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ON SOME STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES OF NOMINALIZATIONS IN GERMAN

NOMINALIZATION TRENDS IN GERMAN

As in most literary languages, the German language also shows a general tendency towards nominalization.1 In addition to the development of highly compressed nominal groups, the core of which is often a verbal tract, the functional verb structures are considered "the second manifestation of the development tendency of the German language towards the nominalization style"2 or even "the main carrier of nominalizing tendencies"3 in the German language.

The following assumptions will be presented in the essay: Nominalizations with verbal abstraction as core can develop in two different directions in contemporary German.

In free constructions, verbal abstracts lose verbal properties and can be incorporated into the nominal paradigm to a greater extent with increasing lexicalization. In comparison to the corresponding subordinate clauses, nominalizations are to be regarded as weakened constructions4.

In functional verb structures, the verbal abstracts lose nominal properties and are incorporated into the verbal paradigm to a greater extent with increasing lexicalization of the structure.

Compared to the corresponding simple verbs, such

Structures are to be regarded as reinforced structures5.

In nominalization verb structures, both developmental tendencies are pronounced, i.e. tendencies towards integration into the nominal paradigm as well as tendencies towards integration into the verbal paradigm. In comparison to the corresponding simple verbs, such structures show properties of reinforced constructions.6

ON THE TERMS ‘FREE CONNECTION’, ‘FUNCTIONAL STRUCTURE’ AND

'NOMINALIZATION VERB'

By free combinations we mean those verbal-nominal connections in which both the verb and the verbal abstract are semantically and syntactically independent. The freedom and variability of the two combination elements is reflected in their different semantic and syntactical values, which are not affected by their co-occurrence and complement each other to form a predication.7 Therefore,

a transformation of a nominalization into a subordinate clause or

Infinitive clause possible while retaining the verb of free construction,

the verb or the noun of free construction by synonyms,

Antonyms or any other lexemes can be replaced and

the noun of the free conjunction can be anaphorized without changing the meaning of the verb of the free conjunction.8

If you want to enforce the deletion of paragraph 218 without replacement, you must make it clear in your argument that in this case the legislator has no duty to protect developing life as a component of our life as a whole.9

If you want to ensure that Paragraph 218 is deleted without replacement, you must make it clear in your argument that in this case the legislature has no duty to protect unborn life as a component of our lives as a whole.

You must make it clear in your argument, if you want to enforce the REMOVAL of paragraph 218 / adoption of paragraph 218 / your plan / ..., that ...

If you want to enforce / achieve / ... the DELETION of paragraph 218 without replacement, you must make it clear in your argument that ...

You must in your argument, if you have it / that / something

/ ... want to enforce, make it clear that ...

Basic properties of the components of a free joint

are evident from examples (1)-(5).

Opinions about what a functional verb or a functional verb compound is and therefore which structural types belong to it are, as is well known, divided. The following structural types10 are often listed as functional verb compounds:

Type V + PP

come into effect, bring to a conclusion, inform.

Type V + Akk

Subtype 2a: (7) apply, experience (suffer) loss; Subtype 2b: (8) criticize, contribute, give an answer.

Type V + Nom

There is no agreement among the delegates.

The exchange will be made upon presentation of the receipt.

Type V + Date

to put someone under scrutiny, to put something under control.

Type V + gene

Subtype 5a: (12) require clarification;

Subtype 5b: (13) to be/remain of the opinion (view, ...).

We will refer to types 2.1 (6) and 2.2a (7) as functional verb structures (FVG),11 and types 2.2b to 2.5b (8)-(13) as nominalization structures (NVG) following v. Polenz12. The verb

Nominalization verb (NV) and the noun in the NVG is called nominalization noun (NN).

FVG differ from NVG essentially in that

that they also fulfil "additional predicative functions" which are to be sought in the area of ​​causality, types of action and passivity,13

through the stronger semantic binding of the

formal features revealed.

One and the same verbal abstract can be expressed once in a free

compound (14), another time in a nominalization verb structure

(16) or in a functional verb structure (18).

He noticed MOVEMENT in the distance.

In the distance he noticed something moving.

Yes, at least your guinea pig gets more EXERCISE.

Yes, at least your guinea pig is moving more.

Contrary to expectations, the train started to MOVE.

The train moved contrary to expectations.

Contrary to expectations, the train began to move.

VERBAL ABSTRACTS AS REINFORCED WORD-FORMATION CONSTRUCTIONS

The core of a nominalization is a strengthened form compared to its verbal basis.14 This claim can be justified as follows:

During the derivation process, one (or even more than one) morpheme is usually added to the verbal stem. The core of a nominalization is therefore more complicated than the corresponding verb stem:

Transformation, speech.

The core of a nominalization usually retains only certain meaning variants of the verbal base and therefore usually has fewer meaning variants than the underlying verb:

preserved: conservation.

Verbal abstracts are predominantly derived from "difficult" verbs, i.e. the underlying verbs are more complicated morpheme constructions, hence longer words, occur relatively rarely and are predominantly full verbs:

to fit in (--> the fit).

In terms of their meaning, the cores of nominalizations (the verbal abstracts) are among the most complicated nouns. Dynamic abstracts are more complicated than static abstracts and the latter are more complicated than concretes:15

Hans < Fire < Love < Transgression.

Non-lexicalized verbal abstracts cannot be considered

prototypical nouns, because

they usually have a dynamic meaning rather than a static one, since verbs usually express an action or a process,

essentially take over the verbal valence,16 whereby the proportion of complicated attribute types (object genitives,

Prepositional groups, infinitive clauses, subordinate clauses) is greater than

in the prototypical nouns,

cannot be pluralized. In the absence of an object genitive, however, perfective verbal abstracts can receive a plural morpheme.

In the course of the lexicalization process, however, verbal abstracts lose properties that they have inherited from their underlying verbs and acquire nominal ones:

Usually, in addition to the dynamic (processual) reading, other, mostly static readings arise: the designation of a state, an abstract result or even a concrete result of the process, which is expressed by the verbal stem of the verbal noun.

In the secondary static readings, the

Verbal nouns are usually pluralizable.

A sign of advanced lexicalization is also the change in accent patterns, i.e. the verbal abstract is stressed according to substantive accent patterns and not according to verbal accent patterns:

the takeover - take over.

The valence that a verbal noun inherits from its source verb is reduced and adjusted to nominal valence patterns.

In contemporary German, productive derivation patterns with the nominal suffix -ung play an important role. In the FF of our first corpus17 they account for more than 50%,18 while the implicit derivations and the substantivized infinitives only come in second and third place respectively. In the FVG and NVG of our second corpus19

Derivatives ending in -ung have the largest share (about 32% and 39% respectively), although this is noticeably smaller than in the FF of our above corpus.20 In FVG, the rise of derivatives ending in -ung began about 200 years ago, but their use only became really intensive in the second half of the 19th century and in the 20th century.21 In the 17th and 18th centuries, the nominal part of FVG still consisted much more frequently of substantivized infinitives. Derivatives ending in -ung were in fact only third place in terms of frequency - after conversions and implicit derivatives. The rise of derivatives ending in -ung was accompanied by the relative increase in verbal bases and the percentage decrease in adjectival bases of verbal abstracts in FVG.22 Related to this is the larger share of derivatives with dynamic meaning in FVG. Since the base verbs of the derivatives ending in -ung are mostly terminative verbs, the proportion of terminative derivatives is also larger. Why is the derivative ending in -ung preferred over the substantivized infinitive in contemporary German, even though the latter, unlike the former, can be formed from almost all verb types? Various reasons are given for this in the linguistic literature. v. Polenz23 points out that the derivatives ending in -ung, unlike substantivized infinitives, are gender-neutral predicate designations. In contrast to the derivatives ending in -ung, substantivized infinitives in modern German cannot be used without an article. Schäublin24 shows in his work that the substantivized infinitive is formally closer to the verb in a number of features than the derivative ending in -ung. The formal differences also correspond to a differentiation in content. The versatile contextual usability of the derivatives ending in -ung can be seen as a function of their formal and content-related

Indeterminacy (implicitness). The substantivized infinitive is only suitable to a limited extent for the roles of the noun in the sentence. A significant substantive advantage of the -ung derivative over the substantivized infinitive is its ability to designate a limited size, which can be seen as a typical nominal feature.25 Among the most marked nouns, the -ung derivatives are therefore to be classified as less marked nouns due to their substantive and formal features compared to the substantivized infinitives.26 The ability of the -ung derivative to designate a limited size is now used intensively in contemporary German, among other things, to form terminative FVG.27 Since FVG are to be seen as reinforced constructions, they occur more frequently in texts with a terminative (i.e. inchoative or egressive) type of action and less frequently with a continuous type of action. Terminative action types are more marked than continuous action types, because in the languages ​​of the world the existence of grammaticalized constructions to express continuity is more common than the existence of such constructions to express terminativity. Another argument for the greater markedness of terminative action types would be the (additional) semantic feature of limitation, which continuous action types do not express. Another ability of verbal abstractions based on - ung, which are derived from transitive base verbs, is their indeterminacy with regard to the gender verbi. This possibility allows the formation of active or passive FVG (NVG) depending on the combined FV (NV). Passive FVG in particular (e.g. use find) have proven to be a productive type of formation over the last 150 years.28

NOMINALIZATIONS AS COMPLICATED NOMINAL PHRASES

Compared to other noun groups that do not contain a verbal abstract as a core, nominalizations with a verbal abstract as a core are more complicated syntactic constructions.29 Since verbal abstracts are among the most complicated nouns, we expect that the phrases they form are also complicated constructions in terms of their structure, clause structure, position in the sentence and importance in the communication perspective (theme-rheme structure):

For example, nominalizations often have more marked right attributes (e.g. genitives, prepositional phrases, subordinate clauses, infinitive clauses).

Nominalizations refer to something inanimate and intangible with the sense organs.30 Animate things are tangible to our sense organs and are closer to the prototypical speaker. From this point of view, inanimate things can be considered more marked.31 The most unmarked sentence element (in nominative-accusative languages) is the subject. Nominalizations occur more frequently as objects (especially as accusative objects) and adverbial clauses.

The nominalizations (especially those with a derivation in -ung as a core) occur more frequently in subordinate clauses than in main clauses. According to their syntactic and illocutionary roles, subordinate clauses are not prototypical sentences and are considered to be more marked.

Compared to other noun phrases, nominalizations occur more frequently as the rheme of the sentence. The rheme can be classified as more marked.

In our corpora, it is noticeable that the proportion of (more marked) right attributes is larger in FF (about 25% of 275)32 or in NVG (about 36% of 443) than in FVG (about 16% of 132).33 This finding does not correspond to our original assumption that the number of postpositive attributes in FVG should be larger than in NVG or FF. So34 was able to prove in the texts of popular scientific prose that the proportion of prefixed attributes in FVG has decreased in the last 150 years (from about 97% in the 17th/18th century to about 81%), while the proportion of more marked postfixed attributes in FVG has increased significantly (from just under 3% in the 17th/18th century to about 17%). In addition, the proportion of multi-level attribution has also increased in the last 150 years compared to the 17th and 18th centuries, with more than 90% of such cases dating from the period between 1838 and 1980.35 Again, there is a connection to the derivations ending in -ung, which are often formed from transitive (i.e. more marked) base verbs. The fact that our findings do not correspond to those in So's corpus could be related to the larger proportion of lexicalized verbal abstracts in our second corpus.

NOMINALIZATIONS AS WEAKEN CONSTRUCTIONS

Nominalizations with a non-lexicalized verbal abstract as a core are weaker constructions compared to the corresponding subordinate clauses,36 because the syntactic and semantic relationships between the parts of a nominalization are less clear than the corresponding

Relationships between the individual parts of the corresponding sentence with finite verb form:

While a finite verb form can be used to express the categories of person, number, tense, mood and gender, this is only possible to a limited extent with a nominalization (using other means).

The nominalizations can save the use of conjunctions that introduce subordinate clauses. However, in other cases they can also be governed by prepositions that correspond to the subordinating conjunctions of the subordinate clauses.

The verbal complements are partly syntactically obligatory, while the corresponding complements of a verbal abstract are rarely syntactically obligatory and are therefore often not expressed in texts.

I hold you responsible for compliance.37

I hold you responsible for ensuring that the soldiers obey the order / that the order is obeyed.

The nominalizations refer to something inanimate and therefore often appear as an accusative object. The most unmarked sentence element for referring to the inanimate is (at least in the nominative-accusative languages) the direct object.

The nominalizations occur more frequently as a theme. Since the theme is linked to something that is already part of the background knowledge of the language participants or is even explicitly mentioned beforehand, it can be classified as unmarked compared to the rheme.

As weakened syntactic constructions, nominalizations are a means of simplifying the structure of the utterance. In contemporary German, there is a tendency towards linearization of the sentence structure.38 This tendency

There is an increase in noun groups and parataxis and a simultaneous decrease in hypotaxis. The numerical decline in subordinate clauses of the second and higher degree is particularly strong.39 We could therefore assume that the tendency towards linearization of the sentence structure is stronger in subordinate clauses than in main clauses, but particularly strong in subordinate clauses on which one or more other subordinate clauses are dependent.40 The leveling of a confusing, complex utterance structure by nominalizing subordinate clauses (of the second and higher degree) makes it easier for the speaker to produce utterances with complex content. The listener or reader may have a simpler (more linear) utterance structure, but he or she must invest more mental effort in order to understand the mostly missing additions and the syntactical relationships that are only expressed implicitly or in the context of the nominalizations. If the nominalizations are not too extensive and not too densely staggered, the comprehension process usually does not suffer. At least in conversational processes, what is missing can usually be deduced relatively easily from the context or from world knowledge. Therefore, a branched hypotactic structure probably presents a greater decoding problem than a more straightforward utterance structure with a nominalization. However, this balance between optimal economy of expression and optimal clarity of expression is disturbed in some functional styles (e.g. in legal language, journalism, scientific language), in which nominalizations accumulate and are overloaded with numerous and complex attributes. However, these functional styles are not to be counted among the natural conversational processes. The assumed markedness relationships are probably not valid here in part. An accumulation of complex

In any case, nominalizations are likely to pose a greater coding problem for the text producer and an even greater decoding problem for the text recipient than complex multi-level hypotactic sentence structures.

FUNCTIONAL STRUCTURES AS REINFORCED CONSTRUCTIONS

However, if nominalizations occur in FVG (NVG), they merge with the FV to form a new semantic unit in which they represent the main carrier of meaning. Compared to the corresponding verbs, the FVG (NVG) are to be regarded as reinforced constructions. They are usually more formally complex, have a narrower meaning, are more difficult to produce, but are easier to decode and are more effective in complicated grammatical environments.41

The greater semantic and formal complexity of the FVG shows

in various characteristics: e.g.

Compared to the verbs in our control sample, the basic verbs of the FN are more often more complex, long and contain less frequent lexemes with relatively few meaning variants.

Compared to the nouns in our control sample, the FN are more frequently more complicated word-formation constructions, less frequently occurring lexemes with relatively few meaning variants.