

Pius ten Hacken

**Carola Trips & Jaklin Kornfilt (eds.) (2017),
*Further Investigations into the Nature of
Phrasal Compounding*, Berlin:
Language Science Press**

Phrasal compounding is a phenomenon illustrated by *slept all day look*. Prototypical examples are determinative compounds with a nominal head and a phrasal non-head. They raise interesting questions about the interaction of syntax and morphology and have been discussed in this context by Botha (1981) for Afrikaans and Lieber (1992) for English. Also in German and Turkish, they have received ample attention. This volume has as its main purpose to extend the range of languages for which phrasal compounds are discussed. It consists of a brief introduction (chapter 1), six chapters devoted to individual languages, and a final chapter with a more general outlook. The use of *further* in the title is perhaps surprising, in particular because the volume under review is the first of a new series. It is motivated by the fact that the papers are from “the second workshop on phrasal compounding”, held in Mannheim in 2015. In this review, I will first present and discuss each chapter, then consider some general points about the volume.

Chapter 2 by Kristín Bjarnadóttir is devoted to Icelandic. The author collected 900 phrasal compounds from corpora and from a large morphological database. She starts by outlining compounding in Icelandic in general. Icelandic has very long compounds formed by the recursive application of compounding. A nominal non-head can be a stem or a genitive noun. In the latter case, the ending is a proper genitive and not a linking element as in German. There are two types of phrasal compound, the traditional type and an innovative type. The former is not stylistically marked, the latter is informal. The range of structures is more restricted in the traditional type.

This chapter gives a good overview of Icelandic compounding. It raises many questions of delimitation, which are not really addressed. It remains unclear how compounds that look like phrases are distinguished from the corresponding phrases. Also the distinction between the two types of phrasal compounding is not described in a way that could lead to a clear delimitation. It seems a rather intuitive, pretheoretical distinction, but for claims of the kind made in the chapter, this does not seem sufficient to me.

Chapter 3 by Bogdan Szymanek focuses on Polish but also looks at other Slavic languages. It starts with an outline of compounding in Polish. Szymanek adopts phonological criteria to delimit compounds. In this definition

of compounding, most English compounds translate as syntactic phrases in Polish. Although phrases can be input to derivation, there are no phrasal compounds in Polish. This conclusion can be generalized to Slavic languages with the exception of Bulgarian.

This chapter shows that Polish differs from Germanic languages in the area of compounding. The question of how this difference is interpreted depends on which properties of compounding are taken as a criterion. Szymanek chooses phonology as central. This is a coherent perspective, but, as argued in ten Hacken (2013), it neglects the significant similarities in the onomasiological use of certain types of what Szymanek calls phrases in Polish to compounds in English. The question of whether Polish has phrasal compounds in such an onomasiological perspective of compounding is not addressed here.

Chapter 4 by Alexandra Bagasheva is about Bulgarian. Bagasheva argues that a new type of phrasal compound has gained currency in Bulgarian in certain registers or genres. Analysing specific sections of the magazine *Cosmopolitan*, she found phrasal compounds that cannot all be analysed as borrowings and calques, because in some cases there is no English counterpart. They can be left-headed or right-headed. Bagasheva assumes that they are evidence for a new construction schema. Whether this schema is borrowed or emerged as an extension of the existing N+N compounding schema is not easy to establish.

The chapter raises some interesting questions as to the nature of word formation as a component of a language. The use of phrasal compounds in a tightly delimited context of communication suggests that they are bound to a particular register. Speakers of Bulgarian using this register may then have the word formation rule (or construction schema) in their linguistic competence as well as the information about the restricted use of the rule in their pragmatic competence. The question of the origin of the rule can in my view not be answered at the level of the language, but only for individual speakers.

Chapter 5 by Kathrin Hein reports on a corpus-based study of phrasal compounds in German. Hein extracted a set of 1576 phrasal compounds from the newspaper component of the *Deutsche Referenz-Korpus*. Adopting a constructional model, she then classified these compounds in a bottom-up fashion. The main criterion for distinguishing fine-grained classes is the semantic relation between the head and the non-head. For higher-level classes, also form-based criteria were used. The result is an inheritance hierarchy of constructions.

The main problem with this chapter is that the author tries to cover too much ground in a short space. In many cases, she refers to her PhD thesis for a more detailed discussion of definitions and classifications. This is a work of over 500 pages. Of course, it is difficult to summarize a 500-page work in less than 8000 words, but when for a classification only the labels of the

classes are given, this is not sufficient to understand the argument that is made with the classification.

Chapter 6 by Kunio Nishiyama is on Japanese. In Japanese, phrasal compounds of the type discussed by Lieber (1992) are translated as phrases, e.g. noun phrases with a postposition or with the clitic *teki* ('like'). Because of rules of accent placement, it is possible to identify a different class of phrasal compounds. A minimal pair combines *doitu* ('Germany'), *bungaku* ('literature') and *kyookai* ('association') into a compound meaning 'association for German literature' or a phrase meaning 'German association of literature'. This contrast can be accounted for in Distributed Morphology by the distinction between real compounds and noun incorporation, which involve different morpheme combination rules. In this analysis, the level of *Word Plus*, proposed by Kageyama (2001) is no longer necessary.

Compared to the other chapters, this chapter is different on at least two counts. It is the only chapter on a non-European language and the only chapter adopting a Distributed Morphology framework. This double specificity creates a larger need for explanation of basic assumptions. The identification of compounds in European languages raises very different questions to their identification in Japanese. Much of the argument in this chapter seems to be directed to other Japanese researchers who will be familiar with the literature referred to here.

Chapter 7 by Metin Bağrıaçık, Aslı Göksel and Angela Ralli treats the Greek dialect of Pharasa. Pharasa is a place in Anatolia which had a Greek-language population until 1923, when this population was moved to Northern Greece after the Greek-Turkish war. The dialect was influenced by Turkish and Armenian when the speakers lived in Anatolia and by the Modern Greek standard after the relocation. Whereas almost all Modern Greek dialects have a compounding construction with a compound marker *-o-*, Phrasiot Greek has a compounding pattern with the first constituent in the genitive, which as such has a striking similarity to Turkish compounding. However, as opposed to Turkish, no phrasal compounding is found. This may be because in Phrasiot Greek, the compound marker is on the non-head, whereas in Turkish, it is on the head. This hypothesis is supported by Khalkha, a Turkic language with a compound marker on the non-head and no phrasal compounds.

This chapter is significantly longer than the others, over 12,000 words as against around 8,000 words for the others. It is also remarkable in the sense that only section 5 (c. 1,500 words) is devoted to the analysis of phrasal compounds. The earlier sections give a detailed overview of compounding in Phrasiot Greek, other "Hellenic" dialects and Turkish. Each assumption or distinction that is made in the analysis is explained with well-chosen examples. In this way, the chapter is interesting for the general description of

compounding and contextualizes the position of phrasal compounds in an exemplary way.

Chapter 8 by Jürgen Pafel has a different orientation. It is based on data from a range of languages that are not described systematically but used for a more general consideration of phrasal compounding. Pafel distinguishes four types of phrasal compound by means of the features [\pm well-formed] and [\pm quotative]. Quotations are reanalysed as nouns, so that quotative phrasal compounds are N+N compounds. Non-quotative phrasal compounds are distinguished as involving well-formed phrases (e.g. *over-the-fence gossip*) or non-well-formed phrases (e.g. German *Vor-Nobelpreis-Ära*, ‘before-Nobel prize era’). Then he distinguishes three ways of accounting for phrasal compounds, merge, insertion and conversion. Merge leads to [XP Y]_Y structures, which is only adequate for non-quotative, well-formed phrasal compounds. Insertion is also not sufficient for all types. Conversion, can account for all types of phrasal compound and provides the best mechanism for doing so.

With its emphasis on broader theoretical questions, this chapter could be taken as a kind of conclusion. However, it does not refer to the material in the preceding chapters and some of the assumptions are hardly compatible with them. In the classification of phrasal compounds, Pafel gives Italian *carta di credito* (‘card of credit’, i.e. credit card) and *cambialvalute* (‘change currencies’, i.e. money changer) as examples of the non-quotative types. However, in these cases the entire compound corresponds to the phrase, whereas in more prototypical phrasal compounds, the phrase is the non-head. Prepositional constructions of the type *carta di credito* are explicitly excluded from compounding in other chapters. Another problem I see is the criterion for [\pm quotative]. Here, Pafel contrasts the sentences in (1).

- (1) a. Jeder hat die Ob-ich-glücklich-bin-Frage beantwortet.
 ‘Everyone has the whether-I-happy-am-question answered’
 b. Jeder hat die “Bin ich glücklich?”-Frage beantwortet.
 ‘Everyone has the “am I happy?” question answered’

According to Pafel (p. 247), *ich* refers to the speaker in the non-quotative (1a), ‘Everyone replied to the question whether I am happy’, whereas in the quotative (1b) it refers to each individual in the scope of *jeder*, ‘Everyone replied to the question whether he/she is happy’. To me, both sentences are ambiguous between both readings with a strong pragmatic preference for the reading Pafel ascribes to (1b).

A general question that arises in the discussion of phrasal compounding is how to determine the boundary between phrasal compounds and phrases. Where this question is addressed explicitly, most chapters adopt phonological criteria, especially stress assignment. Interestingly, the editors state in their

introduction that they consider the non-separability of head and non-head the most reliable, crosslinguistically valid criterion for compounds (p. 6). In later chapters, this criterion is hardly mentioned if at all. In ten Hacken (2013), I argue for a semantic criterion, based on the way compounds receive their meaning. A certain correlation between theoretical outlook and compounding criteria can be expected. In a theoretical approach in which the generation of forms is the focus, phonological criteria receive a stronger weight. In an onomasiological approach, which highlights the naming function of compounds, semantics is more important. It is therefore not surprising that chapter 6, with its Distributed Morphology outlook, uses a phonological definition of compound. Chapter 4 on Bulgarian, which mentions Štekauer's (1998) onomasiological approach, makes more use of semantic considerations.

As a catalogue of overviews of compounding in different languages and phrasal compounding in particular, the editors produced a useful volume. The theoretical background of most chapters is fairly homogeneous. Apart from chapter 6 (Japanese), all chapters adopt or are compatible with a view of morphology based on constructions. Especially chapters 2 (Icelandic), 3 (Polish) and 7 (Greek) give well-documented general overviews of compounding that can be used more widely.

There are some rather unfortunate errors in the volume, some of which should normally have been caught in the editing process. Thus, Trips & Kornfilt (p. 2) mention Dutch examples, but they are Afrikaans. Bjarnadóttir (p. 20) has German *liebessbrief* without a capital. Nishiyama (p. 170) has "Chomsky's (2001) 2001 conjecture". Bağrıaçık et al. (p. 209) have "Jaspersen" for "Jespersen". Pafel (p. 240) uses "in the same vain". In some chapters, also the English could have benefited from a more careful proofreading, with some superfluous or missing articles and misplaced adverbs. Hein uses *substantive* instead of *noun*, which is not the normal English terminology in theoretical linguistics. Whereas these problems do not seriously affect the quality of the chapters, the fact that many non-English examples in chapters 4 and 5 are presented without translations restricts their use to readers who know Bulgarian and German, respectively.

In general, one can say that the volume is more valuable as a collection of individual papers than as a coherent overview of phrasal compounding. The editorial introduction is very brief. The part before the summaries of the chapters is just over 2000 words. The summaries in the introduction are very uneven, ranging in length from 68 words for Bagasheva's chapter 4 to 500 words for Bağrıaçık et al.'s chapter 7. The brevity of the introduction is not compensated for by a proper conclusion. Although Pafel's final chapter has a more comparative perspective, he does not refer to the earlier chapters. Perhaps this lack of attention for the editorial finishing of the volume is connected to the mode of publication. The default presentation of the volume

is as a freely downloadable PDF file or a separate file for each chapter. This has the important advantage that interested readers can download individual chapters, which may have been the typical use of the volume intended by the editors. In any case, in its electronic form this volume is great value for (no) money. A hard copy can also be ordered through Amazon.

References

- Botha, Rudolf P. 1981. A base rule theory of Afrikaans synthetic compounds. In Moortgat, Michael, van der Hulst, Harry & Hoekstra, Teun (eds.), *The scope of lexical rules*, 1–77. Dordrecht: Foris.
- ten Hacken, Pius. 2013. Compounds in English, in French, in Polish, and in General. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10. 97–113.
- Kageyama, Taro. 2001. Word Plus: The intersection of words and phrases. In Jeroen van de Weijer & Tetsuo Nishihara (eds.), *Issues in Japanese phonology and morphology*, 245–276. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 1998. *An Onomasiological Theory of English Word-Formation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Prof. Dr. Pius ten Hacken
 Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck
 Institut für Translationswissenschaften
 Herzog-Siegmond-Ufer 15
 A-6020 Innsbruck
pius.ten-hacken@uibk.ac.at