

## Incorporated Appositions: Incorporation in Part-Whole and Generic-Specific Constructions

Sadler and Nordlinger (2006), using data from a variety of Australian Aboriginal languages, argue for an analysis of juxtaposed NPs such as part-whole (1) and generic-specific (2) constructions in which they are treated as sets at f-structure, akin to standard LFG treatments of coordination.<sup>1</sup> The f-structure associated with the generic-specific construction in (2) is shown in (3).

(1) **kawuka jardiyali**

bundle fighting.stick

‘a bundle of fighting sticks’ (Kayardild, Evans (1995: 249))

(2) dathin-a dangka-a niya wumburung-kuru raa-ja **wanku-ya** **kulkiji-y.**  
that-NOM man-NOM 3SG.NOM spear-PROP spear-ACT elasmobranch-MLOC shark-MLOC

‘That man speared a shark with a spear.’ (ibid: 244)

(3)

$$\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{INDEX} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{PERS} \quad 3 \\ \text{NUM} \quad \text{SG} \end{array} \right] \\ \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \quad \text{'ELASMOBRANCH'} \\ \text{INDEX} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{NUM} \quad \text{SG} \\ \text{PERS} \quad 3 \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \\ \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \quad \text{'SHARK'} \\ \text{INDEX} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{NUM} \quad \text{SG} \\ \text{PERS} \quad 3 \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

Sadler and Nordlinger (2006) consider only part-whole and generic-specific constructions that involve the juxtaposition of two nominals in the syntax. In fact, many polysynthetic languages allow these construction types to be formed through the incorporation of one of the nominals. The Bininj Gun-wok (Australia) examples below show incorporation alternates (optionally) with the juxtaposed construction:

(4) a. **Bamurru** a-bom **gun-godj**

magpie.goose 1-shoot:PP IV-head

‘I shot the magpie goose in the head.’ (Evans (1996: 65))

b. **Bamurru** a-godj-bom

magpie.goose 1-head-shoot:PP

‘I shot the magpie goose in the head.’ (Evans (1996: 65))

(5) a. **An-barnadja** **an-mim** ngarri-bowo-ni

III-owenia:vernicosa III-fruit 1a-put.in.water-PI

‘We used to put the owenia vernicosa fruit in the water (to poison the fish).’ (Evans (1996: 73))

b. **An-barnadja** ngarri-mim-bowo-ni

III-owenia:vernicosa 1a-fruit-put.in.water-PI

‘We used to put the owenia vernicosa fruit in the water (to poison the fish).’ (Evans (1996: 73))

These examples clearly demonstrate that the incorporated construction is functionally and semantically equivalent to the corresponding juxtaposed construction, despite the obvious differences in morphosyntactic structure. Indeed Evans (1996) argues for part-whole constructions such as (4) that “the same syntactic argument structure should be postulated for a clause whether or not the body part is incorporated” (p. 87). The purpose of this paper is (i) to demonstrate how the analysis of Sadler and Nordlinger (2006) can be extended to include such examples of ‘incorporated apposition’, thereby exploiting the flexible architecture of LFG to provide a unified analysis of part-whole and generic-specific constructions across the different

<sup>1</sup>Given that coordination is often asyndetic in these languages, whether a coordinate or appositional reading is appropriate will depend on context, and may be signalled, for example, in the verb morphology.

morphosyntactic configurations; and (ii) to discuss the implications that this analysis has for LFG analyses of noun incorporation more generally.

Such incorporations demonstrate that morphologically bound elements can contribute elements to f-structure sets on a par with their phrasal (c-structure) counterparts. On our analysis, the f-descriptions associated with the derived (incorporated) form is as follows:

- (6) *godj-bom* ( $\uparrow$  PRED) = shoot < (SUBJ)(OBJ)>  
 ( $\uparrow$  OBJ ( $\in$ )) =  $\downarrow$   
 ( $\downarrow$  PRED) = mouth

A lexical description such as (6), resulting from a general (morpholexical) process incorporating nominal stems permits the incorporate to be either the OBJ or a member of the OBJ set (Bininj Gun-wok additionally permits incorporation of/from intransitive SUBJ). In the case where the phrasal syntax contributes no additional member(s) to the set, the minimal solution will choose ( $\uparrow$  OBJ). Given PRED uniqueness, if the syntax also contributes a nominal for the OBJ, then the incorporate must be a member of a set ( $\uparrow$  OBJ  $\in$ ). (Note that as in Sadler and Nordlinger (2006), NP is annotated ( $\uparrow$  GF) =  $\downarrow$  |  $\downarrow \in$  ( $\uparrow$  GF), accounting for syntactically discontinuous structures). An associated semantic constraint ensures that the nominal PREDs are compatible with the appositional (e.g. part-whole or generic-specific) semantics.

One of the implications of this analysis is that, if incorporated nominals are able to contribute to hybrid f-structures in this way, then we might expect to find examples of incorporated coordinations also. In fact, this is exactly what we do find (albeit rarely), as in (7). Furthermore, this approach provides a way of accounting for the NP doubling that is possible in many languages with classifying (non-valency reducing) noun incorporation (NI) (Rosen 1989), as in (8) but which has to date not been discussed in previous LFG analyses of this type of incorporation (as far as we are aware).

- (7) Oo gunak gare yi-yerrng-ma-ng, **gun-boi**.  
 oh fire perhaps 2-wood-get-NP IV-cooking.stone  
 ‘Well maybe you should get some firewood and cooking stones’. (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans (2003: 453))
- (8) yiga **gun-geb** a-geb-badjidji-ni.  
 sometimes IV-beak 1/3-beak-smash-PI  
 ‘Sometimes I’d smash a beak.’ (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans (1996: 99))

In (8), the incorporated nominal *geb* ‘beak’ is doubled by an NP headed by the identical nominal *gun-geb* (with no noun class prefix). Standard LFG treatments of classifier NI (e.g. Mohanan (1995); Manning (1996); Wescoat (2002)) assume that the incorporated nominal provides the PRED feature for the relevant argument (OBJ, in this case) at f-structure. However, such doubling with an overt NP should therefore be ruled out, since the PRED values are subject to PRED uniqueness and thus cannot unify. In contrast, such examples are a natural extension of the analysis presented here, for languages with the right lexical and syntactic resources: each nominal is simply one member of the set-valued OBJ function. This analysis thus provides a unified account not only of part-whole and generic-specific constructions across morphosyntactically distinct construction types, but also of non-valency reducing noun incorporation more generally.

## References

- Evans, Nicholas. 1995. *A Grammar of Kayardild: With Historical-Comparative Notes on Tangkic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evans, Nick. 1996. The syntax and semantics of body part incorporation in mayali. In H. Chappell and W. McGregor, eds., *The Grammar of Inalienability: a typological perspective on body-part terms and the part-whole relation*, pages 65–109. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. *A Pan-dialectal Grammar of Bininj Gun-Wok (Arnhem Land): Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Manning, Christopher D. 1996. *Ergativity: Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations*. Dissertations in Linguistics. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. Revised and corrected version of 1994 Stanford University dissertation.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1995. Wordhood and lexicality: noun incorporation in hindi. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13(1):75–134.
- Rosen, Sara. 1989. Two types of noun incorporation: a lexical analysis. *Language* 64:294–317.
- Sadler, Louisa and Rachel Nordlinger. 2006. Apposition as Coordination: evidence from Australian Languages. In M. Butt and T. H. King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications: <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications>.
- Wescoat, Michael. 2002. *On Lexical Sharing*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.