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1. Two types of deadjectival nominalizations in S-C

- **Two types of derived nominals in S-C** with respect to the stress pattern: one in which the stress falls on (the last syllable before) the nominalizing suffix ((1a), in further text: **Post-stem Stressed Nominals, PSN**), and the other in which the stress is the same as in the motive word ((1b), **Stem Stressed Nominals, SSN**).

(1) a. opás-n-ost, solidár-n-ost, ljubáz-n-ost, praz-n-ina
   danger-Adj-ost solidar-Adj-ost kind-Ajd-ost empty-Adj-ost
   'danger' 'solidarity' 'kindness' 'emptiness'

b. òpas-n-ost ùče-n-ost ljùbaz-n-ost pràz-n-ost'
   danger-Adj-ost solidar-Adj-ost kind-Ajd-ost empty-Adj-ost
   'dangerousness' 'solidarity' 'kindness' 'emptiness'

- Different semantics: when used for properties of particular persons and objects, i.e. **tropes**, **SSNs are more suitable**, and **PSNs are sometimes out**.

(2) Njegova òpasnost/*opás-n-ost ne dovodi se u pitanje.
   his dangerousness.SSN/PSN not lead Refl in question
   ‘His dangerousness does not come into question.’

- **SSN can only have the trope interpretation, and never the event reading.**
- I take the term *trope* in a slightly narrower sense than that of Moltman, the sense that Villalba (2009) calls a *property*, i.e. ‘a condition an object is in’, a type of predicates that are well paraphrased in English by the construction [being + adjective]. I keep the term *trope*, as the term *property* is loaded with other uses.
- As for the notion of an event, I take it as a non-homogeneous predicate assigned a temporal interval, in the sense of Borer (2005).
- **When the same adjectives derives both a PSN and a SSN**, only **PSNs, and not their SSN counterparts, can denote events**. Evidence follows.
- **PSNs can be modified by adverbials that select for quantized eventualities**, while their SSN counterparts cannot.

(3) a. česta opásnost, nekadašnja rudarska solidárnost
   frequent danger.PSN earlier.Adj miners’ solidarity.PSN
   ‘frequent danger’ ‘miners’ solidarity from the older times’

b. *česta òpasnost, *nekadašnja rudarska sólidarnost
   frequent dangerousness.SSN earlier.Adj miners’ solidarity. SSN

c. *Jovanov-a/-e povremen-a/-e ljùbaznost(-i)
   J.Poss.Sg/Pl occasional.Sg/Pl kindness(es)

d. Jovanov-a/-e povremen-a/-e ljubáznost(-i)
   J.Poss.Sg/Pl occasional.Sg/Pl kindness(es)
   ‘an occasional kindness from/by Jovan’ / ‘occasional kindnesses by/from Jovan’

- **PSNs go well with count quantifiers and modifiers**, receiving the **eventive interpretation** (quantification is over events in which the property denoted by the adjective is instantiated), while with **SSNs these constructions are ungrammatical.**
(4) a. nekoliko Jovanovih ljubáznosti/*ljùbaznosti
   several Jovan’s kindnesses.PSN/kindnesses.SSN
   ‘several events instantiating Jovan’s kindness’
   b. razne opásnosti/*òpasnosti
diverse dangers’/dangerousnesses’
   ‘diverse dangers’

• A subtle intuition: while PSNs can have a generic meaning, referring to a concept, an intensional property, SSNs always seem to imply a bearer of a property, property as instantiated in a particular referent.

(5) a. ta mala ljubáznost, koju niko nije pokazao...
   that little kindness.PSN which nobody Neg.Aux shown
   ‘that little kindness, which nobody manifested’
   b. #ta mala ljùbaznost, koju niko nije pokazao...
   that little kindness.SSN which nobody Neg.Aux shown
   ‘that little kindness, which nobody manifested’

• SSNs never have generic interpretations, while with PSNs, it is always available.

(6) a. Knjìževnost *(ovog teksta) je upitna.
   literariness.SSN this.Gen text-gen is questionable
   ‘the literariness of this text is questionable’
   b. Knjìževnost *(#ovog autora) je upitna.
   literariness.SSN this.Gen author.gen is questionable
   ‘#the literariness of this author is questionable’
   (unless the context makes literariness a natural property of an author)
   c. Knjižévnost (ovog autora) je upitna.
   literature.PSN this.Gen author.Gen is questionable
   ‘the literature (by this author) is questionable’
   d. #Knjižévnost ovog teksta je upitna.
   literariness.SSN this.Gen text.gen is questionable
   ‘#the literature (by this text) is questionable’
   (unless a context is made where certain literature belongs to a certain text)

• PSNs involve many different (stem-specific) suffixes, while all deadjectival SSNs are built by the suffix -ost.

(7) a. knjižévn-ost, dobró-ta, slàv-a, ùmor-∅, bel-ína...
   litera-N good-N glor-N tire-N white-N
   ‘literature’ ‘good(ness)’ ‘glory’ ‘tiredness’ ‘whiteness’
   b. glèdan-ost, zaóstal-ost, sàdašnj-ost, ljùbazn-ost…
   watched-ost retired-ost now.Adj-ost kind-ost
   ‘watchedness’ ‘retiredness’ ‘present’ ‘kindness’

• Adjectival participles (passive and active) only derive SSNs, never PSNs. Semantically, they cover all the types of meanings under discussion.

(8) a. úvređen-ost vs. *uvredén-ost, óčuvan-ost vs. *očuván-ost
   offended-ost.SSN offended-ost.PSN preserved-ost.SSN preserved-ost.PSN
   ‘offendedness’ ‘preservedness’
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b. pósustal-ost vs. *posustál-ost, utihl-ost vs. *utihl-ost
go_awry-ost.SSN go_awry-ost.PSN go_silent-ost.SSN go_silent-ost.PSN
‘awriness’ ‘silence(dness)’

(9) a. (?)ta mala úvređenost, koju niko nije pokazao...
that little offendedness.PSN which nobody Neg.Aux manifested/shown
‘that little kindness, which nobody expressed/showed’

b. (?)ta (krajnja) posústalost, koju niko nije pokazao...
that utter lassitude.PSN which nobody Neg.Aux manifested/shown
‘that little lassitude, which nobody manifested’

• A relatively small subclass of active participles derive SSNs: only those built from unaccusative or middle VPs.

(10)a. u-trnul-ost, oba-mrl-ost
   in-thorn.ActPcl-ost, round-die.ActPcl-ost
‘numbness’ ‘fatigue’, ‘being asleep’, ‘numbness’

b. *u-daril-ost, *ot-peval-ost
   in-hit.ActPcl-ost, of-sing.ActPcl-ost

• The traditional active participle in S-C is rather a subject-oriented participle, which assigns a process or result interpretation of the respective verb to the subject of a transitive or unergative verb, and only a result interpretation to the subject of an unaccusative verb. Only the latter nominalize, and hence only result interpretations are attested on nominalizations of the active participle.

• More neutrally: only those adjectival participles, which can also be used with a copula, with an internal argument as the subject can derive -ost SSNs.

(11)a. Ruka je u-trnula/o-bamrla.
   arm is in-thorn.ActPcl/round-died.ActPcl
   ‘an/the arm is numb’

b. Jovan je pevao (pesmu)
   J Aux sing.ActPcl song
   ‘Jovan sang a/the song.’
   vs.
   *pesma je pevala (the song being the theme)
   song Aux sing.ActPcl int. ‘The song went on.’
   hence:
   *peval-ost
   sing.ActPcl-ost
   int. ‘the property of having sung’ or ‘the property of having been sung’

• As SSNs typically denote properties manifested in particular referents, this suggests that a predication underlies each SSN, or syntactically: SSNs derive from PredPs.

• A detailed analysis of a closely related phenomenon in Slovenian can be found in Marvin (2002). The data discussed here are different from Marvin’s in three ways: 1) she discusses participant-denoting nominalizations, not those denoting the predicate, 2) Marvin only considers nominalizations of participles and 3) the generalizations on the interaction of stress with syntax and semantics of the derived nouns observed in S-C and in Slovene are different in important ways.
2. Analysis

- **PSNs are syntactically simple.** The suffix acts as the head, and the syntactically primitive stem adjoins. By a lexical rule, only the projecting head carries stress, and by a general prosodic rule in S-C, the stress moves one syllable to the left.

\[ \text{(12) } \text{ljúbazn-òst}_N \rightarrow (\text{the second member preserves stress}) \text{ ljúbazn-òst}_N \]

 kind.\text{Adj-}òst

‘kindness’

\[ \text{ljúbazn-òst}_N \rightarrow (\text{the stress moves one place to the left}) \text{ ljúbáznost} \]

- Depending on the higher functional structure that the noun derived in PSNs are syntactically simple. The suffix acts as the head, and the syntactically primitive stem adjoins. By a lexical rule, only the projecting head carries stress, and by a general prosodic rule in S-C, the stress moves one syllable to the left.

\[ \text{(12) projects, it may have a generic meaning (naming the property) or in a referential one, and due to the lack of type restriction – it may refer in the domain of objects or eventualities (according to one’s favorite theory of genericity and referentiality, e.g. Borer 2005, Chierchia 1998, Zamparelli 1995).} \]

- **SSNs derive from full-fledged predications.** The head of PredP is filled by the adjective, which moves there from its base-generated position within AdjP.

\[ \text{(13) a. } [-òst [\text{PredP} [\text{DP Jovan} ] ljúbazan [\text{AdjP ljúbazan}]]] } \]

\[-òst \text{ J kind.\text{Adj kind.\text{Adj}}}

\[ \text{ljúbaznost } (mog prijatelja) \text{ Jovana kindness my.Gen friend.Gen J.Gen} \]

\[ \text{ljúbaznost } \text{Jovanova} \text{ ljúbaznost J.Poss kindness} \]

‘(my friend) Jovan’s kindness’

- As the noun is not capable of assigning Nominative, the subject is assigned genitive, or realized as a possessor.

\[ \text{(14) a. } \text{ljúbaznost kind-òst } \text{Jovan’s kind-}òst \]

‘Jovan’s kindness’

- The noun derived refers to the property denoted by the adjective, as instantiated in the particular predication, matching the definition of a trope.
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- The phonological realization, more precisely, the **stress pattern**, is now different because the **stem is now the lowest projecting head** in the structure.

(15) 1. \([-\text{öst } [\text{PredP}_{\text{DP}} \text{ Jovan} \ {	ext{AdjP}} \text{ ljùbazan} \ [\text{AdjP}_{\text{AdjP}} \text{ ljùbazan}]]] \rightarrow [-\text{öst ljùbazan}]\)

- This captures the empirical **generalization that only** -ost **SSNs are fully productive**: they can be build from any PredP; -ost **PSNs are rather idiosyncratic**: only certain adjectival stems build such nominals, while others wither use different suffixes or do not build PSNs.
- Roy (2010) argues that in French, adjectives can appear in ‘bare’ APs, or in PredPs embedding APs, but only those in PredPs may **undergo nominalization**.
- In S-C, ‘bare’ Adj(P)s also appear with the nominalizing suffix -ost, although not productively.
- PSNs are derived by a truncation of the functional structure of SSNs (more precisely of PredP). Truncation is triggered by a shift in the lexical meaning of the noun.

3. **SSNs built from participles**
- The same basic analysis of SSNs goes for those derived from participles with one small modification. The only difference being that instead of a lexical adjective, there is a VP (more precisely AspP/MoodP) structure of a participle.

(16)a. čit\text{-}\text{an-ost} \quad \text{knjige}

> read.PassPcl-ost \quad \text{book.Gen}

> ‘the popularity of a/the book among readers (its ‘readedness’)’

b. \[\text{ čit\text{-}an- knjiga} \quad \text{Pred'} \quad \text{ čit\text{-}an\text{-}knjiga} \]

- The availability of the verbal projections means **specification of different quantificational and modal components** for the meaning derived, which in turn allows for a **range of different interpretations** instead of only one, available for SSNs with a PSN counterpart.
- Exactly **the restricted meaning of adjectival SSNs is the reason for the emergence of PSNs in the lexicon**. Participial SSNs have a broader range of meanings and no additional form need be derived to express the entire inventory of meanings. In adjectival SSNs, the nominalized structure is far simpler: it is a bare predication. This restricts the denotation of an adjectival SSN to a trope, and
excludes all other readings. Only once this structure is neutralized, as it is done by truncation, nominalizations may have a broader range of meanings.

4. Conclusion

• A phenomenon is presented in which syntax, semantics and phonology interact in a systematic way. Phonological asymmetries pattern with the semantic ones, and I argued that this is all reflected in the underlying syntactic structures. I proposed an analysis following Roy 2009 in taking PredP to be the only available basis for nominalization of adjectival expressions, and proposed a more detailed analysis of the S-C data. The crucial elements were the presence of the PredP and the presence of the verbal functional projections. The analysis captures the phonological asymmetries, and at the same time explains the corresponding semantic effects related to quantization of the denotation of the nominalization, its availability to count quantification, a necessary instantiation of a suitable referent and other observed asymmetries.
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