



EDITORS' PREFACE

This thematic issue on nominalisations contains selected papers from the 9th JENom workshop, which took place on 17th–18th June 2021. The workshop series was initiated in France, which explains the French acronym JENom from *Journées d'Études sur les Nominalisations*. The previous eight editions took place in Nancy, Lille, Paris, Stuttgart, Barcelona, Verona, and Fribourg. Because of the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the ninth edition of the workshop was held online and was jointly organised by two Polish universities: the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin and the University of Silesia in Katowice.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, deverbal nominalisations can be thought of as a hybrid category, exhibiting properties of underived nouns and verbs (Koptievs-kaja-Tamm). Differences can be observed in the ways researchers draw the boundaries between particular types of deverbal nominals. The mixed behaviour of event nominals situates them on a cline between purely non-finite categories such as infinitives and gerunds, on the one hand, and referential nominals, on the other. Since the publication of Chomsky's "Remarks on nominalisation", the derivation and internal structure of deverbal nominalisations have been hotly debated and have served as a testing ground for various theoretical approaches. Grimshaw's seminal monograph instigated research into the realisation of Argument Structure (AS) and Event Structure in deverbal nominalisations and continues to hold interest, especially in syntax-oriented models of morphology (Borer; Alexiadou, *Functional Structure*; Harley). Grimshaw proposed a tripartite division into result nominals (R-nominals), simple event nominals (SE-nominals), and complex event nominals (CE-nominals). Only CE-nominals, also referred to in other approaches as Argument Supporting nominals (AS-nominals), are analysable in terms of aspectual distinctions and have an associated argument structure like verbs. SE-nominals, like CE-nominals, have event implications and preclude contexts typical of concrete objects, in which R-nominals are attested. Despite eventive semantics, they are not associated with an Event Structure and hence lack Argument Structure, which is substantiated

by their inability to license event-related PPs and the potential for plural marking. Non-eventive R-nominals, which also lack an associated argument structure and behave like non-derived nouns, show a variety of interpretations, with the product or result of the event denoted by the base verb being most common. Linguists have not yet forged a consensus regarding the interactions of the layers of structure responsible for AS-licensing, aspectual characteristics and purely verbalising layers. For example, Borer conflates the categories of R-nominals and SE-nominals under a common label of R(eferential)-nominals, and crucially binds the licensing of Argument Structure with the presence of the AspP layer. However, Alexiadou (“On the Complex Relationship”) demonstrates that internal argument licensing need not follow from the presence of the AspP projection in the structure (see Bloch-Trojnar for similar findings). Sleeman and Brito argue that we need to distinguish more “nouny” and more “verbal” CE-/AS-nominals. Despite extensive research and robust literature, basic distinctions remain far from settled, and the nature of the V-to-N category switch is not yet fully understood (Alexiadou and Borer).

The ninth edition of the JENom workshop provided a platform for discussion of the most recent developments in the area of nominalisations, with special emphasis on their aspectual and argument-licensing properties, semantics, and interactions with compounding. The papers contained in this issue, entitled ‘Eventive and non-eventive nominalisations in a cross-linguistic perspective’, address the above-mentioned problems from different angles, including the syntax-based neo-constructive approach, the constructionist vantage point, as well as the lexicalist perspective. On the one hand, the contributions redress the balance between the continued focus on Argument structure/Aspect realisation in nominalisations and semantic considerations, and on the other cast new light on these issues in compounding. Argument structure and Aspect realisation in deverbal nominals feature prominently in the papers by Xabier Artiagoitia and Anna Malicka-Kleparska, whereas Maria Rosenberg’s paper, as well as that by Furkan Dikmen and Ömer Demirok, address AS-licensing potential in compounds. The semantic characteristics of nominals and of compounds headed by deverbal nouns are discussed in the papers by Maria Bloch-Trojnar, Pius ten Hacken, Sven Kotowski, Viktoria Schneider and Lea Kawaletz, as well as by Bożena Cetnarowska.

Xabier Artiagoitia, in “Functional Heads and Eventive Nominals: the Basque Perspective”, proposes structures of eventive nominals and nominalised clauses which reflect their distributional and case-licensing characteristics. Derived event nominals, which do not represent the core vocabulary of Basque, have limited verbal structure incorporating vP and defective VoiceP accounting for their limited eventive reading, inability to license adverbial modification and genitive case marking on both the external and internal argument, a feature peculiar to Basque. Nominalised

clauses, which are a general and unrestricted form of nominalisation, systematically allow an event reading and admit all kinds of adverbial and PP modification, as well as regular subject case-marking. This cluster of properties is reflected in their functional structure: DP-TP-(NegP)-AspP-VoiceP-vP-root. The Author concludes that Basque is an ergative-absolutive language at the sentence level, but has a neutralised case system noun-phrase internally.

Maria Bloch-Trojnar, in “The Structure of R-nominals in *-nie/-cie* in Polish and the Factors Conditioning Their Emergence”, looks into the functional make-up of referential nominals that contain aspectual markers in addition to a theme element, which is an indicator of the verbalising layer. The proposed analysis envisages a multi-layered aspectual projection of inner aspect in their structure, and dissociates the licensing of the internal argument from the presence of verbalising morphology or the presence of the inner aspect projection. The licensing of the full argumental complex follows from the presence of the projection of viewpoint aspect which is missing in R-nominals. The verbalising layer in the structure of R-nominals accounts for the availability of simple event reading alongside a concrete interpretation. Stem-based R-nominals are pre-empted by root-based R-nominals.

In her paper entitled “The Interaction of Nominalisation and Compounding in Polish: On the Analysis of *listonosz* ‘mail carrier’ and *korkociąg* ‘corkscrew’ in Construction Morphology”, Bożena Cetnarowska deals with interfixal-paradigmatic formations in Polish, which are generally treated as exocentric compounds on account of the fact that the right-hand verbal stem does not occur as an independent noun. The Author points to semantic parallels in the range of meanings exhibited by the structures in question and that of nouns derived by means of V-to-N conversion. Furthermore, the interfixal-paradigmatic formations in question are demonstrated to differ significantly from exocentric compounds in which the verb stem stands in the initial position. In the proposed analysis, couched in the model of Construction Morphology, the right-hand verb stems are assumed to have undergone conversion into nouns. This is formally captured by resorting to the unification of schemas, i.e. the conflation of the operations of compounding and conversion. The Polish data provide additional support for the phenomenon of “embedded productivity” (Booij), whereby unification boosts the productivity of certain subschemas.

Furkan Dikmen and Ömer Demirok, in “Compounding with a Polymorphic Deverbalizer in Turkish”, observe that compounds with deverbal heads bearing the suffix *-Im* in Turkish are ambiguous between event descriptions (as in *home building*) and predicates of individuals (as in *home-made*), which they attribute to affix polymy. In both functions, the affix scopes over the verb with the Theme argument. The presence of the internal argument in nominal compounds is supported by the fact that the head nouns can be related to transitive and unaccusative verbs to the

exclusion of unergatives. Structures headed by *-Im*_{relative} result in kind-level modifiers whose compositional semantics differs significantly from predicates generated by standard relativisation.

Pius ten Hacken, in “The Meaning of Nominalization”, considers deverbal and deadjectival nominalisations through the optics of Jackendoff’s Parallel Architecture (PA) with the proviso that grammar includes a separate word formation component. In this approach, only the rules that change conceptual structure are part and parcel of the word formation component, to the effect that transpositions are ruled out. The Author discusses cases where a Dutch noun is ambiguous between a transpositional and a meaning-changing interpretation (e.g. *vertaling* ‘action of translating, translation’, *hoogte* ‘height, elevation’). He argues that there is a word formation rule that produces the second (meaning-changing) reading on the basis of the first, and that such a rule falls within the typology of rules for modifying representations in PA. The rule in question changes the conceptual structure in a uniform way, but its individual applications are subject to onomasiological coercion, which accounts for concomitant idiosyncrasies.

Sven Kotowski, Viktoria Schneider and Lea Kawaletz, in “Eventualities in Nominalisation Semantics: The Case of Denominal *-ment*-formations”, put a challenging problem on the table—that of the most appropriate way to analyse English *-ment* nominals whose bases are non-eventive nouns. It is generally assumed that the verbal base is the source of eventuality-related semantics. The Authors develop an analysis in the frame-semantic approach, in which nominalising semantics has the potential to induce referential shifts on base structures. Employing frame-based deep decomposition, they identify the location of the eventuality within the semantic structure of two types of nominal bases, i.e. eventuality-denoting psych nouns and person-denoting attitudinal nouns.

Anna Malicka-Kleparska, in “Derivation of Nominals Corresponding to Object Experiencer Verbs in *roz-* in Polish”, points to striking morpho-syntactic and semantic parallels between the passive participles of Object Experiencer Verbs with the prefix *roz-* and the corresponding nominals, and proposes that they share a significant part of their morpho-syntactic structure. Namely, both categories show properties of Kimian states, license the same arguments and share morphological structure, with the exception of purely inflectional markers. This paper highlights disparate problems for analyses deriving *roz-* psychological nominals from active forms of Object Experiencer Verbs, Subject Experiencer Verbs or bare roots, one of them being the violation of the *Aspect Preservation Hypothesis* put forward by Fábregas and Marín.

Maria Rosenberg, in “Action Nominal Constructions and their Use in a Swedish COVID-19 Corpus”, conducts a lexeme-based investigation of action nominal constructions (ANCs) representing compounding and the phrasal type in Swedish.

The approach is innovative in that it studies Swedish ANCs in use. The analysis focuses on the expression of arguments and addresses issues of frequency, productivity and competition. The Author argues for a cline ranging from morphological formations such as primary compounds, deverbal compounds and compounding ANCs, to syntactic formations, i.e. phrasal ANCs.

We would like to express our gratitude to the Authors for their insightful contributions and their willing response to editorial comments and suggestions. Likewise, we would like to thank the reviewers who graciously shared their expertise, and without whom this project could not have come to fruition. We sincerely hope that this volume will mark another step on the way to a deeper understanding of eventive and non-eventive nominal structures.

Maria Bloch-Trojnar, Bożena Cetnarowska and Anna Malicka-Kleparska

WORKS CITED

- Alexiadou, Artemis. *Functional Structure in Nominals: Nominalization and Ergativity*. John Benjamins, 2001.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. "On the Complex Relationship between Deverbal Compounds and Argument Supporting Nominals." *Aspect and Valency in Nominals*, edited by Maria Bloch-Trojnar and Anna Malicka-Kleparska, Mouton de Gruyter, 2017, pp. 53–82.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Hagit Borer, editors. *Nominalization: 50 Years on from Chomsky's Remarks*. Oxford UP, 2020.
- Bloch-Trojnar, Maria. "Simple Event Nominals with Argument Structure? – Evidence from Irish Deverbal Nominalizations." *Journal of Word Formation*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2020, pp. 143–63.
- Booij, Geert. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford UP, 2010.
- Borer, Hagit. *Structuring Sense I: In Name Only*. Oxford UP, 2005.
- Borer, Hagit. *Structuring Sense II: The Normal Course of Events*. Oxford UP, 2005.
- Chomsky, Noam. "Remarks on Nominalization." *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, edited by Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, Ginn and Company, 1970, pp. 184–221.
- Fábregas, Antonio, and Rafael Marín. "The Role of Aktionsart in Deverbal Nouns: State Nominalizations Across Languages." *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2012, pp. 35–70.
- Grimshaw, Jane. *Argument Structure*. MIT Press, 1990.
- Harley, Heidi. "The Morphology of Nominalizations and the Syntax of vP." *Quantification, Definiteness and Nominalization*, edited by Anastasia Giannakidou and Monika Rathert, Oxford UP, 2009, pp. 321–43.
- Jackendoff, Ray. *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. Oxford UP, 2002.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. *Nominalizations*. Routledge, 1993.
- Sleeman, Petra, and Ana Maria Brito. "Aspect and Argument Structure of Deverbal Nominalizations: A Split vP Analysis." *The Syntax of Nominalizations across Languages and Frameworks*, edited by Artemis Alexiadou and Monica Rathert, Mouton de Gruyter, 2010, pp. 199–217.