1 Pseudo-Incorporation and Anaphora

1.1 Incorporation and Pseudo-Incorporation

What is incorporation?

- Morphological integration of a nominal head N into a transitive verb, thereby filling an argument slot (cf. Mithun 1984, Baker 1996, ...)

What is pseudo-incorporation?

- Syntactic integration of an NP with a transitive verb, thereby filling an argument slot, but syntactically closer than "regular" object

Example (Niuean, Oceanic; Massam 2001, Seiter 1980)

1. (1) a. Takafaga tūmau nī [e ia] [e tau ika]. non-incorporated
   hunt always EMPH ERG he ABS PL fish
   'He always hunts for fishes', 'He is always fishing.'

   b. [Takafaga ika] tūmau nī [a ia]. incorporated
      hunt fish always EMPH ABS he.
      'He is always fishing.'

2. (2) Ne [inu [kofe konq]] [a Mele]. incorporated, complex
      PST drink coffee bitter ABS Mary
      'Mary drank bitter coffee.'
1.2 Pseudo-incorporation in Hungarian (Farkas & de Swart 2003)

(3) a. Mari olvas *egy hosszú verset.*
Mari read a long poem.
'Mary is reading a long poem.'

b. Mari hosszú verset olvas.
Mari long poem ACC read
'Mary is reading a long poem / long poems.'

◆ pseudo-incorporated nominals are number neutral
◆ they lack articles
◆ they occur in pre-verbal position

1.3 Pseudo-incorporation in Persian (Modarresi 2015):

(4) a. Mæn roobah did-æm.
I fox saw-1SG
'I saw a fox / foxes.'

b. Mæn yek roobah(-ra) did-æm.
I a fox-(ACC) saw-1SG
'I saw a fox.'

c. Mæn roobah-rā did-æm.
I fox-ACC saw-1SG
'I saw the fox.'

(5) Mæn mobl-e atiqhe mi-froucham
I sofa-EZ antique DUR-sell-1SG
'I sell antique sofa(s)'

◆ pseudo-incorporated nouns are bare nouns lacking accusative case marking (-rā)
◆ pseudo-incorporated nouns are number-neutral
◆ indefinite nouns may lack accusative marking
◆ bare nouns with accusative marking are interpreted as definite (no definite article)
1.4 Pseudo-Incorporation and Anaphora

- Common claim: Pseudo-incorporated NPs cannot be taken up by anaphora.
- But: Massam 2001, Asudeh & Mikkelsen 2000 for Danish, Dayal 2011 for Hindi claim that uptake by anaphora is possible in certain cases.
- Farkas & de Swart 2003 call this discourse translucency (contrasted with discourse transparency, discourse opacity):

(1) Jánosi\textsuperscript{beteget, vizsgált a rendelőben.}

\textsuperscript{b} \textsuperscript{j} examine.PAST the office.in ‘János, patient, examined in the office.’

a. \textsuperscript{∅} Túlsulyosnak talált \textsuperscript{∅} és \textsuperscript{∅} a korházba. find.\textsuperscript{pro}, too.severe.DAT and \textsuperscript{pro} intern.CAUSE.PAST the hospital.in ‘He found him too sick and sent him to hospital.’

2 Discourse Referents and Thematic Arguments: Farkas & de Swart

2.1 Discourse Translucency

- Pseudo-incorporated NPs are not accessible to overt pronouns
- But anaphoric uptake is possible for covert pronominals (pro).

Theoretical reconstruction in Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp & Reyle 1994) here illustrated with Persian data, to ensure comparability.

Format of discourse representations (DRS):

(6) K\textsubscript{0} + \textit{Pedro owns a donkey.} = [x\textsubscript{1} x\textsubscript{2} | x\textsubscript{1}=PEDRO, DONKEY(x\textsubscript{2}), OWN(x\textsubscript{1},x\textsubscript{2})]

(7) K\textsubscript{0} + \textit{Every farmer owns a donkey.} = [x\textsubscript{1} | \textit{[x\textsubscript{1} | FARMER(x\textsubscript{1})} \rightarrow [x\textsubscript{2} | DONKEY(x\textsubscript{2}), OWN(x\textsubscript{1},x\textsubscript{2})]]]

Regular indefinite object vs pseudo-incorporated object:

(8) K\textsubscript{0} + \textit{Leili [yek sib] khaerid]} = [x\textsubscript{1} x\textsubscript{2} | x\textsubscript{1}=LEILI, APPLE(x\textsubscript{2}), BUY(x\textsubscript{1}, x\textsubscript{2})], \text{two DR introduced: } x\textsubscript{1}, x\textsubscript{2}

(9) K\textsubscript{0} + \textit{Leili [sib khaerid]} = [x\textsubscript{1} | x\textsubscript{1}=LEILI, APPLE(x\textsubscript{2}), BUY(x\textsubscript{1}, x\textsubscript{2})] = K\textsubscript{1} \text{one DR introduced: } x\textsubscript{1} x\textsubscript{2}: “thematic argument”
Standard interpretation of DRS:

(10) \[ x_1 \ x_2 \mid x_1 = \text{LEILA, APPLE}(x_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_2) \]

is true w.r.t. a model M = \langle A, [] \rangle

iff there is a DR assignment f: \{x_1, x_2\} \rightarrow A

such that all DRS conditions are true in the model w.r.t. the assignment f,

i.e. f(x_1)\in[\text{LEILA}], f(x_2)\in[\text{APPLE}], \langle f(x_1), f(x_2) \rangle \in [\text{BUY}]

Interpretation of thematic arguments:

(11) A function f verifies a condition of the form P(x_1, ..., x_n) relative to a model M

iff there is a sequence \langle a_1, ..., a_n \rangle \in A^n, such that \langle a_1, ..., a_n \rangle \in [P],

and if \( x_i \) is a discourse referent, \( a_i = f(x_i) \)

and if \( x_i \) is a thematic argument, \( a_i \) is some element in A.

\* As thematic arguments do not introduce DRs, no anaphoric uptake possible.

\* We need a special rule for translucency cases.

2.2 Semantics of Translucency

(12) If a suitable discourse referent cannot be found in K for an anaphoric expression, introduce a new DR \( x_j \) and add a condition of the form \( x_j \approx x_i \),

where \( x_i \) is a thematic argument that is part of a condition P(x_1, ..., x_i, ..., x_n) in the conditions of K or a DRS that is superordinate to K

(13) f verifies \( x_j \approx x_i \), where there is a condition P(x_1, ..., x_i, ..., x_n),

iff f maps \( x_j \) onto the individual \( a_i \) that is the i-th element of the n-tuple \( \langle a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_n \rangle \) that verifies the condition P(x_1, ..., x_i, ..., x_n).

Example:

(14) K_1 + \[ \text{Majnoon khord} = \emptyset \]

= \[ x_1 \ x_2 \mid x_1 = \text{LEILA, APPLE}(x_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_2) \]

\[ x_3 x_4 \mid x_3 = \text{MAJNOON}, x_4 = x_2, \text{EAT}(x_3, x_4) \]

true w.r.t. f and a model \langle A, [] \rangle

iff f(x_1) = [\text{LEILA}],

there is an a_2 such that a_2 \in [\text{APPLE}],

there is a sequence \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \in AxA with f(x_1) = a_1 and \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \in [\text{BUY}]

f(x_3) = [\text{MAJNOON}],

f maps x_4 to a_2,

\langle f(x_3), f(x_4) \rangle \in [\text{APPLE}]
2.3 Problems

- Non-compositional rule:
  \(a_2\) is bound by existential quantifier “there is a...”, hence not accessible from outside.

\[
\text{iff } f(x_1) = \llbracket\text{LEILA}\rrbracket, \\
\text{there is an } a_2 \in A \text{ with } a_2 \in \llbracket\text{APPLE}\rrbracket, \\
\text{there is a sequence } \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \in A \times A \text{ with } f(x_1) = a_1 \text{ and } \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \in \llbracket\text{BUY}\rrbracket \\
f(x_3) = \llbracket\text{MAJNOON}\rrbracket, \\
f \text{ maps } x_4 \text{ to } a_2, \\
\langle f(x_3), f(x_4) \rangle \in \llbracket\text{APPLE}\rrbracket
\]

- Yanovich 2008:
  the rule does not guarantee binding between the individual that is an apple and the individual that Majnoon ate, as \(a_2\) is bound by two independent quantifiers “there is...”

- Yanovich 2008 also points out an empirical problem with Farkas & de Swart’s claim about Hungarian:
  Anaphoric uptake of pseudo-incorporated objects with overt pronoun is possible (data: Anna Szabolcsi):

\((15)\) A bátyám házat, vett a múlt héten. Egész vagyon adott érte₁.
  ‘The brother house-bought last week. He spent a fortune for it.’

3 Number-neutral Discourse Referents: Modarresi 2015

3.1 Number-neutral DRs

- Pseudo-incorporated NPs do introduce DRs
- But these DRs are number-neutral
- Overt pronouns are marked for number, hence expect number-marked DRs
- Covert pronouns: not marked for number, hence do not expect number-marked DRs
- If world knowledge suggests atomic or sum interpretation of number-neutral DR, singular or plural overt pronouns are possible.

Number-neutral DRs in Kamp & Reyle 1994:

\((16)\) All lawyers hired secretaries and payed them well.
  ‘All lawyers hired one or more secretaries and payed him/her/them well.’

Example for number neutral DRs (rendered by \(\xi\)):

\((17)\) Leili sīb khāerid. Majnoon khord-∅ /-ʔesh/ -ʔeshoon.
  Leili apple bought.3SG Majnoon ate-prot-ill-them
  ‘Leila bought apple(s). Majnoon ate it / them.’

\[
[x_1 \xi_2 \mid x = \text{LEILI, APPLE/S}(\xi_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, \xi_2)] \\
[x_3 \mid x = \text{MAJNOON, ATE}(x_3, \xi_2)]
\]
\(\xi_2\): number-neutral DR
3.2 Contextual factors for singular / plural overt pronouns

Example for contexts that favors atomic / sum interpretation:

(18) *Leili apartman khærid. Gheimat-esh bala bood.*
Leili appartment bought.3SG. Price-its high was.3SG
‘Leili bought appartment(s). Its price was high.’

(19) *Leili havij khærid. Majnoon khord-eshoon.*
Leili carrot bought.3SG. Majnoon ate-them.
‘Leili bought carrot(s). Majnoon ate them.’

Role of context like in specificational anaphora (anaphora adds information):

(20) *There was a donkey at the gate. The poor old animal cried terribly.*
(21) *There was a person at the door. She was quite young.*

Problems:

- Why are pseudo-incorporated NPs interpreted as number neutral, in spite of being morphologically singular?
- Uptake not always easily possible, even with covert pronoun.

(22) *Man roobah didam. Shekar kardam-∅.*
I fox saw.1SG hunt did.1SG.
‘I saw fox(es). I hunted it/them.’

(23) *Man yek roobah didam. Shekar kardam-∅ / -esh.*
I one fox saw.1SG hunt did.1SG-pro / -it.
‘I saw a fox. I hunted it.’
4 Incorporated NPs and E-type Pronouns

4.1 E-type pronouns

Pronouns that pick up DRs with quantifier antecedents, without being c-commanded by them (Evans 1980):

(24) Few congressmen admire Kennedy, and they are very junior.

‘There are (only) few congressmen that admire Kennedy, and the congressmen that admire Kennedy are very junior.’

Maximality effect with the pronoun interpretation, lacking with indefinites (Heim 1990):

(25) a. A wine glass broke last night. It was very expensive.

(o.k. if several wine glasses broke last night, and only one was expensive.)

b. Few wine glasses broke last night, but they were very expensive.

(all the wine glasses that broke last night were very expensive.)

E-type pronouns have been seen as evidence for a descriptive theory of pronouns (Neale 1990, Heim 1990, Elbourne 2005), but this is not required (Nouwen subm.)

4.2 E-type pronouns in DRT

DRT (Kamp & Reyle 1993, Hardt 2003): abstraction and summation over DRSs

(26) John beats most donkeys he owns. They complain.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{x_1 & | x_1 = \text{JOHN}, \{x_2 | \text{DONKEY}(x_2), \text{OWN}(x_1, x_2)\}\} \langle \text{MOST } x_2 \rangle [\langle \text{BEAT}(x_1, x_2)\rangle] \\
\xi_3 & = \Sigma x_2 \{x_2 | \text{DONKEY}(x_2), \text{OWN}(x_1, x_2), \text{BEAT}(x_1, x_2)\}\}
\end{align*}
\]

Abstraction and Summation rule:

\begin{itemize}
\item Given a triggering configuration with a duplex condition \(K_1 \langle Q \rangle K_2\) in a DRS \(K\),
\item form the union \(K' = K_1 \cup K_2\),
\item choose a DR \(x\) from the universe of \(K'\), add new DR \(\xi\) to universe of \(K'\),
\item add condition \(\xi = \Sigma x K'\)
\end{itemize}

\(\Sigma x K'\) is interpreted relative to an assignment \(f\) and a model \(M = \langle A, [] \rangle\) as the sum of all \(a \in A\) such that there is an extension \(f'\) of \(f\) with \(f'(x) = a\), and \(K'\) is true w.r.t. \(f'\) and \(M\)

Notice:

\begin{itemize}
\item DRs that are introduced in embedded DRSs become available as antecedents
\item the choice of singular / plural pronoun depends on whether \(\xi\) is atomic or not
\item Maximality effect arises by the interpretation of summation, \(\Sigma\)
\item reference to DRSs \(K_1, K_2\) is itself an anaphoric process (cf. Asher & Lascarides)
\end{itemize}
4.3 E-type analysis of incorporated nominals

Taking up a suggestion of Yanovich 2008 for “thematic argument abstraction”, but assuming that incorporation is treated like quantification:

- Pseudo-incorporated nominals are introduced in embedded DRS
- Anaphoric uptake is possible, but only via abstraction + summation

Predictions:

- Anaphoric uptake is more complex for incorporated antecedents
- Number neutrality of incorporated NPs
- Uptake can be achieved by covert number-neutral anaphora
- Uptake possible with singular or plural pronouns, depending on context.

Proposal, in more detail:

- Existential closure (EC) (Diesing 1991) with scope over vP
- EC quantifies over the event variable of the verbal predicate
- Nominals within EC can introduce DRs within the scope of EC

4.4 Illustration of E-type analysis

(27) $K_0 + \exists t_1 [^v \text{Leili} \quad \text{EC} \quad [^v \text{sīb } kharīd_2]]$

‘Leila apple bought’

$[x_1 \mid x_1 = \text{LEILI}, \exists [e_2 x_3 \mid x_3 = \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_3, e_2)]] = K_1$

Syntactic structure:

- Pseudo-incorporated noun sīb remains within vP
- Existential closure over vP, indexed with event argument
- Subject Leili has moved out of vP, leaving trace

Discourse representation:

- Existential closure creates embedded DRS, with quantifier $\exists$
- Quantifies over an event argument of the predicate, $e_2$
- Bare singular noun sīb is interpreted as dependent definite, here on the event argument, apple-of($e_2$): ‘the apple of the event $e_2$’
- Being dependent on $e_2$, the associated discourse referent $x_3$ must be interpreted in the local box

Semantic interpretation:

- Condition $\exists K$ is true w.r.t. assignment $f$, model $M$ iff there is an extension $f'$ of $f$ such that $K$ is true w.r.t. $f'$, $M$. 
4.5 Anaphoric uptake of incorporated NP

Abstraction and summation over existentially quantified DRS

(28) \( K_1 + [_{IP} \text{Majnoon}_4 \text{EC}_5 [_{IP} t_4 t_6 \text{khord-∅}]] \)

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 & \quad | \quad x_1 = \text{LEILI}, \exists [e_2 x_3 \mid x_3 = \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_3, e_2)] \\
x_4 \xi_6 & \quad | \quad x_4 = \text{MAJNOON}, \\
\xi_6 &= \Sigma x_3 [e_2 x_3 \mid x_3 = \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_3, e_2)], \text{ Abstraction, Summation} \\
\exists [e_5 \mid \text{EAT}(x_4, \xi_6, e_5)] \]
\end{align*}
\]

◆ The covert pronoun can be interpreted as an e-type pronoun, requiring abstraction and summation
◆ The covert pronoun does not require a specific number feature, ideally relating to the number-neutral DR \( \xi_6 \)
◆ If world knowledge suggests an atomic or sum individual, overt singular or plural pronouns are licensed (cf. Modarresi 2015)
◆ Anaphoric uptake is more complex compared to cases in which a DR is already introduced; hence if speaker intends to take up a DR, non-incorporated NPs are better.

4.6 Number neutrality

The representation of singular incorporated count nouns refers to atomic individuals

(29) \( K_0 + [_{IP} \text{Leili}_1 \text{EC}_2 [_{IP} t_1 \text{sīb}_3 \text{kharīd}_2 ]] \)

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 & \quad | \quad x_1 = \text{LEILI}, \exists [e_2 x_3 \mid x_3 = \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_3, e_2)], \\
\text{where } \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2): & \text{ the unique apple of } e_2.
\end{align*}
\]

Nevertheless, we have apparent number-neutrality:
◆ The existential closure does not imply uniqueness, there may be many buying events \( e_2 \) for which there is a unique apple that Leili buys.
◆ Anaphoric uptake uses abstraction and sum formation, which involves all of the ways in which the vP-DRS can be interpreted:

(30) \( \xi_6 = \Sigma x_3 [e_2 x_3 \mid x_3 = \text{APPLE-OF}(e_2), \text{BUY}(x_1, x_3, e_2)] \)

◆ Hence, reference to all apples for which there is a buying event \( e \) by Leili.
4.7 A new prediction: Maximality

- Maximality effect, as with other E-type pronouns, due to summation $\Sigma$
- Not predicted by Farkas & de Swart 2003, Modarresi 2015

Ali has house(s). House-EZ-other also has that rent gives.

Ali has a house. He also has another house that he rents.

4.8 Comparison with yek-marked indefinites

With *yek-*marked nouns without *-ra*, we assume vP-internal interpretation:

(33) $K_0 + [_{IP} \text{Leili}_{1} \text{EC}_{2} [_{IP} \text{yek sib} \text{ kharid}]]$
Leili an apple bought.

Two possible readings:

(34) $[x_1 \mid x_1 = \text{LEILI}, \exists[e_2 \text{ x} \text{3} \mid \text{APPLE}(\text{x3}), \#(\text{x3})=1, \text{BUY}(\text{x1},\text{x3},\text{e2})]$
- No relation of $\text{x3}$ to $\text{e2}$
- Compatible with more than one apple being bought by Leili
- Anaphoric uptake by abstraction and sum formation would refer to all the apples that were bought by Leila, just as with bare nominals
- The number information of *yek* ‘a / one’ would be irrelevant in this case
- Hence this reading is blocked by the form with bare nominal.

(35) $[x_1 \text{ x} \text{3} \mid x_1 = \text{LEILI}, \text{APPLE}(\text{x3}), \#(\text{x3})=1, \exists[e_2 \mid \text{BUY}(\text{x1},\text{x2},\text{e3})]]$
- Indefinite NP is interpreted outside of the existential closure
- This is known to be possible with indefinites, cf. “specific” reading of:

(36) *If you see a black dog, then be careful, it will bite you!*  
$[x_1 \mid \text{BLACK-DOG}(\text{x1}), [e_2 \mid \text{SEE}(\text{YOU}, \text{x1}, \text{e2})] \Rightarrow [e_3 \mid e_1<e_3, \text{BITE}(\text{x1}, \text{YOU}, \text{e3})]$
- Notice: $\text{x3}$ is an accessible singular discourse referent, can easily be picked up by singular pronouns in subsequent sentences.
4.9 Accusative-marked bare nominals

Assumption (Modarresi 2015):

- ra marking is a morphological reflex of an object scrambling out of vP, with interpretative consequences
- (Movement of an object NP into a initial focus position does not require ra-marking)
- (Scrambling of subjects has similar effects, but this is marked only prosodically)

ra-marking of bare NP results in definite interpretation:

(37) \[ \text{Leili}₁ \text{sīb-rā₃ EC₂ [vP } t₁ t₃ \text{ kharīd]} \]

Leili apple-ACC bought-3SG

‘Leili bought the apple.’

- Recall: we have interpreted bare NPs as definites w.r.t. an event: APPLE-OF(e)
- Outside of vP, e cannot be dependent on the event e₂ introduced by EC
- Hence it must depend on a salient event given in the previous discourse or in the utterance situation
- Generates definite reading: the apple given in previous discourse or in the situation
- Predicts: No number neutrality
- Observe: We have a uniform interpretation of bare NPs as definites (for Persian)

4.10 Accusative marking of indefinite nominals

rā-marking of yek-marked nouns also indicates scrambling out of vP

(38) \[ \text{Leili} \text{[yek sīb-rā]}₃ \text{ EC₂ [vP } t₁ t₂ \text{ kharīd]} \]

Leili an apple-ACC bought-3SG

‘Leili bought an apple.’

- possible, but disfavored in the current case
- reason: wide-scope indefinite reading can be achieved without rā
- but good to guarantee wide scope with respect to other quantifiers, especially when c-commanding the other quantifier

(39) \text{yek ketab-rā} \text{ har daneshjoo-i bayad be-khoon-ad}

a book-RA each student-i must SUBJ-read-3SG

‘Each student must read a certain book.’
4.11 i-marked nouns

Another way of expressing indefiniteness in Persian: i-marking

(40) a. [IP Mæn₁ EC [vP t₁ roobah-i did-æm]]
   I fox-INDEF saw-1SG
   ‘I saw a fox (not: foxes)’

   c. [IP Mæn₁ roobah-i-rā₂ EC [vP did-æm]]
   I fox-INDEF-ACC saw-1SG
   ‘I saw a certain fox.’

i-marking: restrictive selection out of a kind or plurality (Windfuhr 1987)
Modeling by choice functions

(41) [IP Leili₁ EC₂ [IP t₁ sīb-i kharid]]
   [ x₁ (F) x₃ | x₁=LEILI, ∃[e₂ | x₃ = F(APPLE), EAT(x₁,x₃,e₂)]]
   F is a choice function, selects F(APPLE), an a where a∈[[APPLE]]
   as with other referring expressions, discourse referent x₃ introduced in higher box, hence easily accessible for anaphoric uptake
   no dependency on on event of existential closure e₂, hence no number neutrality

Situation is more complex, as combination yek + i is possible as well: yek sīb-i

5 Weak Definites

Carlson e.a. 2006, relating weak definites to incorporation and bare singulars; cf. also Bosch 2010; Schwarz 2012 for a kind-referring analysis

Number neutrality:
(42) *The accident victims were taken to the hospital.

Narrow scope effect of weak definites:
(43) *Every accident victim was taken to the hospital.
(44) *Jedes Unfallopfer wurde ins Hospital gebracht. (ins: in das)
(45) Hans ist im Kino und Maria auch.
   Hans is in the cinema and Mary too.
   ‘Hans is in the cinema, and Mary too (potentially different cinemas)’

Representation as event-dependent definites:
(46) Mary took John to the hospital.
   [x₁ x₂ | x₁ = MARY, x₂ = JOHN, ∃[e₃ | x₄ = HOSPITAL-OF(e₃), TAKE-TO(x₁,x₂,x₄,e₃)]]
   Weak definites as functional definites, cf. Asic and Corblin 2012, but w.r.t. event
   Prediction: Anaphora to weak definites are possible only via abstraction / summation
6 Predictions for Anaphoric Processing

We have examined three theories to account for discourse translucency:

◆ Farkas & de Swart 2003:
  Thematic arguments, DRs can be created by special rule for covert pronominas

◆ Modarresi 2015:
  Number-neutral DRs, can be picked up by covert pronouns,
  also, supported by world knowledge with overt singular / plural pronouns

◆ Proposed here (working out suggestions by Yanovich 2008):
  Event-dependent functional definites, can be picked up by abstraction / summation,
  world knowledge relevant for using singular / plural pronouns

Other work:

◆ Asudeh & Mikkelsen 2000: Implicit entities, as in *John got married. She is nice.*

◆ Dayal 2011, 2015: influence of aspect

◆ Schwarz 2012, for weak definites: reference to event kinds

How to decide? – Different, testable predictions for anaphoric uptake, for example:

◆ Do covert pronouns always have an advantage over overt pronouns?

◆ Is uptake of incorporated NPs with covert pronouns
  always as easy as uptake of non-incorporated NPs with covert/overt pronouns?

◆ Is there a maximality effect with anaphoric uptake of pseudo-incorporated NPs?