A COMPRESSED VIEW ON THE 2002 GLOW CONFERENCE AND WORKSHOPS IN AMSTERDAM AND UTRECHT

JOSEPH EMONDS, June 2002
KOBE-SHOIN UNIVERSITY

On Monday June 3 at 6 pm at the Kobe-Shoin Graduate School, I will present an extremely compressed view of the packed week of generative linguistics held in Amsterdam and Utrecht (Netherlands) from April 7 through April 13. This was, by one count at least, the **25th anniversary of the GLOW conferences** (Generative Linguistics in the Old Worlds), and consequently a big effort was made to bring in many speakers and to hold a number of additional Workshops in Utrecht which, depending on one's focus, might be considered more important than the Main Colloquium on "Microvariation" in Amsterdam (April 9-11).

Main Colloquium: www.meertens.knaw.nl/glow2002/programme.html
Workshops: www-uilots.let.uu.nl/conferences/glow/GLOW.html
> The Syntax Discourse Interface (April 12)
> Phonological Language Acquisition (April 12&13)
> Tools in Linguistic Theory (April 7 & 8)

One simplification is that I won't speak of phonology (I only attended the invited lecture by Alan Prince.) To facilitate situating 52 non-phonological talks in a short time, interested people can preliminarily look over the above sites for familiar names and topics.

My comments on 3rd June will try to discern some "trends" or "popular approaches" at GLOW, which is the central meeting for Chomskyan/ minimalist syntactic research throughout Europe or more accurately, the North Atlantic, including MIT. Syntacticians who wish to have the pulse/ development of minimalism ("MP") should follow events at GLOW. (You may be aware there have also been 3 Asian GLOW conferences in the past few years.)

Presenters of 45 of the 52 talks are affiliated with European and US East Coast institutions: MIT, Montreal, New York, Penn, U Mass, Yale; Eastern Europeans are increasingly evident as speakers and especially in the audience. 2 presenters were Japanese—partly of course due to the distance.

To provide some flavor of my overview, I give here a few comments on some Workshop presentations. On June 3rd I will (briefly!) cover these and others, as well as some of the Friday Workshop talks and several talks from the Main Colloquium as well. With respect to the Main Colloquium, I will point out a methodological division that seems to divide the "Mediterranean school" (influenced by Cinque, Rizzi, Haegeman) from a "Germanic school".

Tools in Linguistic Theory: Talks. In many ways, the initial "Tools" Workshop, to judge by the many established names on the program and the current centrality of the topics, might be considered the most important part of the week. It gave the feeling for the rest of the week that the "theory is moving forward', which has often not been the case at recent GLOWs.

The main thrust of many speakers in this Workshop was to try to **derive certain operations and concepts in current minimalism from other ones**. A less central theme seemed to be attempts to move away from representations to derivations. Unlike in the Main Colloquium, many empirical patterns were mentioned but less often examined in detail,. Examples of some talks following these themes:

a. Stepanov (Potsdam, ex-Connecticut) set out to derive the 'imperfect' division between adjunction and substitution of γ into a tree from whether this γ has Unchecked FF (substitute) or only Checked FF (adjoin). He also wished to derive post-cyclicity of adjunction from "Least Tampering" with a tree. He claimed that inherent case DPs always "adjoin" because all their FF are internally checked.

b. Starke (New York Univ, ex-Geneva) gave or alluded to 10 arguments that Specifier is a redundant concept. Two: (i) His proposal eliminates doubly-filled SPEC-HEAD filter. (This argument doesn't mesh with e.g. Hoshi's Poster below.) (ii) He can also eliminate the doubling of features required by "checking". His proposal was among the most daring, and received much (ineffectual) criticism.

c. Bouchard (Montreal) claimed many minimalist conceptions are imperfect redundancies: (i) Traces violate "Inclusiveness". (ii) Multiple copy theory requires stipulative Spell-Out conditions. (iii) EPP features are pure stipulations. (iv) Mention of "edges" in Phrase Impenetrability is unexplained. B. espouses a theory not far from HPSG: heads can take e.g. preceding complements whose features are actually present in "extended sisters" at the moment of Merge. Variations in word order arise not from imperfection but from multiplicity of optimal solutions, exemplified by diverse N-A orders.

d. Grohmann (Stuttgart) proposed something new, "Anti-locality", by which many remnants he argues are cluttering minimalism and can be discarded: much of theta-theory, the Case Filter, and the Affect Criteria of various sorts. However, he creates domains of increasing size (theta domain, agreement domain, discourse information domain) which in turn require "unique addresses" of a chain in each. In this way he wants to "shift attention to the derivational syntactic component as much as possible."

e. Hiraiwa (MIT) proposed to eliminate the Minimal Link Condition (MLC) altogether, by using a strictly derivational approach to Case-marking (termed Agree, as is now standard): simultaneous multiple agreement is blocked only by derivationally prior operations. Although he included a hugely elaborate formal discussion, the small Japanese data base did not seem to me to contain some crucial sentences whose status would (dis)confirm his idea. My commentary will present such sentences.

f. Mueller (Mannheim) made the strongest case for eliminating any role for representations whatever. For example, the MLC must cede to Phrase Impenetrability, which means essentially that a derivation has moved beyond a certain domain and can't access it. He introduced a "Workspace" which includes the unused numeration, and checking ("Phrase Balancing") between a derivation in progress and the unused numeration. He discussed impressively many paradigms, but also some obvious problems.

Tools in Linguistic Theory: Poster Session. These didn't generate discussion as people were exhausted. However, the 3 I understand (partly) seem very interesting.

Vogel's (Potsdam) is the only OT Workshop paper, out of my area of expertise. He tries to account for why lack of morphological signalling tends to freeze word orders that otherwise might vary.

Van Gelderen (Ariz. State) develops a comprehensive minimalist theory of 4-stage cyclic syntactic change based on economy; her examples with English negation through history are easiest to understand. Rather than trying to eliminate MP redundancies, she nicely utilizes every operation currently still accepted and shows that **all are instantiated by various historical stages.**

H. Hoshi's (Doshisha) abstract is a brief cogent essay on re-designing Uninterpretable Formal Features (UFF) as an Interface interaction—I'll discuss favorably and suggest a reformulation.