

Previous Syntax reading group meetings:

17 March 2021, 15:00-16:00		Georg Höhn Georg-August University Göttingen	Crosslinguistic variation in quantificational unagreement view abstract (PDF)
15 March 2017 15:00 - 17:00	B02	Ad Neeleman (UCL Linguistics)	Constructing verb clusters (The Transformational Cycle in Dutch and German)
22 March 2017 14:00-16:00	101	Ziren Zhou (UCL Linguistics)	To be confirmed
13 April 2016 14:00 - 16:00	CH B01	Sampson Korsah	Phases and high rewards: Tonal reflexes of movement in Akan.

[Click here to download a copy of the abstract.](#)

This presentation is hosted jointly with the [UCL phonology reading group](#)

Date/Time	Location	Speaker	Title
31 March 2016 14:00 - 16:00	CH G15	Paul Melchin	Manner, Result, and Argument Structure

Abstract: Many features of the argument structure of verbs can be explained in terms of the verbs' lexical semantics. To the extent that this is true, c-selection, or subcategorizational features listed in a verb's lexical entry, can be eliminated, simplifying the grammar. However, the availability of Unspecified Object Deletion (UOD) has resisted explanation in terms of lexical semantics alone; that is, some have claimed that the difference in obligatoriness of the object between near-synonyms like eat and devour (John is eating/*devouring) must simply be listed. In this talk, I show that the crucial components of meaning determining the difference between eat and devour are manner and result. Manner and result have been proposed as important parts of the lexical semantics in determining verbal event decompositions or aspectual structures. I propose that they play a crucial role in determining the possibilities for the realization of a verb's arguments: if a verb specifies manner, an agentive external argument must be expressed; if a verb specifies result, an internal argument of which the result is predicated must be expressed. A verb may be listed as specifying either manner or result, or both, or neither. Verbs that specify only result are unaccusatives like break, which may take a non-agentive causer, or have the cause unspecified. Verbs that specify only manner are activity verbs like eat, which require an agentive causer, but do not require an internal argument. Devour specifies both manner and result, and requires that both agent and patient be realized. And a verb

like clean is unspecified for either, so it may appear with either component of meaning in a sentence. I also propose a tentative account of how manner and result are projected in the syntax. In this way, the availability of UOD is derived from verb meaning, reducing the need for c-selection in the lexicon.

Date/Time	Location	Speaker	Title
9 March 14:00 - 16:00	CH B02	Coppe van Urk	Eliminating A/A'-positions

Abstract: It is often assumed that syntactic positions come in at least two distinct types, A-positions and A'-positions, and that the A/A'-distinction ultimately derives from their respective properties (e.g. Chomsky 1981, 1995; Stowell 1981; Mahajan 1990; Déprez 1990; Miyagawa 2010). In this talk, I argue that this positional distinction is unnecessary, and propose instead that the A/A'-distinction should be derived solely from independent properties of the triggering features (in other words, from differences in the triggering Agree relation). by the features. I show how such an approach can make sense of differences in locality, pied-piping, the ability to move non-nominals, and reconstruction for Principle C. I then offer a way of extending this proposal to deal with differences in Weak Crossover, anaphor binding, and the licensing of parasitic gaps.

Finally, I investigate a prediction of this featural view of the A/A'-distinction. In particular, if properties of A- and A'-movement derive solely from the Agree relation, we might expect movement types that co-occur with both types of Agree relations (for example, Wh and ϕ). The resulting movements should be associated both with the properties of A-movement and those of A'-movement. I will show that is systematically true in the Nilotic language Dinka Bor (South Sudan), as well as some Bantu and Austronesian languages. All phrasal movement in these systems displays a mix of A/A'-properties: movement can be long-distance, but, at the same time, is restricted to nominals, lacks pied-piping effects, and displays (some) visibility to case assignment and binding.

Date/Time	Location	Speaker	Title
2 March 2016 14:00 - 16:00	CH B02	Hans van de Koot	Epistemic bias in (embedded) negative polar questions.

As is well-known, sentences denoting polar alternatives can be embedded under a wide range of predicates and can also appear in subject position. These environments all allow ‘inside negation’ polar questions (INPQs), which are typically associated with a bias towards the negative alternative and license NPIs. However, their ‘outside negation’ counterparts (ONPQs), which have a bias towards the positive answer and do not license NPIs (Ladd 1981), show variable acceptability:

- (1) a. John is wondering if/whether Mary doesn't like spinach (either/too).
- b. John is asking if/whether Mary doesn't like spinach (either/too).
- c. John knows if/whether Mary doesn't like spinach (either/*too).
- d. John remembers if/whether Mary doesn't like spinach (either/*too).
- e. Whether Mary doesn't like spinach (either/too) is not very clear to John

I will argue that this embedding restriction is correlated with the presence of a subjective epistemic bias (Lyons 1977; Papafragou 2006; Tancredi 2007; Anand & Hacquard 2009). In particular, it will be shown that predicates that do not tolerate ONPQs in their complement also do not tolerate a complement with a subjective epistemic modal category. ONPQs will also be shown to pattern with subjective epistemics in giving rise to various scope freezing effects (including so-called ‘epistemic containment’). I propose a tentative analysis of these facts and also briefly explore its consequences for INPQs that express a subjective epistemic bias.

- **3rd February 2016 [Taviton (16) room 431 room 116 14:00 -16:00]**

Author: [Alex Drummond](#) Title: [Rule H without Structural Parallelism](#)

Abstract: Fox (2000) shows that a single principle, Rule H, can account for (i) Strong Crossover, (ii) the ban on co-binding, and (iii) Dahl's puzzle. Though elegant and appealing, Fox's analysis faces both conceptual and empirical problems.

Conceptually, the analysis assumes that a bound pronoun within an elided VP must be bound in a structurally parallel configuration to its counterpart in the antecedent VP; this requirement does not follow from independently-motivated constraints on VP ellipsis. On the empirical side, Roelofsen (2011) has turned up additional Dahl-like ellipsis phenomena where Rule H undergenerates. So far, attempts to fix the preceding problems (mine included) have yielded principles that lack Rule H's explanatory scope. In this talk, I will argue that a relatively minor modification to Fox's original analysis suffices to solve both the conceptual and empirical problems. The main idea is to increase the domain of application of Rule H while at the same time relaxing the licensing requirements on bound pronouns within elided VPs. Rule H itself is unmodified, but now additionally acts as a filter on focus alternatives (which I take to be derived via syntactic substitution). VP ellipsis is constrained only by a Rooth-style contrast constraint, with no special requirements imposed on bound pronouns

- **27th January 2016 [CH room 101 13:00 - 15:00]**

Title: Interactions of gender and number agreement: Evidence from Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

Abstract: Class II split hybrid nouns in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian display two sets of interesting properties: they can bear both natural and grammatical gender, and which gender participates in agreement depends on the number of the noun. While in the singular they invariably trigger natural (masculine) agreement, alternation between masculine and (grammatical) feminine obtains in the plural. The problem for theories of such nouns comprises two challenges: the Agree mechanism needs to be able to operate on two kinds of gender, and the mechanism needs to allow gender agreement to interact with number. Previous accounts (e.g. Wechsler and Zlatic 2000) propose complex mapping between semantic, syntactic and class features, but ultimately cannot derive the obligatoriness of natural agreement in the singular and optionality in the plural in a unified way. A Minimalist account of such nouns has not yet been proposed, and the existing accounts of hybrid agreement cannot capture this particular

pattern. I provide a Minimalist analysis of hybrid nouns' agreement combining the formal tools of feature hierarchies and relativised probing, deriving the obligatoriness of natural gender in the singular, and cyclic Agree, with different orders of application of Agree operations, which derives plural alternations as intervention effects.

- **20th January 2016 [CH room B07 14:00 - 15:30]**

Title: Beyond syntactic priming: Evidence for activation of alternative syntactic structures. Authors: Marina Vasilyeva and Heidi Waterfall.

Alina Koradt will be discussing - Priming methodology was previously used to investigate children's ability to represent abstract syntactic forms. Existing evidence indicates that following exposure to a particular syntactic structure (such as the passive voice), English-speaking children increase their production of that structure with new lexical items. In the present work, we utilize priming methodology to explore whether exposure to passive primes may increase children's production of sentences that have a different structure but share a similar purpose in discourse. We report three studies, two involving English and Russian-speaking children, and a third involving Russian-speaking adults. Unlike English, Russian offers a variety of syntactic forms that emphasize the patient of a transitive action, thus fulfilling the discourse function of the passive. We found that English speakers increased the use of the particular syntactic form presented in the prime, whereas Russian speakers increased their production of several different syntactic forms used to emphasize the patient of the action.

- **9th December 2015 [CH room 101 15:30-17:00]**

Kriszta Szendroi will lead a discussion on [Szendroi 2015](#) "The Syntax of information structure and the PF interface". Certain languages exhibit movement of the focal constituent to a noncanonical position. Brody (1990, 1995) and Rizzi (1997) proposed a unified analysis of Hungarian and Italian focus movement, arguing that focus movement is like wh-movement. In this paper, I propose that this unified treatment is on the wrong track. In contrast, I propose that focus movement comes in two types: Type 1 focus movement, as exemplified by Hungarian focus movement, is always accompanied by verb movement; Type 2 focus movement, as exemplified by Italian focus movement, is not accompanied by verb movement. Attendees may also like to look at [Hamlaoui and Szendroi \(2015\)](#) and [Hamlaoui and Szendroi \(to appear\)](#) in advance of the meeting.

- **2nd December 2015 [CH room G10 13:00-14:30]**

Ezekiel Panitz will lead a discussion on [Kasai \(2014\)](#). Abstract: "This paper argues that the null clausal complement in Japanese is not derived via CP ellipsis but is rather an instance of pro. The availability of sloppy interpretation in the construction under investigation apparently argues that ellipsis is involved there, but it is revealed under close scrutiny of the sloppy interpretation in question that the null clausal complement behaves like deep anaphora, not like surface anaphora."

- **18th November 2015 [CH room 201 14:30-16:00]**

Nino Grillo will present recent work of his on the syntax and semantics of Pseudo Relatives. The following provides some background on Nino's work.

Proposition-denoting expressions tend to be expressed with 'larger' syntactic constituents, housing more functional structure, while expressions that denote events are typically 'smaller', often tenseless, phrases. This syntax-semantics mapping is best revealed under perception verbs. Epistemically positive perception reports

(Barwise 1981)—so-called indirect perception reports—are expressed by finite CPs (as in the Italian example in (Gianni saw from the tears that Maria was crying, #but thought she was laughing)), whereas epistemically neutral perception reports are expressed with infinitives (Gianni saw Maria crying but thought she was laughing). In this short report ([see NELS45](#)), we show that Pseudo-Relatives — while finite — give rise to direct perception like infinitives. We provide novel evidence, however, that PRs differ from infinitives in being referential descriptions of situations rather than being existentially quantified (Higginbotham 1983). We then propose, based on independent syntactic evidence, that PRs are headed by a determiner that is responsible for the low type of PRs compared to ‘normal’ finite clauses. [NELS46 Handout](#).

- **14th October 2015 [CH room 101 14:00-15:30]**

Caterina Paolazzi will present the results of a study she conducted on the processing of passive sentences (see summary, below) and also lead a discussion on [Ferreira 2003](#). The difficulty of non-canonical structures, such as passives, has often been attributed to inaccurate heuristic processing that abides by an agent-first strategy (Bever, 1970; Ferreira, 2003; Townsend & Bever, 2001). However, discrepant results have been found in the previous literature: understanding passives seems to be more difficult than processing active in offline tasks (Street and Dabrowska, 2010; Ferreira, 2003) but easier in online ones (Traxler et al., 2014; Carrithers, 1989). Our data, collected in a self-paced reading task, seem to suggest that passive sentences are not harder to process than active ones, either online or offline. The difference between the present results and previous findings could stem from properties of the predicates, used across the studies, which determine the possibility and complexity of the predicates' passivization. Supplementary readings: Carrithers, C. (1989). Syntactic complexity does not necessarily make sentences harder to understand. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 18.1, 75-88.
Gehrke, B., & Grillo, N. (2009). How to become passive. *Interface Explorations*, 231-268.

- **1st July 2015 [CH room 201 14:00 - 15:30]**

UCL PhD student Jiri Kaspar will be presenting his own work. Note that there is no reading for this week, as Jiri will take us through the paper. A summary of the paper is below.

There is a selectable position high in the Czech left periphery into which elements interpreted as contrastive topic, and only those, may move. The existing accounts of the Czech left periphery either consider this position to be semantically underspecified (e.g., Meyer (2006), Sturgeon (2008), Gruet-Skrabalova (2012)), or fail to recognise its existence altogether (e.g., Toman (1981), Veselovska (1995)). As far as syntax is concerned, the present account is in line with the analysis of contrastive topic proposed in Constant (2014). As far as semantics is concerned, the Czech data pose an interesting problem for many existing theories of contrastive topic (e.g., Buring (2003), Wagner (2012), Constant (2014)).

- **10th June 2015 [CH room B07 14:00 - 15:30]**

Patrick Elliott will present a [short proceedings paper](#) by Jeremy Hartman in which Hartman argues that tough-constructions, as in (1), are subject to a defective intervention effect from an experiencer in the matrix clause. This is presented as evidence in favour of a two-step movement derivation, where the subject (i) undergoes A'-movement in the embedded clause, followed by (ii) A-movement to the

matrix subject position.

(1) John is tough (for Mary) to please.

Patrick will also present some challenges to Hartman's analysis, from Bruening (2014) and elsewhere.

Supplementary readings:

Bruening, B. (2014). Defects of Defective Intervention. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 45(4), 707-719.

[Ahn, B. and Sailor, C. \(2014\). Obligatory object gaps in infinitival clauses. Handout from a talk at LSA 2014, Minneapolis.](#)

[Keine, S. and Poole, E. \(2015\). Intervention in tough constructions. Handout from a talk at GLOW 38, Paris.](#)

Hartman, Jeremy. (2012). Varieties of clausal complementation. PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (chapter 4)

- **18th March 2015 [CH room 101 14:00 - 15:30]**

Ezekiel Panitz will lead a discussion on Ivy Sichel's paper, "[Resumptive Pronouns and Competition](#)", in which Sichel argues that Hebrew resumptive relatives are sometimes, though not always, generated under movement, and that the selection of the movement alternative is governed by an economy constraint which allows resumptive relatives to be generated under movement only in those contexts in which gap relatives are disallowed.

- **4th March 2015 [CH room 101 14:00-16:00]**

Wing Yee Chow will present data from an event-related brain potential (ERP) study on the processing of number agreement in Basque. Previous cross-linguistic research has found that comprehenders are immediately sensitive to various kinds of agreement violations (e.g., John runs/*run), and many studies have examined how comprehenders compute agreement based on different features (e.g., person, number, gender) and between different constituents (e.g., subject-verb vs. object-verb agreement.). In this study we ask whether sensitivity to subject-verb (S-V) agreement violations vary as a function of the presence vs. absence of O-V agreement. We focus on Basque, an SOV ergative language with both S-V and object-verb (O-V) agreements, and compare the effects of S-V agreement violations in transitive vs. intransitive sentences. We found that S-V agreement violations elicited qualitatively different ERP effects in transitive vs. intransitive sentences. These results provide initial support for the hypothesis that S-V agreement processing is affected by the presence or absence of O-V agreement. I will discuss alternative accounts of these data (e.g., Arregi & Nevins' (2012) proposal that analyses S-V agreement in transitive verbs (but not in intransitives) in Basque as a pronominal clitic) and future directions of this research.

The current study was designed based on some of the findings reported in Díaz B., Sebastián-Gallés N., Erdocia K., Mueller J.L., & Laka I. (2011). [On the cross-linguistic validity of electrophysiological correlates of morphosyntactic processing: A study of case and agreement violations in Basque](#). *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 24 (3), 357-373., which will be available on our website shortly.

We have also set aside up to half an hour (on top of the normal hour and a half) to discuss the format of the SRG with the group. Please bring any comments or ideas on what you'd like to see in the future!

- 18th February 2015 [CH room 101 14:00-15:30]**
 Debates on the structure of English existential sentences of the following four types have a long history in generative grammar.

 - 1) There emerged a solution.
 - 2) There is a man in the garden.
 - 3) There is a man playing chess.
 - 4) There have just been several fish caught.

Klaus Abels will be discussing Harwood's ([2013, chapter 6](#)) contribution to this debate with special attention to the issue of whether 'be' in examples (3) and (4) is auxiliary 'be' or main verb 'be.'
- 4th February 2015 [CH room 101 14:00 - 15:30]**
 Caterina Paolazzi will lead a discussion on '[Agreement attraction in comprehension: Representations and processes](#)' by Wagers, Lau, Phillips (2009). Based on the data collected in a comprehensive series of experiments, the authors propose that agreement attraction errors arise as a result of a faulty cue-based retrieval mechanism, and not, as previously argued, as a result of an incorrect representation of the features of the subject
- 21st January 2015 [CH room 101 14:00 - 15:30]**
 Laura Aldridge will present Svenonius (2008), "[Spatial P in English](#)", in which Svenonius investigates the structure of spatial prepositions in English from a nano-syntax perspective, arguing for a rich structure in the extended projection of P. In addition to the commonly-assumed 'path' and 'place' projections, Svenonius posits 'degree', 'axial part' and 'deictic' projections, among others. This decomposition of spatial P is argued to be required in order to account for a complex array of phenomena, including the (un)availability of modification by measure expressions, and the contexts in which the complement of P can go unpronounced.
- 10th December 2014 [CH room 116 14:00 - 15:20]** (rescheduled from 19 Nov)
 Yasu Sudo will present Merchant (2014), "[Gender mismatches under nominal ellipsis](#)". Abstract: Masculine/feminine pairs of human-denoting nouns in Greek fall into three distinct classes under predicative ellipsis: those that license ellipsis of their counterpart regardless of gender, those that only license ellipsis of a same-gendered noun, and those in which the masculine noun of the pair licenses ellipsis of the feminine version, but not vice versa. The three classes are uniform in disallowing any gender mismatched ellipses in argument uses, however. This differential behavior of gender in nominal ellipsis can be captured by positing that human-denoting nouns in Greek, while syntactically and morphological uniform in showing a masculine/feminine contrast, do not all encode this contrast in their semantics. Under a semantic identity theory of ellipsis, the attested variation in nominal ellipses in Greek is posited to derive from the fact that nominal ellipsis has two possible sources: a nominal constituent can be elided (true ellipsis), or a null nominal proform can be used (model-theoretic anaphora).
- 3rd December 2014 [CH room 101 14:00-15:30]** Patrick Elliott will present Kastner (2014), "Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs." Kastner proposes that the complements of presuppositional verbs are definite DPs, which denote an entity. By contrast, non-presuppositional verbs select for a proposition. This proposal accounts for various differences between presuppositional and non-presuppositional verbs. Crosslinguistic data is used to show that the entity/proposition split parallels a split in interpretation between DP and CP complements: a presuppositional DP complement is interpreted like a presupposed

entity, while a non-presuppositional CP complement has the semantics of a novel proposition. This way of looking at clausal complements also allows us to account for the behavior of sentential subjects, which have been argued to be both nominal and factive. Kastner fleshes out these generalizations and shows that they emerge as a natural result in his framework. With sentential subjects as with clausal complements, factivity and presupposition correlate with the syntactic category of the argument. Kastner takes this to imply a form-meaning isomorphism in the syntax and semantics of what a verb licenses (DP vs CP). The paper can be downloaded [here](#).

- **5th November 2014 [CH room 101 16:00-17:30]**

Andrea Santi will present Matchin et al. (2014) on "A structural distance effect for backward anaphora in Broca's area: An fMRI study". This recent fMRI study looks to advocate between theories of Broca's area that assign syntactic operations (eg, movement) vs domain general processing to the region. The design contrasts backward anaphora to wh-questions over long vs short distances. The results are interpreted to support the latter of the two theories mentioned. The paper can be found [here](#).

- **22 October 2014 [CH room G06 14:30-16:00]** Hans van de Koot will present Chomsky's recent paper, "Problems of Projection", which explores the consequences of the idea that the standard notion of projection has no place in the simplest Merge-based system of phrase structure. Since syntactic objects require a label for interpretation at the LF interface, the computational system must contain a labelling algorithm. The paper proposes a search-based version of such an algorithm and argues that it accounts for a variety of phenomena, including the obligatory raising of XPs from intermediate (=non-criterial) positions, obligatory raising of either the external or the internal argument from v*P (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001) and other cases of obligatory raising that Moro captures with a principle of "dynamic antisymmetry", as well as the core cases of ECP. The paper can be found [here](#).

- **8 October 2014 [CH room G06 14:00-15:30]**

Zoë Belk will present Roy and Soare 2014 on the internal eventive properties of -er nominals. Roy and Soare (2014) argue that -er nominals fall into two categories according to animacy: inanimate nominals may never be eventive, while eventive nominals (which are always animate) may involve either a generic or an episodic event. The differences between the classes can be teased apart using modifying adjectives, and in particular the event-related meanings of attributive adjectives. The difference is a result of the differing underlying structure of the various kinds of -er nominals. The paper can be found [here](#).

- **26 March 2014 [CH room 201, 14:00-15:30]**

Patrick Elliott will present Ramchand & Svenonius (to appear). Abstract: "The Cartographic enterprise has uncovered convincing evidence for a rich functional hierarchy of fine-grained categories. This is difficult to square with the Minimalist Program, which argues that the role of UG should be minimised. In this paper, the authors attempt to reconcile the tension between the two approaches by arguing that many apparent ordering effects can be derived on the basis of factors including scope, polarity, and semantic category. A detailed account of the English auxiliary system is given as a case study. The residual 'Core Functional Hierarchy' is speculated to arise on the basis of nonlinguistic cognition." [[download](#)]

- **5 March 2014 [CH room 116, 13:00-14:00]** Matthew Reeve will present Toosarvandani 2013 on gapping and VP ellipsis. Toosarvandi argues that, contra Johnson 2009, gapping is not a form of across-the-board movement after low coordination, but is rather low coordination plus VP-ellipsis, which solves many of the problems present in the Johnson paper. [[download](#)]
- **29 January 2014 [CH room 101, 14:00-15:30]** Jiri Kaspar will present Artstein (2002). Abstract: "Echo questions are interpreted through focus semantics. Echo questions must be entailed by previous discourse; focus is therefore not needed to mark givenness, and instead it is used to compute the question denotation: the questioned element, marked with a pitch accent, is a focus constituent, and the alternative set of the echo question is its question denotation, i.e. the set of possible answers. The focus strategy exempts echo questions from locality restrictions ("islands"), allows echo questions on parts of words, and allows second-order echo questions which denote sets of questions." [[download](#)]
- **15 January 2014 [CH room G13, 15:00 to 16:30]** Harris Constantinou will present Kotek & Erlewine (to appear). In this paper, the authors argue for the existence of covert pied-piping in wh-questions through a previously unnoticed pattern of intervention effects in superiority obeying English multiple wh-questions. The claim is that the preference of covert pied-piping is for movement of larger constituents, unlike overt pied-piping. It is argued that this discrepancy stems from conflicting requirements of PF and LF. [[download](#)]
- **10 December 2013 [CH room 201, 13.00-14.30]** Maria Varkanitsa will present Gryllia (2009), which explores the discourse-semantic properties of preverbal and postverbal object foci in Greek. Through different tests the author shows that preverbal object foci do not differ from their postverbal counterparts with respect to exhaustivity and contrastivity. However, evidence from backward anaphora and discourse continuation suggest that preverbal object foci are discourse topics. [[download](#)]
- **19 November 2013 [CH room 116, 13.00-14.30]** Nino Grill will be presenting Cinque 1992 on the pseudo-relative and acc-ing constructions after verbs of perception. [[download](#)]
- **22 October 2013 [CH room 201, 14:30-15:30]** Yasu Sudo will critically examine Kim's (2007) and Grosu's (2010) analyses of Internally Headed Relative Clauses (IHRCs) in Japanese (and Korean). Yasu will also discuss "tokoro"-relative clauses, which is another kind of IHRC construction in Japanese. (This is a continuation from the October 8th meeting, but you don't need to have attended the previous meeting). [[download](#)]
- **8 October 2013 [CH room 201, 13.00-14.30].** Yasu Sudo will be presenting Shimoyama 1999 on internally-headed relative clauses in Japanese. [[download](#)]
- **22 May 2013 [CH room 201, 15:30-17:00]** Hans Van de Koot and Laura Aldridge will present the main points of Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012: Linguistic Inquiry 43.3: 331-369) - "Manner and result in the roots of verbal meaning". In addition, Laura Aldridge will present the results of her own experimental work, which are directly related to the paper. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic of the paper.
- **16 January 2013 [CH room G03, 14:00-15:30]** Ezekiel Panitz will present the main points of Fukaya (2012. Island-sensitivity in Japanese sluicing and some implications. In J. Merchant & A. Simpson (Eds.), Sluicing: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives (pp.

123-163). Oxford: Oxford University Press.) [[download](#)]. By attending to the range of interpretations available in Japanese and English sluicing examples, the author argues that sluicing does not repair island violations. The presentation is followed by a discussion around the topic, including some general remarks on the interpretation of elliptical sentences -- an issue which bears directly upon the validity of Fukaya's arguments, as well as upon the more general program of establishing whether sluicing repairs island violations.

- **12 December 2012 [CH room G03, 13:30-15:00]** Elena Titov will be presenting Part I of her thesis ([download](#)) that proposes a novel analysis of Russian neutrally scrambled constructions and argues that the parametric variation in the availability of neutral scrambling of arguments cross-linguistically depends on the type of relative interpretative argument prominence that a language encodes via syntactic structure. When thematic and information-structural prominence relations do not coincide, only one of them can be structurally/linearly represented. The relation that is not structurally/linearly encoded must be made visible at the PF interface either via prosody or morphology. The analysis is covered by the first four chapters, with chapters 2 and 3 being the most relevant. If needed, Elena can present Part II at another session.
- **21 November 2012 [CH room 201, 15.30-17.00]** Zoë Belk will present the main points of Johnson 2011 ([download](#)). a paper that attempts to derive the differences in how Wh-movement and quantifier raising are pronounced. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic.
- **27 September 2012 [CH room 101, 11:30-13:00]** Cilene Rodrigues will be sharing the results of fieldwork on the syntax of embedding and recursion in Pirahã in our next UCL syntax reading group meeting ([download](#)).
- **3 October 2012 [CH room 201, 15:30-17:00]**. Nino Grillo will present the main points of Moulton, Keir (2013. Raising from the dead. Linguistic Inquiry 44, 1.) ([download](#)). By providing evidence from nominal quantification, the paper argues that modal adjectives (such as "necessary") embed covert clausal material. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic.
- **16 May 2012 [CH room 101, 3.30pm]** Claire Grant will present the main points of Giorgi & Pianesi (1994) ([download](#)). The paper develops a theoretical account that explains why in English the continuous reading of the present tense is impossible with all eventive predicates. It is argued that, the English verb has special morphosyntactic properties which set it apart from Romance and the other Germanic languages. It is shown that the morphosyntactic structure of the English verb largely determines its aspectual characteristics, and, consequently, the peculiar interpretive properties of the present tense. The authors propose that the way perfective events are related to anchoring events is universally constrained by what they term the punctuality constraint. They show that it is impossible to relate a perfective event to the speech event, and that this impossibility accounts for the crosslinguistic differences observed in the interpretation of the present tense. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic.
- **2 May 2012 [CH room 101, 4pm]** Harris Constantinou will present the main points of Frey (2010) ([download](#)). The paper argues that the notion of emphasis has to be part of the grammar of German. It is demonstrated that in German, A-bar movement to the left periphery of a declarative clause is associated with a conventional implicature which encodes the emphatic interpretation of the moved item. The appropriate notion of emphasis is characterized and it is shown how it differs from a

coarse concept of contrast. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic.]

- **28 March 2012 [CH room 101, 2pm]** Maria Varkanitsa will present the main points of Hornstein (1996) ([download](#)). The paper argues for eliminating Quantifier Raising (QR) as a rule of Universal Grammar. It is suggested that the relative scope and binding properties that quantified NPs manifest is parasitic on the movements that all NPs undergo to satisfy grammatical demands such as case requirements and other species of feature checking. As always, the presentation will be followed by a discussion.]
- **14 March 2012 [CH room 101, 4pm]** Matthew Reeve will present the main points of Sheena (2011) ([download](#)). The paper argues that relative clause extraposition should be analysed as base-generated (along the lines of Koster 2000), while complement clause extraposition should be analysed as involving 'scattered deletion' (i.e. leftward movement of the whole DP plus deletion of the relevant parts), in conformity with the LCA. As always, the presentation will be followed by a discussion.
- **7 March 2012 [CH room 201, 4pm]** Elena Titov will present the main points of Fanselow and Lenertova (2011) ([download](#)). The paper discusses the generalization that only the leftmost accented part of the semantic focus can be moved to the left periphery in German and Czech. It proposes that movement to the left periphery is generally triggered by an unspecific edge feature of C (Chomsky 2008) and its restrictions can be attributed to requirements of cyclic linearization, modifying the theory of cyclic linearization developed by Fox and Pesetsky (2005). As always, the presentation will be followed by a discussion.
- **7 December 2011 [CH room 201, 4pm]** Nathan Klinedinst will present (in a way accessible to non-semanticists) the main points of Abrusán (2011) ([download from: http://semprag.org/article/view/sp.4.5](http://semprag.org/article/view/sp.4.5)), a paper which adopts a semantic approach towards explaining the unacceptability of wh-islands in degree questions. Nathan will then proceed to a brief comparison of Abrusán's (2011) approach and Eddy Ruys's approach (presented at Linguistics Seminar Series on 16 November 2011) focusing on the issue of what counts as a semantic explanation of some phenomenon. This will be followed by a discussion around the topic.
- **9 November 2011 [CH room 101, 4pm]** Misako Tanaka will present the main points of Cresti (1995) (title of the paper: Extraction and Reconstruction), which discusses a semantic filter on wh-islands and a semantic treatment of scope reconstruction. This will be followed by a discussion around the topic. [[download](#)]
- **12 October 2011 [CH room 101, 4pm]** Dorothea Hackman will present the main points of Speer et al (2011), a paper which demonstrates through speech production and categorization experiments that speakers and listeners reliably use correspondences between prosodic phrasing and syntactic constituent structure to resolve standing and temporary ambiguity. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic. [[download](#)]
- **28 September 2011 [CH room 116, 4pm]** The discussion of this session will revolve around Berwick et al's (2011) paper on the poverty of stimulus. [[download](#)]

- **21 September 2011 [CH room 101, 4pm]** The discussion will revolve around Perfors et al's (2011) paper on the learnability of abstract syntactic principles. [[download](#)]

13 July 2011 [CH room 301, 2pm] Klaus Abels will present his own work on the topic "Does sluicing repair islands?". The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic.

Reading: <http://home.uchicago.edu/~merchant/pubs/variable.island.repair.pdf>

8 June 2011 [CH room 201, 4pm] Harris Constantinou will present the main points of Eckardt (2001), a paper which investigates the meaning of the German intensifier "selbst". The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic. [[download](#)]

25 May 2011 [CH room 201, 2pm] Dr Akis Kechagias will present the main points of Cesceg and Kiefer (2009) (attached), a paper which proposes a different (from the traditional) view of information structure. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around the topic. [[download](#)]

27 April 2011 [CH room 101, 2pm] Misako Tanaka will present the main points of Takahashi(2002), a paper which proposes an overt movement analysis of split-QP constructions in Japanese and is an alternative to the classic unselective binding analysis that treats the split-QP constructions as another instance of donkey anaphora. The presentation will be followed by a discussion around this topic.

Primary reading: Takahashi, Daiko (2002) Determiner raising and scope shift, *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 575-615. [[download](#)]

Optional reading: Shimoyama, Junko (2006) Indeterminate phrase quantification in Japanese, *Natural Language Semantics* 14: 139-173. [[download](#)]

23 March 2011 [CH room 101, 4pm] M. R. Baltin. (2010) Deletion versus pro-forms: An overly simple dichotomy. Ms.NYU. [[download](#)]

Extra reading: B. Haddican.(2007). The structural deficiency of verbal pro-forms. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 38(3):539–547 [[download](#)]

F. Chalcraft. (2006). Do-doubling in varieties of English. In *Workshop on Syntactic Doubling*, Amsterdam. [[download](#)]

M. Houser, L. Mikkelsen, and M. Toosarvandani. (2007) Verb phrase pronominalization in Danish: Deep or surface anaphora? In E. Brainbridge and B. Agbayani, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Western Conference on Linguistics*, pages 183–195. University of California, Fresno, CA. [[download](#)]

2 March 2011 [CH room 301, 2pm] Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2009. Dutch modal complement ellipsis. Chapter 2. You have the right to remain silent: The syntactic licensin of ellipsis. Ms. Catholic University of Brussel. [[download](#)]

6 October 2010 [CH room tba, 4pm] Stroik, Thomas and Michael Putnam. *The Structural Design of Language*. Chapter 1: The Biolinguistic Turn. Ms. University of Missouri & Carson-Newman College. [[download](#)]

10 February 2010 [CH room 101, 4pm] Lahousse, Karen (2009). Specificational sentences and the influence of information structure on (anti-)connectivity effects. *Journal of Linguistics* 45, 139-166.

20 January 2010 [CH room 101, 4pm] Brisson, C. (2003) Plurals, 'all', and the Nonuniformity of Collective Predication. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26.2: 129-184.

25 November 2009 Valentina Bianchi and Mara Frascarelli (2009). Is topic a root phenomenon? Ms. Università di Siena and Università di Roma III. [[download](#)]

30 March 2009 Joy Ruff (2009). Locus and Linkers. MS. UCL. [[download](#)]

9 March 2009 Akis Kechagias (2009). On the Left-Periphery: Decoupling A-bar movement and Quantification. MS. UCL. [[download](#)]

16, 23 February 2009 Cornelia Endriss. Quantificational topics: a scopal treatment of exceptional wide scope phenomena, to appear in *Studies in Linguistics & Philosophy*, Springer, a revised version of her PhD thesis (2006), University of Potsdam. [[download](#)]

26 January 2009 Gregory M. Kobele (2008). To appear in *Local Modeling of Non-local Dependencies* Artemis Alexiadou, Tibor Kiss and Gereon Muller (ed.) [[download](#)]

1 December 2008 Jonathan David Bobaljik and Susi Wurmbrand (2008). Word Order and Scope: transparent interfaces and the 3/4 signature. Ms. MIT. [[download](#)]

17 November 2008 Danny Fox and Uli Sauerland (2008). Illusive Scope of Universal Quantifiers. In G.Matos et al. (ed.): *Interfaces in Linguistic Theory*, Edições Colibri/Associação Portuguesa de Linguística, Lisbon, 149–176. [[download](#)]

3 November 2008 Theodora Alexopoulou (2008). Binding Illusions and Resumption in Greek. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Volume on Greek Syntax and Semantics. [[download](#)]

9 June 2008 Irene Heim (1997). [Predicates or Formulas? Evidence from Ellipsis](#). [This is based on Rooth's 1992 [Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy](#)]

2 June 2008 Ruth Kempson and Akiko Kurosawa (2008). At the Syntax Pragmatics Interface: Japanese Relative Clause Construal. [[download](#)]

19 May 2008 Shoichi Takahashi and Sarah Hulsey (2008). Wholesale Late Merger: Beyond the A/A'-distinction. To appear in *Linguistic Inquiry* [[download](#)]

5 March 2008 Svetlana McCoy (2003). Connecting Information Structure and Discourse Structure through “Kontrast”: The Case of Colloquial Russian Particles -TO, ŽE, and VED’. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 12: 319–335.

20 February 2008 Nikos Velegrakis (2008). Exploring the Structure of Greek Polydefinites. Ms. UCL. [[download](#)]

6 February 2008 Akis Kechagias (2008). VOS in Modern Greek: Syntax & Information Structure Revisited. Ms. UCL. [[download](#)]

5 December 2007 [room 3, 21 Gordon Square] J.-R. Hayashishita (2007). On the nature of the [sic] inverse scope. Ms, University of Otago. [[download](#)]

21 November 2007 [room 3, 21 Gordon Square] Hui Cao. On *dou* "all" and *you* "have" in Mandarin Chinese. [[download](#)]

17 October 2007 Peter Culicover and Ray Jackendoff (2006). Turn over control to the semantics! *Syntax* 9: 131-152.

10 October 2007 Alec Marantz (to appear). Phases and words. [[download](#)]

3 October 2007 Ilan Hazout (2004). The Syntax of Existential Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 393-430. [[download](#)]

There is a (short) reply by Edwin Williams to this article, which might also be interesting to read.

Williams, Edwin (2006). The Subject-Predicate Theory of *There*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 648-651. [[download](#)]

13 June 2007 Bowers, John (2007). Arguments as Relations. Ms. Cornell University.

16 May 2007 at 14.00 Bowers, John (2007). Arguments as Relations. Ms. Cornell University.

14 March 2007 at 14.00 Bobaljik, Jonathan (2006). Where's Phi? Agreement as a Post-Syntactic Operation. Revised version. March 2006. [[download](#)]

28 February 2007 at 14.00 Kehler, Andrew (1996). Coherence and the Co-ordinate Structure Constraint. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 22. [[download](#)]

24 January 2007 Citko, Barbara (2005). On the nature of Merge: External Merge, Internal Merge, and Parallel Merge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(4): 475-496. [[download](#)]

6 December 2006 Hulsey, Sarah and Uli Sauerland (2006). Sorting out relative clauses. *Natural Language Semantics* 14, 111-137. [[download](#)]

1 November 2006 Buring, Daniel (2005). Bound to Bind. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.2

18 October 2006 Levine, Robert D. and Ivan A. Sag (2003). Some empirical issues in the grammar of extraction. In: Stefan Müller (ed.), Proceedings of the HPSG03 Conference. CSLI Publications. [[download](#)]

4 October 2006 Haddican, Bill (2006). The structural deficiency of verbal pro-forms. Ms. University of York (revised version to appear in *Linguistic Inquiry*). [[download](#)]

14 June 2006 [Sauerland, Uli and Kazuko Yatsushiro \(2004\). Genitive Quantifiers in Japanese as Reverse Partitives.](#) Ms. Centre for General Linguistics, Typology and Universals Research (ZAS).

31 May 2006 Richards, Marc (2004). Object Shift and Scrambling in North and West Germanic: A Case Study in Symmetrical Syntax. PhD, University of Cambridge. **Chapter 3.** [please e-mail if you haven't received the file]

1 March [David Adger and Gillian Ramchand \(2005\). Merge and Move: Wh-dependencies revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:2, 161-193.](#) [from UCL machine or with Athens authentication]

25 January 2006 [Felicia Lee \(2003\). Anaphoric R-expressions as Bound Variables. *Syntax* 6.1: 84-114.](#) [from UCL machine or with Athens authentication]

30 November 2005 [starts at 4.15pm] [Edward Stabler \(2004\). Varieties of crossing dependencies.](#) Published in *Cognitive Science* 28(5): 699-720.

16 November 2005 [starts at 3 pm instead of 4pm] [James McCloskey \(2000\). Quantifier Float and Wh-Movement in an Irish English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:1, 57-84.](#) [from UCL machine or with Athens authentication]

2 November 2005 [starts 3 pm instead of 4 pm] [Caroline Heycock and Roberto Zamparelli \(2003\). Coordinated Bare Definites. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:3, 443-469.](#) [from UCL machine or with Athens authentication]

26 October 2005 Gisbert Fanselow (1988). Aufspaltung von NP und das Problem der "freien" Wortstellung. *Linguistische Berichte* 114: 91-113. [a copy of this article will be available from the PhD room, 21 GS]

16 September 2005 [Noam Chomsky. \(2004\). On Phases.](#) Ms. MIT. [freely downloadable]