

## Sessions

---

**Michael Bilynsky,**

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

### **DEVERBAL COINAGES AS AN OBJECT OF ONOMASIOLOGICAL LEXICOGRAPHY**

An onomasiological theory of the lexicon as an orientation "from sense to means of its expression" is manifested in multiple versions of synonymy that are contained in the respective thesauri. The verbs that happen to be synonymous are subjected to certain derivational constraints. A relevant issue for word formation theory would then be the (un)matching reflections of a string of parent verbs in the strings of category- or even suffix-homogeneous deverbal coinages. Such strings of derived (near-)synonyms are not given in the thesauri. We have developed a multi-tier electronic framework that juxtaposes strings of synonymous verbs with a complete word family of each of their constituents. The gathered evidence amounts to several hundred thousand parent and derived strings from over twenty processed thesauri which have been also put into an aggregate database. It will be assessed for the configurations of empty positions, lexicometric, including angular geometry, parameters of parent and derived strings, gaps-induced onomasiological curves in an atlas of stringed word families, as well as matrices of temporal similarity (chronotropism) that reflect the formation of strings of deverbal coinages affiliated to different categories. The developed methodology seems to be of relevance for the onomasiological theory of word formation and Natural Language Processing.

---

**Lýdia Borková,**

P. J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovak Republic

### **NATURE OF PICTURES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON WORD- FORMATION**

As it has been observed in Borgwaldt and Benczes (2011) and in Borgwaldt et al. (2012), nature of pictures used for elicitation of new naming units affects what word-formation process is used. Salient shape pictures in these studies resulted in a smaller number of lexical blends, and similar to pictures with prototypical functions or prototypical features, they also resulted in more naming units containing modifiers. This paper discusses some other effects of hybrid object picture nature and how they are reflected in creation of new naming units elicited through different types of these pictures. Therefore, this study uses hybrid object pictures merging two objects or elements into one hybrid object (e.g. a tank caravan, a horse cloud). The main picture peculiarities discussed include whether a hybrid object picture in question is perceived as a half-and-half hybrid or a dominant-subdominant element hybrid, and in what way its two objects or elements are put or blended together. The main word-formation effects observed include a choice for a particular word-formation process, ordering of elements in compounds

and blends, lengths of preserved material in lexical blends, and shortening or blending patterns in lexical blends.

## References

- Borgwald, Susanne R. & Benczes, Réka. 2011. Word-formation patterns in a crosslinguistic perspective. Testing predictions for novel object naming in Hungarian and German. In Schönefeld, Doris D., Converging evidence: Methodological and theoretical issues for linguistic research. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. 221–246
- Borgwald, Susanne R. & Kulish, Tetyana & Bose, Arpita. 2012. Ukrainian Blends: Elicitation paradigm and structural analysis. In: Renner, Vincent & Maniez, François & Arnaud, Pierre J.L. Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 75- 92.

---

**Bożena Cetnarowska,**

University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

## **DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ATTRIBUTIVE-APPOSITIONAL AND COORDINATE N+N COMBINATIONS IN POLISH**

This presentation investigates some difficulties in drawing the border between Polish attributive-appositional and coordinate N+N combinations, when Scalise and Bisetto's (2009) compound classification is applied to compound-like juxtapositions (cf. Szymanek 2010). The discussion will focus on two classes of N+N expressions:

- (1) a. kobieta anioł (lit. woman angel) 'an angel of a woman'  
b. samochód-marzenie (lit. car dream) 'a dream of a car'
- (2) a. mąż fajtlapa (lit. husband milksop) 'a milksop husband'  
b. dziennikarz głupiec (lit. journalist fool) 'a fool of a journalist'

The noun-noun expressions in (1) are not reversible and their right-hand constituent expresses metaphorically some property of the head. They belong to attributive-appositional (i.e. ATAP) combinations, similarly to such Italian compounds as *viaggio lampo* (lit. journey lightning) 'very fast journey' (see Masini and Scalise 2012). The N+N combinations in (2), on the other hand, seem to fall between ATAP and coordinate expressions. They resemble the ATAP juxtapositions since the property denoted by the right-hand constituent is attributed to the referent of the left-hand constituent. However, it will be argued that they should be regarded as coordinate combinations, due to their reversibility, referential intersectivity and semantic transparency.

## References

- Masini, F. and S. Scalise. 2012. Italian compounds. *Probus* 24, 61-91.
- Scalise, S. and A. Bisetto. 2009. Classification of compounds. In R. Lieber and P. Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of compounding*, 49–82. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Szymanek, B. 2010. A panorama of Polish word-formation. Lublin: Wyd. KUL.

---

**Mubashir Iqbal Chaudhary,**

University of Gujrat, Sub-Campus Narowal, Pakistan

## THE PLURALIZATION OF PLURALS IN URDU: AN OT ANALYSIS

The study brings forth the morpho-phonological processes responsible of forming plurals of the plurals in Urdu. Optimality Theory introduced by (McCarthy & Prince 1993a, 1993b; Prince & Smolensky 1993) is utilized to analyze the data. The paper starts by offering a brief introduction of the pluralization system of Urdu. First, a short description of the formation of sound plurals, which are based on suffixation, is given, for example *kīṭab* 'book' → *kīṭab-ā* 'books'. It then rejects Hardie's (2004, p. 35) claim that "Urdu inflection is based on suffixation ...." by explaining (shortly) Urdu broken plurals, a grammatical rule borrowed from Arabic, which can be formed through infixation, transfixation and circumfixation. For example, *māsdzīd* 'mosque' → *mās-a-dzīd* 'mosques' is the result of inserting an infix -a- in the middle of the stem. Hardie (2004) and Mangrio (2016) has discussed the pluralization through suffixation, and Mangrio (2016) has merely touched Urdu broken plurals. However, the pluralization of plurals is missed by all the previous researchers. Therefore, this study focuses on explaining the process of the formation of plurals of the plurals, which is only the property of Urdu language as no other language depicts such phenomenon. It can be explained with the help of this example: *rāsəm* 'custom' → *r-u-s-u:-m* 'customs' → *rōsu:m-a:ṭ* 'customs'. The stem is *rāsəm*, from which a broken plural is formed i.e.

*rōsu:m*, and then the plural-plural marker -a:ṭ is attached to the broken plural, the new stem, which forms *rōsu:m-a:ṭ*, the plural of the plural. Two processes: morphological and phonological, are involved in this formation. When the broken plural *rōsu:m* is formed, the plural markers are inserted in the stem and the word is totally re-syllabified, and when the plural-plural marker -a:ṭ is attached to *rōsu:m* to get *rōsu:m-a:ṭ*, the coda in the last syllable of the stem i.e. /m/ becomes the onset of the plural-plural marker. Thus, the syllabification pattern is *rāsəm* 'custom' → *rō.su:m* → *rō.su:.ma:ṭ*. Four plural-plural markers: -r:n, -a:n, -mi and -a:ṭ are found in Urdu. The data for the first three are too little to regard them regular patterns, they can be said exceptions. However, the last marker i.e. -a:ṭ is a regular pattern. Moreover, this marker exhibits two patterns

of pluralization and can be said: plural marker and plural-plural marker: firstly, it forms plurals from singulars such as *māf.rub* 'drink' → *māf.ru.b-a:ṭ* 'drinks', and secondly, it also forms plurals from plurals such as *qī.səm* 'kind/type' → *ʌq.sa:m* 'kinds/types' → *ʌq.sa:.m-a:ṭ* 'kinds/types'. The paper also includes the OT analyses of plural-plural marker patterns.

Keywords: Urdu Pluralization, Broken Plurals, Pluralization of Plurals, OT

---

**Niladri Sekhar Dash,**

Linguistic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

# **THE MORPHODYNAMICS OF GENITIVE CASE MARKERS IN FORMATION OF BANGLA WORDS: A CORPUS-BASED EMPIRICAL STUDY**

Because of the inflectional nature, most of the words in Bangla are formed with various word-formative elements including case markers. The percentage of words formed with case markers in Bangla is almost (49%) same with the words formed without case markers (51%). After morphological analysis to a large number of words formed with genitive case markers, in this paper, we describe the operation of various morpho-phonological processes that take place at the time of conjoining genitive case markers with noun bases. We also show how the allomorphs of some case markers are generated and distributed based on the final character of a word; how words denoting spatiotemporal information are permitted to use certain kinds of genitive case markers; and how deletion of the noun base triggers shifting and attachment of case markers with preceding adjectives, which change parts-of-speech and functional roles of words. This paper is the first attempt of its kind in which we have tried to ventilate into the linguistic uniqueness of genitive case markers in formation of Bangla words, the insight of which help us revise earlier descriptions and theories about the form and function of genitive case markers in formation of Bangla words.

---

**Reema Dawoky,**

Awaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

## **TYPOLOGICAL AND UNIVERSAL PROPERTIES OF 4 FRENCH BASED CREOLES' WORD FORMATION**

While there has been a great deal of work on grammatical features that creole languages share, little of this has actually tried to place the creole languages in a broader typological perspective.

The main purpose of this paper is to review a number of word formation theories and processes which are characteristics of creole languages basically the relationship between the lexicon and its phonological structure. The languages chosen for the purpose of this study are: (1) Mauritian Creole, (2) Rodriguan Creole, (3) Réunion Creole and (4) Seychellois Creole. We show that the issue can be tackled with a comparative approach based on a selection of phonological, lexical and structural features, resulting in suggestive patterns on the connections between the various creoles and the superstrate language in the sample. An advantage in using comparative methods is that it also allows us to assess the relative degree of divergence in lexical items of a Creole from its lexifier. There was a previously held belief that Creole languages are devoid of inflectional morphology and whether creoles differ structurally from non-Creole languages, thus forming a special class of languages with specific typological properties. This debate about the typological status of Creole languages lacks systematic empirical study, and this justifies the relevance of this study. The paper is an attempt to investigate the typological and universal properties of 4 French Based Creoles' word formation and its implications with other cross linguistic factors. This paper argues that although typological studies are related to historical and contact linguistics as they look for similarities inherited or spread by contact; this study rather attempts to show the differences in phonological structures despite the fact that all these creoles share the same lexifier that is French.

Keywords: Language Typology, Universals, Morphological Typology, Creole Languages

### **References**

Adone, D. (1994) "The Acquisition of Mauritian Creole". John Benjamins Publishing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

- Ansaldi, U., Matthews, S. and Lim, L. (2007) "Deconstructing Creole". John Benjamins Publishing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Bissoonauth, A. & Offord, M. (2001) language use of Mauritian Adolescents in Education. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 22(5), 381-400.
- Comrie, B. (1989) "Language Universals and Linguistic Typology". Blackwell Publisher. Chicago.
- Croft, W. (2002) *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Finegan, E. (2012) "Language: Its Structure and Use". Wadsworth, USA.
- Greenberg, J., H. & Kemmer, S. (1990) "On Language, Selected Writings of Joseph H.Greenberg". Stanford University, California.
- Lefebvre, C. (2011) "Creoles, their Substrates, and Language Typology". John Benjamins Publishing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Lefebvre, C. (2014) "Relabeling in Language Genesis". Oxford University Press. New York.
- Michaelis, S. (2008) "Roots of Creole Structures: Weighing the Contribution of Substrates and Superstrates". John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam.

---

**Masoumeh Diyanati,**

University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

**Alexander Onysko,**

Alpen-Adria University, Klagenfurt, Austria

## **METONYMY AND MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN PERSIAN NOMINAL COMPOUNDS**

In cognitive semantics, metonymy is considered a significant process of everyday thinking, which helps human beings to use one entity to refer to another, contiguous entity (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Indeed, this underlying role of metonymy, not only in thinking about the world but also in communicating thoughts, is represented in various language forms (Littlemore, 2015). As has been shown before (cf., e.g., Geeraerts, 2002; Barcelona, 2008; Benczes, 2011; Onysko, 2017), the meaning of compound words can rely on metonymical associations. This is also the case in Persian compounds, which are the focus of the current study. An analysis of 210 Persian noun-noun compounds that contain one metonymical part is geared at answering the question of whether the type of metonymy affects the construction of meaning in Persian metonymical compounds. To answer this question, the data is classified in line with Radden & Kövecses's (1999) basic typology (part-for-part metonymies vs. whole for part/ part for whole metonymies). The analysis reveals that meaning construction in part for part metonymical compounds is more complex, compared to whole for part/ part for whole metonymical compounds. It appears that whole for part/ part for whole relations are based on 'categorization' as a basic cognitive ability, which facilitates access to the target. Part for part metonymical compounds, on the other hand, connect to the target via a more complex and maybe less predictable relation (such as agent-object, cause-effect, etc.). Therefore, it seems that even though all of these compounds have one metonymical part, their meaning construction can show different levels of complexity depending on the general type of metonymy.

### **References**

- Barcelona, A. (2008). The interaction of metonymy and metaphor in meaning and form of bahuvrihi compounds. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 6, 208–281. [Doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.10bar](https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.10bar)
- Benczes, R. (2011). Putting the notion of "domain" back into metonymy: Evidence from compounds. In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona & F.J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (Eds.), *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics Towards a consensus view* (pp. 197-215) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Geeraerts, D. (2002). The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in composite expressions. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 20], (pp. 435–465). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Doi: 10.1515/9783110219197.435
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Thought and Communication*. Cambridge: John Benjamins.
- Onysko, A. (2017). Conceptual metaphor variation in meaning interpretation: Evidence from speakers of New Zealand English. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies*, 4:1, 7–35. Doi 10.1075/cogls.4.1.02ony
- Radden, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K. U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought* (pp. 17–59). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

---

**Jan Don, Hernán Labbé Grunberg, Judith Rispen, Fred Weerman,**

ACLCL- University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

### **PROBING WORD PROCESSING WITH MMN**

Research into the storage and retrieval of words has centered around two possible mechanisms: Either words are stored in their surface form as a single representation, or they are assembled on-line through the (de)composition of their constituent elements. If morphologically complex words are retrieved via the separate activation of their constituent elements, regular inflections would be likely candidates for such a mode of storage and retrieval. While the empirical evidence regarding processing of plural nouns across languages is mixed, and does not favor one mechanism over the other, studies on the Dutch plural inflection that compared reaction times to words of different frequency counts do seem to suggest that one mechanism – that of surface-form lexical storage – is mainly responsible for how these nouns are processed.

However, recent neurophysiological evidence suggests that processing of grammatical information occurs very early on in word processing. If this is the case, frequency-dependent response times might not be suitable to tap into such early processing stages. By using a specific ERP-component, called mismatch negativity (MMN), we were able to modulate the responses differently for singular and plural Dutch nouns, suggesting different processing mechanisms for simple and complex nouns. Furthermore, we found the frequency effect does not modulate the response to our stimuli in the same way that it affects response times in previous studies. Our results suggest that some plural Dutch nouns might be processed through a decomposition of their stems and suffixes at such early stages, and that the frequency effects reported on previous studies might not apply at such early time windows.

---

**Elena Fornasiero,**

Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy

### **EVALUATIVE MORPHOLOGY IN ITALIAN SIGN LANGUAGE (LIS): A PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION**

This paper provides a preliminary description of the display of evaluative morphology in LIS improving the previous study by [1]. The analysis of both elicited and corpus data reveals that LIS employs two strategies to convey diminutive and augmentative features (endearment and pejorative were mainly conveyed through adjectives): (i) manual simultaneous evaluation: the manual signs for nouns are modified in their articulation (restricted for the diminutive, enlarged for the augmentative) and through

specific non-manual markers (NMMs) for each evaluative feature; (ii) manual sequential evaluation: the evaluative feature is conveyed articulating a classifier (CL) defining size and shape of the entity following the sign for the noun. Displaying both sequential and simultaneous processes in which morphemes are easily segmented, LIS fits the typological classification of sign languages as agglutinative languages [2]. It also fits the typological classifications defining evaluative morphology in spoken languages [3], regardless the different modality employed: it displays both diminutive and augmentative features; suffixation (through NMMs and CLs) is the preferred strategy; it respects the formal and semantic conditions [4] in displaying both the standard (the manual sign) and the evaluative meaning (encoded in NMMs and CLs). At the present stage, it seems to be a derivational process.

## References

- [1] Petitta, G., Di Renzo, A., Chiari, I. (2015) "Evaluative morphology in sign languages". In: Grandi, N., Kortveleyssy, L. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 155-169, Edinburgh University Press.
- [2] Schuit, J. (2007) *The typological classification of sign language morphology*. Master's Thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- [3] Kortvélyessy, L. (2015). *Evaluative morphology from a cross-linguistic perspective (1)*. Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K.: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [4] Grandi, N. (2002) *Morfologie in contatto. Le costruzioni valutative nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*. Milan, Italy, Franco Angeli.

---

**Hans Götzsche,**

Aalborg University, Denmark

## **COMPOUNDS AS IDIOMS. A CASE STUDY OF A 'META-TREND'**

When writing a manuscript for a *Festschrift* I came across some compounds in Swedish that only could be interpreted as tropes. Take the word *kulturmaffia* 'cultural mafia'. It does not seem to be found in English and is confined to Scandinavia. Apart from the Swedish spelling of *mafia* the compound is hardly understandable without some contextual information. The meaning is 'a group of people who are especially influential in the sphere of fine culture (literature, drama, paintings) in a society'. Whereas the word *culture* is polysemous the word *mafia* cannot be used in its original meaning; which is well known. So, is its meaning metaphorical, and, in that case since it has become conventionalised, is its combination with *culture* idiomatic. Another case is the use of *meta-* in combination with, mainly, abstracts. The compound *metadata* is now ubiquitous because of the dissemination of electronic devices and one may find quite many, often technical, terms with a prepositioned *meta-*. Some dictionaries classify the expression *meta-* as a prefix, and considering the somehow peculiar origin of the accepted term *metaphysics* one may ask if the expansion of its use is some kind of 'metatrend'? My presentation will go through a few of the Swedish 'idiomatic compounds' and then take up a number of word-formations with 'meta-' in order to try to clarify whether you could call these formations compounds or not and whether their semantics justify a classification as idioms. I will use this as a frame of some

theoretical contemplations over the notions 'word' and 'phrase' and the segmentation of these units. Therefore the only piece of reference is the one to Haspelmath (2011).

## **References**

Haspelmath, Martin (2011): 'The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax', in *Folia Linguistica* 45/1, pp. 31-80.

---

**Zhuzhuna Gumbaridze,**

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Adjara, Georgia

## **A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPOUND NOUNS IN ENGLISH AND GEORGIAN**

The speaker's linguistic knowledge not only covers the skill of segmenting the stream of sounds of utterance into meaningful units, but also includes information which enables a speaker to specify morpho-syntactic characteristics of individual words into his or her mental lexicon. An internal structure of words as one of the most fundamental units of linguistic structure is a rule-governed system. However, a human vocabulary has a live mechanism which operates dynamically and apart from static, fossilized information, the speaker can enrich lexical fund by forming words creatively through the process of affixation and compounding. This is a complicated phenomenon undergoing at three different stages simultaneously. In particular, morphological, syntactic and semantic processes attest derivation. Within the field of morphology, many questions can arise in regard with the nature of words, but among the most persistent questions we aim to pose the following ones in this paper: 1. What is a usual means of distinguishing a compound word from a phrase? 2. What clues does orthography offer in regard with differentiation between compound nouns and phrases? 3. To what extent can semantics of a compound noun be predictable? 5. Are derivational patterns of compounding identical in English and Georgian?

Responses to the above questions are drawn in the results section of the paper. The discussion section provides an interpretation of derivational morphology suggested by Greenbaum, Leech, Starvik, Downing, Fromkin, Quirk, Akmajian and presents our own hypothesis towards the findings. The conclusion summarizes the main arguments and suggests the ways to tackle the above subject.

---

**Zeinab Gvarishvili,**

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Adjara, Georgia

## **ENDOCENTRIC AND EXOCENTRIC COMPOSITES IN ENGLISH AND GEORGIAN LANGUAGES**

English and Georgian languages are two morphologically asymmetrical languages. The former is the most analytic language among all of the European languages and the latter agglutinative, incorporating language. The paper concerns itself only with the standard dialects of the two languages, which are hypothesized to be different in the process of forming nouns through compounding. In this paper, an attempt is made to identify how many compound noun-formation patterns occur in each of the languages? Then, the paper aims at examining and contrasting where do English and Georgian compound nouns resemble semantically syntactically? And where do they differ? For this study, the data have been collected from over 30 various English and Georgian sources and re-analyzed with reference to compound nouns in the two languages. It is unveiled that compound nouns in English and

Georgian have five analogous areas in semantics, whereas they differ only in two semantic aspects. Meanwhile, in syntax, the four points of resemblances are outweighed by the ten points of divergences. The study also revealed the differences from the stand point of spelling of compound nouns (hyphenated compounds)

Key words: endocentric, exocentric, copulative, appositional, coordinative, nominalization

---

**Katrin Hein,**

Institute for German Language, Mannheim, Germany

## **APPLYING THE CONCEPT OF MORPHOLOGICAL PRODUCTIVITY TO COMPOUNDING: A LEXEME-BASED APPROACH**

The paper at hand discusses productivity in German compound formation. While the notion ‚morphological productivity‘ – until now – has been predominantly reserved for the domain of derivation (cf. Bauer 2005), we plan to demonstrate its fruitful applicability to compounding.

We perceive morphological productivity as a quantitatively measurable, gradual phenomenon (cf. Roth 2014, 167) and will look at compound formation from a lexeme-based synchronic perspective. In a first step, we determine the productivity of compounds with the help of current productivity measures (cf. Baayen 2009; 1992) on the basis of large corpora (Deutsches Referenzkorpus, ‚DeReKo‘). In this context, we focus on groups of compounds with head words that are semantically similar (e.g. compounds with a color word like *quitschegelb* (‚squeaking yellow‘) or *papstviolett* (‚pope purple‘)) or that had a similar frequency as a simplex respectively. In a second step, we try to systematically explain empirically carved out differences in productivity. This means that potential factors for productivity are empirically validated, e.g., morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of the immediate constituents, frequency and semantic/formal patterns of compounding (cf. Hein/Engelberg 2018).

All in all, this analysis of selected simplexes can also provide a promising instrument to gain more general insights into the nature of compounding.

### **References**

- Baayen, Harald (1992). Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity. In: Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1991*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109-149.
- (2009). Corpus linguistics in morphology: Morphological productivity. In: Anke Lüdeling and Merja Kytö (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics. An international handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 900–919.
- Bauer, Laurie (2005). Productivity: Theories. In: Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of wordformation*. Dordrecht: Springer, 315–334.
- Hein, Katrin/ Engelberg, Stefan (2018, to appear). Morphological variation: the case of productivity in German compound formation. In: *Online Proceedings of the Eleventh Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM11)* (Edited By: Jenny Audring, Nikos Koutsoukos, Francesca Masini).
- Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2017). *Deutsches Referenzkorpus / Archiv der Korpora geschriebener Gegenwartssprache 2017-II* (Release vom 01.10.2017). Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache. [www.ids-mannheim.de/DeReKo](http://www.ids-mannheim.de/DeReKo).
- Roth, Tobias (2014). *Wortverbindungen und Verbindungen von Wörtern. Lexikografische und distributionelle Aspekte kombinatorischer Begriffsbildung zwischen Syntax und Morphologie*. Tübingen: Francke

---

**Engin İlbay,**

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany

## **WORD-FORMATION IN THE TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM: PLANNED SUFFIX POLYSEMY?**

The present paper aims at discussing a specific part of word-formation processes used by the Kemalist language reformers during the Turkish language reform that was initiated among a number of striking reforms after the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. The main purpose of the Turkish language reform was a large-scale “cleansing” of Arabic and Persian elements, which constituted a large portion of the lexicon of the Turkish written language. According to the reformers, the native Turkish words substituting the foreign elements should come from three sources: a) by revitalizing words from older stages of Turkish, b) from Turkish dialects including Turkic languages outside Turkey and c) by coining neologisms based on existing native material. The latter has been the most controversial since. The reformers mainly deployed derivation that usually is the main word-formation process in Turkish before composition. One of the favorite affixes used in that era is the deverbal nominal suffix -(X)ntX that attracted some criticism for allegedly being used quite indiscriminately. The results of this suffixation belong to several semantic categories, raising the central question in this paper whether the suffix polysemy is indeed the result of deliberate word-formation by the reformers as claimed by critics.

---

**Ava Imani, Adel Rafiei (corresponding author),**

University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

## **A CONSTRUCTIONAL STUDY OF THE WORD FORMATION PATTERNS CONSISTING OF BODY PARTS IN PERSIAN**

This paper aims to examine the construction of three word-formation patterns namely [sar-X], [del-X] and [cheshm-X] (compounds of three frequent body parts “head”, “heart” and “eye”) and to investigate their semantic variations, the most general schemas and subschemas in Persian employing the Construction Morphology approach (Booij, 2010). To this end, a collection of 294 compounds were collected from different Persian Dictionaries and Google. The results reveal that two general constructional schemas and several subschemas make up the hierarchical construction of [sar-X] and one general constructional schema and three subschemas form [del-X], while for the “eye” compounds no subschema is formed. It means that the polysemy we are dealing with here is not at the word level but it is at the construction level and the meaning contribution of the mentioned compounds lies within the constructions on the one hand, and the meaning of the constituents, operation of conceptual metaphor (metonymy) and encyclopedic knowledge on the other. Finally, postulating a paradigmatic nature of word-formation and positing the concept of construction as a basis for argument, CM can account for our data and necessitate reevaluation of the demarcation between derivation and compounding at least in compounds of body parts in Persian.

**Key words:** Construction Morphology, constructional schema, constructional polysemy, word formation, compounding, body part

---

**Sandra Jiménez-Pareja, Salvador Valera,**

University of Granada, Spain

## **ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE ON THE ADJECTIVE/ADVERB INTERFACE: SUBJECT-RELATED -LY**

Subject-relatedness in -ly derivatives has been defined subsidiarily to subject-orientation, to accommodate for when the derivative allows no adverbial interpretation, only the predicative function (Díaz-Negrillo 2012, Valera 2014). These predicative-only -ly derivatives usually fall in the literature under the term 'subject-oriented adverbs' (Quirk et al. 1985, Guimier 1991, Valera 1998). Corpus evidence of subject-relatedness has been reported to occur in few cases, the common property of which is that the adjectival bases are adjectives of colour (Valera 2014). This appears to limit subject-relatedness to this class of adjectives but, as colour adjectives are a central member of the class (cf. Dixon 1977), the relevance of this structure may be higher than it might seem. This paper presents results of a systematic corpus search of 17,460 BNC bigrams of the profile in question. The results take subject-relatedness well beyond colour adjectives alone. The interpretations of this mismatch between the suffix -ly and the categorial meaning associated with this suffix or with the structures where they appear are manifold.

### **References**

- Díaz-Negrillo, Ana 2012. Subject-Relatedness in -ly Premodifying Adverbs. *English Studies*, 95:4, 459-474. Dixon, R.M.W. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? *Studies in Language* 1: 1-80. Guimier, Claude 1991. Sur l'adverbe orienté vers le sujet. In: Claude Guimier & Pierre Larcher (eds.), *Les états de l'adverbe*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes; 97-114. Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman. Valera, Salvador 1998. On subject-orientation in English -ly adverbs. *English Language and Linguistics* 2(2): 263-282. Valera, Salvador 2014. Derivation by conversion. In: Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of derivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 154-168.

---

**Pavol Kacmar, Livia Körtevelyessy, Pavol Štekauer,**

P.J. Safarik University, Kosice, Slovakia

## **ON CREATIVITY AS A FACTOR AFFECTING COMPLEX-WORD FORMATION AND COMPLEX-WORD INTERPRETATION**

In spite of extensive morphological research into complex-word **formation** and psycholinguistic research into complex-word **interpretation** in recent decades **creativity** as a word-formation and meaning-predictability factor has not been studied yet. The paper, therefore, presents new insights into the way in which language users of unequal creativity characteristics form and interpret complex words. We start with basic theoretical principles are followed by our research methodology.

The underlying idea is that of **competition** in natural languages (eg. MacWhinney et al. 2014) It manifests itself in word-formation as competition between various rules available for the formation of a new complex word (e.g., Bauer 2009, Aronoff 2013, Lindsay & Aronoff 2013) and as competition between various potential readings of novel complex words (eg., Gagné & Shoben 1997, Spalding et al. 2010)

The project covered two different age groups of respondents (250 secondary school and 250 university undergraduates). They undertook the *Torrance Test of Figurative Thinking* that is based on four indicators of creativity: elaboration, fluency, flexibility and originality. Each indicator was evaluated and, by the application of the median value, both age groups of informants were further divided into two subgroups for each indicator.

Subsequently, all the respondents were tested for the formation and meaning-predictability of potential complex words. The word-formation experiment was based on three sets of tasks; these involved giving names to Agents, including (i) multiple choice; (ii) naming based on a description; and (iii) naming based on drawings of people in unusual situations. The experiment was evaluated in terms of two tendencies competing in each act of word-formation: the tendency towards **semantic transparency** vs. the tendency towards **economy of expression**.

The meaning predictability experiment included potential complex words. The respondents were asked to propose as many meanings for each of them as they could think of, and to rate their level of acceptability. This kind of experiment can be advantageously evaluated using Luce's (1959) choice rule which makes it possible to weigh the strength of the most predictable reading against the strength of any number of competing number of readings.

Each group of respondents that resulted from the Torrance test was evaluated in terms of the results obtained by both the word-formation and the meaning predictability experiments. This will enable us to draw conclusions on the interrelatedness between the four creativity indicators, on one hand, and the word-formation and meaning predictability, on the other.

#### References:

- Aronoff, Mark. 2013. Competition and the Lexicon. To appear in Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of La Società di Linguistica Italiana. Prepublication paper.
- Bauer, L. 2009. Competition in English word-formation. In Anns van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 177-198.
- Gagné, Christina L. & Shoben, E. J. 1997. The influence of thematic relations on the comprehension of modifier-noun combinations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, 71-87.
- Lindsay, M. and M. Aronoff. 2013. Natural Selection in Self-Organizing Morphological Systems. In F. Montermini, G. Boyé, and J. Tseng (eds.), *Morphology in Toulouse: Selected Proceedings of Décembrettes 7*. Munich: Lincom Europa
- Luce, Robert Duncan. 1959. *Individual Choice Behaviour*. New York: Wiley.
- MacWhinney, Brian, Malchukov, Andrej, and Moravcsik, Edith (eds.) 2014. *Competing Motivations in Grammar and Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spalding, T. L., Gagné, C. L., Mullaly, A. C., & Ji, H. 2010. Relation-based interpretations of noun-noun phrases: A new theoretical approach. In S. Olson (ed.), *New impulses in word-formation* (Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 17), Buske, Hamburg, 283-315.

---

**Vesna Kalafus Antoniová,**

P. J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovak Republic

## ONOMASIOLOGICAL STRUCTURE RULES IN ENGLISH WORD-FORMATION

Nominal compounds represent one of the greatest part of the present day inventory of English words. Despite their frequent use in everyday language and their apparent structural simplicity, these units hide much more intricacies that one may expect, especially when it comes to their semantics. Based on a 616 586-item corpus, this paper examines the internal structure of English nominal compounds in terms

of semantic categories with the primary aim of delimiting a set of onomasiological structure rules. The paper opens with a brief theoretical overview of the past research on the meaning relationships of N+N units (Štekauer 2005, Gagné&Spalding 2014, ten Hacken 2016, Fernández-Domínguez 2016). Then, it discusses some of the major methodological difficulties related to the collection of data from the corpus. The empirical part subsequently analyzes a sample of 500 N+N compounds from an onomasiological point of view. Based on the results of an analysis, the paper formulates a number of onomasiological structure rules which function as constraints on the interpretation of these units. Finally, the paper outlines some perspectives for future research of this topic.

## References

- Bauer, Laurie. 1998. When is a sequence of noun+noun a compound in English? *English language and linguistics* 2 (1): 65-86.
- Bauer, Laurie and Tarasova, Elizaveta. 2013. "The meaning link in nominal compounds", *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10 (3): 2-18
- Bauer, Laurie; Körtvélyessy, Livia; Štekauer, Pavol. 2015. *Semantics of Complex Words*. Dordrecht : Springer, 2015.
- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús. 2010. "N+N compounds in English: Semantic categories and the weight of modifiers", *Brno studies in English* 36 (1): 47-76.
- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús. 2016. "The semantics of primary NN compounds: from form to meaning, and from meaning to form". In P. ten Hacken (ed.) *The Semantic of Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press. pp. 129-149
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2000. *English word-formation. A history of Research (1960-1995)*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2005. *Meaning Predictability in Word-Formation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Štekauer, Pavol 2016. "Compounding from an onomasiological perspective." In: P. ten Hacken (ed.) *The Semantics of Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 54–68.
- Štekauer, Pavol, Valera, Salvador, Körtvélyessy, Livia. 2012. *Word-Formation in the World's Languages. A Typological Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarasova, Elizaveta. 2013. *Some new insights into the semantics of English N+N compounds*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Victoria University of Wellington.

---

**László Károly,**

Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Sweden

## **SEMANTIC CORRELATION BETWEEN BINOMINAL CONSTRUCTIONS AND DENOMINAL NOMINALS IN TURKIC**

Turkic languages extensively use both compounding and derivation as means of word-formation, and both techniques can often express the same semantic concepts. For instance, Turkish *tuz kutusu* [salt container-poss.3sg] and *tuzluk* (← *tuz* 'salt') can equally refer to a 'salt-cellar'. Similar to this, both Turkish *kamyon şoförü* [lorry driver-poss.3g] and *kamyoncu* (← *kamyon* 'lorry') mean a 'lorry driver'. The main goal of the presentation is to compare binominal constructions and denominal nominals in terms of their semantic capacity, interchangeability and competitiveness. The description is based on a wide range of older and modern Turkic languages allowing family-internal generalisation.

Grammars of the Turkic languages, see e.g. Erdal (2004) for Old Turkic, Lewis (1967) and Kornfilt (1997) for Turkish, often present compounding in an oversimplified form and cite a limited number of ad hoc examples based on the introspection of their authors. Other descriptions with an effort at systematization provide just cursory overview, see e.g. Göksel (2009) and Károly (2016). For that reason, first we present a complete list of possible construction types with an emphasis on endocentric ones. These are (1) juxtapositions, (2) possessive constructions, (3) izafet constructions, (4) relational constructions, and (5) phrasal compounds.

Using the categories of Levi (1978) and Estes & Jones (2006), we then define a set of possible semantic relation ( $\mathcal{R}$ ) types, which allow unequivocal comparison of binominal constructions and derived nominals, see e.g.:

- (1) mezarların yeri [grave-pl-gen place-poss.3sg] ‘cemetery’  
mezarlık ‘cemetery’ ← mezar ‘grave’
- (2) yol arkadaşı [way friend-poss.3sg] ‘fellow traveller’  
yoldaş ‘comrade, fellow traveller’ ← yol ‘way’

Then we discuss the Turkic denominal nominalizers and their relation to binominal constructions. Our data makes it evident that the semantic relations represented by a nominalizing suffix fall into a limited number of categories. The greater semantic variability of binominal constructions is due to the fact that they encompass two independent lexical elements, whereas derivatives are only based on single lexical items. However, derived nominals cannot always be expressed by composition of two nominal constituents, see e.g. Turkish çocukluk (← çocuk ‘child’) ‘childhood’ and çocuk olma durumu [child being state-poss.3sg] as its shortest equivalent expressing the same relation. We conclude that the reciprocal relationship between binominal constructions and denominal nominals is because of their different compositional and structural degree of complexity (Rescher 1998).

## References

- Erdal, M. 2004. A grammar of Old Turkic [Handbook of Oriental Studies 8, Central Asia 3]. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Estes, Z. & Jones, L. L. 2006. Priming via relational similarity: A COPPER HORSE is faster when seen through a GLASS EYE. *Journal of Memory and Language* 55(1): 89–101.
- Göksel, A. 2009. Compounds in Turkish. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 2: 213–236.
- Károly, L. 2016. Tatar, in *Word-Formation. An international Handbook of the Languages of Europe 5* [Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (HSK) 40.5], P. O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, F. Rainer (eds), 3398–3413. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish Grammar* [Descriptive grammars]. New York: Routledge.
- Levi, J. N. 1978. *The syntax and semantics of complex nominals*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University.
- Rescher, N. 1998. *Complexity. A Philosophical Overview*. New Brunswick & London: Transaction Publishers.

---

**Mathew Knowles,**

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

## ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN KOREAN: MORPHOLOGICAL INTERACTIONS AND THE IMPACT ON KOREAN PERCEPTIONS

When words move from one language to another, ‘nativisation’ allows loanwords to ‘become assimilated and undistinguishable from indigenous’ language (Katamba, 2003:139). For reasons of need (Matras, 2009), prestige (Crystal, 2011) or nuance (Cook, 2013), South Korea’s political and economic

contact with the Anglosphere has resulted in language contact and borrowing of English words into the Korean language.

A corpus of English loanwords was compiled from 32 South Korean newspaper articles. The corpus indicates that 77.3% of loans were unaffixed loans while 19.1% of loanwords from English carried Korean morphemes. English loans demonstrated affixation with Korean nouns to form compounds and with clitic morphemes, e.g. camera-ga. Some lexemes (e.g. the noun (sports) fan) occurred with and without morpheme blending (chukgu-fan meaning ‘soccer fan’), supporting the notion that modification can occur after borrowing (Winter-Froemel, 2008).

A survey was then designed to investigate 49 Korean speakers’ perceptions of the ‘nativeness’ of loans regarding the presence and absence of Korean morphemes. Perceived ‘nativeness’ was negatively affected by Korean morphemes affixed to English lexemes. In contrast, English loanwords without affixation were more accepted. Ultimately, this study proposes approaches to more detailed investigation of the factors that lead to loanwords acquiring the perceived quality of ‘nativeness’.

Keywords; corpus linguistics, loanwords, borrowing, morphology

---

**Ewa Konieczna,**

University of Rzeszow, Poland

## **COMPLETED ACTIONS IN POLISH AND ENGLISH: IN SEARCH OF COMMON ASPECTUAL GROUND**

Typologically different languages exhibit considerable variety in terms of marking aspectual distinctions. Polish, belonging to the Slavic group employs prefixes, which apart from encoding perfective aspect may also mark situation aspect, i.e. Aktionsart, with the former frequently interacting with the latter (Śmiech, 1986; Swart, 2012). English, representing Germanic languages, encodes aspect periphrastically, making a distinction between progressive and non-progressive actions. Additionally, English marks contrast between telic and atelic events (Dowty, 1979), which is either context-dependent or realised by means of telic particles. Given this, the application of traditional theoretical frameworks for the discussion of aspectual oppositions in Polish and English yields two unrelated accounts without the possibility of comparing verbal aspect in the two languages under study.

However, in the recent model proposed by Croft (2012: 53), which offers a two-dimensional phasal analysis of aspectual types, involving a description of the development of an event in time and the change of its quality in each of the phases, it is possible to find correspondences between aspectual distinctions in any typologically different languages due to the fact that aspectual classes are described at the lower level of abstraction. Consequently, the present paper constitutes an attempt at finding common ground for the comparison of aspectual potential of verbs denoting completed actions (accomplishments in the sense of Vendler, 1957) in Polish and English.

---

**Lívía Körtvélyessy,**

P.J. Safarik University, Kosice, Slovakia

## **ON THE POSITION OF ONOMATOPOEIA IN WORD-FORMATION**

Onomatopoeia has not been paid much attention in theoretical linguistics, which may be related to its symbolic-iconic nature. Moreover, the concept of onomatopoeia and its classification seems to vary in different linguistic traditions. This paper pursues the objective of clarifying the position of onomatopoeia in the system of language with regard to different theoretical frameworks and proposes a new theoretical approach to it. The point of departure is Saussurean theory of linguistic sign that has faced criticism for various, many times unjustified, reasons. The paper reveals certain bottlenecks of this kind of criticism aimed at Saussure's comprehension of onomatopoeia. Furthermore, the paper explores the postulated 'uniqueness' of onomatopoeia by mapping its behaviour at the level word-formation in two typologically different languages - English and Slovak.

---

**Petr Kos,**

University of South Bohemia in České Budejovice, Czech Republic

## **METAPHOR AND METONYMY AS A MEANS OF FORMAL ECONOMY**

Within Štekauer's onomasiological model (1998, 2005), the conflict between the explicitness of expression and the economy of expression in WF is discussed on the structural, onomasiological, level in connection to different onomasiological types (e.g. Körtvélyessy et al. 2015). The aim of the paper is to demonstrate that formal economy is achieved on the onomatological level too, through the use of metaphor and metonymy, this being a universal feature across languages. Metaphor, among other things, enables the compression of the constituents of the onomasiological structure into a formally less complex expression. For example, the semantic constituents TREECREEP-AGENT can have literal realization as treecreeper, or the agent and the determined constituent are compressed into metaphoric mouse, as in tree mouse, or the agent and both determined and determining constituents are compressed into squirrel, as in squirrel bird; all these names referring to the identical referent. Formal economy is also achieved by A MEMBER OF A CATEGORY FOR CATEGORY metonymy, as in sparrow hawk, chicken hawk, the Swedish speckhök (finch hawk), or Czech vrabčák (sparrow+suff.), denoting any small bird that the same referent, a bird of prey, feeds on. The topic thus further elaborates on Štekauer's theory. The presentation will be illustrated by samples of bird names across languages.

### **References**

- Körtvélyessy, L., Štekauer, P., Zimmermann, J. (2015). Word-Formation Strategies: Semantic Transparency vs. Formal Economy. In: Bauer, L., Körtvélyessy, L., Štekauer, P. (eds.) *Semantics of Complex Words*. Springer
- Štekauer, P. (1998). *An onomasiological theory of English word-formation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.
- Štekauer, P. (2005). Onomasiological approach to word-formation. In: Štekauer, P. & Lieber, R. (eds.), *Handbook of word-formation*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Cardiff University, Wales

- (1) ani eyze snob-it 'I am some snob' (<http://www.tapuz.co.il/blogs/viewentry/371153>) (2) ani  
eyze snob-a 'I am some snob'  
(<https://stips.co.il/ask/4988953/%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%94-%D7%9C%D7%A1%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%91%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%90%D7%95->

%D7%9E%D7%99-%D7%A9%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%99%D7%9F-  
%D7%AA%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9)

(3) hi mamaš larj-it 'she is really large(generous)' (celebs.walla.co.il/item/2968806)

snob takes -it or -a , while larj takes only -it. Most loanwords take -it , but web searches reveal words that take both. This results from the interaction of semantic and morphological criteria.

#### Derogatory meaning

Most of these words are derogative (debil 'stupid'). Hebrew has feminine derogatory loanwords with no masculine base, and the majority of them end with -a (pustem-a 'blockhead' (\*pustem)). This makes -a more typical of derogatory meaning. Consequently, it is attached to other words, competing with -it.

#### Foreign affixation

Loanwords with foreign suffixes take only -it (tizer-it 'teaser (provocative)', klules-it 'clueless'), as speakers perceive them as typical loanwords. In contrast, loanwords with -a have no particular foreign structure and resemble native words. Such words act as an intermediate category between native and non-native words.

The study adds to previous accounts of morphological variation and change. It enables to shed light on the motivation for such change from morphological and semantic perspectives.

---

**Varvara Magomedova,**

Stony Brook University, US

**Natalia Chuprasova,**

State University of Saint-Petersburg, Russia

**Natalia Slioussar,**

Higher School of Economics and State University of Saint-Petersburg, Russia

### **GENDER STABILITY IN RUSSIAN EXPRESSIVE NOUNS**

Slioussar & Malko (2016) propose that apart from markedness, gender has a property of stability, basing on the agreement attraction data. They have found that masculine gender is the most resistant to the attraction, while neuter is least resistant. To study the gender stability on the word level we chose expressive suffixes that would pattern the resulting form to a different declension class than the base noun. For example, monstrMASC 'monster' → monstriščeMASC?NEUT 'big monster'. We have performed an experiment where participants were asked to pick an adjective for a form they saw on the screen. Our goal was to see, which gender do speakers assign to these forms. We got the same results as Slioussar & Malko (2016) did on the phrase level – masculine gender is the least likely to be changed as a base gender (monstrMASC 'monster' →

monstriščeMASC?NEUT 'big monster') and is the most likely to be assigned (e.g. sobakaFEM 'dog' → sobačokFEM?MASC 'little dog'). This is interesting, because on the phrase level the default gender is neuter (Corbett & Fraser 2002) and on the word level it is masculine (Corbett & Fraser 2002, Rice 2005 among others)

## References

- Slioussar, N. and Malko, A., 2016. Gender agreement attraction in Russian: production and comprehension evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
- Corbett, G. G., & Fraser, N. M. 2002. Default genders. *Mouton Classics: From Syntax to Cognition. From Phonology to Text*, 297.
- Rice, C. 2005. Optimizing Russian gender: A preliminary analysis. Fourteenth meeting on formal approaches to slavic linguistics: The South Carolina meeting, 265-275

---

**Varvara Magomedova,**

Stony Brook University, US

## WHAT DO BABYTALK AND OBSCENE WORDS HAVE IN COMMON?

In this paper, I argue that expressive forms have a marker of being expressive which may or may not coincide with markers of diminutive, augmentative, intensification, attenuation etc. There is at least one language, where the expressiveness is marked, but no further distinction (e.g. augmentative vs diminutive) is made – Bicol (Mattes, 2006). There are also languages that have the same form for attenuation and intensification. I argue, that the expressiveness can also be marked in the languages that have the diminutive vs augmentative distinction and that in Slavic languages it is marked with palatalization. Contrary to (Alderete & Kochetov, 2017) expressive palatalization goes both ways – both augmentative and diminutive suffixes trigger palatalization in Slavic languages. Second, there are pairs of homonymous suffixes, where one suffix is expressive and the other is not. In this case, palatalization only appears in the expressive form. For example, the suffix -uška: loh (fool) à lohuška (foolFEM) vs volk (wolf) à volčuška (little wolf). Third, in languages where the decay of stem-final consonant mutation (into alveo-palatal or palatal) is observed (e.g. Russian, Ukrainian) palatalization triggered by expressive suffixes or non-expressive suffixes in obscene words, are much more stable than those in non-expressive forms.

## References

- Mattes, V., 2006, January. One Form Opposite Meanings? Diminutive and Augmentative Interpretation of Full Reduplication in Bikol. In Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (pp. 17-20).
- Alderete, J. and Kochetov, A., 2017. Integrating sound symbolism with core grammar: The case of expressive palatalization. *Language*, 93(4), pp.731-766.

---

**Stela Manova,**

University of Vienna, Austria

**Renáta Gregová,**

P. J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovak Republic

## ON THE ORIGIN OF DIMINUTIVES: INFLECTIONAL DIMINUTIVES, DIMINUTIVES PROPER, DOUBLE AND MULTIPLE DIMINUTIVES IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

It is well known that there is a diachronic link between diminutive suffixes and linguistic items expressing the relation between ‘the adult and the young’ (Grandi 2011). Manova (2005) supports this

idea by the claim that in Slavic languages, the origin of diminutives can be explained with the help of the so-called nt-stems, an inflectional class that comprised the young of animals in Old Church Slavic (OCS), e.g. tel-ę ‘calf-nom.sg’ → tel-ęte ‘calf-gen/loc.sg’; -ę developed into the inflection -e and -ęte into the very productive diminutive suffix -ence in Modern Bulgarian (MB) (tel-e ‘calf’ → tel-ence ‘calf-dim’). Ivanova-Mircheva & Xaralampiev (1999) assumed that in colloquial Old Bulgarian (OCS) all diminutives belonged to the nt-stems, i.e. -ę marked diminutivization. This assumption explains the inflectional diminutives in MB, e.g. meč-ka ‘bear’ → meč-e ‘teddy-bear & bear-dim’, cf. the diminutives meč-ence → meč-enc-ence, etc. We analyze diminutives from animals and their offspring and dialectal diminutives and demonstrate that those forms, if seen as paradigmatically organized, allow for a number of interesting observations. In addition to the South Slavic data from Bulgarian, we consider parallel examples from East and West Slavic languages, the goal being to draw conclusions relevant to the whole Slavic family.

## References

- Grandi, N. 2011. Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European evaluative morphology. In *Diminutives and Augmentatives in the Languages of the World*. Lexis: e-J. Engl. Lexicology 6, eds. Livia Körtvélyessy and Pavol Stekauer, 5–25. [http://lexis.revues.orgimg/pdf/Lexis\\_6.pdf](http://lexis.revues.orgimg/pdf/Lexis_6.pdf)
- Manova, S. 2005. Derivation versus inflection in three inflecting languages. In *Morphology and its Demarcations. Selected Papers from the 11th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 2004*, eds. Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky, Oskar Pfeiffer, and Franz Rainer, 233–252. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mircheva-Ivanova, D. & I. Xaralampiev. 1999. *Istorija na bălgarskija ezik / A History of the Bulgarian Language*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

---

**Elise Mignot,**

Sorbonne University, France

## CLIPPING IN ENGLISH - AND WHAT IT TELLS US ABOUT NOUNS.

I articulate issues of word-formation and a reflexion on lexical classes, more specifically nouns.

My aim is to show that the formation of nouns involves more opacification processes than the formation of adjectives or verbs. This, I argue, has to do with the semantic specificity of nouns. Better and more than any other part of speech, they categorize. Now, how do we name categories? Not by their “prototypes” (Rosch 1978), because they would not hold for all members. Not by a common feature either, because in most cases there is not one (Wittgenstein 1953, Rosch 1978). The only way is to resort to opacity (or “arbitrariness”, in Saussure’s terms).

My overall corpus consists of 10042 words (nouns, adjectives and verbs), extracted from the Concise Oxford Dictionary.

Here I focus on clipping as a case study to illustrate my more general point. My corpus contains 216 instances of clippings, 93% of which are nouns.

First I summarize what we know about clipping, and describe my corpus.

Then I explain why I interpret clipping as an opacification process, and argue that it gives us some insight into the procedural (or: instructional) meaning of nouns.

## References

- Ackema, Peter. 1999. *Issues in Morphosyntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2004. *Beyond Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adams, Valerie. 1973. *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Routledge.
- Adams, Valerie. 2001. *Complex Words in English*. London: Pearson Education.
- Anderson, Sephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.
- Aronoff, Mark & Kirsten Fudeman. 2005. *What is Morphology?* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Lexical word-formation. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1621-1721.
- Bauer, Laurie, Livia Körtevélyessy, PavolŠtekauer (eds.). 2015. *Semantics of Complex Words*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Booij, Geert. 2005. *The Grammar of Words. An Introduction to Linguistic Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booij, Geert. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin & A. Sims. 2010 (2nd. edition). *Understanding Morphology*. London: Hodder Education.
- Hippisley, Andrew & Gregory Stump (eds.). 2016. *The Cambridge Handbook of Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Rosch, Eleanor. 1978. Principles of Categorization. In Rosch Eleanor & Barbara B. Lloyd (eds), *Cognition and Categorization*. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum, 27-48.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1967 (1916). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.
- Spencer, Andrew & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.). 2001. *The Handbook of Morphology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Štekauer, Pavol& Rochelle Lieber (eds.). 2005. *Handbook of Word-Formation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Szymanek, Bogdan. 1989. *Introduction to Morphological Analysis*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1953 / 1978. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by Gertrude E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

---

**Makiko Mukai,**

Faculty of Cultural Studies, University of Kochi, Japan

## REASONS FOR PRODUCTIVITY OF RECURSIVE COMPOUNDS

Recursion at word-level is productive in many languages across the world, just as at phrase is (Roeper, Snyder and Hiramatsu 2002, Bisseton 2010). The standard assumption is that left-branching recursive compounds (e.g. [[student film] society]) are more productive than right-branching recursive compounds (e.g. [student [film society]]) (Berg 2007, Pöll 2015, Tokizaki 2011, Mukai 2008, 2017). However, this assumption has hardly ever been tested empirically in more detail. Using British National Corpus for British English and National Web Japanese Corpus for Japanese and native speaker's judgements on the semantic interpretation of the data, we found that the prediction is borne out. In other words, left-branching recursive compounds are preferably interpreted as left-branching. After presenting representative data from each language I will propose that leftbranching recursive compounds [[A B] C] are easier to parse, since a constituent can be formed earlier than in [A [BC]] structures (Pöll 2015). To explain this difference, I will propose a theoretical analysis within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 2008, 2013), given that compounding is morphology-syntax (Harley 2009, Nöbrega (2015)).

At the end of this talk I will conclude my talk with further implications of my analysis for comparatively restricted recursive compounds in Romance languages.

---

**Akiko Nagano,**

Tohoku University, Japan

**Masaharu Shimada,**

Tohoku University, Japan

## **ON TWO LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES OF BORROWING PREPOSITIONS AND PARTICLES**

In contact situations, verbs and P-items (prepositions/particles) are not borrowed as easily as nouns (Moravcsik 1978). Muysken (2000, 2016) argues that foreign verbs are borrowed via two main strategies: (i) Insertion into VP head position or (ii) Adjunction to recipient's helping verbs corresponding to 'do', 'make', 'be', etc. We examine how English P-items are casually used in Internet written-Japanese communication and argue that Muysken's two strategies can also be attested in P-borrowing. Muysken's data suggest that the choice between the two strategies primarily depends on the donor/recipient combination, but we observe that both Insertion and Adjunction are employed in the same contact situation. In our case, strategy-choice correlates with the preposition vs. particle distinction of the original P item. English particles such as *up* are borrowed via Insertion into the stem position of Japanese change-denoting predicates, while English prepositions such as *with* are borrowed via Adjunction to the same predicates. P items that have both usages, such as *in* and *on*, can be borrowed via both routes. Because @ stands for *at*, we also touch on "NP @ NP" expressions in Japanese. They suggest the working of construction borrowing as a third strategy.

### **References**

- Moravcsik, Edith (1978) Language contact. In Joseph E. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language* I, 95-122. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter (2000) *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter (2016) From Colombo to Athens: Areal and universalist perspectives on bilingual compound verbs. *Languages* 1 (2); doi:10.3390/languages1010002.

---

**Ryohei Naya,**

Kanto Gakuin University, Yokohama, Japan

## **ON THE TWO FACTORS TRIGGERING SUBHEAD PHENOMENA IN ENGLISH COMPOUNDS**

A left-hand constituent in certain compounds behaves like a head in that it appears to determine the occurrence of a PP complement of the compound:

- (1) a. the healing-time of all ills (Boase-Beier (1987: 67))  
       cf. healing of all ills  
       b. a guidebook to modern linguistics (Namiki (1985: 152))  
       cf. a guide to modern linguistics

Given this behavior, Namiki (1985) calls the relevant constituents “subheads.” In this presentation, I will argue that subhead phenomena can be triggered by two different factors: syntactic and semantic. In (1a), healing functions as a subhead because the head (i.e., time) is a semi-lexical noun (Naya (2016, 2017)); semi-lexical nouns behave in the same way as nominal suffixes (cf. Emonds (2000)), which allow their base words to take complements (e.g., the examination of the patients (Grimshaw (1990: 49))). Accordingly, the PP complement in (1a) is syntactically selected. In (1b), the PP is licensed by guide functioning as a semantic head; book elaborates or clarifies the meaning of guide, specifying its formal characteristic (cf. Benczes (2014)). Namely, it plays the same role as the prenominal modifiers in audio guide, video guide and visual guide. Therefore, guide can serve as a semantic head and license the PP.

## References

- Benczes, Réka (2014) “Repetitions which are not Repetitions: The Non-redundant Nature of Tautological Compounds,” *English Language and Linguistics* 18, 431-447.  
 Boase-Beier, Jean (1987) *Poetic Compounds: The Principles of Poetic Language in Modern English Poetry*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen  
 Emonds, Joseph E. (2000) *Lexicon and Grammar: The English Syntacticon*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.  
 Grimshaw, Jane (1990) *Argument Structure*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.  
 Namiki, Takayasu (1985) *Gokeisei (Word Formation)*, Taishukan, Tokyo.  
 Naya, Ryohei (2016) “A Note on Transparent Heads in Compound,” *Tsukuba English Studies* 35, 79-94.  
 Naya, Ryohei (2017) “Headedness in Compounds and Semi-lexical Categories,” paper presented at Tsukuba Morphology Meeting 2017, University of Tsukuba.

---

**Renáta Panocová,**

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia

**Pius ten Hacken,**

Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Austria

## THE POSITION OF -ATION AND ITS CORRELATES IN THE FORMATION OF PROCESS NOUNS IN SELECTED EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

In general, processes can be expressed by verbs and nouns. In a pair such as English *celebrate* and *celebration*, the verb and the noun express the same meaning, but they are syntactically different. Dokulil (1962) refers to such changes as transposition. Here we will pay special attention to the position of suffixes derived from Latin *-ation*. In Latin, the suffix is *-io(n)*, with the *-n* elided in the nominative singular. It attaches to the supine stem, which for the first conjugation ends in *-at-*, as in *laudatio* (‘praiseN’). Formations with a suffix based on *-ation* appear in a range of languages and show the effects

of the interaction of word formation and borrowing. In our analysis we will pursue two main aims. First, we will explore and compare the mechanisms of the formation of process nouns in English, German, French, Slovak and Russian. Second, the competition between different mechanisms for the formation of process nouns will be investigated in order to establish the position of -ation (or its language-specific correlate) in the word formation system of the five languages mentioned above. Provisional results will provide a basis for formulating generalizations on the conditions in which -ation is preferred or dispreferred.

---

**Joseph Pentangelo**

The Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA

## **PHONESTHEMES AND GERMANIC WORD FORMATION**

The etymologies of English *blood* and *bone* are obscure. Although their cognates are well represented in the Germanic family, both lack clear cognates in other Indo-European languages. Various explanations of their origins have been proposed, including that they may be non-Indo-European (e.g. Hawkins 1987). *Blood* and *bone*, and their cognates, share an initial /b/ with numerous body-related words (e.g. *beard*, *breast*, *bosom*) throughout Germanic. This initial /b/ constitutes a phonestheme. Phonesthemes — “recurring sound-meaning pairings that are not clearly contrastive morphemes” (Bergen 2004, 290) — are present in many Germanic languages, but their role in lexicogenesis is little understood. I suggest that *blood* and *bone* were formed by blending the initial /b/ phonestheme with two preexisting lexemes: PGmc.\**flōda*- ‘something that flows’ and \**staina*- ‘stone.’ Phonesthetic blending may also be the method by which English *dog* was coined (Gašiorowski 2006), and may be a fruitful avenue for future etymological research.

### **References**

- Bergen, Benjamin K. 2004. The Psychological Reality of Phonaesthemes. *Language* 80.2: 290-311.  
Gašiorowski, Piotr. 2006. “The Etymology of Old English \**docga*,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111: 275–284.  
Hawkins, John A. 1987. “Germanic Languages,” in *The World’s Major Languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie. Oxford University Press.

---

**Steve Pepper,**

University of Oslo, Norway

## **ONOMASIOLOGICAL TYPES AND THE TYPOLOGY OF BINOMINALS**

This paper introduces ‘binominal lexeme’ as a comparative concept (Haspelmath 2010) that cuts across the traditional division of language into grammar and lexicon, and of grammar into morphology and syntax. Binominals are **lexical items** that consist primarily of **two nominal constituents** or ‘thing-morphs’ (cf. Haspelmath 2012) and whose function is **to name** a concept that involves an **unstated relation** between two entities.

Binominals correspond closely to Štekauer’s (1998) *Onomasiological Type 3* (naming units with a complex mark in which the determined element is not present), and also to Rainer’s (2013) notion of *relational adjectives and their competitors*, and Bauer & Tarasova’s (2013) concept of *adnominal nominal modification*.

I will first discuss binominals in the context of Štekauer's onomasiological typology and comment on the extensions of the latter, first in Körtvélyessy, Štekauer & Zimmermann (2015) and then in Štekauer (2016).

I will then present an empirically-based typology of binominals. The data consist of 10,000 lexical items from 100 languages that represent 100 meanings, collected using online databases, dictionaries and questionnaires. The meanings cover a range of semantic domains, including body parts (e.g. NOSTRIL), natural phenomena (e.g. RAINBOW) and man-made artefacts (e.g. RAILWAY).

Eight core types of binominal are identified, along with a number of intermediate forms (which are often indicative of grammaticalization paths), and the absence of two expected types is noted. The presentation considers the challenges involved in representing such a typology as a hierarchical structure, and proposes an alternative representation inspired by Croft (2003).

## References

- Bauer, Laurie & Elizaveta Tarasova. 2013. The meaning link in nominal compounds. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(3). 2–18.
- Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2012. How to compare major word-classes across the world's languages. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, Theories of Everything* 17, Article 16. 109–130.
- Körtvélyessy, Livia, Pavol Štekauer & Július Zimmermann. 2015. Word-formation strategies: semantic transparency vs. formal economy. In Laurie Bauer, Livia Körtvélyessy & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *Semantics of Complex Words*, 85–113. Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-14102-2\_6.
- Rainer, Franz. 2013. Can relational adjectives really express any relation? An onomasiological perspective. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(1). <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL22/>.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 1998. *An onomasiological theory of English word-formation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2016. Compounding from an onomasiological perspective. In Pius ten Hacken (ed.), *The semantics of compounding*, 54–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

**Vincent Renner,**

University of Lyon, France

## **UNECÉTONE-ALCOOL BUT UN CÉTOL: ON ASSIGNING GRAMMATICAL GENDER TO FRENCH NOUN-NOUN COMPOUNDS AND BLENDS**

Grammatical gender assignment in French is generally considered to be positionally based in noun-noun compounds – the left element gives its gender to the compound (Fradin 2015a: 392) – while it is erratic in noun-noun lexical blends (Fradin 2015b: 41). These two statements deserve, however, to be somewhat refined or nuanced in the light of varied sets of lexical data. In this paper, I will aim to slightly revise the gender assignment rule(s) for compounds in order to account for the existence of a small class of morphologically right-headed units and I will then zoom in on lexical blends, attempting to find order in the chaos. In contrast to compounds, institutionalized blends tend to be right-headed, a finding that could be explained by the fact that the process of blending blurs lexemic boundaries, makes its morphological outputs simplex-like and thus gives special prominence to word endings (see Lyster 2006). Erraticness thus seems to be rooted in the conflict between the phonological-cum-orthographic basis of gender assignment in monolexemic units and the semantic basis of gender assignment in polylexemic units.

### **References**

- Fradin, Bernard. 2015a. Blending. In Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (eds), *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Volume 1, 386-413. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Fradin, Bernard. 2015b. Les mots-valises : jeux et enjeux. *Neologica* 9, 35-60.
- Lyster, Roy. 2006. Predictability in French gender attribution: A corpus analysis. *Journal of French Language Studies* 16 (1), 69-92.

---

**Alba E. Ruz, Salvador Valera,**

University of Granada, Spain

## **FURTHER ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONVERSION- RELATED PAIRS**

Little attention is paid to the relationship between pairs related by conversion. According to Bauer, Lieber & Plag (2013: 545-549), it lies '[...] somewhere in the range between homonymy and polysemy'.

Conversion is typically included within homonymy (Jespersen 1909-49, vol. I: 84; 1933: 43; Marchand 1963: 176; Adams 1973: 38; Paul 1982: 305; Lipka 1986: 134-135, 137; 1990: 86, 138, 140) but also within polysemy (Lehrer 1990: 208-209; Tătaru 2002, cited in Frăţilă 2011: 56; Zawada 2005: 134, 137; Martsa 2013: 202, 205). The latter interpretation is further complicated by the intervening variable of lexical extension (Crocco-Galeas 1990: 27-28; Dirven 1999: 277-279; Kövecses & Radden 1998: 54-55; Radden & Kövecses 1999: 37; Colman & Anderson 2004: 547; Schönefeld 2005: 149-150).

Not any of these is without problems, and revisions are frequent, even if not always in the literature of morphology. The relationship has thus been regarded as endonymy (Cruse 1986: 130, 133), heterosemy (Brugman 1984, cited in Heine 1997: 9; Lichtenberk 1991: 476-477; Enfield 2006: 297), homomorphy (Quirk et al. 1985: 70-71), hyponymy (Magnusson & Persson 1986: 40-41), paronymy

(Cruse 1986: 132), and zero-derivation (Sanders 1988: 157), to name some. The interpretations multiply themselves in so-called intracategorial conversion as a different type of heterosemy and as synsemy (Magnusson & Persson 1986: 42-51; Persson 1988, cited in Lichtenberk 1991: 576; Persson 1990: 156-161), as a result of the interpretation of the latter, both theoretically and as regards the source quotation. Other references, e.g. Adams (2001: 20) simply do not even consider the need for a special relationship.

This paper is a bibliographical review with a subsequent analysis of how each of these fits the relationship in conversion, understood as a dynamic process with a directional connection.

## References

- Adams, Valerie 1973. *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.
- Adams, Valerie 2001. *Complex words in English*. Harlow: Pearson Education/Longman.
- Brugman, Claudia 1984. Metaphor in the elaboration of grammatical categories in Mixtec. Linguistics department, University of California, Berkeley.
- Colman, Fran & John M. Anderson 2004. On metonymy as word-formation: with special reference to Old English. *English Studies* 85: 547-565.
- Crocco-Gáelas, Grazia 1990. Conversion as morphological metaphor. In Julián Méndez Dosuna & Carmen Pensado (eds.), *Naturalists at Krems. Papers from the Workshop on Natural Phonology and Morphology*. Salamanca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Salamanca; 23-32.
- Cruse, Alan 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dirven, René 1999. Conversion as a conceptual metonymy of event schemata. In Klau-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins; 275-287.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2006. Heterosemy and the grammar-lexicon trade-off. In Felix K. Ameka, Alan Dench & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *Catching Language: The Standing Challengers of Grammar Writing*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter; 298-320.
- Frătilă, Loredana 2011. *Words about Words: An Introduction to English Lexicology*. Editura Universităţii de Vest, Timisoara.
- Goddard, Cliff 1998. *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto 1909-49. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Jespersen, Otto 1933. *Essentials of English Grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kövecses, Zoltán & Günter Radden 1998. Metonymy: Developing a Cognitive Linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (1): 37-77.
- Lehrer, Adrienne 1990. Polysemy, Conventionality, and the Structure of the Lexicon. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1-2: 207-246.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek 1991. Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization. *Language* 67 (3): 475-509.
- Lipka, Leonhard 1986. Homonymie, Polysemie und Ableitung im heutigen Englisch. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 34 (2): 128-138.
- Lipka, Leonhard 1990. *An Outline of English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-formation*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Magnusson, Ulf & Gunnar Persson 1986. *Facets, Phases and Foci: Studies in Lexical Relations in English*. Acta Universitatis Umensis. Umeå: University of Umeå.
- Marchand, Hans 1963. On a question of contrary analysis with derivationally connected but morphologically uncharacterized words. *English Studies* 44: 176-187.
- Martsa, Sándor 2013. *Conversion in English: A Cognitive Semantic Approach*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Paul, Peter. 1982. Homonyms, semantic divergence and valency. *Lingua* 58 (3-4): 291-307.
- Persson, Gunnar 1988. Homonymy, polysemy, heterosemy: the types of lexical ambiguity in English. In Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen and Arne Zettersten (eds.) *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer; 269-280.
- Persson, Gunnar 1990. *Meanings, Models and Metaphors. A Study in Lexical Semantics in English*. Acta Universitatis Umensis. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Radden, Günter and & Zoltán Kövecses 1999. Towards a theory of metonymy. In Klaus-Uwe Panther and & Günter Radden (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins; 17-59.
- Sanders, Gerald. 1988. Zero derivation and the overt analogue criterion. In Michael Hammond and Michael Noonan (eds.) *Theoretical Morphology. Approaches in Modern Linguistics*. San Diego: Academic Press; 155-175.
- Schönefeld, Doris 2005. Zero-derivation – Functional change – Metonymy. In Laurie Bauer & Salvador Valera (eds.) *Approaches to Conversion/Zero-Derivation*. New York, München and Berlin: Waxmann; 131-159.
- Tătaru, Cristina. 2002. *An Outline of English Lexicology. Word Formation*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes.
- Tournier, Jean 1985. *Introduction descriptive à la lexicogénétique de l'anglais contemporain*. Paris et Genève: Champion-Slatkine.
- Twardzisz, Piotr 1997. Zero derivation in English. A cognitive Grammar approach. UMCS.
- Zawada, Britta E. 2005. *Linguistic creativity and mental representation with reference to intercategoryal polysemy*. PhD Thesis, University of South Africa.

---

**Michał Rzepiela,**

Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, Poland

## **THE TERM 'SLOVOTVORNÝ TYP' AND ITS EQUIVALENTS IN OTHER LANGUAGES**

The term 'slovotvorný typ' introduced to the studies of word formation by Czech linguist Miloš Dokulil (1962) gained a foothold mainly among the scholars of central European countries, such as Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland. It has also been submitted there to critical reinterpretations, for example with regard to its adaptation for onomasiological concepts (Štekauer 2005) or to the evaluation of its usefulness in the notional system of word formation (Štícha 2012, 2013). The present contribution aims to investigate its equivalents in other languages as long as they can be detected in the works of scholars formed by different than the Prague school of structural and functional linguistics schools and traditions. It focuses then on the terms which can be seen to describe the class of words united by certain semantic and formal criteria. Terms such as microstructure (Dubois 1973/2002), Semantische Nische (Baldinger 1950, Hüning 2009), lexico-semantic class (Pounder 2000 and others) particularly are discussed. The contribution points out the implications which the adoption of a given term has for interpretation of word formation process. The observations are essentially based upon the studies devoted to word formation in Latin.

### **References**

- Baldinger, K. *Kollektivsuffixe und Kollektivbegriff. Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutungslehre im Französischen mit Berücksichtigung der Mundarten*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1950.
- Dubois, J. 1973 [in]: *Dictionnaire de la linguistique*, Paris, Larousse, 2002.
- Fruyt, M. *Problèmes méthodologiques de dérivation à propos des suffixes latins -cus*, Paris 1986.
- Hüning, M. Semantic niches and analogy in word formation, *Languages in Contrast* Vol. 9:2, 2009, p. 183-201.
- Pounder, A. *Processes and Paradigms in Word-formation Morphology*, de Gruyter Mouton, 2000.
- Štekauer, P. Onomasiological Approach to Word-Formation [in:] *Handbook of Word-Formation*, Dordrecht: Springer 2005, p. 207-232.
- Štícha, F. Jak v epoše elektronických korpusů následovat Miloše Dokulila (Miloši Dokulilovi ke stému výročí narození), *Jazykovědné aktuality*, XLIX (2012), číslo 3 a 4, s. 98-100.

---

**Ken Sasahara,**

Reitaku University, Japan

## **DERIVATIONAL MORPHEME DENOTING MALE HUMAN IN UPPER SORBIAN**

Upper Sorbian is a Slavonic language spoken in Germany and its speakers are bilingual with German. The language has derivational morphemes (čitar “reader” < čitać “to read”), which serves to make a new noun. Its base can be noun, verb, adjective (stem). This presentation deals with the morphemes denoting male human associated with the notion of the stem. Which morpheme the stem takes is fixed, so that the verb rěceć “to speak” is always associated with the morpheme -nik (rěčnik “speaker”), not with -er (\*rěčer). However, this morpheme serves to derivate a noun denoting thing (rěčnik above vs. spěwnik “songbook” < spěw “song”). Previous researches (e.g. Faßke 1981, Šewc-Schuster 1984) contributed to the semantic classification of the morphemes but lack the viewpoint of the derivational process. Here I discuss the combinational possibility in terms of part of speech of the stem and in terms of similarities to and differences with the equivalents in German. Through my research it is pointed out that each morpheme has its core meaning (denoting human, thing, abstract and so on) and that the cases which have non-core meaning are either the result of drift or of approximation to German according to the degree of fixing.

---

**Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald,**

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

## **LINEAR AND NONLINEAR WORD FORMATION IN HEBREW - THE CASE OF WORDS WITH -ON ENDING**

Two major word formation processes exist in Hebrew (in addition to minor compounding, blends and acronyms): (a) a combination of a consonantal root with a template, e.g. *higdil* 'increased' and *migdal* 'tower' derived from the root  $\sqrt{\text{gdl}}$  with the templates *hiCCiC* and *miCCaC*; (b) affixation to a stem, e.g. *balšanut* 'linguistics' from *balšan* 'linguist' + *ut*, *xidon* 'quiz' from *xida* 'riddle' + *on*.

The ending -on demonstrates ambiguous cases of root and template versus suffixed word formation. In many cases it is part of the nominal templates *CiCaCon*, *CiCCon* and *CaCCon* which create mainly abstract nouns in the first two templates. In other cases +on is attached to various stems carrying the following meanings which are not always mutually exclusive and share some of the meaning with words formed by templates: diminutive (e.g. *suson* 'small horse'); collective (e.g. *še'elon* 'questionnaire'); instrumental (e.g. *'ecba'on* 'thimble'); animal and plants (e.g. *zeron* 'harrier (bird)'); periodicals (e.g. *šavu'on* 'weekly newspaper'); and divisional (e.g. *'axuzon* 'percentile'). Thus the ending-on as part of a template and as a suffix creates opacity both in derivational processes and meanings. One outcome of the findings is that syllabic structure is the most prominent factor determining the word structure in Hebrew.

---

**Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald,**

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

## **STRESS ASSIGNMENT IN WORDS WITH +I SUFFIX IN HEBREW**

The purpose of this paper is to describe, analyze and explain the stress patterns of words formed by the homonymic suffix +i that carries different morphological roles in Hebrew – derivational as well as inflectional, e.g. *yaldut+i* 'childish' (derivation) and 'my childhood' (inflection). This suffix functions in two inflectional and three derivational categories: (a) 2nd person singular feminine in verbs (e.g. *kitví* 'write! [f.sg]', *takúmi* 'you[f.sg] will get up'); (b) 1st person singular in nouns, prepositions, and several other words (e.g. *'aví* 'my father', *kamóni* 'like me'); (c) gentilic affiliation (e.g. *germaní* 'German', *síní* 'Chinese'); (d) adjectival formation (e.g. *'olamí* 'worldwide', *cíní* 'cynical'); (e) affectionate expression (e.g. *xamúdi* 'sweetie'). Polysemy seems to occur in gentilic words (c) and adjectives (d), however, each of the functions creates different word classes – n+adj in (c), only adj in (d) – and therefore must be differentiated. The stress in words with the suffix +i is not fixed, as could be seen in the examples above. In most cases the suffix is stressed (except for (e) which is always unstressed). Penultimate stress is determined in each category by various phonological and morphological rules as well as by other non-linguistic factors which will be described and explained in the paper.

---

**Richard Skultéy Madsen,**

Aalborg University, Denmark

## **WORD-FORMATION PREFERENCES OF NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS**

This paper presents the preliminary results of a study of the word-formation preferences in their second/foreign languages of non-native speakers. Thus, the study attempts to bring together linguistic typology and second language acquisition. Several pairs of native – non-native languages, for example Danish (NL) – German (NNL), Slovene (NL) – English (NNL), are tested. The informants are university students of the respective foreign languages.

It is investigated which word-formation processes (prefixation, suffixation, compounding or combinations hereof) are preferred by the informants. Apart from measuring the preferences purely quantitatively on the basis of the frequencies of the various word-formation types, it is also taken into account which word-formation processes come to the informants' minds first when asked to produce new words from certain roots.

The preferences of word-formation processes are correlated both with the informants' native languages and the target languages. The purpose of the correlation is to examine whether the word-formation choices of the informants are influenced more by the typological nature of their mother tongues or by the typological nature of the target languages.

---

**Magda Ševčíková,**

Charles University, Prague

## **DISCERNING ACTION NOUNS FORMED BY A ZERO SUFFIX FROM UNMOTIVATED NOUNS**

The paper focuses on action nouns with a zero suffix in Czech, which are described as derivation from verbs since the action meaning is primarily expressed by verbs (Dokulil 1962, 1968). However, such nouns have a simpler morphemic structure than the corresponding verbs (cf. *beh* ‘run’ – *beh-a-t* ‘to run’) and thus differ from the majority of word-formation types in Czech in which the base word is formally simpler and the derivative more complex. In this paper, 100 top-frequent action nouns extracted from a representative corpus of Czech (Kren et al. 2015) are analysed for features which could support the semantic evidence when determining the direction of motivation between a formally simpler noun and a more complex verb. First, we test whether action nouns derived from verbs do not undergo morphophonemic alternations in inflection (cf. *beh.nom* – *behu.gen*) while in pairs of a base noun and a derived verb the noun is sensitive to alternations (cf. *snít* ‘snow’, which is the base word for *snežit* ‘to snow’, has genitive *snehu*; Millet 1958). Second, we verify the assumption that a derivative is less frequent than its base word (Furdík 1978, Panocová 2017). Third, the valency potential of both groups of nouns is compared (Kolárová 2010).

### **References**

- Dokulil, M. (1962): *Tvorení slov v češtině 1: Teorie odvozování slov*. Praha: Nakl. CSAV.  
Dokulil, M. (1968): *Zur Frage der Konversion und verwandter Wortbildungsvorgänge und -Beziehungen*. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 3, pp. 215–239.  
Kolárová, V. (2010): *Valence deverbativních substantiv v češtině*. Praha: Karolinum.  
Kren, M. et al. (2015): *SYN2015: A representative corpus of written Czech*. Prague: Institute of Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Arts, Charles University; <http://www.korpus.cz>  
Millet, Y. (1958): *Les postverbaux en tchèque*. Paris: Institute d'études slaves.  
Panocová, R. (2017): *Internationalisms with the Suffix -ácia and their Adaptation in Slovak*. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Resources and Tools for Derivational Morphology (DeriMo)*. Milan:EDUCatt, pp. 61–72.

---

**Pius ten Hacken,**

Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Austria

## **RELATIONAL ADJECTIVES BETWEEN SYNTAX AND MORPHOLOGY**

While the contrast between relational adjectives (RA) and other types of adjective has long been recognized, the question of whether to analyse RA+N combinations as syntactic or morphological continues to be controversial. Traditionally, they are treated as the result of a syntactic construction. Thus, to the extent that they are lexicalized, Matthews (1974) considers them idioms, because the RA is inflected. Levi (1978), however, proposed to analyse them as a reflection of compounding. In fact, the range of possible meanings of the RA and the way a choice among them is made in a particular RA+N support a compounding analysis. In ten Hacken (2013), I argued for such an analysis on the basis of a comparison of English, French and Polish data. A question that remained to be resolved is the factors involved in the choice between different compounding constructions. Further data from German and Italian collected by ten Hacken&Muigg (in press) suggest a cross-linguistically shared bias towards expressing certain types of relationships between the head and the non-head of compounds by RA+N.

In my analysis I will explore how this bias can be circumscribed and what consequences it has for the analysis of RAs.

## References

- ten Hacken, Pius (2013), 'Compounds in English, in French, in Polish, and in General', *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10: 97-113.
- ten Hacken, Pius & Muigg, Christina (in press), 'Nominal Compounds in German and in Italian', Konecny, Christine & Autelli, Erica (eds.), *Proceedings of Lexemkombinationen und typisierte Rede in mehrsprachigen Kontext*, Innsbruck 11.-13. Februar 2016, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Levi, Judith N. (1978), *The syntax and semantics of complex nominals*, New York: Academic Press.
- Matthews, Peter H. (1974), *Morphology: An Introduction to the Theory of Word Structure*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

**Simeon Tsolakidis,**

University of Patras, Greece

**Alina Villalva,**

Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

## CROSS-LINGUISTIC ETYMOLOGICAL MISMATCHES, SEMANTIC IMPRECISIONS AND MORPHOLOGICAL CONTRASTS

The present paper is a contribution to the study of challenges and problems arising in the field of word studies or *histoire des mots* (Chantraine 1999) at a cross-linguistic level. To be more exact, in the first part of our presentation, we will refer to language specific and cross-linguistic etymological, semantic and morphological problems that need to be tackled in the field of word studies, using major Portuguese, Greek and Romanian lexicographical reference works. In the second part of our study we will try to highlight the advantages of the European Roots (ER) dictionary prototype (Villalva & Silvestre 2015), which provides us with the possibility to relate words from different languages, etymologically, semantically and morphologically. We will look at two case studies: the cover terms for 'daisy' in Portuguese (*margarida*), Greek (*μαργαρίτα* [*marya'rita*]) and Romanian (*margaretă*); and the Portuguese *fúria*, Greek *θυμός* [*thí'mos*], Romanian *fúria*, meaning 'anger'. We will discuss how the above mentioned lexical items could be integrated and interconnected in ER as a tool reflecting the cross-linguistic common and uncommon grounds of European languages, providing its users with better and more accurate synchronic and diachronic data about the relations of words denoting similar meanings in different languages.

## References

- Chantraine P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (2eme edition). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Villalva A. & Silvestre J. A. 2015. Filling gaps in dictionary typologies: ROOTS – a morphological historical root dictionary. In Silvestre J. P. & Villalva A. (eds.), *Planning non-existent dictionaries*. Lisbon: Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa, 86-102.

---

**Anita Visket,**

University of Pécs, Hungary

## **BARE NP + V CONSTRUCTIONS IN HUNGARIAN – A LEXICALORSYNTACTICALSOLUTION?**

The main issue over the past decade in relation to the Hungarian bare NP has been whether it can be considered a real or an incorporated argument of the verb (Farkas–de Swart 2003, Kiefer 1990–91, Maleczki to be published, Vincze 2011). There are pros and cons to both statements. Hungarian bare NPs are indefinite and non-specific, number-neutral, are never interpreted generically but, at the same time, they can have adnominal dependents, there are no restrictions on their thematic role (though they cannot be objects to Psych-verbs), and their syntactic position is fixed (they behave like preverbs).

In this paper I will argue for bare NPs to be a heterogeneous group, so they must be studied in separate categories to answer the question in the title. Building on the results of recent research on the relationship between possessive constructions and the definite article in Hungarian, I suggest that first, constructions must be distinguished from productive items (a much larger category than earlier thought), second, Vendler's classification must be taken into account. Finally, the remaining items can be analyzed as non-incorporated real arguments even if the syntactic structure of the sentence containing them assigns an obligatory interpretation.

### **References**

- Farkas, Donka, & de Swart, Henriette, 2003, *The Semantics of Incorporation. From Argument Structure to Discourse Transparency*. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Kiefer, Ferenc (1990-91): *Noun Incorporation in Hungarian*, In: KieferKerenc (ed.): *ActaLinguistica Hungarica*, Vol. 40 (1-2), pp. 149-177 (1990-91), Akadémiai, Budapest
- Maleczki, Márta (megjel. előtt): *Verbswithbare (common) noun arguments*. In: *Comprehensive Grammar Resources, Verb phrases in general and finite verb phrases*, Amsterdam University Press
- Szabolcsi, Anna (1994). *The NounPhrase*. In F. Kiefer, & K. É. Kiss (eds.), *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. *Syntax and Semantics* 27. (pp. 179-274). New York: Academic Press.
- Vincze, Veronika, 2011: *Semi-Compositional Noun + Verb Constructions: Theoretical Questions and Computational Linguistic Analyses*. PhD Thesis, Szeged.

---

**Alexander Yemets,**

Khmelnytsky National University, Ukraine

## **TYPES OF CONVERSION IN MODERN ENGLISH LITERARY AND NEWSPAPER TEXTS**

David Crystal notes that language is undergoing constant changes. These changes are particularly obvious in the sphere of vocabulary and word-formation. According to YuryZatsny, in the last 20 years about 65% of neologisms have been created by means of affixation and compounding (2007:165). However, one of the most creative and efficient type of word-formation is conversion. In my report I

would like to concentrate on such type of conversion as substantivation, or nominalization, which involves the creation of new nouns from different parts of speech without derivation.

The most typical is the process verb-noun, in particular modal verb-noun: His novel is a must for all readers (the "Newsweek" magazine). Another frequent example includes the conversion Present perfect form - noun: You are a has-been (J. O'Hara ). A more modern type is the conversion of compound verbal predicates which contain modal verbs into nouns: America is full of "can do" people ( " Newsweek "). In this case the words are given in inverted commas which means they are not adapted in the language of mass media yet. However, the predicate with must is now widely used as a substantivized unit, like must-see, must-read, must-have. The " Newsweek" magazine has a book review page called Must-reads. So, the predicate is completely substantivized. Moreover, such forms are borrowed by other languages, for example Ukrainian. Some 2 years ago our national newspaper "Сегодня" there was an article with a title " Врубелъ - цеабсолютнийmust-сеежовтня" (Vroubel is an absolute must-see of October "). As we can see, the substantivized predicate is given in English spelling as something alien. But must-have is often used in Ukrainian mass-media both in English and in Russian (Ukrainian) spelling: маст-хев.

In modern fiction the substantivized modal predicates are used as an echo, as a reaction to the preceding utterance: I shouldn't have left the house. – The shouldn't-haves are the path to insanity, Nathansaid. (J.Abbot)

In my report I will also single out other substantivated parts of speech such as numerals, adjectives, conjunctions, some of which are part and parcel of the language like But me no buts. At the conference I would like to specify the functions of substantivation which, in stylistic terms, is called transposition and is used as foregrounding in some contexts.

---

**Nadia Yesypenko,**

Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine

## **SEMANTIC FLEXIBILITY IN THE CONCEPT'S REALIZATION IN TEXT**

A domain may be defined as any knowledge configuration which provides the context for the conceptualization of a semantic unit. In this study we explore the role of domains and domain-based knowledge in the semantic structure of the lexemes nominating the concept Freedom. While focusing our research on two lexemes "freedom" and "liberty" that embody the concept in the novels of British literature of the XVIII-XX centuries, the whole array of domains of its conceptualization has been found. Our findings are proved by R. Langacker's thesis, that most concepts require specifications in more than one domain for their characterization (Concept, Image, and Symbol, 1990). The concept Freedom includes in its domain matrix a specification for territory in the spatial domain; activities configuration in the activity's space domain; a location in the domain of restriction/limitation; as well as numerous specifications pertaining to human relations, emotional sphere, and social liberties. A full characterization of the meaning of the words "freedom" and "liberty" needs to make reference to these domains and to incorporate them into the semantic value of the expression. Such an approach commits us to an encyclopedic conception of meaning. The research shows that not all facets of domain-based knowledge are equally central to a word's meaning. Equally, we cannot claim that each facet is relevant to each use of a word representing the concept. On the contrary, certain contexts can cause a particular domain to be highlighted, while others might be background. We conclude that conceptualization associated with a word will tend to vary according to the context in which the word is used. Semantic flexibility shows that context is an essential element (but the only element) in a word's semantic

representation. The concept Freedom is constructed out of elements which reside in a rich network of encyclopedic, domain-based knowledge.

Key words: concept Freedom, conceptualization, domain, domain-based knowledge, semantic flexibility