Remarks on Nominalization
Chomsky on Morphology and the Lexicon

Matthew A. Tucker

Linguistics 105: Morphology
Fall 2012

October 29, 2012
**Administration**

**HWs**
- HW 4 due right now.
- HW 5 posted, on the final project.

**Readings**
- Chomsky (1970) in a few minutes
- for next week: Mohanan (1995) on Hindi incorporation
**Administration**

**HWs**
- HW 4 due right now.
- HW 5 posted, on the final project.

**Readings**
- Chomsky (1970) in a few minutes
- for next week: Mohanan (1995) on Hindi incorporation
HWs

• HW 4 due right now.
• HW 5 posted, on the final project.

Readings

• Chomsky (1970) in a few minutes
• for next week: Mohanan (1995) on Hindi incorporation
HWs

- HW 4 due right now.
- HW 5 posted, on the final project.

Readings

- Chomsky (1970) in a few minutes
- for next week: Mohanan (1995) on Hindi incorporation
1 Context for Remarks

2 Nominalizations: The Data

3 Nominalizations: The Analysis

4 The Beginnings of X’-Theory
The Position of Semantics

Questions

- What is the timing of syntax wrt. semantic interpretation?
- How much of synonymy is encoded in the syntax?

- “Sentences with the identical meaning have the same deep structure.”

- Notice that “identical meaning” can extend to words:

  (1) a. Omar caused Stringer to die.
      b. Omar killed Stringer.

  (2) a. Omar shot Stringer.
      b. Stringer was shot (by Omar).
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More on Generative Semantics

Generative Semantics

Deep structures are the structures of semantic interpretation.

"Interpretive" Semantics

Semantic interpretation is interpretive of the (final) syntactic representation.

- Example: Quantifier raising:

  (3) Every boy built a boat.

  a. "There is one boat such that every boy built it (together)."
  b. "Every boy built a boat by himself."

- Quantifier scope is c-command(?)
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**Observation**

Certain nominalizations have similarities to their underlying verbs.

(4) Hank’s punishing Bobby . . . \(\text{NP}_{\text{agt}} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \text{NP}_{\text{pat}}\)

(5) Hank punished Bobby. \(\text{NP}_{\text{agt}} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \text{NP}_{\text{pat}}\)

**Question**

Are nominalizations formed by transformation of a deep structure?

(6) The peasants’ revolution (worried Buster).

(7) The peasants revolted.
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**Gerunds**

- Term used for various kinds of *non*-finite verb forms.
- Two kinds in English:
  1. Poss-ing: Matt’s rebuilding of the barn took all weekend.
  2. Acc-ing: Matt’s rebuilding the barn took all weekend.

**“Derived” Nominalizations**

- Other nominalizations are a bit more heterogeneous.
- (10) belief, doubt, conversion, permutation, laughter, marriage, construction, actions, activities, trial, residence, qualifications, specifications, revolution …
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Gerundive Nominalizations...

- **... are more productive:**
  1. John’s being easy/difficult to please...
  2. John’s amusing the children with his stories...

- **... are semantically compositional/transparent:**
  3. Mark’s rebuilding the barn took all weekend...
  4. Mark rebuilt the barn...

- **... have verbal syntax.**
  - No nominal elements available:
    5. *Jim’s unmotivated criticizing the book...
    6. *Jim’s three rebuildings the barn...
  - Verbal elements available:
    7. Alan’s having criticized the book...
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### The Data

#### Summary — Derived vs. Gerundive Nmlz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Gerundive</th>
<th>Derived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>transparent</td>
<td>less transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax, I</td>
<td>no adjectives</td>
<td>adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax, II</td>
<td>no numerals</td>
<td>numerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax, III</td>
<td>accusative case</td>
<td><em>of</em> required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax, IV</td>
<td>verbal aspect</td>
<td>no verbal aspect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### The Morphology Can Lie

(25) The farmer’s rebuilding the fence...

(26) The farmer’s rebuilding of the fence...
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Two Possible Analyses

Transformations
A nominal with a related verb is truly *deverbal* — transformations relate even derived nominals to underlying forms.

Enriching the Base
{Some, all} nominalizations are formed by Phrase Structure Rule — there can be no syntactically derived nominal for these forms.

Chomsky’s Position
• Derived nominalizations’ irregularities support the Base solution.
• Gerundive nominalizations could be syntactically derived.
• Question: is this *weak* or *strong* lexicalism?
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**Productivity**
- The nominalization transformation \( Xn \) is *marked* to exclude derived nominalizations.
- Some verbs have both *(rebuild)*.

**Semantics**
- Some syntactic structures are being interpreted *idiomatically*.
- Sometimes very large structures *(kill)*.

**Syntax**
- There are actually two transformations, one for derived and another for gerundive nominalizations.
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Productivity

- Excluded derived nominalizations are simply not listed in the lexicon.
- The productive gerundives are the result of a productive Xn.

Semantics

- Xns do not affect meaning.
- Idiosyncratic meanings are lexically listed.

Syntax

- Derived nominalizations’ part of speech was always N.
- If you’re a gerundive…
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**Structured Feature Sets**

- Lexical items come with subcategorization features *based upon their lexical category*.
- These subcategorization features encode, e.g., whether or not there is a derived nominal.

- *Cf.*, eager and easy; only the former has a derived nominal.

(27)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{eager, A [ __ TP]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{eager, N [ __ TP]}
\end{align*}

(28)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{easy, A [ __ TP]}
\end{align*}
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What about Gerundives?

- Gerundive nominals have nearly identical syntax wrt their underlying verbs.
- Idea: their ability to get a subject (possessor) and object (complement) is not a feature of their lexical category (i.e., being a verb).

Contextual Categories

- Lexical entries can then be underspecified wrt. lexical category.
- Gerundives aren’t derived by Xn, then. Instead,…
- They are roots that can be either verbs or nouns appearing in their nominal context.
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