Pseudo-incorporation as sub-event kind formation

This study argues that Turkish pseudo-incorporated (PI-ed) bare singulars yield sub-event kinds in line with Dayal 2011, but as singular kind arguments introduced at the event kind domain instead of properties (of type \(<e,t>\) modifying the verb, contrasting with it and other analyses where they are treated as properties (e.g. van Geenhoven 1998, Farkas & de Swart 2003). This way, their (non-canonical) syntactic argument status is reflected semantically, as well as keeping them separate from canonical arguments which are introduced at the event token domain (cf. McNally & Espinal 2011).

**Data** PI-ed bare singulars differ from canonical arguments, e.g. definites, quantified expressions, etc., in forming a unit with the verb immediately preceding it and not receiving case marking (Öztürk 2005) (1a). So, they are unable to undergo case-driven movements like passivization. However, they can still be considered as syntactic arguments as the occurrence of an extra object with the same thematic role (1b) and the assignment of case marking associated with direct objects to other arguments are blocked (see Öztürk 2005). (Cf. with Chamorro where theme-doubling is possible, Chung & Ladusaw 2004).

   Ali book read-PAST  
   ‘Ali did book-reading.’ (one or more books) 

   b. *Ali Savaş ve Barış(-t) kitap oku-du. 

   ‘Ali war and Peace-ACC book read-PAST’

Number neutrality, non-referentiality, and obligatory narrow scope are the hallmarks of PI, which, in this analysis, will be captured in different ways than the property analyses.

**Singular Kinds** Bare plurals are kinds so they can combine with kind-level predicates: Dinazor-lar 66 milyon yıl önce yok oldu. ‘Dinosaur-s became extinct 66 million years ago.’ As in English (Chierchia 1998, cf. Carlson 1977), plural kinds are derived by nom, i.e.: \(\lambda P_{<e,t>}, \lambda S \in [P_{<e,t>} (S)]\), and in object-level contexts, they undergo pred which returns their instantiation sets in a given s, i.e.: \(\lambda k_{<e,t>}, \lambda x [x \leq k]\). In episodic contexts, bare plurals are defined by covert type shifting via iota (Turkish lacks an overt definite D) or narrow scope existentials by Derived Kind Predication (DKP) which, drawing on pred, repairs sort mismatch by introducing \(\exists\)-quantification: Kedi-ler çiftleşiyor. ‘(The) Cat-s are mating.’ They are number neutral as in English; the multiplicity reading disappears in downward entailing contexts and questions. Bare singulars are also kinds and they can combine with kind-level predicates: Dinazor 66 milyon yıl önce yok ol-du. ‘The dinosaur became extinct 66 million years ago.’ However, they are only interpreted as definite and singular in episodic contexts: Kedi çiftleşiyor. ‘The cat is mating.’ This would not be expected if they were number neutral as claimed in Bale at al. 2010. Like plural kinds, they would be derived by nom, and in episodic contexts they would get existential readings by DKP. Plus, since bare plurals are number neutral, the singularity of bare singulars cannot be reduced to a competition story. Instead, they are like definite singular kinds of English (Dayal 2004). Dayal claims that common nouns are ambiguous in denoting properties of ordinary individuals and properties of (sub-)kinds (taxonomic). E.g. the noun cat denotes an atomic set of cats, and in a taxonomic domain it denotes a singleton set containing the unique cat-kind. The singular definite interpretation of bare singulars is derived by the combination of the former with iota, whereas singular kinds are derived by the combination of the latter with iota: \(X [P_{<e,t>} (X)]\), (X and P_t range over taxonomic entities and properties). Singular kinds are conceptually plural associated with the same set of instantiations as plural kinds, but grammatically they are impure atomic like groups. Since they are non-transparent to instantiations, pred (or Carlson’s R) and DKP are unavailable, so they lack narrow scope existential readings. They can only occur with object-level predicates if they refer to the species as a representative object. The impure atomicity is further evidenced by their incompatibility with reciprocals and distributive predicates like come from different areas requiring access to the atomic level (Schwarzschild 1996 for groups).

**PI-ed bare singulars** are singular kinds, supported by the following facts, which could not be fully captured if they denoted properties of type \(<e,t>\): (i) They are interpreted number neutrally although their property denotation is atomic.¹ (ii) Modification is incompatible with them (requiring indefinites or plurals) (2a) unless it operates at the taxonomic domain, establishing a sub-kind of the bare singular (2b). (2a is good if old refers to ancient kinds of books.) This is because singular kinds are built on taxonomic properties, not ones of ordinary objects, and they are impure atomic terms which cannot be type-shifted into sets of instantiations suitable for modification at the ordinary object level.

¹ If old refers to ancient kinds of books, this is because singular kinds are built on taxonomic properties, not ones of ordinary objects, and they are impure atomic terms which cannot be type-shifted into sets of instantiations suitable for modification at the ordinary object level.
Implications

This study is inspired by the analysis of weak definites of English (e.g. *Lola is reading the newspaper*) in Aguilar-Guevara & Zwarts 2010 where they are argued to be singular kinds, having the same properties as PI in Turkish (cf. Schwarz 2014). This and PI in other languages can alternatively be considered within our proposal, though it comes with a generality problem: Some of these are restricted in various ways contrasting with the highly productive one in Turkish (e.g. in English stereotypical functions with a limited set of nouns). This issue is also a problem for the previous analyses and can be explained by positing language-specific lexical rules as already proposed in them.

Dayal argues that atelicity is the reason for neutrality. Though in telic contexts singularity is more salient in our case, it is not necessitated.

Caseless indefinites with *bir ‘one’* are not considered as PI in the semantic terms adopted here.