

Compounding and argument structure
Andrew McIntyre, Université de Neuchâtel

The talk analyses (mainly English) synthetic compounding, with a view to exploring its consequences for the general theory of argument realisation. Synthetic compounds are structures of the form [X V Affix] in which X is interpreted as an argument of V, e.g. *truck driver*, *mind-altering*, *Beatles-inspired*. Evidence for the grammatical relevance of the argument interpretation of X comes from well-attested but little-known synthetic compounds paralleling verb-object idioms, e.g. (1). Such (demonstrably productive) alternations suggest that V selects N (not DP) in idioms. This is a challenge if we stay with the DP hypothesis and eschew unconstrained deletion transformations, but I suggest that the challenge can be met if we marry two ideas: (i) the idea that incorporated nouns doubling full DP objects function as selection restriction narrowers (e.g. Rosen 1989), and (ii) the idea that the idiomaticity of data like (1) partly resides in V's having very narrow selection restrictions.

(1) *tone-setting* (cf. *set the tone*); *hackle-raising* (cf. *raise X's hackles*)

The argument status of the nonhead in synthetic compounds is simply captured using a structure like (2b), but (2b) is often criticised because the proposed complex V constituents are mostly bad as verbs (**to piano-play*). Resolving the paradox by positing (2a) plus percolation of selectional features is dubious since the same problem besets modifier incorporation (*home-made*, *oft-derided*, but **home-make*, **oft-deride*), and modifiers are not selected, so there is no selection feature to percolate. I thus prefer (2b) to (2a). The problem of an 'overgenerating morphology' is a genuine problem, whose solution consists in the independently attested ability of affixes to license otherwise unproductive compounding patterns, cf. *three-wheeler*, *one-legged* (cf. **three-wheel*, **a wheeler*; **one-leg*; **legged*).

(2) a. [_N piano [_N [_V play]ing]] b. [_N [_{V(P)} [_N piano] [_V play]] ing]

I defend a variant of the First Sister Principle (FSP), which says that nonheads of synthetic compounds correspond to the immediate sister of the verb (e.g. Harley 2008). I derive the FSP from general principles of syntactic merger. I show that apparent empirical challenges for the FSP (e.g. alleged subject incorporation: *state employee*) are not genuine.

My approach, although syntactic, eschews head movement, *pace* Harley (2008). I note that head movement incorrectly predicts stranded complements of incorporated heads (**son promotion t_{son} of one's friend*).

The final part of the talk addresses previously undiscussed synthetic compounds based on particle verbs and prepositional verbs, cf. the (attested) data in (3) and (4).

(3) *water soaker-upper*, *title thinker-upper*, *form filler-inner*

(4) *site watcher-overer*, *maze-goer-througher*, *movie writer-abouter*, *photo looker-at-er*

Compounds with particle verbs like *ball-thrower-inner* lack a parallel with full PPs: **ball thrower into the basket*. (German offers analogous (and simpler) data: *Ballreinwerfer* 'ball-in-thrower' vs. **Ballwerfer in den Korb* 'ball-thrower into the basket'.) The generalisation is that nominals cannot incorporate in the presence of prepositional complements unless the latter incorporate too. The FSP says that the nominal must be sister to V to incorporate. In a structure like **ball thrower into the basket*, the nonhead *ball* is not a sister to V but to a larger V-projection, so there can be no incorporation. The analysis, if correct, supports the following claims: (i) left-headed complex verbs exist, (ii) resultative predications are not strictly confined to specifier-complement relations