

What can the semantics of number tell us about the syntax of pseudo-incorporation?

Veneeta Dayal

Pseudo-incorporation $r(V+NP$ rather than $V+N$) has been taken to be sensitive to plural marking, but not to singular marking, on the NP. That is, $V+NP$ -plural is taken to involve relations to pluralities while $V+NP$ -singular is taken to involve relations to atomic entities or to pluralities. On the basis of evidence from Hindi and Hungarian, I show that $V+NP$ -singular involves relations only to atomic entities. The effect of plurality arises from interaction with aspectual information.

There are two syntactic questions this claim gives rise to, both having to do with a 3-way distinction among indefinite arguments: complements of regular transitive verbs, complements of incorporating transitive verbs and complements of compounding verbs. The first question is whether this three-way distinction corresponds to the DP-NumP-NP distinction. The second question concerns the position of complements in syntactic structure.