Structural government effects in Hungarian locative incorporation

Balázs Surányi
RIL Hungarian Academy of Sciences / PPCU
suranyi@nytud.hu

1. Structural government

- A central tenet of TG has been that it strives to maximally exploit constituent structure in its account of syntactic phenomena. Accordingly, the central notion of government that TG developed (in distinction to lexical government) is formulated in terms of hierarchical constituent structure:

(1)   Structural government:
       (c-)command restricted to some local syntactic domain

(2)   C-command (informal):
       A c-commands B iff A is not higher in constituent structure than B.

(3)   C-command:
       A c-commands B iff the first node that dominates A also dominates B.

(4)   C-command phenomena:
       -- variable binding
       -- NPI licensing
       -- quantifier scope interpretation
       -- Condition C of classic Binding Theory
       -- etc.

(5)   Structural government (informal):
       A governs B iff A locally c-commands B (and A belongs to the class of governors).

- Locality in government:

  – Version 1:
    No barrier:
    The element to be governed is not contained in a barrier category BC, with the governor being outside of BC.
  – Version 2:
    Minimality/Closeness:
    There is no potential governor A' that can govern B and that is closer to B than A is.

(6)   Government phenomena:
       -- theta role 'assignment'
       -- Case-marking
       -- anaphor binding
       -- movement dependencies
       -- argument/adjunct asymmetries
       -- subject/object asymmetries
       -- etc.

2. Structural government in incorporation

- Baker's descriptive generalizations (1988: 81ff, 244ff):

(i)   Possible incorporees:
    -- No incorporation of (or some element from) external argument dependents like agentive subjects into a verb.
    -- Incorporation of (or some element from) internal arguments like Theme/Patient objects, Theme/Patient subjects (of unaccusatives), as well as Goal/Beneficient arguments and some other obliques is well-formed.
    -- Adjuncts are precluded from incorporation.

(ii)   Locality/Minimality:
    No incorporation of a syntactic constituent that is (or is contained in) an argument of a direct argument of the verb (unless the direct argument of the verb is itself incorporated).

(iii)   Syntactic phrase structural status of incorporee:
    Only simplex elements (syntactic heads) may incorporate, syntactic phrases (multi-word units) cannot.

(7)   Baker's condition:
    Incorporation is available to lexical items which, when in their un-incorporated basic positions, are governed by the host of incorporation.

Baker's condition, in turn, is derived from the Empty Category Principle (ECP), a general condition requiring the trace position of any movement to be properly governed.

- Back to (i): Possible incorporees:
    -- External arguments are higher than the verb in basic constituent structure.
    -- Internal arguments like Theme/Patient objects, Theme/Patient subjects (of unaccusatives), as well as Goal/Beneficiary arguments and some other obliques are not structurally higher than the verb in basic structure (Baker 1988 takes them to be complements, i.e., sisters to the verb).
    -- The canonical position of adjuncts is higher than that of the verb and its complements.

(8)   Baker's basic model of incorporation:
    a. Incorporation is the result of a movement transformation: the incorporee is moved from its basic position to the verb.
    b. It is not incorporation per se but movement at large that is constrained by a government requirement: a moved element must govern its original position (Chomsky 1986, Rizzi 1990).

(9)   Incorporation a la Baker (1988):
    a.   Movement of the incorporee to the host of incorporation. This movement respects restrictions on movement.
    b.   Both the incorporee and the host of incorporation are syntactic heads.
    c.   The incorporee and its host make up a syntactic constituent.
    d.   The incorporee and its host make up a structurally complex syntactic head constituent.

This talk:
Hungarian locative 'incorporation' (HLI)

Claim:

I show that despite the empirical differences found from the data discussed by Baker (1988), the apparent 'incorporation' of locative elements in Hungarian essentially corroborates his structural government based approach (the relevant component here: c-command).

More recent developments in TG:

- Re (ii) Minimality:

  Sustained in current TG (basically, any change here is mostly terminological).

- Re (iii) Syntactic phrase structural status of incorporee:

  -- 'Incorporation' of phrases is also attested (aka pseudo-incorporation, e.g., Niuean, Massam 2001; Hindi, Dayal 1999; Chamorro, Chung and Ladusaw 2003; Turkish; essentially, Mithun's 1984 notion of Type I incorporation, "incorporation by juxtaposition")

-- (Some part of) a syntactically phrasal incorporee and the host of incorporation can form a single morphological/phonological word (e.g., Bobaljik 1995, Julien 2000).

3.   Structural government based asymmetries

3.1   Some background on LI in Hungarian

- LI in Hungarian (and incorporation more generally in this language) has been argued to involve phrasal elements (in this sense, it is pseudo-incorporation).

- First, incorporated locative particles, which are single words of category P (e.g., Bartos 1999, É. Kiss 2002, Dékány 2009), are in complementary distribution with other 'incorporated' elements that may be full PPs, AdvPs, or bare NPs (É. Kiss 1994, 2002). These bare NPs are modifiable (e.g., by attributes), case-marked, but strictly articleless (11a). Different types of secondary predicates can also be incorporated (11b,c).

(10) a.   Fel   tette   a könyvet   a polcra
              up   put-past the book-acc the shelf-onto
              'He put the book on(to) the shelf.'
      b.   A polcra   tette   a könyvet
              the shelf-onto   put-past the book-acc
              'He put the book on(to) the shelf.'
      c.   Az asztal alá   tette   a könyvet
              the desk below   put-past the book-acc
              'He put the book under the desk.'

(11) a.   János   reggel   szerelmes verset   írt   Marinak   [theme]
              John   morning   love poem-ACC   wrote   Mary-DAT
              'In the morning John wrote a love poem to Mary.'
      b.   János   nagyon okosnak   tartja   Marit
              John   very smart-DAT   considers Mary-ACC
              'John considers Mary smart.'
      c.   János   teljesen laposra   verte   Billt   [resultative secondary predicate]
              John   completely flat-onto   beat   Bill-ACC
              'John beat the shit out of Bill.'

3

- Second, 'incorporated' elements may undergo a variety of XP-movements (Farkas and Sadock 1989; Brody 2000; Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000; see also Den Dikken 2004).

- Third, some incorporated particles are possessed heads agreeing with their *pro* possessor complement, i.e., they have a possessive internal structure (Marácz 1986). See section 6.

- Semantic incorporation:
  Pseudo-incorporated bare NPs are semantically incorporated into the verb (e.g., Farkas and de Swart 2003; Bende-Farkas 2002). Full DPs are prohibited in the incorporee position.
  HLI to the verb also creates a complex semantic predicate together with the verb.

3.2   Asymmetries

I argue that HLI exhibits a range of asymmetries accountable for in the manner of Baker's structural government based approach.

- While goal and route directional particles as well as stative locative particles are ubiquitous in the incorporee position (12b–d), source directional elements are unattested in the pre-verbal position of incorporated elements, see (12a) (É. Kiss 1998, 2002):

(12) a. *Belőle   hozott   egy kis gombát   (az erdőből)
          from.it(=PRT)   brought-3sg   a little mushroom-acc   (the woods-from)
          intended: 'He brought mushrooms from the woods.'   [source locative]
     b. Bele   tette   a gombát   (a kosárba)
          into.it(=PRT) put-past-3sg   the mushroom-acc   (the basket-into)
          'He put the mushroom into the basket.'   [goal locative]
     c. Keresztül   sétált   (a parkon)   [route directional locative]
          across(=PRT)   walked-3sg   the park-on
          'He walked through the park.'
     d. Rajta   állt   (papírfecnin)   [stative locative]
          on.it(=PRT)   stood-acc   paper-scrap-on
          'He was standing over the scrap of paper.'

- Orientation of trajectory locative particles are not attested either (with activity verbs) (see (13)), despite the fact that they are expected to affect aspecual interpretation, giving rise to an imperfective interpretation.

(13) *Felé   ment   Mari   a várnak
      towards-3SG went-3SG   Mary   the castle-DAT
      intended: 'Mary walked towards the castle.'   [orientation of trajectory locative]

- The opposition of goal and route locatives on the one hand, and source locatives and orientation of trajectory locatives on the other, extends to constructions involving (overt or covert) incorporation in other languages (Nam 2005: English, Koopman 2000: Dutch).

(14) a. If the boat is jumped into, it may capsize.   [goal locative]
     b. *If the boat is jumped from, it may capsize.   [source locative]
     c. The road can be run across only at great risk.   [route locative]

(15) ??The house was advanced towards by John.

- "External" (or "outer") stative locatives and "internal" (or "inner") stative locatives are also contrasted, the same way as in English (for the latter, see Hornstein and Weinberg (1981)):

(16) Benne aludt János (a régi szekrényben)
in-3SG slept-3SG John-NOM (the old wardrobe-in)
'John slept in the old wardrobe.'

(17) *Benneláttam egy filmet (az új moziban)
in-3SG saw-1SG a film-ACC (the new cimena-in)
'I saw a film in the new cinema.'

(18) a. My bed was slept in last night
b. *New York was slept in last night

- Neither durative, nor completive temporal adpositions can function as a verbal particle, even though in most cases they are formally identical with their locative counterparts.

(19) *Alatta élt a török megszállásnak [durative]
under-3SG lived-3SG the Turkish occupation-DAT
intended: 'He lived at the time of the Turkish occupation.'

- Summarizing :
  ➤ types of elements that can raise to the particle position (non-exhaustive list):

(20)   Inner Stative locatives
       Route locatives
       Goal locatives
       Duratives, Completive temporals
  ➤ types of elements that cannot raise to the incorporee position (non-exhaustive list):

(21)   Outer Stative locatives
       Orientation of Trajectory locatives (=OT)
       Source locatives

- The division between elements in (20) and (21) can be captured based on the simple Bakerian premises:

(22) […Durative/Source/OrientTr/Stative$_{external}$…[____ … […Stative$_{internal}$/Route/Goal…]]]

- Based on independent empirical asymmetries in word order, anaphor licensing, variable binding by quantificational expressions and other phenomena, modifiers of the verb like those above the incorporation site in (22) are indeed generated in structurally higher basic positions within a hierarchically structured predicate phrase than those below the incorporation site. .

- Adjuncts:
  ➤ Temporal adverbials like duratives are higher than locatives (e.g., Nilsen 2000; Cinque 2006, Ch. 6; Schweikert 2005).
  ➤ Stative locatives: generated either inside the (maximal) verbal phrase (Larson 1988; Pesetsky 1995; Nilsen 2000; a.o.) or in a low region immediately above it (Hinterhölzl 2002; Cinque 2006, Ch. 6; Baltin 2007; a.o.). They are often taken to be "event-external," modifying the whole of the eventuality denoted by the (maximal) verb phrase. directionals are seen as

5

"event-internal," modifying the event (or a subevent) internally, or predicating of participant in the event. "Internal" stative locatives are also "event-internal" (see Maienborn 2003).

➢ Correspondingly, directional locatives and "internal" statives have been argued to be located below "external" statives at the level of basic clause structure (e.g., Hoekstra 1984; Nilsen 2000; Tungseth 2003; Schweikert 2005; Nam 2005).Source locatives: generated higher than goal locatives (Nam 2005; Ramchand 2008). Confirmed by anaphor licensing:

(23) a. Átültették   [a két egérből$_i$]   [egymás$_i$ testébe]   a chipet
      transplanted-3pl   [the two mouse$_i$-from]   [each other$_i$'s body-into]   the chip-acc
      'They transplanted the chips from the two mice into each other's bodies.'

      With Goal scrambled above Source:
      a'. ?Átültették   [egymás$_i$ testébe]   [a két egérből$_i$]   a chipet
      transplanted-3pl   [each other$_i$'s body-into] [the two mouse$_i$-from   ]   the chip-acc

      b. *Átültették   [egymás testéből$_i$]   [a két egérbe$_i$]   a chipet
      transplanted-3pl [each other$_j$'s body-from] the two mouse$_i$-into   the chip-acc
      'They transplanted the chips into the two mice from each other's bodies.'

      With Goal scrambled above Source:
      b'. ??Átültették   [a két egérbe$_i$]   [egymás$_i$ testéből]   a chipet
      transplanted-3pl [the two mouse$_i$-into] [each other$_i$'s body-from]   the chip-acc

• Following Baker's line, HLI to the verb takes place at a position that is higher than the base position of all the elements in (22b) (=low predicate phase internal locatives), and lower than the base position of the elements in (22a) (=high predicate phrase internal locatives), as represented schematically below:

(24)   … [... high locatives ... [__ V   [low locatives ...]]]

That HLI takes place in a predicate phrase medial position is corroborated by some better known asymmetries in the availability of further elements for incorporation:

(25) a. Resultative and some other ('low') secondary predicates, Theme bare (articleless) NPs, Oblique internal argument bare NPs
      b. Agent bare NPs, Experiencer bare NPs

Data:

• Agentive subject NPs (of transitive and unergative verbs), in contrast to unaccusative subject NPs, have been shown to be excluded from being placed in the particle position (e.g., (26a); see Marácz 1989; É. Kiss 2002). Experiencer subjects and objects are also banned from the particle position (26b,c).

(26) a. *Lány   futott   a parkban   [agentive subject]
      girl-nom   ran-3sg the park-in
      '(A) girl ran in the park.'
      b. *Lány   fél   az egértől   [experiencer subject]
      girl-nom   feared-3sg the mouse-from
      '(A) girl was afraid of mice.'
      c. *Lányt   ijesztettek   az egerek   [experiencer object]
      girl-acc   frightened-3pl   the mice-nom
      '(A) girl was frightened by the mice.'

Farkas and de Swart (2003): Agent incorporation:

(27)   *Gyerek   sírt   a közelben*
       child-NOM   cried-3SG   the vicinity-in
       'A child was crying nearby.'

The verb sír 'cry' is not agentive:

(28)   a. **Gyerek   sírt   meghatóan   /   szándékosan*
          child-NOM   cried-3SG   touchingly /   deliberately
          'A child was crying in a touching way / deliberately.'
       b. ?**Gyerek   sírt*
          child-NOM   cried-3SG
          'A child was crying.'

Another possibility is to analyze the verb in (27) as a verb of sound emission. Cross-linguistically, verbs of sound emission and verbs of manner of motion may show not only unergative, but also unaccusative behavior (e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995).

- Summarizing:
  ➢ types of elements that can raise to the particle position (non-exhaustive list):

(29)   Inner Stative locatives
       Route locatives
       Goal locatives
       Duratives
       Theme arguments
       Oblique internal arguments (=Obl)

  ➢ types of elements that cannot raise to the incorporee position (non-exhaustive list):

(30)   Outer Stative locatives
       Orientation of Trajectory locatives (=OT)
       Source locatives
       Agent arguments
       Experiencer arguments (=Exper)

Revised scheme:

(31) [...Durative/Agent/Exper/Source/OT/Stative$_{external}$...[__... [...Stative$_{internal}$/Route/Goal/Theme/Obl...]]]

➔ Asymmetries in pseudo-incorporation of locatives:
-- are correlated with independently detectable asymmetries in hierarchical position (in terms of relative c-command), and hence
-- they can be accounted for in Baker's structural government based approach on the assumption that the position of pseudo-incorporation (in Hungarian) is vP-medial

4.   **Incorporation of adjuncts**

Basic criterion applied to detect adjuncts:
lack of selection.

But:
In most current TG accounts,
-- a selected goal PP is, or can be, base-generated as a secondary predicate of a Small Clause complement to the verb (going back to Kayne 1985, Hoekstra 1988, 1992; for a current implementation, see Ramchand 2009).
-- an unselected goal PP is, or can be, base-generated as a secondary predicate of a Small Clause complement to the verb (the verb phrase is said to be 'augmented' with an additional Small Clause-type substructure, as an option).

So we need to find *additional* ways to distinguish adjunct goal PPs from resultative secondary predicate adjuncts.

4.1   Event structure and the appearance of arguments

- It is characteristic of resultative predicates that they introduce their own argument when combining with an unergative verb (see (32), from Zeller (2001)).

(32) a. Peter   spülte   (*das Fett)
          P-nom   washed   the grease-acc
      b. Peter   spülte   *(das Fett)   ab
          P-nom   washed   the grease-acc   off

(33) a. John read (the passage)
      b. John read *(the passage) out

(34) Argument-Per-Subevent Condition
      There has to be one argument XP in the syntax per subevent in the event structure.
      (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2001: 779; for similar conditions, see Grimshaw 1990, van Hout 1996).

(35) a. *János*   *énekelt   (valamit)*
          J-nom   sang   (something-acc)
      b. What's funny about John's answerphone?
          János   a rögzítőjére / rá   énekelt   (valamit)
          J-nom   the answerphone-onto / onto.it   sang   (something-acc)
          'John sang (something) on it.'

(36) a. *János   írt   (valamit)*
          J-nom   wrote   something-acc
      b. Why is the revised version of the paper two pages longer?
          János   hozzá   írt   (valamit)
          J-nom   to.it   wrote   something-acc
          'John wrote (something) to it.'

→ **adjunct** goal incorporee

- this is not related to some lexical property of these verbs :

(37) a. János   fel   írt   *(valamit)
       J.-nom   up   wrote   something-acc
       'John wrote something down.'
   b. János   el   énekelt *(valamit)
       J.-nom   away   sang   something
       'John sang something.'

4.2 Entailment of the final state

- In the case of telic predicates of perfective sentences, reaching the endstate is strictly entailed in a resultative construction, while this is not necessarily so otherwise.

(38) a. Mari   hozzá   vágta   az esernyőt   (a falhoz)   [endstate entailed]
       M-nom to-3sg   fung-3sg the umbrella-acc (the wall-to)
       'Mary flung the umbrella at it (the wall).'
   b. János   rá   lőtte   a nyilat   (a fatörzsre)   [endstate not entailed]
       J-nom   onto-3sg shot-3sg the arrow-acc the tree.trunk-onto
       'John shot the arrow at it (the tree trunk).'

➔ The goal PP in (38b) is not a resultative secondary predicate ➔ as it is not selected, it is an **adjunct**

4.3 Subextraction

- In a resultative construction, the movement of an element from inside the (predicate-external) subject of the Small Clause should be disallowed (cf. Basilico (2003) for the contrast between verbal and non-verbal complement Small Clauses in terms of subextraction from their subjects).

(39) a. ??Which politician do you consider [a photo of __] unattractive?
   b. ??Which politician did they boo [an imitator of __] off the stage?

(40) ?*Melyik politikussal   fogsz   bele   könyörögni
    which politician-with   will-2sg   into-3sg   beg-inf
    [egy interjút __] (a kötetbe)?
    an interview-acc the volume-into
    '*Which politician are you gonna beg an interview with into it (the volume)?'

(41) a. *Melyik politikussal   keltett [egy interjú __]   nagy botrányt?
     which politician-with caused   an interview   big scandal-acc
     '*Which politician did an interview with cause a big scandal?'

   b. ^(?)Melyik politikussal   fognak   le   hozni   [egy interjút __] ?
     which politician-with   will-3pl down   bring-inf an interview-acc
     'Which politician are they going to publish an interview with?'

→ The goal particle in (40): resultative secondary predicate (subextraction is bad from subject of resultative Small Clause + neither the NP nor the locative is selected)

→ If subextraction from the accusative NP is acceptable, then the incorporated locative cannot be a resultative secondary predicate predicating of that NP. If in addition the incorporated locative is unselected, then it must be an **adjunct.**

(42) John has made a documentary about political corruption, but it still needs an ending. He has decided to add an interview to the end with a Hungarian politician, and he's searching the BBC archives right now.
Melyik politikussal   fog   hozzá   másolni   [egy interjút __] ?
which politician-with will-3sg to.it   copy-inf   an interview-acc
'Which politician is he going to copy an interview with to the end (of it)?'

4.4 Selective modification of a result / endstate subevent

- The unavailability of selective modification of a result state by adverbials like 'again', 'partway', 'almost' (e.g., Krifka 1998, Rothstein 2004) also suggests that some non-selected goal locative modifiers are adjuncts.

    -- Restitutive reading of modification by *again*:
       The result state, but not the whole complex eventuality, has already obtained at least once. The result state obtains once again.
    -- Repetitive reading of modification by *again*:
       The whole complex eventuality has already obtained at least once, and it obtains once again.

- The restitutive reading is available to unaccusative verbs, while it remains inaccessible to unergative verbs:

(43) The dog was hidden into a pit. It climbed out, and then…
Unaccusative:
a. *Bele   zuhant   újra   (a gödörbe)*   (restitutive)
    into-3sg   fell-3sg   again   the pit-into
    'It fell into the pit again.'
Unergative:
b. *#Bele   ugrott   újra   (a gödörbe)*   (#restitutive)
    into-3sg j jumped-3sg again   the pit-into
    'It jumped into the pit again.'

- Object of transitive verb vs. subject of unergative and subject of transitive:

(44) Mary took the lift upstairs to her boss' office, and after a short while she came down. The lift then broke down. Her mobile rang, and she was called for by his boss, so…
Object of transitive verb:
a. Mari   fel   vonszolta   magát   újra   (restitutive)
   M-nom   up   dragged-3sg herself-acc again
   'Mary dragged herself up(stairs) again.'
Subject of unergative verb:
b. #Mari   fel   szaladt   újra   (#restitutive)
   M-nom   up   ran-3sg   again
   'Mary ran upstairs again.'

Subject of transitive verb:
c. John wanted to take his cat and his dog for a walk, but his cat and his dog don't get on well.
   So, John first took the dog for a walk. After he came back,
   #János   el   vitte   sétálni   a macskát   újra
   J-nom   away   took-3sg   walk-inf   the cat-acc   again
   'John took the cat for a walk again.'

(45) *Direct Object Restriction (DOR)*
A resultative phrase may be predicated of the immediately postverbal NP, but may not be
predicated of a subject (external argument) or an oblique complement.
(Simpson 1983, Levin and Rappaport-Hovav 1995: 34)

➢ Subjects of unergatives and transitives are base-generated as external arguments, and hence
cannot serve as subjects of resultative secondary predicates, according to the DOR. → (43b)
and (44b) cannot have a resultative structure → there is no result state (endstate) for *again* to
restore in these cases → locative particles in exs with unergative subjects are not resultative
secondary predicates

→   when they are selected by the verb (as in (43b), where a locative is obligatorily selected by
    the manner of motion verb 'hop'), they must be a complement

→   when they are not selected by the verb, they are **adjuncts**:

(46) a.   Mari   szándékosan   hangosan   köhintett
          Mary   deliberately   loudly   coughed
     b.   Mari   a papírzsebkendőbe / bele   köhintett
          Mary   the paper.tissue-into / into.it   coughed
          'Mary coughed into the paper tissue / it.'

➢ According to the DOR, the unaccusative underlying object and the transitive object are
possible to be predicated of in resultative predication. This option is realized in (43a) and
(44a).

→   incorporated locative particles in (the restitutive reading of) exs with unaccusative verbs
    are generated as resultative secondary predicates

The membership in the class of verbs of motion that directly embed a resultative substructure versus in
the class that do not is a matter of idiosyncratic lexical specification (see Folli (2002) and Folli and
Ramchand (2005) for Italian).

(47) The boy found a cherry pit on a plate. He put it in his mouth, and…
     a. #Rá   köpte   a meggymagot   újra   a tányérra
        onto.it   spit-past-3sg   the cherry-pit-acc   again   the plate-onto
        'He spit the cherry pit onto the plate again.'   (#restitutive)
     b. *Rátette   a meggymagot   újra   a tányérra*
        onto.it   the cherry-pit-acc   again   the plate-onto
        'He put the cherry pit (back) onto the plate again.'   (restitutive)

→   the goal PP in (47a) must be an **adjunct**

•   Other tests of the same general type (involving selective adverbial modification of the result state)
    can be based on adverbs like *félig* 'partway' and *majdnem* 'almost' (see Krifka 1998; Rothstein 2004
    for references).

→	Unselected adjuncts may incorporate, if they are base generated sufficiently low.

5. Apparent selection by the verb

Another canonical government effect in locative incorporation: selection.
Two major types of apparent selection (of a dependent) by complex verbs composed of a verb and an incorporated adpositional element:

- Descriptively, Type I involves cases where the (oblique) case form of the dependent is selected by the incorporated adposition, e.g., (48).

(48) *Keresztül*   *gyalogoltak*   *a katonák*   *a mocsáron*
      through   **marched-3pl** the soldiers-nom the swamp-**on**
      'The soldiers marched through the swamp.'

(49) [PP   [XP   a mocsáron]   [P keresztül]]
             the swamp-**on**   **through**
      'through the swamp'

- Type I:
  The selectional effects exerted by a directional adposition on its oblique nominal complement (licensing of occurrence, restriction on form) remain unchanged after the incorporation of some phrasal part of the adpositional phrase, giving rise to the illusion of selection by the 'complex verb', see (48) (for the functional structure of PPs, and movements within them, see Koopman 2000, Svenonius 2008, 2010).

(50) [PP   *Keresztül*]   *gyalogoltak*   *a katonák*   [pP   a mocsáron   [PP   __]]
             through   **marched-3pl** the soldiers-nom   the swamp-**on**
      'The soldiers marched through the swamp.'

- Type II involves (optional) dependents whose oblique case, a suffixed adposition, appears to be selected: it must be identical to the incorporated adposition (as in most of the examples above).

(51) a. *Neki*   *ütközött*   *a falnak/*ba/*hoz*
          against.it bumped-3sg   the wall-against/*into/*to
          'It bumped against the wall.'
      b. Bele   ütközött   a falba/*nak/*hoz
          into.it bumped-3sg   the wall-into/*against/*to
      c. Hozzá   ütközött   a falhoz/*ba/*nak
          to.it   bumped-3sg   the wall-to/*into/*against

- Type II exclusively includes incorporated adpositions that are inflected for person and number ('pronominal' adpositional elements). Some background:

  The structure projected by inflected adpositions (Marácz 1986):

(52)   a. [PP   én / *pro*$_{1SG}$ [P utánam]]   b. [PP   *Mari*   [P *után*]]
           I-nom / pro$_{1SG}$-nom   after-poss.1sg   M-nom   after

- Marácz (1986):
  - -- Exactly those postpositions that take a caseless noun phrase as a complement (as in (53a)) bear person/number inflection (when their complement is a personal pronoun) (as in (53b)).
  - -- The paradigm of inflections carried by such postpositions is identical to the paradigm of inflections suffixed to possessed nouns.
  - -- The complement of an inflected postposition is caseless. Possessor dependents of nouns within NP are caseless.
  - -- The complement of the postposition can appear at a distance from the postposition, but only if it appears in dative case; the same is true of nominal possessive constructions (Szabolcsi 1983).

  → such PPs have a possessive structure, with the P bearing the role of the possessed head

(53) a. *Mari után*　　　　　　　　　　(54) a. *Mari-ért*
　　　　Mary after　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Mary-for
　　 b. *te / pro után-ad*　　　　　　　　　　　 b. *te- / pro -ért-ed*
　　　　you　　after-2SG　　　　　　　　　　　　you-　　-for-2SG

- Given that the suffixal locative particles illustrated in (51a) above bear the same paradigm of inflections agreeing with their pronominal complements (see (54a–b)), they too should have a possessive structure, with a suffixal adposition being the possessed head (see É. Kiss 2002). That in their case the possessor noun phrase cannot appear at a distance from the possessed postposition is expected, given the affixal nature of this class of postpositions.

- Pronominal possessors, which the possessed head (noun or adposition) agrees with for phi-features, can in general remain covert, realized by a silent *pro* (the natural choice unless the possessed phrase is a syntactic topic or focus), see (54b). It can be inferred that the "incorporated" locative particles at hand also contain a *pro* possessor, as well as a functional head associated with possessive person/number-agreement; whence they must be a full-fledged phrase.

- Adopting the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1993, 1995), a syntactic movement based analysis of Type II can be offered:

(55) a. The incorporated pronominal locative and the lexical locative are links in a movement chain.
　　 b. Chain Reduction (Nunes 2001, 2004): Maximize deletion in a movement chain (while respecting independent conditions like Recoverability, morphological effability, etc.)
　　 c. This movement chain is light-headed: its head link is an optimally reduced copy.

(56) *János　talán　hozzá　ért　Marihoz*
　　　John　perhaps　to.her　touched　Mary-to
　　　'John may have touched Mary.'

(57) *János　　　talán...*
　　　John-nom　perhaps...

　　 a. *　　　　　　　　　　*ért*　　　　　　[*Marihoz*]　　　(incorporation is obligatory)
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　touched-3sg　M-to

　　 b. *[~~Mari~~ -hoz]　　　　*ért*　　　　　　[*Marihoz*]　　　(stranded affix)
　　　　　M.　-to　　　　　　touched-3sg　M-to

13

c. [pro *hozzá*]   *ért*   [*Marihoz*]   (light-headed mov't chain:
    to-poss.3sg   touched-3sg   M-to   deletion up to person+number,
                                                               morphological readjustment)

d. [*Marihoz*]   *ért*   [~~*Marihoz*~~]   (regular movement chain)
    M-to   touched-3sg   M-to

e. *[*ő*   *hozzá*]   *ért*   [*Marihoz*]   (reduction is not minimal)
    she-nom to-poss.3sg   touched-3sg   M-to
    'He touched Mary.'

Further movement from the position of pseudo-incorporation is possible, as usual:

(58) a. Hozzá   szeretném,   hogy   érj   a falhoz   (long movement)
      to.it   would.like-1sg that   touch-subj   the wall-to
      'I would like you to touch the wall.'
    b. Hozzá   azért   nem   ért   a falhoz   (loc.pron.=contrastive topic)
      to.it   though   not   touched   the wall-to
      'He didn't touch the wall though.'

Agreement and agreement mismatch with plural lexical locatives:

(59) *János   neki   ment /   nekik   ment   a járókelőknek*
     J.-nom   to-poss.**3sg** went-3sg / to-poss.**3pl** went-3sg   the passer.by-**pl**-dat
     'John bumped into the passers-by.'

→   singular on incorporated locative is lack of number
→   deletion is maximal if number is deleted too, splitting it off person features

- On this view the construction is yet another case of a movement chain with more than one overt occurrence (see, among others, Pesetsky 1998; Hornstein 2000; Fanselow and Cavar 2000, 2002; Richards 2001; Nunes 2001, 2004). The spell-out pattern of the chain formed by the incorporated pronominal locative and its double in its base position is essentially similar to the pattern found in *wh*-scope-marking constructions that fall under McDaniel's (1989) "direct dependency" approach, where a reduced *wh*-phrase appears in the head position of a *wh*-chain (see Cheng 2000 for a recent reinterpretation of the "direct dependency" approach in terms of multiple overt links of a single chain).

No doubling by pronominal locative:

(60) a. *János*   [*pro hozzá*]   *ért*   *([*pro hozzá*])   (deletion is not maximized)
     J-nom   to-poss.3sg   touched-3sg   to-poss.3sg
     'John touched her.'
    b. *János*   [*pro hozzád*]   *ért*   *([*pro hozzád*])   (deletion is not maximized)
     J-nom   to-poss.2sg   touched-3sg   to-poss.2sg
     'John touched you.'

The double can be pronominal if it is pre-verbal or if it appears in a superordinate clause:

(61) a. *HOZZÁ akarok*   *[hozzá*   *vágni*   *egy tányért __]* *(és nem JÁNOSHOZ).*
     to.him   want-1SG   to.him   throw-INF a plate-ACC   (and not John-to)
      'I want to throw a plate at HIM, and not at JOHN.'

b.　Hozzád　　azért　　[hozzád vágnék　　　　egy tányért ____]
　　to.you　　though　　to.you　throw-COND-1sg　a plate-ACC
　　'At you I WOULD throw a plate though.'

→　Explained if Chain Reduction takes place (cyclically) within local domains, specifically in phases (Fanselow and Cavar 2002).

> This approach accounts for the apparent selection effects holding between the complex verbal form and the lexical locative (both in terms of the latter's occurrence/licensing, and in terms of its morphological form).

6.　Conclusions

- Asymmetries in pseudo-incorporation of locatives:
  -- are correlated with independently detectable asymmetries in hierarchical position (in terms of relative c-command), and hence
  -- they can be accounted for in Baker's structural government based approach on the assumption that the position of pseudo-incorporation (in Hungarian) is vP-medial

- It follows from this account, it seems correctly, that unselected adjuncts may incorporate, if base generated sufficiently low.

- The apparent selection holding between the complex verb (consisting of the verb and the incorporee) and a lexical double of the incorporee is due to movement. Pronominal locative incorporees in the locative doubling construction arise from the reduced spell out of the higher link of the movement chain.

Selected references

Ackema, Peter. 1999. *Issues in Morphosyntax.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman. 2001. Competition between syntax and morphology. In: J. Grimshaw, G. Legendre and S. Vikner (eds.), Optimality Theoretic syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 29–60.
Ackermann, Farrell. 1987. Pronominal incoroporation: The case of prefixal adverbs. In: Kenesei, István (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian* Vol 2, 213–260. Szeged: JATE.
Babko-Mayala, Olga. 2003.　Perfectivity and prefixation in Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 11 (1): 5–36.
Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of Grammatical Function Changing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
Csirmaz, Anikó. 2004. Particles and phonologically defective predicates. In: É. Kiss, Katalin and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German, and Dutch*, 225–252. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. *Particles: On the Syntax of Verb-particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions.* OUP.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian.* Dordrecht: Reidel.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 1994. Sentence structure and word order. In: *Hungarian Syntax*, 1–90. New York: Academic.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Verbal Prefixes or Postpositions? Postpositional Aspectualizers in Hungarian. In: Groot, Casper de, and István Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian* Vol. 6, 123–148. Szeged: JATE.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 2005. First steps towards a theory of the verbal prefix. In: Piñón, Christopher and Péter Siptár (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian* Vol. 9, 57–88. Budapest: Akadémiai.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006a.　The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In: É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.), *Event Structure and the Left Periphery. Studies on Hungarian*, 17–56. Dordrecht: Springer.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006b.　From the grammaticalization of viewpoint aspect to the grammaticalization of situation aspect. In: É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.), *Event Structure and the Left Periphery. Studies on Hungarian*, 129–158. Dordrecht: Springer.

Farkas, Donka and Jerrold M. Sadock. 1989. Preverb climbing in Hungarian. *Language* 65 (3): 318–338.

Folli, Raffaella and Gillian Ramchand. 2005. Prepositions and results in Italian and English: An analysis from event decomposition. In: Verkuyl, de Swart, van Hout (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*, 81–105. Dordrecht: Springer.

Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua* 74 (2–3): 101–139.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. MIT Press.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2003. Event-internal modifiers: Semantic underspecification and conceptual interpretation. In: *Modifying Adjuncts*, 475–510 Mouton de Gruyter.

Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 153–197.

McIntyre, Andrew. 2004. Event paths, conflation, argument structure, and VP shells. *Linguistics* 42 (3): 523–571.

Marácz, László. 1986. Dressed or naked: the case of the PP in Hungarian. In: Abraham, Werner and Sjaak de Meij (eds.), *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality*, 227–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marácz, László. 1989. Asymmetries in Hungarian. Ph. D. dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Nam, Seungho. 2005. Directional locatives in event structure: Asymmetry between goal and source. *Eoneohag* (Linguistics) 43: 85–117.

Neeleman, Ad. 1994. Complex predicates. PhD diss., OTS, Utrecht University

Neeleman, Ad and Fred Weerman. 1993. The balance between syntax and morphology: Dutch particles and resultatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 433-475.

Puskás, Genovéva. 2000. *Word Order in Hungarian: The Syntax of A-bar Positions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2004. Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes. *Nordlyd* 32 (2): 323–361.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: CUP.

Ramchand, Gillian and Peter Svenonius. 2002. The lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verb-particle construction. In: *Proceedings of the 21st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 387–400. Cascadilla Press.

Riemsdijk, Henk van, and Riny Huijbregts. 2007. Location and locality. In: *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture. Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation*. 339–364. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Romanova, Eugenia. 2004. Superlexical vs. lexical prefixes. *Nordlyd* 32 (2): 255–278.

Schweikert, Walter. 2005.*The Order of Prepositional Phrases in the Structure of the Clause*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Surányi, Balázs. 2006b. Hungarian as a Japanese-type scrambling language. *NELS 36*.

Svenonius, Peter. 2004. Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP. *Nordlyd* 32 (2). 205–253.

Svenonius, Peter. 2007. Adpositions, particles and the arguments they introduce. In: Reuland, Eric, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, and Giorgos Spathas (eds.), *Argument Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 71–110.

Tungseth, Mai. 2003. Two structural positions for locative and directional PPs in Norwegian motion constructions. *Nordlyd* 31 (2): 473–487.

Zeller, Jochen. 2001. *Particle Verbs and Local Domains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.