

Evidence for multi-dominance in Spanish word formation

Antonio Fábregas

CASTL-Universitetet i Tromsø / MorBo Group-Università di Bologna

PURPOSE OF THE PRESENTATION. Since the work of Gärtner (1997), the view that a each node in a tree structure is the representation of a set has been pursued by some authors. In this view, displacement of constituents is regarded as the expected situation in which one and the same element belongs to more than one set –that it, the item reemerges in another node-, which leads to a representation where shared elements are multi-dominated by different nodes. The purpose of this presentation is two-fold: to provide evidence for the necessity of multi-dominance structures taken from Spanish word formation and to restrict the conditions that multi-dominance requires both of the lexical items and the structures involved.

DATA. It has been noticed in the studies on the relationship between morphology and syntax that some morphological processes ‘cancel’ arguments that were otherwise required or allowed by the base form. Here we will concentrate in two such cases. The first one involves the suffix *-dor* (typically, but not exclusively, agentive or locative). This suffix has two crucial properties for our purposes: first, it is incompatible with an independent agent or causer (1a); secondly, it requires an argument position available in the base, in such a way that, when the base is a noun, a theme vowel that constructs argument structure (cfr. Jablonska 2007, Fábregas and Pazó 2008) is required (1b).

- (1) a. Este policía escribe novelas → escri-tor de novelas (*por este policía)
This policeman writes novels → writ-er of novels (*by this policeman)
b. leñ-a-dor, histori-a-dor
wood-ThV-er, history-ThV-er

Another relevant case is the nominaliser suffix *-miento*, which is incompatible with a Path Argument (be it a DP with incremental meaning or a path PP). This property becomes apparent in the unavailability of this suffix for nominalisations of inherently directional verbs (2a) and in the ungrammaticality of a path complement for *-miento* nominalisations of verbs that otherwise allow them (2b). This property extends to DP's which denote locative paths (2c).

- (2) a. llega-da, veni-da, subi-da... vs. *llega-miento, *veni-miento, *subi-miento
arrive-Part, come-Part, ascend-Part vs. arrive-miento, come-miento, ascend-miento
b. Seguir a Juan a su casa → el seguimiento de Juan (*a su casa)
To follow ACC J. to his house → the follow-miento of J. (*to his house)
c. Seguir el río → *el seguimiento del río
To follow the river → *the follow-miento of-the river

THEORETICAL PROBLEM. Previous morphological accounts have used linking rules that apply in the lexicon to give account of these data. The general idea is that the suffix contains a referential argument which gets coindexed with one of the theta roles of the lexical item (DiSciullo & Williams 1987, Lieber 2004); after coindexation, the theta role is no longer available for syntax. Some problems arise in this explanation. The first one is that in the absence of a D-Structure to represent lexical relations, it is not clear how theta roles can be represented as properties of lexical items, as they arise from a structural configuration at the level of LF. The second problem is that coindexation of the referential argument with a theta role of the base implies that the denotation of the nominalisation should be identical to the denotation of the theta-role, something which

is not empirically true (cfr. Booij & Lieber 2004); so either the data are not captured, or the coindexing of the arguments is random (Lieber 2004), which makes it impossible to predict the properties of these words.

HOW REMERGE SOLVES THE PROBLEM. In the account that I propose the affixes that cancel an argument are introduced in the position which that argument requires inside the verbal structure, in such a way that argument cancellation just amounts to structural incompatibility. The suffix *-dor* is introduced in the position for causers, the specifier of InitP, and the suffix *-miento* is introduced in the position for path arguments, the complement of ProcP (cfr. Ramchand 2008 for independent motivation of these positions). This explains that these suffixes, in order to be introduced in the derivation, always require some verbal structure to be constructed (remember 1b). However, the properties of these particular lexical items are such that they have an additional N feature which is not licensed in situ by the verbal structure. This forces them to remerge on top of the verbal structure to license this categorial feature by projecting as heads, in such a way that they can be dominated by a DP and license N.

WHY DOES REMERGE HAPPEN. Remerger in this account is motivated by the lexical item having an additional categorial feature which is not licensed in the base position, not being dominated by D. From here it follows that, under normal circumstances, an argumental DP cannot remerge, correctly predicting that nominalisations do not contain D's and lexically restricting the units that can take part in this process.

WHEN DOES REMERGE HAPPEN. It also follows that remerge has to take part exactly when the phase, weak or strong, is defined. If remerge happens after the phase is defined, the additional N feature not being licensed, the derivation crashes, and if it happens before the phase is constructed, the structure does not materialise as a word, which we assume to be related to phases (Arad 2003). It is predicted, then, that word formation processes that cross a (strong) phase cannot cancel arguments. This prediction is borne out: orational *-ing* constructions in English (*John's finding Mary in the park*) and orational infinitive in Spanish (*El encontrar Juan a María en el parque*), which contain both InitP and TP, cannot cancel arguments because remerge didn't happen.

HOW DOES REMERGE HAPPEN. The lexical item with the additional N feature projects on top of the verbal structure, redefining the functional sequence: the verbal heads associated to aspect, mood and tense cannot be merged, and, instead, the heads that introduce number and referentiality are introduced, including D. No coindexing of the lexical item and the theta role of the verb ever happens, so we expect the denotation of the nominalisation to be free, predicting non agentive *-dor* nominalisation and non path *-miento* nominalisations.

WHY DOES IT HAVE TO BE REMERGE. There are other three theoretical possibilities to explain absence of a syntactically realised argument. The first one is binding the argumental position of the base with the affix. If this is performed in syntax, then it is not explained why the position is not accessible for projection of a constituent (cfr. Reinhart & Tal Sioni 2005); if it takes place in the lexicon (DiSciullo & Williams 1987), then it is not predicted that a suffix like *-dor* can take constituents which cannot be verbs as bases (cfr. *leñ-a-dor*, 'woodsman'). The second one is that the position is not projected inside InitP; this predicts, for example, that *-dor* can take verbs without an Initiator, which predicts that formations as **nac-e-dor*, 'borner', are grammatical. The third one is that the position is occupied either by the verbal stem or by a pronominal category. In the first instance, the semantic entailments do not follow and, additionally, categorial selection is violated; in the second instance, it comes as a surprise that the pronominal category cannot be substituted by a DP that gets genitive case inside the nominal functional structure.

EXTENSIONS OF THE ANALYSIS: ROMANCE V-N COMPOUNDS. Although I concentrate here on deverbal nominalisations, I would like to remark that the analysis has implications that may solve a much discussed morphological property of Romance, the existence of productive compounds with the structure V-N which lack an overt nominaliser suffix but are categorised as nouns (Sp. *limpia-botas*, lit. *clean-boots*, meaning *boot clean-er*). As the noun inside the compound lacks a determiner, following the logic of my analysis, the N feature of the noun is not licensed in situ and has to remerge again, turning the compound into a noun, and allowing syntax to merge D.

Arad, Maya (2003). "Locality Constraints on the Interpretation of Roots". *NLLT* 21:737-78 // Booij, G. & R. Lieber (2004): On the paradigmatic nature of affixal semantics. *Linguistics* 42, 327-357 // DiSciullo, A.-M. & E. Williams (1987): *On the definition of word*. MIT Press. // Fábregas, A. & J. Pazó (2008): Un análisis radicalmente sintáctico de la vocal temática. *Cuadernos de lingüística del IUOG* // Gärtner, H. M. (1997): *General Transformations and Beyond*. Frankfurt/Main. Dissertation // Jablonska, P. (2007): *Radical decomposition and argument structure*. Tromsø University dissertation // Lieber, R. (2004): *Morphology and lexical semantics*, CUP // Ramchand, G. (2008): *First phase syntax*, CUP // Reinhart, T. and T. Siloni. "The Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and other Arity Operations", *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 36, 3.