Ora Matushansky, SFL (CNRS/Université Paris-8/UPL)/UiL OTS/Utrecht University
email: Ora.Matushansky@cnrs.fr
homepage: http://www.trees-and-lambdas.info/matushansky/

ON THE THEME OF RUSSIAN DEVERBAL NOUNS
Slavic Linguistics Colloquium, November 3, 2021

1.   THE RUSSIAN THEME

The Russian verb may contain additional morphology between the lexical stem and tense:

(1)   a.   [[[[[PRFX + [stem + v]] + ASP] + THEME] + TENSE] + AGR]

       b.   pere-   -start-   ov-   ɨv-   a-   e-   t
             over   start   V   IMPF   TH   PRES   3SG
             is restarting

Some verbs are athematic: nothing intervenes between the stem and tense:

(2)   a.   lez-   e-   t   b.   lez-   l-   a
             climb   PRES 3SG   climb   PAST FSG
             is climbing/climbs   *was climbing/climbed*

(3)   a.   čit-   áj-   e-   t   b.   čit-   á-   l-   a
             read   TH   PRES 3SG   read   TH   PAST FSG
             is reading/reads   *was reading/read*

Most Russian verbs are not athematic:

	PRES.1SG	PRES.2SG	PAST.FSG	INF		
a.	léz-u	léz-e-šʲ	léz-l-a	léz-tʲ	'climb'	Ø
b.	čit-áj-u	čit-áj-e-šʲ	čit-á-l-a	čit-á-tʲ	'read'	a(j)
c.	bel-éj-u	bel-éj-e-šʲ	bel-é-l-a	bel-é-tʲ	'be white'	e(j)
d.	to-n-ú	tó-n-e-šʲ	to-nú-l-a	to-nú-tʲ	'sink'	(n)u
e.	kolʲ-ú	kól-e-šʲ	kol-ó-l-a	kol-ó-tʲ	'stab'	o
f.	smol'-ú	smol-í-šʲ	smol-í-l-a	smol-í-tʲ	'tar'	i
g.	gor'-ú	gor-í-šʲ	gor-é-l-a	gor-é-tʲ	'burn'	e

(4)

All these verbal classes except (a), (e) and (g) are productive

Obviously, they allow nominalization

2.   NOMINALIZATION AND THEME

Being morphologically rich, Russian has many nominalizing and adjectivizing suffixes

Some of them are purely deverbal, others are not:
I preferably use feminine or dative singular endings so as to avoid the surface zeros realizing nominative and/or masculine forms

(5)   a.   risov-   **a-**   l-   a
             draw   TH   PAST FSG
             [she] drew

       b.   risov-   **a-**   n-   ij-   u
             draw   TH   PPP   NMZ   DAT_II
             drawing

(6)   a.   risov-   **a-**   l-   a-   sʲ
             draw   TH   PAST FSG   REFL
             [she] showed off

       b.   risov-   k-   a
             draw   DIM   FSG
             showing off, posing

On the semantic side both derivations allow for the event readings *and* the result reading
For broader spectrum studies of Russian nominalizations see de Valdivia Pujol 2014 on the event/result type and Lychyk 1995, Hippisley 1998 and particularly Naccarato 2017 on agentive nominals

The choice between the two patterns of derivation is stem-based, sometimes both are possible (e.g., *štrixovanie* vs. *štrixovka* 'shading, hatching', the former has the process reading only, but this might be accidental)

The pattern in (5b) is more productive and more regular (less likely to give rise to idiomatic interpretations), very similar to *-ing* in English
All other patterns are more like *-al* in *arrival*, *-age* in *stowage*, etc.: they block the more productive one and are more idiosyncratic

Two distinctions:
  ➢ presence/absence of a theme suffix
  ➢ categorial sensitivity

Are they linked?

This talk: a preliminary investigation of Russian deverbal nominalizations as a window into the status of theme suffixes

3. THEME-RETAINING NOMINALIZATIONS

It can always be assumed that athematic verbs have a zero theme, if necessary

3.1. Theme-retaining event/result nominalizations

Pazelskaya and Tatevosov 2006, Tatevosov 2011, 2013, 2015, Pazelskaya 2009a, b, 2012, Valdivia, Castellví and Taulé 2013, Pereltsvaig 2018, etc.): focus on aspectual characteristics

(7) a. **pre- obraz- ov-   a-   n-   a**   PPP
         trans-form   VRB   TH   PPP   FSG
         transformed

     b. **pre- obraz- ov-   a-   n-   ij-   u**   -ing
         trans-form   VRB   TH   PPP   NMZ DAT$_{II}$
         transformation, transform

Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997: derivation by the combination of the PPP-suffix (which has three surface realizations, [n], [en] and [t]) and the abstract nominalizing suffix *-ij-* (with an allomorph *-ĭj-*):
The underlying form of the surface [n]/[en] and even the distribution of the two allomorphs are subject to debate (see Feldstein 1986, Garde 1998:329-332)

(8) a. ot- kry-   t-   a   PPP
         from cover PPP FSG
         [is] opened, discovered

     c. ot- kry-   t-   ij- u   -ing
         from cover PPP NMZ DAT$_{II}$
         discovery

This **allomorphy** is phonologically determined but not derived by regular phonological rules (Halle 1973, Feldstein 1986, Garde 1998:329-332, Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997)
The lack of a theme suffix in (8) is due to the fact that the verb is athematic: the *-t-* allomorph is only found with athematic verbs

The distribution of Grimshaw's (1990) three readings (complex event, simple event, result) depends on the stem (see Pazelskaya 2009a, b, Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997)

The *-ij-* suffix is also used to form abstract nouns on the basis of (a) the abstract nominalizing suffix *-stv-*, (b) compounds and (c) OCS adjectives (rarely, the usual allomorph is *-ĭj-*):

(9) a.   so- čuv- stv- ij-   u
          with feel NMZ   NMZ   DAT$_{II}$
          compassion

     b.   uzk-   o- lob-   ij- u
          narrow LNK forehead NMZ DAT$_{II}$
          the property of having a narrow forehead

     c.   zdrav- ij- u
          hale   NMZ DAT$_{II}$
          health

Resulting interpretations are semantically transparent, some of the few exceptions are:

(10) a.   *imenie* 'manor' ← *imet^j* 'to possess'
     b.   *priležanie* 'assiduity, diligence' ← *priležat^j* 'to adjoin, to lie adjacent to'

Tradition views the PPP-*ij* complex as a single suffix

Missing derivational steps: Russian **secondary imperfectives** do not form PPPs (Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997, Borik and Gehrke 2018), but they can form PPP-*ij* nominals, even though the contribution of the suffix there does not seem to be aspectual, see Comrie 1980, Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997)

Ineffability is attested though for null-derived "theme-changing" secondary imperfectives, which do not allow PPPs (Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997)

PPP-*ij* nominals can be formed from **passive and intransitive verbs** (looks like *priscianic word formation* (Matthews 1972)):

(11) a.   muč-i-t^j reflexive
          dolor-TH-INF
          to torture

     b.   muč-i-t^j-s^{j}a
          dolor-TH-INF-REFL
          to suffer

     c.   muč-0-en-ij-u
          dolor-TH-PPP-NMZ-DAT$_{II}$
          suffering

(12) a.   pas-t^j unaccusative
          fall-INF
          to fall

     b.   pad-en-ij-u
          fall-PPP-NMZ-DAT$_{II}$
          suffering

Babby 1993: for both PPPs and event/result nominals "the initial verb's external theta-role is dethematized, and the initial verb stem is converted into a [+N] (nominal) stem"

The issue of missing derivational steps is huge for Russian morphology, but too complicated to deal with here

What is relevant for us:

- ➢ a given PPP-*ij* nominal can have a complex event, simple event or result reading, or some combination of the three

- ➢ they **can have idiosyncratic interpretations** (as far as I can see, they are always non-eventive)

- ➢ secondary imperfectives form only PPP-*ij* nominals and these have only complex event readings (Schoorlemmer 1995 lists some exceptions like *vsxlipyvanie* 'sob')

- ➢ the presence of inner aspect prefixes does not require the secondary imperfective suffix for imperfective interpretation and its presence seems to distinguish lexical nuances (e.g., the idiomatic *raspisanie* 'schedule' vs. the predictable *raspisyvanie* 'assigning, painting' from *raspisat^j/raspisyvat^j* 'to assign, paint')

- ➢ the PPP-*ij* sequence is purely deverbal (one exception is *obyknovenie* 'habit' from *obyknovennyj* 'usual') and obligatorily retains the theme

This theme-retaining nominalization is very regular and mostly predictable (as well as most recent chronologically)

3.2. Theme-retaining agentive nominalizations

Russian also has theme-retaining agentive (*er*) nominals formed with the suffix *-tel^j-*
Like English er-nouns, derived nouns can be agentive (cf. *experiencer*) or instrumental (cf. *pressure-cooker*), cf. Paykin 2003 for a recent discussion

(13) a. **pre- obraz- ov- a- n- a**
trans- form VRB TH PPP FSG
transformed

b. **pre- obraz- ov- a- tel^j- u**   -er
trans- form VRB TH NMZ DAT$_{II}$
transformer

The agent suffix *-tel^j-* is a monomorphemic suffix that is **purely deverbal and added on top of the theme suffix**
Lychyk 1995 notes that there are some denominal *tel^j*-formations that contain intermediate verbal morphology without there being the corresponding verb, e.g., *doždevatel^j* 'water sprinkler' ← *dožd^j* 'rain' (**doždevat^j*)

Agentive nominalizations can contain lexical aspect (Aktionsart) prefixes and the secondary imperfective suffix (e.g., *razbryzgivatel^j* 'sprinkler')

The argument structure of the base is not lost in the derived agentive noun, but quirky case is:

(14) a. l^{j}ubit^j muzyku
love.INF   music.ACC
to love music

b. l^{j}ubitel^j muzyki/*muzyku
love.ER   music.GEN/ACC
a music lover

(15) a. pravit^j stranoj
rule.INF   country.INS
to rule a country

b. pravitel^j strany/*stranoj
rule.ER   country.GEN/INS
the ruler of the country

(16) a.　podražat^j　D^jureru
　　　　imitate.INF　Durer.DAT
　　　　to imitate Durer

　　 b.　podražatel^j　D^jurera/*D^jureru
　　　　imitate.ER　　Durer.ACC/DAT
　　　　an imitator of Durer

Given that two unmarked genitives are not possible in Russian NPs (Comrie 1980; a partitive can combine with a genitive), agentive nouns formed from double-object verbs cannot appear with both arguments:

The interpretation of (17b) suggests that the genitive here is not the thematic direct object, but a possessor

(17) a.　učit^j　　detej　　　　　matematike
　　　　teach.INF　children.ACC　mathematics.DAT
　　　　to teach children mathematics

　　 b.　učitel^j　detej
　　　　teach.ER　children.GEN
　　　　the children's teacher, not: ^{??}*a teacher of children*

　　 c.　učitel^j　matematiki/*matematike
　　　　teach.ER　mathematics.ACC/DAT
　　　　a teacher of mathematics

　　 d. *učitel^j　detej　　　　matematiki/matematike
　　　　teach.ER　children.GEN　mathematics.GEN/DAT

The goal/beneficiary dative cannot be present in any form:

(18) a.　darit^j　podarki　　det^jam
　　　　gift.INF　gifts.ACC　children.DAT
　　　　to give gifts to children

　　 b.　daritel^j　(*podarkov)　(*det^jam/*detej)
　　　　gift.ER　　gifts.GEN　　children.DAT/GEN
　　　　donor, benefactor

It seems that **the argument structure of the verb is suppressed** (this would explain the ban on double genitives), yet **aspectual morphology can still be present**

Note that the possessive genitive can still be interpreted through the meaning of the verb. How?

Resulting interpretations are semantically transparent, some of the few exceptions are:

(19) a.　*roditel^j* 'parent' ← *rodit^j* 'to give birth to (a child)'
　　 b.　*nastojatel^j* 'abbot' ← *nastojat^j* 'to insist, persist'
　　 c.　*obyvatel^j* 'average man, philistine' ← no independently attested verbal stem,
　　　　should be **obyvat^j* (from *byvat^j* 'to be' (habitual) + prefix)

Chronologically, these deverbal nominalizations are the most recent

3.3.　Intermediate summary

Thematic nominalizations may retain (event/result nominals) or lose (agentive nominals) the argument structure of the base verb

They are mostly regular both semantically and syntactically and exclusively deverbal (though exceptions exist)

They can contain lexical aspect prefixes and secondary imperfective suffixes (i.e., projections higher than *v*)

Their derivation can involve missing steps (but this is a general issue for Russian)

4. THEME-LACKING NOMINALIZATIONS

The same two types, many more options

Many of the suffixes used for simple nominalization are also used to form compounds (the so-called **parasynthetic compounds**, e.g., *churchgoer*)

4.1. Theme-lacking event/result nominalizations

Athematic *ing*-nominalizations can be formed with a variety of suffixes (though none seem to be as productive as the PP-*ij* combination)

They are clearly not purely deverbal

The abstract suffix *-stv-* derives states (20a), abstract properties (20b), group nouns (20c) and also activities (20d):

(20) a.   *vdovstvo* 'widowhood' ← *vdova* 'widow'
     b.   *udobstvo* 'comfort' ← *udobnyj* 'comfortable'
     c.   *kupečestvo* 'merchant class, the state of being a merchant' ← *kupec* 'merchant'
     d.   *proizvodstvo* 'production' ← *proizvodit^j* 'to produce'

The suffix *-k-* is a diminutive (21a), a feminizer (21b), a deadjectival nominalizer (21c) and a generic nominalizer in principle (21d, e), permitting deverbal nominalization (21f):

(21) a.   *myška* 'small mouse' ← *myš^j* 'mouse'
     b.   *avtor* 'author' ← *avtorka* 'a female author'
     c.   *zel^{j}onka* 'brilliant green' ← *zel^{j}onyj* 'green'
     d.   *kastorka* 'Castor oil' ← *kastorovoe maslo* 'Castor oil', from a cranberry root
     e.   *palka* 'a stick', from a cranberry root
     f.   *peredelka* 'redoing, alteration, also: jolly mess' ← *peredelat^j* 'to redo'
        cf. *peredelyvanie* 'redoing' ← *peredelyvat^j* 'to redo (impf.)'

Derivation by truncation (null derivation, **conversion**) is also possible:

(22) a.   *plesk* 'splash' ← *plesk-a-t^j* 'to splash'
     b.   *spusk* 'descent' ← *s.pusk-a-t^j-s^{j}a* 'to descend'

Pazelskaya 2009a, b notes that it is not always obvious what the direction of the derivation is, but the presence of purely verbal prefixes (22b) is a clear sign of null derivation

Most Russian prefixes also function as prepositions, and *s* 'with, from' is no exception, but in nominalizations formed from PPs the complement of the preposition defines the ground, which is clearly not the case in (22b)

Pazelskaya 2009a, b: event/result nominals derived by *-k-* and by *-0-* have the same range of interpretations as those derived by the PPP-*ij* sequence

Corpus studies analyzing the distribution of deverbal nominals derived with *-nij-*, *-k-* and *-0-* by tracking and analyzing the occurrences in the corpus of 10 frequent nouns of each type in a situation reading:

     ➢   the base can be telic or atelic for all three types

     ➢   *-0-* *nomina actionis* are mildly preferentially intransitive, while *-k-* and *-nij-* ones are preferentially transitive

     ➢   for most properties examined (including durative adverbials and adjectives, overt internal argument, the presence of a possessor, ability to control, etc.): no obvious difference between *-k-* and *-nij-* nominals

Such nouns can contain verbal prefixes (21f), but **not secondary imperfective suffixes**

Schoorlemmer 1998: Grimshaw's readings all available for various event nominals

4.2. Theme-lacking agentive nominalizations

Also a number of suffixes (see Naccarato 2017:63 for a partial list)

Both *-0-* and *-k-* suffixes can create agentive nouns, but mostly in compounds:

(23) a.   *les-o-rub* 'logger' ← *les* 'forest' + *rub-i-tʲ* 'to chop'   agent
        b.   *led-o-rub* 'ice-axe' ← *led* 'ice' + *rub-i-tʲ* 'to chop'   instrument

(24) a.   *sam-o-uč-k-a* 'autodidact' ← *sam* 'self' + *učitʲ* 'to study'   agent
        b.   *mʲas-o-rub-k-a* 'meat grinder' ← *mʲaso* 'meat' + *-rub-* 'chop.ROOT'   instrument

The *-0-* suffix does not create agentive nouns outside of compounds (and while productive, it only applies to a closed class of roots), the *-k-* suffix does so rarely (and then usually yields instruments rather than agents):

(25) a.   *zaznajka* 'conceited person' ← *za.zna-tʲ-sʲa* 'to take on airs'   agent
        b.   *lejka* 'watering pot' ← *li-tʲ* 'to pour' (root: *-lĭj-*, cf. imperative *lej*)   instrument

These suffixes are not category-specific

For *-k-* it has been shown above. For *-0-* it is far more complicated because back-formation is often reanalyzed:
This is a very complicated topic. See Sigalov 1986 for some discussion of truncation in Russian

(26) a.   *fizik* 'psysicist' ← *fizika* 'physics'   denominal
        b.   *demokrat* 'democrat' ← *demokratija* 'democracy'
        c.   *liberal* 'a liberal' ← *liberalizm* 'liberalism' (or *liberalʲnyj* 'liberal')
        d.   *memorial* 'a memorial' ← *memorialʲnyj* 'memorial'   deadjectival

Lychyk 1995, Naccarato 2019:69: agentive suffixes are often non-category-specific and have broader distribution (true not only for Russian, but also for other languages, cf. Booij 2007):

(27) a.   *černec* 'monk' ← *čʲornyj* 'black'
        b.   *borec* 'fighter' ← *borotʲsʲa* 'to fight'
        c.   *londonec* 'Londoner' ← *London* 'London'

Important: the suffix *-ec-* does not create event/result nominals, it is always concrete

Lychyk 1995: the suffix *-ščik-* yields mostly nouns denoting workers or specialists in the field determined by the stem, which can be [±V]
He also notes that many deverbal *-ščik-* nouns have an intermediate nominal stage, and I think this is right

(28) a.   *plazmenščik* 'physicist who studies plazma' ← *plazmennyj* 'plasma'_ADJ
        b.   *ogranščik* 'precious stone cutter' ← *ogranitʲ* 'to facet'
        c.   *detektivščik* 'a mystery novel writer' ← *detektiv* 'a mystery novel'

As with *-telʲ-*nouns, the base argument structure is not available in the derived agentive noun

How accidental is it that these suffixes are athematic?

4.3. Intermediate summary

Theme-lacking nominals do not seem to be semantically different from athematic nominals in areas where they intersect:
   ➢   core interpretations: agent (developing into instrument) and event/result
   ➢   athematic nominals have other meanings available as well (e.g., place)

Athematic nominals cannot be formed from secondary imperfectives in *-yv-*
-0- secondary imperfectives are allowed, cf. *zapusk* 'launching' from *zapuskat^j* 'to launch' (imperfective, the perfective form is *zapustit^j*)

Theme-retaining nominals are strictly deverbal while athematic nominals are category-neutral

The opposite is not true: the suffix *-un-* is **strictly deverbal and athematic** yielding agentive (Vinogradov 1952:222) and instrumental (Vinogradov 1952:238) nominals:
One exception (Vinogradov 1952:222): *gorbun* 'a hunchback' from *gorb* 'a hump'

(29) a.   *govor-un* 'talker, chatterbox' ← *govor-i-t^j* 'to talk' (not **govor^jun*)
      b.   *kol-un* 'wood-chopper' ← *kol-o-t^j* 'to prick, shop'
      c.   *beg-un* 'runner' (human or technical) ← *beg-a-t^j* 'to run'

Strictly deverbal derivation can be athematic, which seems to entail that it is not the thematic suffix that creates the verb
Vinogradov 1952 lists the suffix *-un-* as non-productive, but Czerwiński 2015 lists one recent derivation, *nesun* 'office thief' from *nesti* 'to carry'

5.   AUGMENTED ATHEMATIC SUFFIXES

Paykin 2003: with stems that cannot take the suffix *-ščik-* for phonological reasons, the suffix *-l^jščik-* is used:

(30) a.   *sušit^j* 'to dry' → *suššcik, *sušil^jščik* 'drier' (a person)
      b.   *nosit^j* 'to dry' → *nosščik, *nosil^jščik* 'a porter, carrier'

This *-l^j-* is far from innocent: it requires the verbal theme

In fact, it does not seem to be phonologically conditioned:

(31) a.   *bol-e-t^j* 'to support, be a fan of' → *bol-e-l^jščik* 'to support, be a fan of'
      b.   *smol-it^j* 'to coat with tar' → *smol-i-l^jščik*, *smol^jščik* 'a tarring professional'
      c.   *smol-it^j* 'to smoke (a cigarette)' → *smol-i-l^jščik* 'a chain-smoker'

The nominalizing suffix *-nik-* also has a *-l^jnik-* variant, as do *-ec-* (*-lec-*) and *-k-* (*-lk-*):
The non-productive place-denoting suffix *-n^j-* (taking bases denoting professionals and returning the place of the relevant professional activity) becomes *-l^jn^j-* with verbal bases

(32) a.   *okuč-nik* 'hiller' ← *okuč-i-t^j* 'to earth up'
      b.   *budi-l^j-nik* 'alarm clock' ← *bud-i-t^j* 'to wake up'

(33) a.   *torgov-ec* 'merchant' ← *torgov-a-t^j* 'to trade'
      b.   *skita-l-ec* 'wanderer' ← *skit-a-t^j-s^ja* 'to wander'

(34) a.   *moj-k-a* 'sink, washer' ← *my-t^j* 'to wash' (cf. imperative *moj*)
      b.   *gre-l-k-a* 'hot-water bottle' ← *gre-t^j* 'to warm up'

> The *-l-* augment is in fact the ancient active past participle (current past tense) suffix

There is no semantic difference between *-l^jnik-* and *-nik-*, or *-l^jščik-* and *-ščik-*, or *-lk-* and *-k-*

But as a result, secondary imperfective stems become possible:

(35) a.   pro.céž- iv-   a-   l^j-ščik- u   ← pro.céž-iv-a-t^j 'to strain' (PRF: *pro.ced-i-t^j*)
             strain   IMPF TH   NMZ   DAT_II
             strainer (human)

      b.   s.ši-   v-   á-   lk-   a   ← s.ši-v-a-t^j 'to sew together' (PRF: *s.ši-t^j*)
             with.sew IMPF TH   NMZ   NOM
             a machine for sewing things together

Descriptively, **deverbal nominalization containing a thematic suffix appears to require an intermediate step that is at least historically non-finite**

Apparent exception: the agentive suffix -*telʲ*- (the standard view is that it is a cognate of the Latin -*tōr*-, from PIE, see Naccarato 2019:62)

Possibility: -*telʲ*- is derived from the infinitive (and the double [t] is degeminated)

Evidence: athematic verbs with infinitives not ending in [tʲ]

Only two of them combine with -*telʲ*-:

(36) a.   *blʲustí* 'to guard' (-*blʲud*-) → *blʲustitelʲ* 'keeper, guardian'
      b.   *rastí* 'to grow' (-*rost*-) → *rastitelʲnyj* 'vegetal' (via the missing stem **rastitelʲ*; there is also the transitive verb *rastítʲ* 'to grow', but it is unlikely to be the base)

As strange as it may seem, thematic nominalization seems to correlate with a missing step

6.   CONCLUSION AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

Three types of deverbal nominalization in Russian:

   ➢   purely deverbal suffixes: -*telʲ*- and PPP-*ij*, which attach on top of the theme, and -*un*-, which doesn't

   ➢   non-categorizing suffixes: -*0*-, -*k*-, etc. (general purpose nominalizers with vague semantics) and -*nik*-, -*ščik*-, -*ec*- (with agentive semantics only)

   ➢   mixed nominalization: a combination of suffixes (-*l*- + -*nik*-, -*ščik*- or -*k*-)

Russian null-derived nominalizations seem to be deverbal (we know this from the presence of verbal prefixes), yet athematic (and the lack of a theme cannot be attributed to phonology)

Thematic nominalizations can contain more material (secondary imperfective suffix), but the resulting range of meanings is the same (Pazelskaya and Tatevosov 2006, Tatevosov 2011, 2013, 2015, Pazelskaya 2009a, b, 2012, etc.)

What seems to emerge as the full picture is that **the presence of a theme suffix necessitates the presence of another suffix between the theme and the nominalizer**

Babby 1993 suggests that these suffixes are deverbalizers, and true nominalizers are added on top

> We still don't know what the presence of a theme does

Issues for future work:

   ➢   is there another way of testing if the suffix -*telʲ*- is built on the infinitive stem?

   ➢   why do we need the -*l*- and PPP augments? What is the difference between them?

   ➢   null-derived nominalizations are overwhelmingly event/result ones when simple yet permit agentive interpretation in compounding. Why?

   ➢   de-participial (i.e., PPP-*ij*) event/result nominalizations are interestingly restricted when it comes to secondary imperfectives derived with the zero allomorph of the SI suffix (Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997)

   ➢   derivation with a **missing step** remains a huge puzzle (apparent extension of the circumfix issue, except that the two suffixes are contiguous)

7.   REFERENCES

Babby, Leonard. 1993. A theta-theoretic analysis of -en- suffixation in Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1, 3-43.

Booij, Geert. 2007. Polysemy and Construction Morphology. In *Leven met woorden*, ed. by Fons Moerdijk, Ariane van Santen and Rob Tempelaars, 355-364. Leiden: Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie.

Borik, Olga, and Berit Gehrke. 2018. Imperfective past passive participles in Russian. In *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016*, ed. by Denisa Lenertová, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík and Luka Szucsich, 53-76. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1980. Nominalizations in Russian: lexical noun phrases or transformed sentences? In *Morphosyntax in Slavic*, ed. by Catherine V. Chvany and Richard D. Brecht. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.

Czerwiński, Piotr. 2015. *Негативно оценочные лексемы языка советской действительности. Обозначение лиц [Negative evaluating lexemes of the language of the Soviet reality]*: LitRes.

de Valdivia Pujol, Glòria. 2014. Russian Deverbal Nouns: Lexical Denotation, Argument Structure & Translation Mismatches, Doctoral dissertation, Universitat de Barcelona.

Feldstein, Ronald F. 1986. The Russian verbal stress system. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 33, 43-61.

Garde, Paul. 1998. *Grammaire russe: phonologie et morphologie (2nd edition)*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris. 1973. The accentuation of Russian words. *Language* 49, 312-348.

Hippisley, Andrew R. 1998. Indexed stems and Russian word formation: a network morphology account of Russian personal nouns. *University of Kentucky Linguistics Faculty Publications* 43.

Lychyk, Victor. 1995. Russian agentive noun formation in the 1970s. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 37, 137-161.

Matthews, P. H. 1972. *Inflectional Morphology: A Theoretical Study Based on Aspects of Latin Verb Conjugation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Naccarato, Chiara. 2019. Agentive (para)synthetic compounds in Russian: a quantitative study of rival constructions. *Morphology* 29, 1-30.

Naccarato, Maria Chiara. 2017. Compound agent nouns in Russian: A comparison of rival word-formation constructions, Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergamo.

Paykin, Katia. 2003. Deverbal nouns in Russian: in search of a dividing line. In *Contrastive Analysis in Language: Identifying Linguistic Units of Comparison*, ed. by Dominique Willems, Bart Defrancq, Timothy Colleman and Dirk Noël, 172-193. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Pazelskaya, Anna. 2009a. Модели деривации и синтаксическая позиция отглагольных существительных по корпусным данным [Derivational patterns and syntactic positions of deverbal nominals (on corpus data)]. *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии [Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies]* 8, 373-378.

Pazelskaya, Anna. 2009b. Модели деривации отглагольных существительных: взгляд из корпуса [Derivational models of deverbal nominals: a view from the corpus]. In *Корпусные исследования по русской грамматике [Corpus studies in Russian grammar]*, ed. by K.L. Kiseleva, V.A. Plungjan, E.V. Rakhilina and S.G. Tatevosov, 65-91. Moscow: Probel.

Pazelskaya, Anna. 2012. Verbal prefixes and suffixes in nominalization: Grammatical restrictions and corpus data. In *Oslo Studies in Language*, ed. by Atle Grønn and Anna Pazelskaya, 245-261.

Pazelskaya, Anna, and Sergei Tatevosov. 2006. Uninflected VPs, deverbal nouns and the aspectual architecture of Russian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14. The Princeton Meeting*, ed. by James Lavine, Steven Franks, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva and Hana Filip, 258-276. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2018. Eventive nominalizations in Russian and the DP/NP debate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49, 876-885.

Sadler, Louisa, Andrew Spencer, and Marina D. Zaretskaya. 1997. A morphomic account of a syncretism in Russian deverbal nominalizations. In *Yearbook of Morphology 1996*, ed. by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 181–216. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schoorlemmer, Maaike. 1995. Participial Passive and Aspect in Slavic, Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.

Schoorlemmer, Maaike. 1998. Complex event nominals in Russian: properties and readings. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6, 205-254.

Sigalov, Pavel. 1986. Об усечении вообще и дезинтеграции в частности (усечение и дезинтеграция) [About truncation in general and desintegration in particular]. *Russian Linguistics* 10, 215-233.

Tatevosov, Sergei. 2011. Severing perfectivity from the verb. *Scando-Slavica* 57, 216-244.

Tatevosov, Sergei. 2013. Множественная префиксация и ее следствия (Заметки о физиологии русского глагола) [Multuple prefixation and its consequences. Remarks on the physiology of Russian verb]. *Вопросы языкознания [Questions of linguistics]* 2013, 42-89.

Tatevosov, Sergei. 2015. Severing imperfectivity from the verb. In *Slavic Grammar from a Formal Perspective*, ed. by Gerhild Zybatow, Petr Biskup, Marcel Guhl, Claudia Hurtig, Olav Mueller-Reichau and Maria Yastrebova, 465-494. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Valdivia, Glòria de, Joan Castellví, and Mariona Taulé. 2013. Morphological and lexical aspect in Russian deverbal nominalizations. In *Current Studies in Slavic Linguistics*, ed. by Irina Kor Chahine. *Studies in Language Companion 146*, 267-280.

Vinogradov, V. V. ed. 1952. *Грамматика русского языка [The Grammar of the Russian Language]*. Moscow: Soviet Academy of Sciences.