Oswald Panagl* and Fritz Schweiger

Nominalization as a typological phenomenon: A comparison between Latin and Australian languages: Types and tokens

<https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2020-2004>

Abstract: This study deals both with action nouns as a semantic class of word formation and with nominalization as a derivational process via offering a lot of relevant data in a kind of typological confrontation. Oswald Panagl investigates Latin examples applying criteria such as productivity, regularity, semantic transparency and syntactic behavior. As a result, he denotes derivations in *-tiōn* as the most vivid and active type of action noun delivering almost countless tokens. As a special case he treats the nominalizations in *-tu* becoming productive when they establish the grammatical category of supine in *-tum*. This procedure of a switch from derivation to inflection represents a sort of grammaticalization. He offers a scale model of increasing concretization (action–result–instrument–location–agents) exemplified with items from a variety of languages. Fritz Schweiger’s research presents a series of data from the Australian languages (Alyawarra, Bunuba, Diyari, Djapu, Gumbaynggir, Guugu Yimidhirr, Kalkatungu, Uradhi, Wambaya, and Wardaman). The author defines and analyzes the morphological principles of word formation in his linguistic material and classifies the data *arte legis*. Because of the specific situation and the complex interrelations within this linguistic group of tongues investigated in this paper, it seems nearly impossible to develop and apply criteria of the common sort for uncovering genealogical kinship.

Keywords: old Latin, classical Latin, Australian languages, nominalization, gerund, supine, participial construction, (non) Pama-Nyungan, case marking, ergative marking

***Corresponding author: Prof. Dr. Oswald Panagl**, FB Linguistik der Univ. Salzburg, Erzabt-Klotz-Str. 1, 5020, Salzburg, Austria, E-mail: oswald.panagl@sbg.ac.at

Fritz Schweiger, FB Mathematik der Univ. Salzburg, Hellbrunnerstr. 34, 5020, Salzburg, Austria, E-mail: fritz.schweiger@sbg.ac.at

1 Prolegomenon

A paper that presents and compares data from languages as different as Latin and a number of Australian languages might surprise at a first glance. The reason may be that there is no obvious base for a genealogical comparison founded on linguistic kinship that could enable any kind of reconstruction. But also another sort of comparison is not applicable to the purpose of this article: the common denominator of every kind of “areal” relation leading among neighboring languages to phenomena of a “Sprachbund” does not work in the case of this study. What remains from a methodological point of view is a typological confrontation based on morphosemantic categories that fulfil an important, even indispensable functional task. The expression of what a person does and in which situation an individual is, is necessary for all types of communication and there is a need or at least a tendency to “compress” and “condensate” sentences, clauses and phrases into the word class of nouns, since such nominalizations permit quotation and create anaphoric relations as practical instruments linking utterances to each other. Additionally, they are valuable suprasyntactic tools to constitute texts. In this respect a confrontation of data coming from quite different time, location, language type seems to be highly relevant and effective. A comparison and the notion of contrasting should deliver results both in the field of grammatical tools and communicative requirements. An investigation within this area should combine semasiological and onomasiological perspectives, i.e. it has to consider the semantic interpretation of the data as well as how to express processes, results and states of affair. The authors of this paper have been working together for a lot of years as researchers and academic teachers.

2 Introductory remarks

The main problem addressed in this article as well as the different potential solutions that have been proposed have a long history in the course of the development both of linguistic theory and its methods and heuristics. In the passages that follow I want to outline at least some important perspectives and crucial aspects of the question how to deal with the relevant data from a theoretical point of view. The Arabic numbers within brackets refer to (lists of) Latin examples. I am grateful to my colleague Ioannis Fykias for his valuable support both in scientific and practical matters.

I start by mentioning and quoting some remarks on this topic that we owe to the excellent typologist Bernard Comrie in a recent paper of his (Comrie 2011). In

this study, he outlines two principled possibilities of a descriptive account of the origin of action nouns. Such types of word formation “can be characterized as combining properties of noun phrases (with a noun as head) and of clauses (with a verb as head)” (Comrie 2011: 7). Employing examples taken from English he contrasts the expression *The enemy destroyed the city* to its nominalization *The enemy’s destruction of the city*, in which no characteristics point at an original clausal construction. On the other hand, there exists an alternative kind of actionality, such as in the sentence *The enemy’s destroying the city (was a major setback)* (with a Saxon genitive!). This last construction

functions externally as a noun phrase, more specifically as the subject of the sentence, its internal structure is much more like that of a clause, for instance in that the object/patient (the city) is marked in the same manner, namely no explicit marking, as that of the corresponding clause, while the subject/agent (the enemy) may either retain its unmarked coding as in a clause, or accommodate to nominal structure by appearing in the Saxon genitive. (Comrie 2011: 8).

This opposition eventually goes back to Chomsky (1970), who emphasizes the basic difference between an inflectional (gerund) and a derivational noun (in *-tion*), a type of condensation or “compression” of a declarative sentence as an argument in favor of the lexicalist and against the transformational account of deverbal nominalization.

The semantic profile of such actional nouns seems parallel to an attractive treatment put forth by Walter Porzig. In this famous book (Porzig 1942), he interprets – from a semantic point of view – genuine action nouns as nominalizations of the full contents of the original sentence (cf. his example *Die Römer zerstörten Karthago* → *Die(se) Zerstörung*). This kind of nominalization does not merely instantiate the semantics of the bare verb; it rather encompasses the complete message of the utterance: *Die Zerstörung* (scil. *Karthagos durch die Römer*).

NB: Since the study deals with a morphosyntactic topic (and not with phonological issues), I mark vowel length only when it is distinctive with respect to grammatical phenomena (cf. *fortunā* ablative case, *pēgi* perfect).

3 Some theoretical considerations

The 1960s and especially the 1970s were characterized by a vivid – sometimes violent – debate within the framework of generative grammar on the origin and the status of deverbal nouns – more specifically of the agentive and actional type. The transformational fraction (generative semantics) maintained that this type of nominalizations should be derived directly from the verbal base via a number of

syntactic rules. Quite on the contrary, the lexicalist paradigm focused on the genesis of such substantives as a separate process linking the respective nouns with the cognate verbs only by application of so-called redundancy rules.

The strongest argument used in the lexicalist interpretation of the crucial data formulated by Chomsky (1970) was repeated and reinforced by scholars such as Jackendoff (1972, 1977) and Jenkins (1977). In favor of the classification of nominalizations as autonomous lexical items – as opposed to functional grammatical intraparadigmatic (verbal) forms such as participles and gerunds. With respect to English data three criteria were employed to support this theoretical standpoint:

1. The first criterion focused on the predictability of the phonological shape of the derived forms. Gerunds such as *teaching*, *taking* and *reading* exactly correspond to the respective infinitives (*to teach*, *to take* and *to read*). Quite on the contrary, other types of derivations such as a type of adjectival derivations offer completely different results: *observe* → *observational*, *describe* → *descriptive*, *explain* → *explanatory*. And when we move to another part of the verbal paradigm, namely the forms of the simple past and of perfect participle, there exists a variety of different formations depending on the class and/or the respective item in the case of irregular verbs: *teach taught*, *take took taken*, *read read* [red]. In a language such as Latin the diffusion of different finite forms of the perfect as well as the form of the perfect participle is even more frequent: cf. (regular) *monere* : *monui monitum* vs. (irregular) *spondere*: *spopondi sponsum*; *laudare laudavi laudatum* vs. *vetare vetui vetitum*. An extreme case of such a variation is the Latin verb *pangere* ('fix', 'pledge') that offers three variants of the active perfect: *pepigi* (reduplication) – *pānxi* (s-perfect, originally aorist formation) – *pēgi* (lengthening of the root vowel, cf. Panagl 2002).
2. A further criterion is the parameter of productivity. Each verb is in a position to form categories such as subjunctive, imperative, preterite and so on. But there is no comparable automatized solution for the productive derivation of action nouns ending in *-(a)tion* (in English) or *-ung* (in German). Cf. *fahren* – **Fahrung* (because of the "blocking" effect of *Fahrt*), but *Umfahrung*; *bleiben* – **Bleibung*, but (*das*) *Bleiben*, (*die*) *Bleibe*. On the other hand, in English there exist at least some subclasses that exhibit full productivity and regularity of this derivational type. Cf. *-fy* → *-fication* e. g. *classify classification*, *-ize* → *-ization*, e. g. *nominalize nominalization*.
3. For lexicalists, the most crucial criterion is the syntactic behavior of inflectional versus derivational categories, respectively. Therefore, going back to the example presented by Comrie, the string *The enemy's destroying of the city* is grammatically correct, whereas **the enemy's destruction the city* is completely wrong and unacceptable. In this case one has to resort to the constructional type of an original noun: *the enemy's destruction of the city*.

4 An outlook at historical and comparative data

Taking up the parameter of syntactic properties there exist some data that exhibit characteristics which do not conform to the results expected by the above mentioned theoretical standpoint.

- In Ancient Greek, some instances of true actional nouns are attested, which preserve the “verbal government” properties of their derivational base

(Plat. Apol. 30d)

μή τι ἐξαμάρτητε περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δόσιν ὑμῖν
‘that you may not fail in God’s gift for you’

The adnominal dative ὑμῖν (for/to you) goes back to the three place valency of the Greek διδόναι, which includes the dative of the beneficiary.

(Dem. 4.21)

στρατευομένους ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀλλήλοις
‘marching in successive turns [succeeding each other]’

The construction of the noun with dative is modeled after the syntactic behavior of the basic verb διαδέχεσθαι

(Plat. Symp. 182d)

ἡ παρακέλεις τῷ ἐρῶντι παρὰ πάντων θαυμαστή
‘what a wonderful encouragement a lover gets from us all’

The adnominal dative τῷ ἐρῶντι, as an object of the action noun παρακέλεις, is influenced by the syntactic behavior of the basic verb παρακελεύομαι (medial diathesis).

- In Pre-classical Latin as well, there are some passages displaying syntactic features pointing to the verbal origin of the action noun.

(Amph. 519)

quid tibi hanc curatiost rem?

‘Why is to you treatment this affair/thing’ (accusative because of the construction of the basic verb *curare*)

(CIL I² 401)

[in] ium quis volet pro iudicatod n. [L] manum iniectio estod.

‘Against this person by everyone should be “seizure the hand”, as if a judgement were passed.’

(Accusative is selected because of the collocation of the basic verb *manum inicere*.) Cf. Section 4.7 for more details.

Also in Classical Latin some passages are attested, where an abstract action noun follows the construction of the cognate verb.

(Cic. Leg. 1.42)

Quodsi iustitia est obtemperatio scriptis legibus institutisque populorum
 ‘Since justice is obedience to written laws and institutions of the peoples’

The dative of the object noun can be ascribed to the behavior of the verb *obtemperare*.

- In Middle High German there occurs the following expression:

(Wolfram, Titurel 153,2)

den bracken, der walt und gevilde phlag der verte

‘the hound who made a walk the forest and field’ (construction with accusative due to the verb *var(e)n* governing an accusative, e.g. *daʒ mer vam* ‘to navigate the sea’).

- In Old Slavonic, a similar sort of construction is attested in the following passage:

Aksl. Cod. Suprasliensis (ed. Severjanov, 525.15f.)

po prijēti mi (‘receipt’)...*velikyĭ darĭ* (‘great gift’)

‘after my receipt ... a great gift’ (accusative because of the construction of the basic verb *prijēti*).

5 From derivational to inflectional morphology: the Latin supine in *-(t)um* – a case study of categorial change

5.1 From derivational to inflectional morphology

Considering that the type of Latin supine ending in *-(t)um* meets us at the beginning of the literary tradition in clearly defined form and complete grammatical potency, used not only for the statement of a spatial goal but also to express the notion of finality and with verbal government of a dependent object, it would appear that the modulation of the nominal *-tu*-stems as an original derivational

category into the function of inflectional morphology is something that has already occurred at some time in the past. In terms of our first hypothesis, however, the prerequisite for this categorial change is full productivity of the relevant pattern of word formation, that is, of action nouns ending in *-tu-*. Therefore for action nouns the implication of this assumption would however be, that with the completed categorial change the productivity of the type of word formation as such would wane only then to expand once more when the newly created inflectional form has become obsolete. The Latin supine is in so far a predestined subject for testing this hypothesis, since the entire body of philological data of the “Königsberger Programmes” of the 1850s is available in Richter’s collection; the evidence is as a whole open to survey; and, in the course of the history of the Latin language, an individual biography of this grammatical category can be sketched out.

5.2 Old Latin

Let us begin with a look at the situation of Old Latin: copious material evidence can be furnished, especially from the comic dramatists (Plautus, Terentius, Caecilius) but also from Cato, Ennius, Lucilius and the tragedians (Accius, Pacuvius): there is no indication of any restriction within the condition of its use, i.e. of its dependence on a verb of motion.

- (1) *eō* ‘go’ (*abeo* ‘go away/off’; *adeō* ‘go nearer, approach’; *prodeō* ‘go, come forth’; *transeō* ‘cross’); (*ad-*)*veniō* ‘arrive’; *adventō* ‘come nearer and nearer’; *accēdō* ‘come close’; *incēdō* ‘go, March along’; (*com-*)*migrō* ‘migrate’; *devortor* ‘turn away/aside’; *proficiscor* ‘depart, set out, leave’; *currō* ‘run’; *pergō* ‘continue going’; *profugiō* ‘flee from’; *prosiliō* ‘leap, spring forth’; *mē recipiō* ‘retire’; *dō* ‘give’; (*col-*)*locō* ‘place, put together’, esp. *nuptum (col-)locāre* ‘marry a girl to’; *tradō* ‘hand over’; *āvehō* ‘take, bring away’; *mittō* ‘send’; *abdūcō* ‘take, bring away’; *condūco* ‘bring, lead together’; *ferō* ‘carry, bring’; *provocō* ‘call forth, provoke; call upon’; *vocō* ‘call, shout’; *accersō* ‘call (near)’; *polliceor* ‘offer, promise’.

These examples can be represented as a word-field having the neutral archilexeme *eo* in its centre, surrounded by verbs of destination (*advenio*, *advento*) and inchoative verbs (*proficiscor*) as well as by sundry examples with special semantic marking: (*com*)*migro*, *pergo*, *curro*, *profugio*, *prosilio*.

Also among the causative (factitive) verbs of motion we come across so-called “neutral” examples such as *do*, *veho*, *duco*, *fero*, besides cases which, as it were, form the periphery of the lexical field and lead to other semantic regions: (*pro*)*voco*, *accerso* and, as an extreme case, *polliceor foras (catillatum)* (cf. Plaut. Cas.

551–552: *operam uxoris polliceor foras quasi catillatum* ‘I’ve promised the aid of my wife out of doors, as though to go lick dishes’). Some expressions occur so numerous that we may assign them a phrasal, idiomatic character.

For example:

- (2) *cubitum (ab)ire* ‘go to sleep’; *nuptum dare/(col-)locare* ‘marry to’; *perditum se ire* ‘ruin oneself’; *dormitum ire*, ‘go to bed/sleep’; *lavatum ire* ‘go to wash’; *pabulatum ire* ‘collect food, forage’; *derisum (aliquem) venire* ‘come to deride/mock s.o.’; *mercatum aliquid mittere* ‘send s.o. to buy s.th.’

We have now tested which and how many of the *-tu*-abstracts present in Archaic Latin as supines ending in *-tum*, are in use as action nouns in Latin literature. The result, in my opinion, is instructive: all of the following examples do not qualify because they were apparently blocked in their formation and their use as independent substantives by the concurrent supine-forms.

- (3) **captātus* (*captātiō* ‘reaching after, catching at s.th.’); **ostentātus* (*ostentātiō* ‘showing, exhibition; boast(ing)’); **accusātus* (*accusātiō* ‘complaint, accusation’); **temptātus* (*temptātiō*, *temptāmen(tum)* ‘attempt, trial’); **coctus* (*coctio* ‘cooking’); **mutuātus* (*mutuātiō*, ‘borrowing, loan’); **salutātus* (*salutātiō* ‘greeting’); **spectātus* (*spectātiō* ‘looking/gazing at’); **perditus* (*perditiō* ‘ruin, perdition’); **ereptus* (*ereptiō* ‘forcible taking, snatching away’); **privātus* (*privātiō* ‘taking away, release from pains’); **prohibitus* (*prohibitiō* ‘hindering, forbidding, prohibition’); **praedātus* (*praedātiō* ‘capturing, plundering’); **oppugnātus* (*oppugnātiō* ‘storming of, assault on’); **aquātus* (*aquātiō* ‘getting/fetching of water’); **lignātus* (*lignātiō* ‘word-cutting, procuring of wood’); **speculātus* (*speculātiō* ‘looking out for’); **pabulātus* (*pabulātiō* ‘collecting of food, foraging’); **catillātus* (*catillātiō* ‘licking of plates’); **servātus* (*servātiō* ‘observation, observed procedure’); **castigātus* (*castigātiō* ‘punishment, correction’); **cantātus* (*cantātiō* ‘singing, song’); **exquisītus* (*exquisitiō* ‘research, inquiry, investigation’); **nuntiātus* (*nuntius*, ‘communication, message’; *nuntiātiō* ‘announcement’); **militātus* (*militia* ‘military service’) (cf. Panagl 1985).

That, among the substitute formations given in brackets, a particularly large number of action nouns in *-tio* may be found renders the well-known distinction between abstract nouns ending in *-ti-* and *-tu-*, drawn by Benveniste (1948), questionable at least in the case of Latin. As is well known, the author, through detailed investigations of mainly Indo-Iranian, Greek, and Latin word-material established a categorial semantics for the *-ti-* forms, “realisation objective” or “fait objectif de l’accomplissement,” and correlated it with the agent nouns ending in *-tōr* (Latin *-tōr*)

as designation of the “auteur d’un acte.” At the same time, in the *tu*-derivatives he perceived a general meaning, “disposition/capacité subjective,” which predisposed them to the function of the Latin supine and corresponded on the side of the agent noun with the *-tēr-* suffix as expression of the “agent voué à une fonction.” Where the *-tu-* forms stay on in use, they are mainly lexicalized examples, which have semantically shifted away from the predictable meaning of a deverbal abstract noun.

- (4) *cubitus* ‘bed’; *postulātus* ‘suit, action’; *habitus* ‘bearing, carriage; habit, dress’; *occupātus* ‘occupation’; *factus* ‘oil-pressing, quantity of oil pressed’; *pastus* ‘pasture’.

5.3 Classical Latin

But let us go on to the next step, to the period of Classical Latin: here we get the impression of stagnation in the development of our category. The dominant authors of this period, Caesar and Cicero, show a striking economy in the use of the supine ending in *-tum*. Where it seems to occur with any frequency we are faced not with productive new formations but with the quotation of set phrases (idioms) such as *cubitum ire* (*discedere*), *salutatatum*, *sessum ire*, *admonitum venire* in Cicero, and *mittere rogatum*, *convenire gratulatum*, *frumentatum* or *pabulatum progredi* in Caesar. More often, however, these authors make other constructions serve their purpose: they use *ad* or the postpositive *causa* with the gerund or, above all, the newly proliferating gerundive construction (e.g. *ad ludos spectandos* / *ludorum spectandorum causa venire*); they use the increasingly popular, typically Latin, future participle which, in effect, continues the temporal grammatical sense or *ire* (e.g. *ludos spectaturus venio*), and, finally, the master-key formula of a purpose clause with *ut* (*venio, ut spectem ludos*). Varro, with his interest in the old language, has more frequent use for the supine, while, in the case of Sallust, as Skard (1932) points out, there is a constant increase in the use of this constructional pattern to match the growth of his archaizing tendency. Remarkable in this context is the lavish use of the supine in the work of the historians Cornelius Nepos and Livius; the latter, particularly, reanimates this construction in all the variety it has for us in old Latin. This is perhaps explained by the stylistic criticism of antiquity which occasionally stigmatized the author’s partiality for constructions which ignored the classical ideal of concinnity, a propensity which also expressed itself in that plentitude of participial phrase characterized as *lactea ubertas* (‘milky richness’). A further feature of Livy’s style was *Patavinitas*, i.e. the provincial smack of his native Patavium (Padua), declared by C. Asinius Pollio (Quintilian 1. 5. 56; 8. 1. 3) to typify Livy’s writing. We have already referred to the restriction of the supine to a few

standard phrases in the case of Caesar and Cicero and interpreted them as the symptom of a gradual fossilization and lost transparence of this syntactic category. Similarly explicable is, on nearer examination, yet another phenomenon observable in the work of a few authors in the literature of classical Latin. The stock-list of governing verbs of motion, originally clearly defined by their semantic features and even representable as word-fields, is occasionally given up. These cases, clearly bold exceptions from the norms of grammar, to my mind exemplify centrifugal tendencies and a growing loss of motivation for the constructional type. Consider, for example, two sentences from Sallust and Vergil, respectively:

- (5) a. (Sall. hist. fr. 3, 61, 17, Oratio Macri)
neque ego vos ultum iniurias hortor
 ‘I don’t exhort you to take revenge for injustices’
- b. (Verg. Aen. 9, 240f.)
Si fortuna permittitis uti/quaesitum Aenean et moenia Pallantea.
 ‘If you permit to use fortune to see Aeneas and to visit the castle of Pallas.’

In philological commentary the example from Sallust is explained by analogy with *ultum eo; ire*, in this case, being taken as implied. I think, however, that another explanation is possible. The archaizing Sallust makes of the contemporary equation of the supine with *ut*-clauses, with the regular substitution of the latter for the former, an occasion for the use of the supine even in cases where we would expect not an *ut*-clause expressing finality but, rather, a clause expressive of demand dependent on *hortari*. This procedure is best described as hyperarchaism.

The second example from Vergil’s Aeneid, 9, 240f.: ‘If you permit to use fortune to see Aeneas and to visit the castle of Pallas’ – so irritated even the Vergil exegetes of antiquity that they sought to save their philological sanity and their author’s honor, grammatically speaking, by assuming dependence of the supine *quaesitum* on a participle *euntis* found in verse 243.

The explanation that lies nearer to hand is of course the simple one of a substitution here too of the choice and elegant-seeming supine for an ordinary clause with *ut* or a construction with *ad* and the gerund or gerundive. Here again, in the process, the concomitant feature of finality has edged out and annulled the genuine motivation of a directional specification.

5.4 The (gradual) decline of the supine in Late(r) Latin and in Vulgar Latin

But what of the further course of the Latin language? In the works of the Augustan poets (Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid) the supine only occurs sporadically,

and the historians of the period of Silver Latin (Curtius, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Florus) too offer only very few examples. The agrarian writer Columella provides, unlike his literary predecessors and models, Cato and Varro, only one solitary example (9,5,1). The historian Velleius Paterculus is the first author from whose works the supine is completely absent. In Petronius there is one instance to be found in the narrative part of his *Satyricon* (71,8); the fact that no example appears in the *Cena Trimalchionis* shows how foreign this construction has already become in the spoken language.

The supine experienced a certain renaissance with Gellius and Apuleius in the second century; which is scarcely to be wondered at as these authors, declared archaists, not only hawked old Latin materials (for example: from Cato and the ancient dramatists), but also in their own style took on an antique coloring. Virtually no relevant data are offered by late Latin poetry: There, in addition to the substitute expressions mentioned above, a construction with the infinitive of causality becomes more common (hence, a new type, e.g. *venio ludos spectare*). Revealing is also the literature of the language of colloquy, produced by authors of Vulgar Latin. Of the *Cena Trimalchionis* we already have affirmed an absence of examples; in the translations of the Bible we only find a few single examples frozen into formulae: thus, there appears the ubiquitous *cubitum ire* in Gen. 19,4, as well as the equally idiomatic *potum dare* in Matth. 10,42, both in the Vulgate. In the *Peregrinatio Egeriae* 24,12 we find a *reponent se dormito*, an equally formulaic phrase, which, however, in its phonetic details (*u > o*, loss of final *-m*) has something of the color of contemporary use. Gregory of Tours (Franc. 5,15) fits in here with his *ulto irent*: moreover, he offers an example of a clarifying of the accusative of the supine form by the preposition *ad* in the phrase *deducat equos ad pastum* (Franc. 3,15); something which fits well in the picture of a gradually developing analytical inflection in Late Latin. At the same time, the form *pastum*, because of this, reenters the categorial role of verbal noun and thus becomes an element of derivational morphology once more. This process grows still more obvious in the phrase *ad potionem veniet* in the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (444 and 503). Here the deverbal abstract noun *potio* takes over the traditional function of the formulation ending in *-tu*.

- (6) *cubitum ire* (Genesis 19,4) ‘to go to bed’; *potum dare* (Vulgata, Matth. 10,42) ‘to give to drink’; *reponent se dormito* (Peregr. Eg. 24,12) ‘they will go to bed’; *ulto irent* (Greg. Franc. 5,15) ‘they would take vengeance’; *deducat equos ad pastum* (Franc. 3,15) ‘he should direct the horses to pasture’; *ad potionem veniet* (Mul. Chir. 444; 503) ‘he will come to drink’

5.5 Middle Latin and Romance languages

With this, however, the history of the supine in Latin comes to an end: in living use of Late Latin this type of construction has disappeared completely, and if it partially returns in Middle Latin, that is due to reminiscences of classical Latin and artificial attempts to revive it. Significantly, there is no trace of the supine in Romance languages – except Romanian, where it might be due to an inherited archaism of the Latin of the Balkan periphery.

With the quiet washing away of this grammatical category in (spoken) Late Latin, however, the *-tu-* formations functioning as nouns turn up again – and with this the second part of our hypothesis is fulfilled. Extensive investigations of the lexicon have shown that just at the time when the supine had shrunk to a few vestigial formulae, before its final total disappearance, a veritable wave of new (i.e. not previously attested) deverbal derivations relating to the suffix *-tu-* swells up. I have collected several examples of them under (7); there exists in every case in the old Latin word-stock a homonymous supine that, however, at this late time – as shown by our texts – was long out of use.

- (7) *exsulātus* ‘banishment, exile’; *ambulātus* ‘walking’; *sessus* ‘sitting down’; *confabulātus* ‘conversation’; *nuptus* ‘marriage’; *sedātus* ‘state of calm’; *discubitus* ‘taking one’s place at table’; *sacrificātus* ‘offering of sacrifice’; *opitulātus* ‘help’; *conductus* ‘contraction (of the eyebrows)’; *commemorātus* ‘mention’; *expiātus* ‘offering of sacrifice’.

5.6 Reasons for loss of productivity

I have now given a lightning sketch of the Latin supine and found confirmed my hypothesis concerning the changing productivity of word formation types which come to be regarded as elements of inflectional morphology. The question next arises why this grammatical category after its heyday in old Latin suffered so swift a loss of popularity. Coming, in the end, to be given up altogether. Seeing that hardly any work has been done on this problem, it follows that my own meditations on it are of a predominantly tentative character. The fact that a variety of possible reasons may account for the brief life of the Latin supine seems to me no disadvantage. I am, in principle, no defender of grand single reasons to explain things, inclining, in fact, to the view that a cumulative causality more genuinely accounts for the phenomenon of linguistic change.

5.7 On the hybrid character of the supine

In the present case we may start out from the point of the never entirely settled, hybrid character of the supine, positioned between the categories of noun and verb. We have the evidence of ancient grammarians to support us here, an eloquent testimony being available in the history of the naming of the supine which is detailed for us in the admirable researches of Benveniste (1932: 136–137) and Wackernagel (1926: I,276ff.). The name, supine, derives from the Greek *hyp̄tion*, a metaphor taken from the language of the wrestling schools. It was used at first for verbs of the type *audeō*, *gaudeō*, or *veneō*, verbs which fluctuated between the active and passive voice, and was subsequently transferred to the supine proper, also neutral of voice.

Diomedes (G[rammatici] L[atini] I 342,4), in view of its hybrid nature, speaks of a *participalis modus*, for the category shares both nominal and verbal features, while Charisius (GL II 175,27) in relation to this entirely unclear situation speaks of *adverbia qualitatis*, including the gerund in this definition.

The nominal trait of the supine is explicitly stressed by the grammarian Priscian V,47f. (Gramm. Lat. II 412,3ff.), when he calls it an accusative without preposition which, like the names of cities, responds to questions of direction. As for the so-called supine II, he equated it with a verbal substantive: *mirabilis visu* for him means exactly the same as *mirabilis visione*.

Grammarians apart, other Latin authors too demonstrate to us over and over again, that they ascribe features of a noun to the supine. As one of the earliest of them we mention Cato, who in de agr. 5, 5 says of the *vilicus*: *primus cubitu surgat, postremum cubitum eat*. In this case, the ablative *cubitū* ‘should rise from the bed’ obviously corresponds to the supine *cubitum*, dependent on the verb of motion *eat*. Even a writer like Gellius, an archaist, as we know, and given to frequent use of the supine, clarifies it occasionally by introducing a preposition of direction, thus making obvious his conception of it as a noun: e.g. *in pastum profecta est* (2,29,13).

- (8) a. (Cato, agr. 5,5)
 (*vilicus*) *primus cubitu surgat, postremum cubitum eat*
 ‘(The landowner’s steward) shall be the first to rise from his bed and the last to go to sleep’
- b. (Gell. 2,29,13)
 in pastum profecta est
 ‘she has left for the pasture’

At least three factors – as far as I can see – militate against a durable validity for the supine conceived as noun.

The simple accusatives of direction responding to the enquiry “where to?” could at the time of the emergence of this category (partly too in literary old Latin) be formed also from appellatives/names. However, with the passage of time, certainly at least in the period of classical Latin, they are limited to place-names, particularly cities, and to a few adverbially frozen forms like *domum* ‘homeward’, *rūs* ‘to the country’, *bellum* ‘to war’. Forms like *pastum* ‘for grazing/to graze’, *salutātum* ‘in greeting/to greet’, or *nuptum* ‘for marrying/marriage’ lose in the course of this development both syntactic motivation and transparency.

5.8 The criterion of verbal construction

The dependence of predominantly accusative objects on supines as transitive verbal abstracts ending in *-tu-* (ex. [15]) was plausible at a time when other nouns of action showed verbal agreement as well (ex. [16]), therefore precisely in the period of Old Latin:

- (9) a. (Plautus, Curc. 67)
parasitum misi petitum argentum
 ‘I sent a parasite to demand the money’
- b. (Asin. 661)
quin tradis huc cruminam pressatum umerum?
 ‘Why don’t you hand me the purse to burden my shoulder with?’
- c. (Bacch. 347)
amicos iit salutatum
 ‘he went to welcome the friends’
- (10) a. (Plautus, Aul. 423)
*quid tibi **nos**, mendice homo, tactiost?*
 ‘Why do you touch us, beggar man?’
- b. (Amph. 579)
*quid tibi **hanc** curatiost **rem**?*
 ‘Why do you take care of this matter?’
- c. (CIL 1² 401)
*in ium quis volet pro ioudicatod n. [L] **manum** iniect[i]o estod*
 ‘Anybody who wants should be permitted to force him (lit. to lay hands on him) to pay 50 sesterces as pursuant to a final judgement’

As constructions of this type are restricted to Old Latin (Late and Vulgar Latin texts allow partial revitalization of this pattern only with agent nouns), the supines as nouns, because also of their accusative objects, get shunted into a syntactic siding.

In contrast, one may consider the supines ending in *-tū*, which have no verbal government (**Difficile est hoc factu*; but: *difficile est hoc facere*): these maintain their position considerably longer in the history of Latin, showing a constant increase in use from Old Latin to Classical language.

5.9 The tendency toward categorial change of meaning

As I have suggested elsewhere, in various of my own studies on word formation, nouns of action generally show an inherent tendency toward categorial change of meaning. This development, for which the term “drift,” going back to Edward Sapir, seems convenient, tends to proceed through the level of resultative noun (*nomen acti*) and in many cases reaches the level of concrete noun (interpretable as instrumental or local), in certain cases achieving even an agentive reading. Thus we find *vectis* originally a noun ending in *-ti-*, meaning ‘motion forward, transport’ which becomes concrete as an instrumental noun meaning ‘lever, Jack’. The younger class of nouns ending in *-(t)iōn*, still productive in Latin, is not exempted from this general development: cp. *mānsio* the actional version of which ‘staying, stop’, becomes concrete as ‘place of residence’ in Late Latin, to end at last as the everyday word for ‘house’ in French *maison*. This development in Latin also did not spare abstract nouns: *pastus* not only means ‘(the) grazing’ but also ‘grazing ground’, *cubitus* also has the concrete sense of ‘bed, couch’, *exercitus* almost ceases to mean ‘exercise’ (except occasionally in the plural), and becomes, rather, ‘army’.

It is this fact, the existence of such highly lexicalized examples (see in our earlier list [3] *gestus*, *habitus*), which, in my opinion, provides a further argument against the expansion, or even the preservation of the category supine in later times.

5.10 Opinions and terms of Latin grammarians

We have already emphasized the hybrid character of the Latin supine as it oscillates between verb and noun, supporting our position with the opinions and descriptive terms of Latin grammarians. We shall now supplement these with quotations and points of fact which bring into stronger relief the verbal character of this category.

- (11) (Priscian IX 39 [GL II 475,18f.])
in um desinens supinum accepto verbo infinito, quod est ire, facit infinitum futuri ut oratum ire
 ‘The supine ending in **-um** together with the infinitive of the verb *ire* forms the infinitive of the future tense as in *oratum ire* (= to go to pray)’

With this, he confirms the observation of modern philologists that *oratum ire* with its notion of future tense is interchangeable with the phrase *oraturus est*. This observation may be supplemented by the well-known fact that the so-called passive future infinitive in Latin, which, admittedly, its meagre occurrence considered, could never have been popular, has grown out of an infinitive formation based on the impersonal *itur* ‘one goes’ and a supine taken as a directional accusative.

That in the course of time a shift in the division into constituents took place, which made the directional case of the supine an element of the predicate phrase and the accusative object dependent on the supine the subject of an accusativus cum infinitivo is shown by the word order of both the old Latin examples that follow:

- (12) a. (Terence, Hec. 39)
rumor venit datum iri gladiators
 lit. ‘The rumour went that they were about to hold gladiatorial games’
- b. (Ad. 694)
credebas illam ... in cubiculum iri deductum?
 ‘Did you believe that she would be taken to your bedroom?’, lit. ‘that they go to guiding her...’

5.11 Instances of ambiguity between supine and perfect passive participle

If the quasi-subject role in these sentences were filled by a masculine or neutral noun or pronoun used in the singular, one might take the forms *datum* or *deductum* not as supines, but, more likely, as accusative participles of the perfect tense ending in *-tus*. And, here, we are on the trail of a further source of the gradual decline of the supine. The phonetic law dictating the raising of a short *o* in final syllables before *m*, *s*, *r* to an *u*, which inscriptions allow us to date in the third century BC, leads to the homophony of the supine formations with participial constructions. Thus supines (that is to say, certain morpho-syntactic and semantic conditions being fulfilled) could also be understood as participial constructions. We have thus the following ambiguous cases from Old Latin:

- (13) a. (Plautus, Aul. 605)
is speculatum huc misit me
 ‘This one has sent me over here for spying/as a spy’
- b. (Pers. 568)
venient ad te comissatum
 ‘They will come to you to hold a merry parade/procession’

- c. (Cist. 595)
perfectum ego hoc dabo negotium
 ‘I shall settle the business’ – ‘I shall have the business settled’
- d. (Terence, Haut. 950f.)
Syrus...adeo exornatum dabo, adeo depexum
 ‘I shall so very well equip Syrus, so thoroughly comb (i.e. batter) him’
- e. (Andr. 684)
ubiubi erit, inventum tibi curabo et mecum adductum tuum Pamphilum
 ‘No matter where he might be, I shall find him and bring to you your Pamphilus’

As Strunk (1962) has clearly demonstrated, such ambiguous cases become syntactic “switching points”; “Das Supinum wurde als eine adjektivische prädikative Ergänzung zum Objekt aufgefaßt..., Das neue Verständnis der syntaktischen Fügung führte nun zu einer völligen Adjektivierung des Supinums mit Genus- und Numerusattraktion” (Strunk 1962: 456).

This is demonstrated by the following three examples:

- (14) a. (Terentius, Phorm. 974)
hisce ego illam dictis ita tibi incensam dabo
 ‘On telling her of this, I’ll make her so incensed (orig. give to ignition) with you.’
- b. (Sallust, Jug. 59,3)
hostes paene victos dare
 ‘almost vanquish the enemies’ (orig. ‘give to defeat’)
- c. (Livius 4,19,3)
iam ego hanc mactatam victimam legatorum minibus dabo
 ‘I shall already offer this slaughtered victim to the souls of the late envoys’ (orig. ‘I shall give this victim for slaughter’).

Again Strunk: “Diese scheinbar rein partizipialen Objektsprädikativa sind genau wie die prädikativen Gerundiva nach Verben wie *dare*, *curare*, usw. nichts anderes als adjektivierte infinitivartige Verbalsubstantiva” (Strunk 1962: 456).

5.12 Conclusions

With the ambiguous “hinge-forms” discussed above we have an additional causative factor for the continuous decline of the supine at a time when the phonetic system had initiated a development towards the homophony of this category

with certain adjectival participle forms. We have reason therefore to assume that behind a further number of participial forms of the passive perfect, predicatively used, there lurks concealed a supine ending in *-um*, either disguised or misunderstood. A textual-critical examination of the relevant cases across the range of Latin literature would be, in truth, a formidable undertaking but one very rewarding in the circumstances.

6 Deverbal action nouns in Latin: types and tokens

In their original and most important function, Nomina actionis serve as a morphological tool in order to nominalize a process or a state of affairs usually realized as a verbal expression within an utterance. The derived noun as the result of this grammatical shift becomes quotable in following sentences, clauses or phrases as communicative unit and therefore serves as an indispensable means for the constitution of texts. Going back to the definition of Porzig (1942: 77), who defines deverbal action nouns from a synchronic and descriptive point of view as “Vergegenständlichung eines Satzinhaltes vom Verbum finitum aus.” The role of this morphosemantic class especially works for coherent, cohesive and consistent sequences, which immediately follow each other. A nice example which also explains the already mentioned verbal construction of the respective action noun occurs in Plautus Aul. 740/744. In a debate of some length a series of misunderstandings happens. Whereas a young man Lyconides begs for the old miser’s (Euclio) daughter whom he wants to marry, the old grouch believes he would be eager to get away with his golden pot (*aulula*), which he cautiously guards as a beloved treasure. The confusion is favored by the same feminine gender of *filia/puella* and *aulula*. Therefore in verse 740 the old man asks:

Cur id ausu’s facere, ut id quod non tuom esset tangeres?

‘Why could you dare to touch what does not belong to you?’

After some further steps of dispute the question expressing displeasure becomes even more urgent (verse 744).

Quid tibi ergo meam me invito tactiost?

Literally: ‘Why is for you a touch that (pot vs girl) against my intention’ (cf. Panagl 1980)

In Latin, there exist at least eight classes of deverbal nouns originally counting as a means to express actionality both through their formation and due to their

syntactico-semantic profile (Leumann 1977: 274–278, 344f., 353f., 366f., 370f., 377f.). All of these types could have already existed as far as there is available evidence by means of external reconstruction in the Indo-European period.

- The first class morphologically represents root nouns such as *lĕx*, *nix*, *frŭx* with the original respective meaning ‘collection’, ‘snowing’ and ‘consumption’.
- Another category is marked both by *o*-stem and *ā*-stem with *o*-ablaut in the root syllable: *rogus* originally ‘raising, setting upright’, *modus* ‘measuring’, (Abl.) *pontō* ‘(procedure of) weighing’, *toga* ‘outer garment’, *cūra* (**koiśā*) ‘care, concern’.
- The stems in *-tu* fully productive in the grammatical class of the supine (see Section 4) are reflected as lexical items in tokens such as *flētus* ‘crying’, *partus* ‘(giving) birth (to)’, *ictus* ‘hitting, beating; blow, slap’.
- Items belonging to *-ti* stems are *sitis* ‘thirst(ing)’ originally ‘becoming ruined, going bad’ and some examples exhibiting syncope of *-i-* in nominative: *ars* (**artis*) originally ‘skillfully putting together’, *mors* ‘dying, death (as a process)’, *mēns* ‘thinking’.
- The most productive type ending in *-tiōn-* might be considered as an “hyper-derivation” of a *-ti*-stem by the suffix *-ōn-*, alternatively as Pre-Latin isogloss with Celtic languages. From the numerous rather countless tokens of this class I only mention earlier attested items as *nātio* ‘(process of) birth’, *actio* ‘acting, action’, *passio* (*-t+t-* → *-ss-*) ‘suffering’.

In the case of the competing stems in *-ti* and *-tiōn-*, the latter ones often remain in the actional function whereas the former type semantically tends to a concrete reading, as can be demonstrated by the following minimal pairs: *vectis* ‘lever’ – *vectiō* ‘riding, using a vehicle’, *tussis* ‘cough’ – *tūsiō* (cf. *contūsiō*) ‘sprain(ing)’, *messis* ‘harvest’ – *messiō* ‘reaping’.

The derivation *statis* is just conserved as a frozen accusative *statim* as an adverb ‘immediately’. In the passage Plaut. Aph. 274 *ita statim stant signa* two readings are possible: either the item *statim* figures as an adverb or it is still used as part of a figura etymologica ‘stand a standing’. The more recent derivation *statio* appears with the notion ‘abode, position’.

- Formations with the suffix *-men* (**-m̥n*, cf. Greek *-μα* and Vedic *-ma*) originally should have been derivations with the value of genuine action nouns, since some cases of them were used in a couple of Indo-European languages (Greek, Vedic) in the function of infinitive. Therefore we may assume an “actional behavior” for this kind of nominalizations in Latin too: *agmen* ‘wandering, marching’, *numen* ‘nodding (of a God’s head)’, *tegmen* ‘cover(ing)’, *augmen* ‘increasing, increase’, *specimen* ‘(critical) looking at’; ‘proof, sample’.

- *mentum* as extension of the original ending *-men-* with the further suffix *-to-* into *-mento-*: *īnstrūmentum* ‘means, instrument’, *dētrīmentum* ‘damage, detriment’. There is an open question, whether this combination of derivational morphemes is just a phenomenon within the prehistory of Latin or if it had already emerged in an earlier period by generalization of the ablative suffix *-tos* (cf. **en-tos* → *intus* ‘from in(side)’, Gr. ἐντός Ved. *antas-* – and by analogy sub^{tu}s: from *sub* ‘from beneath’, funditus ‘from the very bottom, from the foundation’, etc.), which led to the genesis of a separate class of derivation. Items such as *tegumentum*, *augmentum*, *documentum*, *monumentum* do not need any further comment and semantic explanation.
- Formations involving *-s*-stems (PIE **-es*) are represented in Latin in the lexemes *genus* ‘gender’, *sīdus* ‘star, heavenly body’, *pondus* ‘weight’. Primarily, they should have been true action nouns in Latin as well, since the active infinitive probably originated in the locative singular of an *s*-formation. The reinterpretation of the case form working together with a change of the internal structure of the sentence results in common not to say trivial Acl pattern. Take the fictitious example *iubeo te *legesī ligna* ‘I order you to the collecting (locative) firewood (accusative)’, which results by sound change and syntactic restructuring in *iubeo te legere ligna* ‘I order/demand that you collect firewood’. In the case of the passive infinitive, the dative with an attitude of purpose or direction of an actional root noun should have been the origin of the construction. Cf. *iubeo ligna*legei* ‘I order the firewood for collection’. Afterwards this utterance may have been understood or interpreted as ‘I order that firewood be collected’ (passive).

7 Derivations of nominals from verbs in Australian languages

In this section a short digression to Australian languages is made. The vast majority of Australian languages belong to the so-called Pama-Nyungan family. The other languages belong to other smaller families or subgroups and are called non-Pama-Nyungan. It should be remarked that the genetic status of these families is still controversial (see Evans 2003). A still good introduction to Australian languages is Blake (1987).

This section does not present a new research on nominalization in Australian languages. Its aim is to illustrate that nominalization is a common feature, cross-linguistically. We present examples from 10 languages in alphabetical order (Alyawarra, Bunuba, Diyari, Djapu, Gumbaynggir, Guugu Yimidhirr, Kalkatungu, Uradhi,

Wambaya, and Wardaman). The presentation avoids theoretical discussion in the hope that it is readable for readers without knowledge of Australian languages. The theoretical background of nominalization and the difficulties to apply this notion to Australian examples is given in Nordlinger (2002). A more recent paper on action nominals is Comrie (2011) but it does not discuss examples from Australian languages.

- a. In **Alyawarra** (Pama-Nyungan) there is a nominal which is derived by the suffix *-intja*. These forms appear in object position:
(Yallop 1977: 89)

<i>anar-a</i>	<i>apilyalp-intja</i>
watch-IMP	come back-NOM

 ‘Look out for (his) coming back.’
- b. with enclitic postpositions:
(Yallop 1977: 90)

<i>amurr-ir-intj-anta</i>	<i>apiyalh-iya</i>
good-INTR-NOM-only	come-PERM

 ‘He can come when he’s got well.’

The same suffix forms a participle which depends on an object or an indirect object.

(Yallop 1977: 90)

<i>alk-intja</i>	<i>unta</i>	<i>ayinha</i>	<i>aw-iyanga</i>
shout-NOM	2sgA	1sgO	hear-NEG

 ‘You didn’t hear my shouting.’

(Yallop 1977: 131)

<i>aringk-irima</i>	<i>itwarini-ka</i>	<i>atntirr-irr-intja</i>
dog-some	see across-PAST	run-pl-NOM

 ‘(We) looked across at the dogs (which were) running.’

The allomorph *-ilanintja* also signals object position.

(Yallop 1977: 132)

<i>arranga-nima</i>	<i>atha</i>	<i>ari-ka</i>	<i>alp-ilanintja</i>
emu-then	1sgA	see-PAST	run away-NOM

 ‘I saw an emu (which was) walking away.’

(Yallop 1977: 90)

<i>teacher</i>	<i>atha</i>	<i>ari-ka</i>	<i>pulparri-lanintja</i>
teacher	1sgA	see-PAST	swim-NOM

 ‘I saw the teacher swimming.’

The suffix *-ila* ~ *-imila* derives a participle which signals subject position.

(Yallop 1977:130)

alku-ka atha rinha aynti-la-nima
eat-PAST 1sgA 3sgO lie-PART-then
'Then I ate it while lying.'

(Yallop 1977: 130)

Dorothy atntirri-ka amuly-ikitja atiriri-la
D. run-PAST lizard-NEGC fear-PART
'Dorothy, fearing the lizard, ran away.'

(Yallop 1977: 131)

ingu-pirna aynpilalh-imila aghirra-nima ipma ari-yalpi-ka
night-after depart-PART kangaroo-next dead see-LIG+AUX-PAST
'Setting out in the morning, (we) now came across a dead kangaroo.'

The suffix *-itjika* ~ *-iyika* signals purpose or obligation similar to Latin supinum.

(Yallop 1977: 53)

alku-tjika atha akira
eat-PURP 1sgA meat
'I want to eat some meat.'

(Yallop 1977: 134)

akngiy-ila ili-ka ayinha ura artj-itjika
my father-ERG tell-PAST 1sgO fire make-PURP
'My father told me to make a fire.'

In **Bunuba** (non-Pama-Nyungan) we find some suffixes which derive words with a lexicalized meaning. These are the suffix *-ngarri* (which appears as a comitative suffix), the suffix *-mili* for a typical behavior, and the suffix *-ngurru* which forms agents or instruments.

(Rumsey 2000: 62)

gambinyi-ngarri
egg (= testicle)-COM₁ = 'male dog'

(Rumsey 2000: 67)

garuwa-mili
alcohol-CHAR = 'drunkard'

(Rumsey 2000: 68)

jarlngga-ngurru
heal-DER = 'bushdoctor'

(Rumsey 2000: 68)

jandama-ngurru

pierceMA₂-DER = ‘needle’

There is a subordinate marker *-nya* which behaves like a participle and takes case markers.

(Rumsey 2000: 120)

birayga-iray-nya

ngag-ira

emerge-3sg+RA+PAST-SUB burn-PAST+3sgO3sgA-RA₂

‘When he (the parrot) came out he had got burned.’

(Rumsey 2000: 59)

yunggu-mili-nhingi

yatha-ray-nya-ngarri

yunggu-yuwa

scrub-CHAR-ABL

sit-3sg+RA+PAST-SUB-CTV

scrub-LOC

‘Because (he was a) scrub man he always used to sit down in the scrub.’

(Rumsey 2000: 109)

nyaga-wuni-nya-ingga

gurama

gamanba-ray-nhi

spear-3sgO3sgA+WU₂+PAST-SUB-ERG

man

hunt around-3sg+RA+

PAST-3sgOBL

‘The man who speared him was looking around for him.’

Note that the ergative marker appears on the first word of the phrase. I also point out that in Bunuba the verb is very complex. After a first word which bears the basic meaning, a complex of pronominal prefixes, the auxiliary verb (in our examples: RA, RA₂, WU₂), and TAM-markers follow.

There are two means by which nominals may be derived from verbs in **Diyari** (Pama-Nyungan). A noun can occur which precedes the verb immediately as an object.

One is the nominalizer *-ni* suffixed to verb stems (Austin 1981a: 161–162). It can derive an instrument.

padu ‘fish’, *parda* ‘tackle’ > *padu pardani* ‘fishing tackle’

pawa ‘seed’, *rdaka* ‘grind’ > *pawa rdakani* ‘seed grinder’

thina ‘foot’, *manda* ‘grasp’ > *thina mandani* ‘foot grasper’ = ‘trap’

wirlpa ‘hole’ > *wirlpanganka* ‘make a hole’ > *wirlpangankani* ‘hole maker’

= ‘opener’

We present one sentence (note that the ergative suffix *-li* and the locative suffix *-nhi* changes optionally the suffix *-ni* to *-na*).

(Austin 1981a: 162)

thina manda-na-li kinhthala parda-yi
 foot grasp-NOM-ERG dog hold-PRES
 ‘The trap is holding the dog.’

The suffix *-ni* also can denote an abstract noun (Austin 1981a: 163).

nganka ‘do’ > *ngankani* ‘work’
thukathadi ‘ride’ > *thukathadini* ‘riding’

(Austin 1981a: 163)

nhawu-ya ngakarni thukathadi-ni nhanhthu
 3sgnf-near 1sgDAT ride-NOM horse
 ‘This is my riding horse.’

(Austin 1981a: 163)

nhani ngama-yi kinhthala kungka-na-nhi
 3sgf sit-PRES dog limp-NOM-LOC
 ‘She is sitting with the lame dog.’

In Diyari there exists a so-called participial from of the verb which is marked by the suffix *-rna*. It is used in connection with some auxiliary verbs or is followed by another verb.

(Austin 1981: 94)

mankada-li nganha nhayi-rna warra-yi parlpa-yi
 girl-ERG 1sgO see-PART AUX-PRES some-ERG
 ‘Some girls saw me.’

Note that the present form of an auxiliary verb very often means past tense.

This form is also used for subordinate clauses. In what follows subject means the conflation of intransitive subject and agent. The participial form is used if a relative clause has the same subject as the main clause.

(Austin 1981a: 205)

nhawu wapa-yi karka-karka-rna
 3sgnfS go-PRES REDUP-shout-PART
 ‘He goes along calling out.’

(Austin 1981a: 207)

nhulu puka thayi-rna nhawu pali-rna warra-yi
 3sgnfA food eat-PART 3sgnfS die-PART AUX-PRES
 ‘While eating some food he died.’

The same construction is also used for inalienable possession. The prolativ suffix indicates that the subject is in motion (Austin 1981a:79).

(Austin 1981a: 207)

kapidi thana mindi-yi nhura tharrka-inga-rna
 goanna 3plS run-PRES tail stand-PROL-PART
 ‘Goannas’ tails stand up as they move.’

If the subject of the relative clause is not coreferential with the subject of the main clause the locative is added to the participial form.

(Austin 1981a: 210)

nganhi wilha-nhi yatha-lha ngana-yi yinda-rna-nhi.
 1sgS woman-LOC speak-FUT AUX-PRES cry-PART-LOC
 ‘I’ll talk to the woman who is crying.’

(Austin 1981a: 210)

panhtha-ma-ø-mayi kilhthi ngakarni ngathu wayi-rna warra-rna-nhi
 smell-TR-IMP-EMPH stew 1sgDAT 1sgA cook-PART AUX-PART-LOC
 ‘Smell my stew that I cooked.’

This change in the construction has been called switch-reference (see Austin 1981a, 1981b for a detailed discussion). It also works in sequential clauses. If the subjects are coreferential the ablative suffix is added to the participial form.

(Austin 1981a: 222)

nhawu pali-rna warra-yi munytyu ngama-rna-ndu
 3sgnFS die-PART AUX-PRES sick sit-PART-ABL
 ‘He died after being sick.’

If the subjects are not coreferential the nominalizer *-ni* is used.

(Austin 1981a: 223)

nganhi wakara-rna warra-yi yundu matya
 1sgS come-PART AUX-PRES 2sgA already
nganhthi wayi-rna warra-ni
 meat cook-PART AUX-NOM
 ‘I came after you have already cooked the meat.’

In this construction a longer form *-ningurra* is used.

(Austin 1981a: 223)

ngali nhinha manka-manka-yi matya nhawu pali-ningurra
 1duexcl 3sgnfO REDUP-find-PRES already 3sgnFS die-NOM
 ‘We find him after he had already died.’

Switch-reference also appears in implicated clauses. The future suffix *-lha* is used with same subjects.

(Austin 1981a: 189)

ngathu nganytya-yi wapa-lha
1sgA want-PRES go-FUT
'I want to go.'

If the subjects are not coreferential then the participial form plus the propriative suffix is used.

(Austin 1981a: 191)

pira kuku tharrka-yi thalara kurda-rna-nhthu
moon overturned stand-PRES rain fall-PART-PROP
'The moon is waning so some rain will fall.'

In Australia the waning of the moon is described as "standing upside down."

A further suffix is *-yitya* which is attached to the so-called participial form of verbs. The suffix *-yitya* denotes habitual associations (Austin 1981a: 164).

mind 'run' > *mindirnayitya* 'runner'
yinda 'cry' > *yindarnayitya* 'crier'
yawada 'word', *yingki* 'give' > *yawada yingkirnayitya* 'preacher'

A sentence follows.

(Austin 1981a: 161)

puluka rdama-rna-yitya-li marda mani-yi
bullock cut-PART-HAB-ERG stone get-PRES
'The butcher is getting the money (lit. stone).'

The next language is **Djapu**, a Yolngu dialect (Pama-Nyungan). Note that according to the used orthography the letter *ä* means long *a* and the letter *o* means long *u*. There is a nominalized verb form which is derived by the suffixes *-na(ra)* ~ *nha(ra)* ~ *nya(ra)*. The addition of the propriative suffix *~mirr* denotes a possible property.

(Morphy 1983: 109)

dhuwal yolŋu buny'tju-na-mirr
this person smoke-NOM-PROP
'This person is a smoker/is able to smoke.'

(Morphy 1983: 109)

dhuwal guya rluka-nha-mirr
this fish eat-NOM-PROP
'This fish is edible.'

The addition of the privative suffix *-miriw* means ‘unable to do X’ or ‘unable to be Xed’.

(Morphy 1983: 110)

nhä *ñä-nha-miriw*
what listen-NOM-PRIV
‘Why can’t you listen?’

(Morphy 1983: 110)

dhuwal *guya* *rluka-nha-miriw*
this fish eat-NOM-PRIV
‘This fish is inedible.’

(Morphy 1983: 78)

yatju-n-mi-nya-miriw
yell-UNM-REC-NOM-PRIV
‘Stop quarrelling!’

The nominalized form can take further verbal derivational suffixes.

(Morphy 1983: 76)

marnrdanjäthi-nya-mara-nha-mi-rr
3du cry-NOM-CAUS-NOM-REC-UNM
‘They make each other cry.’

We find (Morphy 1983: 77):

<i>rluka-nhara-y</i>	‘from eating’
eat-NOM-CAUS	
<i>nhä-nhara-ñur</i>	‘from seeing’
eat-NOM-CAUS	
<i>lruka-nha(ra)-mirr</i>	‘edible’
eat-NOM-PROP	
<i>djäma-mirr</i>	‘work’
work-PROP	

We note that there are around five verbs (like *djäma* ‘work, do’) which are Austronesian loans and are non-inflecting (Morphy 1983: 65).

The use of this suffix to express subordinate clauses is discussed in Morphy (1983). We give just one example.

ñarra *ñanya* *nhä-ma* *djatthu-nar* *gäyu*
1sgS/A 3sgO see-UNM chop-NOM tree
‘I’m watching him chopping down a tree.’

There is a suffix *-puyŋu* (~ ‘inhabitant of’) which is used with place names, e.g. *bäniyala-puyŋu* ‘person from Bäniyala’ (Morphy 1983: 45). Adding the suffix to a verb means ‘doer of X’.

(Morphy 1983: 110)

<i>wunay’</i>	<i>marrtji-nya</i>	<i>ŋunhi-ny-dhi</i>	<i>yolŋu-n</i>
honey	go-PASTNONIND	that-PRO-ANAPHORIC	person-ACC
<i>wapirti-warrtju-na-puyŋu-nha-ny</i>	<i>weka-nha</i>		
stingray-spear+pl-NOM-INHABITANT-ACC-PRO	give-PASTNONIND		

‘(We) would go and give honey to those stingray-spearling people.’

In **Gumbaynggir** (Pama-Nyungan) there is only one suffix *-gam* documented which is not very widely used (Eades 1979: 287).

(Eades 1979: 287)

<i>ngarridyu</i>	<i>nya:wang</i>	<i>ya:m</i>	<i>gulu:rra</i>	<i>bagu:liyay-gam</i>
3sgA	see+PAST	DEM	bones	lie+PRES-NOM

‘He saw the bones lying.’

(Eades 1979: 287)

<i>ngarra:nga</i>	<i>ngarri</i>	<i>gangga:liyay-gam</i>
listen+IMP	3sgO	call out+PRES-NOM

‘Listen to him calling out.’

(Eades 1979: 287)

<i>nga:dya</i>	<i>nungu:</i>	<i>nya:wang</i>	<i>biyambay-gam</i>
1sgA	kangaroo	see+PAST	eat+PRES-NOM

‘I saw the kangaroo being eaten.’

These examples show that the object of the main clause is either the intransitive subject or the object of the nominalized verb. If the actor of a transitive verb appears another construction is used.

(Eades 1979: 287)

<i>nga:dya</i>	<i>nungu:</i>	<i>nya:wang</i>	<i>ngarri-dyu</i>	<i>biyambang</i>
1sgA	kangaroo	see+PAST	3sg-ERG	eat+PAST

‘I saw the kangaroo, it ate (= I saw the kangaroo eating).’

This nominalized form can also be declined.

(Eades 1979: 287)

<i>ngayan</i>	<i>bunggi:-gam-ba</i>	<i>ngali:</i>	<i>ya:n.gu</i>	<i>ma:nay-gu</i>	<i>ga:yi</i>
sun	set+PRES-NOM-LOC	1duinclA	go+FUT	fetch-PURP	bream

‘When the sun sets we will go and get bream.’

Sometimes this form behaves like a participle.

(Eades 1979: 287)

dyu:gaway-gam *ni:garr* *ngayingging* *bigu:-da*
 be tired+PRES-NOM man sit+PAST tree-LOC
 ‘The tired man was sitting near the tree.’

Guugu Yimidhirr (Pama-Nyungan) has a suffix *-baga* which characterizes a person in the habit of something. It is joined to the verb stem by a ligative.

(Haviland 1979: 99)

nyulu *galga* *balga-al-baga*
 3sg spear make-LIG-HAB
 ‘He is a spear maker / He is always making spears.’

(Haviland 1979: 99)

milbi *miirrii-l-baga* *nhayun*
 story tell-LIG-HAB that
 ‘That one is a gossip / That one is always telling stories.’

There are some other verbal suffixes which signal different types of subordinate clauses but they can hardly be seen to derive nominals. There are two suffixes which are related to the main clause in the following way. The suffix *-ayga* ~ *-ga* seems to be used if the subordinate subject is the object in the main clause.

(Haviland 1979: 141)

ngayu *bama* *nhaadhi* *buligi* *gunda-ayga*
 1sgA man see+PAST bullock kill-SUB₁
 ‘I saw a man kill the bullock.’

The suffix *-nhun* mostly is used if the subject in the subordinate clause is the intransitive subject or agent of the main clause.

(Haviland 1979: 142)

ngayu *mayi* *buda-y* *gadaa-nhun*
 1sgA food eat-PAST come-SUB₂
 ‘I ate the food while (I was) coming.’

Kalkatungu (Pama-Nyungan) contains a suffix *-nytyirr* which characterizes typical behavior. The antipassive suffix *-yi* is used as a ligative.

(Blake 1979: 79)

thungumpirri *tyaa-ka* *arkunaan* *lha-yi-nytyirr*
 bad here-PROS savage kill-ANTI-NOM
 ‘He’s bad, a savage killer.’

Another suffix *-nti* expresses some instruments.

(Blake 1979: 80)

kuu-ya *puyur-puni-nti-yi-nytyirr*
 water-DAT hot-TR-INST-ANTI-NOM
 ‘a boiler (= a thing which one makes water hot)’

The suffix *-manthi* is glossed as Imperfect II by Blake. It behaves like a participle and case markers are attached to it.

(Blake 1979: 109)

ngatyi *kurla-yi* *arnka-manhthi-thu* *lhayi* *tyaa* *thungumpirri*
 1sgDAT father-ERG ail-IMPERF-ERG kill here bad
 ‘My sick father killed the bad man.’

(Blake 1979: 55)

paa *ngai* *pirlapirla-ya* *manyi-yi* *ingka-manhthi-i*
 there 1sgS child-DAT see-ANTI go-IMPERF-DAT
 ‘I’m watching that kid walking.’

The antipassive suffix *-yi* which means a continuing action requires the dative for O-function.

There is another participle *-nyin* ~ *-tyin* which also takes case markers (in the first example the absolutive marker is $\emptyset$).

(Blake 1979: 59)

ngathu *manya* *matyumpa* *ari-li-nyin* *kathirr-ku*
 1sgA see kangaroo eat-ANTI-PART grass-DAT
 ‘I saw a kangaroo eating grass.’

(Blake 1979: 59)

yarikayan-ati-nyin-tu *tyaa* *ngathu* *lhayi*
 hungry-INTR-PART-ERG here 1sgA kill
 ‘Being hungry I killed it.’

(Blake 1979: 59)

ngathu *lhayi* *yurru* *nhitha-yi-nyin* *ngatyi-wa-ku* *yalkapari-i*
 1sgA hit man steal-ANTI-PART 1sgDAT-LIG-DAT boomerang-DAT
 ‘I hit the man who stole my boomerang.’

(Blake 1979: 114)

tyaa yunhthu ngatyi thuku pilhthipuniyi tyipa-yi mrtia-ku
 here arm 1sgDAT dog crush this-ERG rock-ERG
nguyi-nyin-tu
 fall-PART-ERG

‘The falling rock crushed my dog the paw (= my dog’s paw).’

We also look at **Uradhi** (Pama-Nyungan). The suffix *-nyu* ~ *-nhu* derives the name of an action or its performer.

(Crowley 1983: 372)

unma-nhu uluβa rapan
 swim-NOM 3sgSA strong
 ‘She is a strong swimmer.’

(Crowley 1983: 372)

uŋumu wanhthi-nhu ikanma
 3sgGEN cook-NOM good+PRES
 ‘His cooking is good.’

(Crowley 1983: 372)

ayu unhuβa akyi-n ipinyi-nhu
 1sgSA 3sgO see-PAST swim-NOM
 ‘I could see him swimming.’

(Crowley 1983: 372)

antuβa ikya-nhu-mun apama-rri
 2sgSA speak-NOM-ABL be silent-IMP
 ‘Stop talking!’

(Crowley 1983: 372)

uluβa ina-nhu-mun anya-n
 2sgSA sit-NOM-ABL stand-PAST
 ‘He stood up after having been sitting.’

The ablative often means a change from one state or action to another.

(Crowley 1983: 373)

urra yuku aŋa-nhu-:namu
 this stick dig-NOM-GEN
 ‘This stick is for digging.’

The genitive is used for the purpose.

(Crowley 1983: 379)

uluβa minha iḍiniŋa-n ama-nhu-yu
 3sgSA bird chase-PAST fly-NOM-DAT
 ‘He chased the bird so it would fly.’

(Crowley 1983: 379)

ayuβa unye-nhu-yu
 1sgSA drink-NOM-DAT
 ‘I want to drink (something).’

(Crowley 1983: 380)

uluβa aḍal aŋa-al
 3sgSA hole dig-PRES
 ‘He digs a hole.’

Here *aḍal* ‘hole’ is given in the (unmarked) absolutive. In the subordinate clause the case-marking is shifted.

(Crowley 1983: 380)

uluβa ana-:lu aḍaw-yu aŋa-nhu-yu
 3sgSA go-PRES hole-DAT dig-NOM-DAT
 ‘He is coming to dig a hole.’

But confer with the following sentence where 1sgO *anhiβa* is used instead of 1sgDAT *athantyu*.

(Crowley 1983: 379)

uluβa ana-:lu anhiβa muntye-nyu-yu
 3sgSA go-PRES 1sgO kick-NOM-DAT
 ‘He is coming back to kick me.’

An interesting example is **Wambaya** (non-Pama-Nyungan). This language has four nominal classes (labelled with Roman numbers) and it possesses an infinitive. The verb can also take case markers.

(Nordlinger 1998: 164)

ngaj-bi ngi-ny-a yarru-warda
 see-NFUT 1sgA-2O-PAST go-INF
 ‘I saw you walking along.’

The dative marks purposive.

(Nordlinger 1998: 165)

mawula-ji-nka g-amany yarru
 play-TH-DAT 3sgS-PAST.TWD go
 'He came to play.'

The next sentence can be interpreted in a way that the infinitive keeps its verbal construction.

(Nordlinger 1998: 165)

yabu ngiy-a gijilulu jiya-ji-nka marn dangi-nka
 have 3sg.nm-PAST money.IV give-TH-DAT white man-DAT
 'She got money to give to the white man.'

However, the next sentence could yield a different interpretation. The pronoun *ngaya* is the oblique case. Therefore the whole purposive phrase can be seen as marked as dative.

(Nordlinger 1998: 214)

yarru ng-amany ngaji-nka ngaya
 go 1sgS-PAST.TWD see-DAT 3sgf+OBL
 'I came to see her.'

The abbreviations TWD and AWY stand for "toward" and "away." They refer to the direction of movement.

The locative marker stands for simultaneous events with coreferential subject.

(Nordlinger 1998: 165)

marrajini-nka ng-uba yarru alalangmi-ji-ni
 kangaroo.I-DAT 1sgS-NPAST.AWY go hunt-TH-LOC
 'I'm going hunting for kangaroos.'

TH stands for the thematic consonant (plus epenthetic vowel).

If the subjects are different, the construction is similar to an accusative with infinitive.

(Nordlinger 1998: 213)

ilinga-j-ba nguyu-ny-u gurla ngarl-warda
 hear-TH-FUT 3sgnmA-2O-FUT 2duO talk-INF
 'She will listen to you two talking.'

The ablative marker signals a preceding event.

(Nordlinger 1998: 166)

gannga g-amany alalangmi-ji-nnga
 return 3sgS-PAST.TWD hunt-TH-ABL
 ‘He returned from hunting.’

The situation of non-finite subordinate clauses is complex and discussed in greater detail in Nordlinger (1998). We give one example of a purposive subordinate clause. Note that the ditransitive verb *jiwayu* ‘give’ requires two accusative objects in a main clause but here it takes dative.

(Nordlinger 1998: 214)

yabu ngiy-a gijilulu jiya-ji-nka marmdangi-nka
 have 3sgnmA-PAST money give-TH-DAT white man.I-DAT
 ‘She had money to give to the white man.’

In the section “Verb-to-nominal morphology” Nordlinger mentions three derivational suffixes. One very productive suffix is the agentive nominalizer.

(Nordlinger 1998: 105)

iniyaga wugbardj-j-barli ngurra
 that.Isg cook-TH-NOM.I 1plincl.OBL
 ‘He’s our cook.’

It is not a great surprise that the object of a transitive verb appears as a dative complement.

(Nordlinger 1998: 105)

ngawurniji aliyulu-j-barlima mayinanyi-nka
 1sg find-TH-NOM.II goanna.I-DAT
 ‘I found the goanna (lit. I am the finder – here a female finder which is signaled by class II – of the goanna – a greater reptile in Australia).’

There is a rare suffix which derives instruments which are highly lexicalized.

(Nordlinger 1998: 106)

ngarag ‘drink’ > *ngarag-ana* ‘grog’

The privative suffix primarily derives nominals from nouns but can also be used with verbs to express the meaning ‘one who cannot/does not do X’ or ‘one who cannot be/is not Xed’.

(Nordlinger 1998: 100)

ngawurniji langan-bajarna
 1sg climb-PRIV.II
 ‘I can’t climb (that tree).’

(Nordlinger 1998: 100)

manku-j-baji

hear-TH-PRIV.I

‘(He is) deaf.’

Wardaman (non-Pama-Nyungan) has several nominal classes which may be signaled by prefixes (in our examples WU). It is rich of productive affixes. The suffix *-yiwujban* ~ *-wujban* characterize persons.

(Merlan 1994: 273)

bu ‘hit’ > *buyiwujban* ‘pugnacious person’, *wo* ‘give’ > *woyiwujban* ‘generous’,

lurle ‘cry’ > *lurlewujban* ‘crybaby’, *wirriwirri-ma* ‘shake the

head’ > *wirriwirrimawujban* ‘nay-sayer’

This suffix can also be attached to nouns.

(Merlan 1994: 273)

wiyan ‘water; grog’ > *wiyawujban* ‘drunkard’, *warrang-gin*

‘corroborree’ > *warrang-gujban* ‘singer’, *yirlarla-n* ‘country’ > *yirlarla-wujban*

‘traveller’

The suffix *-yi* forms infinitives.

(Merlan 1994: 272)

bu ‘hit’ > *buyi* ‘hitting’, *gurr-ga* ‘sleep’ > **gurr-gibayi* > *gurr-gibiyi/gurr-gibi*

‘sleeping’

Some examples follow. The use of the verbal prefix *ya-* (labelled as 3) is discussed in Merlan (1994: 124).

(Merlan 1994: 278)

ya-wud-janga-n *jejbarla-yin* *wu-munburra-wu*

3-3nsg-come-PRES ask-NOM+PURP WU-money-DAT

‘They are coming to ask for money.’

(Merlan 1994: 278)

ngan-jewu-ri *ginyi-yin* *mayi-wu*

3sgA1sgO-show-PAST cook-NOM+PURP food-DAT

‘He showed me how to cook [the] food.’

Note that in both sentences the object of the infinitive is marked as dative.

(Merlan 1994: 283)

jarrambu-yi-warr mayi-warr ngarr-ya
 search-NOM-ALL food-ALL 1inclpl-go
 ‘Let’s go looking for food.’

Here the whole phrase bears an allative marker on both words. This phenomenon could be related to modal case marking in some Australian languages (Dench and Evans 1988).

The following sentences where the verb stems *ngorlog* ‘talk’, *worlorl* ‘fill’ are expanded by a so-called particle suffix, are similar.

(Merlan 1994: 277)

ngan-gaygbarla-n ngorlog-ba-wu mad-gu
 3sgA1sgIO-shout to-PRES talk-VPART-DAT word-DAT
 ‘He’s shouting to me to talk language.’

(Merlan 1994: 277)

yirr-worlorl-ma-rri-ya wurru-gu mernde-wu bornborn-gu
 1exnsg-fill-VPART-PAST-NAR 3nsg-DAT white-DAT bathe-DAT
 ‘We filled it up (the tank) for Europeans to bathe.’

7.1 Final remarks

Hopefully, this section shows that Australian languages exhibit different forms of nominalizations. Occasionally examples could be found where nominalized verbs assign a different case than the verb in a clause.

8 Categorical types of semantic development – kinds of lexicalization

8.1 Semantic development as a drift phenomenon

A model that I developed some time ago for my own investigations of action nouns in a couple of languages – especially Modern German – provides a successive multi-stage development from an abstract meaning (as a process, state or factual circumstances) to a concrete notion following a scalar and irreversible procedure over mostly ideally six stages or steps:

(i) *Nomen actionis* → (ii) *nomen acti/rei actae* → (iii) concrete materialized result as a tangible object → (iv) instrument → (v) place maybe considered as an instrument with a local dimension → (vi) (group of) person(s)

This type of gradual change or rather mutation seems to be a true drift phenomenon in the acknowledged terminology of Sapir (1921: 168–170).

Drawing from contemporary German, this development can be illustrated step by step in the following chain: *Bewilligung*, *Befreiung*, *Beseitigung* – *Rettung*, *Verwandlung*, *Besprechung* – *Zeichnung*, *Radierung*, *Verwundung* – *Heizung*, *Bekleidung*, *Ernährung* – *Wohnung*, *Behausung*, *Siedlung* – *Regierung*, *Versammlung*; *Bedienung*, *Begleitung*.

To supplement this list with some comments, first I point at such types of pairs where merely the co-text, the context or the syntactic behavior makes a difference as far as the intention of the speaker/writer and the interpretation of the listener/reader is concerned. In a phrase *die Rettung eines Menschen*, the (result of the) actional notion becomes quite evident, whereas in the case of *die Rettung wird bald kommen*, the concrete institution with its equipment (car, crew, etc.) becomes more plausible. Both by the respective verb of motion (*kommen*) and the empirical pragmatic knowledge of the world. Likewise, the noun *Erziehung* can be understood both as a process and the result of this procedure. Cf. *die Erziehung der Kinder ist eine schwere Aufgabe* versus *Diese Kinder haben eine gute Erziehung*. In the case of *Regierung* with its threefold notion (‘governing’ – ‘government’ – ‘team of politicians; parliament’. A genitive attribute (*Österreichs*) might be interpreted either as a subjective or objective case. A similar situation appears in Russian, where sometimes the syntactic properties of a derivation enable the speaker/listener to differentiate between two possible readings. In the deverbal compound *rukovodstvo* when signifying “direction” as a procedure the nominalization is constructed with instrumental case just as in a syntagma involving a verb (*rukovodstvo institutom*), whereas when it means a (group of) person(s), adnominal genitive appears (*rukovodstvo instituta*). A similar doublet of constructions appears in *vladenije*: ‘mastery’ (*jazykom* ‘of language’ instrumental case) versus ‘possession’ (*knig* ‘of the books’ genitive plural).

For the genesis of such ambiguous, i.e. personal formations with personal interpretation or reading, sometimes a combination of syntactic and pragmatic reasons can be held responsible. In the case of *Begleitung* ‘company’ versus ‘accompanists’, a gap between the production of the utterance and its apperception/interpretation may be the (or at least a) reason for the ambivalent notion. In an expression *Ich habe Hans mit neuer Begleitung gesehen* the proper meaning of the deverbal noun is the process of being accompanied by a person. But since this “action” implies an “agent,” the nominalization can be understood as

accompanist, which finally becomes lexicalized in this personal (individual or collective) meaning. For similar cases in the area of semantic change cf. Leumann (1927: 105–118).

In Latin, the scale of increasing concretization is attested for example in the semantic history of the item *legatio*: the semantic drift starts with ‘message’ (*legationem suscipere*), is continued as ‘task’ (*legationem referre*) and ‘office’ (*legationem administrare*) and ends up with (collective) agentive notion ‘ambassador, legation’ (*legationes sociorum reverti iubentur*). In another case this kind of successive shift appears in *cenatio* ‘feeding’ with its further readings ‘meal’ (concrete) and ‘dining room’ (location).

8.2 Some instances of lexicalization

Lexicalization in conventional and widely accepted linguistic terminology holds for cases when a lexeme though derived in a transparent way from a clear-cut base (deverbalization, denominalization, deadjectivalization) is not yet predictable as far as its special meaning is concerned. Whereas *lectio* from a semantic point of view is the result of the “intension” of *legere* together with the categorial meaning of action nouns, the items *legio* as a military term and *lex* ‘law’ (in a sense of a collection of orders, warnings, etc.) became opaque having drifted into the lexicon (both as a book and a mental object) and therefore must be learned as separate units. In most cases, lexicalization leads to a stricter and neater meaning (with a more specific intension, i.e. the internal content of a term or concept), whereas the extension (i.e. all the things or concepts to which it applies, also including the frequency of usage) decreases. The agent noun *legulus* is not the common word denoting a collector in its broad sense of application, but is specialized for a slave trained and assigned to collect olives fallen from the tree. Quite similarly *factus* (*u-stem*) exhibits another specialization of notion, since in a certain period of language history and within a sort of texts, it cannot denote the process of making/producing something in general but rather points at the pressing of olives to gain oil.

Appendix: list of abbreviations

A	agent
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ALL	allative
ANTI	antipassive
AUX	auxiliar verb

AWY	away
CAUS	causative
CHAR	characterizing suffix
COM	comitative
CTV	continuative
DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
DER	derivational suffix
du	dual
EMPH	emphatic clitic
ERG	ergative
excl	exclusive
f	feminine
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
HAB	habitual
IMP	imperative
IMPERF	imperfect
incl	inclusive
INF	infinitive
INST	instrumental
INTR	derives an intransitive verb
LIG	ligative
LOC	locative
m	masculine
NAR	narrative particle
NEG	negation
NEGC	negative causal
nf	non-feminine
NFUT	non-future
nm	non-masculine
NOM	nominalizer
NPAST	non-past
nsg	non-singular
O	object
OBL	oblique
PART	participle
PAST	past
PASTNONIND	past non-indicative
PERM	permissive
pl	plural
PRES	present
PRIV	privative
PRO	prominence clitic
PROL	prolative
PROP	proprietary
PROS	prosodic particle

PURP	purposive
REC	reciprocal
REDUP	reduplicated
S	intransitive subject
sg	singular
SUB	subordinate
TH	thematic suffix
TR	derives a transitive verb
TWD	toward
UNM	unmarked tense
VPART	verb particle
1,2,3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person

References

- Austin, Peter. 1981a. *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, Peter. 1981b. Switch-reference in Australia. *Language* 57(2). 309–334.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1932. Supinum. *Revue de Philologie* 58. 136–137.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1948. *Noms d'Agent et Noms d'Action en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Blake, Barry. 1987. *Australian Aboriginal grammar*. London, Sydney & Wolfeboro, NH: Croom Helm.
- Blake, Barry J. 1979. *A Kalkatungu grammar*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in transformational grammar*, 184–221. Waltham, MA: Ginn.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2011. Action nominals between verbs and nouns. *Rivista di Linguistica* 23(1). 7–20.
- Crowley, Terry. 1983. Uradhi. In Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol. 3, 306–428. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Dench, Alan & Nicholas Evans. 1988. Multiple case-marking in Australian languages. *AJL* 8. 1–47.
- Eades, Diana. 1979. Gumbaynggir. In Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol. 1, 244–361. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. Comparative non-Pama-Nyungan and historical linguistics. In Nicholas Evans (ed.), *The non-Pama-Nyungan languages of Northern Australia*, 3–25. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Haviland, John. 1979. Guugu Yimidhirr. In Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol. 1, 26–180. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X'-Syntax: A study of phrase structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jenkins, Lyle. 1977. Morphology in the extended standard theory. In Gaberell Drachman (ed.), *Akten der 2. Salzburger Frühlingstagung für Linguistik*, 141–155. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Leumann, Manu. 1927. Zum Mechanismus des Bedeutungswandels. *IF* 45. 105–118.

- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik auf der Grundlage des Werkes von Friedrich Stolz und Joseph Hermann Schmalz, Band 1: Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre.* (= Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2:2,1). München: Beck.
- Merlan, Francesca C. 1994. *A grammar of Wardaman: A language of the Northern Territory of Australia.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Morphy, Frances. 1983. Djapu, a Yolngu dialect. In Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol. 3. xxiv.1–188. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 1998. *A grammar of Wambaya, Northern Territory (Australia).* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 2002. Non-finite subordinate verbs in Australian languages: Are nominalised verbs really nominalised?. In Cynthia Allen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2001 conference of the Australian linguistic society.* <https://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als2001/nordlinger.pdf> (last accessed 11 August 2020).
- Panagl, Oswald. 1980. Die verbale Rektion deverbalen Substantiva im Licht der neueren Wortbildungstheorie. In Joachim Dalfen, Karl Forstner, Maximilian Fussl & Wolfgang Speyer (eds.), *Symmetria Philologica Salisburgensia. Georgio Pfligerstorffer Sexagenario Oblata*, 291–307. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Panagl, Oswald. 1985. Das lateinische Supinum: Geschichte und Funktion einer grammatischen Kategorie. In Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner (eds.), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Berlin 20.–25. Februar 1983*, 324–339. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Panagl, Oswald. 2002. Ein Verbum – drei Perfektstämme. Zur Morphologie von lateinisch pangō. In Matthias Fritz & Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, 349–355. Graz: Leykam.
- Porzig, Walter. 1942. *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rumsey, Alan. 2000. Bunuba. In Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *The Handbook of Australian languages*. vol. 5, 34–152. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language.* New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Skard, Eiliv. 1932. Studien zur Sprache der Epistulae ad Caesarem. *Symbolae Osloenses* 10. 61–98.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1962. Über Gerundium und Gerundivum. *Gymnasium* 69. 429–460.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1926. *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch. I.* Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Yallop, Colin. 1977. *Alyawarra: An Aboriginal language of Central Australia.* Canberra: A.I.A.S.