1 Noun-verb constructions: lexical or syntactic?

Some data:

(1) (a) *Pet* wa?-ha-**hwist**-ahtu-?t-a?.
    *Pat* PAST-3MS-**money**-lost-CAUS-ASP
    ‘Pat lost money.’

(b) *(pro)* Wa?-ha-**yw**?-**kv**-ahni:nu-?.
    PAST-3MS/3N-**tobacco**-buy-ASP
    ‘He bought tobacco.’

(c) *Ti-seuan-mu-ban.*
    1sS/AO-**man**-see-PAST
    ‘I saw the/a man.’

- Whose respective meanings have equivalents in (2):

(2) (a) *Pet* wa?-ha-**htu**-?t-a? 
    *Pat* PAST-3MS/3N-**lost**-CAUS-ASP **ne?** PRE-**money**-SUF
    ‘Pat lost the money.’

(b) *(pro)* Wa?-ha-**hninu**-?
    PAST-3MS/3N-buy-ASP **ne?** PRE-**tobacco**-SUF
    ‘He bought the tobacco.’

(c) *Seuan-ide* ti-mu-ban.
    man-SUF 1sS/AO-see-PAST
    ‘I saw the/a man.’

- Are **money**-lost, **tobacco**-buy and **man**-see lexical entries, or syntactically derived?
- Baker argues for the latter.
1.1 Productivity and referentiality

Noun-verb constructions also exist in English:

(3) (a) Pat is a hopeless money-loser.
    (b) Martha went man-watching.
    (c) Humphrey enjoys puddle-jumping.

- Semi-productive in English
- However, in (1) the noun-verb construction gives a verb, in (3) a noun is had.

- Though rare, noun-verb constructions resulting in a verb do exist in English:

(4) (a) I babysat for the deOrios last week.
    (b) We need to grocery-shop tomorrow.

- There are still two important differences between (1) and (4):
  (i) (4) is ungrammatical in a non-noun-verb construction, whereas (1) has grammatical non-noun verb construction forms:

(5) (a) *I sat the baby for the deOrios last week.
    (b) *We need to shop the groceries tomorrow.

(ii) In (4), ‘baby’ and ‘grocery’ are non-referential, whereas in noun-incorporation, the noun-verb construction can be referential. Consider (6) where incorporated ‘corn’ corefers with the non-incorporated ‘corn’:

(6) No:nv akwe: yo-stathv no:-nvhs:t-e sok nu:-wa
    when all 3N-dry PRE-corn-SUF then now
    v-tsaka-nvhs:t-aru:ko. (Mohawk)
    FUT-1PS-corn-takeoff
    ‘When the corn was completely dry, it was time to shell it (the corn).’

- Given these differences, Baker calls the examples of (1) noun incorporation while those in (3) and (4) he calls noun-verb compounding.

1.2 UTAH

- Baker considers noun incorporation to be syntactic.
- UTAH states that the noun incorporated structures (like (7)) will have the same deep structure as the equivalent non-noun incorporated structure (like (8)).
- Thus Baker proposes the structures in for (7) ((1)(a) from above) and (8) ((2)(a) from above)
2 Evidence

2.1 Objects incorporate, agentive subjects do not

- In these languages object incorporation is very productive, however subject incorporation is absent.
- Thus (7) from above is grammatical, while (9) is not:

\( \text{Pet } wa?\text{-ha-hwist-ahtu-?t-a?}. \)
Pat \( \text{PAST-3MS-money-lost-CAUS-ASP} \)
‘Pat lost money.’

\( \text{S} \)
\( \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \)
\( \text{Pat} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{NP} \)
\( \text{money} \quad \text{-lose} \quad \text{Pre-money-SUF} \)

(9)

\( \text{S} \)
\( \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \)
\( \text{Pat} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{NP} \)
\( \text{lose} \quad \text{money} \)

- This is due to the **Empty Category Principle**, which subject incorporation would violate:
For any application of IM of X and Y, X ∈ Y, X must c-command its trace (XP-movement), or the newly created head X+Y must c-command X’s trace (head movement).’ (Week 5, p.4)

- In fact, it is not subject incorporation that is unattested, but agentive subject incorporation.

- Thematic subject, ergative verb is grammatical; consider (11)
- Agentive subject, unergative verb is ungrammatical; consider (12)

(11) (a) \textit{Ka-hsahe\textsuperscript{t}-ahi-hw-i.} \hspace{2cm} \text{(Onondaga)}
\begin{align*}
3N\text{-bean-spill-CAUS-ASP} \\
\text{‘The beans spilled.’}
\end{align*}

(b) 

\begin{align*}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{e} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{beans}_i \quad \text{spilled} \quad t_i
\end{align*}

(a) \textit{∅-khuien-teurawe-we.} \hspace{2cm} \text{(Onondaga)}
\begin{align*}
A\text{-dog-run-PRES} \\
\text{‘The dog is running.’}
\end{align*}

(b) 

\begin{align*}
\text{*S} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{t}_i \quad \text{N} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{dog}_i \quad \text{run}
\end{align*}

- The unergative-ergative distinction is the most striking, however, in (12):

(12) \textit{∅-hliawra-h’ar-hi yede.} \hspace{2cm} \text{(Southern Tiwa)}
\begin{align*}
A\text{:A-lady-eat-FUT that} \\
\text{‘The lady will eat that.’} \text{ but ‘She will eat that lady.’}
\end{align*}

2.2 Stranding

- Determiner-stranding exists in English
- Suggests movement:
(13)  (a) The time has \( t_i \) come [for my departure].
    (b) The time [for my departure] has come.

• Similarly, quantifier-stranding in (14) suggests that ‘man’ moved from its original location:

(14) \( \text{Wisi bi-seuan-mu-ban} \)  

\( \text{two 1sS:B-man-see-PAST} \)

‘I saw two men.’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{N} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \text{I} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{QP} \quad \text{N’} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{man}_{i} \quad \text{-see} \quad \text{two} \quad \text{N} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{t}_{i} \\
\end{array}
\]

• This respects UTAH given the structure of the equivalent sentence in (15):

(15) \( [\text{Wisi seuan-in}] \text{ bi-mu-ban.} \)  

\( \text{two man-PL 1sS-see-PAST.} \)

‘I saw two men.’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{N} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \text{I} \quad \text{saw} \quad \text{QP} \quad \text{N’} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{two} \quad \text{N} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{men} \\
\end{array}
\]

• Possessor-stranding exhibited in (16) suggests the same:

(16) \( \text{Wa?-k-nuhs-ahni:nu} \ [\text{John lao-nuhs-a?}]. \)  

\( \text{AOR-1sS-house-buy John 3M-house-SUF} \)

‘I bought John’s house.’
• This respects UTAH given the structure of the equivalent sentence in (17):

(17)

3 Summary

1. English exhibits noun-verb compounding.

2. Languages such as Onondaga, Mohawk and Southern Tiwa exhibit noun incorporation.

   (a) Productivity and referentiality suggest that these structures are syntactically derived and rather than lexical entries

   (b) UTAH stipulates that the deep structure of noun incorporation be the same as that of equivalent non noun incorporated structures. This is supported by:

      i. The fact that only objects and not subjects can incorporate

         A. More accurately, agentive subjects do not incorporate, but thematic subjects may.

      ii. Stranding of elements such as quantifiers and possessors.