

## **Hamida Demirdache**

### *What do Pieces of Words “Name”?*

In my talk, I will be providing strong arguments for a semantically causative analysis of both unaccusatives and unergatives - in particular, the implications of reflexive morphology in deriving both unaccusatives and unergatives in Salish. I will also discuss the role of morphology when it does not mirror the direction of the semantic derivation from causative > unaccusative - i.e. causativizing/transitivizing morphology.

## **Hubert Haider**

### *Quirky Subjects - but only in VO with Morphological Case*

*Premise:* directionality of identification of a head is the parametric factor for head-final vs. head-initial merger.

*Corollary:* A head-initial projection (‘VO’) requires a functional identifier for the pre-head argument in the VP. In this case, The pre-head phrase moves to the spec of a functional projection. If nominative checking is not structurally implemented (i.e. not restricted to spec-head agreement of a specific functional projection), quirky subjects result from raising-to-spec of the DP merged last if that DP is not nominative (see Icelandic).

*Theorem 1:* OV-languages cannot have quirky subject constructions

*Theorem 2:* Languages without morphological case cannot have quirky subject constructions.

*‘Proof’:* to be presented in the presentation.

## **Dalina Kallulli**

### *Yet another Syntactic Account of Unaccusativity*

In this talk, I will attempt to provide a formal and uniform analysis of constructions with unaccusatives broadly conceived (i.e., including passives, reflexives, anticausatives and other non-alternating unaccusatives, etc.). The main claim that I will put forward is that all these construction types differ only in terms of the respective building blocks that enter syntactic computation but all arise through the same operation, namely suppression of a feature in *v*. In particular, I will argue that the distinction between passive and the anticausative formation is due to a feature in *v* that encodes the ontological event type of the (verbal) root.

## **Hilda Koopman and Dominique Sportiche**

### *On the Form of Mirror Order Violations*

Morphology is often argued to obey the Mirror Principle (Baker, 1985), with 1 > 2 > 3 corresponding to 3-2-1- order (inner affixes are hierarchally closer to the root than outer affixes). I will discuss cases where morphology does not mirror the syntax, and where we find linear orders that we also find in syntax (3-1-2), or (4-1-2-3). These violations are frequent in African languages which show extensive verbal morphology, and raise the question how they should be analyzed. I will present one case study from Wolof and show that the properties of these morphological objects follow from general syntactic principles and independently motivated syntactic hierarchies.

**Alec Marantz**

*Objects out of the Lexicon: Objects as Events*

The empirical core of the paper will be the demonstration that incremental theme objects, including objects of VPs of creation, are not arguments of the lexical verb. Rather, as sisters to an activity little *v*, these objects are interpreted as subevents caused by the activity. A correlation between the distribution of re-prefixation in English and benefactive double object constructions proves key here. The analysis holds strong implications for the roles of overt and covert morphology at the syntax/semantics interface. Crucially, overt morphemes glossed as “causative” in the world’s languages would be reanalyzed as realizations of an activity little *v*.

**Gillian Ramchand**

*Morphological Causativization/Anticausativization in Hindi/Urdu*

**Maria-Luisa Rivero**

*On Quirky Person Restrictions in Spanish and the Morphology-Syntax Interface*

Keywords: dative logical subjects, nominative logical objects, 3rd person restrictions on nominatives, Spanish, Icelandic.

**Peter Svenonius**

*Deconstructing Quirky Case*

Icelandic has causative-inchoative alternating verbs in which a dative or accusative theme in the causative version appears as nominative in the inchoative version; I call these “normal” unaccusatives. In addition, Icelandic has a number of transitive dative or accusative-taking verbs which show up with dative or accusative subjects (respectively) in monoargumental uses. I call these “quirky” unaccusatives. Passives of dative-taking verbs are always “quirky” in the sense that dative case is always preserved, and passives of accusative-taking verbs are never quirky in the sense that accusative case is never preserved. I show how these apparently idiosyncratic facts about Icelandic case correlate strongly with event-structural meaning, leading to a deconstructivist account of Icelandic case and event structure.

**Jochen Trommer**

*Closest c-command in Albanian Non-active Constructions*

**Edwin Williams**

*Double Object Scope Fixity*