

## De-verbal nominalizations in English – An LMBM approach

Maria Bloch-Trojnar (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin)

Since the publication of the seminal paper by Chomsky (1970) English de-verbal nominalizations have served as a testing ground for various theoretical models, which with varying success attempted to accommodate their systematic as well as idiosyncratic properties and come to grips with the process/result dichotomy. This paper presents an analysis couched in the model of Lexeme Morpheme Base Morphology (LMBM), put forward by Beard (1976, 1995). What differentiates this approach from ‘a structural model’ (e.g. Fu, Roeper and Borer 2001) and an ‘event model’ (Grimshaw 1990), which are currently most influential, is the fact that it endorses the *Separation Hypothesis* which says that there is no direct connection between the side of morphology that deals with morphophonological operations and the side that specifies semantic-syntactic changes. This helps to avoid certain problems and stipulations of morpheme-based approaches (cf. Alexiadou and Grimshaw 2008) in which the properties of nominalizations are partly attributable to the affixes involved. Another characteristic of Beard’s model which sets it apart from other theories and is instrumental in conducting our analysis is that Number in nouns is an inherent morpholexical feature which can be exploited in derivation (Beard 1982). Consequently, it will be argued that de-verbal nominalizations are products of two distinct lexical rules, which neutralize (but not delete) verbal features and differentiate nominalizations in terms of their capacity for expressing number.

Firstly, there is *-ing* suffixation, which produces uncountable nominalizations interpreted as ‘action or process of V-ing’. The second productive way of forming de-verbal nominalizations is zero derivation whose primary function is to form count nominals with the *Nomen Acti* reading, i.e. ‘a single instance of V-ing’. The grammatical specification of a given type of nominalization has ramifications both for its syntactic behaviour and semantic reading. Semantic, formal and grammatical regularity (manifested in terms of possible satellite phrases) coupled with high productivity of *-ing* suffixation are sufficient evidence for regarding it as an exponent of a regular nominalizing process. We shall adduce some evidence put forward by linguists of different persuasions (Brinton 1998, Cetnarowska 1993, Beard 1995, Bloch-Trojnar 2007) for a similar treatment of zero derivatives. Zero derivatives are also highly productive, they can be derived from verbs of all situation types and are capable of inheriting arguments (cf. Cetnarowska 1993). They introduce an element of telicity which is related to their countability (cf. Brinton 1998).

We do not challenge the view that the meaning of action nouns, regardless of the derivational type they belong to, is subject to lexicalization which consists in deleting verbal features and may yield names of material or immaterial results, names of affected objects, causers, instruments, locations.

As nominalizations terminating in *-ment*, *-ation*, *-ance/-ence*, *-al* etc. are products of virtually unproductive rules, their status is different. They are listed in the Permanent Lexicon and can only be described by redundancy statements (Malicka-Kleparska 1988).

- Alexiadou, A. and J. Grimshaw. 2008. Verbs, nouns and affixation. In: Schäfer, F. (ed.) *Working Papers of the SFB 732 Incremental Specification in Context 01 (2008)*: 1-16.
- Beard, R. 1976. A semantically based model of a generative lexical Word-Formation Rule for Russian adjectives. *Language* 52, 108-120.
- Beard, R. 1982. Plural as a lexical derivation. *Glossa* 16, 133-48.
- Beard, R. 1995. *Lexeme Morpheme Base Morphology*. Albany, NY.
- Bloch-Trojnar, M. 2007. Even more remarks on nominalization. In: Stalmaszczyk, P. & Witczak-Plisiecka, I., (eds.), *PASE Studies in Linguistics*. Łódź, 47-56.
- Brinton, L. 1998. Aspectuality and countability: a cross-categorical analogy. *English Language and Linguistics* 2, 37-63.
- Cetnarowska, B. 1993. *The Syntax, Semantics and Derivation of Bare Nominalizations in English*. Katowice.
- Chomsky, N., 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In: Roderick, J. & Rosenbaum, P., eds., *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Waltham, 189-221.

- Fu, J., Roeper, T. and H. Borer. 2001. The VP within process nominals: Evidence from adverbs and the VP anaphor do so. *Natural language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 549-582.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 1993. *Nominalizations*. London.
- Malicka-Kleparska, A. 1988. *Rules and Lexicalizations. Selected English Nominals*. Lublin.