Noun Incorporation and the Lexicalist Hypothesis

Michael Barrie, Sogang University

Abstract: Many recent and not so recent debates on noun incorporation (NI) pit a syntactic analysis (Baker, 1988, 1996; Haugen, 2008; Sadock, 1980, 1986) against a lexical origin (Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987; Rosen, 1989) of NI constructions. Within the past 10 years or so, many researchers have abandoned any sort of generative lexicon in favour of the so-called single-engine hypothesis in which word formation is handled strictly in the syntax, with the possibility of some post-syntactic re-arrangements (Halle & Marantz, 1993; Julien, 2002; Marantz, 1997, 2001; inter alia). The goal of this paper is to examine how these discussions on NI bear on the Lexicalist Hypothesis. I will end the discussion with some brief remarks on bare noun constructions in some East Asian languages and compare these to the NI constructions discussed here.[*]

1   Introduction

Lexicalism has played a central role in many discussions on grammar for at least several decades (Ackema, 1999; Ackema and Neeleman, 2002, 2004; Aronoff, 1994; Baker, 1985, 1988; Chomsky, 1970; Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987; Hale and Keyser, 2003; Halle and Marantz, 1993; Harley, 2008; Julien, 2002; Kiparsky, 1997; Lees, 1960; Marantz, 1997, 2001; Pollock, 1989). The central question is this: Is there a separate morphological module that builds words, which are then manipulated by a separate syntactic module? I will examine this question in the context of noun incorporation (NI), a phenomenon found in numerous languages around the world. Building on previous work (Baker, 1988, 1996, 2009; Barrie, 2008b; Haugen, 2009; Mithun, 1984; Oxford, 2008; Rosen, 1989; Sadock, 1985) I will conclude that no separate word-building component of the grammar is, in fact, necessary to account for the properties of NI. In addition, I will discuss some criticisms of a syntactic approach to NI and present a preliminary analysis to address these concerns. The over-arching theme of this paper, however, is that a detailed understanding of NI leads to the conclusion that no separate pre-syntactic word-forming module is needed to account for NI.

Facts will be drawn from a variety of languages in this discussion; however, Onondaga, an Iroquoian language spoken by about 100 people in southern Ontario, Canada and in New York State, USA, will be the primary language of discussion. Much of the Onondaga data comes from my own field work in Six Nations. I also discuss data from Mohawk and Oneida, two other Iroquoian languages. The syntactic properties of Onondaga, Oneida and Mohawk (along with other Northern Iroquoian languages) are typically similar enough (and in some cases identical) that generalizations in one language can be shown to hold across the Northern Iroquoian branch. Thus, in the current discussion, I often make remarks about Onondaga which also hold for the other Northern Iroquoian languages. Any differences of importance are appropriately noted. Other languages with data taken from primary sources are noted as they arise in the forthcoming discussion.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a background discussion on the issues at the heart of the lexicalist/non-lexicalist debate. Section 3 introduces the core properties of NI, paying particularly close attention to those properties

that impinge on the debate. Section 4 presents Baker's syntactic analysis of NI along with some problematic aspects which have been pointed out by those promulgating a lexicalist account of NI. Section 5 presents a preliminary analysis of NI that addresses these concerns. Section 6 is a brief conclusion.

2 The Lexicalist Hypothesis and the Single-Engine Hypothesis

This section introduces the key properties of the Lexicalist Hypothesis and the Single-Engine Hypothesis. The core difference between these two approaches is the relationship between morphology and syntax. The Lexicalist Hypothesis contends that the minimal units of syntax are (potentially) morphologically complex words whose internal structure is invisible to syntax. The Single-Engine Hypothesis rejects this approach and contends that words and phrases are formed by a uniform syntactic module. Although Distributed Morphology (Embick and Noyer, 2007; Halle and Marantz, 1993) is probably the most well-known instantiation of the Single-Engine Hypothesis, it is not the only one. It is not the point of this discussion to argue for one particular framework over another. Rather, I simply intend to show that NI offers additional evidence in favour of the Single-Engine Hypothesis.

The Lexicalist Hypothesis aligns closely with a traditional view of grammar in that it contains a Lexicon with a word-formation module (Ackema, 1999; Ackema and Neeleman, 2004; Anderson, 1982; Aronoff, 1994; Chomsky, 1970; Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987; Williams, 1981). The output of this word-formation module is the syntactic word, which is functionally atomic for all syntactic operations. That is, no syntactic operation can depend on the internal morphological structure of a word. Thus, in a phrase such as *thicken the sauce*, the 'word' *thicken* is formed in the Lexicon and is inserted into the syntax. Although it has morphological structure, it is functionally atomic for syntactic operations.

(1)

```
            VP
          /    \
         V      DP
         |      /\
      thick-en  the sauce
```

The Single-Engine Hypothesis rejects any kind of presyntactic lexical module (Arad, 2005; Julien, 2002; Marantz, 1997). Thus, the Single-Engine Hypothesis is a rejection of the Lexicalist Hypothesis. Under this approach, syntax manipulates individual morphemes rather than word-like elements (although once the syntax has formed a word-like element it can be manipulated as a whole).[1] The precise notion of "syntactic word" has consequently received less attention since it appears to be epiphenomenal.[2] Under this approach, we get the following derivation for *thicken the sauce* instead.

---

[1] As mentioned above, there are other approaches to the Single-Engine Hypothesis. Nanosyntax (Starke, 2003, 2009), for instance, holds that syntax manipulate features directly, and that morphemes map onto miniature sections of the syntactic tree.
[2] Julien (2002) suggests that wordhood is a psycholinguistic notion: "The correct question is not how words are formed, but how two or more morphemes come to be perceived as a word." (Julien, 2002, 36).

(2)

```
                              vP
                    ┌─────────┴─────────┐
                    v                   VP
               ┌────┴────┐         ┌─────┴─────┐
            thick_i     -en        V           DP
                                   │          ╱───╲
                                  t_i       the sauce
```

Advocates of the Lexicalist Hypothesis posit certain properties of syntactic words as evidence for a pre-syntactic word-formation module. I list here various properties that are argued to distinguish syntactic words (i.e., morphologically complex syntactic atoms) from syntactic phrases (Ackema and Neeleman, 2004; Williams, 2007). I list these below and discuss each one in turn.

- no delayed resolution
- no inheritance
- information encapsulation (modularity)
- intuitions on wordhood
- special meaning

2.1 Delayed resolution

Williams (2007) notes that anaphoric relations in syntax can be resolved across a large expanse of a clause. Specifically, an anaphoric element and its antecedent can be separated by several words.

(3)   John[1] told stories about the destruction of himself[1].

In (3) the resolution of *self* is delayed until later in the sentence. By contrast, Williams offers the following example to show that word-internal *self* cannot seek delayed resolution.

(4)   John told self-destruction stories.

In (4) *self* cannot be resolved outside the word *self-destruction*. Thus, *self* cannot refer to John in this sentence, but can only have arbitrary reference. This is assumedly due to the fact *self-destruction* is a word whose internal structure is invisible to the syntax. Consider, however, the following example.

(5)   a.   John's (unfortunate) self-destruction
   b.   John's expectation/tendency to self-destruct.

Here, *self* must refer to John and cannot take arbitrary reference. Thus, it is not clear that lack of coreference between *John* and *self* in (4) is related to any word-level domain. Consider also the following Onondaga example. Observe again that the reflexive marker takes its reference from outside the word.

(6)   John waʔhadadaehsę́thwaʔ   [Onondaga]

John[1]	waʔ-	ha-	**atat**[1]**-**	aehsęthw-	aʔ
John	FACT-	3.SG.NOM-	**REFL-**	kick-	PUNC

'John kicked himself.'

Although I have not shed any light on the unavailability of coreference in (4), the data here show that delayed resolution does not identify a category of 'syntactic word'.

2.2   Inheritance

A syntactic analysis of word formation predicts that the components of a syntactically formed word should have the same syntactic properties as when it appears as an independent word. Ackema & Neeleman (2004) discuss the derivation of the word *driver* in this regard. If *driver* is formed syntactically from the verb *drive* and the nominalizer *-er*, then the verb should retain its verbal properties and be able to take an object ultimately giving rise to the ungrammatical **driver a truck*. Here is the structure they suggest.

(7)

```
                        NP
            ┌───────────┴───────────┐
            N                       VP
        ┌───┴───┐           ┌───────┴───────┐
        V       -er        t_i             NP
        │                                 ╱‾‾╲
      drive_i                            a truck
```

It is far from clear that the structure they propose converges, however. Since Burzio (1986) it has been known that a verb does not assign accusative Case without also assigning an external θ-role. It is also now standardly assumed that accusative Case is assigned by v, which is absent in the structure above. In fact, many of the properties of the verb are actually properties of higher functional projections, again which are absent in the structure above. I would put forth that the high degree of null allomorphy in English obscures the difference between *He is a driver* and *He drives*. In another language with more overt morphology, this discussion could very likely be moot. Thus, it seems that there's actually very little to inherit aside from the verb's thematic properties, which *are* present in the compound.

Ackema & Neeleman note this potential objection and suggest instead the following possible derivation (Ackema and Neeleman, 2004: 24).

(8)

```
                              F_1P
                ┌──────────────┴──────────────┐
               F_1                           F_2P
        ┌───────┴───────┐           ┌─────────┴─────────┐
      F_2l             F_1        PP_j                 F_2'
    ┌───┴───┐                    ╱‾‾╲           ┌───────┴───────┐
   N_k      F_2            of a truck  t_l     NP
 ┌──┴──┐                                   ┌────┴────┐
V_i    -er                               t_k        VP
 │                                              ┌────┴────┐
drive                                          t_i       t_j
```

4

In this derivation the PP raises to a licensing position in SpecF$_2$P, which Ackema & Neeleman themselves suggest could take place covertly. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest that PPs in English raise overtly to some licensing position. Thus, the derivation in (8) could be simplified to the following (Marantzian v and n notwithstanding).

(9)

```
                    NP
              ┌──────┴──────┐
              N            VP
          ┌───┴───┐    ┌────┴────┐
         V_i     er   t_i       PP
          │                  ┌───┴───┐
        driver              of a truck
```

This structure is isomorphic to the morphological structure they propose for the same construction, however. Given that the PP raising analysis is not needed, the syntactic analysis turns out to be no more complex than the morphological analysis. Even if it turns out that a more fine-grained or complex syntactic analysis is required, then excluding it because the morphological analysis is simpler is the result of a faulty comparison between two competing models. The derivation in (9) (or the morphological equivalent suggested by Ackema and Neeleman) is preferable to that in (8) in terms of complexity only to the extent that these two models otherwise stand on equal footing. They do not, however. The model in (9) requires two linguistic modules to work where the model in (8) requires only one. Thus, I conclude that their argument in terms of inheritance does not present a valid argument in support of an independent, pre-syntactic word-forming module.

2.3   Information Encapsulation

Williams discusses the data in (10) under the label of 'information encapsulation' in adducing support for a separate word-forming module. This argument is quite similar to the discussion on inheritance above and has to do with the familiar notion of modularity. The word *complete* can merge with *how* to form *how complete* or with *-ness* to form *completeness*. It follows that **how completeness* should be able to be derived from the underlying adjectival form *how complete*. The surface forms should be able to appear in the sentences below.

(10)   a.   how complete
        b.   completeness
        c.   *[how complete]-ness
        d.   How complete a record do you admire?
        e.   What degree of completeness do you admire?
        f.   * How completeness do you admire?

There is a fundamental problem with the argument, however. It assumes that *complete* in both (10)a and b are structurally identical. Following Abney (1987) the degree word *how* merges with an adjectival phrase (here *a*P) to form a DegP as shown in (11)a. I represent the adjective *complete* as a root that merges with a phonologically null *a* (Marantz, 2001), although nothing hinges on this. The form *completeness* in (11)b arises by the nominalizer *-ness* merging with the *a*P *complete* to form the *n*P *completeness*, assuming some kind of raising.

5

(11) a.

```
         DegP
        /    \
      Deg     aP
       |     /  \
      how   a    √
                 |
              complete
```

b.

```
       nP
      /  \
     n    aP
     |    /\
  -ness  complete
```

Consider now the two possible derivations of *how completeness* in (12).[3] In neither case does the derivation converge. In the derivation on the left, Deg, merges with *n*P. The functional head, Deg, is part of the extended adjectival projection, however, so cannot merge with *n*P. In the derivation on the right, the nominalizer, *-ness*, merges with a DegP; however, once functional material along an extended projection has been merged into the structure, then it is reasonable to assume that the form cannot be recategorized. (For instance, once a noun is pluralized, it cannot be verbalized.) Thus, the form *how completeness* is not generable under standard assumptions.

(12)

```
           ?P
          /  \
        Deg   nP
         |   /  \
        how n    aP
          /  \   /\
       a-√ᵢ   n  tᵢ
        |     |
    complete -ness
```

```
        ?P
       /  \
      n    DegP
      |    /\
    ness  how complete
```

To conclude, the argument of information encapsulation relies on a problematic analysis of *how completeness*. Rather, I have shown that this form is excluded on basic syntactic principles.

2.4   Special Meaning

The notion of special meaning is often attributed to the existence of word-sized categories. That is, words can have meanings that are not necessarily compositionally transparent based on their components. For example, words formed by *-ment* in English typically have meanings that are not predictable from the base.

(13)   better → betterment
        govern → government
        depart → department

As Marantz (1997; 2001) has previously pointed out, however, idioms are no different in this regard. In fact, Marantz suggested that idioms go much beyond the prototypical 'cat is out of the bag' examples and argues that idiomatic meanings are rampant in natural language. The existence of idioms thwarts the correlation between words and special meaning by showing that units larger than a traditional word can carry special meaning.

---

[3] I have shown a derivation here that assumes head movement from √ to *a* to *n*. This is not vital to the argument here, so I have simply shown an abbreviated form of the derivation in which the *a*-√ complex moves as a unit.

(14) a.   throw a party/fit/game
      b.   take a break/drink/leak/glimpse

Furthermore, Kiparsky (1983) argues that denominal verbs have unpredictable meanings based on 'canonical use', for which he coined the term Canonical Use Constraint (CUC). For instance, the verb *to butter* refers to a specific way of spreading butter on something. Because of this, Kiparsky argues that denominal verbs must be stored as such in the Lexicon and are not derived syntactically. The CUC, however is not restricted to putatively lexically stored words, but rather it is a property of bare nouns in general (Harley, 2008; see also Stvan, 2009), as the following English data show.

(15) a.   in bed   in the bed
      b.   * on bed   on the bed
      c.   at church   at the church

Expressions such as *in bed* and *at church* denote specific events in which the bed and the church are used for their canonical activities. Thus, if John is playing bingo in a church basement, he is 'at the church' but he is not 'at church'. Thus, canonical use cannot be used as a diagnostic to distinguish words from phrases.

2.5   Summary

I have discussed various purported properties that distinguish words from phrases and have argued that none of them presents a solid case for positing a word-building module distinct from syntax. In the next section I discuss the properties of NI in Onondaga (and some other languages), paying close attention to those properties of NI which have been presented as a challenge to the Single-Engine Hypothesis.

3   Properties of Noun Incorporation

This section introduces the fundamental properties of NI with particular emphasis on those properties that bear on the debate on lexicalism. The discussion focuses mainly on Northern Iroquoian, but properties of NI in other languages are introduced where appropriate. I begin with a basic description of the phenomenon followed by a discussion of the following properties.

- class of incorporable objects
- special/institutionalized meaning
- modifier stranding

3.1   Basic Structure of NI

NI constructions are prototypically formed from a verbal root and a nominal root or base that thematically stands in a verb-direct object relation (Baker, 1988; Lounsbury, 1949; Mithun, 1984), although incorporation of adjuncts is also available as I will discuss below (Mithun, 2004). Consider first the following Onondaga example with a non-incorporated DP (Gloria Williams and Nora Carrier, speakers).

(16) waʔkhnínú: neʔ ganakdaʔ   [Onondaga]
     waʔ-   k-   hninu- ́:   neʔ   ka-**nakt**-aʔ
     FACT- 1.SG-   buy-   PUNC   NE   NOM.PREF-**bed**-SUF
     'I bought the/a bed.'

Notice that the free-standing object DP contains functional morphology that is absent when the nominal root meaning *bed* undergoes NI, as shown in the following example. The absence of nominal morphology on the incorporated root is a hallmark of NI (Gerdts, 1998; Massam, 2009).

(17) waʔgenakdahnínú: [Onondaga]
     waʔ-   k-   **nakt**-   hninu- ́:
     FACT- 1.SG-   **bed**-   buy-   PUNC
     'I bought a bed.'

Baker (1988) proposes a syntactic analysis of NI based partly on the alternation between (16) and (17) in which the head of the object NP undergoes head movement to V.

(18)

```
                    VP
                   /  \
                 V      NP
                / \      |
              Nᵢ   V     tᵢ
              |    |
             bed  buy
```

Despite the attractiveness of this approach, there are various properties of NI which render a straightforward syntactic analysis difficult to implement. The rest of this section discusses these properties which have garnered considerable interest in the literature.

3.2   Incorporation of non-objects

In addition to direct objects, other elements including paths, locations, and instruments can also undergo NI, as mentioned above (Mithun, 1984; Muro, 2009; Spencer, 1995). In Blackfoot (Algonquian) and Greek, adverbs can also undergo NI (Alexiadou, 1997). Recipients and benefactives, however, cannot undergo NI. This seemingly disparate set of elements (direct objects, paths, locations, instruments and adverbs) was originally an argument against a syntactic analysis for NI (Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987; Spencer, 1995). Consider the following Onondaga example (Woodbury, 2003: 282). Here, a locative argument has been incorporated rather than a theme or direct object.

(19) honathahidákheʔ   [Onondaga]
     hon-   at-   hah-   idakhe-   ʔ
     3.PL.M.AG- SRFL-   path-   run-   PUNC
     'They are walking on a path.'

The following example from Blackfoot (Algonquian, Beatrice Bullshields, speaker) gives an example of adverb incorporation.[4]

(20)   tsa ááni anná Mary anní John omaanistsíkkamiyoowatahpi aniskayi apastaminam?

tsa   aani   ann-wa Mary   ann-yi John
how   say   DET-PROX Mary   DET-OBV John

om-**aanist-ikkam**-iy-oowat-a-hp-yi
3-**DEG-fast**-?-eat.VTA-EPEN-NZLR-INANIM.SG

ann-yi-ahk-ayi   apastaminamm
DET-OBV-INVIS-3.SG   apple

'How quickly did Mary say that John ate that apple?' (embedded scope on 'how')

Before presenting a potential syntactic analysis for this set of facts, I would like to turn to some curiously similar Chinese data (Li, 2010). Mandarin Chinese possesses non-canonical object constructions in which paths, locations, instruments, but not goals, sources, or recipients can function as the direct object. Consider the following examples.

(21)   a.   ta   xihuan chi   **haohua canting**   - locative
              he   like   eat   fancy restaurant
              'He likes to eat at fancy restaurants.'

        b.   ta   xihuan **zai haohua canting**   chi   fan
              he   like   at fancy restaurant   eat   meal
              'He likes to eat at fancy restaurants.'

(22)   a.   ta   xihuan zuo   **baitian**   - temporal
              he   like   do   daytime
              'He likes to work in the daytime'

        b.   ta   xihuan   **zai   baitian**   zuo   (shi)
              he   like   at   daytime   do   work
              'He likes to work in the daytime'

(23)   a.   ta   xihuan xie   **zhe zhi maobi**.   -instrumental
              he   like   write   this CL brush.pen
              'He likes to write with this brush pen.'

        b.   ta   xihuan **yong**   **zhe zhi maobi**   xie   (zi)
              he   like   use   this CL brush.pen   write   word
              'He likes to write with this brush pen.'

As with NI, idiomatic or canonical uses appear in these constructions. Thus, *chi canting* ('eat restaurant') can mean 'eat at a restaurant' or 'eat restaurant food'. The difference between NI

---

[4] This example illustrates the fallacy of delayed resolution again. Note that *tsa* ('how') can modify "word"-internal *annist-ikkam* (DEG-'fast') to make a matrix question.

and non-canonical objects, of course, is that non-canonical objects are full DPs (as Li shows). They are clearly syntactically derived constructions. Li argues that the non-canonical object receives accusative Case, hence the unavailability of adverbs as non-canonical objects. Since incorporated nouns traditionally do not require Case, adverbs are free to be incorporated. Adverbs aside, then, the set of elements that can undergo NI and the set of elements that can appear as non-canonical objects in Chinese are identical. I take this as evidence that no separate word-forming module need be posited to account for NI.

I do not offer an analysis of these facts here (though see Barrie and Li, 2011 for an attempt); however, I do note that a Larsonian shell (Larson, 1988, 2004) may shed light on the analysis. Under this proposal, 'adjunct' PPs and adverbs actually appear in the specifier and complement positions of an articulated VP. Recipients and benefactives are introduced by a separate functional projection, ApplP (Pylkkänen, 2002, 2008) and are not direct arguments of the verb under her approach.

Although I do not present an analysis here, I have suggested that syntactic properties may account for the restriction of NI to paths, themes, locations, instruments and adverbs. Furthermore, I drew a parallel to non-canonical objects in Chinese, which restricts this construction to an identical set of elements (less adverbs).

To sum up, although NI is prototypically described as involving the incorporation of a direct object, other kinds of elements can be incorporated such as paths, instruments, locations, and adverbs. Many languages with NI allow full DP doubles and stranded elements. The DP doubles and incorporation of non-objects have been cited as challenges to a syntactic account of NI.

3.3   Special Meaning

Recall from above that some authors have claimed that wordhood is distinguished by the property of special meaning. Recall also that I have shown various arguments against this position based on mismatches between putative words and domains of special meaning. Polysynthetic languages offer an additional testing ground for special meaning due to their tendency to pack an entire clause into a phonological word. Marantz (1997) proposes that the domain of special interpretation is *v*P. Such a proposal predicts that special meanings should arise only for those parts of the word that correspond to something smaller than a *v*P. Consider the following example (Woodbury, 2003: 225). The verb embedded under the causative morpheme is an unaccusative, whose argument is part of the VP. Thus, an idiomatic reading is possible for 'someone's body disappeared', namely, 'become lost'.

(24)   waʔgọyaʔdahdǫ́ʔdaʔ   [Onondaga]
        waʔ-   kǫ-   yaʔt-   ahtǫ-   ʔt-   aʔ
        FACT-   I:you-   body-   disappear-   CAUS-   PUNC
        'I lost you (e.g. in a crowd).'

As the translation indicates, there is an idiomatic reading for this portion of the word. However, no idiomatic reading possible if verb embedded under a causative contains an agent. Consider the following example (Gloria William, Nora Carrier, speakers).

(25)   waʔkheyǫdyaʔdẹʔ   [Onondaga]
        waʔ-   khe-   yǫdy-   a-   ʔt-   ẹ-   ʔ
        FACT-   1.SG.NOM.3.ACC-   laugh - EPEN-   CAUS-   BEN-   PUNC
        'I made them/her laugh.'

Yǫdy ('laugh') is an unergative with a single external argument. No idiomatic reading is possible here.[5] Thus, what we observe here is portions of words that are not capable of idiomatic readings. These facts are not predicted by the Lexicalist Hypothesis, but receive a principled explanation under hypothesis that the domain of special meaning is rooted in syntactic structure rather than in the notion of a wordhood.

NI is also subject to the CUC (Kiparsky, 1997), in the same way discussed in the previous section. Consider the following Oneida (Northern Iroquoian) example (Michelson and Doxtator, 2002).

(26) wahathwistáshete?

wa?-	ha-	at-	hwist-	ashet-	e?
FACT-	3.SG.M.NOM-	SREFL-	money-	count-	PUNC

'He counted money.'

This construction cannot refer to counting kinds of money or numbers of bill or coins, but can refer only to counting the sum value of a set of money. Again, I gave examples above that showed that bare nouns in general are subject to the CUC. Recall from just above that unincorporated nouns must bear extensive nominal morphology in Northern Iroquoian languages (unlike the *in church* vs. *in the church* examples in English). Thus, the absence of bare nouns outside of NI constructions predicts that instances of CUC should be restricted to NI in these languages (even though they are not in languages which allow bare nouns to appear as stand-alone phonological words).

3.4   Incorporation: Stranding and Doubled Objects

The next property is doubling and stranding. In some languages with NI the incorporated noun can be doubled by a full (usually more specific) DP. In the following Onondaga example (Gloria William and Nora Carrier, speakers), the incorporated noun *naskw* ('animal') is doubled by the more specific *kwiskwis* ('pig').

(27) wa?g**nasgw**ahnínǫ́: gwísgwis   [Onondaga]

wa?-	k-	**naskw**-	hninu- ː		kwiskwis
FACT-	1.SG-	animal-	buy-	PUNC	pig

'I bought a pig.'

In the following example, the incorporated noun is accompanied by a demonstrative. This phenomenon is sometimes referred to as stranding following Baker's analysis. Both doubling and stranding are widely attested in Onondaga (Gloria Williams and Nora Carrier, speakers) (and in Northern Iroquoian in general), as well as in numerous other languages with NI.

(28) wa?genakdahnínú: nęge?   [Onondaga]

wa?-	k-	nakt-	hninu- ː		nęke?
FACT-	1.SG-	bed-	buy-	PUNC	that

'I bought that bed.'

Baker used the stranding examples as in (28) to argue for an N-to-V head movement analysis of NI, as shown in (18). The stranded material is adjoined to NP and so does not interfere

---

[5] A full scale study of idioms in Onondaga awaits, but preliminary evidence suggests that idiomatic readings are available only to elements below *v*P.

with head movement. Doubling, however, does not follow straightforwardly. Baker (1996) argued that DP doubles are adjoined to the clause and are not part of the NP, thus salvaging his syntactic approach; however, I return to this issue in more detail below.

As is well known, there are some languages with NI that do not allow doubling or nominal modifiers. Consider the following example from Mapudungun (an Araucanian language spoken in Chile and Argentina) (Baker et al., 2005). The stranded demonstrative renders this sentence ungrammatical.

(29)   Pedro   ngilla-waka-y   (*tüfachi)   [Mapudungun]
       Pedro   cow-buy-3.SG   (this)
       'Pedro bought a/*this cow.'

Doubling with NI has always been problematic for syntactic analysis of NI since the DP double assumedly occupies the original Merge position of the incorporated noun. I return to this issue in the discussion of Baker's analysis of NI below and in my own proposal in section 5.

To conclude, this section has echoed the results of the previous discussion in showing that the properties of NI constructions do not warrant a separate word-forming module. I have held in abeyance the discussion of stranding and doubling as these scrutinized in light of Baker's analysis, the topic of the next section.

4   A Syntactic Analysis of NI

As mentioned, Baker (1996) proposed a syntactic analysis of NI based on the stranding facts discussed above. For the doubling examples, Baker argued that the overt double is a clausal adjunct that is coreferential with the incorporated noun, along the lines of left dislocation in the following English example.

(30)   Beans, I like them.

The following are the two structures that Baker proposed for modifier stranding and doubling, respectively.

(31)   VP   modifier stranding

            V   NP

        N_i V   Mod t_i

(32)   S   doubling

            S   NP

                 VP   double

        V t_i

    N_i V

The evidence that Baker adduces for these two structures comes from idioms and *wh*-movement, which I discuss in turn. Briefly, idioms in Mohawk are found only with NI, not with full DP forms, which suggests that full DPs are adjuncts and not part of the VP. Baker also claims that *wh*-movement not possible with NI, further suggesting that the full DP double (the *wh*-phrase) is an adjunct.

Starting with idioms, Baker (1996:133) notes that pieces of idiom cannot appear as an adjunct. In the following sentence, the idiom *break the ice* (meaning 'start up a discussion after an initial period of awkward silence') contains an idiom chunk, *the ice*, which cannot be left-dislocated.

(33)　a.　　Susan finally broke the ice.
　　　　b.　　# The ice, Susan finally managed to break it at 11:30.

Baker (1996) claims that idiomatic meanings restricted to NI in polysynthetic languages as his Morphological Visibility Requirement requires that all overt nominals be adjoined as in (32); however, the following Dëne Sųłiné (Dene-Yeniseian) example shows that this is not the case (Cook and Wilhelm, 1998). The idiomatic reading is available both the incorporated and non-incorporated forms.[6]

(34)　　na-jĕth-the-Ø-Ø-da
　　　　ITER-hook-M/A-3.SG-VCL-sit
　　　　'S/he is fishing again.' (lit: sitting with a hook)

　　　　jĕth　　　　ghą　　　　the-Ø-Ø-da
　　　　hook　　　　with　　　　M/A-3.SG-VCL-sit
　　　　'S/he is fishing again.' (lit: sitting with a hook)

Thus, it appears that non-incorporated nominals must be able to appear in argument position, at least in some polysynthetic languages. As a side note, this example illustrates again that the domain of special meaning cannot be correlated with the notion of a "word".

Baker adduces further evidence for the structures in (31) and (32) by examining *wh*-movement. The basis of his argument lies in the observation that *wh*-movement cannot take place from an adjoined position (Cinque, 1990; Rizzi, 1986).

(35)　a.　　John read this book.
　　　　　　What did John read *t*?

　　　　b.　　This book, John read it.
　　　　　　* What *t*, did John read it?

Consider the following Mohawk data from Baker's (1996: 323) discussion.

(36)　a.　?*Úhka　t-　　Λ-　　hse-　　wír-　　a-　　hkw　　　　-e'
　　　　　　who　DUC-　FUT-　2.SG-　baby-　EPEN-　pick.up　　-PUNC
　　　　　　('Who are you going to pick up (a baby)?')

---

[6] In defense of the Morphological Visibility Condition, Baker would likely conclude that Dëne Sųłiné is not a true polysynthetic language and hence not bound by the constraint that all overt nominals appear in adjoined positions. Like most Athabaskan languages, however, Dëne Sųłiné is highly polysynthetic in the traditional sense.

b. Ka nikayʌ   t-   ʌ-   hse-   wír-   a-   hkw   -e'
   which   DUC-   FUT-   2.SG-   baby-   EPEN-   pick.up   -PUNC
   'Which baby are you going to pick up?'

Baker shows that *úhka* ('who') is a full nominal while *ka nikayʌ* ('which') is a nominal modifier. As a full nominal *úhka* must appear in the clausal adjunct position shown in (32) when it doubles an incorporated noun (*wír* 'baby'), a position from which *wh*-movement cannot take place. In (36)b, however, *ka nikayʌ* modifies the NP *wír* ('baby'), as in (31). From this position, the modifier can undergo *wh*-movement.

   Consider, however, the following Onondaga data. *Wh*-movement is clearly available with NI in Onondaga.[7] Here, *nwadę'* ('who') can accompany NI and undergo *wh*-movement. Furthermore, a full nominal phrase *gaęnigáe' gwísgwis* ('which pig') can do the same. Although Baker's (36)b can be explained by the structure in (31), this is not the case for the Onondaga example in (37)b since a lexical noun occupies what is supposed to be the extraction site for the incorporated noun.

(37) a. nwadę' wa'snasgwahní:nǫ'
        nwadę'   wa'-   s-   nasgw-   a-   hninǫ-   '
        what   FACT-   you-   animal-   EPEN-   buy-   PUNC
        'What (kind of animal) did you buy?'

     b. gaęnigáe' gwísgwis wa'snasgwahní:nǫ'
        gaęnigáe'   gwisgwis   wa'-   s-   nasgw-a-   hninǫ-   '
        which   pig   FACT-   2.SG-   animal-EPEN-   buy-   PUNC
        'Which pig did you buy?'

   The Lexicalists' response to the stranding and doubling phenomena that Baker presents was to argue that Baker's analysis draws a false distinction between these two phenomena (Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987; Rosen, 1989). Indeed, Rosen notes that modifier stranding is available independently of NI, a fact which is replicated in the Onondaga data below.

(38) a. wa'genakdahnínú: nęge'
        wa'-   k-   nakt-   hninu-ː   nęke'
        FACT-   1.SG-   bed-   buy-   PUNC   that
        'I bought that bed.'

     b. wa'khnínú: nęge'
        wa'-   k-   hninu-ː   nęke'
        FACT-   1.SG-   buy-   PUNC   that
        'I bought that one.'

---

[7] Baker (1996: 325) lists several examples of *wh*-movment similar in structure to (37)a, which is indicates are ungrammatical, in line with his proposal. My Onondaga consultants have consistently judged these examples grammatical, so I am at a loss to explain this disparity. Note that claiming this is a true point of variation would mean that Onondaga is not a polysynthetic language in Baker's sense. Since Mohawk and Onondaga are so closely related and share so many other syntactic properties, this would be a strange conclusion. Nevertheless, (37)b is still unexplained under Baker's proposal, and he fails to show the crucial evidence that such examples are ungrammatical in Mohawk.

Baker's analysis would require two analyses for stranded modifiers, not to mention the two distinct analyses for stranding and doubling shown above. I return to these facts below.

Despite these challenges to a syntactic analysis of NI, I maintain that it is not necessary to invoke a distinct lexical/morphological module to explain these facts. In the next section, I outline a preliminary analysis that addresses these concerns.

5   Proposal

The conclusions of the discussions above are that none of the purported arguments in favour of a lexical analysis of NI holds water. Specifically, many of these properties were shown to hold for unequivocal cases of syntactically derived constructions. Nevertheless, the previous section highlighted con continuing problems with a syntactic approach to NI. I outline a preliminary analysis to account for these facts.

I propose that the incorporated noun and the double are merged as a constituent as a sister to the verb. Note that similar proposals have been put forth for other related phenomena such as clitic doubling (Uriagereka, 1995), resumptive pronouns (Boeckx, 2003), and Principle B type pronouns (Kayne, 2002).

(39)   V [N DP]

In this construction the N undergoes NI and the DP fulfils the role as the double. Recall that stranding is available independently of NI. This fact is easily captured under the model in (39) because the DP double functions independently of the incorporated noun, N. Consider the following stranding examples again.

(40)   a.   wa'genakdahnínú: nege'
              wa'-   k-   nakt- hninu- ́:   nęke'
              FACT- 1.SG- bed- buy- PUNC   that
              'I bought that bed.'

       b.   wa'khnínú: nege'
              wa'- k-   hninu- ́:   nęke'
              FACT- 1.SG- buy- PUNC   that
              'I bought that one.'

I propose the following structure for the VP in this sentence. Note that the DP *nege' pro* can appear as the object with or without the incorporated noun, N. Thus, the availability of stranding with or without NI does not require two distinct analyses.

(41)   a.   VP   b.   VP
            ┌───────┴───────┐   ┌───────┴───────┐
            V   ┌─┴─┐   V   DP
            │   N   DP   │   ╱─────╲
          hninu   │   ╱──╲   hninu   nęke' *pro*
           buy   nakt nęke' *pro*
                          bed   that

Furthermore, the DP in question can be a full DP, which again does not force us to posit two completely different structures for stranding and doubling constructions. This also allows us to account for the *wh*-movement facts presented above.

Turning to Mapudungun and other languages that lack doubling and stranding, I propose that the verb in such languages selects only N as a complement, and not the complex [N [DP]] structure available in Northern Iroquoian.

6   Extensions of the Analysis

Finally, I briefly discuss how the study of NI in polysynthetic languages impinges on the study of similar constructions in East Asian languages. This has already been mentioned for Mandarin Chinese above. Here, I mention Japanese and Cantonese. Bare noun constructions have been pinpointed in previous work, which bear a striking resemblance to noun incorporation. These have sometimes been discussed under the rubric of semantic incorporation (Dayal, 2011; van Geenhoven, 1998).

Consider first the following Japanese data (Sato, 2010).[8] Sato observes that light verb constructions with bare noun roots give rise to idiomatic readings, which are absent in the constructions where the objects are Case marked. What's interesting here is that the 'incorporated' forms in the 'a' examples sit at the boundary between the notion of a word and the notion of a phrase, thus blurring the distinction between these two concepts. What I have argued here based on the NI facts presented is that the distinction does not exist.

(42)   a.   beknyoo-suru
              studying-do
              'to study' / 'to discount'

        b.   benkyoo-o   suru
              studying-ACC   do
              'to study' / * 'to discount'

(43)   a.   ryoori-suru
              cooking-do
              'to cook' / 'to handle well'

        b.   ryoori-o   suru
              cooking-ACC   do
              'to cook' / * 'to handle well'

Consider next the following Cantonese data (Barrie, 2008a). Observe that idiomatic readings are found with bare object noun constructions, but not when the object contains higher functional material. Again, this mirrors the observations of NI in Northern Iroquoian where idiomatic readings hold only with bare nouns, which are syntactically incorporated in Northern Iroquoian.

(44)   a.   caat3   haai4
              polish   shoe
              'flatter' / 'polish shoes'

---

[8] Readers will undoubtedly recognize similar constructions in Korean (Ahn, 1991; Ahn, 2002; Karimi-Doostan, 2005, inter alia).

b. caat3 ni1 deoi3 haai4
polish this CL shoe
'polish this pair of shoes'
* 'engage in this instance of flattery'

(45) a. jam2 ca4
drink tea
'have dim sum' / 'drink tea'

b. jam2 ni1 di1 ca4
drink this cl tea
'drink this tea'
* 'have this (bit of) dim sum'

The following cognate object noun constructions also show that the noun in object position is not necessarily a theme, but can also be a location or instrument. Again, this mirrors the observations with Mandarin non-canonical object constructions and NI in general.

(46) a. paau2 bou6
run path
'to run'

b. bong1 sau2
help hand
'to help'

c. lok6 gaai1
go.down street
'to go outside'

It is highly unlikely that the similarity in the properties shared between NI and the bare noun constructions in East Asian languages is accidental. Much of the research on these constructions is in an incipient stage, however, and much work needs to be done in determining the basic syntactic, semantic and prosodic properties of these constructions.

7 Conclusions

This paper has reviewed various arguments for and against positing a separate, pre-syntactic word-forming module. The properties that were argued to distinguish words from phrases have been shown to correlate with other syntactically defined units. In particular, the domain of special meaning was shown to be larger than the word, and the CUC was shown to be a property of bare nouns. Other properties discussed were shown to have numerous systematic exceptions. Noun incorporation was discussed as an illustration of this debate. Again, the properties of NI were shown not to require any special word-building module. I concentrated on those properties of NI that have been challenging to a syntactic account of this phenomenon. First, the class of incorporable objects includes elements other than the direct object (the theme). Specifically, adverbs, paths, locations and instruments can also be incorporated. It was shown that Mandarin Chinese exhibits a construction known as non-canonical objects that is restricted to the same set of elements (save adverbs). The issue of

special meaning was taken up again. Interestingly, it was suggested that the domain of special meaning can be smaller than a word in some cases if the word is larger than a *v*P. Finally, stranding and doubling were discussed. These have previously been resistant to syntactic analysis, including Baker's head movement analysis. I put forth a preliminary syntactic analysis of NI that addresses the issues that Baker leaves unanswered, showing that the properties of NI are fully compatible with a syntactic approach (and in some cases, fare better than an approach assuming a distinct word-building module). Finally, some tentative remarks about NI-like constructions in Japanese and Cantonese were made and a link was suggested that ties these constructions together.

References:

Abney, Stephen. 1987. The English Noun Phrase and its Sentential Aspect, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Ackema, Peter. 1999. *Issues in Morphosyntax*. Amsterdam, Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Ackema, Peter, and Neeleman, Ad. 2002. Syntactic Atomicity. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 6 (2-3):93-128.

Ackema, Peter, and Neeleman, Ad. 2004. *Beyond Morphology: interface conditions on word formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ahn, Hee-Don. 1991. Light Verbs, VP-Movement, Negation and Clausal Architecture in Korean and English, University of Wisconsin: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Ahn, Sung-Ho. 2002. The State-Event Distinction and the Light Verb Construction. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 12 (2):441-466.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 1997. *Adverb Placement: A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anderson, Stephen. 1982. Where's Morphology? *Linguistic Inquiry* 13 (4):571-612.

Arad, Maya. 2005. *Roots and Patterns: Hebrew morpho-syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Iteslf: Stems and Inflectional Classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Baker, Mark C. 1985. The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16 (3):373-416.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Mark C. 2009. Is head movement still needed for noun incorporation? *Lingua* 119 (2):148-165.

Baker, Mark C., Aranovich, Roberto, and Golluscio, Lucía A. 2005. Two types of syntactic noun incorporation: Noun incorporation in Mapudungun and its typological implications. *Language* 81 (1):138-176.

Barrie, Michael. 2008a. Bare Nouns in Cantonese. Paper presented at *12th Bilingual Workshop in Theoretical Linguistics*, Dec 5-6, Ottawa, ON.

Barrie, Michael. 2008b. Noun Incorporation, Doubling, and Linearization. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Structure and Constituency of Languages of the Americas, 12*. University of Lethbridge. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.

Barrie, Michael, and Li, Yen-hui Audrey. 2011. Non-Canonical Objects in Chinese and Northern Iroquoian. Paper presented at *Fall meeting of the Korean Generative Grammar Circle: Minimalism and its Expansion*, November 12, 2011, Sungsil University.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and Chains: Resumption as stranding*. Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on Nominalization. In *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* vol., eds. Roderick Jacobs and Peter Rosenbaum, 184-221. Washington: Georgetown UP.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-Bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cook, Eung-Do, and Wilhelm, Andrea. 1998. Noun Incorporation: New Evidence from Athapaskan. *Studies in Language* 22 (1):49-81.

Dayal, Veneeta. 2011. Hindi Pseudo-Incorporation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29 (1):123-167.

Di Sciullo, Anna Maria, and Williams, Edwin. 1987. *On the Definition of Word*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Embick, David, and Noyer, Robert Rolf. 2007. Distributed morphology and the Syntax/Morphology Interface. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces* vol., eds. Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss, 289-324. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1998. Incorporation. In *The Handbook of Morphology* vol., eds. Andrew Spencer and Arnold M. Zwicky, 84-100. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hale, Ken, and Keyser, Samuel J. 2003. *A Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris, and Marantz, Alec 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistic in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger* vol., eds. Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2008. Bare Roots, Conflation and the Canonical Use Constraint, February 5-6, 2008, University of Lund, Lund, Sweden.

Haugen, Jason D. 2008. *Morphology at the Interfaces: Reduplication and Noun Incorporation in Uto-Aztecan*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haugen, Jason D. 2009. Hyponymous objects and Late Insertion. *Lingua* 119 (2):242-262.

Julien, Marit. 2002. *Syntactic Heads and Word Formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karimi-Doostan, Gholamhossein. 2005. Light Verbs and Structural Case. *Lingua* 115 (12):1737-1756.

Kayne, Richard. 2002. Pronouns and Their Antecedents. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program* vol., eds. Samuel Epstein and Daniel Seely, 133-166. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1983. Word-Formation and the Lexicon. In *1982 Mid America Linguistics Conference Papers* vol., ed. Frances Ingeman, 3-29. Lawrence: Dept. of Ling., Univ. of Kansas.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1997. Remarks on Denominal Verbs. In *Complex Predicates* vol., eds. A. Alsina, Joan Bresnan and Peter Sells, 247-288. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19 (3):335-391.

Larson, Richard K. 2004. Sentence Final Adverbs and "Scope". In *Proceedings of NELS 34* vol., eds. Keir Moulton and Matthew Wolf, 23-43. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.

Lees, Robert. 1960. *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.

Li, Yen-hui Audrey. 2010. Case and Objects. Paper presented at *GLOW in Asia VIII*, Aug 12-14, Beijing Language and Culture University.

Lounsbury, Floyd Glenn. 1949. Iroquoian Morphology, Yale University: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Marantz, Alec. 1997. No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (2):201-225.

Marantz, Alec. 2001. Words. Paper presented at *20th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, February 23-25, 2001, University of Southern California.

Massam, Diane. 2009. Noun Incoporation: Essentials and Extensions. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3 (4):1076-1096.

Michelson, Karin, and Doxtator, Mercy. 2002. *Oneida-English/English-Oneida Dictionary*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The Evolution of Noun Incorporation. *Language* 60 (4):847-894.

Mithun, Marianne. 2004. The Non-universality of Obliques. Paper presented at *Syntax of the World's Languages*, August 5-8, 2004, University of Leipzig and Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Muro, Allesio. 2009. Noun Incorporation: A New Theoretical Perspective, Dipartimento di Discipline Linguistiche, Comunicative e dello Spettacolo, Universitá degli Studi di Padova: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Oxford, Will. 2008. A Classifier Analysis of Direct Object Doubling. In *MUN Occasional Student Papers in Linguistics* vol. 1, eds. C. Dunphy and Will Oxford, 19-35. St. John's, NL: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (3):356-424.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. Introducing Arguments, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On the Status of Subject Clitics in Romance. In *Studies in Romance Linguistics* vol., ed. Osvaldo Jaeggli, 391-419. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rosen, Sara Thomas. 1989. Two Types of Noun Incorporation: A Lexical Analysis. *Language* 65 (2):294-317.

Sadock, Jerrold. 1980. Noun Incorporation in Greenlandic: A Case of Syntactic Word Formation. *Language* 56 (2):300-319.

Sadock, Jerrold. 1985. Autolexical Syntax: A Proposal for the Treatment of Noun Incorporation and Similar Phenomena. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 3 (4):379-439.

Sadock, Jerrold. 1986. Some Notes on Noun Incorporation. *Language* 62 (1):19-31.

Sato, Yosuke. 2010. Bare Verbal Nouns, Idiomatization and Incorporation in Japanese. Paper presented at *Theoretical East Asian Linguistics, 6*, Peking University.

Spencer, Andrew. 1995. Incorporation in Chukchi. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* 71 (3):439-489.

Starke, Michal. 2003. Spellout as a trigger for (some) movements. Paper presented at *Workshop on Antisymmetry and Remnant Movement*, Oct 31 - Nov 1, 2003, New York University.

Starke, Michal. 2009. Nanosyntax - A short primer to a new approach to language. *Nordlyd* Peter Svenonius, Gillian Ramchand, Michal Starke and Tarald Taraldsen 36 (1):1-6.

Stvan, Laurel Smith. 2009. Semantic incorporation as an account for some bare singular count noun uses in English. *Lingua* 119 (2):314-333.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26 (1):79-123.

van Geenhoven, Veerle. 1998. *Semantic Incorporation and Indefinite Descriptions: Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Noun Incorporation in West Greenlandic*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Williams, Edwin. 1981. On the Notions "Lexically related' and 'head of a word'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:245-274.

Williams, Edwin. 2007. Dumping Lexicalism. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces* vol., eds. Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woodbury, Hanni. 2003. *Onondaga-English/English-Onondaga Dictionary*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.