

## Mixed Categories in Jóola Eegimaa Derived Nominals

Mamadou Bassene  
Department of Linguistics  
Rutgers University, New Brunswick

### Abstract:

This paper examines the properties of Eegimaa derived nominals and offers a comparative analysis between agentive and manner nominals on the one hand and instrumental and locative nominals on the other hand. At first sight, all four types of nominals display a mix of nominal as well as verbal properties. However, a closer look at these nominals revealed a significant difference in their ability to accommodate verbal properties. Instrumental and locative nominals are very restricted in terms of the type of verbal properties they can accommodate. They can take an object but they don't allow any of the verbal negative markers, they don't permit adverbial and aspectual modifications, whereas agentive and manner nominals allow all these verbal properties. The examples below clearly show that adverbs cannot modify instrumental and locative nominals.

### (1) Adverbial modification in derived nominals

- a) A-lob-a            jon  
   CL-speak-AGT well  
   'speaker well'
  
- b) Ba-lob-er-ol        jon  
   CL-speak-MAN-POSS ADV  
   'his/her manner of speaking well'
  
- c) #Gu-lob-um        jon  
   CL-speak-INS ADV  
   #'language well'
  
- d) #Fu-womun-or-um    çab  
   CL-gather-RCM-LOC quickly  
   #'venue quickly'

One of the basic tenets of Distributed Morphology (DM) is that roots are categoryless (Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer 1999, Panagiotidis 2011). The hypothesis of *Root Categorical Neutrality* (RCN), which will be followed in this paper, is passionately pursued further by Borer (2005, 2012) who not only claims that root morphemes (which she refers to as *listemes*) are category neutral but also argues that they do not have an internal structure either. According to Borer, syntax is the only component of Grammar which is responsible for structure formation. She argues that roots are inserted (free of category membership) into syntactic structures in the course of the (syntactic) derivation process and once merged, roots take on the syntactic category of their merger. In other terms, roots acquire their syntactic category in the context where they occur and they do not have an independent category outside of that context. Assuming a RCN approach helps provide a straightforward account of why agentive and manner nominals differ from instrumental and locative nominals in terms of the mix of properties they allow. I argue that

Eegimaa agentive as well as manner nominals have an *active event* property and that the event is induced by *v* in the derivation process, whereas Instrumental and locative nominals have an *inactive event* feature. In instrumental and locative nominals, the event induced by *v* has been suppressed in the course of the derivation with the addition of the morpheme *-um* and therefore, the verbal base in these two nominals cannot accommodate the verbal properties we find in agentive and manner nominals. I further argue that Eegimaa agentive and manner nominals are verb-like whereas instrumental and locative nominals are noun-like.

## References

- Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. *The View from Building 20*. Ed by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 1999. State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology. *GLOT International* 4 (4). 3-9.
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. *The Normal Course of Events: Structuring Sense II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, Hagit. 2012. In the event of a nominal. *The Theta System: Argument Structure at the Interface*. Ed by Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj and Tal Siloni, 103-149. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panagiotidis, Efthymoulos Phoevos. 2011. Categorical features and categorizers. *The Linguistic Review* 28. 365-386.