Different syntactic contexts of two types of abstract nominalizations in English

Piotr Twardzisz
University of Warsaw, Poland

The interaction of lexis and grammar is clearly visible in morphologically complex words. The presence of grammar in inflected words is obvious. However, the interaction of grammar and derived (affixed) words is not so evident. In particular, productive low-frequency affixed types constitute intriguing cases for lexico-grammatical analyses.

In the case of affixed words, two levels of lexico-grammatical interaction can be tentatively postulated. At one level, interaction takes place word-internally regarding a morphologically complex word. At the other level, interaction takes place between a morphologically complex word itself and its immediate syntactic environment. The two levels of lexico-grammatical interaction are different, but both involve an intricate interplay between lexical items and their 'host' grammatical constructions.

Two word-formation patterns will be analysed regarding the two kinds of interaction. One pattern consists of proper names (names of political states) with the nominalizing suffix *-ization* (e.g. *Japanization*). The other pattern consists of proper names (politicians' surnames) attracting the nominalizing suffix *-ism* (e.g. *Titoism*). The nominalizations obtained from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA) (Davies 2008) show mutual attraction between the lexical and grammatical component. High morphological productivity of both patterns, confirmed in this study, constitutes evidence of this mutual lexico-grammatical dependence. A detailed analysis of the grammatical environments for these nominalizations indicates more lexico-grammatical relationships.

Some clarifications are required for the choice of the above two word-formation patterns. Given that any nominalizations ending in *-ization* and *-ism*, regardless of the word-formation base, are very frequent, some narrowing of the range of data is necessary. Both types of suffixation appear in numerous formations, which makes a detailed qualitative analysis of all these types impossible to carry out. While basic statistics can be collected for all these formations, dealing with their syntactic contexts verges on the impossible. Therefore, the choice has been made to limit the total amount of data and fine-tune the semantic make-up of the formations in question. The above two types of formations constitute homogeneous semantic categories. Detailed qualitative analyses of their syntactic contexts should yield results which are characteristic of these semantically consistent word-formation categories.

The two pools of data were obtained via two independent searches. Nominalizations in *-ism* with politicians' surnames cannot be retrieved automatically. Initially, any nominalizations in *-ism*, regardless of their bases, were extracted from COCA's written text genres. As a result, 2,534 types (with 114,903 tokes) were obtained from academic texts and 1,935 types (with 96,353 tokens) were retrieved from journalistic texts. After manual selection of the bases, 37 and 52 types with politicians' surnames were found in academic and journalistic texts, respectively. In academic texts, the 37 types were represented by 1,333 tokens, which is 1.2% of all 114,903 tokens in this genre. In journalistic texts, the 52 types were represented by 861 tokens, which constitutes 0.9% of all 96,353 tokens in this genre. Nominalizations in *-ization* with names of political states are only allegedly easier to obtain automatically. The queries used constituted the three possible endings of English *Nomina Actionis*: **zation*, **sation* and **fication.* The three lists obtained (one for each ending) consisted of 2,018, 339 and 657 types, ending in *-zation*, -

sation and *-fication*, respectively. Each of these types covered varied numbers of tokens, from 51,832 to 1. The lists were searched manually. Out of the initial list of 193 names of the United Nations member states, 187 potential derivational bases-names were established. However, in the COCA search, only 47 out of the 187 expected derivational bases were detected in abstract nominalizations (i.e. 47 state names altogether). These were distributed across the two genres, academic and journalistic. In the academic, 39 types were supported with 587 tokens. In the journalistic, 24 types were backed up with 154 tokens. Some of the types were found in both genres.

While an affixed formation (e.g., *Brasilianization* or *Clintonism*) counts as a lexical item (a noun in this case), it also includes a semi-grammatical component represented by the suffix (i.e., *-ization* and *-ism*, respectively). Thus, an affixed derivation constitutes a lexico-grammatical unit. The affix determines the syntactic (i.e. nominal) profile of the composite formation. But, the relationship between the base and the affix is bidirectional. On the one hand, a particular base type (particular proper name) is required by a given suffix. On the other, a particular suffix is called for by a given (type of) proper name. The actual process of attaching a bound morpheme to a lexical base is sanctioned by a word-formation pattern (e.g., $[[name_1][ization_N]]$, $[[name_2][ism_N]]$). These simplified patterns are lexical and grammatical, or semantic and syntactic units, at the same time. Loosely, these patterns follow Langacker's (1987, 1991) schemas or Croft's (2009: 21) constructions.

Both kinds of nominalizations are used within certain syntactic constructions. The data from COCA after manual post-editing show several regular lexico-syntactic patterns (cf. Hunston & Francis 2000) hosting and interacting with key nominalizations. The comparison of these patterns results in two general observations. Nominalizations in *-ism* are more noun-like than those bearing the suffix *-ization*. The latter are more verb-like, though both types are derived nouns. The verb-like nature of *-ization* nouns is dictated by the internal *-ize* verb, but also by the syntactic environment characteristic of verbs. Nominalizations in *-ism* contain nouns, so they are noun-like internally. But, also, they appear in syntactic constructions compatible with their internal syntactic qualities.

References

Croft, W. (2009) *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, M. (2008). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 520 million words, 1990–present*. corpus.byu.edu/coca [accessed 18 May 2017].

Hunston, S. & Francis, G. (2000) *Pattern Grammar: A corpus-driven approach to the lexical grammar of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Langacker, R.W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1: *Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R.W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 2: *Descriptive application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.