

Björn Lundquist, Universitetet i Tromsø/CASTL

A note on bare verbal forms vs. verb-(*n*)*ing* in compounds etc.

In this talk I will discuss three contexts where bare verbal roots and de-verbal (*n*)*ing*-nominals seem to compete for the same “slot”. I will try to determine which the relevant factors are for determining the shape of the stem. Finally I will say some things about the so-called linking *-s* that sometimes turns up in nominalizations, and about lexical categories of “roots” in general.

First, in many nominal contexts, verbs surface either in the (*n*)*ing*-form, or as something that looks like a bare root (or some other nominal form).

- (1) a. Jag hörde ett rop / ??ett visk
- b. Jag hörde en viskning / ??en ropning

Secondly, in V-N compounds, the verbal left-hand member can come out either in a bare form, or as a (*n*)*ing*-nominal (or another nominalized form). If overt nominalizing morphology is present, the linking *-s* is obligatory. If the verb appears in its bare form, the linking *-s* is only seen if the verbal element is clearly complex, as seen in (2-c):

- (2) a. skriv-maskin, spring-tur, vänt-rum,
- b. kopiering-s-maskin, träning-s-läger vandring-s-led, övervakning-s-kamera
- c. ut-tal-s-övning, in-kör-s-port etc.

Finally, the derivational suffix *-bar* attaches either to a bare form (2-a), or a (*n*)*ing*-nominal (2-b) (see Josefsson 1998 for discussion). The linking *-s* is once again present in the (*n*)*ing*-forms, but it is however (preferably) absent both when the left-hand element is simple and complex:

- (3) a. ät-bar, reparer-bar, stapel-bar etc.
- b. behandling-s-bar, öppning-s-bar etc.
- c. ut-tal-bar (??ut-tal-s-bar), in-fäll-bar (??in-fäll-s-bar) etc.

Given the existence of such a thing as zero-derived de-verbal nominals (or noun-verb-conversion), one could suspect that all verb-looking left-hand members in nominalizations and *-bar*-derived adjectives, are in fact nominal. That would mean that we don't have any V-N compounds in Swedish, and that adjectives derived by *-bar* in fact are compounds. Looking closer at the data, it however becomes obvious that there are different forces at work in all three cases. In the *bar*-cases, (*n*)*ing* is only used if the outcome of bare root + *-bar* would violate phonotactic constraints of Swedish (i.e. **vandr-bar*). We can see clearly verbal stems in the *bar*-adjectives, most notably verbs that end in *er(a)*, as in *reparer-bar*. Verb forms ending in *er(a)* can otherwise never form zero-derived nominals, and only very rarely appears as the left-hand member in V-N compounds, unless they appear in unambiguously nominal form (the only exception that I know of is *friser-salong*). The (*n*)*ing*-form is also more likely to be used if the verbal stem is morphologically complex. In the compounds, the (*n*)*ing*-form is also more likely to be used if the left-hand member is complex (compare *hyr-bil* and *ut-hyr-ning-s-bil*), though other factors are involved as well. When it comes to nominalizations, certain verb groups are more likely to have corresponding zero-derived nominal forms than others (see Hale and Keyser 2002 for discussion). In the end though, noun-verb-conversion is not productive, and the zero-derived de-verbal nouns probably have to be listed in the lexicon, in contrast to the *-(n)ing*-forms that are productively formed. Taking everything together, it seems like only a subset of the verbal roots that come out in their bare form in *-bar*-forms will come out as bare when they appear as left-hand members in compounds, and only a subset of them come out as bare/zero-derived nominals.

I will lay out the different patterns and tendencies, and then speculate about the linking-*s* and the nature of stems/roots in compounds and derived forms.