Toward a unified analysis of antipassive and pseudo noun incorporation constructions

Summary: In pseudo noun incorporation (PNI) constructions, an NP, usually the internal argument (IA), is merged in place of a DP. This choice triggers syntactic and semantic ramifications: (i) case alignment changes, (ii) object agreement disappears, (iii) IAs take narrow scope, (iv) IAs display number neutrality (e.g. Baker 2012; Dayal 2011; Massam 2001). *I posit that antipassive (AP) constructions, which display similar effects, also arise via NP-merger not variation in functional heads.*

AP Properties: Inuktitut exemplifies the similar behavior of AP (see also Aldridge 2012 on Tagalog; Campbell 2000 on Ki'che'; Dryer 1990 on Dyirbal; Kozinsky et al. 1988 on Chukchi; Rude 1988 on Nez Perce).

(1) **AP alters case alignment** (Johns 2002)**.**

a. anguti-**up** nanuq-**Ø** kapi-jaa
man-**ERG** polar.bear-**ABS** stab-3sS/3sO
'The man stabbed the polar bear.'

b. angut-**Ø** nanur-**mik** kapi-si-juq
man-**ABS** polar.bear-**OBL** stab-AP-3sS
'The man is stabbing the polar bear.'

(2) **AP obviates object agreement** (Spreng 2006)**.**

a. anguti-up arnaq-Ø kunik-**taa**
man-ERG woman-ABS kiss-PART.**3sS/3sO**
'The man kissed the woman.'

b. anguti-Ø kunik-si-**vuq** arna-mik
man-ABS kiss-AP-IND.**3sS** woman-OBL
'The man kissed a woman.'

(3) **AP IAs are narrow scope indefinites** (Bittner 1994)**.**

suli Juuna atuakka-mik ataatsi-mi tigu-si-sima-nngi-laq [¬ > ∃; *∃ > ¬]
still J.-ABS book-OBL one-OBL get-AP-PERF-NEG-3sS
'Juuna hasn't received (even) one book'

(4) **AP IAs are number neutral** (Wharram 2003)**.**

ippaksaq qallunaar-mik taku-**qatta-**lauq-tunga
yesterday white.people-OBL see-**again&again-**PST.PRT-1sS
i. 'Yesterday, I kept seeing different white people.'
ii. 'Yesterday, I saw the same white person again and again.'

Unifying PNI, AP: Like PNI, I suggest the behavior of AP arises due to NP-merger. If, in some languages, NPs cannot participate in case/agreement calculation (e.g. Massam 2001, Baker 2012), (1-2) fallout. On this account, AP morphology overtly spells out of failed agreement (e.g. Preminger 2011). (3-4) are also expected given the semantics of NPs and DPs (e.g. Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2001; Van Geenhoven 1999).

The NP-status of AP IAs alone also explains the atelicity of AP predicates, seen in the translations in (1) (e.g. Benua 1995; Cooreman 1994; Kozinsky et al. 1988). NP/DP alternations in English also affect telicity.

(5) a. John walked the dogs for/in 2 minutes.
b. John walked dogs for/*in 2 minutes.

Analyzing NP merger as the trigger for AP provides a crash-proof syntax that does not rely on selecting correct functional heads to yield a well-formed derivation (cf. e.g. Spreng 2006, Aldridge 2012). This proposal echoes one of Baker (1988) that (P)NI and AP are related. But, what unifies them is not N^0-to-V^0 movement, which Spreng (2006) refutes, but rather merger of NP rather than DP.

Nevertheless, AP and PNI differ. PNIed nominals must be linearly adjacent to the verb (Baker 2012). No such requirement holds of AP, (3). Thus, PNI and AP reveal two alternative licensing strategies. While NPs cannot participate in case calculation, they must nevertheless be licensed (e.g. Takahashi & Hulsey 2009). In PNI, verbal-adjacency is sufficient to license the NP (Levin 2014). In AP, licensing via P^0-insertion yields oblique NP morphology (see also Stowell 1981, Halpert 2011, and van Urk in prep.)