

Cambridge Comparative Syntax 8 (CamCoS 8)

Co-organised by the University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University

Dates: 2-4 May 2019

Venue: St John's College, Cambridge

After the success of the seven previous CamCoS conferences (see: <http://recos-dtal.mml.cam.ac.uk/conference>), we are delighted to announce **CamCoS 8**, which will again be co-hosted by the **University of Cambridge** and **Anglia Ruskin University**.

Conference theme: Comparative perspectives on phases

Since Chomsky (2000) first proposed that the syntactic derivation proceeds in phases, there has been a vast array of work on this topic (see Fox & Pesetsky 2000, Legate 2003, Gallego 2010, 2012, Citko 2014, Bošković 2013, 2014, 2016 amongst many others). Much of this has focused on identifying exactly which clausal phrases count as phases, with the proposed answers varying from: every phrase (Müller 2010), CP and vP (van Urk 2015, Georgi 2017), just vP (Rackowski & Richards 2005), or more nuanced possibilities (Den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2007, Wurmbrand 2012, Harwood 2015, Ramchand and Svenonius 2014, Bošković 2014, Sailor 2014, Aelbrecht & Harwood 2015). Various phasal diagnostics have been proposed, including new evidence for successive cyclicity (Biberauer & D'Alessandro 2006, van Urk 2015, van Urk & Richards 2015). There has been some debate, with an emerging consensus, that there is also a nominal phase (Svenonius 2004, Butler 2004, Bošković 2013, Syed & Simpson 2017), and a (parameterised) PP phase (Abels 2003, 2012, Citko 2014). While it seems fair to say that we are far from reaching a consensus on these issues, it is also true that these explorations of phases as a construct have triggered much interesting and intricate work on locality. The time is now ripe to compare the various formulations of phases and see what insights emerge from focused comparative investigation.

Phase-based approaches can also account for the Condition on Extraction Domain (CED) with additional assumptions (see Chomsky 2001, Gallego & Uriagereka 2007, Chomsky 2008), but, because phases permit movement through their edges, additional restrictions must be placed on movement itself in order to explain other extraction restrictions (see Amaechi and Georgi, to appear). One very fruitful proposal of this kind is Antilocality. This ban on movement which is too local has been argued to provide an explanation for a wide range of extraction restrictions (Bošković 1994, Grohmann 2000, Murasugi and Saito 1995, Ishii 1997, Abels 2003, Erlewine 2016, Douglas 2017). An alternative approach pursues the idea that there is a bottleneck at the phase edge in some languages, so that movement of one phrase to the phase edge blocks extraction of lower material (Aldridge 2004, Coon et al. 2014, Holmberg et al. 2018). It remains unclear whether both kinds of accounts are required or whether one can reduce to the other (see Douglas et al. 2017 for discussion). Restrictions on A-movement have also been given a phase-based explanation (Sheehan & Cyrino 2018).

In investigations of antilocality, a crucial idea is the proposal that phases are dynamic or context-sensitive. Bošković (2013, 2014, 2016) has argued that in languages with determiners, DP is a phase, whereas in languages which lack D, NP is a phase. There is some evidence that this holds also at the vP level (Wurmbrand 2013, Bošković 2014, Harwood 2015). Gallego (2007) and Den Dikken (2007) independently argue that phases can be extended where a phase head undergoes head-movement. What is not clear yet is whether this

dynamic status of phases is sufficient to account for all kinds of cross-linguistic variation regarding A-bar extraction, or whether additional parameterisation is required.

Phase-based accounts have also been given for **binding** (Lee-Schoenfeld 2004, 2008, Canac-Marquis 2005, Heinat 2006, Hicks 2006, 2009, Despić 2015, Bošković 2016), **ellipsis** (Gengel 2013, Yoshida & Gallego 2013, Bošković 2014, Aelbrecht 2016, Wurmbrand 2017) and **case assignment** (Baker 2015). Finally, there has been extensive work on long-distance Agree, raising the question whether the domains for agree and movement are the same or different (Bhatt & Keine 2017). A closely related question is the status of other kinds of long-distance A-dependencies and what they mean for phase theory (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005, Wurmbrand 2017, 2018, Fong 2018).

Despite all this interest, many within generative grammar have also been sceptical about phases, seeing them as nothing more than a minimalist translation of barriers (Boeckx & Grohmann 2007). Some work has argued explicitly against phases (Torr 2012). It remains to be seen, however, how phenomena such as left-branch extractions, *that*-trace effects, anti-*that* trace effects and island conditions can be handled in a model without phases. We welcome contributions which directly address this issue, and others, including:

- Which phrases count as phases?
- How dynamic are phases? Is there an upper/lower limit on them?
- Is this subject to variation across languages? If so, how? And what are the implications for acquisition, on the one hand, and change on the other?
- Which version of the PIC is correct, if either?
- Are passive/unaccusative vPs also phasal?
- How can phases account for movement restrictions?
- How do phases work in instances of long-distance A-dependencies such as agreement and restructuring phenomena such as long passivisation?

Invited speakers

Ángel Gallego (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Doreen Georgi (Potsdam)

Coppe van Urk (Queen Mary, University of London)

Susi Wurmbrand (Vienna/Harvard)

Call for papers

Given this year's 'Phases' theme, we particularly invite abstracts for 30-minute presentations with a **comparatively oriented** focus on phases. In addition, we also welcome abstracts on any topic in comparative generative syntax. As always, we are particularly interested in papers explicitly addressing parametric issues and/or offering comparative analyses (synchronic or diachronic) of previously un(der)studied varieties and/or phenomena, and papers concerned with "bigger picture" questions, such as what insights modern comparative generative syntax might offer in relation to linguistic typology, syntax-interface mappings, and our understanding of language as a cognitive system. We also encourage papers concerned with methodologies for modern comparative generative syntax.

Anonymous abstracts should not exceed two pages (12-point Times New Roman font, with single spacing and margins of at least 2.54cm/1 inch), including examples and references. They should be uploaded in pdf format via EasyAbstracts (<http://linguistlist.org/easyabs/camcos8>).

The **submission deadline** is Sunday, **31 January 2019**.

For more information, please contact Theresa Biberauer (mtb23@cam.ac.uk) or Michelle Sheehan (michelle.sheehan@anglia.ac.uk).

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Ph.D. dissertation: U. Conn.
- Abels, Klaus. 2012. *Phases. An Essay on Cyclicity in Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton
- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2016. What ellipsis can do for phases, and what it can't but not why. *Linguistic Review* 33(4): 453-482.
- Aelbrecht, Lobke, and William Harwood. 2015. To be or not to be elided: VP ellipsis revisited. *Lingua* 153:66-97.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. Ph.D. dissertation: Cornell.
- Amaechi, Mary and Doreen Georgi. To appear. On subject/non-subject extraction asymmetries in Igbo. In Michael Yoshitake Erlewine (ed.). *Subject Extraction (Glossa Special Collection)*.
- Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case. Its Principles and its Parameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatt, Rajesh and Stefan Keine. 2017. Long-distance agreement. In Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, 2nd Edition, Volume IV*. Wiley-Blackwell, NJ: 2291-2321.
- Biberauer, Theresa and Roberta D'Alessandro. 2006. Syntactic Doubling and the Encoding of Voice in Eastern Abruzzese. In Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon (eds). *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 87-95.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan and Susi Wurmbrand. 2005. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 809-865.
- Boeckx, Cedric and Kleantes Grohmann. 2007. Putting phases in perspective. *Syntax* 10(2): 204-222.
- Bošković, Željko. 1994. D-structure, θ -criterion, and movement into θ -positions. *Linguistic Analysis* 24: 247-286.
- Bošković, Željko. 2013. Phases beyond clauses. In Lilia Schürcks, Anastasia Giannakidou, and Urtzi Etxeberria (eds). *The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 75-128.
- Bošković, Željko. 2014. Now I'm a phase, now I'm not a phase: on the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45. 27-89.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. On the timing of labeling: deducing comp-trace effects, the subject condition, the adjunct condition and tucking in from labelling. *The Linguistic Review* 33: 17-66.
- Butler, Jonny. 2004. *Phase Structure, Phrase Structure, and Quantification*. Ph.D. dissertation: University of York.
- Canac-Marquis, Réjean. 2005. Phases and binding of reflexives and pronouns in English. In Stefan Müller (ed.). *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 482-502.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka (eds). *Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89-156.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.). *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1-52.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds). *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 133-166.
- Citko, Barbara. 2014. *Phase Theory: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro and Omer Preminger. 2014. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: evidence from Mayan. *Linguistic Variation* 14(2): 179-242.
- Den Dikken, Marcel. 2007. Phase extension contours of a theory of the role of head movement in phrasal extraction. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(1): 1-41.
- Despić, Miloje. 2015. Phases, reflexives and definiteness. *Syntax* 18(3) : 201-234.
- Douglas, Jamie. 2017. Unifying the *that*-trace and anti-*that*-trace effects. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 2(1).60:1-28.
- Douglas, Jamie, Rodrigo Ranero and Michelle Sheehan. 2017. Two kinds of syntactic ergativity in Mayan. In Michael Yoshitake Erlewine (ed.). *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI Volume 2 (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics)*. Cambridge, MA., 41-56.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2016. Antilocality and optimality in Kaqchikel Agent Focus. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34(2): 429-479.
- Fong, Suzana. 2018. Proper movement through Spec-CP: an argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. To appear in *Glossa*. Available at: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004307>
- Fox, Danny and David Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31: 1-45.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2007. *Phases and Parametric Variation*. Ph.D. dissertation : Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2010. *Phase Theory*. Amsterdam : Benjamins.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2012. *Phases. Developing the Framework*. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gallego Angel and Juan Uriagereka. 2007. Sub-extraction from subjects: a phase theory account. In José Camacho (ed.). *Romance Linguistics 2006: Selected Papers from the 36th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 155-168.
- Gengel, Kirsten. 2013. *Pseudogapping and Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2017. Patterns of movement reflexes as the result of the order of Merge and Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48: 585-626.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2003. *Prolific Domains. On the Anti-locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam : Benjamins.
- Harwood, William. 2015. Being progressive is just a phase: celebrating the uniqueness of progressive aspect under a phase-based analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33: 523-573.
- Heinat, Frederik. 2006. *Probes, Pronouns and Binding in the Minimalist Program*. Ph.D. dissertation: Lund University.
- Hicks, Glyn. 2009. *The Derivation of Anaphoric Relations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Holmberg, Anders, Michelle Sheehan and Jenneke van der Wal. To appear. Movement from the double object construction is not fully symmetrical. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Ishii, Toru. 1997. *An Asymmetry in the Composition of Phrase Structure and its Consequences*, Ph.D. dissertation: University of California, Irvine.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2004. Binding by phase: (non-)complementarity in German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 16(2): 111-171.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2008. Binding, phases, and locality. *Syntax* 11(3): 281-298.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2003. Some interface properties of the phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:506-16.

- Müller, Gereon. 2010. On Deriving CED Effects from the PIC. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 35-82.
- Murasugi, Keiki and Mamoru Saito. 1995. Adjunction and cyclicity. In Raul Aranovich, William Byrne, Susanne Preuss and Martha Senturia (eds). *Proceedings of the 13th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 13)*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 302-317.
- Rackowski, Andrea and Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: a Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 655-600.
- Ramchand, Gillian and Peter Svenonius. 2014. Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 46: 152-174
- Sailor, Craig. 2014. *The Variables of VP Ellipsis*. Ph.D. dissertation: UCLA.
- Sheehan, Michelle and Sonia Cyrino. 2018. Why do some ECM verbs resist passivisation: a phase-based explanation. To appear in *Proceedings of NELS 48*.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2004. On the edge. In David Adger, Cecile de Cat and George Tsoulas (eds). *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and their Effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 261-287.
- Syed, Saurav and Andrew Simpson. 2017. On the DP/NO status of nominal projections in Bangla: consequences for the theory of phases. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2(1): 68. 1-24.
- John Torr. 2012. Phasing out phases and re-relativizing relativized minimality. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6: 96-129.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2015. A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: A Dinka Bor case study. Ph.D. dissertation: MIT.
- van Urk, Coppe and Norvin Richards. 2015. Two components of long-distance extraction: successive cyclicity in Dinka. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46: 113-155.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2012. The syntax of valuation in auxiliary-participle constructions. In Jaehoon Choi, E. Alan Hogue, Jeffrey Punske, Deniz Tat, Jessmyn Schertz and Alex Trueman (eds). *Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 29)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 154-162.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2013. QR and selection: covert evidence for phasehood. In Stefan Keine and Shayne Sloggett (eds). *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society Annual Meeting 42 (NELS 42)*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA, 619-632.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2017. Stripping and topless complements. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48(2): 341-366.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2018. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. To appear in *CLS Proceedings*.
- Yoshida, Masaya and Ángel Gallego. 2013. Ellipsis and phases: evidence from antecedent-contained sluicing. In Artemis Alexiadou, Tibor Kiss and Gereon Müller (eds). *Local Modelling of Non-local Dependencies in Syntax*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 353-370.