

# Pseudo-noun incorporation and the DP/NP distinction

---

Imke Driemel

University of Leipzig

Imke.driemel@uni-leipzig.de

Pseudo-noun incorporation languages (e.g. Spanish, Korean, Turkish, Niuean) show a robust cross-linguistic correlation between the lack of case-marking and the restriction to low scope, shown for Hindi in (1). Some languages additionally require adjacency between N and V (Tamil, Spanish).

(1) Hindi (Dayal 2011: 137)

Anu	<i>bacca</i> <sup>¬∃, *∃¬</sup> / <i>bacce</i> – <i>ko</i> <sup>¬∃, ∃¬</sup>	<i>nahiiN</i>	<i>samhaalegii</i> .
Anu	child/child-ACC	not	look.after-FUT

‘Anu will not look after children.’

DP/NP accounts attribute case-drop, low scope, and adjacency to V’s availability of optionally selecting for NPs/NumPs which are of type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  (whereas DPs are  $\langle e \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ ). Case-marking is tied to a [+D]-feature, either via category-sensitive case assignment (Dayal 2011), movement to (Massam 2001) or merge in (Öztürk 2009) a case position, or phase status (López 2012). In addition to flexible c-selection, many theories need to postulate either separate lexical entries for each verb that allows for incorporation (van Geenhoven 1998, Dayal 2011) or an additional compositional mode, tailor made for incorporation (Chung & Ladusaw 2004, López 2012), thereby ensuring that verbs can compose with properties.

I propose a version of a DP/NP approach that makes use of a silent operator (2) which merges with the to be incorporated argument. The operator itself checks the selectional feature [uD] on V/v, while also introducing incorporation semantics and obligatory low scope. While this assumption leads to consistent c-selection and avoids enrichment of the lexicon, the reason for the lack of case-marking can be found in the syntactic nature of a pseudo-incorporated NP: a shell created by the operator (ResP constitutes a phase) blocks case assignment by vT (Chomsky 2000).

(2)  $[[Res]] = \lambda P_{\langle e, t \rangle} \lambda Q_{\langle e, \langle e, s, t \rangle \rangle} \lambda e \exists z [P(z) \wedge Q(z)(e)]$

Evidence for Res comes from the inability of incorporated arguments to act as a binder and to control PRO. The adjacency requirement can be implemented as a contextual restriction on the spell-out of the operator Res.

**References:** • Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin et al. (eds.), *Step by step: Essays in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge: MIT Press. • Chung, S. & W. Ladusaw. 2004. *Restriction and saturation*. Cambridge: MIT Press. • Dayal, V. 2011. Hindi pseudo incorporation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29, 123–167. • López, L. 2012. *Indefinite objects. Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. Cambridge: MIT Press. • Massam, D. 2001. Pseudo-noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19, 153–197. • Öztürk, B. 2009. Incorporating agents. *Lingua* 119, 334–358. • Van Geenhoven, V. 1998. *Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions*. Stanford: CSLI.