA XXXI.3-4 (1997)
Olsen, Susan (*)
Praedikative Argumente syntaktischer und lexikalischer Koepfe: Zum Status der Partikelverben im Deutschen und Englischen.

GLOT INTERNATIONAL 2.7 (1996 [1997])
de Hoop, Helen
Phillip, William
GLOT INTERNATIONAL 2.9/10 (1996 [1997])
Schaeffer, Jeannette
Vanden Wyngaerd, Guido

GLOT INTERNATIONAL 3.1 (1998)
Harley, Heidi

GLOT INTERNATIONAL 3.2 (1998)
Bernstein, Judy B.

THE JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE GERMANIC LINGUISTICS 1.2 (1997)
Bennis, Hans, Norbert Corver and Marcel den Dikken (*)
  Predication in nominal phrases. 85-117.
Diesing, Molly (*)
  Light verbs and the syntax of aspect in Yiddish. 119-156.
Rullmann, Hotze

JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS 34.1 (1998)
Kearns, Kate (*)
  Extraction from make the claim constructions. 53-72.
Taglicht, Josef (*)
  Constraints on intonational phrasing in English. 181-211.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter
van Kemenade, Ans

LANGUAGE 74.1 (1998)
van Kemenade, Ans
Katz, J.T.

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION 6.2 (1997)
Neeleman, Ad and Fred Weerman (*)
L1 and L2 Word Order Acquisition. 125-170.

LINGUA 104.1/2 (1998)
Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman (*)
Conflict Resolution in Passive Formation.

LINGUISTIC INQUIRY 29.1 (1998)
Krifka, Manfred (*)
Scope Inversion under the Rise-Fall Contour in German. 75-11.

LINGUISTIC INQUIRY 29.2 (1998)
Epstein, Samuel David (*)
Overt Scope Marking and Covert Verb-Second. 181-227.
Nakajima, Heizo
Concessive Expressions and Complementizer Selection. 333-338.
Tortora, Christina M.
Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion are Compatible with Resultative Phrases. 338-345.

LINGUISTICS 35.6 (1997)
Bennis, Hans, Frits Beukema, and Marcel den Dikken (*)
Getting Verb Movement. 1003-1028.
Bobaljik, Jonathan David (*)
If the Head Fits ...: On the Morphological Determination of Germanic Syntax. 1029-1055.
den Dikken, Marcel and Eric Hoekstra (*)
Parasitic Participles. 1057-1089.
Zwarts, Joost (*)
Complex Prepositions and P-Stranding in Dutch. 1091-1112.

LINGUISTICS 36.1 (1998)
Boerjars, Kerstin and Carol Chapman (*)
Agreement and pro-drop in some dialects of English. 71-98.
LINGUISTICS 36.2 (1998)
Barron, Julia (*)
*Have* contraction: explaining "trace effects" in a theory without movement. 223-251.
Blume, Kerstin (*)
A contrastive analysis of interaction verbs with dative complements. 253-280.
Eckert, Miriam

LINGUISTICS AND PHILOSOPHY 20.6 (1997)
Groenink, Annius V. (*)

LINGUISTISCHE BERICHTHE 173 (1998)
Vogel, Ralf, and Markus Steinbach (*)
The Dative - an Oblique Case. 65-90.
Johannessen, Janne Bondi

LINGUISTISCHE BERICHTHE 174 (1998)
Buering, Daniel, und Katharina Hartmann (*)
Asymmetrische Koordination. 172-201.
den Dikken, Marcel

NATURAL LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC THEORY 15.4 (1997)
Lieber, Rochelle and Harald Baayen (*)

Odijk, Jan (*)
Topicalization of Non-Extraposed Complements in Dutch. 191-222.
NATURAL LANGUAGE SEMANTICS 6.2 (1998)
Grosu, Alexander, and Fred Landman (*)
Strange Relatives of the Third Kind. 125-170.

NORDIC JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS 20.2 (1997)
Swan, Toril (*)
From Manner to Subject Modification: Adverbialization in English. 179-195.
Wechsler, Stephen (*)
Prepositional Phrases from the Twilight Zone. 127-154.

Lenci, Alessandro

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE 22.1 (1998)
Mallen, Enrique

Bobaljik, Jonathan D. and Hoeskuldur Thrainsson (*)
Two Heads Aren t Always Better than One. 37-71.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND WORKING PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS 6 (1998)
Grohmann, Kleanthes K.
Speculations on the Syntax and Semantics of German Multiple Interrogatives. 71-101.

WORD 48.2
Milfull, Inge

WORKING PAPERS IN SCANDINAVIAN SYNTAX 60 (December 1997)
Vikner, Sten
The Interpretation of Object Shift, Optimality Theory, and
Minimalism. 1-24.
Barthdal, Johanna.
Oblique Subjects in Old Scandinavian. 25-50.
Engdahl, Elisabeth.
Relative Clause Extractions in Context. 51-79.
Anders Holmberg.
Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: Movement of Phonological Features in the Syntax. 81-124.

*******************************************************

2.3 From Edited Volumes

Linguistische Arbeiten 374.

Werner Abraham
The base structure of the German clause under discourse functional weight: contentful functional categories vs. derivative ones.
Hartmund Czepluch
Word order in English: old problems and new answers
Elly van Gelderen
Inflection and movement in Old English
Hubert Haider
Projective economy: On the minimal functional structure of the German clause
Jan-Wouter Zwart
Transitive expletive constructions and the evidence supporting the multiple specifier hypothesis
Artemis Alexiadou and Elena Anagnostopoulou
Toward a uniform account of scrambling and clitic doubling
Kleanthes K. Grohmann
Pronouns and the left periphery of West Germanic embedded clauses
Enrique Mallen
Agreement and case matching in noun phrases in German
John R. te Velde
Deriving conjoined XPs: a minimal deletion approach
Christer Platzack
The Initial Hypothesis of syntax: A Minimalist perspective on language acquisition and attrition
Rex A. Sprouse
The acquisition of German and the "Initial Hypothesis of Syntax": A reply to Platzack

Stephen Berman and Arild Hestvik
Split Antecedents, Noncoreference, and DRT.

Hamida Demirdache
Principle C.

Robert Freidin
Binding Theory on Minimalist Assumptions.

James Higginbotham
A Plea for Implicit Anaphors.

Jan Koster
Anaphora and the Uniformity of Grammar.

Howard Lasnik
Levels of Representations and the Elements of Anaphora.

Seth Minkoff
On the Syntax of Local and Logophoric Control.

Gertjan Postma
Logical Entailment and the Possessive Nature of Reflexive Pronouns.

Eric Reuland and Sigridur Sigurjonsdottir
Long Distance Binding in Icelandic: Syntax or Discourse?

Ken Safir
Symmetry and Unity in the Theory of Anaphora.

Chris Tancredi
Pronouns and Perspectives.


Joost Zwarts
Lexical and Functional Properties of Prepositions.


Gosse Bouma and Gertjan van Noord
Dutch Verb Clustering without Verb Clusters (*)

Erhard Hinrichs and Tsuneko Nakazawa
The Third Construction and VP Extraposition in German (*)
Andreas Kathol
Constituency and Linearization of Verbal Complexes (*)

G. MATOS, et al., eds., On Interfaces in Linguistic Theory --
Selected Papers from the International Workshop on Interfaces in
Linguistics. Lisbon: APL/Edicoes Colibri.

Nomi Erteschik-Shir and Tova R. Rapoport
Verbal Projection.

Uli SAUERLAND and Orin PERCUS, eds. 1998. The Infinite Tract. MIT

Susi Wurmbrand
Downsizing Infinitives, 141-175.

Gert WEBELHUTH, J.-P. KOENIG and A. KATHOL (eds.): Lexical And
Constructional Aspects of Linguistic Explanation. CSLI
Publications. [in press]

Kordula De Kuthy
Linearization versus movement: evidence from German
pied-piped infinitives

Detmar Meurers
German partial-VP topicalization revisited

Andreas Kathol
The scope-marking construction in German

******************************************************

2.4 Unpublished Material

Towards an Optimal Account of Second Position Phenomena.
Ms., Yale University.

Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework. Ms., MIT.
den Dikken, Marcel, and Rint Sybesma. 1998.
*Take* serials light up the middle. Ms., Tilburg and
Leiden.

Zur Positionierung der Adverbiale im deutschen Mittelfeld
(On the positioning of adverbials in the German middle field). Ms., University of Stuttgart, to appear in Linguistische Berichte. (*)

Syntactic Inquiries into Discourse Restrictions on Multiple Interrogatives. Ms. (generals paper), University of Maryland. (*)

Null Aux Constructions and Minimalism. Ms., University of Maryland.

R-word PP formation in Dutch. Ms., Leiden University.

Simplex Adpositions and Vector Theory. Ms., Leiden University.

Events and Aspectual Structure in Derivational Morphology.


Kennedy, Christopher, and Jason Merchant. 1997.
Attributive Comparatives and Bound Ellipsis. Ms., University of California at Santa Cruz.

Koeneman, Olaf en Ad Neeleman. 1998.
Transitive Expletive Constructions in Flexible Syntax. Ms., University of Utrecht and University College London.


Primitives of Binding. Ms., Utrecht University.

Structural Conditions on Chains and Binding. Ms., Utrecht University.

Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. Ms., University of Bergen.


Wurmbrand, Susi. 1998.

3. Abstracts

3.1 Books and Dissertations


The main aim of my study is to specify the contextual conditions that apply to the use of the three central expressions for future in Swedish: the present form and the auxiliaries skola and komma. A tense suffix indicates a temporal domain and states that a mediating element, here called FIX, is placed in the indicated domain. The present suffix points to a domain that overlaps temporally with the speech point (SP). The past suffix points to a domain which lies entirely before SP. If it is to be possible to interpret a finite clause temporally, the speaker and the listener must be able to determine the placing of FIX within the suffix domain. FIX must therefore be specified by some intra- or extralinguistic (temporal) element. Two main types of FIX specification are distinguished: 1. TA-specification (the element that specifies FIX is a time adverbial, TA); 2. context specification (FIX is specified by a time that is stated in the discourse space (i.e., SP) or by a referential situation that has been mentioned in the preceding linguistic context (narration-specification). When TA is TA-specified, there is a temporal overlap between FIX and SIT (i.e., the time of the referential situation). When FIX is context-specified, there is a temporal overlap between FIX and SIT if the aktionsart of the finite verb is unbounded, while SIT can be located after FIX if the aktionsart of the finite verb is bounded. As regards the function of the future expressions in the tense system, the question of which element specifies FIX is crucial for the analysis of them all: the present used to refer to the future can be either
TA-specified or SP-specified, and for both skola and komma their function as central verbal expressions for the future is above all associated with contexts where SP specifies FIX.

Future skola can be subdivided into two functions: intentional-predictional skola which occurs only when SP specifies FIXm and purely predictional skola, which occurs most commonly when FIX is narration-specified. The auxiliary komma can be divided into two main functions: aspectual komma, which mainly occurs in contexts where something other than SP specifies FIXm and future komma, which largely occurs only in contexts where SP specifies FIX.


ASPECTS OF TENSE presents a semantic theory of tense, based on data from Italian, English, and Dutch. By arguing that all tenses incorporate temporal and aspectual information, the author offers an explanation for the problematic behavior of tenses in embedded contexts. This approach allows for a unified analysis of Sequence of Tenses (Consecutio Temporum) and its exceptions. As this study is not committed to a particular theoretical framework, it is of interest to all those concerned with tense, aspect, and Sequence of Tenses.


In this work two linguists from different theoretical paradigms develop a new general theory of natural language predicates capable of addressing a broad range of issues concerning (complex) predicates, many of which remain unresolved in previous theoretical proposals. This new theory is grounded in empirical evidence from a wide variety of genetically and geographically unrelated languages (German, Hungarian, Fox, Nenets, Tzotzil, Malayalam, among others) and constitutes a synthesis of conceptual and representational assumptions from several different theoretical traditions. The authors focus on cross-linguistically recurring patterns of predicate formation where identical contentive notions (i.e. lexical semantic and morphosyntactic information) are expressed by predicates consisting of a single morphological word or by
combinations of independent words that need not form a single syntactic unit. They provide a detailed implementation of their theory for German tense-aspect, passive, causative, and verb-particle predicates, while also discussing extensions of these representative analyses to the same predicate constructions in other languages. Beyond providing a formalism for the analysis of language-particular predicates, they demonstrate how the basic theoretical mechanisms they develop can be employed to explain universal tendencies of predicate formation. For this purpose, they introduce the construct 'grammatical archetype' into linguistic theory and show how the theory of predicates developed in this book can be used to relate universal patterns of predicate formation to language-particular patterns in a principled fashion.

This book will be of interest to linguists and grammarians from any generative, cognitive/functional, or traditional perspective and has been designed to be accessible to interested philosophers, psycholinguists, cognitive scientists, computational linguists, anthropological linguists, and philologists.

NOTE: One of the representations in the book was printed incorrectly. The corrected representation can be viewed at http://www.unc.edu/~webelhut/erratum.html


I have investigated the use of space in German Sign Language (DGS) and have identified the major parameters that govern the placement and displacement of objects in signing space in DGS. I have revealed a number of linguistic regularities and have proposed several principles of a grammar of space. Empirical evidence is provided that ultimately favors the locative hypothesis. The discussion shows that Generative Grammar (Chomsky, 1981ff.), Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp/Reyle, 1993), and Conceptual Semantics (Jackendoff, 1972ff.) all contribute to a fruitful understanding of the linguistics of space. The discussion includes the details of object placement (see below), the phenomenon of quantification in space, a model of the restricted use of pronominal forms, the specification of the categorial nature of locus-assigners as postpositions, and some hitherto not well understood forms of signs in DGS (and other sign
languages), and a comparison of seemingly distinct classes of verbs. Generally speaking: only objects that have been placed in signing space may be pronominally accessed in ongoing discourse. I hold that pronominal forms must (and do only) agree syntactically in (morphosyntactic) place features in DGS; no further grammatical features are required, and no other features lead to grammatical sentences. This general regularity has not yet been well understood, because a number of phonological, morphological and pragmatic factors interact and have to be resolved and isolated to give way to a uniform model. However, once a model sorts out some of these factors, a lot falls into place and one can easily identify quite a few NEW pronouns, adpositions, adverbs etc. whose existence might seem rather unlikely in view of the functional outfit of the host spoken language.

The regularities of locus-assignment are as follows:
1. The most obvious way to place an object is to use an index-form (default: G-handform) as a proper locus-assigner for the so-called simple indirect placement of objects that are (phonologically) body anchored. Morphosyntactic processes, e.g. classification, cliticization or adjunction and phonological or phonotactic processes, e.g. assimilation, may alter the default index-form. Furthermore, other factors, e.g. the physical abstractness of an object, come into play and may require the use of some container sign or relation (see 4. below) to make an object eligible for placement.
2. Simple indirect placement contrasts with so-called simple direct placement insofar as signs that may be placed by the latter, differ only with respect to some phonological parameter from the former. Signs that are not body anchored, i.e. that are not phonologically specified for the contact or the place of articulation feature, may (- but need not) be directly positioned in signing space, thereby absorbing the dimensional location features of that place. Technically speaking, the locus-assigner is then absorbed at the place of articulation. This also holds for objects that are physically present, e.g. the interlocutors.
3. Verbs of motion and location are generally known to effect the (re)location of virtual objects in space. In terms of what makes them do this, I suggest that locus-assigners are, indeed, internalized (or if you like: morphologically incorporated) in these verbs. This is compatible with both the locative hypothesis and the transitivity hypothesis. However, while the locative
hypothesis would entail that all verbs have some locative features and relations in common conceptually, the transitivity hypothesis holds that whatever their conceptual representation is, we must assume a grammatical feature level that is distinct and not simply an isomorphic mapping of semantic features. It is shown, however, that in DGS, the proper use of so-called agreement-verbs as well as pronominal access to objects in space (be they virtual or real) are both licensed through assignment of place (and path) features in syntax. Furthermore, only place (or path) features may be used for the identification of some referent in discourse representation structure. Thus, the so-called class of agreement verbs by no means differs from the class of verbs of movement and location in that these verbs also lead to (re)locations of objects in space. I conclude that syntactic agreement is definitely not with person features in DGS, but with place features, as evidenced by the articulation of bi-transitive verbs, given distinctly located arguments and by the interpretation of postponed, not-yet-mentioned OBJECTS. Thus, there seems to be good evidence in favor of the locative hypothesis and for a direct mapping from conceptual structures to morphosyntactic and phonological form. Viewed from the perspective of (three dimensional) signing, the set of diverse morphosyntactic grammatical features in spoken languages is nothing more than a means to encode (and to compress with some loss) three dimensional conceptual information into a linear phonological string. Interpreting this enriched string equals restoring (decode and extract) three dimensional locative relations between or among objects in conceptual structure. Verbs, therefore, internalize relational locus-assigners.

4. Relational locus-assigners, however, need not be internalized, but may have a morphophonological form in their own right. Again, the so-called relational indirect placement of an object is easier to observe. Assuming that some object is placed in space (e.g. using 1. or 2. above), a further object may be named and placed INTO, UNDER, NEXTTO etc. the former by using an overt relational locus-assigner. In principle, this object may then be selectively addressed with a pronominal form. As far as I know, and all things being equal (e.g. no extra syntactic operations), all sign languages conform to a principle of space quantification: The range of quantified space is defined by the first sign. In general terms: the RELATUM (complement, object of relation) precedes the THEME (specifier, subject of relation). For your own convenience
check your sign language equivalents of e.g. "the hole in the rock..." and "the rock in the hole...

5. Intriguing evidence for this analysis is provided by scrutinizing the claim that a relational direct placement of objects should also be possible using appropriate non-body anchored signs. Indeed, the claim can be substantiated in much the same way as in 4. However, as phonological properties of signs vary with sign languages, I cannot suggest which relation you might check. To show that the relational placement has been achieved, selective pronominal access to the referents must be possible; try, for instance, a big and a small object as in: "A frantic fan grabbed the ball in the goal".

6. To a vast degree, these means of assigning certain objects to signing space or, to put it differently, providing certain objects with syntactic and pragmatic place features, are left to a signer (with respect to some location of the (virtual) object in signing space). Thus, this use of space is not conventionalized. This opens the possibility that conventionalized locations in signing space also exist, and that is exactly what is found: Any of the three logically tenable combinations of conventionalization vs. non-conventionalization of some selected location in space, and an open-meaning vs. a fixed-meaning of those locations is evidenced in DGS. To give an example, consider reference to some point in time in your sign language. In my opinion there is nothing like a time-line (see also Jacobowitz/Stokoe, 1988), but there are conventionalized locations in space that are associated with a fixed-meaning. Thus I argue for time-locations and location-times, and for general cognitive principles (transitivity, reflexivity etc.) that are available for linguistic behavior. When you combine relative time-locations with transitivity, these locations will be located on an imaginary line.

3.2 Articles and Papers


In this paper we will argue that a typology of passive
formation can be derived from the optimality-theoretic interaction between three well-known constraints. These are the Extended Projection Principle (VP must have a subject), Stay (do not move), and Parse (elements from the input should occur in the output). The analysis will not only account for different forms of passives (personal passives vs. impersonal passives) but also for languages which lack passives (of certain verbs) altogether. To account for this we employ the so-called null parse, a candidate without structure.


The English auxiliary *have* may reduce to the monosyllabic form /v/ in certain environments. This phenomenon (known as *have* contraction) has been adopted by proponents of derivational approaches to syntax (e.g. Radford 1988:414) as evidence for the existence of traces and of verb movement in general. However, closer examination of the data reveals that *have* contraction only occurs when three conditions apply: i. when the auxiliary is finite, ii. when it follows a pronoun with an empty coda, iii. when that pronoun is the whole subject, that is, not conjoined with any other noun or pronoun.

It is not clear how the movement approach can account for conditions (ii) and (iii) above. My proposal is that the frequent occurrence of strings conforming to the above conditions is such that over time the auxiliary verb has become an affix. The solution is offered within the framework of lexical functional grammar, a unification-based approach in which words and phrases are represented at copresent parallel levels containing functional and categorial information (f-structure and c-structure). The two individual f-structures created by the pronoun and the affix are able to unify to create the larger f-structure of an inflected pronoun. The affix *v* attaches to its pronominal host through morphological composition using inside-out function application. In this way the affix is able to supply information regarding TENSE and ASP to the whole sentence. This is blocked if the inflected pronoun is part of a conjoined subject, explaining the ungrammaticality of sentences with conjoined NP subjects, one of which is an inflected pronoun. This behaviour would not be predicted by theories that assume that *have* contraction is a purely surface (phrase-structure) phonetic
phenomenon.


Child language features a striking difference in root clauses between finite (auxiliary) verbs (in IP) and root infinitives and participles (in VP). Fronted nonfinite verbs are virtually never attested in child language. However, it is shown that there is no one-to-one correlation between position and inflection since finite verbs do not always front. It is argued that a derivational treatment in terms of verb fronting is the proper way to establish a relationship between the two verbal positions. Differences between developmental stages in Dutch, English, and French are accounted for by making crucial use of the status of T as a content-licensing head and the strength of the formal finiteness feature on the functional head T, and by exploiting the status of modality, aspect, and negation as heads potentially blocking movement from V to T. While special attention is paid to the separate status of auxiliaries in acquisitional and historical development, a novel perspective on linguistic change is sketched by relating data from verb placement in the developmental stages of French to verb-placement facts in the history of English. An integrated account of finiteness and verb fronting is provided to explain their inverse relationship.


The main theoretical subject of this paper is the symmetry between nominal and verbal projections. It is demonstrated that predication exists in the nominal domain, in a way quite similar to predication in the clausal domain. An analysis of predication in a configurational way -- such that the subject and the predicate together constitute a small clause -- makes it possible to provide detailed analyses of complex nominal constructions involving predication, and predicate inversion in particular. This paper focuses on three construction types from Dutch: the N-VAN-EEN-N construction (EEN BEER VAN EEN KEREL 'a bear of a guy'), the WHAT-VOOR construction (WAT VOOR EEN KEREL 'what kind of guy'), and the WAT-EEN exclamative (WAT EEN
KEREL 'what a guy'). Another aspect of symmetry concerns the fact that the nature of the functional projections in the nominal domain is not significantly different from that of functional projections in the clausal domain. For instance, it is argued that copular elements and complementizers are not peculiar to the clausal domain, but that these are found in the nominal domain as well.


Agentive two-place verbs with dative complements (e.g. German *helfen* help, *folgen* follow) are generally assumed to bear a lexical feature that blocks regular accusative linking for their nonsubject argument and indicates the selection of dative case. In the present paper, it is argued that dative selection of two-place verbs is cross-linguistically systematic. Evidence for this claim is provided from one group of two-place verbs with dative complements that are called "interaction verbs".

It is shown that the Polynesian dative-selecting two-place verbs ("middle verbs") included in the data of Chung's (1978) investigation show a striking affinity in meaning to two-place verbs with dative complements in four Indo-European languages of different families. This observation seriously challenges any account that treats two-place verbs with dative complements principally as idiosyncratic. However, Kiparsky's (1995) recent proposal to motivate the dative selection of two-place verbs semantically by the homogeneity of the events the respective verbs denote is rejected.

In the present approach, the marked linking pattern of these verbs is explained in terms of their low semantic transitivity. I assume that the semantic transitivity of a verb with more than one argument is low if the thematic roles of the arguments show no agent-patient asymmetry.


This paper investigates the role of morphology-syntax interactions in explaining apparent parametric variation in Germanic syntax. It is argued that the Spec,TP parameter (Bures 1993; Bobaljik and Jonas 1996) is a reflex of
aspects of the inflectional morphology that divide the Germanic languages into two groups, and not simply an arbitrary parameter as previously assumed. The theory of distributed morphology is adopted and leads to the following position. Complementary distribution between tense and agreement markers in a language must be taken to reflect FUSION of the functional heads in that language. This fusion is only possible if head movement in the syntax has concatenated the relevant heads in a specific configuration. The required configuration in turn follows from a derivation that precludes the licensing of Spec,TP. Thus, only languages that do not have this complementarity in their inflectional morphology may utilize the syntactic derivation that licenses the specifier of TP.


We propose a novel theory of verb raising in which different surface positions of the finite verb across languages reflect differences in phrase structure in a principled manner. Assuming that the inventory of functional projections dominating VP is not universal (e.g., the presence of Agr-Phrases is a point of parametric variation) current assumptions about locality predict obligatory verb raising in a language with Agr-Phrases, but obligatory V in situ in a simple IP-VP configuration. We predict a correlation with other morpho-syntactic phenomena reflecting the presence/absence of AgrPs: extra subject and object positions, transitive expletive constructions, multiple inflectional affixes, etc. This prediction is borne out for the VO Germanic languages; for the OV languages we predict the existence of head-final Infl projections.

Boerjars, Kersti and Carol Chapman. 1998. 'Agreement and pro-drop in some dialects of English'. Linguistics 36.1, 71-98.

In this paper, we consider data from a number of English dialects in which the distribution of pronouns and verb inflection differs radically from that in standard English. In these dialects, pronouns adjacent to the verb occur with an uninflected form of the verb, at least for some types of subjects and some subset of verbs. Pronouns that are separated from the verb or immediately follow it,
on the other hand, occur with an inflected verb form. We provide an analysis of these constructions within lexical-functional grammar (LFG) in which the pronouns occurring with the uninflected form are analyzed as pro-clitics to the verb. Given this analysis of pronouns as verbal inflection, the constructions in which they occur lack an overt subject and can hence be referred to as "pro-drop" constructions. We examine a property that has frequently been associated with pro-drop languages -- the COMP-trace effect -- but find the link between the two properties too weak to be relevant to our discussion. Finally, we consider briefly the implications of the LFG analysis of this phenomenon for diachronic aspects of the data.


The authors argue that the word order of German as well as Dutch verb clusters can be accounted for without attributing constituent status to them. Their analysis rests on the assumption that a single head-complement schema exists, which licences phrases consisting of a lexical head and an arbitrary number of its complements. Word order is accounted for by means of linear precedence statements only. A set of such statements is given which accounts for the full range of ordering possibilities encountered in German and Dutch verb clusters. Furthermore, it is shown how the analysis leads to an improved account of partial VP fronting.


This paper presents a number of observations about German clause coordination with subject gaps that have -- to the best of my knowledge -- not been discussed before. In particular, we observe a scope subordination effect, i.e. pronouns in the second conjunct can get bound by quantifying elements in the first. Based on this and a couple of other data we propose an analysis of empty subject coordination in which the second conjunct is adjoined to the first one, rather than coordinated with it.
Its adjunction site is flexible such that it can get into the scope of almost every element of the first conjunct. In an appendix we give an explicit semantics which covers all the data discussed in the article.


The stem construction in Yiddish is a type of light verb construction in which a light verb (heading an LVP) takes an Asp(ect)P complement, which in turn takes a VP complement (cf. Travis 1992). The AspP is headed by an aspectual operator, yielding a "diminutivized event" interpretation. A puzzling fact about stem construction is that the verbal elements seem to reflect an OV order, while Yiddish is in other respects a VO language. This OV-like ordering is a consequence of incorporation. A second, more restricted, type of light verb construction in Yiddish is also discussed, in which the thematic element is an indefinite NP complement. Here there is no AspP; the light verb takes a VP complement which is headed by a null verb which itself takes the predicate nominal as its complement. In both constructions, the light verb semantically selects for a complement which denotes some sort of diminutivized event; the differing distribution of the verbal and nominal forms of the light verb construction results from semantic differences between the Asp operator and the indefinite determiner.


Frisian exhibits the curious phenomenon of parasitic participles: one occurrence of the perfect auxiliary is able to license more than one perfect participle. Recursive checking (a one-many relation) is possible just in case the feature that recurs is not the one that is semantically interpreted. Thus the feature on the perfect auxiliary is the one that is semantically interpreted. Central to our analysis is a relativization of the head-movement constraint: movement of X across Y is illegitimate if Y possesses features relevant to X.
In this article I investigate certain phenomena relating to superiority, the Empty Category Principle (ECP), and scope. I propose a chain-based scope-marking convention and a new analysis of adjunction, and hypothesize that English is a covert verb-second grammar. The analysis is couched within checking theory and ultimately within the bare theory of phrase structure. I propose category-neutral(-ized) LF representations, displaying VP-recursion, but lacking functional heads and their projections, and I suggest that this, in turn, allows significant simplification of index-sensitive head government conditions appearing in many contemporary formulations of the ECP.

The paper argues that there are base positions for adverbials in the middle field of the German sentence. By using a set of tests for determining base positions it is established that there are five classes of adverbials as far as their base positions are concerned: (I) frame adverbials, (II) sentence adverbials, (III) event-related adverbials, (IV) event-internal adverbials and (V) process-related adverbials. Within these classes, there may by semantic preferences for a certain order but this order is not syntactically determined. The base position of these classes and their c-command-relations reflect their semantic relations to the rest of the sentence. It is shown that there is evidence for scrambling among members of the different classes of adverbials and that scrambling of adverbials is a meaningful concept within a projective grammar. The paper concludes with a critical discussion of minimalistic analyses which place adverbials in the Spec-positions of functional projections and assume that the order of adverbials is determined by a universal hierarchy of functional projections.
This paper classifies a family of grammar formalisms that extend context-free grammar by talking about *tuples* of terminal strings, rather than independently combining single terminal words into larger single phrases. These include a number of well-known formalisms, such as head grammar and linear context-free rewriting systems, but also a new formalism, *(simple) literal movement grammar, which strictly extends the previously known formalisms, while preserving polynomial time recognizability. The descriptive capacity of simple literal movement grammars is illustrated both formally through a weak generative capacity argument and in a more practical sense by the description of conjunctive cross-serial relative clauses in Dutch. After sketching a complex result and drawing a number of conclusions from the illustrations, it is then suggested that the notion of *mild context sensitivity* currently in use, that depends on the rather loosely defined concept of *constant growth*, needs a modification to apply sensibly to the illustrated facts; an attempt at such a revision is proposed.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 1998. 'Syntactic Inquiries into Discourse Restrictions on Multiple Interrogatives'. Ms. (generals paper), University of Maryland, College Park.

Multiple interrogatives in German involve highly thematic Wh-elements. This is captured by the notion of "Discourse-Restricted Quantification" (DRQ): discourse restrictions in German (and possibly other languages, though not English) force both Wh-elements in double questions (Multiple Wh) to move to a syntactically thematic position which is assumed to be a functional projection in an articulated CP-structure; this projection is Top(ic)P. This movement is motivated by an underlingly complex structure assigned to the elements which in turn has overt realizations that can be found in (interrogative) partitives. The movement is instantiated similarly to pre-subject scrambling, independently taken to be topicalization. The higher Wh-topic then moves to CP in order to check the Wh-feature; the other Wh checks its Wh-feature covertly. Evidence from a number of languages shows interesting correlations of Wh-movement and Topicalization supporting this proposal. Semantically, the scope of multiple Wh-phrases in German is subject to DRQ: the sets of referents for both Wh-elements are limited in
that they must be known to speaker and hearer. The
differences between German and English will be addressed
and there is also plenty of cross-linguistic discussion.
A wide range of phenomena are scrutinized here, including
(but not exclusively) Wh-adjuncts, Wh-islands and child
language. The upshot is that a conception of Wh-topics is
not only more natural than one would think at first but
also superior to any other account presently made public in
the minimalist literature.

Grosu, Alexander, and Fred Landman. 1998. Strange Relatives of

In this paper, we argue that there are more kinds of
relative clause constructions between the linguistic heaven
and earth than are dreamed of in the classical lore, which
distinguishes just restrictive relative clauses and
appositives. We start with degree relatives. Degree, or
amount, relatives show restrictions in the relativizers
they allow, in the determiners that can combine with them,
and in their stacking possibilities. To account for these
facts, we propose an analysis with two central, and novel,
features: First, we argue that the standard notion of
degree (a number on a measuring scale) needs to be replaced
by a notion of structured degree, which keeps track of the
object measured. Second, we argue that at the CP-level of
degree relatives and operation of (degree) maximalization
takes place. We show that the observed facts concerning
degree relatives follow from these assumptions. We then
broaden the discussion to other relative clause
constructions. We propose that the operation of
maximalization takes place in relative clauses when the
head noun is semantically interpreted CP-internally, while
syntactically the CP is part of a DP that also contains CP-
external material. Based on this, we argue that degree
relatives form part of a linguistically coherent class of
relative clause constructions -- we call them *maximalizing
relatives* -- which all show restrictions similar to those
observed for degree relatives, and which differ
semantically (and often also syntactically) both from
restrictive relative clauses and from appositives. We
discuss free relatives, internally-headed relatives, and
corelatives.

Hinrichs, Erhard, and Tsuneko Nagazawa. In press. The Third
The authors present an analysis of the so-called third construction in German. This construction type refers to a syntactic configuration in which a subject control verb such as *versuchen* ('try') splits its VP complement, e.g. *das Auto zu reparieren* into discontinuous parts, as in *dass Peter das Auto versucht zu reparieren* ('that Peter tries to repair the car'). What makes the third construction notoriously difficult to analyze is the fact that this construction does not fit neatly in the opposition between two types infinitive constructions in German that, following Bech 1955, are commonly referred to as coherent and incoherent infinitive constructions. Rather, the third construction exhibits some of the properties of each of these two classes.

Hinrichs and Nakazawa present an HPSG analysis of the third construction which makes use of argument composition, originally proposed for the treatment of German auxiliaries by the same authors (Hinrichs and Nakazawa 1989). Argument composition allows control verbs to form complex predicates with their governed zu-infinitive; its nominal complements are `raised' to the matrix level, giving rise to the discontinuous word order of the elements of the VP complement. A wide-range of related properties of the third construction and of the coherent/incoherent infinitive constructions are treated by a single lexical rule which alters the subcategorization framework of control verbs.
constituency and linear order. This allows him to retain common assumptions about the constituency relations and to treat the verb cluster as a syntactic constituent. Embedded in the linearization-based approach of Kathol, the analysis extends naturally to the clause-initial occurrences of finite verbs in root environments in a purely linearly-based fashion.

In the final section, Kathol compares his approach to that of Reape 1992, which is often considered to be a competitor of the argument composition analysis. A number of shortcomings of Reape's proposals are pointed out which argue that a complex predicate view of German verb clusters is to be preferred over a purely linearization-based analysis.


The sequence *make the claim that S* has certain syntactic properties which indicate the presence of some sort of complex predicate, previously suggested to be a Light verb Construction (LVC) or a reanalysis of N and V to a complex V. I consider and reject both these proposals, and propose an alternative structure which is still a type of complex predicate. Adopting the locality framework of Manzini (1992, 1994), I show that a syntactic account of extractions from *make the claim* follows straightforwardly. I also show that extraction from *make the claim* is distinct from extraction from indefinites.

Krifka, Manfred. 1998. 'Scope Inversion under the Rise-Fall Contour in German'. Linguistic Inquiry 29.1, 75-11.

A well-known but ill-explained fact about German is scope inversion under a rise-fall accent contour. The scope inversion in this reading can be derived from general principles of scope assignment and focus marking in German. In particular, focus is assigned to preverbal constituents, leading to syntactic configurations that result in ambiguous interpretations. This explanation must be couched in a framework of derivational economy that favors shorter derivations. The relevant comparison class is defined with respect to phonological form, not, as has been suggested for English, with respect to identity of semantic
interpretation; this may be a general property of "free" word order languages.


We propose that the choice between the auxiliaries *hebben* 'have' and *zijn* 'be' in Dutch is determined by a particular semantic feature of verbs. In particular we propose a feature of meaning [IEPS] for 'inferable eventual position or state' that characterizes whether the action denoted by the verb allows us to determine the eventual position or state of the verb's highest argument. It is argued that only verbs which exhibit the feature [+IEPS] or which obtain the feature compositionally in the syntax select *zijn* as their auxiliary. Our analysis is then compared to a number of other analyses of auxiliary selection in Dutch.


Many parameters proposed in the literature are construction specific to a greater or lesser degree. This has some unfortunate consequences. First, such parameters do not provide an explanation for the rapidity and success of first-language (L1) acquisition. Second, they make it hard to test hypotheses about the nature of second-language (L2) acquisition. In this article, a version of the OV/VO parameter is developed that is not construction specific. It relates various empirical domains, including basic word order, scrambling, Exceptional Case Marking, and the distribution of particles. If correct, this parameter reduces the number of learning tasks for the child. It also allows evaluation of the various hypotheses about the accessibility of parameters in L2 acquisition. Following Clahsen and Muysken (1986; 1989), we argue that, whereas L1 acquisition is a process of parameter setting, L2 acquisition crucially involves the positing of construction-specific rules, a process guided by general learning strategies.

Odijk, Jan. 1998. 'Topicalization of Non-Extraposed Complements
It is argued in this paper that topicalization of non-extraposed complements in Dutch is compatible with (what I will call) *Higgins's Generalization for Dutch*, despite the fact that sentences containing this construction appear to constitute prima facie counter examples to this generalization. It is argued that the relevant sentences do not involve topicalization of the whole non-finite complement, but only of the VP contained in it. This, together with a particular assumption about the properties of so-called *D-pronouns* in Dutch accounts for all relevant facts in a manner which is compatible with Higgins's Generalization. Since the validity of Higgins's Generalization for other sentential complements has been established already, it is concluded that it is fully valid for Dutch. It is argued that this generalization can be derived from an analysis of topicalization of sentences as a special case of contrastive dislocation but not from (two varieties of) a topicalization analysis. A further consequence is that infinitival complements in Dutch cannot be analyzed as subjectless VPs but contain further structure above the VP, and the analysis imposes specific requirements on the nature of certain rules for interpreting pronouns.


This article proceeds from the assumption that syntax and morphology are basically distinct components of grammar whose interface is worth studying. Interestingly, when a verb which requires a predicative complement combines with a prepositional stem that is also capable of functioning as an adverb (Germ. 'weg+laufen'; Engl. 'to run in'), the result is formally and semantically indistinguishable as to whether it was formed in the syntax and is therefore a simplex verb with a free adverbial complement or as to whether it is a product of morphological (or lexical) rules and as such represents a complex (particle) verb stem.

The paper discusses the process of adverbialization in English, focusing on one type of adverb, subject-modifier adverbs such as 'sadly', 'thoughtfully' and 'pinky'. It is also shown that the '-ly' suffix in English (unlike its cognates in the other Germanic languages) has become an extremely versatile adverb suffix. Finally, it is argued that in English, the manner adverb category is prototypical, whereas other adverb types, notably subject-modifier adverbs, are less central adverbs.


This paper argues that intonational phrasing in English is subject to two constraints formulated purely in terms of surface syntax. The first applies to all headed structures, and the second to all structures of coordination. It is claimed that these constraints account for the facts more adequately than Selkirk's Sense Unit Condition. Several problematic types of constructions are discussed in this context, including structures with parentheticals. In addition to thessyntax, accent placement is also shown to be relevant to intonational phrasing. Finally, proposals are made for the incorporation of the syntactic constraints in an HPSG grammar of English.


This paper offers a unified syntactic analysis for free and subcategorized dative objects in German. While assuming genuine Case positions for the structural cases nominative and accusative, we treat all dative objects as syntactic adjuncts. This explains the contrast between accusative and dative objects w.r.t. word order variation, anaphora binding, extraction, a.o. The binding properties of dative objects can be explained with a slightly modified version of the binding theory of Reinhart & Reuland (1993). We thus revive the old case theoretic distinction between structural case (accusative) and oblique case (dative). Several consequences follow from this for case theory and the concept of markedness. Some current syntactic theories suffer from not having implemented this distinction.

This paper proposes a treatment of optional prepositional phrases with a status intermediate between adjuncts and complements. The essential idea is simply that such PPs are semantically but not syntactically selected. It is argued that prepositions often assign an external theta role to a complement of the governing verb, subject to the heretofore unnoticed syntactic condition that such external arguments must be direct rather than oblique. This explains certain binding opacity effects and also greatly simplifies the subcategorization frames of verbs. The analysis is formulated in the framework of Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Pollard & Sag 1994).


The set of prepositions in Dutch can be divided into two classes, for which the terms "type A" and "type B" are used. The complement of a type A preposition can be stranded when its complement takes a special form (e.g. "er achter" 'there behind', "waar in" 'where in'), but this is not possible with type B prepositions (e.g. "*er namens" 'there in name of', "*waar gedurende" 'where during'). The two classes show a wide range of additional differences with respect to frequency, register, morphology, interpretation, transitivity. It is argued that only type A prepositions are real prepositions, that is, members of category P. Type B prepositions are syntactically complex, consisting of two heads: a preposition and a member of another category, a noun (e.g. "middels" 'by means of' or "benoorden" 'north of'), a verb (e.g. "betreffende" 'concerning' or "behoudens" 'barring'), an adjective (e.g. "inclusief" 'including'), or even a preposition (e.g. "beneden" 'beneath'). The prepositional head is often realized as a prefix ("be-") or affix ("-s"). The impossibility of stranding type B prepositions can be made to follow from locality constraints on movement.
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