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1 Introduction

• A common piece of generative wisdom: noun phrases resemble sentences in nontrivial ways (Lees 1963 and much subsequent work)

(1) a.John's eagerness to please
b. John's refusal of the offer
c. John's criticism of the book
d. John criticized the book
(2) a. John is eager to please.
b. John has refused the offer.
c. John criticized the book.

• Chomsky's (1970) X'-theory succeeded in capturing this parallelism by positing a single uniform structure for all phrases, regardless of their category.

• The adoption of X'-theory, of course, also led to the postulation of various functional heads: T in the clausal domain (Stowell 1981:67f.) and D in the nominal domain (Abney 1987:21–25 et passim).

• More recently, work on the double object and other constructions has led to a further elaboration of clausal structure: a functional head, v, between V and T (Larson 1988, Hale and Keyser 1993, Kratzer 1996).

⇒ Given the parallelism between sentences and noun phrases, is it possible that v, too, has a counterpart in the noun phrase?

• Northern Paiute—a Uto-Aztecan language of the Numic branch spoken across the Great Basin—has an inventory of several deverbal nominalizers (Toosarvandani 2010).

• Two of these, -dü and -na, have a particular distribution:

(3) a. Nüü ika kutsu patsa-dü yahu.'1SG.NOM DEM.ACC cow kill-NMZ talk.DUR
‘I am talking to the cow killer.’ (elicitation, EM, BP14-2-s3)
b. Su mogo'ni ka na-diika-dü natuüma-wninü-si... DEF.NOM woman DEF.ACC PASS-eat-NMZ take.away-IMPF-SEQ
‘The woman took away the food...’ (elicitation, EM, BP31-5-s60)

(4) a. Grace saa-na ne-hu.
cook-NMZ burn-PUNC
‘What Grace cooked burned.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-9-s19)
b. Uṣu pū-kuba uskatii-čai-na yaisi oo-tu patsa-u.
DELMON 3SG-LOC 3SG.ACC=Sit-IMPF-NMZ PTC there-LOC kill-PUNC
‘The one he was riding.’ (Porcupine) killed there.’ (narrative, Thomnes 2003:478)

• They are both 'clausal nominalizers': they create noun phrases with the internal structure of a verb phrase, just like gerunds in English.

• But, they pick out the PARTICIPANTS in the event described by the verb, not just the event itself:

– The SUBJECT NOMINALIZER -dü creates nominalizations that describe individuals that would be the subject of the verb if it appeared in its own clause.

– The NONSUBJECT NOMINALIZER -na, in contrast, creates nominalizations that describe the individuals that would bear some nonsubject grammatical relation, such as direct object.

• I only know of two other languages with such participant clausal nominalizers: Badiaranke, a Niger-Congo language of Senegal and Guinea (Rebecca Cover, personal communication) and Turkish (Underhill 1972, Hankamer and Knecht 1976, Kornflit 1997:57–67).

• Other subject-nonsubject asymmetries, such as the that-trace effect, involve syntactic alternations that are conditioned by extraction.

• This asymmetry in Northern Paiute involves neither a syntactic alternation nor extraction — just two different lexical items.

⇒ Why are there two such lexical items with this division of labor?

• I propose that both nominalizers in Northern Paiute are realizations of a functional category, n, located between D and N in the extended nominal projection.


⇒ I argue that n, when it is realized as one of the nominalizers -dü or -na takes a VP as its complement.

• The complimentary functions of the two Northern Paiute nominalizers arise from a difference in their syntax.

⇒ While -na projects a specifier to which it assigns the agent theta-role, -dü does not project a specifier at all.

• By identifying two different types of n, we strengthen its resemblance to v, which is commonly taken to come in (at least) two different 'flavors': one that introduces an external argument and another, found in unaccusative and passive predicates, that does not.

• In the rest of this talk, I will

1. give some background on case in Northern Paiute;
2. lay out my proposal for the syntax of the two deverbal nominalizers;
3. demonstrate how this yields their complimentary functions;
4. show how the Northern Paiute nominalizers are also able to derive certain kinds of event-denoting nominalizations; and,
5. sketch the beginnings of a typology of clausal deverbal nominalizers.

1
2 Case in Northern Paiute

2.1 Case on determiners

• Northern Paiute has demonstrative and definite determiners. Both inflect for nominative and accusative case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMONSTRATIVE</th>
<th>DEFINITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>isu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>isu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>massa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• For the definite determiners, the nominative determiner appears in subjects, and the accusative determiner shows up in objects, whether they are patients (5a) or recipients (6b), as well as in the objects of postpositions (6c):

(5) a. Su nana dua wadzi-mia.
DEF.NOM man son hide-go
‘The man’s son ran away.’ (elicitation, MS, BP32-2-s6)

b. Su naatsi’ti biino’o ka tis=doogga haanü.
DEF.NOM boy PTC DEF.ACC.REFL=dog scold
‘The boy is scolding his dog...’ (prompted narrative, MS, BP24-1-t3)

(6) a. Yaisi ka baa’a ma puni=ggwüni.
PTC DEF.ACC water there see-CONT
‘Then he’s standing there looking at the water.’ (prompted narrative, MS, BP24-1-t3)

b. Nüü ka tübbi ka nana kia.
1SG.NOM DEF.ACC rock DEF.ACC man give
‘I gave the rock to the man.’ (elicitation, MS, BP12-4-s-45)

c. ... ka üdíidií üjüpi mno usmabina-hu-si.
DEF.ACC hot dirt-with 3SG.ACC=bury-PUNC=SEQ
‘...then you bury it with the hot dirt.’ (procedural text, MS, BP13-4-s9)

• I assume that accusative case on the object is licensed in the usual way, by the main verb (v under more current assumptions) or a postposition.

2.2 Case on pronouns

• The same nominative-accusative case distinction exists in the pronominal paradigm:

| NOMINATIVE  | ACCUSATIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg.</td>
<td>ni=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg.</td>
<td>u=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg.</td>
<td>u=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1dl.</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta (taka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl. incl.</td>
<td>tammi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tammi (tammika)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl. excl.</td>
<td>nümü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nümü (nümükka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3pl.</td>
<td>iümü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mi=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenthetical forms from Oregon Northern Paiute (Thornes 2003:168)

• The accusative pronouns’ strong forms are morphologically free and receive word stress:

(7) a. Su mogo’ni níka mutuhe-hu.
DEF.NOM woman 1SG.ACC kiss-PUNC
‘The woman kissed me.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-3-s30)

b. Nü uka u=giatan.
1SG.NOM 3SG.ACC 3SG.ACC=give
‘I gave that to him.’ (elicitation, Thornes 2003:305)

• The clitic forms occur immediately preceding the verb:

(8) a. Tü=gudu’u ggwüni yaisi oi-tu múiskwápi.
REFL=stick carry PTC there-LOC 2/3PL.ACC=spank.DUR
‘He was carrying this stick, and he spanked them.’ (narrative, MS, BP09-1-t1, 13)

b. Nü muzakaoka-si usu a=mái mooniimgia-puini.
1SG.NOM close-eyes-SEQ DEM.NOM 4.GEN=hand money 1SG.ACC=give-STAT
‘I closed my eyes, and this hand was giving me money.’ (narrative, Thornes 2003:304)

2.3 Case on adjectives

• Case affects the realization of adjectives, too, though indirectly: the form an adjective takes depends on the case of the MAXIMAL DP in which it occurs.

• The simple case is one where the adjective modifies a DP’s head noun:

(9) a. Su mitsi’yu nana habi-hu.
DEF.NOM short-NOM man lie.down-PUNC
‘The short man fell down.’ (elicitation, MS, BP32-3-s17)

b. Su nana pah-heggwá wia tsopa.
DEF.NOM man three-ACC acorn pick
‘The man picked three acorns.’ (elicitation, EM, BP13-5-s32)

• But what if an adjective modifies a DP contained within another DP, as in a possessive description?

Possessive descriptions where the possessor is a full DP are not marked in any way:

(10) Su nana tua wadzi-mia.
DEF.NOM man son hide-go
‘The man’s son ran away.’ (elicitation, MS, BP32-2-s6)

(11) Nüü ka nana puggu patsa-hu.
1SG.NOM DEF.ACC man horse kill-PUNC
‘I killed the man’s horse.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-3-s22)

The n head introduces the possession relation between the possessor and the possessum, which of course varies depending on what the possessum is and other, contextual factors.

Evidence for this structure comes from the behavior of genitive pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>CLITIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg.</td>
<td>i=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg.</td>
<td>u=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg.</td>
<td>a=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl.</td>
<td>ti=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl. excl.</td>
<td>ni=, mi=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 pl.</td>
<td>mi=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenthetical forms are from Oregon Northern Paiute (Thornes 2003:168)

- The strong genitive pronouns occur to the right of determiners, while the clitic pronouns are in complimentary distribution with determiners:

(13) a. Su nana ka niika puggu patsa-hu.
   DEF-LOC man DEF,ACC ISG,GEN horse kill-PUNC
   ‘The man killed my horse.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-3-s23)

b. Su nana isbuggu patsu-hu.
   DEF-LOC man ISG,GEN,GEN horse kill-PUNC
   ‘The man killed my horse.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-3-s24)

- I treat all genitive pronouns as originating in Spec-nP. Strong pronouns and full DPs stay there, with genitive case being assigned to them by D (Abney 1987:54-85):

(14) DP
    D
    nP
    [ka DP n’ n NP nika puggu]

- The pronominal clitics, in contrast, are deficient and raise to head-adjoin to D to receive genitive case (Cardinaletti 1998):
But, internally, have the structure of a verb phrase:

- Strongly lexicalist frameworks, such as Lexical Function Grammar (LFG) and Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), have technically distinct ways for deriving the mixed properties of nominalizations (Bresnan 1997, Malouf 2000).

But why are the nominalizers not members of some other category? They are not Ns for two reasons:

1. Semantically, they would be very strange: we are used to thinking about common nouns as sets of entities, but it is not clear that nominalizers denote the same thing.
2. More importantly, we would expect to be able to substitute more canonical nouns in the same phrase-structural position. But nouns do not take verb phrase complements.

Instead, we might think that the nominalizers instantiate a category located higher in the noun phrase — D, for instance. But they are able to cooccur with determiners:

- Nominalizations can contain verbal modifiers, such as the locative deictic oo „there” or a temporal modifier idži’ „yesterday”:

• By treating both nominalizers as members of the same category, we derive straightforwardly that they never cooccur.

• And, by treating the nominalizers as independent terminal nodes, we account straightforwardly for the fact that the resulting nominalizations have the distribution of a noun phrase:

  (20) Ka idžiti-dii-ggew núu kuna’a-hu.
  DEF.ACC idžiti-NOM-LOC 1SG.NOM sweat-PUNC
  ‘I sweated in the heat.’ (elicitation, EM, BP2-2-s37)

(21) Su pa’mogo ka nana tii-patsa-na-gguba kauté.
  DEF.NOM frog DEF.ACC man NSF-kill-NOM-LOC sit-DUR
  ‘The frog is sitting on the man’s kill.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-7-s14)

• But, internally, have the structure of a verb phrase:
  - Direct objects are realized just as they would be in a full clause:

    (22) a. Su nana ñi[tii]-kuhani-kii-dii i=supidakwatu.
        DEF.NOM man 2SG.ACC=NSF-cook-APPL-NMZ 1SG.ACC=know
        ‘The man cooking for you knows me.’ (elicitation, Thornes 2003:280)

        1SG.NOM 3SG.ACC=hear-believe DEF.ACC boy 1SG.ACC tell-NMZ
        ‘I believe what the boy told me.’ (elicitation, Thornes 2003:446)

  - Nominalizations contain verbal modifiers, such as the locative deictic oo „there” or a temporal modifier idži’ „yesterday”:

    (23) a. ...yaši uu mišoso aata-dii hayu ninimai-’yakiwí
        PTC DEM.NOM PLS=there SPL-PL-NMZ somehow 1PL.EXCL.ACC=say-IMPF
        “Talk English! Talk English!” we usupa nimmi na-nimai-’yakiwí.
        QUOT always 1PL.EXCL.NOM PASS=say-IMPF
        ‘...then that one (of) those where sitting there somehow kept telling us, “Talk English! Talk English!” thus continually we would be told.’ (narrative, Thornes 2003:537)

  - Of course, both -dii and -na in Northern Paiute are morphologically bound suffixes — like -ing in English — and must move onto the base verb.

4 Nonsubject nominalizations

• We can now give a concrete structure for nonsubject nominalizations:

    (26) Grace saa-na ne-hu.
        cook-NMZ burn-PUNC
        ‘What Grace cooked burned.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-9-s19)

    (27) Grace
        DP
        nP
        DP
        n
        VP
        nom
        DP
        V
        pro
        saa

• The agent of the event described by the verb is introduced in Spec-nP, the specifier of -na.
• It might seem that I am inadvertently confusing -na with the functional head that introduces the possessor in possessive descriptions.

• There is some evidence, though, that they are the same head:

  1. When the agent in Spec-nP is pronominal, it receives the exact same morphological realization as a possessor:

     (28) a. I=hab=’i oo habi-nümni.
         1SG.GEN=older.brother there lie-around
         ‘My older brother is lying over there.’ (elicitation, MS, BP32-4-s54)
     b. I=sa-na ne-hu.
         1SG.GEN=cook-NMZ burn-PUNC
         ‘What I was cooking burned.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-9-s15)

  2. When the agent is a full DP, the realization of adjectives shows us that they are genitive case-marked:

         PL=two-NOM women cook-NMZ good taste
         ‘The two women’s cooking tastes good.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-8-s4)
     b. Nüi ka waha-ggu momoko’ni sää-na pisapi.
         1SG.NOM DEF,ACC two-ACC women cook-NMZ like.DUR
         ‘I like the two women’s cooking.’ (elicitation, EM, BP32-8-s9)

  3. Finally, agents and possessors never cooccur, a complementary distribution that follows if they are introduced in the specifier of the same head.

• The complement of the verb in (27) is a null resumptive pronoun. It satisfies the subcategorization requirements of the verb, and it is case-licensed by getting accusative case from n.

• Sometimes the resumptive pronoun is overt, as when the nominalization describes an argument that is projected as the complement of a postposition:

     (31) Usu pu=ku-ba uskatü-čai-na yaisi oo-tu patsu-u.
         DEM.NOM 1SG.LOC 3SG.GEN=hit=DMFP-NMZ PTC there-LOC kill-PUNC
         ‘The one he was riding, (Porcupine) killed there.’ (narrative, Thornes 2003:478)

• This happens, presumably, to satisfy the semantic needs of the determiner, which requires a set of individuals as its argument.

• I assume that n introduces the agent thematic role in the same way that Kratzer (1996) proposes for v. With a neo-Davidsonian event semantics, n denotes a relation between individuals and events that combines with the VP by event identification.

• After abstraction over the resumptive pronoun, the nP denotes the set of things that are cooked by Grace.

• Nominalizations in -na can describe nonsubject participants, then, because verb-phrase-internal argument positions — whether internal arguments of the verb or arguments of a postposition — can be saturated by a resumptive pronoun.

• The DP merged in Spec-nP saturates the agent argument, and abstraction over the resumptive pronoun produces a set of entities bearing a nonsubject thematic role as the meaning for the entire nominalization.
5 Subject nominalizations

- For subject nominalizations, n does not project a specifier:

\[(34)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Niüü ika katsu patsa-düi yadu'ii.} \\
\text{1SG.NOM DEM.ACC cow kill-NMZ talk.to.DUR}
\end{array}
\]

'I am talking to the cow killer.' (elicitation, EM, BP14-2-s3)

\[(35)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
\text{nP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{katsu patsa}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V}
\end{array}
\]

- Even though it does not project a specifier, I propose that n can still contribute an agent semantic role since the nominalization describes the agent of the cow-killing event, and it is able to license accusative case.

- Pronominal objects are realized just as in a regular clause, as pronominal proclitics or strong pronouns:

\[(36)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
a. Su naaci niessapidakwatu-düi sükudu-ga. \\
\text{DEF.NOM woman know-NMZ school-NOT}
\end{array}
\]

'The boy who knows us goes to school.' (elicitation, Snapp et al. 1982:69)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
b. . . .müü naå nii koi-dü hüa na-nana, . . . hii PL PTC 2/3PL.ACC kill.PL-NMZ PTC PL=men kill.PL-NMZ there busy
\end{array}
\]

'...those killers of them, the killers of the men, there they busy...' (narrative, Liljeblad 1966:67)

- The agent argument remains unsaturated, so that the entire nominalization describes the agent:

\[(37)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
t_{\text{ache}}(\text{kill}(\text{cow})(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : e
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\lambda x_{\text{ache}}(\text{kill}(\text{cow})(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : [e, t]
\end{array}
\]

(by 3-closure)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\lambda x_{\text{ache}}(\text{kill}(\text{cow})(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : [e, \langle x, t \rangle]
\end{array}
\]

(by event identification)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
-dii \text{ kill(cow)} : \langle x, t \rangle
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} : \langle x, t \rangle
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
katsu patsa cow : e \text{ kill : }
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\langle e, \langle x, t \rangle \rangle
\end{array}
\]

- The nP denotes the set of individuals who are agents of a cow-killing event. The demonstrative determiner applies to this set, picking out the unique cow killer.

- With unaccusatives and passives, there is no way to case-license DPs merged inside the VP:

\[(38)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Su mogo'ni ka na-diži-düi natüüna-wünnü-si.}
\end{array}
\]

DEF.NOM woman DEF.ACC PASS-eat-NMZ take.away-IMPF-SEQ

'The woman took away the food...' (elicitation, EM, BP31-5-s60)

\[(39)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{køj jn VP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
düi nadika
\end{array}
\]

- In clauses, the internal argument of an unaccusative or passive predicate raises to subject position. But in Northern Paiute nominalizations, there is no subject position to raise to, so these arguments are simply not projected.

- The meaning of this nominalization composes in the familiar way, except now the VP has an individual-type argument position open:

\[(40)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
t_{\text{ache}}(\text{eat}(z)(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : e
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\lambda x_{\text{ache}}(\text{eat}(z)(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : [e, t]
\end{array}
\]

(by 3-closure)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\lambda x_{\text{ache}}(\text{eat}(z)(e) \land \text{agent}(y)(e)) : [e, \langle x, t \rangle]
\end{array}
\]

(by event identification)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
-dii \text{ eat} : \langle x, t \rangle
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} : \langle x, t \rangle
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{eat :}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\langle e, \langle x, t \rangle \rangle
\end{array}
\]

- Since this is a passive predicate, the agent argument is existentially bound.

- And, since the internal argument of tuka 'eat' fails to project, it goes unsaturated, so that the entire nP denotes the set of individuals consumed in an eating event.

\[\Rightarrow\] Nominalizations in -dii, since they do not project Spec-nP, can describe the agent of an event.

\[\Rightarrow\] Or, if the base verb is accusative or passive, then it describes the patient: without accusative case, it is an internal argument that must stay unsaturated.

6 Event-denoting nominalizations

- So far, deverbal nominalizations in -dii and -na have always described event participants — agents, patients, and so forth. But -na also very productively derives event nominalizations:

\[(41)\] 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
a. Su naana, ka toogga uñatsa-na idzi'ii.
\end{array}
\]

DEF.NOM man DEF.ACC dog 3SG.GEN=kill-NMZ yesterday

'The man’s killing the dog happened yesterday.' (elicited, EM, BP32-4-s29)
• We see this most clearly when nominalizations saturate the event argument of a perception verb:

(42) a. Nüü ka Toha Kammü sue-na naka.

'Ve see it snowing.' (elicitation, EM, BP32-4-s11)

b. Nüü ka mogo'ni tüba'a saa-na ðikwi.

'I smell the woman cooking pine nuts.' (elicitation, EM, BP32-7-s35)

• Recall that nominalizations in -na describe event participants because they are able to case-license a resumptive pronoun that is abstracted over.

• But, just because an argument position can be saturated by a resumptive pronoun does not mean that it has to.

• When all of the verb’s arguments, including the agent argument, are saturated by contentful DPs, then nominalizations in -na describe events:

\[
\lambda \ell \lambda \text{w}'(\ell') : \langle \text{Toha Kammü} : \lambda \lambda \lambda \text{e}(\text{laugh} : \langle \text{white-rabbit} : e \rangle) : \langle e, (x, t) \rangle \rangle \\
\langle (x, t), s \rangle
\]

\[
\text{white-rabbit : e} \quad \text{agent : laugh :} \\
\langle e, (x, t) \rangle \quad \langle (x, t) \rangle
\]

• The definite determiner applies to this set of events to pick out the unique event of White Rabbit laughing.

• Somewhat unexpectedly, this account predicts that nominalizations in -dúi too, should be able to describe events when certain conditions are satisfied.

• nPs headed by -dúi denote a set of individuals either because the agent argument is unsaturated or because accusative case is not assigned and the patient argument is left unsaturated.

• What if the verb did not take any individual-type arguments? There would be no agent and no accusative case, but this would not matter since there would not by any internal arguments either.

• Weather predicates fit this description, and they do indeed form event nominalizations with -dúi:


'Ve see it snowing.' (elicitation, EM, BP32-4-s11)


'The man was dancing when it was raining.' (elicitation, EM, BP32-4-s25)

• The nP headed by -dúi denotes a set of events, from which the definite determiner ka picks an event that serves as the argument to a perception verb or temporal postposition.

⇒ Under this proposal, we understand how Northern Paiute deverbal nominalizers are able to derive event-denoting nominalizations of two types:

• 'nonsubject nominalizer' -na: event nominalizations from verbs that take an agent argument

• 'subject nominalizer' -dúi: event nominalizations from verbs that take no individual-type arguments (e.g. weather predicates)

7 Conclusions and an emerging typology

• Northern Paiute has two nominalizer suffixes that derive nominalizations with the internal structure of a verb phrase but the external distribution of a noun phrase.

• These two nominalizers have complementary functions: -na derives nominalizations that describe event participants that would not be the subject of the corresponding clause, and -dúi derives nominalizations that describe the participant that would be the subject.
⇒ I argued that these properties of Northern Paiute nominalizers follow from their realizing a functional category n, paralleling v in the clausal domain.

⇒ While -na projects a specifier containing the agent, -dii does not. This gives rise to the complimentarity in the nominalizers’ functions.

• In addition, both -na and -dii are able to create event-denoting nominalizations. For -na, this only happens when all of the verb’s individual-type arguments, including the agent, are saturated, and for -dii when the verb has no individual-type arguments to saturate (e.g. weather verbs).

⇒ This, too, follows from my account since the verb’s event argument can remain unbound just in case there are no other arguments open.

• If Northern Paiute deverbal nominalizers are both members of a functional category n, we expect it to show up in other languages with potentially different realizations.

• We might wonder about English gerunds, since they have been so well-studied and are themselves also clausal nominalizations.

• Restricting our attention solely to the gerunds that occur with genitive arguments (what Abney (1987) calls poss-ing gerunds), they only describe events — never participants:

(47) Caesar’s destroying the city
(48) the woman’s falling

• Assuming that -ing in English is a realization of n, when it projects a specifier, only event-denoting nominalizations are possible:

(49)

A nonsubject participant nominalization is not possible, here, since English lacks resumptive pronouns of the right type that can be abstracted over: e.g. *Caesar’s destroying (of its) that which Caesar destroyed’.

• Notice that English differs from Northern Paiute in another way. As Abney (1987:23ff.) originally noted, ALL possessor DPs sit in Spec-DP.

• This EPP-like property makes an additional case available, accounting for the absence of subject nominalizations with -ing:

⇒ With these two features, a typology of clausal deverbal nominalizers begins to emerge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>Resumptive Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-ING</td>
<td>+ resumptive pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Paiute</td>
<td>-dii</td>
<td>-NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ English, which has a nominal EPP (Spec-DP must be filled) and lacks resumptive pronouns, has a single clausal deverbal nominalizer -ing that realizes n both when it does and does not project a specifier.

⇒ In contrast, Northern Paiute has the appropriate kind of resumptive pronouns and it lacks a nominal EPP. Thus, depending on whether n projects a specifier or not, the nominalization has one of two complimentary functions. These functions have been lexicalized as two different nominalizers.

⇒ What would the languages in the other quadrants of this table look like?
Data and abbreviations

Northern Paiute is comprised of several closely related dialects (Babel et al., to appear). Most of the data presented here come from my own fieldwork on the Mono Lake variety, spoken at Mono Lake in eastern California and immediately to the north in Bridgeport and Coleville, California and Sweetwater, Nevada. Additional data comes from the Burns, Oregon variety (Thornes 2003), and to a lesser extent the McDermitt, Nevada variety (Snap et al. 1982) and the Bannock variety spoken at Fort Hall, Idaho (Lijebjald 1966). For all dialects of Northern Paiute, there are probably no more than 700 fluent speakers today (Golla, to appear), and for the Mono Lake dialect, there are 5–10 speakers. I thank Grace Dick, Leona Dick, Morris Jackson, Elaine Lundy, Edith McCann, and Madeline Stevens for teaching me about their language.

I use the following abbreviations in this paper: ACC = accusative, ADV = adverbial suffix, APPL = applicative, CAUS = causative, DEF = definite, DEM = demonstrative, DIM = diminutive, DUR = durative, EMPH = emphatic particle, EXCL = exclusive, F = feminine gender, GEN = genitive, IMPF = imperfective aspect, INCH = inchoative aspect, INCL = inclusive, IP = instrumental prefix, IRR = irrealis mood, LOC = locative postposition, M = masculine gender, MOD = modal particle, MOT = motion suffix, NEG = negation, NOM = nominative, NMZ = nominalizer, NSP = nonspecific object, PASS = passive, PERF = perfect aspect, PL = plural, PLUR = pluralization, PTC = discourse particle, QUOT = quotative, REFL = possessive reflexive anaphor, SEQ = sequential marker, SG = singular, and STAT = stative aspect.
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