

## Compounding and Derivation: Interactions in Structure and Interpretation

Gianina Iordăchioaia  
University of Stuttgart

Martina Werner  
Austrian Academy of Sciences

Compounding and derivation are word-formation processes that build new lexemes. Beyond the usual language-specific and universal problems of definition (see Lieber & Stekauer 2009, 2014), what the two processes have in common (and what differentiates them from inflection) is their combining content morphemes (i.e., roots, stems, affixes), whose interaction raises intricate questions about both the morphosyntax and the interpretation of the output. The main difference between the two processes is morphological: derivation adds an affix to a lexeme (root or stem; e.g., *play-er*), while compounding combines (several) lexemes (e.g., *fair play*). A direct consequence of this difference concerns interpretation. While derivational affixes usually contribute a compositional (though, possibly, polysemous) meaning to derived words, the semantic relations between the parts of primary compounds, in particular, may be rather underspecified (see the notorious German example *Fischfrau* 'fish woman'), even though these lexemic parts make compounds conceptually more descriptive than derivations (Dressler & Crocco Galèas 1992). Beyond these differences, compounding and derivation tend to exhibit similar structural properties (binary branching, recursion, and headedness; Olsen 2014).

Various topics related to compounding and derivation, and especially their interaction in synchrony and diachrony have made the focus of linguistic research in modern times. Historically speaking, affixes may develop from productive compound parts that no longer preserve their free form (e.g., *-ship*, *-hood*, *-ful*), and synchronic formations may exhibit properties in between derivation and compounding as a result of language change (e.g., *manlike*, *trustworthy*; see Marchand 1969, Dalton-Puffer & Plag 2001, Trips 2009, Schlücker 2012, Werner 2012, Olsen 2014). In addition, the linguistic tradition has long debated the status of so-called synthetic compounds, in which compounding and derivation interact (e.g., *dog-train-er*, *long-leg(g)-ed*), although, for various theoretical reasons, neither of the two naturally qualifies as preceding the other (see Levi 1978, Roeper & Siegel 1978, Selkirk 1982, Lieber 1983, 2004, Booij 1988, 2005, Leser 1990, Ackema & Neeleman 2004, Harley 2009, Borer 2013 i.a.).

Within this background, our workshop aims to discuss the patterns of interaction between the morphological units of derived words and compounds, along with their effect on the interpretation of the output and the implications for their theoretical modeling. We invite submissions on synchronic and diachronic studies that address (but are not limited to) the following topics:

**1. The morphosyntactic status of the morphological units in compounds and derived words from a crosslinguistic perspective.** Language families are known to vary in their structural properties. For instance, compounds are right-headed in Germanic (Williams 1981), but left-headed in Romance (cf. contributions in Scalise & Masini 2012). In addition, while Germanic languages may use linking elements (e.g., *state-s-man* vs. *state employee*, German *Universität-s-bibliothek* 'university library', *Anmietung-s-vereinbarung* vs. *Anmiet-vereinbarung* 'rental agreement'), Romance languages employ prepositional/case marking on the non-head of so-called analytic compounds (e.g., French *homme d'Etat*, Romanian *om de stat* 'statesman'). What are the main principles that rule word formation in different languages, and what are the theoretical implications for the analysis of compounds and derived words in general (cf. Haider 2001, Delfitto, Fabregas & Melloni 2011)? How do we distinguish word

formation segments (roots, stems, affixes) in different languages and language stages? Although our workshop has a focus on European languages, we also welcome comparisons to other language families.

**2. Synthetic compounds.** How can we reliably characterize the structure of synthetic compounds in relation to derivation and primary compounds? How many types of synthetic compounds are there? Nominal synthetic compounds most often appear with *-er* and *-ing*, but we also find them with derived nominals (e.g., *student evaluation*, *law enforcement*). Synthetic compounds based on conversion have been controversial in English (see Grimshaw 1990, Borer 2013), but in German we find them with nominalized (converted) infinitives, whose eventive interpretation resembles the typical English synthetic compounds (e.g., *Sternebeobachten* 'stargazing'). The question then is what properties of the deverbal head are relevant in the formation of a synthetic compound? For instance, is there a difference between the compounds based on heads with different suffixes (cf. German *Sterne-beobacht-erei* vs. *Sterne-beobacht-en* 'stargazing') and/or of different lexical categories (cf. nominal vs. adjectival/participial compounds as, e.g., *handwritten*, *long-legged*)?

**3. Argumental and modificational relations in the morphosyntax and the interpretation of compounds and derived words.** In the modeling of synthetic compounds the question of whether the non-head is an argument of the derived head plays a crucial role (Grimshaw 1990, Bobaljik 2003, Lieber 2004, Borer 2013). How can we distinguish between genuine argumental relations and those that arise only by association in compounds (see internal argument in *teacher evaluation* vs. external argument reading in *teacher recommendation*)? What is the status of relational adjectives based on deverbal nouns, which seem to realize an argument of the latter in a compound-like behavior (e.g. *presidential election*; Marchis 2010)? Moreover, do phrases with derived words and arguments (e.g. *the training/trainer of the dog*) differ from corresponding compounds (e.g., *dog-training/-trainer*) in terms of argument structure (Alexiadou 2001, Borer 2013)? In Germanic languages the two patterns differ in form (see left- vs. right-headedness), but in Romance languages they are both left-headed and differ only in the (discourse-linked) interpretation of the non-head (cf. Ro. *dresorul câinelui* 'trainer.the dog.the.Gen' vs. *dresorul de câini* 'trainer.the of dogs'). What are the possible semantic and syntactic relations between heads and non-heads in primary compounds? How do we model 'exocentric' compounds in these respects?

We welcome studies that are couched in both formal and functional approaches to morphology and especially encourage new insights driven by large corpus-oriented data from theoretical linguistics, historical linguistics, language typology, and variational linguistics.

#### **Keynote speakers:**

Susan Olsen (Humboldt University of Berlin)  
Paolo Acquaviva (University College Dublin)

#### **References:**

- Ackema, P., Neeleman, A. 2004. *Beyond Morphology: Interface Conditions on Word Formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexiadou, A. 2001. *Functional structure in nominals: Nominalization and ergativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bobaljik, J. 2003. Auspicious Compounds. In T. Grüter and T. Takehisa, (eds.), *Papers in Memory of Lara Riente, McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* vol 17.2, 65-71.
- Booij, G., 1988. The relation between inheritance and argument linking: Deverbal nouns in Dutch. In: *Morphology and Modularity. In Honour of Henk Schultink*. Dordrecht: Foris, 57-74.

- Booij, G., 2005. Compounding and derivation: Evidence for Construction Morphology. In Dressler, W., Kastovsky, D., Pfeiffer, O. & Rainer, F. (eds.): *Morphology and its Demarcations*. John Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 109–132.
- Borer, H. 2013. *Structuring Sense: Volume III: Taking Form*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. & I. Plag. 2001. Categorywise, some compound-type morphemes seem to be rather suffix-like: on the status of -ful, -type, and -wise in Present Day English. *Folia Linguistica* 34(3-4). 225-244.
- Delfitto, D., A. Fabregas, and C. Melloni. 2011. Compounding at the interfaces. In S. Lima, K. Mullin and B. Smith, eds., *Proceedings of the 39th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*: 255-269. GLSA Publications, Amherst.
- Di Sciullo, A.-M., Williams, E. 1987. *On the Definition of Word*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Di Sciullo, A.-M. 2005. *Asymmetry in Morphology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dressler, W. U. & G. Crocco Galèas. Trasparenza morfotattica e morfosemantica dei composti nominali più produttivi dell'italiano d'oggi, in *Linee di tendenza dell'italiano contemporaneo. Atti Società Linguistica Italiana* 25. Roma: Bulzoni 1992. 9-24.
- Fabregas, A. 2013. Towards a syntactic account of affix combinations: from nouns to adjectives and vice versa, in Iordachioaia, G., I. Roy & K. Takamine, *Categorization and Category Change*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 95-122.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument Structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Harley, H. 2009. Compounding in Distributed Morphology, in Lieber & Stekauer (2009).
- Haider, H. 2001. Why are there no Complex Head-Initial Compounds? In Schaner-Wolles, C., Rennison, J. & Neubarth, F. (eds.): *Naturally! Festschrift for Wolfgang U. Dressler*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 165–174.
- Lieber, R. 1983. Argument linking and compounding in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 251–286.
- Lieber, R. 2004. *Morphology and lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieber, R. & Stekauer, P. (eds). 2009. *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lieber, R. & Stekauer, P. (eds.). 2014. *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leser, M. 1990. *Das Problem der 'Zusammenbildungen': eine lexikalistische Studie*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag
- Levi, J. N. 1978. *The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals*. Academic Press, New York.
- Marchand, H. 1969: *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. 2nd edition. München: Beck.
- Marchis, M. 2010. *Relational Adjectives at the Syntax-Morphology Interface in Romanian and Spanish*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Stuttgart
- Olsen, S. 2014. Delineating derivation and compounding, in Lieber & Stekauer (2014).
- Roeper, T. & M. E. A. Siegel. 1978. A lexical transformation for verbal compounds. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 199-260.
- Scalise, S. & F. Masini (eds.). 2012. Special Issue on Romance Compounds. *Probus* 24:1.
- Schlücker, B. 2012. Die deutsche Kompositionsfreudigkeit. Übersicht und Einführung. In Gaeta, L. & Schlücker, B. (eds.), *Das Deutsche als kompositionsfreudige Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1–27.
- Selkirk, E. O. 1982. *The Syntax of Words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Trips, C. 2009. *Lexical Semantics and Diachronic Morphology. The Development of -hood, -dom and -ship in the History of English*. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Werner, M. 2012. *Genus, Derivation und Quantifikation. Zur Funktion der Suffigierung und verwandter Phänomene im Deutschen*. Berlin/ Boston: de Gruyter.
- Williams, E. 1981. On the notions of *lexically related* and *head of a word*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 245-274.