

27. Tolkien J.R.R. Silmarillion / J.R.R. Tolkien. – Boston; N.Y. : Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999. – 365 p.
28. Völuspá. – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://norse.ulver.com/-edda/voluspa.html>.
29. Vulgate (Latin) // Internet Sacred Text Archive. – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/vul/gen.htm>.

Аурелія Хангану
(Кишинів)

СТРУКТУРИ З ВІДДІЄСЛІВНИМИ ПРЕДИКАТИВНИМИ АКТАНТАМИ В РУМУНСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Розглядається одна з типових структур предикативного актанта: як у вигляді предикативних актантів, виражених іменниками з вербальним значенням, так і предикативних структур, актантами яких виступають іменники з вербальним значенням.

Ключові слова: семантично-синтаксична структура, предикативний актант, валентність, іменник, номіналізація.

Рассматривается один из типов структур с предикативными актантами: как в виде предикативных актантов, выраженных существительными с вербальным значением, так и предикативных структур, актантами которых выступают существительные с вербальным значением.

Ключевые слова: семантико-синтаксическая структура, предикативный актант, валентность, существительное, номинализация.

This article discusses one of the types of structures with predicative actants: those that manifest predicative actants expressed by nouns with verbal meaning, as well as the predicative structures with the nouns with verbal meaning.

Key words: semantic-syntactical structure, predicative actant, valency, noun, nominalisation.

The actant researches that focus on the noun reveal two important facets of a problem: on the one hand, the valence of the noun is meant, "even more controversial than that of the adjective [Sommerfeldt apud 9, p. 7] and, on the other hand, the verballity / predicativity of the noun is meant, an idea generally supported by the observation that the post-verbal (substantival) formations retain the meaning of the verb. The first research direction also attests various theoretical approaches and practical applications, especially in the form of valence dictionaries (including that of nouns), although the latter are not major lexicographical descriptions [see 9, p. 7 ssq.].

The second aspect of the problem, on which this article focuses, was approached as early as the 60's of the past century, in particular in

grammars and the nominalisation theories [see, for example, 2, 3,4 etc.]. The new research in the field of semantic syntax makes the analysis of the functional properties of the components expressed through predicative signs possible from different points of view. G.A. Zolotova, in the context of the approached topic, states: "In relation to the verb-predicate [unconjugatable verbal forms – our note] can be regarded as its syntactic derivatives, as ways of secondary, implicitly-predicative examination of the action: infinitivization, attributivization and adverbization. Such nominalizations, methods of denoting the action are used as a syntactic method of extending the elementary model of the sentence, creating its predicativity" [20, p. 242].

The complexity of classification of syntactic verbal forms lies in the fact that they are disparate elements reflecting the link between a verb and a noun, combining their category meanings. More broadly, the names of procedural semantics, formed by the transposition of the verbal complex, "summarize a whole sentence, based on the predicate" [22]. This means that they are focused on syntactic substantivization of the predicate, which can be expressed by a verb or adjective. N.D. Arutiunova states that the names of the qualities, characteristics, actions, states are determined as names of sentence semantics [15, p. 161], whose appearance is caused by the transposition of sentences. I.D. Apresean calls verbal and adjectival words as predicative words which semantically occupy "the position of an entire situation and syntactically - the position of a sentence" [14, p. 35–36].

The idea was also formulated by the Czechs specialists in Russian language, who consider that the adjectival and verbal names fulfil "the function of the main part nominalised by the dependent predication" [13, p. 40] and "frequently become the basis of multistage configurational chains" [24, p. 221].

Therefore, the deverbatives appear in the structure of the statement as methods of implicitly-predicative secondary expression of the action [20, p. 183–184], thus showing several meanings: direct, directly related to verbal semantics and indirect, with nominative significance, including the semantics of resultativity. Hence, the name of the object considered as a result of certain actions. In the statement, the deverbatives independently or in a structure with other words, are signs of complexity of a fact of reality or of the whole situation [26, p. 3], peripheral in relation to the situation represented by the main predicate. Such a function of the deverbatives is possible as a result of inheriting by them

the semantics of the action¹. With the help of analytical means, the processual nouns "express an action in time and modal-phase situations" [21, p. 34–36]. The ability of deverbatives and adjectives along with the dependent words to function in the sentence to convey a complementary situation is explained by the lack of correlation with the concrete objects of the reality, that is the processual names do not appear in the role of a significant substitute of a concrete object, but are names of the complex facts typical of reality [see 23; 19].

Therefore, we should mention that, apart from the verb, the noun, adjective, adverb and interjection² are characterized by valence³ and thus can be centres of actantial structures.

The name, represented, first of all, by a noun is characterized by valency. More broadly, the entire nominal group actually represents a structure with arguments / actants having a name as the centre of the group – a noun, adjective, pronoun or numeral. Like the verb, the noun as a centre selects its adjuncts based on its combinatorial availability and its selected properties of semantic compatibility. This phenomenon becomes evident, first of all, within the determination and attributive relations. The attributive relations are generally determined by the combinatorics specific of the morphological classes. However, in general, the capabilities of the noun and adjective valence are relevant for the attributive relations. Accordingly, structurally, the syntactic constructions formed by a noun can primordially have the configuration Noun + Attr or Attr + Noun. In addition, the noun as

¹ In same context Gheorghe Stog's statement is important, which emphasizes that the verb and the verbal words differ in functional and aspectual terms: in functional terms the verbal words are assigned to the name, performing the same function in the sentence and revealing grammatical categories specific to the name, while in aspectual terms the verbal words are related to the verb as regards "the process", noting that this "process" is static, being somewhat only established [25, p. 25–26].

² In the researches from recent years, in the semantic syntax various semantic types of predicativity are highlighted, even if the issue of correlation between the semantic and formal-grammatical constructions with predicative actants does not have a sufficiently developed character.

According to V. Bogdanov (important author for the further development of the (Russian) actantial theory of, including that of the predicative actant) [17] the semantic structure of any kind of statement presents in itself a predicative expression, i.e. the predicate and its actants, whose number depends on the valence of the semantic predicate. The predicate has the central organizational function in the predicative expression, which is expressed by an independent verbal lexeme. The predicative actant is a predicate that has a dependent syntactic position in the structure of the complex predicative expression. The status of the second predicate is determined by the syntactic inclusion in the predicate-actant structure of the higher predicate (basic predicate) [see also 16].

³ It should be noted that although the actancy involves the valence, the relationship is not necessarily reverse: the valence is directly related to the relationship of determination, while the actancy implies the idea of predication.

the group centre can connect the actants performed propositionally. For example, *venirea directorului* – *directorul vine*; *concluzia vorbitorului* – *vorbitorul/ cel care vorbește trage concluzii / concluzionează*.

It should be pointed out that many of the nouns that open valences and thus can organize actantial structures are of verbal origin (formed from verbal roots / verbs). They are known in specialized literature as verbal nouns, deverbatives, post-verbal nouns, nominalisations of the verb or action names.

The term *action name* is defined, after a broad insight into the history of the problem, by Camelia Stan [see 12]. In this sense, to which we subscribe, the action name is a word characterized by: inflection of nominal type; syntactic valences of verbal type (specific) and nominal type (non-specific, identical to those of prototype nouns); its distribution characteristics in a larger context, including its group of syntactic determinants; the possibility of substitution with a verb in certain contexts; the possibility of exclusively verbal defining of the lexical meaning; a logical-semantic status of a general descriptive sign; a pragmatic function specific of nouns (different from that of verbs) , namely, the reference: the name of the action is the referential expression of the "action" in a traditional acceptance of the term **action** (as opposed to **state**).

Thus, it follows that the Romanian nouns interpreted as nominalisations of the verb (action name, state names) or the adjective (especially, state names) preserve the configuration of thematic roles of the main verb or adjective: Agent⁴ (*munca lui* – *El muncește*), Theme (*zugrăvirea camerei* – *Zugrăvește camera*), Experimenter (*în văzul tuturor* – *Toți văd; tristețea lui* – *El (este) trist.*), Cause (*omor / omoară din imprudență*), Instrument (*trasul/ trage cu arcul.*), Source, Target, Course (*traversarea / traversează de pe un mal pe altul, peste pod.*), Locative (*prezența în casă* – *El (este) prezent în casă.*), Beneficiary (*cumpărarea de cadouri copiilor* – *Cumpără cadouri copiilor.*) etc. [see 12, chapter 7].

Nouns, which not having a verbal root, express a meaning specific of verbs (*criză, exod, rapt* etc.), can participate in thematic relations similar to those manifested in nominalised structures of the verbs. For example: *exodul populației* – *Populația pleacă, emigrează* (Agent); *criza de ficat a bătrânului* – *Bătrânului îi este rău de la ficat* (Experimenter).

The nouns derived from agentive transitive verbs may occur in ambiguous constructions having an actant corresponding to the subject Agent

⁴ For the accepted definitions of the actants see Ion Bărbuță [1] .

or direct object Theme from the basic verbal group. For example, the structure *Cercetarea studenților* can be interpreted as „*studenții cerce-tează*”, in which *studenții* appear in the role of Agent, „(*cineva*) îi cerce-tează pe *studenți*”, the same word functioning as Theme, and also „*opera (științifică a) studenților*” in which it functions as Possessor).

Certain agent names are compatible with some arguments of the basic verb. For example: *cultivator(ul) de cereale* – *Cultivă cereale* (Theme); *jucător de cărți*. – *a jucat cărți* or *cu cărți(le)* (Theme / Instrument); *conducătorul statului* – *Conduce statul*, (Theme / Possessor) etc. The causality, when performing as a nominative subject, is expressed by a prepositional group in the nominalised construction. For example: *Căldura topește gheața*. – *topirea gheții de/la căldură*.

The Romanian nouns analysed as composite groups, namely as united verbal groups, have an internal structure similar to that of the corresponding verbal group. The composite groups of this type can be described as being composed of one centre and an object of the centre [see 8, p. 68–70], being in various thematic relations. In the Romanian language, the thematic roles of the arguments participating in the structure of compound nouns are more varied than those of the arguments incorporated in the suffixal derivatives. See examples of the type: *sare-garduri*; *fugi-de-la-mine*; *taie-câinilor-frunză* [apud 11, p. 219].

In morphological terms, the representation of actants varies. Another name can function as the actant of the noun (noun, pronoun or numeral), predominantly forms of the genitive case or of the accusative case with a preposition. For example: *dorință a Mariei* / *a ei* / *a primei* și *vizită de curtoazie* / *dintre acelea* / *dintre primele*.

The actants expressed by adjectival forms precede or follow the noun centre. This expression is the most frequent: *poveste interesantă* / *incredibilă* / *citită*, *acea poveste*, *două povești* etc.

Another category of actants of the noun is expressed by an adverb or supine and is built with the help of the preposition *de*: *poveste de citit*, *pictură de acolo*. In ante-position, the adverb is not accompanied by a preposition: *așa pictură*.

The completions of the noun fulfil different functions in the plan of the discourse and in the plan of semantic organization of the construction. Some of them are available to fulfil several functions, others are specialized. The group structure varies depending on the syntactic context, the syntactic position performed through the noun centre, and depending on its casual form. The conditionings are general and

independent of the semantic features of the substantival centre.

On the other hand, the nouns with a verbal value represent a special structural type of predicative actants. These are: 1) verbal forms: *remarcă, dorință, explicație, compoziție* etc., E.g.: *Voi credeți în scrisul vostru, noi nu credem în nimic* (M. Eminescu); 2) adjectival forms: *bunătațe, dificultate, atenție* etc.. E.g.: *La cei săraci nici boii nu trag* (Folklore); 3) abstract names which do not have a direct verbal or adjectival origin (including those that refer to natural phenomena and have been formed by composition (joining of roots): *vânt, binefacere, teorie, fapt, idee, atitudine, problemă*. E.g.: *În timp vom înțelege esența fenomenului*.

The verbal and adjectival nouns play an important role in the nominalisation process. They create the opportunity to increase the capacity of the predicative essence of the statement, are an expressive manifestation of the linguistic phenomenon of compression.

The action named by the verbal noun can correlate with the actants represented in the statement through the form of the subject that is the coincidence of the grammatical subject and of the semantic one is noticed. For example: *El stoarce un zâmbet de pe buze*. In this case, the word *zâmbet* is not a predicative actant and, accordingly, does not form a structure with predicative actants; consequently, it does not exhibit secondary predication, given that the statement in question is equivalent to the statement *El zâmbeste*. Evidently, the verb *stoarce* does not perform the function of the main predicate of the statement, but rather the function of a determinant of the element *zâmbet*. The man smiles with evil intent, maliciously unwittingly etc.

Thus, only that noun is considered a predicative actant which is necessary to complete the relative sense of the main predicate and performs the function of a constructive element of the situation involved.

The nouns that refer to natural phenomena are assigned to the group of predicative actants given the fact that they, by naming these natural phenomena, atmospheric substances etc., identify, at the same time, a concrete process (fall, appearance etc.). In other words, they represent the whole of the object and of the action. The nouns which refer to natural phenomena form sentences which have a particular semantic structure, in which the interaction between the subject and predicate does not occur in accordance with the traditional scheme: verb – action, noun – actant, but according to a main different semantic model: noun – process, verb – characteristic of the process, in which, contrary to the

traditional representation, the main role in the organization of the sentence meaning is assigned to of the noun [18, p. 10].

The predicate character of these abstract names can be inferred, including by lexical interpretation (given in the dictionary) in which they are explained using the verbal nouns. For example: CĂUTĂRE, căutări, s. f. The action of searching. 1. Research done in order to find something. 2. Care, treatment or medical care. 3. Management of a material good. 4. Inspection, examination. 5. Painsstaking, striving. 6. Look, stare. 7. Good price. ◇ Expr. *A avea căutare* = (of people) to enjoy popularity; (of goods) to be requested [5].

Compare also with the synonymous lexical units, also verbal nouns cited by The Dictionary of Synonyms [10]: CĂUTĂRE s. 1. rummage, rummaging, ransacking. (*Termină cu ~!*) 2. demand. (*~ de marfă.*) 3. price. (*O marfă care are ~.*) 4. affectation, artificiality, emphasis, grandiloquence, mannerism, pathos, conceit, rhetoric. (*~ în stilul cuiva.*)

The abstract nouns are characterized generally by the fact that the majority form the group of so-called anaphoric words, which function as secondary names of certain states of affairs and serve as contextual alternates of the statement. These names, by their functions, resemble the pronouns. Camelia Stan identifies several structural types of verbal nouns (action names) [12]:

a) semi-analysable• formations with a long infinitive structure: *cântare, plecare, coborâre, alege, pierdere, curățire*; • with a supine structure: *mers, scris, cântat, sculat, aburit, răpit; copt*; • with the structure of a participle in the form of singular feminine: *zisă* "advice, urge"; *lăsată (secului)* (Shrove Thursday); (de-a) *târâta* "crawling"; *agonisită* "acquirement", *ieșită* "exit, departure", *mulțemită* "the action of / result of the action of thanking"; *bătuță* (folk dance) etc.; • as derivatives with suffixes (from a verbal / noun / adjective base in the case of integrally analysable formations): *blocadă, bătaie, periaj, propaganda, coborâș, înșelăciune; albinărit; clipeală, ronțăială, privești* "the action of looking"/"image, landscape"; *e, vânătoare, ninsoare; ajutor, interogatoriu; sperietură, arsură; nutriție, substituție, excursie; urcuș* etc.; • as derivatives with prefixes from base nominal base, the majority from action names with long infinitive structure: *antimălurire; confabulație, coacțiune, coproducție*, etc.; • with elements of composition, generally from noun bases, action names with long infinitive structure; *autoabrogare, macrofilmare, suicid; cardioscopie, amigdalectomie* etc.; • as compound lexical units: *aerosoloterapie, Bobotează, convorbire-fulger, du-te-vino, omucidere, predare-pri-mire, raidanchetă, scris-citit, vânzare-cumpărare* etc.; • as lexical units

composed parasynthetically, containing an adverb, a verbal theme and suffix *-(i)ntă*: *binesunânță* „eufonie”, *binescriință*; • as singular units created under the influence of the plural: *batjocură*, *rugămintă*; • as lexical units created by conversion (substantivization): *chiu* “shriek”.

(b) non-analysable words: *conflict*, *cruce*, *drum*, *exod*, *jaf*, *plajă*, *plug*, *rapt* etc. Some nouns belonging to this type are unadapted phonetically, they are obsolete loans – *hrisis* “usage” – or recent borrowings, especially in English, ending in *-ing* – *dumping*, *jogging*, *printing*, *shipping* – or with a different type of structure – *comeback*, *hold-up*, *replay* etc. In the recent formations elements of cumulative composition sometimes occur: *citospectrofotometrie* etc.

The noun action name preserves the original meaning of the verb, so it can denote corresponding states of affairs. However, the semantic structure of the noun depends on the lexical meaning of the verb from which it is derived and its lexical-syntactic features – transitivity / intransitivity, continuous character / interrupted character, durable character / terminative character etc., denoting: – processes: *alergare*, *plimbare*, *curgere*; – events: *decizie*, *remarcă*, *sosire*; – states: *dorință*, *cunoaștere*, *existență*. These nouns are referred to, respectively, as process names, action names, and names of states.

Some researchers consider the non-personal specific manifestations of verbal forms to be part of the same category of verbal nouns: nouns of infinitive, gerund, participle origin: *cartea e de citit* / *cartea trebuie citită*; *cartea e pentru citire*, *aduce de băut* etc.⁵.

Some specific features of combining verbal nouns with the adjectives which are their basic diffusers should be mentioned. Basically, the verbal nouns will not be determined by adjectives with the meaning of a characteristic of concrete physical objects – those that describe the shape, colour, size, etc. Adjectives with circumstantial meanings specifically appear as descriptors of verbal nouns, rarely – with modal, aspectual or subjective meanings. The use of possessive pronouns with the meaning of the subject or object of the action is also widespread. Adjectival names have the meaning of quality, sign of the object. The meanings of many nouns formed from adjectives are characterized by a mobile quantitative feature which may be subject to measurement: *înălțime*, *umiditate*, *greutate* etc. The nouns may denote the tendency, the capacity of acting: *răbdare*, *abilitate*, *exclamație* etc.

⁵ In more details about the functioning of non-personal verbal forms as verbs and nouns see M. Gabinski [6]

The primary function of verbal and adjectival names is to denote states of affairs. However, in the process of functioning of these nouns the change of their propositional content in object content is observed. In other words, the nouns acquire secondary meanings, passing in the class of nouns not only according to their function but also to their meaning. It should be mentioned that cases of homonymy of nouns with primary and secondary meaning may occur. Let us compare the examples: *Pictura* (the action of painting) *lui m-a fascinat pentru că el o executa cu mâna stângă.* and *Pictura* (the result, synonym with “the painting”) *lui m-a fascinat pentru că era atât de mare.* In the first example, the word *pictura* (painting) is a verbal noun in its primary meaning, and in the second example, the noun *pictura* has a secondary meaning and is the result of the action of painting (the product of the activity).

Camelia Stan, in connection with this phenomenon, points out that in some constructions the noun updates, in addition to the verbal meaning (of "Action"), the metonymic value as well (of "a result, object and so on of the action") [11, p. 205]. Such ambiguity of the noun implies the ambiguity of the thematic report in which it participates. For example: (*El se va ocupa de*) *denumirea instituției*, will deal with finding a name for the institution, will name the institution" (Theme), “will deal with the name of the institution" (Possessor).

The secondary meanings of verbal nouns include: the meaning of agent (*ajutor* = the person or thing that helps); the meaning of object (*import*); the meaning of result (*pictură*); the meaning of modality (*ridicare*); the meaning of place (*stop*); the meaning of way of acting (*alergare* = the way in which people or things tend to move); the meaning of time of the action (*clipire* = the time required to blink). The following meanings refer to the secondary semantic values of names formed from adjectives: the bearer of the sign (*personalitate*); the place (*vecinătate*); collective notion (*tineret, congregație*); substance (*lichid, eterogenitate*).

Between the nominated structures in the genitive participates (*alergarea câinilor, lansarea cărții, prezența trupelor internaționale*) and those in which groups with the preposition *de* participate (*alergare de câini, lansare de carte, durere de dinți*) there is, in general, a difference in conceptualizing an action or state to which these structures refer. The noun in the genitive is determined by the article, which specifies its extension and involves a referent. The noun formed with the preposition *de* is indeterminate and, therefore, is interpreted intensionally, it is not related to a class of extension (or referents), but

specifies the extension of the regent noun, so that the nominated structure has, as a whole, a specific referent. In the prepositional structures with *de*, the thematic significance – Agent, Theme, Location – is attenuated compared to the corresponding verbal/ adjectival structures or with those nominated in which the genitive participates [see also 7, p. 139–142, 150–152]:

a. *Pe stadion s-a organizat o alergare de câini* (type of action, sporting event); *Câinii aleargă* (the running of the dogs) *pe stadion* (action + Agent);

b. *Am participat la o lansare de carte* (type of event); *Am participat când s-a lansat cartea* (book launch) (event + Theme);

c. *Îl chinuie o cumplită durere de dinți* (type of state); *Îl dor dinții* (state + Locative).

In general, in the nomination Target / Recipient (*acordarea de ajutoare sinistratilor* (dative) – *Acordă ajutoare sinistratilor* (dative, indirect object)); The beneficiary (*cumpărarea de cadouri copiilor* (dative) – *Cumpără cadouri copiilor* (dative, indirect object) and the various roles performed in a syntactic position of circumstantial, in the verbal or adjectival group maintain their form: *Vizită / vizitează din curiozitate* (prepositional group, Causal); *Traversarea / traversează de pe un mal pe altul peste pod* (prepositional groups, Source/ Target / Route); *prezența / prezent în casă* (prepositional group, Locative).

The adnominal dative, generally considered as having possessive meaning, was interpreted as Theme, in the argument structure of a semantic predicate of relational type (a noun that denotes a family, social, human relationship). Gabriela Dindelegan Pana [in 7] considers that the nouns such as *brother in law*, *brother*, *friend*, *relative*, *cousin* etc., used in the unarticulated form, in the syntactic position of predicative name or isolated attribute, are intrinsically or contextually symmetric semantic predicates with two arguments assigning the same thematic role to the arguments: *Ion (este) frate lui Gheorghe*. In this interpretation, the symmetrically semantic predicates are exception to the "principle of unity of thematic roles", according to which a role relationship appears only once in the basic structure of a simple sentences. The symmetrical arguments with the role of Theme can be reversed or coordinated:

a. *Gheorghe (este) frate lui Ion*; b. *Ion și Gheorghe (sunt) frați*.

In such contexts, the dative may alternate with a group which contains the preposition *cu*: *Ion (este) frate cu Gheorghe*.

If the "predicative" noun with plural form, is associated with the pronominal group *unul... altul/celălalt* (one, another, the other) (with reciprocal value), the second term of the pronominal group has the form of da-

tive case or is preceded by *cu*: *Ei sunt frați unul altuia* (or *unul cu altul*).

The structures of this type could be interpreted as realizations of a semantic predication "is a brother." In the above construction the argument developed by the dative case (*lui Gheorghe, lui Ion*) or by prepositional group (*cu Gheorghe*) is the Theme of the noun predicate *frate*, and the argument developed by the nominative case (subject – *Ion, Gheorghe*) is the Theme of the complex predicate *este frate* (thematic role associated conceptually to the copulative / existential verb "to be"). In the construction (*Ion și Gheorghe (sunt) frați*), both arguments (*Ion, Gheorghe*) have the role of Themes of the complex predicate *sunt frați*, developed by the nominative case, in the syntactical position of the subject and coordinated copulatively. The verbs which incorporate a semantic predicate of symmetrical type – *a (se) împrieteni < prieten, a (se) încuscri < cuscru, a (se) înfrăți < frate, a (se) înrudi < rudă etc.* – are also interpreted as complex semantic predicates: *Ion se înrudește („este/devine rudă cu Gheorghe. (cu Gheorghe – The theme of the semantic predicate is “rudă”; Ion is the theme of the complex semantic predicate “se înrudește”)*.

In conclusion, we can say that the nouns of verbal origin are an element of grammar that deserves the attention of the researcher, including the potentiality of organizing actantial structures. These, being at least in syntactic-semantic terms in the position of the word which organizes (actantial) structure or of the word which complements the valence of another structure centre, follow the typology of the structures organized by the verb from which they derive and, in most cases, also preserve the function of its functional roles / actants.

REFERENCES

1. Bărbuță I. Structura pragmasemantică a enunțului din limba română / Ioan Bărbuță. – Chișinău : Inst. de Filologie al AȘM, 2012. – 192 p.
2. Chomsky N. Remarks on Nominalization / Noam Chomsky // Readings in English Transformational Grammar / [eds. Roderik A. Jakobs, Peter S. Rosenbaum]. – Massachusetts; Toronto ; London, 1970. – P. 184–221.
3. Cilianu-Lascu C. Notes sur la nominalization à base verbale en roumain et en français / Corina Cilianu-Lascu // Études contrastives. La structure du groupe nominal et la nominalization en roumain et en français. – Bucuresti, 1988 – P. 211–255.
4. Cornilescu A. A Note in Dative Clitics and Dative Case in Romanian / Alexandra Cornilescu // *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*. – 1987. – P. 213–224.
5. Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române. – București : Univers Enciclopedic, 1998. – 1194 p.
6. Gabinschi M. Formele verbale nepredicative nonconjunctivale ale limbii române : (pe marginea tratării lor în gramatica oficială) / Marcu Gabinschi. – Chișinău : Inst. de Filologie al AȘM, 2010. – 108 p.
7. Gramatica limbii române. – București : Ed. Acad. Române, 2005. – 1036 p.

8. Grimshaw J. *Argument Structure* / June Grimshaw. – Cambridge, Mass : MIT Press, 1990. – 202 p.
9. Iroaie A. Lexikografische Vorüberlegungen für die Substantivvalenzbeschreibung im Deutschen und im Rumänischen (Implicații lexicografice ale descrierii valenței substantivelor în germană și română) // Резюме тезі докторат. Университет дін Букуреști, 2010. – 50 p. – Disponibile : [http://www.unibuc.ro/studies/Doctorate2011Februarie/Iroaie%20Ana%20-%20Implicatii%20lexicografice%20ale%20descrierii%20valentei%20substantivelor-%20in%20Germana%20si%20Romana/rezumatul tezei de doctorat iroaie ana 2010.pdf](http://www.unibuc.ro/studies/Doctorate2011Februarie/Iroaie%20Ana%20-%20Implicatii%20lexicografice%20ale%20descrierii%20valentei%20substantivelor-%20in%20Germana%20si%20Romana/rezumatul%20tezei%20de%20doctorat%20iroaie%20ana%202010.pdf)
10. Seche M. *Dicționar de sinonime* / M. Seche. – București : Litera Internațional, 2002. – 443 p.
11. Stan C. *Categoria cazului* / C. Stan. – București : Ed. Univ. din București, 2005. – 260 p.
12. Stan C. *Gramatica numerelor de acțiune din limba română* [online] / C. Stan. – București : Ed. Univ. din București, 2003. – 302 p. – Disponibile : <http://ebooks.unibuc.ro/filologie/stan/mainframe.htm>.
13. Адамец П. О семантико-синтаксических функциях deverbальных и deadъективных существительных / П. Адамец // Науч. докл. высшей школы. – 1973. – С. 40–46.
14. Апресян Ю.Д. Синтаксис и семантика в синтаксическом описании / Ю.Д. Апресян // Единицы разных уровней грамматического строя языка и их взаимодействие. – М. : Наука, 1969. – С. 32–36.
15. Арутюнова Н.Д. Семантическое согласование слов и интерпретация предложения / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Грамматическое описание славянских языков. – М. : Наука, 1974. – С. 158–171.
16. Арутюнова Н.Д. Сокровенная связка : к проблеме предикативного отношения / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Известия АН СССР. – 1980. – № 39 (4). – С. 347–358.
17. Богданов В.В. Семантико-синтаксическая организация предложения / В.В. Богданов. – Л. : Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1977. – 204 с.
18. Дмитриева В.С. Лексико-семантическая сочетаемость имен, называющих атмосферные осадки в русском языке : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 „Русский язык” / В.С. Дмитриева. – Л., 1985. – 21 с.
19. Дюндик Л.Г. Межсобытийные предикаты в современном английском языке : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 „Германские языки” / Л.Г. Дюндик. – М., 1979. – 24 с.
20. Золотава Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса / Г.А. Золотава. – М. : Наука, 1982. – 367 с.
21. Золотава Г.А. Очерк функционального синтаксиса русского языка / Г.А. Золотава. – М. : Наука, 1973. – 351 с.
22. Курилович Е. Деривация лексическая и деривация синтаксическая [online] / Е. Курилович // Очерки по лингвистике. Биробиджан : ИП "ТРИВИУМ", 2000. – [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа : <http://www.scribd.com/doc/71635124/59795-Kurilovich-e-Ocherki-Po-Lingvistike>.
23. Ломтев Т.П. Структура предложения в современном русском языке / Т.П. Ломтев. – М. : Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1979. – 198 с.
24. Скоумалова З. Синтаксические конструкции с глагольным существительным / З. Скоумалова // Československá rusistika. – 1968. – № 13 (4). – С. 220–229.
25. Стог Г.П. Лексикографирование молдавского глагола : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 „Молдавский язык” / Г.П. Стог. – Кишинев, 1985. – 189 с.
26. Супрун А.В. Грамматика и семантика простого предложения / А.В. Супрун. – М. : Наука, 1977. – 263 p.