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This talk takes as its starting point, the following two observations:

Observation 1 (Dayal 2011): Noun phrases which are “singular” or “non-plural” are uniformly unacceptable as standard complements of collective predicates like “collect” and “compare”. They are uniformly acceptable in compounding. They yield different results in pseudo-incorporation. They are acceptable with “collect” but not with “compare”.

Observation 2 (Mithun 1984, 86): The noun-verb relation in compounding must denote an “institutionalized” activity. This holds to a significant degree also of pseudo-incorporation, but obviously not of standard complementation.

It investigates the possibility that the variations at issue reside in the semantic type of the complement: standard complements are DPs/NPs of argumental type (\(<e> or \(<<e,t>,t>\)), pseudo-incorporated complements are NPs of property type (\(<e,t>\)), nouns inside compounds are Ns denoting kinds (\(<e_k>\)). Using the framework of distributed morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993 and Harley 2012), it looks for a systematic mapping from morpho-syntax to semantics.
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