

both of which require strict linear adjacency between heads, then the behavior of *liu* has a straightforward explanation. Only if the modifier *liu* follows the head noun will the head be linearly adjacent to the verb.

An Argument against Baker (2012): Baker suggests that *only* NPs generated in [Compl,V] can undergo PNI. This is not the case for Balinese. Themes, regardless of their position, *never* undergo PNI. Above, we saw that pre-verbal Themes do not display NP-internal word order restrictions (5), and that post-verbal Themes can be *wh*-moved (4). (7-8) provides further confirmation that Themes never undergo PNI.

(7) **Themes can be definite.**

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. Wayan η-uber cicing-e
W. AV-chase dog-DEF
'Wayan chased the dog.' | b. cicing-e uber Wayan
dog-DEF OV.chase W.
'Wayan chased the dog.' |
|---|---|

(8) **Themes can be separated from the verb.**

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. Wayan η-uber keras-keras cicing-e
W. AV-chase quickly dog-DEF
'Wayan chased the dog quickly.' | b. cicing-e keras-keras uber Wayan
dog-DEF quickly OV.chase W.
'Wayan chased the dog quickly.' |
|---|---|

This scenario is typologically rare. Other languages which have been argued to display Agent PNI also display Theme PNI (e.g. Turkish (Öztürk 2009) and Hungarian (Farkas & de Swart 2003)). However, if we assume that Balinese PNI arises to prevent a Case Filter violation, it follows that only the post-verbal Agent, at risk of not receiving Case, incorporates in order to be licensed. More problematic for Baker (2012) is that Agent Incorporation – not only in Balinese, but Turkish and Hungarian as well – requires Head Movement from a non-complement position – [Spec, vP]. Such movement is deemed illicit under the Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984, Hale & Keyser 1992). If Morphological Merger is responsible for linear adjacency, then there are no HMC violations to contend with.

Morphological Merger: If Head Movement is not the correct means to enforce linear adjacency, we must provide another mechanism with similar effect. At PF, the V+T complex in OV is linearly adjacent to the Agent NP in [Spec, vP]. I suggest that when the head of that NP is linearly adjacent to T⁰, Morphological Merger takes places bracketing T⁰ and the head (H⁰) as in (9).

(9) *Morphological Merger* (Marantz 1984)

$$T^0 [_{HP} H^0] \rightarrow [T^0 + H^0]$$

I posit that this post-syntactic operation simultaneously enforces adjacency and ameliorates the Case Filter violation. As Bobaljik (1994) notes, such merger does not need to be realized overtly as affixation, and it is not realized as such in Balinese. If this is the case, one might wonder if the proposed analysis, with some language-specific modifications, can capture all instances of PNI and true Noun Incorporation.

The proposed account captures another typologically rare trait of Balinese PNI. Unlike, definite descriptions (2), other DPs – pronouns (10a) and proper names (10b) – can appear in post-verbal position.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (10) a. be-e daar ida
fish-DEF OV.eat 3 rd .sg.
'(S)he ate the fish.' | b. be-e daar Nyoman
be-DEF OV.eat N.
'Nyoman ate the fish.' |
|--|---|

This observation poses another problem for Baker and Massam who state that only NPs can undergo PNI. One might wonder if post-verbal DPs are have incorporated. The fact that post-verbal DPs display the same linearity requirements as NPs, seen in (3), suggests they have.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (11) a. *be-e daar keras-keras ida
fish-DEF OV.eat quickly 3 rd .sg
'(She ate the fish quickly.)' | b. *be-e daar keras-keras Nyoman
fish-DEF OV.eat quickly N.
'(Nyoman ate the fish quickly.)' |
|--|--|

The Morphological Merger account provides a solution to the puzzle of why pronouns and proper names can incorporate but definite descriptions cannot. As seen in (2), the definite morpheme *-e* and the definite determiner *ento* 'that' appear to the right of the NP. If PNI requires linear adjacency between the incorporating head – N⁰ or D⁰ – with the verb then the intervening NP in (2) blocks PNI. However, pronouns, which occupy D⁰ and lack a NP complement (e.g Postal 1966, Elbourne 2001), *can* be realized adjacent to the verb. Similarly, proper names have been argued to move into D⁰ (Longobardi 1994). Here too, PF adjacency with the verb holds as there is no intervening NP material.