Agnieszka ZATORSKA
Uniwersytet Łódzki
Agnieszka.Zatorska@uni.lodz.pl

SELECTED ISSUES OF NOMINALIZATIONS AS PROPOSITIONAL ARGUMENTS IN POLISH AND SLOVENE SENTENCES WITH PSYCH-VERBS

In this paper I claim that the occurrence of nominalizations in the position of the propositional argument assigned by a psychological predicate is very probable and natural[1]. This hypothesis will be tested with sets of Polish (30) and Slovene (30) verbs from the semantic field of thinking and feeling. For the verbs connected with knowledge and thinking I use the term *mental verbs*, and for the other class, related to feelings, I have chosen the term *emotional verbs*. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this work I have decided to use the common term *Psych Verbs*.

Firstly, I will briefly introduce the problem of defining and describing the so-called Psych-Verbs and their relation to mental and emotional verbs. I will present a short overview of the literature concerning this matter in Slavic linguistics. Secondly, I will focus on the phenomenon of nominalizations. I will very briefly refer to the definition of nominalization and the cluster of issues connected with this phenomenon. Thirdly, I will refer to my observations on the semantic structures of the verbs and the syntactical representation of these structures. I assume that incorporating the propositional argument is an obligatory feature of the examined verbs. The question arises of which of the examined verbs pre-

clude the incorporating of nominalization. The aim of my study is to show similarities between Polish and Slovene in such matters as the semantic and syntactic structures of the so-called Psych Verbs, and their tendency to entail the propositional content in the shape of the nominal phrase.

PSYCH-VERBS

The title of the paper suggests that my data comprise the so-called Psych-Verbs. They cover the class of predicators[2] based on complex semantic structures. Such structures are composed of the main predicate and assigned arguments. The set of Psychological Verbs includes verbs with the embedded concept of knowledge, e.g.: Polish *wiedzieć*, *znać*. In this section there are also verbs associated with judging, characterized by different levels of certainty, such as Polish *przypuszczać*, *sądzić*, *uważać*. Some of the examined verbs are related to states (stative verbs), e.g.: *wiedzieć*. Others indicate actions, operations on knowledge (active verbs), e.g.: *analizować*, *myśleć*. Additional features are manifested by affixes in the verbs such as *przemyśleć*, *rozmyślać*. The added prefixes evoke the complex problem of aspect in Slavic languages. Part of my verbal inventory is captured by words of emotions, emotional verbs, e.g.: *bać się*, *cieszyć się*. Mental verbs have been the subject of linguistic studies for years. Some researchers understand the term *mental* as limited to the field of the intellect. Others talk about a huge group of verbs called *mental*, which includes intellectual as well as emotional predicators (Wierzbicka 2006: 145–146). Wierzbicka grouped the universal and elementary items such as THINK, KNOW, WANT, FEEL, SEE and HEAR into one class called *Mental Predicates*. Studies of mental verbs (limited to the intellectual verbs) were also conducted previously in Polish linguistics. The above-mentioned verbs were also classified and described by me in a paper titled *O problemie kryteriów klasyfikacyjnych predykatorów mentalnych* (Maliszewska 2001). In that study I concentrated on such factors as modality, temporality and the predicate-argument structure, important

---

[2] The term *predicator* means a verbal or analytical unit on the language level. On the deep level, the predicator corresponds to the predicate. The mentioned *predicator* is used in linguistics, compare the article by Hale K. & S. J. Keyser, 1997. *On The Complex Nature of Simple Predicators* [in:] Alsina et al. eds. *Complex Predicates*. CSLI Publications, Stanford Calif. 29–65.

for describing a class of verbs. Danielewiczowa published a book about epistemic verbs in Polish (Danielewiczowa 2002), in which she exhaustively worked out this particular problem. Among Polish achievements we should also mention a study written by I. Nowakowska-Kempna devoted to emotional predicators (Nowakowska-Kempna 1986).

THE CHOSEN POLISH AND SLOVENE PSYCH-VERBS. SELECTED ISSUES

The goal of this presentation is to provide insight into the fact that Mental Verbs tend to implicate propositional arguments in the shape of the nominal phrase (the propositional nominal phrase). In the current study I follow the path of Semantic Syntax Methodology, which has developed in Poland (Karolak 2002) and also serves as a useful device for comparative studies concerning Slavic syntax (Kiklewicz, Korytkowska 2010). The main assumption of the school is the division between the semantic and the syntactic (formal) levels of representation. I consider the predicates and arguments as elements of the Predicate-Argument Structure on the semantic level of representation. The formal level, where the linguistic, syntactical facts occur, is treated as a projection of semantic structure (the Predicate-Argument Structure). On the formal level, I use the term *predicator*, which covers verbs as well as analytical verbal items. However, the data in the current work are limited to verbal items.

For the purpose of the present study, I have examined 60 verbs from Polish and Slovene data (30 + 30). The analysis was based on sentences and phrases, not on separate lexemes. The Slovene predicators are excerpted from two sources. The scope of Slovene data was confirmed by the valency dictionary *Vezljivostni slovar slovenskih glagolov* (Žele 2008) and by the handbook *Slovene Verb* (Lečič 2011), containing basic verbal vocabulary with the emphasized frequency of a particular verb, which provided the condition for its inclusion in the set. The Polish verbs taken into consideration are: 1. *analizować* 2. *bać się* 3. *boleć* 4. *cierpieć* 5. *cieszyć się* 6. *domniemywać* 7. *identyfikować* 8. *kojarzyć* 9. *kojarzyć się* 10. *marzyć* 11. *myśleć* 12. *ocenić, oceniać* 13. *pojąć, pojmować* 14. *porównać, porównywać* 15. *poznać, poznawać* 16. *przemyśleć, przemyśliwać* 17. *przyjąć, przyjmować* 18. *przyjąć coś za coś, przyjmować coś za coś* 19. *przypuszczać* 20. *rozmyślać* 21. *rozumieć* 22. *sądzić* 23. *udowodnić,*

udowadniać 24. *ustalić, ustalać* 25. *utożsamić, utożsamiać* 26. *uważać* 27. *wahać się* 28. *wątpić* 29. *wiedzieć* 30. *znać*. The Slovene verbs examined here are: 1. *analizirati* 2. *asocirati* 3. *bati se* 4. *boleti* 5. *dojeti, dojemati* 6. *dokazati, dokazovati* 7. *določiti, določati* 8. *domnevati* 9. *dvomiti* 10. *identificirati* 11. *kombinirati* 12. *meniti* 13. *misliti* 14. *oceniti, ocenjevati* 15. *poznati* 16. *predstaviti si, predstavljati si* 17. *premisliti, premišljati* 18. *presoditi, presojati* 19. *primeriti, primerjati* 20. *razmisliti, razmišljati* 21. *razumeti* 22. *sanjati* 23. *soditi* 24. *spoznati* 25. *sprejeti, sprejemati* 26. *sprejeti za, sprejemati za* 27. *trpeti* 28. *ugotviti, ugotovljati* 29. *vedeti* 30. *veseliti se*. The verb may occur in two aspectual forms, e.g.: Pol. *przyjąć* perfect., *przyjmować* imperfect and Sloven. *sprejeti* perfect., *sprejemati* imperfect. The verbal sets in both languages are not completely parallel as the semantic scope of lexical items in both languages is not identical. The choice of verbs is determined by the purpose of introducing the main issues connected with the examined verbs.

The studies carried out here are based on the assumption that the argument structure is determined by the predicate and the verb, which is a lexical projection of such a predicate. The first step of my research was to sketch the predicate-argument structure for constructions with the particular verb in the Polish and Slovene material. I assigned the symbols and patterns used in the model of grammar applied in previously presented research (Kiklewicz, Korytkowska 2010) and the ones used in the current project. I classified the analyzed verbs as dyadic and triadic verbs. Following this classification, I used the main semantic structures in the analyzed material: $P(x, q)$ for a two-argument structure; $P(x, q, r)$ for a three-argument structure. The depiction $P(p, x, q)$ is reserved for the structure with the causative internal propositional argument p. The presence of argument x is obligatory for all the verbal items presented here, serving as explanations of mental predicates. X is a bearer or an agent of the mental state or operation. Another required element is the implicated predicate-argument structure, which serves as an argument, propositional argument q, r or p. The second main division among verbs shows which of them are able to incorporate phrases with a nominalized predicate and which of them do not allow such a transformation. This question reveals the goal of the presented work, which is providing the presentation of how verbal items put restrictions on the incorporating of nominalized internal predication. The hypothesis is that Psych Verbs in both considered languages are able to implement a complement in the form of nominalization.

As previously mentioned, our data fall into two classes. The first one consists of verbs with one subject complement and another clausal. The other class includes verbs with three complements. One argument is the subject and two others are propositional, hence they represent inner predicates. Some lexical items are split into 2 classes and may occur in each of them. The Polish verb *poznać* is specified as the dyadic *poznać₁* and the triadic *poznać₂*. Similarly the Slovene *dojemati* is classified as *dojemati₁* incorporating 2 complements and as *dojemati₂* which implicates 3 arguments.

The Polish verbs with 2 arguments examined here are: *analizować*; *bać się*; *boleć*; *cierpieć*; *cieszyć się*; *domniemywać*; *marzyć*; *myśleć*; *ocenić, oceniać*; *pojąć, pojmować*; *poznać₁*; *przemyśleć, przemyśliwać*; *przyjąć, przyjmować*; *przypuszczać*; *rozmyślać*; *rozumieć*; *sądzić*; *udowodnić, udowadniać*; *ustalić, ustalać*; *uważać*; *wahać się*; *wątpić*; *wiedzieć*; *znać*; Slovene: *analizirati*; *bati se*; *boleti*; *dojeti₁, dojemati₁*; *dokazati, dokazovati*; *določiti, določati*; *domnevati*; *dvomiti*; *meniti*; *misliti*; *oceniti, ocenjevati*; *poznati*; *predstaviti si, predstavljati si*; *premisliti, premišljati*; *presoditi, presojati*; *razmisliti, razmišljati*; *razumeti*; *sanjati*; *soditi*; *spoznati*; *sprejeti, sprejemati*; *trpeti*; *ugotviti, ugotovljati*; *vedeti*; *veseliti se*. The verbs with 3 arguments are Polish: *identyfikować*; *kojarzyć*; *kojarzyć się*; *porównać, porównywać*; *poznać₂*; *przyjąć coś za coś, przyjmować coś za coś*; *utożsamić, utożsamiać*; Slovene: *asocirati*; *dojeti₂, dojemati₂*; *identificirati*; *kombinirati*; *primeriti, primerjati*; *sprejeti za, sprejemati za*. The predicates with 3-argument complementation comprised only 20% of the analyzed verbs in each class of language data.

NOMINALIZATIONS

The goal of the author is to demonstrate the issues related to a particular class of words which denote events. I intend to illustrate the complex problems of nominalizations with a set of sentential examples. In this paper I deal with the nominalization phenomenon, which is understood here as the presentation of the predicative content in the nominal form. This concept has been the object of long studies during the last 60 years. Since my examination is based on Polish and Slovene data, I will mainly present some opinions about nominalizations in Slavic studies. In Polish linguistics the monograph about nominalizations written by Jędrzejko (Jędrzejko 1993) is treated as a classic. Among Polish works we can find contrastive studies about English, Polish and Italian nominal manifesta-

tions of events presented by Rozwadowska (Rozwadowska 1997). Her study, though stemming from generative and post-generative theories, also concerns the lexical complexity of the analyzed words. Rozwadowska takes into consideration such verbal properties as aspect in Polish, which is encoded by prefixes, even in nominals (Rozwadowska 1997: 63–68). The discussion comprises the term and the scope of nominalization (Rozwadowska 1997). I would also like to recall the Polish and Bulgarian contrastive study of Korytkowska and Małdżiewa (Korytkowska, Małdżiewa 2002). In Slovene linguistics the article *Razvoj posamostaljanja v slovenskem publicističnem jeziku med 1946 in 1995* (Žele 1996), which dealt with propositional nouns and their stylistic functions, should be mentioned. The author presented a simple but significant definition of a nominalization: "*Najznačilnejši rezultat posamostaljanja je glagolnik, ki je tipična oblika za izražanje besedotvornega pomena dejanja*" (Žele 1996: 191), in which the notion of action transformed into the nominal form is stressed by the so-called Slovene *glagolnik*. The Slovene linguist emphasized the raising of nominalization occurrence in Modern Slovene (Žele 1996: 198). The frequency of nominalizations in Slovene, along with some issue of nominalizations such as metaphors functioning in special texts, were the object of research in Slovenia (Mikolič Južnič 2011). The Slovene names of actions are presented in *Nomina actionis we współczesnym języku słoweńskim* (Tokarz 1987). In my study on Polish and Slovene causatives the realization of one or two propositional arguments (cause and result arguments) by a nominal phrase (also as nominalization) was a very common practice in both languages (Zatorska 2013). In the text *Nominalizacije in njihova funkcijskost v besedilih o zgodovini Slovenije* (Zatorska, Gojkošek 2013) we attempted to show the functioning of nominalization in texts about Slovene history. We claimed that the presence of nominalizations is a distinctive feature of scientific works, popular science texts, and also of texts from the field of history. Nominalizations are characteristic means for scientific texts, as well as for popular science texts (Mikolič Južnič 2011: 321). In that short study (Zatorska, Gojkošek 2013), we also showed some of the most apparent issues related to nominalization occurrence, such as the type of predicates implicating nominal phrases in the place of the inner predicate, and the ways of realization of the elements of the Predicate-Argument Structure. The type of predicates which implicate the complements in the form of nominalizations, including the role of psychological predicates, had already been investigated (Grimshaw 1990).

The data confirm different types of nouns as nominalization. They are generally related to original, basic verbs and derived from verbs, e.g.: Pol. *przybyć/przybywać – przybycie*: *Wspólnota katolików cieszy się z tego, że przybywa papież – Wspólnota katolików cieszy się z przybycia papieża*; *spadać – spadek*: *Przyjmujemy, że krzywa popytu spada – Przyjmujemy spadek krzywej popytu*; *stworzyć – stworzenie*: *Artysta marzy, że stworzy własny teatr w Warszawie – Artysta marzy o stworzeniu własnego teatru w Warszawie*. A more complex situation is found in Slovene. In this language nominalization is treated strictly as a deverbal derivation with some other restrictions, for example, associated with special suffixes. It is labeled *glagolnik* and separated from other names of events. Dictionaries describe which of them fulfill such requirements. Due to this fact, the Slovene data are restricted mainly to clear nominalization, but the Polish data include both types. For example, for Polish *Rozmyśla o skandalu w teatrze*, see Slovene *Razmišlja o gledališkem škandalu*; in both sentences I classified the complements as nominalizations. However, accordingly to SSKJ, the biggest Slovene dictionary, the noun *škandal* is not labeled as *glagolnik* (nominalization). The status and types of nominalizations were discussed by Rozwadowska (Rozwadowska 1997). The author of the above-mentioned contrastive study indentifies and enumerates different nominal structures in Polish as underived event nominals: *pożar*, for example, *pożar Londynu*, (see in our data Slovene *požar Londona*); derived nominals: *prezentacja studentów*, (see Slovene *študentska predstavitev*; *predstavitev študentov*); derived event/process nominals: *prezentacja systemu przez studentów*, (see Slovene *študentska predstavitev*); and verbal nouns: *Zaprezentowanie systemu przez studentów*. In the presented paper, the class of nominalizations also encompasses nominal phrases denoting attributes, such as Pol. *mądrość* 'wisdom', for example, *Cieszy mnie jego mądrość* vs. *Cieszy mnie to, że on jest mądry*.

POLISH AND SLOVENE PSYCH-VERBS WHICH ASSIGN NOMINALIZATIONS. SELECTED PROBLEMS

The predicators from each class (based on dyadic and triadic predicates) can be specified in terms of argument type. The problem can be handled in the way of propositional argument occurrence. Among the analyzed predicators, we may differentiate ones which put some

restrictions on the implication of arguments. In Polish and Slovene we can point out such verbs opening a place for every type of sentential argument manifestation (a sentence with autonomic verb V, a nominalization NV, a noun N). The analysis of the Polish verb *analizować* and Slovene *analizirati* posits the same type of underlying predicate-argument structure *P (x, q)*, and the argument *q* can be expressed by three main types of expressions. We may say in Polish: *Historyk analizuje, jak przeszłość może wpływać na teraźniejszość* V; *Historyk analizuje przemiany w Polsce* NV; *Pacjentka na terapii analizuje swoje własne relacje i związki* NV; *Badacz analizuje postaci* N; *Genetyk analizuje geny* N. Slovene is parallel in that matter: *Skupina francoskih in švicarskih strokovnjakov analizira, kako delujejo možganske celice* NB V; *Skupina francoskih in švicarskih strokovnjakov analizira delovanje možganskih celic* NB NV; *Avstrijski publicist v novi knjigi analizira avstrijske kanclerje* NB N. The corpus-based material confirmed that the type of sentences with the Polish verb *analizować* opened place for nominalization is highly represented.

Most of the analyzed dyadic predicators allow the assignment of a propositional argument in the form of nominalization (NV). In the Polish data we note the following examples with verbs such as *bać się* – *Człowiek boi się śmierci, przemijania* Rp; *boleć* – *Komendantów boli rozbicie harcerstwa* Pp. *Rodaków boli traktowanie Polaków jako ludzi drugiej kategorii* Pp; *cierpieć* – *Dziecko cierpi z powodu samotności* Pp; *cieszyć się* – *Wspólnota katolików cieszy się z przybycia papieża* Pp; *domniemywać* – *Domniemywa o jego udziale w walce*, see (Bańko 2014); *marzyć* – *Chłopiec marzył o odkrywaniu nowych światów* P. *Kobieta marzy o zauroczeniu i fascynacji*; *myśleć* – *Myślimy o śmierci, czujemy strach* Rp; *ocenić* – *Rodzina oceniła jego wybór. Kierownik ocenił ich pracę*; *pojmować* – *Mały dzikus pojmuje swój obowiązek*; *poznać* – *Piętnastoletnia dziewczyna z londyńskich przedmieść poznała tylko przemoc i bluzgi jako jedyną formę porozumiewania się ze światem* Rp. *Poznał lęk, samotność, rozłączenie* Rp; *przemyśleć* – *Ukarana przemyślała swoje zachowania*; *przemyśliwać* – *Przemyśliwał nawet o ucieczce do Szwecji*; *przyjąć* – *Rząd przyjął za cel odbudowę pogłowia wilków* P; *przyjmować* – *Przyjmujemy spadek krzywej popytu*; *rozmyślać* – *Bohater rozmyśla o istnieniu i cierpieniu*; *rozumieć* – *Terapeuta rozumie mechanizmy ich związku*; *udowodnić* – *Udowodnił legalne pochodzenie swojej gotówki*; *ustalić* – *Lekarz ustalił przyczyny choroby* Pp; *ustalać* – *Inżynier ustala stężenie substancji*; *uważać* – *Domowa kobieta z książek i filmów za swoje powołanie uważa nieustanne służenie* Rp; *wahać się* – *Wahał się przed podjęciem tego kroku,*

see (Bańko 2014); *wątpić – Rodzice wątpili w jego umiejętności* Pp. *Ten człowiek wątpi w wartość dóbr cywilizacyjnych* Pp; *wiedzieć – Przewodnik wie o istnieniu tego zabytku; znać – Policja zna wszystkie jego wyczyny*. The Slovene data include such verbs us *bati se – Boji se kazni/smrti; Boji se trpljenja/lakote. Britanija se boji vtikanja Unije v njene notranje zadeve* NB; *boleti – Po evforiji ob nastopu reprezentance še bolj boli spomin na prazne tribune* NB; *dojeti – Zdravnik dojame pacientovo pričakovanje* NBp. *Diplomat je zlahka dojel razveseljivo novico* NB; *dojemati – Zakonodajalec dojema delovanje trgovine* NBp; *dokazati – Strelec je dokazal mojstrstvo* NBp; *določiti – Določili so položaj ladje* (Žele 2008: 94); *dvomiti – Dvomil je v potrditev programov* NB; *misliti – Mislil je o praznovanju* NB; *oceniti – Janko je ugodno ocenil delovanje turističnega radia* NBp; *poznati – Predsednik pozna probleme Evrope, tudi probleme manjšin* NB; *predstavljati si – Predstavlja si ponudbo za največjo ciljno skupino na svetu: ljubitelje športa* NB; *premišljati – Premišlja o njihovem delu* NB; *razmišljati – Nova skupina Romov razmišlja o kolektivni izselitvi v Zahodno Evropo ali Kanado* NBp; *razumeti – Publika je razumela to dejanje* NBp; *sanjati – Mladi Koprčan sanja o vrhunski uvrstitvi* NBp. *Že od malih nog sem sanjal o igranju za Anglijo* NB; *spoznati – Diplomant računalniške fakultete spozna delovne zahteve* NBp; *trpeti – Gospodarstvo trpi zaradi nizke produktivnosti v podjetjih* NBp; *ugotoviti – Ugotovil je vpliv spremenjenega baričnega pritiska na zračenje jam* NB; *vedeti – Vedela je o problemu* NBp; *veseliti se – Veseli se srečanj s svojci v starem domu* NB. *Veselijo se napovedanega hitrejšega umeščanja daljnovodov v prostor* NB.

Verbs based on predicates with a 3-argument structure are derived from a more complex underlying semantic structure. These predicates symbolized by *P (x, q, r)* let both propositional arguments *q* and *r* show transposition to nominal phrases. The set of Polish specified items with 3 arguments comprises: *identyfikować – Odbiorca reklamy fikcyjną wypowiedź identyfikuje z własnym przekonaniem* Pp (*q* and *r* as NV = 2 NV); *kojarzyć – Spanie w ubraniu alkoholicy kojarzą z pijaństwem* (2 NV); *kojarzyć się – Nadmierne liczenie się z opinią innych ludzi kojarzy mu się z pójściem na łatwiznę* Pp (2 NV); *porównać – Klientka porównała te biurokratyczne działania ze znaną jej uproszczoną procedurą zakładania biznesu* (2 NV), *porównywać – Student porównuje badanie języka do działania na liczbach* (2 NV); *przyjąć coś za coś – Młody człowiek przyjął odpowiedź za komplement* Pp (2 NV); *utożsamić – Młody dziennikarz utożsamił podryw z pracą* (2 NV), *utożsamiać – Chłopczyk utożsamia wygląd bohatera bajki z jego postępowaniem* (2 NV). The Slovene data comprise: *asocirati – Ure-*

sničitev je asocirala s tveganjem (2 NV); *dojemati₂ – Prizadeta javnost dojema varstvene ukrepe predvsem kot omejitev* (2 NV); *identificirati – Prijatelj identificira življenje s potovanjem* (2 NV); *primerjati – Vodja primerja svoje pričakovanje z rezultati* NB (2 NV); *sprejeti za – Pričakovanja sprejmejo za obljube* (2 NV).

The structure *P (x, q, r)* allows the appearance of only one propositional argument as nominalization, for example, Polish: *porównać – To, że młodzi ludzie maszerowali z zapalonymi pochodniami, ktoś porównał do przemarszu nazistów* (only 1 NV).

I would like to highlight the ways internal components connected with nominalization are expressed. Polish and Slovene differ in that matter. In Slovene an internal argument by nominalized predication is very often manifested by adjectives or pronouns. An example with a pronoun is illustrated by *Premišlja o njegovem nepremišljenem tratenju denarja* NBp. In the sentence *Hamlet ne razume materinega in stričevega ravnanja* NB Slovene possessive adjectives *materin*, *stričev* are used. The Polish translation includes nouns instead of them: *Hamlet nie rozumie postępowania matki i stryja*. Other examples are: *Mislimo o skupnem uspehu, družinskem triumfu* NBp; *Že takrat nisem poznal več ne veselega fantovskega potrpljenja* NB. The functioning of relative and possessive adjectives as arguments, along with nominalizations in Polish and Slovene, was already mentioned in previous works (Zatorska 2013: 136, Zatorska, Gojkošek 2013: 500)[3].

SYNTACTICAL MATTERS

On the surface of the formal syntactical level, the environment of nominalizations could be pointed out. The occurrence of a preposition is determined by a particular verb. Among the typical prepositions which are connected with examined nominalizations we may find in Polish: *do – Porównał jego wyjazd do katastrofy*; *nad – Dyplomaci przemyśliwali nad politycznym rozwiązaniem konfliktu*; *o – Domniemywał o jego związkach ze służbami specjalnymi. Myślą o przedłużeniu gatunku*; *przed – Chory wahał się przed podjęciem terapii*; *w – Wątpi w rozpoczęcie prac*; *z – Ktoś porównuje pracę zawodową z prowadzeniem domu*; *za – Alarm prawie wszyscy przyjęli za*

---

[3] See Tokarz E., *Nomina actionis we współczesnym języku słoweńskim*, Katowice, 42–59.

kiepski żart (Bańko 2014: 363). The Slovene set of the used prepositions that precede nominalizations consists of: *na – Mislila je na smrt*; *o – Dvomi o uspehu. Premišlja predvsem o odmevu pisateljevih besed. Razmišlja o zamenjavi direktorja* NB. *Sanja o lepem, mirnem meniškem življenju* NB; *v – Dvomi v hiter začetek*; *z/s – Primerja pričakovanja z rezultati* NB; *za – Boji se za življenje in hodi k specialistom po vsem svetu* NB. The data also reflect the causative meaning expressed by Slovene *zaradi* (see Polish *z powodu*): *Množice so trpele zaradi političnih dejanj.*

POLISH AND SLOVENE PSYCH-VERBS WHICH DO NOT ALLOW THE ASSIGNATION OF NOMINALIZATIONS

The presented material has proved the hypothesis that nominalization is a typical realization of the propositional argument implemented by Psych-Verbs in Polish and Slovene. Nonetheless, the investigated data include verbal items which do not assign the propositional complement in the form of nominalization. We can refer to Polish *sądzić* – *Marian sądzi, że Marek wyjechał* but **Marian sądzi wyjazd Janka*. We may also suspect that the item *uważać* tends to not implement nominalization: *Uważa, że ma rację*; however, the material contains the sentence: *Domowa kobieta z książek i filmów za swoje powołanie uważa nieustanne służenie* Rp. Among Polish predicators which do not open a place for nominalizations, we may find the verb *przypuszczać*. The above-mentioned Polish dictionary notes only examples with clauses as realizations of the propositional argument followed by this verb (Bańko 2014: 376). Some of the analyzed predicators based on psychological predicates allow complementation with nominalization. However, the data prove that sentences with such a verb in which the propositional argument is expressed by a clause are more common. We may observe such a situation in the phrases based on Slovene *dojeti* 'understand'. The complementation of this verb by sentential realization of the propositional argument in the corpus data is found in 90% examples, such as: *Hitro dojamem, da so se tudi vse okoliške ulice spremenile* NB. *Dojel sem, da je utrujen* NB. *Mercator dojel, da je Slovenija premajhna, zato gre na jug* NBp.

The Slovene item *kombinirati* (the second meaning) is depicted in the valency dictionary of Slovenian (Žele 2008: 176) only by the sentence with the clause in the propositional argument position. The Slovene verb

meniti in the data opens a place for sentences, e.g.:. *Drugi menijo, da je tudi na področju poslovnosti, trgovanja, investicij in podobno prostor za etične odločitve* NB. *Menil je, da Italija ni storila dovolj* NB. *Uprava podjetja je menila, da je najprej treba končati program lastninskega preoblikovanja* NB. The investigation did not confirm nominalizations in the position of complementation of *meniti*.

CONCLUSIONS

The conducted study has proved that the syntactical shape of elements of semantic structure is determined and may be licenced by the verb which functions as the projection of the main predicate. The relation between the underlying semantic structure and the surface syntactical structure is demonstrated by the analyzed data. The observations carried out in this work demonstrate clearly that the typical, expected way of realization of the propositional argument in the place opened by Psych Verbs, which is a projection of a complex predicate, is nominalization. Such a manner of explication of the content was allowed by 90% 2- and 3-argument verbal units in Polish and Slovene from the field of intellect as well as emotions. The analysis demonstrates that only 10% of the examined verbs in each language (Polish and Slovene) do not allow the realization of the propositional argument as nominalization. The results in this respect are similar in Polish and Slovene.

SOURCES

NB   – the Slovene corpus Nova Beseda http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/s_beseda.html
NBp   – paraphrased examples from NB
P   – PELCRA the part of NKJP The Polish Corpus http://www.nkjp.uni. lodz.pl/index
Pp   – paraphrased examples from P
R   – Rusin K., 2010, *Co z tym życiem?* Warszawa
Rp   – paraphrased examples from R

REFERENCES

Bańko, M. (ed.) 2014. *Inny słownik języka polskiego PWN*, Warszawa (second edition).

Danielewiczowa, M. 2002. *Wiedza i niewiedza. Studium polskich czasowników epistemicznych*. Warszawa.

Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument Structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Hale, K. & S. J. Keyser. 1997. "On The Complex Nature of Simple Predicators" In Alsina and al. (eds.) *Complex Predicates*. CSLI Publications, Stanford Calif., 29–65.

Jędrzejko, E. 1993. *Nominalizacje w systemie i w tekstach współczesnej polszczyzny*. Katowice.

Karolak, S. 2002. *Podstawowe struktury składniowe języka polskiego*. Warszawa.

Kiklewicz, A., Korytkowska M. et al. 2010. *Podstawowe struktury zdaniowe współczesnych języków słowiańskich: białoruski, bułgarski i polski*, A. Kiklewicz, M. Korytkowska eds., Olsztyn.

Korytkowska, M., Małdżiewa W. 2002. *Od zdania złożonego do zdania pojedynczego (nominalizacja argumentu propozycjonalnego w języku polskim i bułgarskim)*. Toruń.

Lečič, R. 2011. *Slovenski glagol. Czasownik słoweński*. Ljubljana.

Maliszewska, A. 2001. "O problemie klasyfikacyjnym polskich predykatorów mentalnych", *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN*, tom XLVI/2001, 91–134.

Mikolič, Južnič. 2011. *Vpliv besedilnih tipov na pojavljanje nominalizacije v slovenščini: korpusna raziskava*. In S. Kranjc (ed.) *Meddisciplinarnost v slovenistiki*, OBDOBJA 30, Ljubljana, 321–327.

Nowakowska-Kempna, I. 1986. *Konstrukcje zdaniowe z leksykalnymi wykładnikami predykatów uczuć*. Katowice.

Rozwadowska, B. 1997. *Towards a Unified Theory of Nominalizations. External and Internal Eventualities*, Wrocław.

Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, SSKJ, 2000, SAZU in ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša in avtorji, Ljubljana.

Tokarz, E. 1987. *Nomina actionis we współczesnym języku słoweńskim.* Katowice.

Wierzbicka, A. 2006. *Semantyka. Jednostki elementarne i uniwersalne*, transl. A. Głaz, Lublin.

Zatorska A., 2013, *Polskie i słoweńskie predykatory kauzatywne z parafrazą przymiotnikową*, Łódź.

Zatorska A., 2013a, "Bitwa o każdy grób". Semantyczno-składniowa oraz funkcjonalna analiza tytułów w "Przewodniku po powstańczej Warszawie". *Folia Linguistica* nr 47/2013, 20–33.

Zatorska A., Gojkošek M., 2013, Nominalizacije in njihova funkcijskost v besedilih o zgodovini Slovenije. In Družbena funkcijskost jezika (vidiki, merila, opredelitve) OBDOBJA 32, A. Žele (ed.), Ljubljana, 497–502.

Žele A., 1996, Razvoj posamostaljenja v slovenskem publicističnem jeziku med 1946 in 1995. In *Jezik in čas*, A. Vidovič Muha (ed.), Ljubljana, 191–200.

Žele A., 2008, *Vezljivostni slovar slovenskih glagolov*, Ljubljana.

WYBRANE PROBLEMY ZJAWISKA NOMINALIZACJI W JĘZYKU POLSKIM I SŁOWEŃSKIM JAKO WYKŁADNIKA ARGUMENTÓW PROPOZYCJONALNYCH PRZY CZASOWNIKACH SFERY PSYCHICZNEJ

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest udokumentowanie tezy, że czasowniki sfery psychicznej (odnoszące się do intelektu i do uczuć) przejawiają tendencję, aby w ich otoczeniu jako wykładnik argumentu propozycjonalnego pojawiały się nominalizacje. Analizę przeprowadzono w oparciu o założenia składni semantycznej, w której płaszczyzna treści i poziom językowy traktowane są jako odrębne. Badaniem objęto 60 czasowników – 30 polskich i 30 słoweńskich, które zilustrowano w postaci bogatej egzemplifikacji zdaniowej. Badane verba podzielono na dwu- i trójargumentowe. Obserwacje potwierdziły wyjściową tezę o obecności nominalizacji przy werbalnych wykładnikach predykatów mentalnych i emotywnych, które w artykule objęto wspólnym terminem czasowniki sfery psychicznej. Nieliczne czasowniki stanowiące 10% materiału nie dopuszczają nominalizacji w pozycji wewnętrznej predykacji (argumentu zdarzeniowego). Oba badane języki wykazują znaczące podobieństwo odnośnie skali dopuszczalności nominalizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: semantyka, składnia, nominalizacje, język polski, język słoweński, czasowniki sfery psychicznej

SELECTED ISSUES OF NOMINALIZATIONS AS PROPOSITIONAL ARGUMENTS IN POLISH AND SLOVENE SENTENCES WITH PSYCH-VERBS

Summary

In this paper a hypothesis concerning the occurrence of nominalizations in the position of the propositional argument assigned by a psychological predicate was tested with sets of 60 (30 + 30) Polish and Slovene verbs from the semantic field of thinking and feeling. In line with Semantic Syntax Methodology, the semantic and the syntactic (formal) levels of representation were separated. Predicates and arguments are elements of the Predicate-Argument Structure on the semantic level of representation. The observations demonstrate that the typical way of the realization of the propositional argument in the place opened by Psych Verbs, in the place of complex predicates, is nominalization. Such a manner of explication covers 90% of the tested 2- and 3-argument verbal units in Polish and Slovene from the field of the intellect as well as emotions. The analysis shows that only 10% of the examined verbs in each language (Polish and Slovene) do not allow the realization of the propositional argument as nominalization. The results in this respect are similar in Polish and in Slovene.

Key words: Semantics, syntax, nominalizations, Polish, Slovene, Psych-Verbs