



PSEUDO-INCORPORATED BARE NPs MAY BE DEFINITE:  
THE EFFECT OF EVENT-LEVEL SINGULAR ATOMICITY

- (4) a. ?? zuótiān wǒ kàndào le YÌ Zǔ YÓUPIÀO<sub>i</sub>. jīntiān wǒ qù shōují le yí xià YÓUPIÀO<sub>i</sub>.  
yesterday 1SG see PFV one set stamp today 1SG go collect PFV one ATM.CL<sub>v</sub> stamp  
*Intended: ??‘Yesterday I saw A SET OF STAMPS<sub>i</sub>. Today I did-a-collecting-of THE STAMPS<sub>i</sub>’*

**ANALYSIS.** 1. I propose a DRT-based semantics for PI and show the effect of conditions (i) and (ii) on PI nominal reference. (5a) gives the canonical number-neutral semantics of the PI-*vP* ‘dog-pet’ in (2a). Crucially, a PI-*vP* introduces an unbounded (cumulative or plural atomic) event DR into the universe – represented as  $E$  – with the condition that any sub-event  $e$  of  $E$  corresponds to some  $X$  such that  $X$  is the theme of  $e$  (cf. Krifka’s [1992] *Mapping-to-Object*). Number neutrality on  $X$  follows from this condition.

(5b) shows that, with event-level singularity and atomicity marking in (2b), the canonically cumulative  $E$  in (5a) reduces to a singular atomic  $e$  [condition (i)]. The object DR  $X$  is also promoted into the matrix universe. Finally,  $X$  reduces to a singular  $x$  iff. the singular atomic  $e$  carries a singularity presupposition over its object reference [condition (ii)]: a single stroke of petting is typically done to a single dog. Uniqueness definite type-shifting can apply only if  $X$  can reduce to  $x$ , i.e. if both (i) and (ii) are satisfied.

- (5) a. wǒ mō le gǒu. ‘I petted (one or more) dogs.’  
 $[y E \mid y=\text{SPKR} \wedge y=\text{Ag}(E) \wedge \text{PET}(E) \quad [e \mid \text{PET}(e) \wedge e \leq_E E] \Rightarrow [X \mid \text{DOG}(X) \wedge X=\text{Th}(e) ] ]$   
 b. wǒ mō le yí xià gǒu. ‘I petted the dog [exactly one-stroke-by-the-hand].’  
 $[y E \mid y=\text{SPKR} \wedge y=\text{Ag}(E) \wedge \text{PET}(E) \quad \frac{\wedge \text{ATM}(E) \wedge \#(E)=1}{[e \mid \text{PET}(e) \wedge e \leq_E E] \Rightarrow [X \mid \text{DOG}(X) \wedge X=\text{Th}(e) ] ]}$   
 $\equiv [y e X \mid y=\text{SPKR} \wedge y=\text{Ag}(e) \wedge \text{PET}(e) \quad \wedge \text{ATM}(e) \wedge \#(e)=1 \quad \wedge \text{DOG}(X) \wedge X=\text{Th}(e) ]$   
 $\equiv [y e x \mid y=\text{SPKR} \wedge y=\text{Ag}(e) \wedge \text{PET}(e) \quad \wedge \text{ATM}(e) \wedge \#(e)=1 \quad \wedge \text{DOG}(x) \wedge x=\text{Th}(e) ]$

2. Cross-sentential pragmatic resolution of the PI-BNP  $x$  is now possible because it is definite and in the matrix universe. (6) gives the DRT analysis of this for context (2-2b).

- (6)  $K_1 = [x_1 e_1 \mid \text{DOG}(x_1) \wedge \text{ATM}(x_1) \wedge \#(x_1)=1 \quad \wedge \text{RUN-COME}(e_1) \wedge x_1=\text{Th}(e_1) ]$   
 $K_{1+(2b)} = [x_1 e_1 \mid \text{DOG}(x_1) \wedge \text{ATM}(x_1) \wedge \#(x_1)=1 \quad \wedge \text{RUN-COME}(e_1) \wedge x_1=\text{Th}(e_1) ]$   
 $y e x \mid y=\text{SPKR} \wedge x=x_1 \wedge y=\text{Ag}(e) \wedge \text{PET}(e) \wedge \text{ATM}(e) \wedge \#(e)=1 \wedge \text{DOG}(x) \wedge x=\text{Th}(e) ]$

The identification of  $x$  with  $x_1$  is strengthened by certain discourse features: the anaphoric definite reading of the PI-BNP is strengthened if it is a continuing topic in subsequent utterances, or if there is overt marking of temporal/logical sequence of events (*jiù*), which may be analyzed as event-sequence markers.

**DISCUSSION.** 1. The analysis of the event-dependency of PI nominals in (5a) can be seen as an improvement upon Krifka & Modarresi’s (2016): here number-neutrality is accounted for by appealing to a representational distinction for number/cumulativity, plus a condition that correlates sub-events with instantiations of PI nominal reference, thus eliminating the K&M’s need for new “ $\exists$ ” operator, which is rather contrary to the original DRT’s inclination toward suppressing dedicated quantificational operators.

2. The availability of definiteness in PI-BNPs in cases like (2b) is crucially *not* due to covert raising out of *vP*. The interpretation of BNPs raised out of *vP* (via the *bǎ*-construction) is event-independent: the availability of definiteness is not constrained by event-internal properties.

3. *Pace* Jenks (2018), the data here shows that uniqueness definiteness does not stand in complementary distribution to anaphoric definiteness in the case of Mandarin.

---

**SELECTED REFERENCES.** Borik, O., & Gehrke, B. (Eds.). (2015). The syntax and semantics of pseudo-incorporation. ♦ Cheng, L. L. S., & Sybesma, R. (1999). Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *LI*. ♦ Dayal, V. (2011). Hindi pseudo-incorporation. *NLLT*. ♦ Jenks, P. (2018). Articulated definiteness without articles. *LI*. ♦ Krifka, M. (1992). Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution. *Lexical Matters*. ♦ Krifka, M., & Modarresi, F. (2016). *SALT*. ♦ Modarresi, F. (2014) *Diss.* ♦ Paris, M. C. (2011). Verbal reduplication and verbal classifiers in Chinese. ♦ Rullmann, H., & You, A. (2006). *ms.* ♦ Zhang, N. N. (2017). The Syntax of Event-Internal and Event-External Verbal Classifiers.