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Abstract:
This paper addresses the formation of deverbal nominals denoting participants in the event(uality) (agent, patient, holder, etc.), starting with so called “agent” –eur nominals in French (chercheur ‘researcher’), the apparent competing form in -ant (enseignant ‘teacher’) and extending the claims to internal arguments (invité (lit. invited) ’guest’).

Three main claims will be defended. First, we argue in favor of a three-way classification of names of participants, in terms of episodic, dispositional and referential nouns, departing from a bi-partite distinction, either in terms of an [inanimate-eventive] contrast (as in Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1992) or in terms of the [episodic-dispositional] distinction alone (as in Alexiadou & Schäfer (to appear)).

Second, we show that “agent” nominals can be integrated in a unified theory of deverbal nominalizations once we accept that: (i) stativity and genericity may be structurally built-up in nominalizations; and (ii) dispositional deverbal nominals are eventive (although not episodic). In particular, we argue in favor of a tight connection between argument structure and event interpretation, which goes beyond what has been suggested for event nominals (e.g., Grimshaw’s 1990): the nature (specific or non-specific) of the argument structure is important in building the episodic vs. dispositional meaning in names of participants. This work is compatible with recent findings at the interface between syntax and semantics in the domain of derived nominals that strongly supports the idea that derived nominals inherit/contribute (cf., Alexiadou et al. (to appear), Hass et al. 2008, Sichel 2010) fine aspectual distinctions. This is also true of the generic character of the underlying eventuality, as well as stativity, we argue.

Finally, we show that names for internal arguments can be fully integrated within this approach, once we accept that only specific arguments (as opposed to non-specific ones) may be nominalized.