

# Types of Complementation: Standard Complementation, Pseudo-Incorporation, Compounding

Veneeta Dayal (Rutgers University)

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 ( $\langle e \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ ), pseudo-incorporated complements are NPs of property type ( $\langle e, t \rangle$ ), nouns inside compounds are Ns denoting kinds ( $\langle e_k \rangle$ ). Using the framework of distributed morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993 and Harley 2012), it looks for a systematic mapping from morpho-syntax to semantics.

## References:

Dayal, V. 2011. Hindi Pseudo-Incorporation. *NLLT* 29.1, 123-167.

Halle, M. and A. Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In: K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 111-176.

Harley, H. 2012. Semantics in Distributed Morphology. In: Maeinborn, von Heusinger and Portner (eds), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*.

Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60: 847–894.

Mithun, Marianne. 1986. On the nature of noun incorporation. *Language* 62: 32–38.