D and N are different nominalizers

Gianina Iordăchioaia
University of Stuttgart
gianina@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

This paper argues for a split between NP and DP from the perspective of derivational morphology, by looking at deverbal nominals. The NP-DPsplit is challenged not only by competing frameworks or theories that argue, e.g., that NPs, and not DPs, are selected. Another challenge comes from derivational theories as in Borer (2013), which refuse to recognize the possibly covert 'lexical' categorizers n(oun)/ v(erb)/ a(djective) (as in Distributed Morphology: Marantz 2001, Panagiotidis 2011) and posit instead overt functional categorizers like Classifier and especially D for nominalizations. In this latter trend, it is the NP/nP (not the DP) whose existence is questioned. This paper argues in favor of 'lexical' categorizers like n/N and for D as a necessary but 'exceptional' nominalizer. I will show that the difference between fully nominalized constructions such as the nominal gerund in English (1a) and those that, in spite of a nominal distribution, heavily resemble their base category (see the verbal gerund in (1b)) is best accounted for by analyzing the former as nominalizations by n/N, and the latter as lacking n and being nominalized by D.

(1) a. *Mary's/the/that **slow**/***slowly** reading <u>of the book</u>*   nominal gerund
    b. *Mary's/*the/*that **slowly**/***slow** reading <u>the book</u>*   verbal gerund

While this idea is reminiscent of Abney (1987), the contribution of this paper is twofold. First, I bring crosslinguistic evidence in favor of a well-defined syntactic domain (i.e., TP), which n cannot nominalize anymore – only D can – and show how Pesetsky & Torrego's (2007) insights on Agree can account for this contrast. Second, while both nominalizations take determiners, I will show that those whose D is a nominalizer impose language-specific restrictions on the lexicalization of D, which allow semantic correlations with Chierchia's (1984) insights on nominalizing operators. In a nutshell, the crucial difference between the two nominalization types lies in the nominal properties in (1a) and the verbal ones in (1b), as reflected by adjectival and adverbial modifiers, respectively. Since in nominalizations such as in (1a) nP is available, feature valuation as in Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) is possible for all determiners under D. In the pattern of (1b), nP is not available, so the determiner under D cannot value its features and will receive a default specification, which is only compatible with particular overt items: the possessive in English as in (1b) and the definite determiner in Spanish, Romanian and German.

References: • Abney, S. P. 1987. *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect.* PhD Thesis, MIT • Borer, H. 2013. *Taking form.* Oxford: Oxford University Press • Chierchia, G. 1984. *Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds.* PhD Thesis. Amherst: University of Massachusetts • Marantz, A. 2001. Words. WCCFL 20 Handout, USC, February 2011 • Panagiotidis, P. 2011. Categorial features and categorizers. *The Linguistic Review* 28. 325–346 • Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian & W. K. Wilkins, *Phrasal and clausal architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation,* 262–194. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.