

Elizabeth Ritter (University of Calgary)

**Nominalization, argument structure inheritance and the count/mass
distinction**

Grimshaw (1990) makes a fundamental distinction between process nominals, which inherit the argument structure of their source verbs, and result nominals, which do not. Borer (2003) attributes this to the fact that result nominals are derived pre-syntactically, while process nominals are derived post-syntactically. This raises the question of why pre-syntactic derivation should fail to preserve argument structure. Harley (2009) proposes that result nominals do in fact inherit the argument structure of the source verb, but are unable to syntactically license their arguments, unlike process nominals. She speculates that this is related to a second difference between them: Process nominals are mass nouns while result nominal are count nouns. In this paper I propose to develop a structural analysis for process and result nominals in English and Hebrew based on this suggestion. My analysis will focus on the structural relationship between argument licensing functional categories and those realizing nominal number.