Mandenkan

Bulletin semestriel d'études linguistiques mandé

57 | 2017

Numéro 57

Bound noun plus verb combinations in Mano

Combinaisons liées verbo-nominales en mano

СВЯЗАННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ ИМЕН И ГЛАГОЛОВ В МАНО

Maria Khachaturyan

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/mandenkan/1026>

DOI: 10.4000/mandenkan.1026

ISSN: 2104-371X

Publisher

Llacan UMR 8135 CNRS/Inalco

Electronic reference

Maria Khachaturyan, "Bound noun plus verb combinations in Mano", *Mandenkan* [Online], 57 | 2017, Online since 14 December 2017, connection on 08 July 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/mandenkan/1026> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/mandenkan.1026>

This text was automatically generated on 8 July 2021.

Les contenus de *Mandenkan* sont mis à disposition selon les termes de la Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Partage dans les Mêmes Conditions 4.0 International.

Bound noun plus verb combinations in Mano

Combinaisons liées verbo-nominales en mano

СВЯЗАННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ ИМЕН И ГЛАГОЛОВ В МАНО

Maria Khachaturyan

---

1. Introduction

- ¹ This paper addresses bounded versus free noun plus verb combinations in Mano¹, a South Mande language, through a detailed study of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics.
- ² Bounded noun plus verb combinations have been studied under many different labels, including “idioms”, “compounding”, “noun incorporation”, “quasi-incorporation”, “pseudo-incorporation”, and “complex predicates”. Studies of idioms often focus on the semantic non-compositionality of N+V combinations (Singer 2011), while studies in compounding focus on the evidence in favor of or against the definition of specific N+V combinations as single words (Scalise & Vogel 2010). As well, studies in noun incorporation typically focus on instances where the compound status of N+V combinations is relatively unproblematic. The issue, then, becomes the underlying process leading to the morphosyntactic bonding of the combination: whether it should be considered a lexical (derivational) or a syntactic process (Sadock 1986; Geenhoven 2002; Haugen 2008; Mithun 1984, 1986). If evidence for the morphosyntactic bond in a particular language is controversial, then the term “quasi-” or “pseudo-incorporation” becomes privileged (Massam 2001; Booij 2010; Borik & Gerhke 2015; Grossman ms.). If incorporation is conferred solely as a result of the loss of an argument status with no additional morphological evidence, then the term “syntactic incorporation” is used (Haig 2002). Several studies, additionally, use the terms “compounding” and “incorporation” interchangeably (Booij 2010). Finally, the term “complex predicates” is often used to cover a variety of issues, including morphology, syntax, and semantics regarding N+V combinations (Haig 2002). For these reasons, I will largely privilege the

most neutral term, N+V combination, and only occasionally will use the term “compound” when there are reasons to argue that a specific type of N+V combination does not have all the properties of a free combination including a verb with its direct object NP.

- 3 The paper begins with an exposition of basic facts about Mano (Section 2) that is followed by an exploration of different criteria suggested in the literature to distinguish compounding from the free combination of lexemes and their application to the Mano language. The Mano data used for the paper is drawn from the author’s field notes. Section 3 focuses on phonology and morphology, Section 4 on morphosyntax, Section 5 on semantics, and Section 6 on argument structure; Section 7 will offer a conclusion on these topics.

2. Basic facts about Mano and N+V combinations

- 4 Mano is a South Mande language spoken by approximately 400,000 people in Guinea and Liberia.
- 5 In Mano, tense, aspect, modality, and polarity are expressed primarily in an auxiliary, which also indexes the subject’s person and number. In the examples (1) and (3-5) below, *āā* is a third-person sg. auxiliary of the perfect series. Similarly, *lèÉ* in example (2), is a third-person sg. auxiliary of the negative series.

(1)	<i>Kòó</i>	<i>āā</i>	<i>ló.</i>
	PN	3SG.PRF	go

- 6 ‘Ko has left’.

(2)	<i>Pèé</i>	<i>lèÉ</i>	<i>nū</i>	<i>néŋ.</i>
	PN	3SG.NEG	come	yet

- 7 ‘Pe has not come yet’.

- 8 The word order is SOV, as in other Mande languages.

(3)	<i>Kòó</i>	<i>āā</i>	<i>wii</i>	<i>ló.</i>
	PN	3SG.PRF	meat	buy

- 9 ‘Ko has bought some meat’.

- 10 Mano is a zero-subject language.

(4)	<i>Āā</i>	<i>ló.</i>

	3SG.PRF	go

- 11 '(S)he has left'.
- 12 There is no passive or other detransitivizing morphology; intransitive constructions, where the verb does not bear additional morphology, can be used in anticausative and even passive functions (passive lability).

(5)	<i>Wĩi</i>	<i>āā</i>	<i>ló.</i>
	meat	3SG.PRF	buy

- 13 'The meat was bought'.
- 14 A typical N+V combination in Mano would be the following: *gbóó* is a noun meaning 'sobbing'. Together with the light verb *bō* 'implement', it forms the complex verb *gbóó bō* 'sob'.

(6)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>gbóó</i>	<i>bō.</i>
	3SG.PST	sobbing	implement

- 15 '(S)he sobbed'.
- 16 In the combination *yí bō*, *yí* means 'interior', but the overall combination means 'explain, to tell (a story)', selecting a direct object.

(7)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>pĩg</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>bō.</i>
	3SG.PST	story	interior	implement

- 17 '(S)he told a story'.²

3. Phonological and morphological criteria

- 18 Several types of criteria are suggested in the literature that can distinguish compounds from free lexeme combinations (Lieber & Štekauer 2009; Aikhenvald 2007): (1) phonological, (2) morphological, (3) morphosyntactic, and (4) semantic. In the ensuing section, I will specifically review phonological and morphological criteria; morphosyntax and semantics will be reviewed in the subsequent sections.

3.1. Phonological criteria

- 19 Phonology and the notion of prosodic words are often evoked as criteria for delimiting words, including N+V compounds. In the Manding group of the Mande family,

compounding (including N+V compounding) is often accompanied by the rules of tonal compactness where a certain tonal pattern encompasses a combination of words, often neutralizing the lexical tone of the right constituent. In the Mandinka example (8a), *jíò*, the definite form of the noun *jíí* ‘water’, does not form a compound with the verb *bòŋ* ‘pour’, therefore, the latter maintains its lexical tone. In (8b), by contrast, *jíí-bòŋ* ‘water-pour’ is a compound characterized by tonal compactness as the verb changes its lexical tone to high.

(8a)	À	yé	jí-ò	bòŋ.
	he	AUX	water-DEF	pour

- 20 ‘He poured the water’.

(8b)	À	yé	dàndàŋ-ò	jíí-bòŋ.
	he	AUX	garden-DEF	water-pour

- 21 ‘He watered the garden’ (Creissels & Jatta 1981: 35).
 22 In Mano, the rules of tonal compactness do not apply: there are no supralelexical tonal patterns present in the language.

3.2. Morphological criteria

- 23 Several morphological processes can accompany compounding, including the loss of nominal inflection as in the example (8b) above. As well, the placement of verbal morphemes can serve as a criterion. In the example (9a) from Kusaiean, Micronesian, the perfect marker *-læ* is suffixed to the verbal stem and, thus, placed before the direct object. In (9b), the object is part of a compound, so the marker follows the nominal stem:

(9a)	Nga	ɔl-læ	nuknuk	ɛ.
	1SG	wash-PRF	clothes	DEF

- 24 ‘I washed the clothes’.

(9b)	Nga	owo	nuknuk-læ.	
	1SG	wash	clothes-PRF	

- 25 ‘I clothes-washed’ (Sugita 1973).

- 26 In the Kla-Dan language, Mande, the position of the causative prefix *lě-* distinguishes free NP+V combinations. In example (10), it precedes the verbal stem from compounds, and in example (11), it precedes the nominal part.

(10)	Yũũfǎǎlè	yǎǎ	zǎlǎ	lě-dǎǎ-ká.
	P.N.	3SG.EXI>3SG	younger.sibling	PRF-learn-INF

- 27 ‘Yufale teaches his younger brother/sister’ (Makeeva 2012: 145).

(11)	Dùù	ǎǎ	dò	yà	ǎ	lě-gúú-lièé	ǎǎ	lǎ	gúú.
	sorcery	person:CS	one	3SG.PRF	3SG	CAUS-interior-turn	mouse	child	in

- 28 ‘A magician transformed him into a mouse’ (Makeeva 2012: 173).
- 29 A more interesting morphological criterion in Kla-Dan is verbal reduplication. In Kla-Dan, verbs can undergo reduplication, thus acquiring the distributive meaning. In NP+V combinations, like in example (12), it is only the verb that undergoes reduplication. Though in some N+V combinations, it is either the N or V separately, or the whole N+V combination, that may undergo reduplication, as in example (13).

(12a)	ǎǎ	dù	yà	lǎ	kpó.
	1SG.POSS	cow	3SG.PRF	child	give.birth

- 30 ‘My cow delivered’.

(12b)	ǎǎ	dù	yà	lǎ	kpókpo.
	1SG	cow	3SG.PRF	child	give.birth~DISTR

- 31 ‘My cow delivered several times’ (Makeeva 2012: 156).

(13a)	ǎǎ	yà	zǎ	bǎ	tòtǎǎ	lǎ	ká.
	person	3SG.PRF	heart	wake.up	story	PL	with

- 32 ‘A person recalled several stories’.

(13b)	ǎǎ	lǎ	wà	zǎ-bǎ-bǎ ~ zǎ-bǎ-zǎ-bǎ ~ zǎ-zǎ-bǎ	tòtǎǎ	lǎ	ká.
	person	PL	3PL.PRF	heart-wake.up~DISTR	story	PL	with

- 33 'Every person recalled several stories each' (Makeeva 2012: 172).
- 34 Transitive and intransitive morphology can serve as evidence for compounding. In the Kusaiean example (13) above, two verbal stems for 'wash' are used: transitive *ɔl* and intransitive *owo*. The intransitive stem is used when the noun is part of a N+V compound while the transitive stem is used when the direct object is expressed by a full noun phrase with definite marking.
- 35 Case manipulation is an additional criterion to be considered. In the example (14a) below from Chukchee, Chukotko-Kamchatkan, the verb is transitive and has two arguments: the agent in ergative and the theme in the absolutive case. In (14b), the object is part of a compound, the verb becomes intransitive, and there is only one argument, which is in the absolutive case.

(14a)	<i>Tumg-e</i>	<i>n-antəwat-ən</i>	<i>kupre-n.</i>
	friend-ERG	3PL.ERG-set-3SG.ABS.AOR	net-ABS

- 36 'The friends set the net'.

(14b)	<i>Tumg-ət</i>	<i>kupr-antəwat-gʷat.</i>
	friend-ABS.PL	net-set-3PL.ABS.AOR

- 37 'The friends were net-setting' (Comrie 1978; Foley 2007: 437).
- 38 In Mano, the placement of verbal morphemes does not serve as a criterion distinguishing compounds from free NP+V combinations. Verbal reduplication is not attested; all verbal inflectional affixes are suffixed. Further, they are not sensitive to the presence of a nominal complement. In fact, there is no transitive or intransitive morphology.
- 39 To conclude, there is no phonological or straightforward morphological evidence of bounded N+V combinations in Mano.

4. Morphosyntax of N+V combinations

- 40 Three additional morphosyntactic criteria are suggested in the literature on compounding: the No Phrase Constraint; the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis; and the extent to which nouns and verbs are separable.

4.1. No Phrase Constraint

- 41 According to the No Phrase Constraint, word formation rules cannot take syntactically complex units as input (Botha 1981). Therefore, it is expected that compounds should not be formed from syntactic phrases, such as the English **story and legend telling*. Yet compounds with syntactically complex constituents are documented across languages, including in English, *berry and mushroom picking*. In Kapampangan, Austronesian,

incorporated nominal components of the N+V combinations do not have case marking and are not indexed on the verb, which in turn is not marked for transitivity, in contrast with the free NP +V combinations. Instead, the incorporated nominals are linked to the verb by the linker =ng.³ In the example below, the first token of the linker =ng links the verb and a coordinated construction, *tahadang mani at letsi plan* ‘peanut brittle and milk flan’. The coordinate structure is being incorporated in violation of the No Phrase Constraint:

(15)	<i>Gawa=la=ng</i>	<i>tahada=ng</i>	<i>mani</i>	<i>at</i>	<i>letsi</i>	<i>plan.</i>	
	will.make=3PL.ABS=LK	brittle=LK	peanut	and	milk	flan	

42 ‘They’ll make peanut brittle and milk flan’ (Mithun 2010: 45).

43 In parallel to Kapampangan, in Mano, components of N+V combinations, even highly idiomatical ones, can be coordinated. So *gbóó* and *yí*, in examples (6) and (7), can as well be coordinated; therefore, the verb can form a combination with a complex nominal structure.⁴

(16)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>pīḡ</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>wà</i>	<i>gbóó</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>ḃō.</i>
	3SG.PST	story	interior	and	sobbing	3PL	Implement

44 ‘(S)he explained a story and sobbed’.

(17)	<i>Ō</i>	<i>gbīnīlā</i>	<i>wà</i>	<i>gèlè</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>gḡ.</i>
	3PL.PRET	hiding	and	war	3PL	fight

45 ‘They hid and started a war’.

46 In rare cases, however, the coordination is not accepted:

(18)	<i>*Là</i>	<i>sḡḡ</i>	<i>wà</i>	<i>à</i>	<i>fī</i>	<i>wāà</i>	<i>ḡḡ.</i>
	3SG.POSS	work	and	3SG	tiredness	3PL.PRF	finish

47 Intended meaning: ‘His work was done and he was tired’ (literal translation: ‘his work and his tiredness finished’).

48 Typically, the coordination is not accepted when one of the N+V combinations also governs some obligatory post-verbal element. As such, the coordinated structure requires that this element be shared by both combinations while it semantically belongs only to one. It may be this conflict that leads to the ungrammaticality of the following example:

(19)	*ɪ	ĩ	fáá	wà	ĩ	kò	wàà	kpòò	yí.
	2SG.PRET	2SG	force	and	2SG	hand	enter	box	in

- 49 Intended meaning: ‘You took the courage and put your hand in the box’.
- 50 Indeed, the expression ‘take the courage in the box’ does not make much sense, which is why the sentence was ruled out as ungrammatical.

4.2 Lexical Integrity Hypothesis

- 51 According to the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis, parts of words cannot serve as referents for subsequent pronouns (Bresnan & Mchombo 1995). Thus, in English, one cannot say **I went berry-picking and picked a lot of them*. However, in Kapampangan, a linked nominal can serve as the antecedent of a pronominal.

(20)	Kuma=la= ng	mitsa ,	sindian= de .
	get=3PL.ABS=LK	wick	ignite=3PL/3SG

- 52 ‘They will get a wick and ignite it’ (Mithun 2010: 48).
- 53 In the example above, the noun *mitsa* ‘wick’ is incorporated, which is indicated by the presence of the linker =*ng* on the verb; however, this noun also serves as the antecedent to the third-person pronominal clitic =*de* on the verb *sindian* ‘to ignite’.
- 54 In Mano, the nominal part of a N+V combination can be pronominalized, which is a violation of the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis. In example (21a), *gbóó* ‘sobbing’ serves as the antecedent for the pronoun in example (21b), and this pronoun is incorporated in the portmanteau form of the auxiliary:

(21a)	Ē	gbóó	ḃōō?
	3SG.PST	sobbing	implement.Q

- 55 ‘Did she sob?’ (literal translation: ‘did she implement sobbing?’)

(21b)	Īĵ,	ā	ḃō.
	yes	3SG.PST>3SG	implement

- 56 ‘Yes, she did’ (literal translation: ‘yes, she implemented it’).
- 57 Other examples of combinations where this criterion worked include: *ḃàà ḃō* ‘slander’, *ḃàà sí* ‘run’.

- 58 The only N+V combination where the criterion did not work among my samples was *fié kē* ‘be lazy’.

4.3. (Non)-continuity of the combination

- 59 A final piece of evidence suggesting the morphosyntactic bond between the components of the N+V combination is the elements’ abilities to separate. In Dutch, nouns can be incorporated into N+V compounds, and the characteristic feature of such nouns is the loss of definiteness marking. In the *aan het* infinitive constructions, however, nominal and verbal parts can optionally be separated. Such is the case for the N+V combination *piano spelen* ‘to play the piano’:

(22)	<i>Jan</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>[piano</i>	<i>aan</i>	<i>het</i>	<i>spel-en/aan</i>	<i>het</i>	<i>piano</i>	<i>spel-en]</i>
	John	is	[piano	at	the	play-INF/at	the	piano	play-INF]

- 60 ‘John is playing the piano’ (Booij 2010: 100).
- 61 In Mano, parts of the N+V combination are systematically detachable. In example (23), *gbóó* is relativized, extraposed to the left, as always happens in relativization (Khachaturyan 2014), and indexed in the portmanteau form of the 3SG auxiliary *ā*.

(23)	<i>Gbóó</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>bō</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>ē</i>	<i>kē</i>	<i>bùò.</i>
	sobbing.FOC	2SG.PST>3SG	implement	TOP	3SG.PST	be	big

- 62 ‘The sobbing that she implemented was big’.
- 63 The same extraposition may happen in more idiomatic expressions, such as *yí bō* ‘explain’, as in example (24b). The relative clause in example (24) semantically functions like a complex clause with a cause-and-effect relation between the parts. In all the examples I tested, the extraposition was accepted.

(24a)	<i>Pĩḡ</i>	<i>lé</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>bō</i>	<i>ā...</i>	
	story	FOC	3SG.PRF>3SG	interior	implement	TOP	
(24b)	<i>Pĩḡ</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>lé</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>bō</i>	<i>ā...</i>	
	story	interior	FOC	3SG.PRF>3SG	implement	TOP	

- 64 ‘Since she (already) explained this story (I have nothing to add)’ (literal translation: ‘the story that she explained’).
- 65 Ultimately, in Mano, components of the N+V combinations violate the morphosyntactic criterion distinguishing compounds from free combinations of lexemes. Nominal parts can coordinate, in violation of the No Phrase Constraint, and serve as antecedents of

pronouns, in violation of the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis. Finally, nominal and verbal components are also systematically detachable in certain contexts.

5. Semantics of N+V combinations

- 66 The most common semantic criterion of compounding is of an idiomatic quality. This, however, is a scalar phenomenon as it does not directly split N+V combinations into two groups (Kavka 2009). Consider the following combinations in Mano; their idiomatic nature can be said to increase from top to bottom:

Scheme 1: Idiomaticity in Mano N+V combinations

- 67 $s\bar{a}\bar{a} \ k\bar{e}$ <work + do> ‘to work’
 68 $s\bar{o}\bar{o} \ d\bar{o}$ <tooth + put> ‘bite’
 69 $s\bar{a} \ k\bar{e}$ <disdain + do> ‘to disdain’
 70 $s\bar{a} \ d\bar{o}$ <disdain + put> ‘to prefer’
 71 $l\bar{i}\bar{e} \ t\bar{o}$ <edge + leave> ‘stop’
 72 $z\bar{o} \ d\bar{o}$ <heart + put> ‘trust’
- 73 The semantic non-compositionality of the N+V combinations was observed by V. Vydrin (2009) in his study of preverbs in Dan-Gweetaa, another South Mande language. The term “preverb” as I will use it corresponds to the nominal components of N+V combinations. The class of preverbs that Vydrin distinguished includes mainly elements homonymous to nouns with locative semantics and only some other elements in exceptional cases. Crucially, in Dan-Gweetaa, preverbs can be followed by various kinds of determinatives and adjectives whose scope is not limited to the preverb but extends to the whole preverb-verb combination:

(25a)	Gbãtò	yà	$\bar{d}$	$\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$\bar{d}\bar{e}\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$t\bar{a}-k\bar{u}$.
	P.N.	3SG.PRF	3SG.REFL	POSS	woman	surface-grasp

- 74 ‘Gbato helped his wife’.

(25b)	$\bar{E}$	$\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$\bar{d}\bar{e}\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$t\bar{a}$	$\bar{d}\bar{a}$	$\bar{x}'$	$k\bar{u}$.
	3SG.REFL	POSS	woman	surface	FOC	3SG.JNT-3SG	grasp.JNT

- 75 ‘It was helping his wife that he did’.

(25c)	Gbãtò	yà	$\bar{d}$	$\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$\bar{d}\bar{e}\bar{b}\bar{a}$	$t\bar{a}=\bar{d}\bar{u}$	$k\bar{u}$.	
	P.N.	3sg.prf	3sg.refl	poss	woman	surface=pl	grasp	

- 76 ‘Gbato helped his wife several times’.

(25d)	GbÀtò	yà	ǎ	bā	dēbā	tā	bā	ǎ	kú.
	P.N.	3SG.PRF	3SG.REFL	POSS	woman	surface	ART	3SG	grasp

- 77 ‘Gbato helped his wife (in the affair and in the manner that were previously discussed)’ (Vydrin 2009: 77-78).

- 78 Example (25a) illustrates a typical verb with a “preverb”, which is homonymous to a spatial noun, *tā* ‘surface’, and the semantics of this combination is non-compositional, *tā kú* <surface + take> ‘help’. The verb and preverb are detached in (25b), which serves as an example of focalization with the determinative *dā*. Interestingly, when a preverb is followed by the plural marker *dā*, as in (25c), the scope of the marker encompasses the overall combination. The marker does not index nominal plurality but rather the multiplicative aspect: ‘help multiple times’. Similarly, the article *bā*, as in (25d), does not modify only the preverb but the whole combination, acquiring the meaning ‘provide that help’ or ‘help in that particular affair or in that particular manner’. According to Vydrin, the scope of the preverbal element’s modifiers determines whether a certain element should be considered a preverb.

- 79 N. Makeeva carefully studied the possibility for modifiers of N to be inserted into the N+V combinations as well as the semantic scope of these modifiers. Her study was based on material from the Kla-Dan language (Makeeva 2009). She found out that, in Kla-Dan, not all combinations of verbs with preverbal elements allow for the modifiers to be inserted; moreover, the scope of modifiers may vary for the exact same combination.

(26a)	Yà	ǎ	bāálá	gǎ-dǎ.
	3SG.PRF	3SG	work	head-put

- 80 ‘He finished the work’.

(26b)	Yà	ǎ	bāálá	gǎ	dǎǎdǎǎ	dǎ.
	3SG.PRF	3SG	work	head	difficult	put

- 81 ‘He finished a difficult part of the work’.

(26c)	Yà	ǎ	bāálá	gǎ	kǎǎǎ	dǎ.
	3SG.PRF	3SG	work	head	short	put

- 82 ‘He quickly finished the work’.

- 83 (26a) is a simple example of a verb with a preverb, $g\ddot{o}$ - $d\ddot{o}$ <head + put> ‘finish’. In (26b), an adjective $d\ddot{x}\ddot{y}\ddot{d}\ddot{x}\ddot{y}$ ‘difficult’ follows the preverb $g\ddot{o}$. As well, the adjective preserves its lexical meaning and does not extend over the whole combination. In (26c), however, the adjective $k\ddot{x}\ddot{l}\ddot{x}$ ‘short’ does take scope encompassing the combination and acquires an adverbial function ‘quickly’.
- 84 In Mano, very few modifiers can be used in N+V combinations, and their meaning is relatively unidiomatic. Among the modifiers that combine with the majority of tested verbs, the plural marker $v\ddot{o}$ and the adjective $d\bar{e}\bar{e}$ ‘new’ are notable.

(27)	$*\bar{y}$	$p\ddot{a}$	$\bar{e}\bar{e}$	$y\bar{i}$	$v\ddot{o}$	$\bar{e}\bar{o}$.	
	1SG.PST	story	DEM	interior	PL	take.off	

- 85 Intended meaning: ‘I told this story several times’.

(28)	$\bar{o}$	$\bar{y}$	$l\bar{e}$	$v\ddot{o}$	$t\bar{a}$.
	3PL.PST	1SG	mouth	PL	close

- 86 ‘They cheated me several times’ (literal translation: ‘they closed my mouth’-PL).
- 87 Example (27) illustrates the impossibility for the plural marker to be used with the N+V combination $y\bar{i} \bar{e}\bar{o}$ ‘explain, tell (a story)’. In example (28), such usage is possible with the combination $l\bar{e} t\bar{a}$ ‘cheat’. The marker has scope encompassing the whole construction, and the meaning is ‘several times’, just like in the Dan-Gweetaa example above (25c).
- 88 N+V combinations in Mano manifest various degrees of semantic integration of the components: certain combinations are semantically non-compositional and nominal components may have modifiers with a scope encompassing the whole combination.

6. Argument assignment in N+V combinations

- 89 This section introduces syntactico-semantic criteria distinguishing N+V compounds and free NP+V combinations based on the way in which the external argument is assigned.

6.1. Argument sharing vs non-sharing

- 90 Typically, N+V compounds analyzed in the literature are intransitive. We have seen that intransitive morphology and such cases serve as evidence promoting the compound status of the combination. Below an additional example from Tongan (Oceanic) is provided for consideration. In (29a), the construction is transitive: the direct object, *kavá* ‘kava’, is marked by the absolutive case while the subject, *Sione* ‘John’, is marked by the ergative case. In the case of incorporation, as in (29b), the noun

kavá ‘kava’ is unmarked for any case while the subject is marked by the absolutive case, which demonstrates the intransitive status of the construction.

(29a)	<i>Na’e</i>	<i>Inu</i>	<i>‘a</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>kavá</i>	<i>‘é</i>	<i>Sione.</i>	
	PST	drink	ABS	CONN	kava	ERG	John	

- 91 ‘John drank the kava’.

(29b)	<i>Na’e</i>	<i>inu</i>	<i>kavá</i>	<i>‘a</i>	<i>Sione.</i>
	PST	drink	kava	ABS	John

- 92 ‘John kava-drank’ (Churchward 1953; Mithun 1984: 851).

- 93 It certain cases, however, the N+V combinations can license their own arguments. This process is known as the manipulation of case in noun incorporation where the incorporated noun loses its argument status while the oblique argument is advanced into the case position, having been vacated by the incorporated noun (Mithun 1984). The example below illustrates this process in Kurmanjî Kurdish (Indo-European):

(30)	<i>Ew-î</i>	<i>ez</i>	<i>gelek</i>	<i>bi</i>	<i>xweşî</i>	<i>qebûl</i>	<i>kir-im[...]</i>
	3SG-OBL	1SG	much	with	pleasure	acceptance	do:PST-1SG

- 94 ‘He accepted/welcome me (into his home) with great pleasure [...]’ (Haig 2002: 26).
- 95 In the preceding example, the N+V combination *qebûl kirim* governs a first person sg. direct object that is indexed in the agreement suffix *-im*.
- 96 Sometimes, the external argument of Kurdish N+V combinations can be interpreted as a possessor of the noun.

(31)	<i>Wî</i>	<i>zanî-bû</i>	<i>ku</i>	<i>dê</i>	<i>pîrik-a</i>	<i>wî</i>
	3SG:OBL	know:PST-PPF	COMP	FUT	grandmother-LK:F	3SG:OBL
<i>alîkari-ya</i>		<i>wî</i>	<i>bi-k-e.</i>			
help-LK:F		3SG:OBL	IRR:do:PRES-3SG			

- 97 ‘He knew that his grandmother would help him’ (literal translation: ‘do his help’) (Haig 2002: 30).
- 98 In this previous example, the second *wî*, marked by bold characters, is a possessor of the noun *alîkariya* ‘help’ and is connected to the noun via the linking morpheme *-ya*.

For this reason, *wî* cannot be considered a direct object of the N+V combination, a designation contrasting with example (30).

- 99 In the extant literature, several approaches have been suggested to analyze the syntactic relationship of the N+V combination and the external argument. One approach is to assign valency to the combination; it is the combination as a whole that licenses additional arguments and, in the case of additional direct objects, becomes transitive. This is the case for classical incorporating languages and is illustrated by examples (9) and (14). The argument sharing approach suggests that both the verb and the noun within the N+V combination assign arguments: the verb assigns the noun while the noun assigns the external arguments, as in example (31) (Jackendoff 1974; Mohanan 1997). The latter approach, however, raises important concerns. In particular, no clear criteria have been articulated to determine what nouns assign external arguments and what nouns are properly incorporated, in which case the external arguments are assigned by the N+V combination. Moreover, a uniform analysis for either of these terms may not apply to any particular language. As a result, in Kurdish the situation is clearly mixed; the argument sharing can be supported with certain non-incorporated N+V combinations, while in cases of noun incorporation, the external argument is assigned by the combination itself (Haig 2002).
- 100 In what follows, I will analyze the relationship between the valency properties of nouns and verbs as parts of the N+V combination and the valency properties of the combinations themselves. I will show that, in Mano, just like in Kurdish, the argument sharing approach fails in certain N+V combinations and that, in these cases, the external argument must be assigned only by the combination itself. These combinations should be considered more syntactically and semantically bound than those combinations where the external argument is assigned by the combination's nominal component.

6.2. Nominal valency and the transitivity of the N+V combination

- 101 All transitive verbs in Mano are always accompanied by a direct object, whether it is a full noun phrase, a pronoun, or a dummy noun, such as *pē* 'thing'.

(32a)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>à</i>	<i>sí.</i>
	3SG.PST	3SG	take

- 102 'He took it'.

(32b)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>wîi</i>	<i>sí.</i>
	3SG.PST	animal	take

- 103 'He took the animal'.

- 104 All verbs occurring in N+V combinations can be used independently of the noun in a transitive construction. Even when used as part of the N+V combination, verbs retain

their valency properties; this becomes especially clear when the nominal part is pronominalized. Consider example (17) repeated below:

(33a)	$\bar{E}$	<i>gbóó</i>	$\bar{b}\bar{o}\bar{o}?$
	3SG.PST	sobbing	implement.Q

- 105 ‘Did she sob?’ (literal translation: ‘did she implement sobbing?’)

(33b)	$\bar{y}\bar{y}$, $\bar{a}$	$\bar{b}\bar{o}$.
	yes	3SG.PST>3SG implement

- 106 ‘yes, she did’. (literal translation: ‘yes, she implemented it’)

- 107 Nouns in Mano are typically divided into two syntactic classes: alienably possessed (free-standing) nouns and inalienably possessed (relational) nouns. The latter class includes prototypical, inalienably possessed nouns, such as body parts ($\bar{z}\bar{o}$ ‘heart’), kinship terms ($\bar{d}\bar{a}\bar{a}$ ‘father’), spatial terms ($\bar{y}\bar{i}$ ‘interior’) (on the semantics of inalienable possession, see Nichols 1988), as well as names of physical or abstract properties ($\bar{n}\bar{o}\bar{n}\bar{o}$ ‘taste’, $\bar{t}\bar{o}\bar{n}\bar{o}$ ‘benefit’, $\bar{f}\bar{a}\bar{n}\bar{a}$ ‘strength’, $\bar{l}\bar{o}\bar{o}$ ‘love [to someone]’, etc.). Inalienably possessed or relational, nouns are usually accompanied by their arguments, though there are some exceptions (Khachaturyan 2015: 7

- 108 6-80). Thus, the noun $\bar{k}\bar{i}$ ‘skin’ can be used with or without the possessive argument.

(34)	$\bar{K}\bar{i}$	$\bar{w}\bar{E}$	$\bar{l}\bar{E}$	$\bar{w}\bar{i}$	$\bar{k}\bar{i}$	$\bar{k}\bar{a}$.
	skin	DEM	3SG.EXI	animal	skin	with

- 109 ‘This skin is an animal skin’.

- 110 The arguments of inalienably possessed nouns are encoded by the basic set of pronouns or by a full noun phrase adjacent to the head noun. Alienably possessed nouns do not take arguments but can be modified by possessor adjuncts, which are encoded by a special set of possessive pronouns. See examples (35) and (36), contrasting alienably and inalienably possessed nouns:

(35a)	$\bar{a}$	$\bar{k}\bar{p}\bar{a}\bar{k}\bar{a}\bar{a}$
	3SG	leg

- 111 ‘his leg’ (the noun ‘leg’ is relational, i.e. normally takes an argument.)

(35b)	$\bar{w}\bar{i}$	$\bar{k}\bar{p}\bar{a}\bar{k}\bar{a}\bar{a}$

	animal	leg

112 ‘animal leg’

(36a)	<i>là</i>	<i>ká</i>
	3SG.POSS	house

113 ‘his house’ (the noun ‘house’ does not normally take an argument.)

(36b)	<i>Pèé</i>	<i>là</i>	<i>ká</i>
	PN	3SG.POSS	House

114 ‘Pe’s house’

115 Significantly, inalienable possessors are marked the same way as direct objects: compare (32a) and (35a), also (32b) and (35b). In view of this striking similarity between the accusative and the genitive position, N+V combinations, like the following examples, can be analyzed in two ways:

(37)	<i>Ē</i>	<i>p̄l̄à</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>bō.</i>
	3SG.PST	story	interior	implement
		NP _{do}	[N	V] _v
		[N _{poss}	N _{rel}] _{do}	V

116 ‘(S)he told a story’.

117 These combinations can be analyzed either as a “transitive,” as I call it, combination *yí bō* ‘explain’, which selects *p̄l̄à* ‘story’ as its direct object, or as a simple transitive verb, *bō* ‘leave’, having as its direct object *p̄l̄à yí*, an inalienably possessed noun *yí* ‘interior,’ which is preceded by its possessor, *p̄l̄à* ‘story’. In the transitive case, the argument *p̄l̄à* ‘story’ can be said to be assigned by the whole combination, *yí bō* ‘explain’. The simple transitive analysis is an example of argument sharing. In what follows, I am suggesting arguments specifically in favor of one or the other interpretation.

6.2.1. A mismatch between the transitivity of the combination and the valency of the noun⁵

118 In the majority of cases, if the nominal item in the combination is an inalienably possessed noun, then the combination itself is “transitive”. This is the case for *yí* ‘interior, inal’ and *yí bō* ‘explain, tr’. The combination can also be “reflexive”, if the possessor of the noun is co-referential to the subject. This is the case in example (38):

wēlē ‘face’ is an inalienably possessed noun, and the combination wēlē yèlè ‘be enraged’ selects a “direct object” co-referential to the subject.

(38)	Lē	ē	wēlē	yèlè-pèlè.
	3SG.EXI	3SG.REFL	face	attach-INF

- 119 ‘He is enraged’. (literal translation: he is attaching his own face)
- 120 If the nominal item is alienably possessed, then the combination is “intransitive”. This is the case for gbóó ‘sobbing, al’ and gbóó ðō ‘sob, intr’. See more matching examples in Table 1:

Table 1: Matching nominal valency and transitivity

líé tó	terminate	edge + leave	inal.	tr.
sùū káá	exterminate	type + pour	inal.	tr.
wēlē yèlè	be enraged	face + attach	inal.	refl.
wúú káá	breathe out	breath + pour	inal.	refl.
wóó káá	bark	barking + pour	al.	intr.
yáá kē	be sick	illness + do	al.	intr.
yìé ðōo	weave	cotton + implement	al.	intr.
yélè kē	be ashamed	shame + do	al.	intr.

- 121 When the nominal valency matches with transitivity, both analysis, argument sharing, and argument licensing by the combination are equally plausible. Sometimes, however, the valency of the noun and of the combination do not match.
- 122 LÉÉ ‘leaf’, as a significant part of a plant, is inalienably possessed.

(39a)	yíí	lÉÉ
	tree	leaf

- 123 ‘leaf of a tree’

(39b)	à	lÉÉ
	3SG	leaf

124 ‘its leaf’

125 The combination $l\acute{e}\acute{e} \ b\bar{o}$ ‘unveil’ is intransitive, though, and the semantic theme of the complex verb is expressed by a postpositional phrase.

(40)	$\bar{E}$	$l\acute{e}\acute{e}$	$b\bar{o}$	$k\bar{a}\bar{a}$	$l\bar{a}$.
	3SG.PST	leaf	implement	theft	on

126 ‘She unveiled the theft’.

127 $v\acute{z}\acute{z}$ ‘wasp’ is an alienably possessed noun; however, the combination $v\acute{z}\acute{z} \ b\bar{o}$ ‘get rid of’ is transitive:

(41a)	$w\bar{a}$	$v\acute{z}\acute{z}$
	3PL.POSS	wasp

128 ‘their wasp’

(41b)	$K\bar{o}\bar{a}$	$\bar{o}$	$v\acute{z}\acute{z}$	$b\bar{o}$	$k\bar{o}$	$m\bar{o}$.
	1PL.PRF	3PL	wasp	take.off	1PL	on

129 ‘We got rid of them’.

130 Similar, non-matching examples are presented in Table 2:

Table 2: Non-matching nominal valency and transitivity

$k\bar{o} \ v\bar{o}$	dominate	hand + send	inal.	intr.
$n\acute{e}\acute{e} \ k\bar{e}$	cure	medicine + do	al.	tr.
$n\acute{a}\acute{a} \ k\bar{p}\acute{o}$	curse	sin + put	al.	tr.
$l\acute{o}\acute{o} \ d\bar{o}$	trade	trade + put	al.	tr.

131 In these cases, it is the combination that licenses its arguments, and their expression is not motivated by the valency properties of the noun. The argument sharing approach, therefore, cannot be applied in such cases.

6.2.2. Noun’s possessor does not semantically match the combination’s theme

132 In N+V combinations where semantics is more or less compositional, the two syntactic interpretations from example (37), “NP_{DO} [N V]_V” versus “[N_{POSS} N_{REL}]_{DO} V”, could be considered paraphrases. Thus, in the case of the combination $b\acute{o}l\bar{o}\eta \ b\bar{o}$ <scratch

take.off> ‘scratch’, “ $n\acute{e}_{\text{DO}}$ [bóloŋ̃ bō]_V” ‘scratch a child’, this could be a paraphrase of “[$n\acute{e}_{\text{POSS}}$ bóloŋ̃]_{rel-DO} bō” ‘take off a child’s scratch’. This is not the case for highly idiomatic combinations, so, $p\tilde{a}_{\text{DO}}$ [yí bō]_V ‘tell a story’ is not a paraphrase of [$p\tilde{a}_{\text{POSS}}$ yí]_{rel-DO} bō ‘take off interior’s story’.

- 133 In other cases, where the degree of idiomaticity is low, there may still be a mismatch between the noun’s possessor and the combination’s theme. Consider the following example:

(42)	$\bar{I}$	$\grave{a}$	$s\acute{o}\acute{o}$	$d\bar{o}$.
	2SG.PST	3SG	teeth	put
		NP _{DO}	[N	V]
		*[N _{POSS}	N _{rel}] _{DO}	V

- 134 ‘You bit him’, NOT ‘you put his teeth’.
- 135 It is imaginable that ‘put teeth’ could be a paraphrase of ‘bite’, as biting is, in a sense, putting one’s teeth on something. Yet, ‘put his (someone else’s) teeth’ is not a paraphrase of ‘bite him’. Consider other transitive verbs with the same disparity: $k\grave{o}$ $d\bar{i}\bar{e}$ <hand pass> ‘exaggerate with smth’ (to pass someone else’s hand) and $j\grave{e}\bar{e}$ $k\bar{e}$ <eye do> ‘guard’ (to do someone else’s eye). Again, in these cases, the argument is licensed by the combination, so the argument sharing approach does not work.

6.2.3. Circularity of valency assignment

- 136 There is a significant number of N+V combinations where the verbal root is preceded by an action-denoting root.⁶ This verbal root functions like a light verb and does not contribute to the semantics of the combination; as well, the nominal part cannot be used independently from the verb in question, like in examples (43b) and (44b).
- 137 Some of these combinations are “transitive”:

(43a)	$\bar{E}$	$\eta w\acute{o}$	$y\bar{a}$	$f\grave{e}y\acute{e}$	$z\bar{e}$.
	3SG.PST	problem	DEM	explanation	kill

(43b)	* $\bar{E}$	$\eta w\acute{o}$	$y\bar{a}$	$f\grave{e}y\acute{e}$.
	3SG.PST	problem	DEM	explanation

- 138 ‘He explained this problem in details’.

(44a)	$\bar{I}\bar{j}$	$m\acute{i}a$	$y\bar{a}$	$s\grave{a}$	$d\bar{o}$.		

	1SG.PST	person.PL:FOC	DEM	disdain	put		

(44b)	*ŋ	míá	yā	sà.
	1SG.PST	person.PL:FOC	DEM	disdain

139 'I despised these people'.

140 Some combinations are intransitive but license a postpositional phrase:

(45)	Mēnēēkēlé	ī	ḃáà	ḃō	ŋ	móḃŋwòḃmḃ?
	why	1SG.PST	abandon	implement	1SG	because.of

141 'Why did you abandon me?'

(46)	ō	ḃàkà	ḃō	ī	mḃ.
	3PL.PST	slander	implement	2SG	on

142 'They slandered you'.

143 Table 3 provides more examples of N+V combinations with action-denoting nominals:

Table 3: N+V combinations with action-denoting nominals

combination	meaning	meaning of the light verb	postpositional argument	transitivity
fólósi kpó	force	put	smb là	intr.
kéi kē	decline	do	smth mḃ	intr.
bàlà sí	run	take		intr.
lèḃō gēē	whisper	say		intr.
ŋwḃḃŋwḃḃ sí	buzz	take		intr.
sòlō ḃō	get	implement		it
súò kē	call	do		tr.
vèi zē	neglect	kill		tr.
léà ḃō	put shame on smb.	implement		tr.

- 144 The argument expression appears to be arbitrary and is not licensed by the light verb. If such action-denoting roots were to be considered independent nouns, then there would be no way to assign their valency except by referring to the valency properties of the combination (if the combination is “transitive”, then the nouns are inalienably possessed; but, if the combination is “intransitive”, then the nouns are alienably possessed). The valency of the combination, though, would then depend on the valency of the nominal part. Thus, if we consider that the valency is assigned by the whole combination, then it will allow us to avoid this circularity in valency assignment.
- 145 This analysis of the argument structure in Mano suggests that the argument sharing approach, which assigns the properties of argument licensing to the nominal component, does not apply in certain N+V combinations. In these cases, it is the combination as a whole that governs the external argument. Such combinations are more syntactically and semantically bound than free NP+V combinations.

7. Conclusion

- 146 Compounding in general, and N+V compounding in particular, is notoriously difficult to define since many criteria are in play in crafting such definitions (Lieber & Štekauer 2009; Aikhenvald 2009). None of these criteria indicates that there is a straightforward answer to the question: what should be considered a compound, and what should not? “Compoundhood”, like “wordhood”, is a scalar phenomenon rather than a binary category (Haspelmath 2011). In languages with poor morphology, like Mano, the task is even more difficult. No phonological, morphological, or straightforward syntactic criteria work in favor of the compound interpretation in this language. Many syntactic criteria, such as the No Phrase Constraint, the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis, and the discontinuity of N+V combinations are against the compound interpretation. Nevertheless, semantic criteria, such as idiomaticity and the scope of the modifiers, points to a more semantically bound status of certain N+V combinations. Moreover, the argument structure of certain N+V combinations — namely, the contradiction and the circularity of valency assignment in the nominal component and the combination itself — makes them more semantically and syntactically bound than the corresponding free combination of a direct object NP and a verb. As different criteria are often in contradiction with one another, however, there is no neat division to be held between the class of compounds and the class of free NP+V combinations.

Abbreviations

abs	absolute	erg	ergative	obl	oblique
al.	alienable	exi	existential	pl	plural
aor	aorist	f	feminine	pn	proper noun
art	article	foc	focus	poss	possessive
aux	auxiliary	fut	future	ppf	pluperfect

caus	causative	jnt	conjoint	pres	present
comp	complementizer	inal.	inalienable	prf	perfect
conn	connector	inf	infinitive	pst	past
cs	construct state	intr.	intransitive	refl	reflexive
def	definite	irr	irrealis	sg	singular
dem	demonstrative	lk	linker	top	topic
distr	distributive	n	noun	tr.	transitive
do	direct object	np	noun phrase	v	verb

Borik, Olga. & Berit. Gehrke. 2015. *The Syntax and semantics of pseudo-incorporation*. Leiden ; Boston : Brill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Booij, Geert Evert. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Botha, Rudolf P. 1981. "A Base Rule Theory of Afrikaans Synthetic Compounding". In Michael. Moortgat, Harry. van.der. Hulst and Teun. Hoekstra (eds.). *The Scope of Lexical Rules*. Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 1-77.
- Bresnan, Joan. & Sam Mchombo. 1995. The lexical integrity principle: Evidence from Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 13, pp. 181–254.
- Churchward, C. Maxwell. 1953. *Tongan grammar*. London ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Winfred P. Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic typology*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 329–394.
- Creissels, Denis & Sidia Jatta. 1981. La composition verbale en mandinka. *Mandenkan*, 2, pp. 31-48.
- Foley, William. 2007. A Typology of Information Packaging in the Clause. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume I: Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 362-446.
- Grossman, Eitan. ms. 2016. *Noun phrase (?) incorporation: A preliminary cross-linguistic study*.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax. *Folia Linguistica*, 45, 1, pp. 31–80.
- Haugen, Jason D. 2008. *Morphology at the interfaces. Reduplication and noun incorporation in Uto-Aztecan*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Jackendoff, Ray. 1974. A deep structure projection rule. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 5, pp. 481-505.
- Keïta, Boniface. 1989. Les préverbes du dialonké. *Mandenkan*, 17, pp. 69-80.
- Khachaturyan, Maria. 2014. *Between correlative clauses, pronoun retention strategy, paratactic construction and cleft: relative clauses in Mano*. Talk presented at the Association for Linguistic Typology conference, Leipzig, August 17, 2013.
- Khachaturyan, Maria. 2015. Grammaire du mano. *Mandenkan*, 54, pp. 1-254.
- Kuznetsova, O. 2013. *ГЛАГОЛ В ЯЗЫКЕ ГУРО [The verb in the Guro language]*. PhD dissertation, Institute for Linguistic Studies, Saint Petersburg, Russia.
- Lieber, Rochelle and Štekauer, Pavol. 2009. Introduction: status and definition of compounding. In Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer. *The Oxford handbook of compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-18.
- Makeeva, Nadezda. 2009. Les préverbes en kla-dan. *Mandenkan*, 50, pp. 85-102.
- Makeeva, Nadezda. 2012. *Grammaticheskiy stroy yazyka kla-dan v tipologicheskoy kontekste rodstvennykh yazykov [The grammar of the Kla-Dan language in the typological context of genetically related languages]*. PhD dissertation, Institute for Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.
- Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19, pp. 153-97.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language*, 60, pp. 847-93.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1986. On the nature of noun incorporation. *Language*, 62 (1), pp. 32-37.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2010. Constraints on compounds and incorporation. In: S. Scalise and I. Vogel. *Cross-disciplinary issues in compounding*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 37-58.
- Mithun, Marianne & Greville Corbett. 1999. The effect of noun incorporation on argument structure. In: Lunella Mereu (ed.), *Boundaries of morphology and syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 49-71.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1997. Multidimensionality of representation: NV complex predicates in Hindi. In Alsina et al. (eds.), *Complex predicates*. Stanford: Center for the study of language and information, pp. 431-471.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. In: W. Shipley (ed.), *In honor of Mary Haas*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 555-609.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1986. Some notes on noun incorporation. *Language* 62, pp. 19-31.
- Scalise, Sergio and Irene. Vogel. 2010. Why compounding? In S. Scalise and I. Vogel. *Cross-linguistic issues in compounding*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-20.
- Singer, Ruth (2011). Typologising idiomaticity: Noun-verb idioms and their relations. *Linguistic Typology*, 15 (3), pp. 625-659.
- Sugita, Hiroshi. 1973. Semitransitive verbs and object incorporation in Micronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12, pp. 393-406.
- Van Geenhoven, Veerle. 2002. Raised possessors and noun incorporation in West Greenlandic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20, pp 759-821.
- Vydrin, Valentin. 2009. ПРЕВЕРБЫ В ЯЗЫКЕ ДАН-ГУЭТА [Preverbs in Dan-Gweetaa]. *Voprosy Jazykosnaniya* 2, pp. 75-84.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers whose valuable suggestions helped me to restructure my argumentation. I am grateful to Pe Mamy for his patience with our work on the questionnaires and wordlists. Finally, I would like to thank the Fyssen Foundation and William F. Hanks who supported the present research.

2. In this paper, I analyze only the N+V combinations where the nominal part directly precedes the verb; however, there exists a large class of N+V idiomatic expressions where the noun and the verb are separated by an auxiliary. For the sake of simplicity, these constructions will not be analyzed in this paper:

À fĩ āā d5.

3SG tiredness 3SG.PRF stop

‘He has had a rest’ (literal translation: ‘his tiredness has stopped).

3. In Kapampangan, constituents of a phrase are typically linked by the enclitic *=ng*. In example (15), the second token of the enclitic *=ng* forms a nominal compound *tahadang mani* ‘peanut brittle’.

4. When direct objects are coordinated, they are usually followed by a dummy 3PL pronoun *o*.

5. In her study of “preverbs” in Guro, O. Kusnetsova made a similar observation that the “preverbs” that derive from inalienably possessed nouns may lose their valency characteristics. Thus, in Guro, the preverb *bē*, derived from the inalienably possessed noun *bē* ‘hand’, and it does not require a possessor when it occurs in the combination *bē jē* ‘hand beat’ <clap the hands>:

(i) *Bēlē lū bē é jē bōlē sā lā.*

girl PL hand FOC beat.PFV moon beam at

‘The girls are clapping their hands in the moon light’ (Kuznetsova 2013: 78).

6. In her study of verbal morphosyntax in the Guro language, O. Kuznetsova includes into the class of preverbs elements that derive from alienably possessed nouns and combine with desemanticized verbs: *yēē-jē* ‘dream’ (*yēē* ‘dream’, *jē* ‘beat’) and *viè-wū* ‘lie’ (*viè* ‘lie’, *wū* ‘bear’) (Kuznetsova 2013: 74). It is these nouns, not the verbs, that contribute the most to the semantics of the corresponding combination.

ABSTRACTS

This paper addresses noun plus verb combinations in Mano, a South Mande language, and suggests novel syntactic and semantic criteria for distinguishing compounds from the free

combinations of noun phrases and verbs. Nominal and verbal components of all N+V combinations in Mano are systematically detachable, and certain N+V combinations contradict the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis and the No Phrase Constraint, all of which are against the definitions of compounding as a formation of “single words”. Nonetheless, the contradiction and circularity of valency assignment in the nominal component and the combination itself make such combinations more syntactically bound than corresponding free combinations of a NP and a V. These criteria can be considered an argument in favor of defining certain N+V combinations in Mano as compounds, and all these criteria applied together present a complex picture where N+V combinations should be considered, more or less, compound-like with no clear division between free combinations and compounds.

L'article présent analyse les combinaisons verbo-nominales en mano, Mandé-Sud, et introduit des critères syntactiques et sémantiques originaux qui permettent de distinguer les composés verbo-nominaux des combinaisons libres des groupes nominaux et des verbes. Les composantes nominale et verbale des combinaisons verbo-nominales en mano sont systématiquement détachables l'une de l'autre. Ces combinaisons contredisent l'Hypothèse de l'Intégrité Lexicale, ainsi que la Contrainte sur une Phrase Complexe à l'intérieur d'un mot. Ces trois critères sont en opposition avec la définition de la composition en tant que formation des « mots intègres ». Néanmoins, la contradiction et la circularité dans l'affectation de la valence de combinaisons verbo-nominales les rendent plus syntactiquement cohérentes que les combinaisons libres. Elles peuvent être considérées comme arguments en faveur de la définition de certaines combinaisons verbo-nominales en mano en tant que composés. Tous ces critères pris ensemble offrent un tableau complexe où les combinaisons verbo-nominales sont plus ou moins proches des composés mais il n'y a pas de division claire entre la classe des composés et la classe des combinaisons libres.

В ДАННОЙ СТАТЬЕ АНАЛИЗИРУЮТСЯ ГЛАГОЛЬНО-ИМЕННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ В ЯЗЫКЕ МАНО (ЮЖНЫЕ МАНДЕ) И ПРЕДЛАГАЮТСЯ НОВЫЕ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ И СИНТАКСИЧЕСКИЕ КРИТЕРИИ, ОТЛИЧАЮЩИЕ КОМПОЗИТЫ ОТ СВОБОДНЫХ СОЧЕТАНИЙ ИМЕННЫХ ГРУПП С ГЛАГОЛОМ. ИМЕННОЙ И ГЛАГОЛЬНЫЙ КОМПОНЕНТЫ ГЛАГОЛЬНО-ИМЕННЫХ СОЧЕТАНИЙ СИСТЕМАТИЧЕСКИ ОТДЕЛЯЮТСЯ ДРУГ ОТ ДРУГА В РЯДЕ КОНТЕКСТОВ. ЭТИ СОЧЕТАНИЯ ПРОТИВОРЕЧАТ ГИПОТЕЗЕ О ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОЙ ЦЕЛОСТНОСТИ, А ТАКЖЕ ОГРАНИЧЕНИЮ НА СОСТАВНУЮ ГРУППУ В СОСТАВЕ ЕДИНОЙ СЛОВОФОРМЫ. ЭТИ ТРИ КРИТЕРИЯ СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВУЮТ ПРОТИВ ТОГО, ЧТОБЫ СЧИТАТЬ ДАННЫЕ ГЛАГОЛЬНО-ИМЕННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ КОМПОЗИТАМИ. ОДНАКО ВНОВЬ ЗАДЕЙСТВОВАННЫЕ КРИТЕРИИ, А ИМЕННО ЦИКЛИЧНОСТЬ И ПРОТИВОРЕЧИЕ В ВАЛЕНТНОСТНЫХ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКАХ ИМЕННОГО КОМПОНЕНТА И ВСЕГО ГЛАГОЛЬНО-ИМЕННОГО СОЧЕТАНИЯ, СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВУЮТ О БОЛЬШЕЙ СИНТАКСИЧЕСКОЙ СВЯЗАННОСТИ ДАННЫХ СОЧЕТАНИЙ. ЭТИ КРИТЕРИИ СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВУЮТ В ПОЛЬЗУ ТОГО, ЧТОБЫ СЧИТАТЬ ДАННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ КОМПОЗИТАМИ. ПО СОВОКУПНОСТИ ПРИМЕНЕННЫХ КРИТЕРИЕВ СЛЕДУЕТ СЧИТАТЬ ГЛАГОЛЬНО-ИМЕННЫЕ СОЧЕТАНИЯ БОЛЕЕ ИЛИ МЕНЕЕ ПОХОЖИМИ НА КОМПОЗИТЫ, ОДНАКО ЧЕТКОГО ДЕЛЕНИЯ НА КЛАСС КОМПОЗИТОВ И КЛАСС СВОБОДНЫХ СОЧЕТАНИЙ ДОБИТЬСЯ НЕ УДАЕТСЯ.

INDEX

Keywords: Compounding, noun incorporation, valency, possession, mano

Mots-clés: composition verbale, incorporation nominale, valence, possession, Mano

mots-clesru глагольные композиты, инкорпорация, валентность, посеcсивность, язык МАНО

AUTHOR

MARIA KHACHATURYAN

US Berkeley, Anthropology Department — LLACAN
mashaha@gmail.com