

Hladký, Josef

On the functions of some deverbative nouns in -er

Brno studies in English. 1979, vol. 13, iss. 1, pp. 105-117

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/118087>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ON THE FUNCTIONS OF SOME DEVERBATIVE NOUNS IN -ER

Josef Hladký

The suffix *-er* (and the related suffixes *-or*, *-ar* etc.) is one of the highly productive means of derivation in Modern English. Substantives in *-er* may be derived from nouns, adjectives, numerals, verbs, noun + verb and verb + noun combinations (Adams 1973.2—4, 68, 69, 79, 84; Marchand 1969.273—80). Out of these the most frequent are perhaps the deverbatives. Jespersen distinguishes three basic types of the *-er* deverbatives relating to persons (1942. 225ff). The derived noun may denote (i) a trade or profession (*composer*), (ii) a person apt to perform the action implied by the verb, the noun being often accompanied by an adjective indicating manner (*speedy goers*), (iii) a person performing an action or being in a certain state at the moment in question (*the sitter*, *the gazer*). An *-er* deverbative may belong to more than one of these categories (cf. *baker* further down). Jespersen treats, under separate headings, derivations from simple words, from noun + verb groups, from phrasal verbs etc.

Trnka (1954.76ff) confronts the English *-er* deverbatives with their Czech counterparts to show the high productivity of the English suffix. There are at least seven Czech suffixes corresponding to the English *-er* (*-tel*, *-ík*, *-ce*, *-ec*, *-čt*, *-ař*, *-čt* etc.) and even those may not be sufficient and Czech has to use a verbal participle or a whole verbal phrase. This is the case of those *-er* nouns which Strang (see below) regards as minimal nominalizations, e. g. *comers* and *goers* — *přicházející* a *odcházející* ['the coming and the leaving persons'], similarly for *reader*, *singer*, *sitter* etc., or *eater* — *ten*, *kdo jí* ['the person who is eating']. The polysemous character of the *-er* deverbatives stems from the functional and semantic variety of the original verbs. The *-er* nouns of agents are found in predication very frequently (after the verb *to be*) where they characterise the subject. The verbal character of these *-er* nouns manifests itself mainly in the following features (none of them being a permanent one): (i) they are used in predication (*I am an awful misser of*

chances), (ii) they may preserve the original adverb/preposition (*a passer-by*), (iii) they employ the same preposition as the original verb (*listeners to his speech*), and (iv) the adjective usually qualifies them only as performers of a certain action, not as persons with other qualities (e. g. *she was a wonderful dancer*, cf. also Quirk 1972.284). After giving the historical conditions of the rise of the *-er* deverbatives Trnka states that the verbalization process with the *-er* nouns has not gone so far as with the *-ing* forms, although they were of the same productivity.

Numerous examples of *-er* deverbatives are quoted by Olsson (1961.121–9). Olsson does not distinguish animate and inanimate nouns and his attention is focused on the types of deverbatives corresponding to Jespersen's categories quoted here under (ii) and (iii), i. e. trades and professions are outside the scope of his interest.

The above mentioned authors also specify the types of verbs from which *-er* derivations cannot be expected. According to Marchand, *-er* nouns are not formed (i) from verbs not allowing the transformation of an active statement into a passive one, (ii) from verbs with the so-called Present of Coincidence (*promise* etc.), (iii) from quasi copulas, such as *seem*. — According to Jespersen, an *-er* deverbative is not to be found where there is already an established noun denoting a trade or a profession, e. g. *student*, or where an *-er* noun would lead to homonymy, e. g. *better*, n. *better*, adj.; two examples of the way homonymy is avoided can be quoted from our own material:

1. As for prayer, Lord H. gives some practical guidance as to how to do it regularly in all manner of everyday situations, while admitting that, as a pray-er himself, he is not even in the gifted amateur class (The Listener 1975.678).

2. But the law is still in an unsatisfactory state. It still gives the 'banners' the chance to duck the big show trial before a jury and concentrate their raids on local areas where there may be magistrates who still think Netta Muskett is 'a bit too warm' (Books and Bookmen 1976: 4.5).

Trnka's relatively short treatment of the *-er* deverbatives does not state any rigid limits on their formation: an *-er* noun can be derived from nearly all verbs which have an *-ing* form. — Olsson quotes *shot, bore, bat, study* (1961. 117) and other converted nouns which make an *-er* deverbative unnecessary.

A linguistic classification of the *-er* deverbatives coupled with an analysis of both historical and contemporary instances has been given by Strang (1968, 1969). She distinguishes between minimal and specialized nominalizations. The minimal forms are generated as required by a process analogous to sentence-building, at the same time preserving the maximum syntactic characteristic of the original verb, while the specialized forms come into being in a more deliberate way, being free to behave like ordinary nouns (e. g. *a baker of those cakes* *x* *a baker* as an occupational term). (The specialized forms roughly correspond to Jespersen's group (i) and the minimal ones to groups (ii) and (iii).) The carry-over of verbal syntax, which should include tense and aspect, is not discussed in any greater detail.

The relation of an agentive noun to the verb is shown by Quirk (1972.262): *a big eater* — *someone who eats a lot* etc. The difference between *a good student* and *a good thief* is in the fact that the former may be changed so that *good* is used predicatively: *that student is good*. Quirk also discusses the difference between *a beautiful dancer* = *a dancer who is beautiful* and *a beautiful dancer* = *a person who dances beautifully* (284–5).

Some examples of *-er* deverbatives (not *putter* or the Shakespearean *doers*, though) are recorded in Kirchner 1952: *comer-outer* (156), *getter-up* (279), *go-withouter* (364) etc. — The relation between the *-er* suffix and the compound verb (in *getter-up*, *come-outer* and *comer-outer*) is treated by Peprník (1955. 216–7). — The use of the *-er* suffix in unconventional word-forming patterns is discussed by Bareš (1974.174). Bareš gives examples of reduplicated suffixes of the type *butter-inner* found mostly in slang. In cases where there is also a converted noun (*butt in*, v. — *butt in*, n.) the suffix is redundant.

Also relevant for the discussion of the *-er* deverbatives is Křížková's paper on the substantives with agentive meaning in Russian and Czech. Křížková points out that Czech verbal nouns do not convey the tense and should not be regarded as one of the verbal forms (as they often are), but as real substantives. Together with actional substantives they perform a number (though limited) of syntactic functions, including those of condensers. In certain contexts, however, the substantives of these types are to be avoided. As further discussion will show, Křížková's observations could be applied to *-er* deverbative substantives as well.

The examples offered by the above-mentioned authors were drawn from newspapers, literary works, parts of conversation. The comparatively high number of examples should not overrule an important observation made by Strang: the minimal type of the *-er* deverbative is felt by her to be alien to modern English. The following comments then, based on instances taken from issues of some British newspapers published in the years 1974 to 1976, from broadcast talks (mostly as reprinted in *The Listener*), from letters to editors, do not attempt to arrive at any stylistic evaluation of the *-er* deverbatives, and parallels between the *-er* deverbatives and some other features of modern English are to be drawn with due regard paid to Strang's proviso.

The possibility of forming, if necessary, an *-er* deverbative from nearly all verbs places this type of formation alongside such non-lexicalized word formations in modern English as conversion or quotational compounds. Examples of conversion were already quoted here from Olsson's material (e. g. *study* in *He was not a quick study, poor boy*). For quotational compounds we take over an example from Vachek's discussion of the problem: *He is a let-me-alone-with-your-nonsense companion* (1961.17; cf. also Mathesius 1975.31). There is also a group of lexicalized quotational compounds, such as *the have-nots*, *the might-have-beens*, *a never-was*, *a has-been*, *the don't knows*, etc., which are formed from verbs from which no *-er* deverbatives are derived. The common feature shared by the minimal-type deverbatives, conversions and quotational compounds (which might be also called quotational conversions) is the fact that they can be formed as needed, *ad-hoc*, to use a traditional term found in Mathesius' and Vachek's writings. In the following paragraphs then, the minimal-type deverbative will be referred to as an *ad-hoc* deverbative. This is not to introduce just another term, but the reason may be sought in the effort to stress the relation between the deverbative and the context, to stress the function of the deverbative.

One of the basic characteristics of *ad-hoc* deverbatives, according to Strang, is the carry-over of verbal features on to the derived noun. Let us first examine the category of tense in some sentences with *-er* nouns:

3. The explorer begins a search; he is a seeker.
4. The discoverer concludes a search; he is a finder.
5. First, because I am very much a believer in Britain joining the European Community, and, secondly...
6. She's a bit of a shower off.
7. I am a fanatical seeker out of other libraries, especially the less familiar variety.
8. This giant basketballer is not much of a mover.
9. Moore is one of the great trainers and practisers of all time.
10. The Thames is a great divider.
11. She is a very bad traveller, but we hope we can get her right for the Hardwick Stakes at Royal Ascot.
12. Ida was going to begin at the beginning and work right on. She was a sticker. (Olsson)
13. Waveney was not cruel, but he was a passionate hater of injustice, ... J. Hilton, *To you, Mr. Chips* 121.
14. He was an able organizer, an effective commander.
15. He was a magnificent distributor of a ball, he could beat a man on either side using methods no one had ever thought about, he could shoot, he could tackle, he was competitive and yet cool under pressure.
16. But she was a conscious deceiver, a fact which itself rules out eccentricity as an explanation of her odd career.
17. The root of the trouble is that he has never been a respecter of Persons with a capital P.
18. He has been a frequent broadcaster on BBC's overseas and domestic services since the 1960s, ...
19. It is doubtful if there has ever been a finer defensive reader of the game than Moore.
20. Mum has always been a poor swimmer.
21. But have you been a quick learner of songs?
22. And he's a doubtful starter for today's race.
23. R. K... remains a searcher after truth, a questioner, and not just a commercial traveller in truth...
24. In English we have to do without the kind of vocabulary that might have evolved if, as a nation over the past couple of centuries, we had been keen observers of culinary processes, and keen tasters of the results.

The above examples refer to the present and to the past. Example 12 expresses intention directed into the future and taken from a passage in semi-direct speech. In all the examples, however, the only conveyor of the category of tense is the respective form of the verb *to be*. The *-er* deverbative does not cooperate with the verb in expressing the tense. — The most frequent tense used in examples 3 to 24 is the present tense. The number of examples, however, is too small to serve as basis for any statistics, but if the examples from Olsson and Adams are taken into consideration as well, we find only three tenses altogether, the most frequent one being the present tense, followed by the past tense and the pre-present tense.

In the following examples the *-er* nouns are used in nominal structures without any direct link with a finite verb form.

25. No respecter of reputations (caption from a poster advertising a wrestling match; usually *-er*, cf. Ex 17, OED).
26. Madame Cliquot: bringer of bubbly (caption from a weekly).
27. Mr. H. W., who will follow Mr. E. H., opener of the debate, will remind the House...
28. Even H. S., the IBA's director of engineering, and provider, yet again, of one of the best papers ..., grabbed the last word in the last session...
29. This cult of the fact was marvellously satirised by Dickens in *Hard Times* in the person of schoolmaster Grandgrind, a stern believer in the idea that learning was learning about.

Although none of the above *-er* deverbatives functions as a conveyor or co-conveyor of the category of tense, an implicit expression of tense might be claimed if the examples were extended into a non-elliptical clause: *Mr. So-*

and-So|The man in the photograph above is no respecter of reputations. Similarly Ex. 26 could be extended into *Madame Cliquot is the bringer of the bubbly*, more precisely *Madame Cliquot was the person who brought the bubbly*, as we learn from the article on the beginnings of champagne production about two centuries ago. It is obvious that the *-er* deverbative is so nominal in its character and is used in such a structure that it cannot reflect the tense differences in the underlying verbal clauses — *who will open* in Ex. 27 and *who brought* in Ex. 26.

Opener of the debate comes under the heading of 'partial strict restrictive apposition' (Quirk 1972.635), without an article, which is common in newspapers. Semantically, it belongs to appositions expressing attribution (ibid. 628). In contrast to the other two semantic types of apposition, i. e. equivalence and inclusion, the attributive apposition "involves predication rather than equivalence" (ibid. 634). (Predication was seen as the basis of apposition already by Mathesius: cf. 1975.90: "The apposition is a non-sentence predication effected by juxtaposition of a coordinate nominal element.") — The absence of a finite verb form in an apposition has the natural consequence in the absence of the conveyor of tense. Temporal indication is supplied by the verb of the main clause and if the apposition (or another nominal expression) is replaced by a verbal phrase, the tense of the main clause governs the tense of the replacing verbal phrase (e. g. in Ex 27 and 28).

The above remarks apply also to Ex 28. There are, however, two coordinated units functioning as appositives. The first — *director* — is a lexicalized *-or* noun (*E. H., who is the IBA's director of engineering*), while the other is, in our view, an *ad hoc -er* deverbative (*E. H., who provided [or, was the provider of] one of the best papers*). There seem to be three differences between *director* and *provider*, all playing a part in the distinction between a lexicalized and an *ad-hoc* deverbative. The first difference is in the tense of a replacing verbal phrase (*is* with *the director, was* with *provider*) and the second is in the choice of the replacing verb phrase: with *provider* (as with *opener* of Ex 27 and *bringer* of Ex 26) the first choice of the replacing verb phrases uses the corresponding notional verb in its finite form (*[has]provided, will open, brought*) while with *director* the first choice is the form of the verb *to be* + the noun and *who directs* is less probable (however subjective these choices may be, they reflect the semantic differences between minimum and specialized nominalizations as seen by Strang, 1969.3). The third difference between *director* and *provider* is in the use of inserted *yet again* with *provider*. An adverbial expression of this type usually qualifies actions expressed by verbs and here it can be considered a signal of a low degree of lexicalization.

Neither in Ex 3 to 24, nor in Ex 25 to 29 could any means be found with the help of which the *-er* nouns were participating in the conveyance of the category of tense. The same applies to the following examples where the *-er* deverbatives are used in fully nominal functions.

30. Escaped — boxing — kangaroo. Finder — please — return to Chiptown Zoo (a notice in a children's book).

31. Escaper on trial (a newspaper headline).

32. It is like a parlour game in which a ball has to pass from hand to hand without being dropped — except that each handler has to make some interesting comment on the ball while he's holding it.

33. The loser [in a bet] pays for the lunch.

34. Certainly, he emerges here as a man who not only had a legion of friends but treasured them in turn: the hater of dogs and children is not to be seen.

35. Trust a press lord to recognise a good splitter of the working class when he sees one.

36. TUC join the doubters on Market entry (a newspaper headline).

37. ... the educational broadcasters have a network of their own, a continuing dialogue involving fellow programme-makers in other companies, teachers, ... and ... ploughers of similar furrows abroad.

38. On the following day, he threw a piece of inky paper while Mr. Pearson's back was turned, refused to confess himself the thrower when the gunmetal watch was brought out, ... (Hilton, *To you...* 124).

39. The lunch was... celebrating this book, which Foyle's had kindly left lying about for eaters to buy.

40. Deadhorse is how you get in and out of the North Slope. Big jets full of boomers and hoppers... The boomers stay... The hoppers return...

41. We did it with some assurance, because we were conscious of being part of the larger family of BBC, the music-makers, the laughter-raisers, the players of drama and games of all kinds, the sports correspondents, ...

42. Main streets are generally spacious — ... — the main danger to the unobservant pedestrian coming from bikes, the occasional lorry, bus, horse drawn cart or reckless pram pusher.

43. Some presenters carry the whole things themselves. Others need guidance and coddling by a producer. De Manio is one of the latter. The best Jack-handler is Barbara Crowther, who knows exactly how to cope with the old guru.

44. L. F. did not, therefore, count for a great deal either as an audience puller or a circulation builder.

Example 41 shows two ways in which a deverbative noun may be linked with the noun expressing the object of the action: either through an *of*-construction (*the players of drama*, or *the hater of dogs* in Ex 34) or through the process of composition (*the laughter-raisers*, or Exx 42 to 44; for a discussion of the two ways, see Olsson 1961.126f.)

Although the *-er* deverbatives seem to have no function in the conveyance of the category of tense, they have other links with the class of verb. Such links may be seen (i) in the preservation of the original word-order, e. g.

45. Everybody is a do-gooder.

The adding of the *-er* suffix to a group of words of this type is a process similar to that found with other English quotational compounds (cf. Mathesius' example *the did-not-goes* in 1975.31 and Vachek's discussion of the status of the word in English, Czech and Russian, 1961.12—23).

The preservation of the adverb position (cf. Trnka 1954.76ff) comes also under the heading of the preservation of the original word order and is exemplified by *a seeker-out of other libraries* (7) or by *putters-on* in the following sentence:

46. Even the most persistent putters-on of kettles during breaks for commercials have to...

A similar case is to be found in Ex 47, but there the second element is a preposition:

47. But posterity — the whole human community — owes its laurels to the happen-upon dark continents of the earth and of the mind, the courageous wanderer in worlds never known to be there. He is the explorer.

The preservation of the original verb-adverb order in the derivative process, being a verbal feature, may serve as a signal of an *ad-hoc* deverbative while the reversion of the order may indicate lexicalization of the deverbative noun. This distinction might be applied to pairs like *looker-on* and *on-looker*, *stander-by*

and *by-stander* (cf. Trnka 1954.79 and Vachek's commentary to Mathesius 1975.177). Similarly, the non-verbal character of the *-ing*-words in the following, rather rare examples is stressed by the reversion of the order: *Nothing is more off-putting than to have the interviewer say before the start: ... or Well, here is one faithful morning listener who believes that the time has come for a little up-pulling of socks, primarily in BBC departments which treat borrowed records badly, but also among producers who do not check them fully before transmission.* Lack of other instances prevents us from going any deeper into the problem of word order in the above forms. It may be only incidental that in both cases the verb and the particle retain their lexical meanings (though *pull up* forms part of an idiom; cf. Potter's classification, 1965.285-9).

The original word order has been preserved in Ex 48 below, where the deverbative is based on a collocation. At the same time, however, Ex 48 should be classified under the second type of link between the *ad-hoc* deverbatives and the class of verbs, i. e.

(ii) the preservation of verbal syntax (or, to use Strang's term, the carry-over of verbal syntax).

48. She was not a planner in cold blood (Olsson 1961.122).

Before discussing Ex 48 in some detail, let us adduce an example of the simplest form of carry-over of verbal syntax, the use of the *not* particle (for a reverse process in back-formation, i. e. *non* with a verb, see Adams 1973. 111-2):

49. The wanters or not-wanters.

The use of *not* in Ex 49 can be contrasted with the use of *non* with other deverbatives:

50. There is an inclination, in a lot of the theatres that are subsidised, to overstaff in terms of the non-doers — administrators, artistic advisers, who have got great talents and ... but ... are being carried, really, without enough work to do.

51. On ITV, as it is constituted at present, news at one hour is, I believe, a non-runner.

The carry-over of verbal syntax is also present in Ex 52 and 53 where the deverbatives took over prepositions which are usually found to collocate with verbal forms:

52. The Braden Week's policy of putting researchers, the readers of files, the standers on doorsteps, in front of the camera made the Rantzen face familiar to its public.

53. The big disappointment of the film is that Beatty, co-writer with Robert Towne, having established that George's offences count fairly low on the crime scale, proceeds to push the moral too far.

A comparison of the standers on doorsteps with Examples of the locative *on* in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (*a carpet on the floor, the jug on the table, pictures on the wall* etc.) reveals a difference in the way the preposition *on* is linked with the nouns before and after it. In the dictionary examples there does not seem to be any link between *carpet* and *on*, while there seems to be a link between *standers* and *on*. This link is given by the fact that *standers* is a noun describing an activity and has been derived from the verb *to stand*. In accordance with Quirk (1972:2.3f; 3.41; 7.2f; 8.46) *stand* of Ex 52 is regarded as a verb requiring complementation by an adverbial of

place (an obligatory adjunct). — In Ex 53 the prefix *co-* also requires complementation of some sort. The preposition *with* usually follows verbal forms when expressing the meaning of 'accompaniment or relationship' (cf. examples in the *Oxford Advanced* under sense 4); in Ex 53 it follows after a noun, which is, however, once again a noun of the dynamic type.

Coming back to a *planner in cold blood* in Ex 48 we can see that the *-er-noun* has taken over the collocating adverbial expression *in cold blood*. A search through a few dictionaries reveals that *in cold blood* is recorded as collocating with verbs only (*to act, to do s. th. in c. b. — Reum, to murder, to cut throats in c. b. — OED, to kill in c. b. — OED & Oxford Advanced*), the expression found in the attributive function being *cold-blooded*. Even without the support of recorded collocations *in cold blood* has to be regarded, in our view, as an adverbial (i. e. not an attribute) qualifying a *planner*. Qualification by an adverbial may be considered a feature indicating a low degree of lexicalization of the *-er-noun*. — A rather similar interpretation can be given for another case of adverbial expressions collocating with an *-er-noun* in Ex 28: *provider, yet again, of one of the best papers*.

The verbal features of the *ad-hoc -er-deverbatives* are probably more than outweighed by some clearly substantival features: the *-er-nouns* are preceded by articles, they can appear in plural form (which is not the case with the gerund and the verbal noun) and they always require a preposition for the joining of another noun, if the source verb is transitive (just as the verbal noun does): *a seeker-out of libraries, the putters-on of kettles* etc. If the non-finite verbal forms were arranged in a scale based on the relation of the verbal and the nominal features, the participles would be followed by the gerund and the last member would be the verbal noun. The *ad-hoc* deverbatives would be placed somewhere between the above forms and the lexicalized deverbatives. Viewed from the substantival end, the *ad-hoc* deverbatives could be labelled as the most dynamic nouns (Quirk 1972:2.16).

The mention of the non-finite verbal forms takes us to another point in the present discussion of the *ad-hoc* deverbatives. The non-finite verbal forms are the most important condensers in modern English. (On complex condensation phenomena, see Mathesius 1975.146f., Vachek 1961.31–44.) There were cases of substantival condensers reported in the material (Hladký 1961.106f), but their definition was based on chance, i. e. on the presence of a finite verbal form in the Czech version of the example; cf. *Would there never be a sound — Což se nic neozve* ['neozve' — 'does not sound']. The *-er-deverbatives*, however, can function as one of the classical types of condensers, for they are derived from a verb and can be usually replaced by a finite verbal form: *opener* of Ex 27 (*who will open*), *co-writer* of Ex 53 (*who wrote...*) etc.

Complex condensation phenomena reflect the nominal tendencies in modern English. All the *ad hoc* deverbatives, even if not functioning as condensers, may be viewed as reflecting such tendencies. This is manifest especially with *ad hoc* deverbatives used in predication (Ex 3 to 24), where the pattern is basically the same as in *to have a bath, to give a laugh, there was a click* or in *Her new book is also a good read*. In all these cases the conveyors of the primary predicative categories are disengaged from conveying the lexical meaning (cf. Firbas 1959a, 1959b, 1961). Such a polarization of functions has one natural consequence, the use of adjectives where Czech, as a language with an un-

weakened verb, uses adverbs. The Czech version of Ex 15 *He was a magnificent distributor of a ball* would be *Báječně rozehrával* [Magnificently distributed-he], that of Ex 21 *But have you been a quick learner of songs* would be *Ale učil jste se písničkám rychle?* [But learned you songs quickly]; cf. also the translations of Exx 21 and 18 below. These examples, to which might be added examples even from other languages than Czech, indicate that the *ad-hoc* deverbatives and conversions widen the range of the nominal predication patterns in English, if compared with Czech (and, probably, other languages as well).

The use of *-er-nouns* has still another aspect: the function of these nouns in functional sentence perspective (see Firbas 1959a, 1959b, 1961; on most recent research in functional sentence perspective see Papers 1970; cf. also TLP 1.289–99). Even without any detailed statistical analysis it seems probable that one of the most frequent patterns where an (*ad-hoc*) *-er-noun* is found is the pattern 'S + to be + (Adj +) Noun' exemplified above in Exx 3 to 24 (other nouns, not *ad hoc* formed, not agentive, are used in this pattern – *student, mother, enemy*, quoted after Quirk 1972.285). If we take Ex 12 as the simplest of them (*She was a sticker*), we can see that it reflects the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, placing the sentence elements into the sequence: theme (*she*) – transition (*was*) – rheme (*a sticker*).

One question deserves further discussion, i. e. the possibility of distinguishing *ad-hoc* and lexicalized deverbatives. Formal criteria, as summarized here above, are not sufficient for cases like *opener* (27) or a *baker* x *the baker of these cakes* (Strang's example, cf. 1968.220) and could be extended by another criterion, i. e. the inclusion in a dictionary.

Out of the deverbatives quoted here in Ex 1–53 (and out of Olsson's and Adams' examples regarded as *ad-hoc* deverbatives) the following are not recorded in *Webster's Third*: *adder-up* (Olsson's example No 261), *banner* (2), *breaker-off* (Adams, p. 125), *breaker-up* (O 262), *bringer* (26), *diner-out* (A 123), *dresser-upper* (O 267), *getter-up* (O 263), *grubber-up* (A 125), *happener upon* (47), *knocker-up* (A 123), *looker-upper* (O 267), *muddler-through* (A 125), *not-wanter* (49), *non-doer* (50), *non-runner* (51), *runner-away* (O 264), *seeker out* (7), *shower-off* (6), *sizer-up* (A 125), *stirrer-up* (O 265), *tidier* (from *park tidier*, O 257). Leaving aside three nouns with negative prefixes, where inclusion in a dictionary is not very likely, we can say that about 90 per cent of these are nouns derived from phrasal verbs.

The fact that an *ad-hoc* deverbative has (not) been recorded in a dictionary, does not, by itself (just as the other formal criteria do not, by themselves), indicate the borders between *ad-hoc* and lexicalized deverbatives (or rather, how the deverbatives should be classified into *ad-hoc*, border-line and lexicalized types).

A check in a dictionary, however, may be revealing in the present search for criteria. The only definition found for the following deverbatives is "one that -s": *deceiver* (16), *doubter* (36), *eater* (3)9, *enjoyer* (O 233c), *hater* (13 + 34), *hoper* (40), *snapper-up* (A 125). This is not unexpected; cf. Strang's observation on the absence of any special semantic feature with minimal nominalizations – 1969.3; cf. also Quirk 1972.262 on the relation of an agentive noun and the verb.

It was relatively easy to form the first and the second group of the *ad-hoc* deverbatives (i. e. those not recorded in the dictionary and those with only

one, the most general, definition). These two groups, though relatively numerous, still represent a minor part of the collection. The major part is formed by *ad-hoc* deverbatives with more than one definition in the *Third Webster*. Yet even with these deverbatives, the search for a definition which would correspond to the meaning of the deverbative in the given context ends up with the "one that -s" definition (this general definition was chosen only after all the others had to be refuted). In this way, the rest of the *ad-hoc* deverbatives can be classified according to the number of definitions recorded (the number of definitions, excluding the "one that -s" one, is given before each paragraph):

- (+1): *believer* (5+29), *conspirator* (0 229), *escaper* (31), *mover* (8), *planner* (48), *plougher* (37), *prayer* (1), *provider* (28), *putter-on* (the definition "one that -s" is specified by 'esp. a worker'; 46), *respector* (17+25), *shouter* (0 302c), *swimmer* (20), *wanter* (49);
- (+2): *buyer* (0 233a), *learner* (21), *rotter* (0 293), *stander* (52), *thrower* (38), *washer-up* (0 266);
- (+3): *broadcaster* (18), *organizer* (14), *practiser* (9), *seeker* (3);
- (+4): *distributor* (15), *opener* (the definitions and the examples quoted at the "one that -s" definition refer to tools only; 27), *splitter* (35);
- (+5): *finder* (4, 30);
- (+7): *crawler* (302), *observer* (29);
- (+8): *divider* (10), *handler* (32), *player* (41), *taster* (24);
- (+9): *searcher* (23), *trainer* (8), *traveller* (11);
- (+10): *collector* (0 233a), *dropper* (0 290), *reader* (292), *sleeper* (0 294), *starter* (22), *slider* (12).

The number of definitions may be regarded, on the one hand, as a criterion of the degree of lexicalization of the noun (the above groups then representing a gamut) but, on the other hand, it by no means alters the fact that the deverbatives in question have been used *ad-hoc* (they have been generated, to quote Strang's paper of 1968.220).

Two of the deverbatives from the present mini-corpus do not appear in any of the above groups: *loser* and *do-gooder* as used in Ex 33 and 45 respectively, do not correspond to a general "one that -s" definition but to a specific definition, i. e. they do not fulfil the criterion of *ad hoc* deverbatives. The third noun is *co-writer*, where *co-* also corresponds to a specific definition.

A similar process may be used with compound nouns from Exx 41 to 44. The *-er*-nouns themselves (*builder*, *handler*, *maker*, *puller*, *pusher*, *raiser*) correspond to the "one that -s" definitions and would be classed between the (+3) and (+11) groups. As most of the compounds in question are substantivized collocations (and not multi-verbal terms), they are not likely to be recorded in a dictionary and none of them is recorded in the *Third Webster*. It should be added that the possibility of forming *ad-hoc* compounds in English is not limited to transitive verbs only; there are cases in Olsson's material based on prepositional phrases: in addition to the productive type based on *goer*, there are compounds like *office stool percher*, *door gossipier*.

There are other deverbatives which may have been formed *ad-hoc*, but it is very difficult, or even impossible, to prove that it has, or has not, been so: Adams' examples may be quoted here (1973.116, 123). *Whipper-in* is probably an *ad-hoc* formation — the preservation of the verb-adverb order may be a reliable indicator of this. *Backslider*, *underachiever*, *outrider*, however, are not so clear. Absence of context (Adams gives only the nouns) prevents their classification. It is especially the semantic criterion that needs the context. — Contextual dependence of *ad-hoc* deverbatives is usually high (*the baker of these cakes*, [lunch] . . . *for eaters to buy*, etc.), but it is not a feature which would

be limited or bound to *ad-hoc* deverbatives and consequently cannot be used as a criterion.

The discussion of criteria for distinguishing *ad-hoc* and lexicalized deverbatives may be summed up in the following way. There are deverbatives in *-er* the *ad-hoc* character of which is clearly indicated by formal criteria, mainly by the preservation of verbal features (*seeker-out, a planner in cold blood* etc.). There are deverbatives in *-er* the *ad-hoc* character of which is deduced from the context, e. g. when semantic analysis excludes any of the possible lexicalized meanings (*opener*). It is also from the context that we can see that the deverbative is used in predication (the pattern 'to be + (adj.) + *-er*', however, employs both *ad-hoc* and lexicalized nouns — *she was a sticker, he was a baker*).

Although the main interest in the present paper is concentrated on deverbative nouns, it should be mentioned briefly, for the sake of completeness, that *-er-nouns* derived from non-verbal bases are found in the same functions as the deverbatives:

54. As an YCler I think I can say that the majority of us can't understand much of what is written in Marxism Today.

55. Liszt was never a middle-of-the-roader.

56. Rather a "good-looker", too, what? — What a curious expression, Birdie... One you've picked up out hunting. — (Sitwell, quoted by Jespersen, 8.237.)

57. She was radiantly beautiful, the best-looker of all his girls, ...

58. You are a very good-looker, are you, Elizabeth? — (quoted and discussed by Olsson 1961.124).

Let us now turn our attention to Czech, starting with the search for equivalents to the English deverbatives of Exx 1 to 40 and 45 to 53, first purely on the level of word-formation (i. e., leaving aside, for the time being, the applicability of the deverbatives in patterns and contexts). There do not seem to be any Czech deverbatives in PSJČ 1935 or SSJČ 1960 equivalent to English *banner, believer, eater, happen-er-upon, hoper, (not-)wanter, practiser, putter-on, respecter, stander, starter, sticker, trainer*. There are equivalents, each formed with a different suffix, to *escaper (uprchlík), finder (nálezcce), organizer (organizátor), reader (čtenář), swimmer (plavec)*. *Learner* has a Czech counterpart in *xxučenec* (x, xx indicate that the noun is classified as obsolete or stylistically limited in one of, or both, of the two dictionaries; if SSJČ 1960 does not record a noun occurring in the examples given below or if the definition indicates a clearly different meaning, the sign ° is used). The remaining equivalents fall into two groups: the smaller one has *-tel* as the deverbative suffix (*observer — pozorovatel, provider — obstaravatel/obstaravač, traveller — cestovatel; distributor — xrozdělovatel/rozdělovač, divider — xdělitel, mover — x°hybatel, opener — xotvíratel/otvírač, prayer — xxmodlitel, seeker — xhledatel*), the larger one having *-ě* (*distributor — rozdělovač, doubter — pochybovač, planner — plánovač, player — hráč, plougher — oráč, seacher — hledač, shower-off — vychloubáč, splitter — rozbíječ, taster — ochutnavač; bringer — xpřinášeč, broadcaster — xxvysílač, deceiver — xpodváděč, handler — x°zachazeč, hater — xnenáviděč, loser — x°prohráč, opener — xotvírač, provider — xobstarávač, seeker-out — xxvyhledavač, thrower — xházeč*). The above comparison of the English and the Czech deverbatives shows that only a minority of the English nouns have counterparts in present-day standard Czech. This, of course, does not mean that deverbative nouns are less frequent in Czech than in English (for the wealth of Czech

deverbatives, see Dokulil 1967). It only shows that Czech does not derive nouns from verbs in the same manner as English does.

The difference between English and Czech is even more marked if we look for verbal features carried over on to the deverbative noun.

59. ... pochybovači o pravosti rukopisů (Šmilauer) [doubters about genuineness manuscripts-of].

60. ... nejruznější kutilové, ..., přemístovatelé značek, čmáralové po zdech ... a svérázní vykladači vyhlášky (Svět motorů)

[various do-it yourselves, ... movers traffic-signs-of, scrawlers on walls ... and personal interpreters traffic-code-of... Motoring World].

61. Tušili, že jsem utečenec z jejich armády (Stašek) [Suspected-they that I-am escaper from their army].

Patterns exemplified by 59 to 61 are rather rare in present-day Czech and are as a rule stylistically marked. Ex 61 is an instance of a Czech deverbative used in predication, which is also more or less exceptional (quotations given in PSJČ 1960 for the Czech deverbatives enumerated in the above paragraphs usually do not record the deverbative used in predication). Thus we come back to one of the basic differences between English and Czech mentioned here above ensuing from the nominal tendencies in English predication. This difference between the two languages can be further exemplified by the Czech translations of Ex 21 and 18 (the translations have been done by three members of the Brno Department of English — E. Golková, J. Ondráček, A. Svoboda):

21. But have you been a quick learner of songs? Ale písničkám jste se učil snadno? [But songs-to have-you learned easily?].

18. He has been a frequent broadcaster on BBC's ... services since the 1950s... Od padesátých let mluvil/působí jako hlasatel v ... vysílání BBC [Since fiftieth years spoke-he/works-he as announcer on ... services of BBC].

Similar translations could be produced for many other English sentences of the pattern 'to be + ... + noun' (*He was a poor bat = Špatně pátkoval* [Poorly batted-he] etc.). Most of the predications of this type have one thing in common: if Mathesius' division of predication into actional, qualifying, possessive and existential is accepted, they mostly fall into the category of qualifying predication. This type of predication would then reveal the differences in the degree of nominal tenor between English and Czech in a very marked way.

REFERENCES

- Adams, V. (1973). *An introduction to Modern English word-formation* (London).
- Bareš, K. (1974). Unconventional word-forming patterns in present-day English, *Philologica Pragensia* 17.173-86 (Prague).
- Buzássyová, Kl. (1974). *Sémantická štruktúra slovenských deverbatív* [The semantic structure of Slovak deverbatives] (Bratislava).
- Dokulil, M. et al. (1967). *Tvoření slov v češtině 2, odvozování podstatných jmen* [Word-formation in Czech 2, The derivation of substantives] (Prague).
- Firbas, J. (1959a). Thoughts on the communicative function of the verb in English, German and Czech, *Brno Studies in English* 1.39-68 (Prague).
- Firbas, J. (1959b). More thoughts on the communicative function of the English verb, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské univerzity A* 7.74-98 (Prague).
- Firbas, J. (1961). On the communicative value of the Modern English finite verb, *Brno Studies in English* 3.79-104 (Prague).

- Hladký, J. (1961). Remarks on complex condensation phenomena in some English and Czech contexts, *Brno Studies in English* 3.105-18 (Prague).
- Ivanova, I. P. (ed.) (1975). *Struktura anglijskogo imeni suščestvitelnogo* (Moscow).
- Jespersen, O. (1942). *Modern English grammar*, vol. 6 (Copenhagen).
- Kirchner, G. (1952). *Die zehn Hauptverben des Englischen* (Halle-Saale).
- Křížková, H. (1968). Substantiva s dějovým významem v ruštině a v češtině [Substantives with actional meaning in Russian and in Czech], *Kapitoly ze srovnávací mluvnice ruské a české* 3.81-134 (Prague).
- McDavid, Raven I. (1942). Adviser and advisor: orthography and semantic differentiation, *Studies in Linguistics* 1.7 (New Haven, Conn.).
- Marchand, H. (1969). *The categories and types of Present-Day English word-formation*² (Munich).
- Mathesius, V. (1975). *A functional analysis of Present Day English on a general linguistic basis* (Prague).
- Olsson, Y. (1961). *On the syntax of the English verb with special reference to 'have a look' and similar complex structures*, Gothenburg Studies in English 12 (Gothenburg).
- Papers on functional sentence perspective* (1970), ed. by F. Daneš (Prague, 1974).
- Peprník, J. (1955). Problematika složených sloves [Problems of compound verbs], *Sborník Vysoké školy pedagogické v Olomouci, Jazyk a literatura* 2.207-22 (Prague).
- Potter, S. (1965). English phrasal verbs, *Philologica Pragensia* 8.285-9 (Prague).
- PSJČ 1935. *Přehledný slovník jazyka českého* [Concise dictionary of the Czech language], 9 vol. (Prague, 1935-57).
- Quirk, R.—Greenbaum, S.—Leech, G.—Svartvik, J. (1972). *A grammar of contemporary English* (London).
- SSJČ 1960. *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* [Dictionary of Standard Czech], 4 vol. (Prague, 1960-71).
- Strang, Barbara M. H. (1968). Swift's agent-noun formatives in -ER, *Wortbildung, Syntax und Morphologie (Festschrift Hans Marchand)*, *Janua Linguarum, Series Major* 36.217-29 (The Hague).
- Strang, Barbara M. H. (1969). Aspects of the history of the -er formative in English, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1969.1 - 30 (Oxford).
- Trnka, B. (1974). *Rozbor nynější spisovné angličtiny 2, Morfologie slovních druhů (části řeči) a tvoření slov* [An analysis of Present-Day Standard English 2, The morphology of word types (parts of speech) and word formation] (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1961). Some less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English, *Brno Studies in English* 3.9-78 (Prague).

K FUNKCÍM NĚKTERÝCH DEVERBATIV NA -er

Některí autoři (Jespersen, Trnka, Strangová, Bareš) se již zabývali možností tvořit deverbativa na -er téměř od všech anglických sloves. Tato deverbativa, tvořená *ad hoc*, mají některé rysy, které je spojují s kategorií sloves (slovosled, záporka *not*), současně však mají i rysy jasně nominální. — Deverbativa je možno zařadit ke klasickým deverbativním kondenzátorům. — Je obtížné vést hranici mezi lexikalizovanými a *ad-hoc* deverbativy, pokud nepomáhají některé z formálních rysů. Je možno rozebírat význam deverbativ. U *ad-hoc* deverbativ se pak, podle slovníkových definic, kryje jejich význam v daném kontextu s nejobecnějším významem v heale (one that . . . s), kdežto u lexikalizovaných přistupují další významové rysy. Deverbativa *ad-hoc* jsou jedním z prostředků nominálního vyjadřování v angličtině. V češtině, jinak bohaté na deverbativní typy, nenacházíme tvoření *ad-hoc*. Setkáváme se někdy se zachováním předložkové vazby (*pochybovat o pravosti rukopisů, čmáralové po zdech*), jde však obvykle o případy stylisticky příznakové.

