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Introduction

The present study is a byproduct of a larger study on deverbal nominalizations (NZNs) in -age and -ment in French. Alongside these nominalizations, very often there exists a converted noun derived from the same base verb.

\[(1)\] attrap-age, attrap-ment, attrape \leftarrow\text{attrap-er} \text{ ‘to catch’}\\
\[\text{N-age} \quad \text{N-ment} \quad \text{Converted Noun (CN)}\]

An extensive search in corpora and the Web allowed me to gather about 315 triplets that illustrate model (1). Even though the search is still ongoing, the sample is large enough to address the issue of the semantics of converted nominalizations in a more concrete way than usually.

- the comparison set is very constrained, which makes things more manageable.
- the sample is big enough for the regularities to come out.
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Issues raised in the past about conversion

- **Competition**: does the meaning of the converted N compete with the meanings associated with suffixed nominalizations?
- **Complementarity**: are these meanings complementary (Plag 1999)?
- **Opacity**: is the meaning of the converted N more opaque than the meaning of the NZNs in -age and -ment (Manova & Dressler 2005)?

The issue of competition arises as soon as we admit that the nominalizations in question have to comply with the requirements of canonical derivation (Corbett 2010)

- distinct exponents within the same morphological family should prompt distinct interpretations (‘avoid synonymy’)

**Prerequisite** The above issues can be addressed only if the NZNs in -age, -ment and the converted N are correlated with the same verbal lexeme (to be defined below)
Introduction

Preliminary issues to be dealt with

• How were the data collected and selected?
• How do we decide that a pair of NZNs in -age and -ment and a converted N form a triplet i.e. are correlated with the same base verb?
• How do we characterize conversion in French? Do all the converted nouns included in the triplets belong to the same type of conversion?
Introduction

Linguistic questions

• Does the existence of a converted N put constraints on the interpretative possibilities of the corresponding NZNs in -age and -ment or vice versa?

• Are the assignation of meaning to converted Ns and to NZNs belonging to the same morphological family completely disconnected?

• No simple answer
Selecting the data

First goal Establish the list of the nominalizations in -age and -ment forming doublets

(a) For each letter of the alphabet, the forms ending in -age, -ment included in the TLFNome are collected. Two lists are obtained.
(b) The two lists are compared and the Ns formally derived from the same verb are selected e.g. batt-age, batte-ment ← batt-re ‘to beat’
(c) In addition, the Web is inspected to see whether there exists a N in -age for each N in -ment lacking such a counterpart in the list obtained at step (b), and vice versa for the nouns in -ment.
(d) Independently, all the pairs in -age and -ment derived from the same verb and present either in the GLÀFF (Gros Lexique À tout Faire du Français, Sajous et al. 2013) or the LEFFFF (Lexique des formes fléchies du français, Sagot 2010) are added to the list in case they are not already included in it:

\[ 408 \text{ (GLAFF)} \oplus 210 \text{ (LEFFFF)} = 445 \]

(e) Result = the gross list of doublets in -age and -ment (liste brute)
Selecting the data

Second goal determine whether a conversion exists for each pair of doublets in -age and -ment

(f) The decision is based on the criteria which define conversion in French (to be given below), plus a verification in dictionaries

(g) Result = the gross list of triplets that includes a pair of doublets in -age and -ment and the corresponding converted noun

Examples of triplets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Bse-V</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amassage</td>
<td>amassement</td>
<td>amas</td>
<td>amasser</td>
<td>‘to collect’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embrouillage</td>
<td>embrouillement</td>
<td>embrouille</td>
<td>embrouiller</td>
<td>‘to confuse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garage</td>
<td>garement</td>
<td>gare</td>
<td>garer</td>
<td>‘to park’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pliage</td>
<td>pliement</td>
<td>pli</td>
<td>plier</td>
<td>‘to fold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selecting the data

Gross number of triplets for each letter of the alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Number of Triplets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step (c) — Web inspection — dramatically enlarged the number of doublets in -age and -ment

Total number of triplets for the time being: 315
Selecting the data

Third goal Select the elements which constitute strict triplets within the gross list of triplets

- Strict triplets / doublets are those whose elements are correlated with the same verbal lexeme
  - Distinction between morphological verb and verbal lexeme

Morphological verb a morphological verb is defined by its inflectional paradigm

(2) RESSORTIR (de NP) ‘go out again’ il ressort, il ressortait…
    RESSORTIR (à NP) ‘come under’ il ressortit, il ressortissait…

- (2) shows that these verbs belong to two ‘irreducible inflectional classes’ (Bonami & Boyé 2014: 38)
  - Two distinct morphological verbs RESSORTIR\(^1\) and RESSORTIR\(^2\)
Selecting the data

**Verbal lexeme** a verbal lexeme is a lexeme such that (i) its syntactic category is V, (ii) it heads a construction (or variants thereof) (Fradin 2016, 2017)

(3) a. $X[AGT] \text{FONDRE}^1 Y[ PAT] \quad \text{‘} X \text{ melt } Y \text{ down’}$
   b. $X[ PAT] \text{FONDRE}^2 \quad \text{‘} X \text{ thaw, melt’}$

(4) a. *À cette époque, l’on fondait$^1$ le minerai de fer à l’aide de charbon de bois.* (Web)
   ‘At this time, iron ore was melted using charcoal’
   b. *Le goudron fondait$^2$ sous mes pieds.* (TLF)
   ‘Tar was melting under my feet’

- FONDRE$^1$ and FONDRE$^2$ are two distinct verbal lexemes but they are instantiated by the same morphological verb
- Strict doublets or triplets are necessarily derived from the same verbal lexeme
Characterizing conversion

“Conversion is a change in form class of a form without any corresponding change of form” Bauer (1983: 32)

“Conversion is (...) a derivational process linking lexemes of the same form but belonging to different word-classes” Bauer & Valera (2005: 8)

“Conversion is change of word-class without the addition of derivational affixes” Manova & Dressler (2005: 72)

“Conversion is a means of creating new lexemes. However conversion does not constitute a morphological category.” Neef (2005: 128)

- Change in word-class (i.e. syntactic category)
- No phonological exponent
- A (subtype of) derivational process
‘Change of word class’
• resulting in a new lexeme = conversion
• not resulting in a new lexeme = transposition (Neef 2005)

(5) a. sagen ‘to say’ \(\rightarrow\) Sagen ‘saying’
    INF N
    (deu)

   b. werzweigt ‘branched’ \(\rightarrow\) werzweigt ‘branched’
    PSTPTP A
    (deu)

Past participle werzweigt, adjective werzweigt, and noun Werzweigen belong to the inflectional paradigm of lexeme VERZWEIGEN

Schema of conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GÄRTNER</th>
<th>GÄRTNERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT:N, GER:M</td>
<td>CAT:V...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener(x)</td>
<td>cultivate(x,y,e) &amp; garden(y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characterizing conversion

‘No phonological exponent’
• inflectional marks do not count as exponent since they follow from the change of category
• zero-marking is a problematic option in derivation because it implies multiplying spurious distinct null exponents (Lieber 1980, Don et al. 2000, Manova & Dressler 2005)

What is the phonological base of conversion?
• the answer depends on the language in question
• Tradition in constructional approaches: root-based (5a), stem-based (5b) or word-based (5c) (Manova & Dressler 2005)

(6) a. lauf-en ‘to run’ → (der) Lauf ‘(the) run’ (deu)
     INF N
b. igr-a-ti ‘to dance, play’ → igr ‘dance, play’ (hbs)
   V N
c. spic-a ‘ear’ → spic-a-re ‘to supply with ears’ (lat)
   N V
Characterizing conversion

• Manova & Dressler (2005: 86) claims that French, like English, has only word-based conversions (cf. (7))

(7) beurre ‘butter’ → beurr-er ‘to butter’ (fra)

N V

• However major lexical categories in French generally involve several bases for inflection or derivation (Bonami & Boyé, 2003, 2005, 2014)

• Accounting for phenomena of French is simpler if these bases are conceived of as stems agglomerating former parts of inflectional exponents (Bonami et al. 2009, Bonami & Montermini 2013) insofar as:
  - variation in Romance is tied to stems, not to morphological exponents,
  - the notion of thematic vowel is irrelevant in present-day French,
  - marking often limits itself to identity function applying to stems (cf. (8))

(8) FONDRE fô, fôd fondent fondateur
fôd, fôd-œr
V, IND.PRS.3SG V, IND.PRS.3PL N, GER:M
\( \lambda e. melt(x,y,e) \) \( \lambda x. \text{melt}(x,y,e) \)
Characterizing conversion

According to Tribout (2012), the phonological input of deverbal conversions in French can be
- the short stem (stem 0) obtained from the stem of the Indicative Present Singular (stem 3): \textit{abaisse} / \textit{abaiss-} \sim \textit{ABAISSER} ‘to roll out [dough]’, \textit{amas} / \textit{amass-} \sim \textit{AMASSER} ‘to collect’, \textit{farce} / \textit{farsi-} \sim \textit{FARCIR} ‘to stuff’
- the stem used for learned derivation (stem 13): \textit{concept} / \textit{concept-ion} \sim \textit{CONCEVOIR} ‘to conceive’
- the stem used to form past participle (stem 12): \textit{avancée} / \textit{avancé} \sim \textit{AVANCER} ‘to advance’, \textit{prise} / \textit{pris} \sim \textit{PRENDRE} ‘to take’

Conversion is a lexeme formation process correlating one of the phonological stems of an input lexeme with a phonologically identical but categorially different output lexeme.

Conversion is stem based (not word based) in French
Characterizing conversion

- Data show about 40 converted forms that are based on stem 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Stem 0</th>
<th>Stem 12</th>
<th>Bse-V</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avançage</td>
<td>avancement</td>
<td>avance</td>
<td>avancée</td>
<td>avancer</td>
<td>‘to avance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>éclaircissage</td>
<td>éclaircisement</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>éclaircie</td>
<td>éclaircir</td>
<td>‘to clarify’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rancissage</td>
<td>rancissement</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ranci</td>
<td>rancir</td>
<td>‘to go rancid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapage</td>
<td>tapement</td>
<td>tape</td>
<td>tapée</td>
<td>taper</td>
<td>‘to hit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traînage</td>
<td>traînement</td>
<td>train/traîne</td>
<td>traînée</td>
<td>traîner</td>
<td>‘to drag’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- These converted forms show the same semantic diversity as others
‘Conversion is a derivational process’

- Neef (2005:107) challenges this view and argues that conversion is not a morphological category, contrary to typical derivational processes such as -ee affixation in English (Bauer 1983, Barker 1998)
- Why? Conversion
  — selects no specific base (unlike transitive V for -ee)
  — has no specific phonological form (unlike /i/)
  — does not denote a coherent group of entities (unlike episodic patients for -ee derivation)

“For conversion to be regarded as a morphological category, it should exhibit a constant meaning aspect across the lexemes belonging to the category (…) Conversion into verbs in German does not constitute a morphological category” (Neef 2005: 107)

- However the premiss is flawed for French: some derivation processes do not denote a coherent group of entities, viz. NZNs in -age and -ment
Interim conclusion

- The gross list of triplets was established in a coherent and principled way
- The nominal forms that count as potential instances of deverbal conversion in French have been characterized
- I assume as a working hypothesis that conversion is a derivational process in French

Next step
- Comparison of the semantic values expressed by the NZNs on the one hand and converted nouns on the other
- Comparison works only in the case of converted nouns competing with affixed NZNs: the conditions permitting competition have to be made explicit
Criteria of competition

• For competition to take place all NZNs and converted nouns (CNs), or those assumed to be, have to be derived from the same base verb as stated in (9)
• This excludes situation (10), where the base verb is derived from the supposedly converted noun

\[(9) \ V \rightarrow \{\text{N-age, N-ment, CN}\} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{relever} & \rightarrow \{\text{relev-age, relève-ment, relève}\} \\
\text{‘to raise, to relieve’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(10) \ \text{CN} \rightarrow \ V \rightarrow \{\text{N-age, N-ment}\} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{béton} & \rightarrow \text{bétonner} \rightarrow \{\text{bétonn-age, bétonne-ment}\} \\
\text{‘to concrete’}
\end{align*}
\]

▷Several criteria can help us to eliminate examples illustrating (10) from our survey
Criteria of competition

1) The N denotes an instrument (activity oriented artifact)
   • The base verb is usually derived from the noun denoting the instrument in question (about 30 examples)
   • The constructed meaning of the V denotes the action performed by an agent using the instrument in a normal way (Aronoff 1980)
   • The use of the instrument is entailed by the verb (cf. (11)) (Koenig et al. 2008)

(11) a. $X \text{ base-}V \ (Y) \models X \ \text{use } Z[\text{INS}]$
    b. $X \text{ base-}V \ (Y) \models X \ V \ (Y) \ \text{with } Z[\text{INS}]$

(12) \textit{Pierre bêche le jardin} $\models$ \textit{Pierre retourne la terre avec une bêche.}
    ‘Peter is spading the garden $\models$ P. is digging the soil with a spade’

• Expressing the semantics of the N on the basis of the meaning of the verb is generally very awkward and leads to circularity
  • Similar arguments can be extended to substances and animals
Criteria of competition

2) The N denotes a substance
   - The constructed meaning of the V denotes the action performed using the substance in question (which functions as a means)
   - Example: X bétonner Y = ‘X cover Y with concrete’
   - argent / argenter, béton / bétonner, huile / huiler, vernis / vernir…

3) The N denotes an animal
   - Verbs derived from animals’ names generally denote a way of behaving or a form characteristic of the animal in question or presumed to be so (Štekauer et al. 2011)
   - Nominalizations in -age and -ment never denote animals, which implies that they never compete with nouns naming animals
   - Sometimes, both the converted N and the animal’s name co-exist e.g. lézarde ‘crack’ / lézard ‘lizard’ ~ (se) lézarder ‘to crack’, which indicates that the latter is the origin of the morphological family
   - âne / ânonner, bourdon / bourdonner, jacasse / jacasser, lézard / lézarder…
4) The N denotes a natural kind (or part thereof)

- The constructed meaning of the V denotes the action performed using the natural kind (Putnam 1975) in question
- Formulating the meaning of the N on the basis of that of the V is uninformative to the utmost and negates the fact that its referent is a natural kind and not a functional object: écorce ‘bark’ = ?? ‘part of a tree which is stripped’ écorcer ‘to debark’ = ‘strip the bark of a tree’
- écorce / écorcer, éclair / éclairer, vent / venter…

- Linguistic criteria may be invoked against scheme (9) for some of the supposedly converted nouns
Criteria of competition

5) Linguistic criteria supporting analysis (10) for the N
• Formulating the constructed meaning of the N on the basis of that of the verb is awkward and uninformative: *àout* ‘August’ / *aoûter*
• The word is not a noun originally but
  — an onomatopoeia: *baragouin, froufrou*
  — an adjective: *quadruple, triple; biais, bleu, plan*
• The form of the N does not correspond to that of verbal stem 0:
  *plafond / plafonn-er, bazar / bazard-er, foudre / foudroy-er, lame / lamin-er, recrue / recrut-er*
• If the N end in *-ion* and is a learned adaptation from a Latin noun in *-io,* it is the base of the V in *-ionner* (Lignon & Namer 2014): *fraction / fractionn-er*
• The N has another origin: *ajourner / ajour (< à jour), bichonner / bichon < barbichon, interligner / interligne < inter+ligne*
• The N has been adapted from a foreign language:
  *arpéger / arpège < ita arpeggio, atrophier / atrophie < lat atrophia*

- We are left with about 150 triplets that satisfy scheme (9)
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

- Contrary to derivation types such as English -ee, French nominalizations in -age and -ment exhibit many distinct meanings.
  - At a first level, these meanings reflect the semantic role assigned by the base verb to its arguments: event, result, location, etc.
- The comparison will be mainly based on these semantic roles.
  - The Tables in the following slides illustrate the varieties of semantic roles available for nominalizations in -age and -ment and for converted nouns.
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>‘action of V’</td>
<td>lavage</td>
<td>aboiement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>‘result of the action of V’</td>
<td>pliage</td>
<td>bâtiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>‘Z such that X V (Y) with Z’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>‘what V (Y)’</td>
<td>éclairage</td>
<td>revêtement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>‘Y such that X V X’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>‘fact of being V-ed’</td>
<td>ébouriffage</td>
<td>engluement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>‘manner of V’</td>
<td>tissage</td>
<td>raisonnement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>‘place where… V’</td>
<td>garage</td>
<td>logement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The only attested example for Patient is hérît-age ‘inheritance’ X hérîter (de) Y ‘X inherit Y’ Il avait héréîté (du | le) domaine.
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

### Semantic roles of converted nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>‘action of V’</td>
<td>fauche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>‘result of the action of V’</td>
<td>accroc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>‘Z such that X V (Y) with Z’</td>
<td>rabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>‘what V (Y)’</td>
<td>renfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>‘X such that X V (Y)’</td>
<td>juge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>‘Y such that X V X’</td>
<td>achat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>‘fact of being V-ed’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>‘manner of V’</td>
<td>marche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>‘place where… V’</td>
<td>forge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Agent role has been added because it shows up with CNs
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

• LE __ (avoir lieu | se produire)… ‘the __ (take place | occur)’

Product = result
• With creation verbs only (Piñon 2008, Beavers 2010, Melloni 2011)

• “It is simply the effecting participant. It need not be animate”. But it appears with “activity verbs” whose semantic representation includes ‘DO'(x…)’ (van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 118). This is not the case of satisfiers, which always involve stative verbs (Fradin 2015).
• DET __ base-V… e.g. Un financement finance… ‘A funding funds’

Result need not be Patient and vice versa
• amas = result of the action of collecting but not a patient
• affiche = ‘ce qu’on affiche’ / poster = ‘what is posted’ is not a result
• Semantic roles cumulate in many cases
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

Comparison of possibilities for suffixed and converted NZNs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>N-sfx</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>‘action of V’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>‘result of the action of V’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>‘Z such that X V (Y) with Z’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>‘what V (Y)’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>‘X such that X V (Y)’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>‘Y such that X V Y’</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>‘fact of being V-ed’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>‘manner of V’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>‘place where… V’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Full competition can only take place with 5 roles
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

- Full competition occurs whenever all elements of a triplet have the same semantic role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For NZNs in -age and -ment this only happens when the role value is ‘event’ or, more rarely, ‘product’ and ‘means’
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

- Consequently, full competition limits itself to rows ‘event’, ‘product’ and ‘means’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

- However, in the data we observe that the only semantic role shared by NZNs in -age and -ment is the ‘event’ role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfier</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Consequently, the discussion will focus on this case
- Less than 65 triplets are involved
Comparing CNs with suffixed NZNs

- Partial competition, on the other hand, combines the 6 possible roles allowed for the suffixed NZNs and the 7 available for the converted nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of possibilities for partial competition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not all possibilities are attested however.

- From now on, I will discuss full and partial competition in turn.
Hypothesis
The degree of lexicalization of the elements of the triplet and their entrenchment in the language interferes with the way their meaning is assigned

- If all elements of the triplet are lexicalized in the language, their meanings will tend to be complementary
- Long history fosters meaning shifts and polysemy

(13) équipage ‘carriage, crew’, équipement ‘equipment’, équipe ‘team’

If an element of the triplet is a newly coined noun, its meaning will tend to be

- complementary to the meanings of the already existing elements if the coining is motivated by conceptual needs (Roché 2011)
- similar to the meaning of other elements in case the coining is motivated by enunciative needs (Roché 2011)
For exposition purposes, three situations can be distinguished:

1. The converted noun is lexicalized while the suffixed NZNs are not:
   - *abandonnage, abandonnement, ABANDON* ‘abandon’

2. At least one of the suffixed NZNs is lexicalized while the converted noun is not or less so:
   - *PINAILLAGE, pinaillement, pinaille* ‘quibbling, nitpicking’

3. The suffixed NZNs and the converted noun are completely lexicalized:
   - *RELEVAGE, RELÈVEMENT, RELÈVE* ‘increase, recovery’
Full competition

Situation 1

- The NZNs are newly coined words and the coiners definitely know the converted noun
- All these nouns denote the same type of event
- This situation is at odds with the canonical derivation principles
- In fact, the NZNs in question often reflect variations in linguistic dimensions: diaphasic/diastratic in (14a, b) (video game players), diastratic in (14c) (religious speech), diachronic in (14d)
  - no effect in (14e): true competition between NZN and CN

(14) a. c'était plutôt toi le spécialiste de l'\textit{abandonnage} de groupe en plein donjon suite à… 24 mai 2005
b. Navré pour l'\textit{abandonnage} de navire hier soir, merci à Inglord de m'avoir suppléer au pied levé. quand au 35K dps .. perso j'y suis !!! les autres. 2/2012
c. Le Dieu de l'\textit{abandonnement} de soi (autre mot encore pour dire cette \textit{kénôsis}, dont parle saint Paul) est celui qui fait place. A Gesché (1998)
d. On fait l'\textit{abandonnement} de ses biens à ses créanciers ; on fait l'abdication d'une couronne, d'un empire,… (1826, Jean-Charles Laveaux)
e. 23 oct. 2014 …la corruption, la dépravation des mœurs, l'\textit{abandonnement} de l'enfant congolais dans la rue, les groupes de Kuluna et les groupes armées.
Full competition

• Other triplets illustrating situation 1

accueillage, accueillement, accueil / accueillir
approchage, approchement, approche / approcher
arrêtage, arrêtémen, arrêt / arrêter
baissage, baissement, baisse / baisser
bouffage, bouffement, bouffe / bouffer
brisage, brisement, bris / briser
jaugeage, jaugement, jauge / jauger
toussage, toussement, toux / tousser
violage, violement, viol / violer
voltigeage, voltigement, voltige / voltiger

‘to greet’
‘to approach’
‘to stop’
‘to lower’
‘to eat’
‘to break (up)’
‘to gauge’
‘to cough’
‘to rape’
‘to flit’
Situation 2

- The NZN is lexicalized while the converted noun is not (15b) or is less frequent (15a). Very few examples
- We presume that the coiner knows the NZN(s)
- This situation contradicts the principles of canonical derivation
- As before, however, the CN is diachronically marked (16a) or conveys diaphasic/diastratic information (16b), thereby satisfying an enunciative need

- Even though the meanings are not complementary, they are not synonymous either

(15) a. *aboyage*, *ABOIEMENT*, *aboi* / *aboyer* ‘to bark’
   b. *TRIPATOUILLAGE*, *tripatouillement*, *tripatouille* / *tripatouiller* ‘to fiddle with’

(16) a. Dès qu'il eut entendu l'*aboi* des chiens, son cuir lui tomba des mains ; il sortit du portique & courut en diligence à l'endroit où il entendait le bruit. 1774
Other triplets illustrating situation 2

réchauffage, réchauffement, réchauffe / réchauffer
renâclage, renâclement, renâcle / renâcler
tressautage, tressautement, tressaut / tressauter

‘to warm, to heat’
‘to rail’
‘to jerk’
Full competition

Situation 3

• The converted noun and (at least one of) the NZNs are lexicalized and the speaker is aware of this

• Although the nouns denote the same conceptual event and should have complementary meanings, this is not what we observe in (18)

• Nevertheless, these nouns do have complementary meanings in other contexts (19), which is the result of their being lexicalized for a long time (increase in polysemy)

▷ No clear case of full competition, since most relevant examples can be appropriately analyzed as cases of partial competition or even of no competition (the nouns are correlated with verbal lexemes exhibiting (slightly) different constructions)

(17) a. recoupage, recoupement, recoupe / recouper ‘to cut again; to cross-check’

(18) a. certaines techniques traditionnelles de recoupe [of flowers] ne sont plus adaptées à notre époque.

b. il est alors primordial d'opter pour des portes coulissantes sur-mesure, afin de ne pas déséquilibrer les vantaux lors du recoupage de la porte.

c. Le recoupement de la gaine est obligatoire au niveau du plancher haut…
Full competition

(19) a. **Recoupe**: [Sewing] remaining part of something that has been cut (Result)

b. **Recoupage**: action of mixing a substance with another one (event)

Ce qui signifie de belles possibilités de **recoupage** [of cocaine] et une valeur à la revente de l’ordre de 600 000 euros.

c. **Recoupement**: cross-checking (event, but metaphoric extension)

Le travail de **recoupement** mené par les gendarmes a permis de lui imputer 16 autres vols

- In (19) the complementary meanings originate in different constructions i.e. in different verbal lexemes

- Other triplets illustrating situation 3

  accordage, accordement, accord / accorder
  brouillage, brouillement, brouille / brouiller
  basculage, basculement, bascule / basculer
  éclaircissage, éclaircissement, éclaircie / éclaircir
  fauchage, fauchement, fauche / faucher
  frappage, frappement, frappe / frapper

  ‘to accord’
  ‘to blur; to fall out with’
  ‘to switch, to upend’
  ‘to lighten, to clarify’
  ‘to scythe; to rob’
  ‘to hit’
## Partial competition

### Number of possibilities for partial competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N-age</th>
<th>N-ment</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I focus on the most frequently attested possibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>result</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amassage</td>
<td>amassemement</td>
<td>amas</td>
<td>‘to mass’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tricotage</td>
<td>tricotement</td>
<td>tricot</td>
<td>‘to knit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recrutage</td>
<td>recrutement</td>
<td>recrue</td>
<td>‘to recruit’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>satisfier</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amorçage</td>
<td>amorce</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to bait’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haussage</td>
<td>hausse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to raise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehaussage</td>
<td>rehaut</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to heighten’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partial competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>patient</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avancage</td>
<td>avancement</td>
<td>avance</td>
<td>to advance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encaissage</td>
<td>encaissement</td>
<td>encaisse</td>
<td>‘to cash in’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recrutage</td>
<td>recrutement</td>
<td>recrue</td>
<td>‘to recruit’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>manner</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frappage</td>
<td>frappement</td>
<td>frappe</td>
<td>‘to hit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portage</td>
<td>portement</td>
<td>port</td>
<td>‘to carry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foulage</td>
<td>foulement</td>
<td>foulée</td>
<td>‘to step on’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abritage</td>
<td>abritement</td>
<td>abri</td>
<td>‘shelter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgeage</td>
<td>forgement</td>
<td>forge</td>
<td>‘forge’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>étalage</td>
<td>étalement</td>
<td>étal</td>
<td>‘display’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partial competition

- The semantic roles of the NZNs are not identical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>satisfier</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adossage</td>
<td>adossement</td>
<td>ados</td>
<td>‘to lean back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachage</td>
<td>attachement</td>
<td>attache</td>
<td>‘to fasten’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>satisfier</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passage</td>
<td>passement</td>
<td>passe</td>
<td>‘to pass’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>éclaircissage</td>
<td>éclaircissement</td>
<td>éclaircie</td>
<td>‘to clarify’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ev</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>res</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>embrouillage</td>
<td>embrouillement</td>
<td>embrouille</td>
<td>‘to mess with’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Many combinations are not attested so far e.g. ev, sta, loc
Partial competition

- Many derived NZNs are apparently polysemous

- However this polysemy stems from the fact that the nouns in question derive from two (or more) different verbal lexemes or lexicalize two different variables of the construction these base verbs denote

\[\text{NP0} \text{ loger NP1 dans NP3} \equiv \text{loger}(x,y,e) \land \text{LOC}(y, \text{INESS}(z)) \text{ ‘to house’}\]
- \(\text{LOGEMENT}^1\) (action) = \(\lambda e. \exists xyz[\text{loger}(x,y,e) \land \text{LOC}(y, \text{INESS}(z))]\)
- \(\text{LOGEMENT}^2\) (location) = \(\lambda z. \exists y e[\text{loger}(x,y,e) \land \text{LOC}(y, \text{INESS}(z))]\)
Partial competition

• Suffixed NZNs and converted nouns do not compete on an equal footing

• Suffixed NZNs are associated with a clear default meaning: the eventive interpretation.

• Nuances: the event denoted by the NZN generally involves (see Fradin 2017 however)
  — more control with -age
  — less control with -ment

• No similar default interpretation for conversion

▷ Coining a new noun in -age or -ment almost automatically makes the interlocutor interpret eventively the nominalization

▷ We came across attestations of new nouns in -age or -ment coined on purpose to suggest that an eventive interpretation has to be chosen
  — jugement (res) / jugeage (ev) ‘judging’
  — transfert (ev) / transfèremen (ev) ‘transfer’
Conclusion

• NZNs and CNs do compete especially if the coining of new nouns is motivated by conceptual and, to a lesser extent, enunciative needs
  ▸ More complementarity than competition otherwise

• The semantic opacity of converted nouns is not higher than that of suffixed NZNs in all cases when they denote the same types of entities
• But it remains true that CNs quite often belong to technical or specialized discourses

• The morphological family does not seem to play a crucial role in the repartition of meanings between suffixed NSNs and CNs
• This sporadically happens, but no regularity can be inferred
Many thanks to Loïc Liégeois (LLF) and Johan Ferguth (LLF) who carried out the search of doublets in -age and -ment in the GLÁFF and LEFFF.
THANK FOR YOUR ATTENTION
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