1 Course description

Nominalizers such as the ubiquitous English suffix -ing have featured prominently in the debate on the division of labor between syntax and the lexicon and have variously been used as arguments against and in favor of assuming a separate module for morphology. For beginning linguists, this topic can therefore provide access to some of the current theoretical frameworks in syntactic and morphological theory that have addressed nominalizations, such as Distributed Morphology or Lexical Functional Grammar.

Nominalizations are interesting because of their syntactic and semantic properties: They often seem to have the ‘internal’ syntax of a verb, but the ‘external syntax of a noun. For example, in both (1) a. and b., ‘the city’ carries the same theta-role (theme), yet it bears different case (acc. in a., gen. in b.):

(1) a. The Romans destroyed the city.
    b. The Romans’ destruction of the city.

A central part of the course will be to discuss in what relation nominalizations such as destruction in (1) b. stands to verbs like destroy. Taking English cases like (1) as the starting point, this course will provide an overview of the types of nominalizations found cross-linguistically, as well as to introduce their syntactic properties (case and θ-role assignment, subordination etc.). Another goal is to make students aware of the cross-linguistic constants of different types of nominalizations and familiarize them with comparing data from different unrelated languages, such as Chol, Sakha, and Latin. Furthermore, students will be required to read the theoretical literature concerned with the role nominalizations play in different approaches to syntactic theory. This will introduce them to theoretical debates in current syntactic theory, but also familiarize them with relating linguistic data to particular theoretical questions.

2 Requirements

- Attendance & participation 20%
- Five problem sets 30%
- Presentation 20%
- Final squib 30%
The problem sets will be based on the readings and the linguistic data discussed in class. The papers will be made available on the course website and should be read in the order given on the syllabus. Each student is expected to give a 15-20 min. presentation of one of the articles on the reading list. The final squib should not be longer than 3-5 pages and expound on a topic discussed in class. It can also be based on the students’ own research.

3 Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction: Nominalizations, nominals, argument structure</td>
<td>Grimshaw 1990 ch. 1 &amp; 2; Alexiadou 2010a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The lexicon/syntax debate</td>
<td>Alexiadou 2010b; Chomsky 1970; Marantz 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Types of nominalizations I: Event nominalizations</td>
<td>Alexiadou et al. 2007, pp. 495-540; Harley 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Types of nominalizations II: Agent nominals, nominal compounds</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Vinokurova 2009, Borer 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Case in nominalizations, ergativity</td>
<td>Alexiadou 2001, ch. 5;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nominalization as subordination strategy</td>
<td>Baker 2011, Cole &amp; Hermon 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Readings


