Carola Trips* and Jaklin Kornfilt

Introduction

Abstract: This volume is a collection of papers on typological and theoretical aspects of phrasal compounds. It is based on talks on this topic held during a workshop, funded by the DFG and the NSF, in June 2013 in Mannheim. The papers introduce new data from a number of languages like English, German, Italian, Greek, Turkish and some Turkic languages, and deal with this phenomenon from different theoretical perspectives, locating it on different levels of language and its interfaces. By comparing the phenomenon in different languages we seek to gain a better understanding of its structural, semantic and other properties.

Keywords: phrasal compounds, classification, typology, theory, locus of (simple and phrasal) compounds

Recently, a growing interest in the phenomenon of compounding can be observed in the field of theoretical linguistics. Since compounds are an interface phenomenon of the different components of grammar they serve well as a testing ground for the validity of various models of grammatical theory. This explains the recent publication of a number of wide-ranging works on the phenomenon of compounds; e.g. the volume co-edited by Scalise & Vogel (*Cross-disciplinary issues in compounding*, Benjamins, 2010), and the *Oxford handbook of compounding* (Oxford University Press, 2009), co-edited by Lieber & Štekauer. In the contributions to these volumes, various types of compounds are described from a typological perspective; at the same time, a number of theoretical models are discussed which are very different from one another. What is really surprising, however, is that one especially interesting type of compounds – phrasal compounds – is almost totally ignored. Since phrasal compounds (e.g. *the "Leave me alone" glance*) share many properties with non-phrasal compounds in being for example an interface phenomenon, but are also different in being structurally more complex consisting of both a phrase and a lexeme, exploring their nature, we believe, is even more interesting and insightful.

*Corresponding author: Carola Trips, Universität Mannheim, Anglistische Linguistik/Diachronie, L 13,9, 68131 Mannheim, Germany, E-mail: ctrips@mail.uni-mannheim.de
Jaklin Kornfilt, Syracuse University, Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, 305 HB Crouse Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA, E-mail: kornfilt@syr.edu

In the literature of the last twenty to thirty years, phrasal compounds have only been mentioned briefly and illustrated by the odd example (see, for example, Botha 1981 and Lieber 1988, 1992). In many papers on compounding especially Lieber's examples have often been cited for completeness' sake, it seems, without investigating the phenomenon in detail. In her monograph, Lieber (1992) classifies her examples according to the properties of the phrasal non-heads and comes to the conclusion that any maximal phrase that belongs to an open class can occur, as well as full sentences (IP, CP). The following examples illustrate this:

(1a)   the Charles and Di syndrome (coordinated NP)
(1b)   over the fence gossip (PP)
(1c)   a slept all day look (VP)
(1d)   a pleasant to read book (AP)
(1e)   a who's the boss wink (CP)   [Lieber 1992: 11]

Based on these and other data she suggests a revision of the principles of X-bar Theory which obviously goes far beyond an investigation of phrasal compounds only. Thus, until today there is no thorough *typological* description of phrasal compounds, nor is there a really satisfactory formal analysis of this phenomenon.

Most of the works that address phrasal compounds are limited to individual languages. Here the studies of phrasal compounds in German by Lawrenz (1996), Gallmann (1990) and Wiese (1996) should be mentioned – the latter comparing German and English in this regard, and the two articles by Meibauer (2003 and 2007), where this phenomenon is described in depth and where a morpho-pragmatic analysis is proposed. Concerning structural aspects Meibauer assumes that phrasal compounds in German occur with an NP, PP, VP, CP, and with a DP if the determiner is part of the concept of the whole expression:

(2a)   *das Romeo-und-Julia-Gefühl* (coordinated NP)
        the Romeo-and-Julia-feeling

(2b)   *die Vor-Premieren-Fahrt* (PP)
        the pre-premiere-tour

(2c)   *das Straßennamen-lesen-Tempo* (VP)
        the street-name-reading-tempo

(2d) *der Irgendwas-stimmt-nicht-mit-dem-Jungen-Blick (CP)*
      the something-is-wrong-with-the-boy-look

(2e) *die Das-verflixte-siebte-Jahr-Problematik (DP)*
      the the seven-year-itch-problem   [Meibauer 2003]

For English, there are two studies by Trips (2012, 2014) where phrasal compounds are investigated in a corpus-based study of the *British National Corpus* (BNC) and analyzed in a conceptual semantic framework following Jackendoff's model of Parallel Architecture (1997, 2009, 2010).

For Turkish, there is some discussion of phrasal compounds in work by Kornfilt (2003), Kornfilt & Whitman (2011), as well as in Göksel (2009). Turkish has phrasal compounds one type of which is very similar to the German(ic) type mentioned above. Kornfilt suggests to differentiate between three basic types: the first type is a phrasal compound, where the phrasal component consists of a fully finite clause; this is illustrated by examples corresponding to the German example just cited:

(3) [*Ali   hapis-ten kaç-tı*]   *söylenti-si*
      Ali   jail-ABL   escape-PAST rumor-COMPOUND MARKER
      'The rumor that Ali escaped from prison' (lit. 'The "Ali escaped from prison" rumor')

The second type also exhibits a phrasal component consisting of a fully finite clause, but in this case the clause is followed by a complementizer, and the compound marker does not occur (compare (3) and (4)). A closer analysis may reveal that such constructions are not genuine compounds, but phrases:

(4) [[*Ali hapis-ten kaç-tı*]   *diye*] (*bir*) *söylenti*
      Ali jail-ABL   escape-PAST COMPL a rumor
      'The/a rumor that Ali escaped from prison'

The third type of phrasal compound in Turkish contains a phrasal component consisting of a nominalized clause:

(5) [*Ali-nin hapis-ten kaç-tığ -ı*]   *söylenti-si*
      Ali-GEN jail-ABL   escape-NOMZR-3.SG rumor-COMPOUND MARKER
      'The rumor that Ali escaped from prison' (Literally: 'The Ali's having escaped from prison rumor')

In some of the papers of this volume, a thorough examination of these types will be provided and corresponding cross-linguistic examples will be pointed out.

To date, for languages other than the ones mentioned above, there are no (comprehensive) studies available. However, some recent work does include some brief discussions of aspects of phrasal compounds, e.g. Bisetto & Scalise (2009) for Italian, Bağrıaçık & Ralli (2012) for Turkish and Greek in a comparative perspective, and Ito & Mester (2007) for Japanese. Since our aim is to gain a better understanding of the common properties of phrasal compounds, comparisons between languages are essential. What is needed in particular is a comparison of languages that are very diverse with respect to their morphological typology, e.g. German with its primarily fusional morphological structure, and Turkish with its primarily agglutinative morphology. An additional interesting aspect of this area of investigation is whether the morphological typology of a given language correlates with its syntactic typology, and if so, to what extent. For example, is the structure of the German phrasal compounds determined by the syntactic type of the language as an SOV-language? The fact that German phrasal compounds coincide with at least one type of corresponding compounds in Turkish suggests that the most important factor is the directionality of (morpho-)syntactic headedness: German clauses are head-final, as are Turkish clauses, and simple compounds are also head-final in both languages. This aspect cannot be tackled here but will hopefully be addressed in a further volume in the future.

The papers in this volume bring together new studies of phrasal compounds in Germanic (German, English) and Romance (Italian) languages as well as in Greek and Turkish/Turkic. We hope that it will catalyze further work on typologically diverse languages (e.g. additional Turkic languages and other Altaic languages, such as Mongolian) and spark off a theoretical discussion of various morphological and syntactic models which analyze the phenomenon of phrasal compounds in different ways. Such a discussion will offer new insights into the explanatory adequacy of such diverse theoretical models. In the following paragraphs the articles of this volume will be briefly introduced:

In his paper **"**On "R" in phrasal compounds – a contextualist approach", **Jörg Meibauer** proposes a contextual approach to phrasal compounds in German. He assumes that in phrasal compounds of the type $XP + Y$, a relation "R" holds between the head and the non-head just as in $N + N$ compounds. Discussing three recent approaches (construction morphology, parallel architecture, and indexicalism) Meibauer comes to the conclusion that they all lack a pragmatic component which is necessary for modeling pragmatic inferencing (the question of how R should be understood) with respect to phrasal compounds. Thus, an "unspecific meaning" approach to the semantics of phrasal

compounds, together with contextualist views on pragmatic enrichment, is a serious alternative to the approaches discussed.

In his paper "Phrasal compounds are compatible with Lexical Integrity", **Jürgen Pafel** assumes that (all) phrasal compounds are compatible with the *Lexical Integrity Hypothesis*. Due to the nature of different types of phrasal compounds he makes a distinction between quotative and non-quotative phrasal compounds. The non-head in a quotative phrasal compound is a pure quote which must be analyzed as a noun. As the formation of pure quotes amounts to phrase-to-word conversion, quotative phrasal compounds behave like $N + N$ compounds and thus do not pose a problem for the LIH. As for non-quotative phrasal compounds, he assumes a special rule of phrase-to-word conversion. As a result for him, phrasal compounds are no violation of the LIH, and they show that morphology does not have to be integrated into syntax because words can be built simultaneously with syntactic phrases.

In their paper "Typological aspects of phrasal compounds in English, German, Turkish and Turkic", **Carola Trips & Jaklin Kornfilt** discuss properties of Germanic (English, German) and Turkish/Turkic phrasal compounds. In line with Lieber & Štekauer (2009) they address two relevant questions: what is the formal status of elements building compounds (micro question), and how can we distinguish compounds from phrasal forms (macro question)? They discuss these questions by investigating hitherto proposed definitions and criteria of compoundhood (Donalies 2003) and Lexical Integrity (Bresnan & Mchombo 1995) and come to the conclusion that they do not suffice to explain the nature of phrasal compounds cross-linguistically. In a further step they provide a comparison of English (and German) and Turkish/Turkic phrasal compounds based on the distinction between phrasal compounds with and without a predicate (Trips 2012, 2014, forthcoming). Concerning their formal and semantic properties they find that there are similarities but also differences in that in Turkish, nominalizations as non-heads are possible which function as the argument of the head, as well as fully tensed clauses as non-heads. It is shown that the relationship between the non-head and the head in Turkish phrasal compounds as an argument-head relation suffices to explain the appearance of a compound marker on the head in both simple and phrasal compounds with a noun head, contra traditional as well as contemporary analyses of the non-head as a noun [N] (under which, in some theoretical approaches, the entire phrasal non-head would be inserted, as also proposed by Göksel's contribution to this volume). It is further shown that the semantic as well as syntactic relation between nominalized non-head clauses in Turkish and the head in phrasal compounds is tighter than in corresponding compounds where the non-head

clause is fully tensed. This difference seems to also be relevant in Turkic-internal parameterization of the non-head–head relationship in phrasal compounds; a brief discussion of phrasal compounds in Sakha shows that this relation is looser in that language than in Turkish, when the non-head in phrasal compounds is a nominalized clause (with a gerundive predicate), thus allowing for constructions with semantically rather loose relationships between the head and the non-head, of a kind not allowed in Turkish phrasal compounds with nominalized clausal non-heads. The study concludes by hypothesizing that in Sakha, the non-head might be not a complement or argument, but an adjunct of the head of the phrasal compound.

In their paper entitled "Phrasal vs. morphological compounds: Insights from Modern Greek and Turkish", **Metin Bağrıaçık and Angela Ralli** compare Modern Greek nominal compounds to their Turkish counterparts and propose that Modern Greek nominal compounds are morphological, while corresponding Turkish compounds are syntactically built. Based on this central claim, they offer an explanation for the availability of phrasal compounds in Turkish but not in Modern Greek: phrase-level items can be involved in syntactic compounds, but not in morphological compounds involving solely morphological items. The study further proposes that the locus of compound formation is not confined to a single module cross-linguistically or within a single language, but that the locus of a specific type of compound in a language entails whether or not phrasal compounds with the same overall compound structure can also occur in that specific language. The authors spell out these proposals in detail, also in reference to the "Generalized Insertion" hypothesis of Ackema & Neeleman (2004), while also referring to the Functional Nominalization framework proposed in Kornfilt & Whitman (2011).

Aslı Göksel, in her paper entitled "Phrasal compounds in Turkish: Distinguishing citations from quotations", shows that Turkish presents motivation for distinguishing between citational, phrasal non-heads and quotational non-heads, by using syntactic, semantic, and prosodic tests to distinguish between the two types. The difference, she argues, lies in the citational vs. quotational nature of expressions, which, in this case, leads to two types that differ from one another: citations, which are sensitive to syntax, and quotations, which have the appearance of phrases but are syntactically opaque. The author further claims that only the first type constitutes phrasal compounds, i.e. compounds where the non-head is a *bona fide* phrase, while the latter has quotational non-heads which are of type N. Finally, she suggests that despite their differences, these two have a common structure that she abbreviates as the XN-*si* construction, and she concludes by discussing how this shared structure can host constructions with different properties.

In her paper "Do Romance languages have phrasal compounds? A look at Italian", **Antonietta Bisetto** investigates whether phrasal compounding is a phenomenon of Italian. Although some have observed that peculiar compounds exist like V + N exocentric compounds which allow for NP constituents, no study has so far been devoted to this issue. Bisetto fills this gap by providing a corpus-based study on N + NP constructions and showing that in Italian there are indeed compounds including compound-like phrases. The questions of whether other types of phrasal compounds also exist and in how far the distinction between quotative and citative phrasal compounds would be applicable is a matter of further research.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative
COMPL	complementizer
GEN	genitive
NOMZR	nominalizer
PAST	past tense
SG	singular

References

Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2004. *Beyond morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bağrıaçık, Metin & Angela Ralli. 2012. Construct state nominals and phrasal compounds in Turkish. Handout of a talk presented at WAFL 8, University of Stuttgart.

Bisetto, Antonietta & Sergio Scalise. 2009. The classification of compounds. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), 49–82.

Botha, Rudolf. 1981. A base rule theory of Afrikaans synthetic compounds. In Michael Moortgat, Harry van der Hulst & Teun Hoekstra (eds.), *The scope of lexical rules*, 1–77. Dordrecht: Foris.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo. 1995. The lexical integrity principle: Evidence from Bantu. *Natural language and linguistic theory* (13). 181–254.

Donalies, Elke. 2003. Hochzeitstorte, laskaparasol, elmas küpe, cow's milk, casa de campo, cigarette-filtre, ricasdueñas … was ist eigentlich ein Kompositum? *Deutsche Sprache* 1/03. 76–94.

Gallmann, Peter. 1990. *Kategoriell komplexe Wortformen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Göksel, Aslı. 2009. Compounds in Turkish. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 2. 213–236.

Ito, Junko & Armin Mester. 2007. Prosodic adjunction in Japanese compounds. *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* 4. 97–112.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. *The architecture of the language faculty*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 2009. Compounding in the parallel architecture and conceptual semantics. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), 105–129.

Jackendoff, Ray. 2010. The ecology of English noun-noun compounds. In Ray Jackendoff (ed.), *Meaning and the lexicon*, 413–451. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In Uwe Junghanns & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information*, 129–215. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kornfilt, Jaklin & John Whitman. 2011. Afterword: Studies in syntactic nominalization. In Jaklin Kornfilt & John Whitman (eds.), *Nominalizations in linguistic theory*. Special Issue of *Lingua* 121(7). 1297–1313.

Lawrenz, Birgit. 1996. Der Zwischen-den-Mahlzeiten Imbiß und der Herren-der-Welt-Größenwahn: Aspekte der Struktur und Bildungsweise von Phrasenkomposita im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 24(1). 1–15.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1988. Phrasal compounds and the morphology-syntax interface. *Chicago Linguistic Society, II Parasession on agreement in grammatical theory*. 202–222.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. *Deconstructing morphology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lieber, Rochelle & Pavol Štekauer. 2009. *The Oxford handbook of compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meibauer, Jörg. 2003. Phrasenkomposita zwischen Wortsyntax und Lexikon. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 22. 153–188.

Meibauer, Jörg. 2007. How marginal are phrasal compounds? Generalized insertion, expressivity, and I/Q-interaction. *Morphology* 17(2). 233–259.

Pafel, Jürgen. 2011. Two dogmas on quotation. In Elke Brendel, Jörg Meibauer & Markus Steinbach (eds.), *Understanding quotation*, 249–267. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Scalise, Sergio & Irene Vogel. 2010. *Cross-disciplinary issues in compounding*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Trips, Carola. 2012. Empirical and theoretical aspects of phrasal compounds: Against the "syntax explains it all attitude" attitude. In Angela Ralli (ed.), *On-line proceedings of the Mediterranean Morphology Meeting 8, Cagliari 2011*, *Morphology and the architecture of grammar*, 322–346.

Trips, Carola. 2014. How to account for the expressive nature of phrasal compounds in a conceptual-semantic framework. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 11(1). 33–61.

Trips, Carola. forthcoming. An analysis of phrasal compounds in the model of parallel architecture. In Pius ten Hacken (ed.), *The semantics of compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weiskopf, Daniel A. 2007. Compound nominals, context, and compositionality. *Synthese* 156(1). 161–204.

Wiese, Richard. 1996. Phrasal compounds and the theory of word syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27(1). 183–193.