PSEUDO NOUN INCORPORATION IN KOREAN VERBAL POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Background: According to one view (Szabolcsi 1994, Tsujioka 2002), which I call 'the possessor raising analysis', the Verbal Possessive Constructions (VPC) in (1) have the derivations in (2): the existential verb *iss-* 'exist' in (2) takes a possessive DP complement. The alienable possessor *Mary* in (2a) is base-generated in spec/PossP and θ-marked by Poss. The inalienable possessor *chayksang* 'desk' in (2b) is base-generated as the complement of the possessee noun and is θ-marked by N. The possessors raise to spec/TP via spec/DP to check off the EPP feature of T.

Puzzle: The sentences in (3) are complex VPC where the possessor nominal contains another possessive DP. (4a) is a sentence where the embedded inalienable possessor *Mary* in (3a) is assigned nominative case. Assuming that there are multiple specifiers available on T (*a la* Ura 2000), we can infer that the embedded possessor *Mary* is undergoing further raising to check off another EPP feature on T. However, the same raising cannot apply to the alienable possessor *Mary* in (4b). The grammatical contrast in (4) is unexpected under the possessor raising analysis.

Proposal: I propose that inalienable VPC differ from alienable VPC in terms of their structures and derivations. Specifically, i) (in line with Tsujioka) an inalienable possessor is the internal argument of a possessee, while an alienable possessor behaves like an external argument of the possessee, and ii) θ-role assigning nouns (e.g. inalienable possessee nouns) project an NP, while non-thematic nouns (e.g. alienable possessee nouns) require a DP layer, and iii) inalienable VPC have an intransitive VP structure, while alienable VPC have a transitive *v*P-shell structure. (5) illustrates my proposal: in (5a), the existential verb θ-marks and inherently case-marks its NP complement. In order to discharge a θ-role to its argument (the possessor in spec/VP), the NP must form a complex predicate with the existential verb under Pseudo Noun Incorporation (PNI), according to which any [NP+V] sequence behaves as a single syntactic unit (Massam 2001). After being θ-marked by the complex predicate, the possessor *chayksang* 'desk' moves to spec/TP for case/EPP reasons. In contrast, in (5b), the possessor DP and the possessee DP are base-generated in spec/*v*P and in the complement position of VP, respectively. The nominative case features of the possessor and possessee DP are checked off by T *a la* Ura (2000).

Regarding the contrast in (4), I propose that the property-denoting possessee noun *maylyek* 'attractiveness' in (4) is also a θ-role assigner projecting an NP, based on its syntactic similarity with verbal nouns in light verb constructions. (6) illustrates the derivation of (4a): in (6a), *maylyek* and *issta* form a complex predicate under PNI which θ-marks and inherently case-marks the embedded possessee NP *nwun* 'eyes'. In the next step (6b), the sequence [*maylyek-i issta*] is reanalyzed as V, creating another syntactic environment for PNI: the embedded possessee NP *nwun* forms another complex predicate with the reanalyzed V. The embedded possessor *Mary* in spec/VP is θ-marked by the new complex predicate [*nwun-i maylyek-i iss-ta*] and moves to spec/TP for case/EPP reasons as in (6c). In contrast, the embedded alienable possessee *sensayngnim* 'teacher' in (4b) appears inside a DP. The DP, as shown in (7a), is θ-marked by the complex predicate [*mayleyk-i issta*]. In the next step in (7b), however, further complex predicate formation is blocked since the D head intervenes between the NP and the existing complex predicate, making PNI impossible. Without a new complex predicate, the embedded alienable possessor *Mary* fails to be θ-marked, violating the θ-Criterion. Thus, (7b) is ruled out.

Further Evidence: Under my proposal, complex predicate formation feeds triple nominative constructions. Thus, it is expected that the construction is never possible in alienable VPC. This expectation is borne out: in (8b) the embedded possessee NP *emeni* 'mother' cannot form a complex predicate with the VP since only the [NP+V] sequence is subject to PNI. Therefore, the embedded possessor *John* fails to be θ-marked and the sentence is ruled out.

1) a. Mary-ka   cha-ka   iss-ta.   (alienable VPC)
    M-nom   car-nom   exist-decl(arative).
    'Mary has a car'
  b. Chayksang-i   selap-i   iss-ta.   (inalienable VPC)
    desk-nom   drawer-nom   exist-decl.
    'The desk has a drawer'
2) a. [$_{TP}$ Mary$_i$-ka   [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_i$ [$_{PossP}$ t$_i$ [$_{NP}$ cha]]]-ka iss-ta]]   (=1a)
  b. [$_{TP}$ Chayksang$_i$-i [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_i$ [$_{N'}$ t$_i$ selap]]-i   iss-ta]]   (=1b)
3) a. [$_{DP}$ Mary-uy nwun]-i   maylyek-i   iss-ta.
       M-gen   eyes-nom   attractiveness-nom exist-decl.
    '(lit.) Mary's eyes have attractiveness/Mary's eyes are attractive'
  b. [$_{DP}$ Mary-uy sensayngnim]-i   maylyek-i   iss-ta.
       M-gen   teacher-nom   attractiveness-nom exist-decl.
    '(lit.) Mary's teacher has attractiveness/Mary's teacher is attractive'
4) a. [$_{TP}$ Mary$_k$-ka [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_k$ nwun]$_j$-i [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_j$ maylyek]-i   iss-ta]]]
       M-nom   eyes-nom   attractiveness-nom exist-decl
  b. * [$_{TP}$ Mary$_k$-ka [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_k$ sensayngnim]$_j$-i [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ t$_j$ maylyek]-i   iss-ta.]]]
       M-nom   teacher-nom   attractiveness-nom exist-decl.
5) a. [$_{TP}$ chayksang$_k$-i [$_{VP}$ t$_k$ [$_{V'}$ [$_{NP}$ selap]-i iss-ta]]]   (inalienable VPC=1b)
                                                                  θ-marking   Pseudo Noun Incorporation
  b. [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ Mary]$_i$-ka   [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ cha]-ka iss-ta]]]   (alienable VPC=1a)
6) a.   VP   (step 1)   b.   VP   (step 2)   c.   TP   (step 3)

      DP   V'   DP   V'   DP$_k$-ka   T'
      Mary   Mary   Mary
          NP-i   V'   NP-i   V   VP   T
          nwun   nwun   [maylyek-i issta]
                 NP-i   V   t$_k$ [nwun-i maylyek-i iss-ta]
                 maylyek   iss-ta

7) a.   VP   (step 1)   b.   *VP   (step 2)

       DP   V'   DP   V'
       Mary   Mary
            DP   V'   DP   V
            sensayngnim   [maylyek-i issta]
                   NP-i   V   NP   D
                   maylyek   iss-ta   sensayngnim   <No PNI>

8) a. [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ John-uy [$_{NP}$ emeni]]$_i$-ka [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ cha]-ka iss-ta]]]]   (alienable VPC)
       J-gen   mother-nom   car-nom exist-decl.
    'John's mother has a car'
  b. *[$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ John-i   [$_{vP}$ [$_{NP}$ emeni]]-ka [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ cha]-ka   iss-ta]]].
       John-nom   mother-nom   car-nom   exist-decl.
    '(same reading)'

Selected References. Massam, D. 2001. 'Pseudo Noun Incorporation in Niuean', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 19*:153-197; Szabolsci, A. 1994. The Noun Phrase. In *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics 27*, Academic Press; Tsujioka, T. 2002. *The Syntax of Possession in Japanese*. Routledge; Ura, H. 2000. *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press.