

## Pseudo-Incorporation in German

It is known for quite some time that in German, resultative arguments, among which directional PPs belong (Wechsler & Noh 2001), show a special behaviour (Steinitz 1989). For example, in contrast to other arguments they have to follow manner adverbials, (1a), they necessarily have to be part of what is commonly called VP-preposing to the prefield, (1b), they cannot precede a floating quantifier, (1c). The special behaviour of resultatives cannot be accounted for just by the stipulation that these constituents cannot scramble. For instance, it can be shown that the base position of manner adverbials is below the base positions of the other arguments. Consider (2). Here the object is a *w*-indefinite and precedes the manner adverbial. However, *w*-indefinites cannot scramble. (1a-c) and other facts, among them also prosodic ones, suggest that resultatives in German, despite constituting a maximal projection, form a complex predicate with the main verb (e.g. Helbig & Buscha 1986, Truckenbrodt 2012). Note that resultatives may be moved to the prefield and they can bear *wh*-morphology, thereby showing certain syntactic freedom.

What has not been discussed so far is that indefinite NPs may show the same special behaviour as resultatives. For example, they may follow manner adverbials, (3a), and if they do so, they cannot be stranded when the predicate is preposed to the prefield, (3b). Note that an indefinite may also precede a manner adverbial. In this case, the predicate may move to the prefield alone, (3c). The talk will argue that data like (3a,b) involve pseudo-incorporation of the indefinite NP. It will be shown that NPs, but not DPs, may be pseudo-incorporated, quantificational and referential phrases being ruled out, (4). Note what are usually called indefinite articles in German may be preceded by a definite determiner, (5). Unlike incorporated nouns, the incorporated NPs allow modification – for example, a restrictive relative clause, (6a), in contrast to a non-restrictive one, (6b), is possible – and they are marked for case. The morpho-syntactic hallmarks of pseudo-incorporation in German are the absence of a determiner in the nominal phrase and the restriction that such a phrase has to occur in a special position adjacent to the verb.

That German too allows pseudo-incorporation of phrasal arguments allows explaining different other hitherto puzzling facts, for example, the lack of a parenthetical niche, (7b), and the possibility of the so called DP-PP-split, (8a) (e.g., de Kuthy 2002). With this construction, it seems that the PP-complement of a DP is moved to the left. However, the construction is not possible with any old DP, (8b), or with a PP which is an adjunct. (8c) shows that the construction is not possible if the nominal argument occurs to the left of a manner adverbial. (8d) demonstrates that the ungrammaticality of (8c) is not due to a freezing effect induced by scrambling, as some authors would assume, since the presumed base position of the PP would be inside a non-scrambled ergative subject. In sum, the data in (8) indicate that the split-construction is only possible if the nominal argument is pseudo-incorporated. Its valence is inherited by the newly constructed verbal complex (cf. e.g. Haider 2010 on valence inheritance in clause union constructions). Another issue to be discussed is the fact that weak definites (Carlson et al. 2006) occupy the same position as incorporated indefinites, (9). Finally, the talk will speculate that an indefinite external argument can be pseudo-incorporated, a pertinent example being (10) with a nominative argument occurring in a preposed VP. Note that in German there arguably exists no EPP-requirement to fill SpecTP (e.g., Haider 2010).

The talk will take the similarity between the incorporated resultatives and the incorporated indefinite NPs as an indication that German pseudo-incorporation should be analysed as the unification of a predicative element with the main verb of the verbal complex (cf. Dayal 2011). The external argument of the incorporated XP is identified with the relevant argument variable of the verb. That incorporated NPs in German do not show number neutrality is not

that surprising given that in German attributive adjectives or NPs in the predicative *be*-construction have to be marked for number.

- (1) a. Paul hat alles (behutsam) unter das Klavier (\*behutsam) gelegt.  
*Paul has everything with caution under the piano laid*  
 b. \*Gelegt hat Max alles unter das Klavier.  
 c. Ich habe die Sachen (alle) unter das Klavier (\*alle) gelegt.
- (2) Maria hat sich gerade was ganz genau angeschaut.  
*Maria has REFL just something very accurately looked at*
- (3) a. Otto hat heute sehr heftig einen Kollegen beschimpft.  
*Otto has today very heavily a colleague berated*  
 b. \*Beschimpft hat Otto heute sehr heftig einen Kollegen.  
 c. Beschimpft hat Otto heute einen Kollegen sehr heftig.
- (4) Max hat heute wunderbar viele/\*alle/\*die meisten Lieder/\*jedes Lied gesungen.  
*Max has today marvellously many/all/the most songs sung*
- (5) die vielen Lieder / das eine Lied  
*the many songs / the one song*
- (6) a. Max hat (laut) ein Lied, das er seit langem kennt, gesungen.  
*Max has powerfully a song which he since a long time knows sung*  
 a. Max hat (\*laut) ein Lied, das ja jeder nur zu gut kennt, gesungen.  
*Max has powerfully a song which PRT everyone just too well knows sung*
- (7) a. Er hat ein Lied – eines von Schubert – sehr laut gesungen.  
*he has a lied one by Schubert very loudly sung*  
 b. \*Er hat sehr laut ein Lied – eines von Schubert – gesungen.
- (8) a. Von Peter hat Maria laut einen Freund beschimpft.  
 ‘Maria has loudly berated a friend of Peter.’  
 b. \*Von Peter hat Maria laut jeden Freund beschimpft.  
*of Peter has Maria loudly every friend berated*  
 c. \*Von Peter hat Maria einen Freund laut beschimpft.  
 d. \*Von Peter ist heute ein Freund mit Maria ausgegangen.  
*of Peter is today a friend with Maria went out*
- (9) a. Hans hat gestern intensiv die Zeitung gelesen. ‘weak’ reading; e.g., H. could have read different newspapers  
*Hans has yesterday intensively the newspaper read*  
 b. Hans hat gestern die Zeitung intensiv gelesen. ‘weak’ reading not available
- (10) Linguisten Langusten gegessen haben hier noch nie.  
 ‘Linguists have not yet eaten spiny lobsters here.’

## References

- Carlson, G. et al. (2006): Weak definite noun phrases. In: C. Davis et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of NELS 36*. Amherst, MA: GLSA. Dayal, V. (2011): Hindi pseudo-incorporation. *NLLT* 29.1, 123-167. De Kuthy, K. (2002): *Discontinuous NPs in German - A Case Study of the Interaction of Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. Haider, H. (2010): *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Helbig, G. & J. Buscha (1986<sup>9</sup>): *Deutsche Grammatik: ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*. Berlin: Langenscheidt. Steinitz, R. (1989): Vu, IY und IZ: Überlegungen zum Prädikativ. *Linguistische Studien A. Arbeitsberichte 194*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 210-234. Truckenbrodt, H. (2012): Effects of indefinite pronouns and traces on verb stress in German. In: T. Borowsky et al. (eds.): *Prosody matters: essays in honor of Elisabeth Selkirk*. Sheffield, UK & Bristol, USA: Equinox, 487-513. Wechsler, S. & B. Noh (2001): On resultatives and clauses: parallels between Korean and English. In: G. Fanselow (ed.): *Elements of Slavic and Germanic grammars: a comparative view*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 235-253.