

Noun Incorporation and Null Verbal Heads in Frisian
David Basilico/University of Alabama at Birmingham

Noun incorporation (NI) in Frisian (Dyk 1997) (1b) presents a challenge because it shows restrictions not typically seen in other languages with NI (such as Mohawk).

- (1) a. Gurbe iet oerenlang jerappels.
Gurbe ate for hours potatoes
- b. Gurbe jerappeliet oerenlang.
Gurbe potato-ate for hours
Gurbe ate potatoes for hours.

While Frisian NI shows the expected distribution in that direct objects/themes incorporate (1b) but agentive subjects of transitive and unergative intransitive verbs do not (2), (Mithun 1984, Baker 1988), there are restrictions with respect to lexical aspect and external arguments that are more unusual. Stative and achievement verbs do not allow object NI (3), while such verbs in Mohawk allow incorporation (Baker 1988). Also, and surprisingly for a syntactic view of NI, unaccusative verbs do not allow incorporation of their surface subject (4). Though Baker et al. (2005) show that there is language variation with respect to whether or not the subject of an unaccusative verb undergoes incorporation, they attribute this variation to an EPP effect; those languages which lack incorporation with unaccusatives also lack an element that is able to check the features of INFL. Such an explanation cannot be extended to Frisian. Frisian allows impersonal passives with an expletive in subject position; incorporation of a direct object of a transitive verb with impersonal passivization is fine with an expletive subject (5b). However, even with an expletive, incorporation of an unaccusative subject is not possible (5a). Finally, only agentive subjects are allowed if the object incorporates (6), a phenomenon that has not been reported in other instances of incorporation.

- (2) a. *Boerwjuddet de biten.
Farmer-weeds the beets.
- b. *Man-kuieret.
Man-walks.
- (3) a. *Loltsje kin net andertwitte.
Loltsje can not answer-know
- b. *Loltsje gûnefynt tusken de fallen blêden.
Loltsje guilder-finds between the fallen leaves.
- (4) *manstjert
man-dies
- (5) a. *Der wurdt manstoarn
there is man-died
- b. Der wurdt apeliten.
there is apple-eaten
- (6) a. It bern plaatsjekleuret.
The child picture-colors
- b. *De ûndergeande sinne hûskleuret.
the setting sun house-colors

I argue that NI in Frisian should be understood not as canonical NI, but as a case of synthetic compounding of the verb with its internal argument. In addition, this synthetic compound is licensed by a null atelic activity v head that requires an agentive external argument

(7). It is this null activity v that is responsible for the aspectual, external argument and unaccusative restrictions seen above.

(7) [_v v_{ACT} [N V]]

This analysis of Frisian NI draws from an the analysis of *-ing* synthetic compounds in English given in Borer (2013). What is interesting is that many of the restrictions noted by Dyk (1997) for Frisian NI are also noted by Borer (2013) for English *-ing* synthetic compounds. As in Frisian, these compounds in English resist both achievement and stative verbs (8). Also, unaccusatives are not found in these synthetic compounds with their surface subjects (9).

- (8) a. *this kind of music admiring/party hating/fact knowing
 b. *this kind of summit reaching/task finishing/oil discovering

(9) *this kind of tree falling/train arriving/smoke (dis)appearing

Borer (2013) adopts the following ((ii) modified from Ackema and Neeleman (2004)):

(i) *-ing* is a simple atelic (activity) event with an originator (originator is akin to an external argument for Borer (2013)).

(ii) N V compounds must be licensed by further morphological processes of compounding or derivation.

The compound involves merger of a verbal and nominal element, followed by merger with *-ing*.

(10) [_n ing [truck drive]]

The restriction in (i) explains the aspectual restrictions, as well as lack of unaccusatives, while that in (ii) explains why we don't find underived synthetic compounds such as *to truck drive, since there is no further process of derivation or compounding to act as a licensor.

We can give a parallel explanation for Frisian NI with the structure proposed in (7) above; it involves a synthetic compound of a verb with its internal argument, and the compound is licensed by a null atelic activity v head that requires an agentive external argument. The presence of the activity v head explains the aspectual restrictions; the semantics of stative and achievement verbs are not compatible with this head. The v_{ACT} head must be present to license the compound (by ii), ruling out a derivation in which we get an N V compound without the v head. Such a derivation would allow a compound with no activity interpretation, such as a compound consisting only of a stative or achievement verb with its argument and no further derivation. Note that the incorporated construction only allows an atelic reading, unlike the unincorporated structure which allows both a telic and atelic reading. Here, like the *-ing* head for Borer (2013), the null v_{ACT} head creates an atelic event.

- (11) a. Bourman fervet de doar yn in oere.
 neighbor paints the door in an hour
 b. ?Bourman fervet de doar oerenlang.
 neighbor paints the door for hours
- (12) a. *Bourman doarfervet yn in oere.
 neighbor door-paints in an hour
 b. Bourman doarfervet oerenlang.
 neighbor door-paints for an hour

Unaccusatives do not incorporate because the v head requires an external argument (EA) and the unaccusative verb is not compatible with such an argument. The ungrammaticality of NI with a non-agentive subject is explained by the presence of v , which requires an agentive EA.

The proposed analysis categorizes this phenomenon as a more typologically appropriate instance of compounding rather than canonical NI.