

Object Incorporation in Latin: Towards Macro- and Micro-Typology of Incorporation*

Elena V. Zheltova

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation;
e.zheltova@spbu.ru, elena.zheltova@mail.ru

Alexander Yu. Zheltov

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; a.zheltov@spbu.ru, ajujeltov@mail.ru

For citation: Zheltova E. V., Zheltov A. Yu. Object Incorporation in Latin: Towards Macro- and Micro-Typology of Incorporation. *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 74–86.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.105>

In this paper, the Latin language is analyzed in the context of typology of object incorporation. The authors draw on the research of Mithun, who considers incorporation on the basis of two obligatory conditions: first, the noun must be embedded in the verb, and second, the language must have parallel syntactic paraphrases with non-incorporated noun. The second criterion is so important that the phenomenon of incorporation is acknowledged to exist even in those languages where there is no complete integration of the noun into the verb, but only a certain syntactic compactness, provided there are parallel constructions. The latter type has been coined “noun stripping” and has launched the division of incorporation into two types, *viz.* “strong” and “weak” incorporation. Another important point of divergence between the incorporating languages is the change of the argument structure of the source verb, namely, the preservation or loss of transitivity of the incorporated complex. Taking all these parameters into account, the authors propose a new typology of object incorporation, including languages that have not previously been considered in the context of this phenomenon. This typology is not based on a strict opposition of incorporating and non-incorporating languages, but represents a kind of continuum in which the place of a language depends on whether it demonstrates: 1) full incorporation or only a close syntactic Noun–Verb compactness; 2) the presence of parallel syntactic paraphrases; 3) the detransitivisation of the resulting compound verb. The authors examine each criterion in detail as applied to Latin and show the place of Latin in this typology.

Keywords: Latin, object incorporation, macro- and micro-typology of incorporation, argument structure, transitivity.

“Incorporating” languages are “incorporating” differently, and “non-incorporating” languages are “non-incorporating” in a different way too.

1. Some theoretical considerations

Incorporation is a grammatical phenomenon in which a word contains morphemes that are perceived as separate elements of a sentence. Sometimes the term is used in a narrower sense to refer only to cases where morphemes are joined by coalescence or where

* We are grateful to our anonymous reviewer and Michael Pozdnev for discussion and valuable advice.

© St. Petersburg State University, 2024

grammatical or semantic relations are restricted in some way, and sometimes it is used in a more general sense to include some cases where the morphemes are not clearly joined morphologically at all (Sadock 2006, 584). The incorporated noun may be a bearer of different semantic roles, namely instruments, locatives, goals, etc., but in the most typical kind of noun incorporation, “the noun that is compounded with the verb designates the objective or theme argument of the predicate¹ and it was in this sense that the word *Einverleibung* was originally used in describing facts of “Mexican” (Nahuatl) by von Humboldt (1988,² 130), who contrasted a sentence with an independent verb and object: *ni-c-qua in nacatl* ‘I-it-eat the meat’ with the incorporated form *ni-naca-qua* ‘I-meat-eat’” (Sadock 2006, 585).

Why does language need such doublets?

First of all, a noun being included in a verb loses the markers of number and gender, and the ability to be qualified by adjectives, pronouns, numerals, etc. Together with these changes that affect the phonological, morphological, and syntactic properties of a noun, the incorporated complex obtains a somewhat wider, generalized meaning like “I am a meat-eater”, i. e. “I am a carnivore”. Thus, incorporation affects both morphosyntactic and pragmatic status of an object: it is no longer a separate word, but becomes unchangeable, non-specific, and non-referential.

The combining of a noun and a verb into a single word (*viz.* univerbation) is the most remarkable but not the only aspect of incorporation as a linguistic phenomenon.

Marian Mithun who studied the phenomenon of incorporation on the data of numerous languages points out that all the languages which exhibit such morphological structures also have syntactic paraphrases. If we know that, in Koryak, one can say

(1a) *tiqoyanmatekn* ‘I-reindeer-slaughter’,
then we can correctly predict the existence of a sentence like

(1b) *tinmekin qoywge* ‘I-slaughter reindeer.’ (Mithun 1984, 847–848).

Although the term “incorporation” literally means “the inclusion of some object or part of it into the whole”, such inclusion may be less important than the parallelism of constructions and the non-referential status of the incorporated noun. Mithun gives several examples of the so-called “noun stripping” which are seen as a kind of incorporation, although no actual incorporation of an object noun into the verb takes place. Thus, in Tamil, such constructions retain all the features of incorporation (parallel constructions are present, object nouns are not modified by adjectives, numerals, case markers, etc.) but they do not form a unity with the verb, since there may be an emphatic particle between the noun and the verb (Mithun 2000, 920–921).³

This approach to incorporation, however, fails to account for constructions that show some compactness of the object and the verb (closer than the relationship between the other constituents) but have no parallel unincorporated variant. Meanwhile, this is exactly what can be observed in the Gban language (Mande, Niger-Congo), in which the group

¹ In this study, we will confine ourselves to only the object incorporation. Other grammatical and semantic relations that come under the heading of noun incorporation go beyond the scope of this paper.

² This is the translation of “Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts” (1836).

³ Such a kind of relations between verb and noun will be referred to as morphosyntactic compactness in this paper.

“pronominal subject — TAM — object — verb” has significantly greater morphosyntactic compactness than constructions with other syntactic elements (such as nominal subjects, indirect objects, other complements, and adverbs), but there are no parallel constructions (see Zheltov 2020).

“Noun stripping” coined by Mithun has fostered a search for similar phenomena in different languages including those traditionally not associated with incorporation, which brought forth a number of synonymous terms, namely “quasi-incorporation”, “pseudo-incorporation” (Caballero *et al.* 2008, 387), and “weak incorporation” (Plungian 2011, 229).⁴

The phenomenon of pseudo-incorporation has been sufficiently investigated in literature,⁵ especially with regard to the so-called “bare nouns”, i. e. “the nominal structures lacking an article or other overt determiner” (de Swarts 2015, 126). “Bare nouns” occur in a number of languages, including Mandarin Chinese, Hebrew, English, Dutch, Swedish, Spanish, and Romanian (Dahl 2004; de Swarts 2015).

Östen Dahl (2004, 217) gives the following pair of sentences from Swedish that can be treated as parallel constructions with “bare”/definite nouns. The omission of indefinite article *en* in (2b) results in a more general understanding of the sentence as compared to (2a), because the object *häst* is non-specific, non-referential, and cannot be qualified by adjectives, numerals, pronouns, etc. The morphological coalescence does not occur, however, and both the noun and the verb are still separate units:

(2a) *vi har en häst*
‘We have a horse.’

(2b) *vi har häst*
‘We have a horse’, i. e. ‘We are horse-owners.’

A similar pair of examples can be found in English: the lack of the article in (3b) makes the verbal phrase *plays piano* what Frey (2015, 229) refers to as „the combination of a verb with a syntactically not quite complete nominal phrase, which is property-denoting, rather than entity-denoting”. No doubt, the referential status of *piano* in (3a) differs from that in (3b):⁶

(3a) She **plays the piano** every day.

(3b) She **plays piano** and loves to cook.

The examples from Swedish and English have shown that the main point of the discussion about noun incorporation as a cross-linguistic phenomenon boils down to referentiality and argument structure rather than to incorporation as the merging of two elements into one form.

In light of such a new conceptual development of the very notion of noun incorporation, Nadav Asraf (2021, 68), while reflecting on the mechanism of noun incorporation in Ancient Greek, refers to Lehmann’s considerations about somewhat watered-down meanings and definitions of well-established classical linguistic terms and concepts: “The condition of the internal position of the incorporated stem was subsequently dropped. Consequently, it became more difficult to distinguish between incorporation (as a type

⁴ Плунгян В.А. Введение в грамматическую семантику: грамматические значения и грамматические системы языков мира. Москва, Издательство РГГУ, 2011.

⁵ See the collection of papers in Borik, Gehrke (2015).

⁶ For more examples of bare/definite alternations, see de Swarts (2015, 148).

of verbal compounding) and syntactic juxtaposition. <...> *Incorporation now apparently designates any configuration of a verb and a nominal dependent that is more tightly bonded than some other construction that belongs to the same syntactic paradigm*” (Lehmann 2007, 418, the italics are ours).

It is clear enough that the discussion of incorporation has long moved beyond the canonical incorporating languages in search for “structures which express the same kinds of meanings as those expressed by incorporated structures, but which are not true incorporated structures at all” (Carlson 2006, 41). This has brought about the overarching term “semantic incorporation”,⁷ which makes it possible to take into consideration almost any language and, consequently, more and more grammatical categories. Apart from the linguistic tools already mentioned, the category of aspect has also turned out to be relevant in the context of semantic incorporation, in particular, in Hindi and Russian (Mueller-Reichau 2015, 266). Olav Mueller-Reichau (2015, 263–264) analyzes two Russian sentences focusing on the opposition of the perfective (4a) and imperfective (4b) aspect:

(4a) *Krokodil prosto vzjal i s’el čerepaxu.*⁸
‘The crocodile just took and ate the/a (specific) turtle.’

(4b) *Ja, kstati, el čerepaxu, na kuricu poxoža.*
‘I, by the way, have eaten a turtle. Tastes like chicken.’

In ex. (4a), the perfective verb phrase *s’el čerepaxu* refers to the single specific event, with the object being referential and definite, whereas in (4b), the imperfective verb phrase *el čerepaxu*, with its non-referential, non-specific object, has the particular “(general-)factual” reading.⁹

One more significant aspect of incorporation concerns the information structure. As Mithun and Corbett pointed out, “the alternation between incorporated and independent nouns is used pervasively to regulate the flow of information through discourse. Separate nouns tend to be used to focus individual attention on a newsworthy piece of information, such as a significant new participant or a contrast. Information that is already an established part of the scene, predictable, or incidental, may be carried along by an incorporated noun” (Mithun, Corbett 1999, 57). This means that in some languages with syntactically free but pragmatically conditioned word order, the latter may contribute to the set of parameters dealing with semantic incorporation.

Let us consider two Russian constructions with opposite word order from this point of view, ex. (5a, b):

(5a) VO (“What are you doing? / What are you reading?”)
Čitaiu knigu.
‘I am reading a book.’

(5b) OV (“What are you reading?”)
Knigu čitaiu.
‘I am reading the book.’

⁷ See more in Carlson (2006, 37–41).

⁸ We preserve the transliteration as in the article of Mueller-Reichau.

⁹ Actually, the situation of the aspectual choice for rendering such meanings is more complicated, which is thoroughly analyzed by Mueller-Reichau (2015).

In (5a), depending on the question asked, the focus can be either the whole verb phrase *chitaiu knigu* ‘read a book’ (“What are you doing?”) or only the direct object *knigu* ‘book’ (“What are you reading?”), whereas in (5b), the focus is only the direct object (“What are you reading?”). Thus, in Russian, two parallel constructions with different word order but without an object embedded into the verb serve to express the same semantic opposition as parallel constructions in the languages with incorporation as a full-fledged category.¹⁰

The alternation of the constituent order may cause the different readings of the so-called ‘weak definites’ in German. According to Frey (2015),

‘weak definites’ ‘seem to occupy the same position as incorporated indefinites. Consider the following examples:

(50a) *Hans hat gestern intensiv die Zeitung gelesen*
 Hans has yesterday intensively the newspaper read
 ‘Hans read the newspaper intensively yesterday.’

(50b) *Hans hat gestern die Zeitung intensiv gelesen*
 Hans has yesterday the newspaper intensively read.

(50a) has a ‘weak’ reading; this means for example that the sentence allows an interpretation according to which Hans could have read different newspapers although *die Zeitung* is in the singular. In this example *die Zeitung* follows a manner adverbial. In (50b) *die Zeitung* precedes the manner adverbial, and it no longer has a weak reading, i. e. (50b) is not appropriate to describe a situation in which Hans has read more than one newspaper” (Frey 2015, 252–253).

To sum up, languages can be typologized not only as incorporating *vs.* non-incorporating, but in a somewhat more complex way, if one accounts for two criteria, the first one being presented not as an opposition but as a kind of scale:

- 1) full inclusion of an object in a verb / morphosyntactic compactness of an object and a verb / no inclusion or compactness;
- 2) parallel constructions / no parallel constructions.

2. An attempt of a gradual typology of incorporation

The above considerations will be presented as a typological matrix in Table 1.

In this matrix, the true incorporating languages Koryak and Tamil are highlighted in gray. The non-incorporating Russian and Gban show not common but diametrically opposed features: Russian has regular parallel constructions but lacks the morphosyntactic compactness of object and verb, while Gban, on the contrary, always has compactness but no parallel constructions.

¹⁰ Actually, a small closed list of compound verbs with idiomatic meaning containing an incorporated noun is present in Russian (e. g., *rukovodit* ‘lead’, *rukopleskat* ‘applaud’, *zloslovit* ‘malign’, *blagodarit* ‘thank’, *blagovolit* ‘favor’, *bogotvorit* ‘worship’, etc. (Plungian 2011, 228–229). Such verbs, however, do not meet the second necessary criterion of incorporation, *viz.* the presence of parallel constructions: although their etymology is quite transparent, *rukovodit* does not mean ‘lead with one’s hand’, *blagodarit* is not ‘bestow a boon’, and *zloslovit* and *blagovolit* have no parallel paraphrases in the modern language at all. It should also be highlighted that practically all these compounds are examples of indirect rather than direct object incorporation. Therefore, the “strong” object incorporation is not found in Russian.

Table 1. Gradual typology of languages based on two criteria of incorporation (compactness and parallelism)

	Full incorporation of an object in a verb	Morphosyntactic Object–Verb compactness	No incorporation, no Object–Verb compactness
Parallel constructions	Koryak	Tamil	Russian, Swedish, German
No parallel constructions		Gban	

In terms of parallel constructions, this typology can be complemented by at least one more type of relevant phenomena that is found in Bantu languages (Niger-Congo). In the case of pronominal object, it is always indexed in the verb, and its functioning as an independent pronoun is impossible:

Swahili (Bantu, Niger-Congo)

(6) *Ni-na-m-penda* (**Ni-na-penda yeye*) (Zheltoy, field notes)

1SG.SBJ-PRS-3SG.OBJ-love (* 1SG.SBJ-PRS-love 3SG)

‘I love him/her.’

In the case of noun object, it is never incorporated into the verb but may be indexed (7b) or not indexed (7a) in the verb as an object affix of the corresponding noun class:

(7a) *Ni-na-∅-ona m-tu* (Zheltoy, field notes)

1SG.SBJ-PRS-∅-see 1CL-person

‘I see a person,’ ‘I see somebody.’

(7b) *Ni-na-mw-ona m-tu (huyu)*. (Zheltoy, field notes)

1SG.SBJ-PRS-3SG.1CL.OBJ-see 1CL-person (this)

‘I see the (this) person.’

These examples can be considered as an inversion of incorporation: the nominal object may be indexed in a verb only as an anaphoric pronominal affix and is not part of the verb. If it is indexed (7b), the meaning of the object is more referential and specific than in the example without indexation (7a). Verb-indexed languages differ from both incorporating and non-incorporating languages, but have one important feature in common with the former: in the case of nominal object, they may have parallel constructions (with or without pronominal indexation) in which the indexation indicates the (more) referential status of the object, while in the case of pronominal object, its indexation in the verb is the only way to use it, which makes these examples similar to the object constructions in Gban, where the compactness of any direct object is obligatory.

So, what we are getting at here is a kind of typological scale of the languages that differ by the criterion of parallel constructions, the position of each language being strictly motivated:

Gban > Swahili > Koryak/Russian.

In this scale, the left position is occupied by a language with obligatory Noun–Verb compactness but no parallel constructions (Gban), followed by a language with verb indexation (Swahili) and parallel constructions that function in a more complicated way:

the indexation of pronominal objects is obligatory, whereas the indexation of nominal objects is optional and functionally motivated, only the latter having parallel constructions. The third slot is given to both a true incorporating language with a noun embedded in a verb (Koryak) and a language without any Noun–Verb compactness (Russian), both having regular parallel constructions. Surprisingly enough, in this gradual scale, two languages diametrically opposed in terms of the compactness criterion occupy the same slot due to the presence of parallel constructions.

To sum up, we have observed a “macro-typology” of phenomena related to the concept of incorporation but not always treated as true incorporation. This macro-typology accounts for only the basic parameters of incorporation (that is the dominant type of Noun–Verb relations and the parallel syntactic paraphrases) and can be extended on account of a more representative sample of languages.

In what follows, we will consider a “micro-typology” of incorporation that includes not only regular and productive forms but also more particular phenomena, and will try to identify the place of Latin in both macro- and micro-typology of incorporation.

3. Object incorporation in Latin in the context of macro- and micro-typology

Incorporation in Latin and Ancient Greek has already drawn the attention of linguists who investigated this phenomenon in different perspectives and provided a solid ground for moving this topic forward.¹¹

Due to the significant structural proximity of Russian and Latin, one could assume that the latter should occupy a position coinciding with Russian within the framework of macro-typology proposed above. Like Russian, Latin has parallel constructions with the order OV, where the verb together with the object constitute focus (8a), and VO, where only the object is focus (8b).¹² As for the second criterion, *viz.* the morphosyntactic Noun–Verb compactness, it is lacking in Latin, too:

(8a) OV (“What did Ligures do?”)

(sc. Ligures) *deinde, postquam oppidum oppugnatum Romanum cernebant, progressi ante portas **aciem struxerunt.*** (Liv. 42.7.5)

‘After that, when they saw that Roman is about to besiege the fortress, they moved out and **formed the battle-line** in front of the gates.’¹³

(8b) VO (“What did Samnites form?”)

(sc. Samnites) *in medium sarcinas coniciunt; armati suis quisque ordinibus instruunt **aciem.*** (Liv. 10.36.2)

‘They drop their luggage in the centre; having taken their arms, each in their own place in battle order, they formed **the battle-line.**’¹⁴

¹¹ See Fugier 1991, Flobert 1996, Baños Baños 2012, Marini 2015, and Asraf 2021.

¹² It is worth noting that this parallelism demonstrates a reversed word order: in Latin OV shows the focus on both verb and object, and VO shows the focus only on the object while in Russian it is *vice versa*.

¹³ The translations are ours, if not indicated otherwise.

¹⁴ The alternation of OV/VO ordering in Latin depends on a variety of factors, as Spevak (2010) has shown, but in this very case we can refer to Pinkster (2021, 779) who argues that “second arguments can be placed in final position if they are focus” and comments on this passage from Livius as follows: “the formation of a battle-line is the predictable thing to do in a war situation, but in the desperate situation the

Since incorporation as a productive morphosyntactic mechanism is absent in both languages, they should seemingly belong to the same type in the typological matrix presented in Table 1, but a closer look at the peculiarities of Latin word formation in the context of “micro-typology” of incorporation reveals significant differences between Latin and Russian.

Actually, Latin has a limited but not inconsiderable list of words that resemble the true incorporated complexes. This is all the more remarkable because compound words are not characteristic of Latin at all. Most of them are combinations of a noun with the verb *facere*, thus ending in *-ficare/-ficari*, such as *ludificari* ‘mock’, *sacrificare* ‘sacrifice’, *aedificare* ‘construct’, *pacificari* ‘pacify’. Emanuela Marini (2015, 125–130) has analyzed 17 verbs ending in *-ficare/ficari* and distributed them according to the types of incorporating verbs proposed by Mithun. In addition to these, there are also some incorporated complexes with other verbs: *belligerare* ‘wage war’, *curagere* ‘manage’, *animadvertere* ‘pay attention’, *morigerari* ‘please’, *tergiversari* ‘show reluctance’, *vendere* ‘sell’, *mandare* ‘hand over’, *gratulari* ‘thank’, *opitulari* ‘give help’, *manumittere* ‘let go free’.

We will try to apply the criteria mentioned above to these verbs. According to the compactness criterion, they all meet the definition of incorporation, since the object is really embedded in the verb. The second criterion, namely the presence of parallel non-incorporated construction, is relevant not for all of them and allows us to distinguish two groups within this sample.

The first group consists of the true incorporating verbs that definitely have parallel verbo-nominal constructions with the same meaning:¹⁵

ludificari — *ludos facere*,¹⁶
belligerare — *bellum gerere*,
curagere — *curam agere*,
animadvertere — *animum advertere*,
morigerari — *morem gerere*,
vendere — *venum dare*.

Remarkably, these verbs can be used in both finite (9a) and non-finite forms (9b):

(9a) *at enim quid ita solus ego ciuium curam ago?* (Liv. 6.15.11.2)
‘but why am I the only one who cares about the citizens?’

(9b) ...*curagente Calpurnio*... (CIL 15.7241)
‘...by Calpurnius’ efforts...’

The second group contains the verbs for which the existence of parallel verbo-nominal constructions is not so evident. Thus, for the verb *gratulari* only *grates (re)ferre* can be treated as non-incorporated equivalent, in which the verbal component is represented in its suppletive (and sometimes prefixed) form,¹⁷ and therefore, does not fully correspond to the incorporating *gratulari*. The same holds for *opitulari* and its syntactic paraphrase *opem ferre*.

Samnites are in it is a remarkable feat, hence the unusual order, with *aciem* following the verb” (Pinkster 2021, 779).

¹⁵ According to Flobert (1996, 197) and Baños Baños (2012), incorporation is the last stage in the evolution of such verbo-nominal constructions.

¹⁶ The other verbs ending in *-ficare/ficari* also have parallel constructions, see Marini (2015, 125–130).

¹⁷ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.508–509 (*o decus Italiae uirgo, quas dicere grates quasue referre parem?*) and Sil. *Pun.* 16.654 (*dis grates laudemque fero*).

The pair *tergiversari* — *tergum vertere* seems also worth being included in the second group, firstly, because *versari* differs from *vertere* in terms of word formation, and secondly, because the meanings of *tergiversari* and *tergum vertere* are quite different (cf. *tergiversari* ‘show reluctance’ and *tergum vertere* ‘flee, run away’).

Mandare evidently goes back to *manus* + *dare* (Glare 1968,1071) but a parallel construction with the same meaning is not found in Latin.

Finally, in *manumittere*, which obviously has spliced from *manu mittere*, the noun fulfils instrumental rather than object function.¹⁸

Therefore, only the verbs satisfying both criteria can be considered as belonging to the first group.

So, we can see that there is a significant discrepancy between Russian and Latin with respect to the phenomenon of incorporation: in Russian, the “strong” object incorporation is absent, whereas in Latin, despite being non-productive and restricted to a closed list of verbs, it is present. Within this list, the functional distinction between incorporated and non-incorporated object is almost similar to the classical incorporating languages of the Koryak type: the incorporated object is non-referential and non-specific, while its non-incorporated counterpart is referential, modifiable by various modifiers (adjectives, pronouns, etc.), and preserves other features of referential and specific nouns.¹⁹

The general picture of incorporation in Latin seems even more non-trivial in terms of the argument structure, because some Latin incorporating verbs fully correspond to classical incorporation by the criterion of detransitivization of the incorporated complex, while others do not.

The former, for instance, are *belligerare*, *morigerari* and *curagere* which have definitely lost the transitivity of the source verbs, as exemplified in (10–11):

(10a) *Cum Armeniorum rege Tigrane grave bellum nuper ipsi diuturnumque gessimus* (Cic. *Sest.* 58. 8).

‘We ourselves waged a hard and long war with Tigranes, the king of Armenia.’

(10b) *Socii nostri cum belligerare nobiscum vellent...* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.16)

‘Our allies, when they wanted to be at war with us...’

(11a) *Pater nunc intus suo animo morem gerit.* (Plaut. *Amph.* 131)

‘Father is in there pleasuring his soul.’

(11b) *Voluptati autem aurium morigerari debet oratio.* (Cic. *Or.* 160.1)

‘Oratory should serve the ears’ pleasure.’

The latter are *animadvertere*, *ludificari* and some other verbs with *-ficare/ficari*, which continue to behave like transitive verbs, ex. (12–13):

(12a) *Animum advertit Gracchus in contione Pisonem stantem...* (Cic. *Tusc.* 3.48)

‘Gracchus noticed Pison standing in the assembly.’

(12b) *Quid singulorum opinioniones animadvertam?* (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.108)

‘Why should I concern myself with everyone’s opinion?’

(13a) *Rogasne, improbe, etiam, qui ludos facis me?* (Plaut. *Amph.* 571)

‘Do you ask me, you scoundrel who is mocking me?’

¹⁸ Fugier (1991, 88) considers *manumittere* as lexical rather than syntactic incorporation.

¹⁹ In more detail, see Marini (2015, 119).

(13b) *Tun me, verbero, audes erum ludificari?* (Plaut. *Amph.* 565)
 ‘Do you dare, you rascal, to mock me, your master?’

It is worth noting that from the viewpoint of preserving the transitivity of incorporating verb, examples (12–13) are similar to Mandinka language (Mande, Niger-Congo), where incorporation is also characterized by the absence of detransitivization of the complex verb, and this phenomenon is regular.²⁰

Thus, the micro-typology of incorporation which takes into account not only regular and productive forms but also more particular phenomena allows us to place Latin into four categories at once:

1) together with Russian, into the category of languages with parallel constructions but without inclusion of the object into the verb (the majority of verbs);

2) together with Koryak — into the classical incorporating languages with parallel constructions and detransitivisation of the compound verb (*belligerare, morigerari, and curagere*);

3) together with Swahili (in the case of pronominal objects) and similar to Gban — into the category of incorporating languages without parallel syntactic paraphrases (*gratulari, tergiversari, mandare, and some others*);

4) together with Mandinka — into incorporating languages with parallel constructions and transitivity preserved by the compound verb (*animadvertere, ludificari and some other verbs with -ficare/ficari*).

In Table 2, we attempt to present a multidimensional matrix of phenomena that determine the place of a language in the “continuum of incorporation”. In this matrix, Latin occupies four positions, thus allowing us to clarify a number of significant parameters.

Table 2.²¹ Place of Latin in the gradual typology of languages based on the three criteria (compactness, parallelism, and transitivity)

	Inclusion of an object in a verb with detransitivization of the incorporated complex	Inclusion of an object in a verb without detransitivization of the incorporated complex	Morphosyntactic Object–Verb compactness	Object indexing in the verb	No Object–Verb compactness
Parallel constructions	Koryak Latin*	Mandinka Latin*	Tamil	Swahili (for nominal objects)	Russian Latin
No parallel constructions	Swahili (for pronominal objects), Latin*		Gban		

²⁰ See Creissels (2008). This phenomenon is described on a wider sample of the languages in Rosen (1989). She defines noun incorporation (NI) that loses transitivity as compound NI and noun incorporation that retains transitivity as classifier NI.

²¹ Classical incorporating languages are marked in gray, the *sign indicates non-productive (irregular) incorporation in a language.

4. Conclusions

The analysis of object incorporation in the context of its theory and typology has shown that incorporating and non-incorporating languages have a more fractional classification within a relevant type. So, we can return to the sentence which we have used as an epigraph: “*Incorporating*” languages are “*incorporating*” differently, and “*non-incorporating*” languages are “*non-incorporating*” in a different way too. Considering languages from the angle of a multidimensional set of features allows us to observe a certain continuum that is significantly more complex than the binary opposition “incorporating vs. non-incorporating”, and to integrate the Latin language into this continuum. According to macro-typology of incorporation, Latin belongs to non-incorporating languages (together with Russian and many others). According to micro-typology which takes into consideration not only productive phenomena, Latin falls into four different types: 1) together with Russian, into the category of languages with parallel constructions, but without incorporating an object into the verb, 2) together with Koryak — into classical incorporating languages with parallel constructions and detransitivisation of the compound verb, 3) together with Swahili (in the case of pronominal object) and similar to Gban — into the category of languages with compact Object–Verb constructions but without parallel syntactic paraphrases, and 4) together with Mandinka — into incorporating languages with parallel constructions and transitivity preserved by the compound verb.

Whether this matrix is universal for the phenomenon of object incorporation can be proved by applying this approach to a much wider range of linguistic data.

References

- Asraf N. The Mechanism of Noun Incorporation in Ancient Greek. *Glotta* 2021, 97, 36–72.
- Baños Baños J.M. Verbos soporte e incorporación sintáctica en latín: el ejemplo de *ludos facere*. *Revista de Estudios Latinos* 2012, 12, 37–57.
- Borik O., Gehrke B. (eds) *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2015.
- Caballero G., Houser M.J., Marcus N., McFarland T., Pycha A., Toosarvandani M., Nichols J. Nonsyntactic Ordering Effects in Noun Incorporation. *Linguistic Typology* 2008, 12, 383–421.
- Carlson G. The Meaningful Bounds of Incorporation. In: S. Voegeleer, L. Tasmowski (eds). *Non-Definiteness and Plurality*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2006, 35–50.
- Creissels D. L'incorporation en mandinka. In: D. Amiot (ed.). *La composition dans une perspective typologique*. Lille, Artois Presses Université, 2008, 75–88 (The preprint version: <http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-incorp.mand.pdf> (accessed: 20.04.2024)).
- Dahl Ö. *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2004.
- Flobert P. Les verbes support en latin. In: A. Bammesberger, F. Heberlein (eds). *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*. Heidelberg, Winter, 1996, 193–99.
- Frey W. NP-Incorporation in German. In: O. Borik, B. Gehrke (eds). *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2015, 226–261.
- Fugier H. Le verbe latin ‘incorpore’-t-il ses compléments? In: J. Herman (ed.). *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Budapest, 23–27 March 1991*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1994, 75–90.
- Glare P.G.W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. London, Oxford University Press; Clarendon Press, 1968.
- von Humboldt W. *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Translated by P. Heath with an Introduction by H. Aarsleff. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988 [1836].

- Lehmann C. On the Upgrading of Grammatical Concepts. In: F. Moerdijk, A. van Santen, R. Tempelaars (eds). *Leven met woorden: opstellen aangeboden aan Piet van Sterkenburg*. Leiden, Brill, 2007, 409–422.
- Marini E. Les verbes à incorporation de l'objet en latin: essai d'aperçu typologique. In: G. V. M. Haverling (ed.). *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century. Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Uppsala, June 6th–11th, 2011*. Uppsala, Uppsala University, 2015, 116–132.
- Mithun M. The Evolution of Noun Incorporation. *Language* 1984, 60, 847–894.
- Mithun M. Incorporation. In: G. Booij, Ch. Lehmann, J. Mudgan (eds). *Morphologie/Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*. Vol. 1. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2000, 916–928.
- Mithun, M., Corbett G. G. The Effect of Noun Incorporation on Argument Structure. In: L. Mureu (ed.). *Boundaries of Morphology and Syntax*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1999, 49–71.
- Mueller-Reichau O. Pseudo-Incorporation in Russian? Aspectual Competition and Bare Singular Interpretation. In: O. Borik, B. Gehrke (eds). *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2015, 262–295.
- Pinkster H. *Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. 2. The Complex Sentence and Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Plungian V. A. *Introduction to Grammatical Semantics: Grammatical Meanings and Grammatical Systems of the World's Languages*. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo RGGU Publ., 2011 (in Russian).
- Rosen S. T. Two Types of Noun Incorporation: A Lexical Analysis. *Language* 1989, 65, 294–317.
- Sadock J. M. Incorporation. In: K. Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Elsevier, 2006, 584–587.
- Spevak O. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2010.
- de Swarts H. Constructions with and without Articles. In: O. Borik, B. Gehrke (eds). *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2015, 126–158.
- Zheltova A. Incorporation and “Formal Incorporation” in Analytic Languages: Mande Languages and Typology of Incorporation. *Language in Africa*, 2020, 1 (4), 98–114.

Объектная инкорпорация в латинском языке: к вопросу о макро- и микротипологии инкорпорации

Елена Владимировна Желтова

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9;
e.zheltova@spbu.ru, elena.zheltova@mail.ru

Александр Юрьевич Желтов

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9;
a.zheltova@spbu.ru, ajuzhelto@mail.ru

Для цитирования: Zheltova E. V., Zheltov A. Yu. Object Incorporation in Latin: Towards Macro- and Micro-Typology of Incorporation. *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 74–86.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.105>

В статье анализируется латинский язык в контексте типологии объектной инкорпорации. Авторы опираются на исследования Мариан Митун, которая рассматривает инкорпорацию на основе двух необходимых условий: первое, существительное должно быть встроено в глагол, и второе, в языке должны быть параллельные синтаксические парафразы с неинкорпорированными существительными. Второй критерий настолько важен, что феномен инкорпорации признается существующим даже в тех языках, где не наблюдается полное сращение существительного с глаголом, а только определенная компактность, при условии, что есть параллельные конструкции. Последняя разновидность инкорпорации была названа термином “noun stripping” и привела к делению инкорпорации на сильную и слабую. Еще один важный пункт расхождения между инкор-

порирующими языками — это изменение аргументной структуры исходного глагола, а именно, сохранение или утрата переходности в процессе инкорпорации. Принимая во внимание типологические исследования данного феномена в языках различного строя, а также существующие работы по инкорпорации в древних языках, авторы предлагают новую типологию объектной инкорпорации, включая в анализ и те языки, которые ранее не рассматривались в контексте данного явления. Данная типология основана не на строгом противопоставлении инкорпорирующих и не инкорпорирующих языков, а представляет собой некий континуум, в котором место языка зависит от того, демонстрирует ли он: 1) полную инкорпорацию существительного в глагол или только тесное морфосинтаксическое единство существительного и глагола; 2) наличие параллельных синтаксических парафраз; 3) детранзитивизацию результирующего глагольно-именного комплекса. Авторы подробно разбирают каждый критерий применительно к латинскому языку и показывают, какое место он занимает в этой типологии.

Ключевые слова: латинский язык, объектная инкорпорация, макро- и микротипология инкорпорации, аргументная структура, переходность.

Received: 02.03.2024

Accepted: 19.06.2024