

## Syntax I workshop

Thursday 28 January, 2010  
HUB, Koningsstraat 336, room 116

10.00-10.30	Marijke De Belder	Flavors of n <sup>o</sup> : The morphosyntax of Dutch collective nouns
10.30-11.00	Karen De Clercq	The syntax of <i>no</i> in PPs
11.00-11.15	<b>Coffee break</b>	
11.15-11.45	Lieven Danckaert	Island pied-piping in Latin
11.45-12.15	Adrienn Jánosi	Case and definiteness in long-distance split topicalization in Hungarian
12.15-13.15	<b>Lunch</b>	
13.15-13.45	Rachel Nye	<i>She showed the data her professor</i> : the alternative double object construction in Lancashire English
13.45-14.15	Amélie Rocquet	Past-participle agreement in French : a post-syntactic phenomenon?
14.15-14.30	<b>Coffee break</b>	
14.30-15.00	Tanja Temmerman	Revisiting the pseudo-DP construction in Dutch

## Abstracts

**Marijke De Belder**, CRISSP/HUB/UiL-OTS/Utrecht University

### **Flavors of *n*<sup>o</sup>: The morphosyntax of Dutch collective nouns**

In this talk I discuss a class of nouns which strongly resist number marking, viz. collective nouns (e.g. *cutlery*). At first sight they falsify the claim that roots can combine with all morphosyntactic structures. I show that they do not: collectives are not roots, but derivations that contain a featureless root and an *n*<sup>o</sup> with a feature specification that is semantically incompatible with number marking.

**Karen De Clercq**, GIST/Ghent University

### **The syntax of *no* in PPs**

Negative indefinite *no* in a PP can either trigger sentential negation or constituent negation, or both. In order to trigger sentential negation the [+neg] feature on *no* must somehow percolate up to PP, whereas for constituent negation the *no* can stay inside the DP (Haegeman 1995). This talk wants to provide syntactic and semantic evidence for the existence of two different kinds of *no*: a quantifier *no* and a numeral *no*. Quantifier *no* is located in the edge of the DP-layer from where its [+neg] can percolate up to PP, whereas numeral *no* is located in the lower part of the DP-layer, NumP, from where [+neg] cannot percolate up to PP. An analysis along these lines might shed light on the role of DP as a phase.

**Lieven Danckaert**, GIST/Ghent University

### **Island pied piping in Latin**

Latin allows for a relativization process in which the relativization site is situated inside a (tensed) propositional island. I will analyze this phenomenon as involving two separate displacements. The first one consists of topicalizing the wh-phrase to the leftmost edge of the island, where this wh-phrase is frozen. The second one is the actual wh-movement, by which the entire island, with the wh-phrase on its edge, is affected, resulting in an instance of super-heavy pied piping.

**Adrienn János**, CRISSP/Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel

### **Case and definiteness in long-distance split topicalization in Hungarian**

In this talk I examine the interaction between long-distance split topicalization and case and definiteness marking in Hungarian. In Hungarian the moved DP-portion can show up in a case different from that of the remnant left behind in the base position. Moreover, the moved DP-portion is optionally accompanied by the definite article in spite of the fact that the discontinuous DP is indefinite. I argue that both case and definiteness are assigned by the matrix verb and will explore the theoretical consequences of this analysis.

Rachel Nye, GIST/Ghent University

***She showed the data her professor: the alternative double object construction in Lancashire English***

Whilst much attention has been paid to the English dative alternation, the existence of a third pattern alongside the canonical double object construction (CDOC) and the prepositional object construction (POC) has rarely been discussed. In the alternative double object construction (ADOC), found in Lancashire English, the direct object theme precedes the indirect object goal, as in the POC, yet both objects are realised as a DPs, as in the CDOC. I begin by making some observations about the particular properties and distribution of the ADOC, which occurs productively with a smaller range of verbs and in a more limited range of contexts than CDOC or POC. In offering an analysis for ADOC I explore the consequences of a third alternant in the dative alternation for accounts (such as Baker (1997)) which view the CDOC as transformationally derived from the POC.

Amélie Rocquet, GIST/Ghent University

**Past-Participle Agreement in French : a Post-syntactic Phenomenon?**

Finite Verb Agreement in  $\varphi$ -features (FVA) is considered to be the result of a subject NP raising to the specifier of the Inflection Phrase (Chomsky 1993, Kayne 1989, Sportiche 1998, among others). In the same way, Past Participle  $\varphi$ -Agreement (PPA) in French is often taken to be the consequence of an object NP raising from the verb's complement position to the specifier of the Object Agreement Phrase, AgrOP, where it is assigned accusative case (Belletti 2001, Chomsky 1989, 1993, Friedemann & Siloni 1997, Kayne 1989, ...).

However, Icelandic and certain ergative languages show that a finite verb may agree with its object or even with an NP which is not part of its argument structure. This observation leads Bobaljik (2008) to conclude that FVA occurs after the syntactic computation of sentences.

In my paper, I will discuss to which extent Bobaljik's (2008) account of FVA can be applied to the most frequent instances of PPA in French and determine whether PPA can be qualified as a post-syntactic phenomenon.

Tanja Temmerman, LUCL/Leiden University

**Revisiting the pseudo-DP construction in Dutch**

Dutch is generally considered to be a verb second language: in a declarative main clause, only one constituent can precede the finite verb. However, a construction known as 'the pseudo-DP' seems to violate this requirement: both an argument and an adjunct precede the finite matrix verb (Barbiers 1995; Musan 1997; van Craenenbroeck 2003). In this talk, I argue that the analysis of the restrictions on the co-occurrence of the adjunct in the pseudo-DP and another adjunct in the sentence is an essential factor in deciding which account of the pseudo-DP construction is most accurate.