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  
    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  
   John completely flat-onto beat Bill-ACC  
   ‘John beat the shit out of Bill.’
• 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)
across(=PRT) walked-3sg the park-on
‘He walked through the park.’ [route directional locative]
d. Rajta állt (papírfecsenin)
on.it(=PRT) stood-acc paper-scrap-on
‘He was standing over the scrap of paper.’ [stative locative]

• 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]
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)  

\begin{align*}
\text{Name} & \quad \text{Verb} & \quad \text{Object} \\
\text{Benne} & \quad \text{aludt} & \quad \text{János} \\
\text{in-3SG} & \quad \text{sleep-3SG} & \quad \text{John-NOM} \\
\text{a régi szekrényben} & & \text{the old wardrobe-in} \\
\end{align*}

‘John slept in the old wardrobe.’

(17)  

\begin{align*}
\text{Name} & \quad \text{Verb} & \quad \text{Object} \\
\text{*Benneláttam} & \quad \text{egy filmet} & \quad \text{az új moziban} \\
\text{in-3SG} & \quad \text{see-1SG} & \quad \text{the new cinema-in} \\
\end{align*}

‘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)  

\begin{align*}
\text{*Álatta} & \quad \text{élt} & \quad \text{a török megszállásnak} & \quad \text{[durative]} \\
\text{under-3SG} & \quad \text{lived-3SG} & \quad \text{the Turkish occupation-DAT} \\
\text{intended:} & & \text{‘He lived at the time of the Turkish occupation.’} \\
\end{align*}

• Summarizing:

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

(20)  

\begin{enumerate}
\item Inner Stative locatives
\item Route locatives
\item Goal locatives
\item Duratives, Completive temporals
\end{enumerate}

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

(21)  

\begin{enumerate}
\item Outer Stative locatives
\item Orientation of Trajectory locatives (=OT)
\item Source locatives
\end{enumerate}

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

(22)  

\[ \ldots \text{Durative/Source/OrientTr/Stative}_{\text{external}} \ldots [\ldots \ldots \ldots \text{Stative}_{\text{external}}/\text{Route}/\text{Goal}\ldots] \]

• 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
“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, ] [egymás, testébe ] a chipet transplanted-3pl [the two mouse,-from] [each other,’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, testébe ] [a két egérből, ] a chipet transplanted-3pl [each other,’s body-into][the two mouse,-from ] the chip-acc

b. *Átültették [egymás testéből, ] [a két egérbe, ] a chipet transplanted-3pl [each other,’s body-from] the two mouse,-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, ] [egymás, testéből ] a chipet transplanted-3pl [the two mouse,-into] [each other,’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 inergative 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 félt az egérről [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 sirt a közelben
child-NOM cried-3SG the vicinity-in
‘A child was crying nearby.’

The verb sirt ‘cry’ is not agentive:

(28) a. *Gyerek sirt meghatóan / szándékosan
child-NOM cried-3SG touchingly / deliberately
‘A child was crying in a touching way / deliberately.’

b. ?*Gyerek sirt
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/Expert/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 incorporée
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 esernyót (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 lötte a nyilat (a fatőrzsre) [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 könyörügni
   which politician-with will-2sg into-3sg beg-inf
   [egy interjú __ ] (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 kellett [ egy interjú __ ] nagy botránnyt?
   which politician-with caused an interview big scandal-acc
   ‘*Which politician did an interview with cause a big scandal?’
b. Geography
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 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
   MNnom up dragged-3sg herself-ace again
   ‘Mary dragged herself up(stairs) again.’

Subject of unergative verb:

b. #Mari fel szaladt újra
   MNnom 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
JNnom 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) \( \text{Keresztül gyalogoltak a katonák a mocsáron} \)

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. \( \text{Neki ütközött a falnak/*ba/*hoz} \)

against.it bumped-3sg the wall-against/*into/*to

‘It bumped against the wall.’

b. \( \text{Bele ütközött a falba/*nak/*hoz} \)

into.it bumped-3sg the wall-into/*against/*to

c. \( \text{Hozzá ütközött a falhoz/*ba/*nak} \)

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. \[ PP én / proSG I-nom / proSG-nom \]

I-nom / proSG-nom after-poss.1sg

b. \[ PP Mari M-nom \]

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).

\[\text{such PPs have a possessive structure, with the P bearing the role of the possessed head}\]

(53) a. Mari után  
Mary after
b. te / pro után-ad  
you after-2SG

(54) a. Mari-ért  
Mary-for
b. te- / pro -ért-ed  
you- after-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 \textit{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 \textit{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 bozzá ért Marihoz  
John perhaps to.her touched Mary-to
‘John may have touched Mary.’

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

a. * ért [Marihoz] 
touched-3sg M-to (incorporation is obligatory)
b. *[Marihoz -hoz] ért [Marihoz] 
M. -to touched-3sg M-to (stranded affix)
Further movement from the position of pseudo-incorporation is possible, as usual:

(58) a. Hozzá szeretném, hogy érj a falhoz (long movement)
   ‘I would like you to touch the wall.’

b. Hozzá azért nem ért a falhoz (loc.pron.=contrastive topic)
   ‘He didn’t touch the wall though.’

Agreement and agreement mismatch with plural lexical locatives:

(59) János neki ment / nekik ment a járókelık nek
   J.-nom to-poss.3sg went-3sg / to-poss.3pl went-3sg the passer.by-3pl-nom
   ‘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 *[ ] (deletion is not maximized)
    J-nom to-poss.3sg touched-3sg to-poss.3sg
    ‘John touched her.’

b. János [pro hozzád] ért *[ ] (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 [bozgó 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.
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