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1. Introduction

The relation between morphology and syntax appears to be a perennial issue in linguistics. In a standard lexicalist approach to morphology, the boundary between morphology and syntax is quite straightforward. The morphological module defines the notion *possible complex word*, and the syntactic module defines the notion *possible sentence*. The morphological module serves to enrich the fund of lexical items in a language, the lexicon, from which these lexical items can be taken and inserted into syntactic structure. The lexicon contains the list of simplex and existing complex words, and in addition it also lists those syntactic units that have idiosyncratic properties, the idiomatic expressions of a language.

There is also a syntactizing approach to morphology, in which one tries to account for morphological data as much as possible by means of syntactic principles. The structure of words is represented as syntactic trees, and different kinds of syntactic operations apply to these trees in order to derive well-formed complex words. This may lead to a position in which there is no separate module for the construction of complex words, but this is not a necessary consequence. For instance, one may adhere to the lexicalist position by defining morphology as *syntax below zero* (Ackema 1999).

In this paper, I will argue in favour of a view in which the boundary between syntax and morphology is blurred, not in the sense that morphological structure is analysed by means of syntactic mechanisms (hence I stick to the lexicalism), but in the sense that both morphology proper and syntax may contribute in a systematic way to the extension of the fund of lexical units in the lexicon. In other words, certain syntactic structures have a function which is similar to that of word formation processes.

The idea that syntactic structure may be functionally similar to morphology is the core content of the notion *periphrasis*. In its strictest form, periphrasis means that certain cells of the inflectional paradigm of a word are filled by multi-word combinations, for instance by the combination of an auxiliary and a participle. A classical example is the use of periphrastic forms in the perfective passive cells of the verbal paradigm in Latin (cf. Börjars et al. 1997, Sadler and Spencer 2001). In a looser, typologically oriented use of the notion periphrasis it indicates that grammatical categories that are expressed in
some languages synthetically, by complex morphological forms, are expressed in other
languages by analytic constructions, combinations of words. For instance, whereas in
Latin the perfect active forms are expressed synthetically, they are expressed analytically
in most present-day Romance and Germanic languages, by means of an auxiliary and a
participle.

In this paper I will argue that the notion periphrasis should be extended to the
realm of word formation. That is, we should allow for periphrastic word formation,
i.e. the construction of analytic lexical expressions. I will discuss two phenomena
that support this idea, the construction of adjective-noun combinations that function
as compounds, and the construction of particle verbs, which are functionally simi-
lar to prefixed verbs.

2. Lexical Phrases and Compounds

As has been pointed out time and again, more recently for English by Jackendoff
(1995, 1997, 2001), noun phrases of the type A+N may have the same function as
compounds: they provide names for a relevant class of entities for which the language
user needs an expression with which these entities can be named. It is obvious that
many of these phrases have to be listed in the lexicon because of their unpredictable
meaning aspects. This applies to English NPs such as hard disk, big toe, yellow pages
and red tape, and equally to Dutch phrases such as the following:

(1) dikke darm 'large intestine', dood spoor 'deadlock', hoge hoed 'top hat', vrije trap
 'free kick', open haard 'fireplace', vaste benoeming 'tenure', zure regen 'acid rain',
 zwarte doos 'black box'

In the literature on English compounds and phrases of the type A+N there is
often confusion or uncertainty about the formal status of individual cases of such
word sequences: is it a compound or a phrase? In Dutch and German, however,
the grammatical status of A+N can be determined unambiguously due to the fact
that prenominal adjectives in NPs are inflected. For instance, in Dutch we find the
pair zaarkool 'sauerkraut' – rode kool 'red cabbage'. The first one is a compound,
the second one a phrase with an inflected adjective ending in schwa. They differ in
their stress patterns: in the compound zaarkool main stress is on the first, adjective-
al constituent zaar, whereas in the phrase rode kool the main stress is on kool. The
phrasal nature of rode kool can also be deduced from its diminutive form *een rood
kooltje 'a small red cabbage', in which the adjective is schwaless due to the neuter
gender of the diminutive noun (Booij 2002: Chapter 2). For some lexicalized ANs, their
being conventional units is reflected by the orthography because they are written as one
word, without internal spacing, as in blindadarm 'blind gut' and jongeman 'young man'. The
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phrasal origin of these lexical units is still visible because the adjective ends in an inflectional schwa.

The nature of ANs as lexical chunks also manifests itself in patterns of code switching, as observed by Backus (2000: 99). For instance, a Turkish student in the Netherlands used the NP verkorte opleiding 'shortened study program' in a Turkish sentence, presumably because this NP expresses a specific concept in the Dutch educational system.

When AN phrases are used as names, i.e. as terms for categories of entities, they have specific formal characteristics: the adjective is always a bare A, without modifiers. In other words, in this case the A does not project a full AP. As soon as we coin a phrase with a modified adjective like een zeer rode kool 'a very red cabbage', the phrase loses its status as a name for a specific kind of cabbage, and becomes a descriptive expression that describes the properties of a piece of cabbage.

The class of AN phrases with a naming function can be readily extended, and is not a closed set of lexicalized phrases. For instance, as soon as there is a kind of tea to be named with its distinguishing colour yellow, the name yellow tea can be coined. Therefore, it seems appropriate to assume a constructional idiom in the lexicon with the form [AN]_NP with two open positions. This template is a specific instantiation of the general syntactic template for NPs. The relation between the two should be expressed in the grammar somehow. One possibility is to make use of inheritance trees in which most properties of the AN sequence derive from that of NPs in general, as defined by the syntactic module. The important implication is that inheritance trees such as those proposed by Corbett and Fraser (1993) will have to cross the boundary between syntax and lexicon.

In a language that has both AN phrases and AN compounds as productive patterns, there is competition between the two kinds of names. In German AN compounding is productive, whereas in English this kind of compounding is unproductive, and AN phrases are used instead. As is so often the case, Dutch is in between these two languages with respect to the use of phrases or compounds, and uses both options. Compare the following cases mentioned in De Caluwe (1990). In German we have systematically AN compounds, Dutch varies, but is rather similar to English, and English has systematically phrases (AN compounds do occur in English but this pattern is no longer productive, Marchand 1969: 63):

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunkelkammer</td>
<td>donkere kamer</td>
<td>dark room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festplatte</td>
<td>harde schijf</td>
<td>hard disk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Dutch the difference between compounds and phrases is reflected systematically (with some exceptions, as mentioned above) by the orthography: there is no spacing within compounds, whereas there is always spacing between the constituents of phrases. The orthography of the Dutch examples correctly indicates that the first four examples in Dutch are phrases, and the last three are compounds.

The complementarity and competition of these two ways of coining expressions has often been observed (cf. De Caluwe 1990). If one form is chosen, the other is sometimes blocked, and this may be taken as an indication of the lexical status of this phrasal pattern. The following examples from Dutch illustrate this point:

(3)  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{AN phrase} & \text{NN compound} \\
\text{academisch jaar} & \text{academiejaar} \\
\text{*academisch lid} & \text{academielid} \\
\text{koninklijk besluit} & \text{koningsbesluit} \\
\text{koninklijk huis} & \text{koningshuis} \\
\text{*koninklijk blauw} & \text{koningsblauw} \\
\text{muzikale scholing} & \text{muziekscholing} \\
\text{muzikaal talent} & \text{muziektalent} \\
\text{*muzikale school} & \text{muziekschool} \\
\end{array}\]

The asterisk does not indicate here that the relevant word is ungrammatical but that its formation is blocked by the existence of a competing expression. As can be concluded from these data, there is not always a blocking effect. The absence of absolute, systematic blocking is the normal situation for productive patterns of coining lexical expressions. But since blocking is typically an effect of the competition of lexical expressions, these blocking phenomena do support the interpretation of AN phrases as lexical expressions.

There is a special set of complex adjectives that only occur in such AN phrases, the so-called relational adjectives. In (3) above, the adjectives academisch, koninklijk, and muzikaal are used as relational adjectives. Typically, these adjectives cannot be modified when used relationally, and, with some exceptions, they are only used in attributive position. Most European languages make use of such relational adjectives for the construction of NPs with a naming function (cf. Heynderickx 2001).
It has been observed time and again that certain types of phrases can feed word formation, in particular nominal compounding, and not only lexicalized ones (cf. Booij 2002 for an overview). However, it is not the case that all kinds of phrases can be used in this position. It is precisely AN phrases of the kind discussed here that form the most frequently used type of phrase in the non-head position of Dutch nominal compounds:

(4)  [oude mannen] huis ‘old men’s home
     [blote vrouwen] blad ‘nude women magazine’
     [hete lucht] ballon ‘hot air balloon’
     [formele logica] cursus ‘formal logic course’
     [open dag] activiteit ‘open day activity’

This underscores the lexical status of these phrases since it is lexical expressions (idiomatic or not) that form the building blocks for the construction of new compounds. If the left constituent of a nominal compound is a full sentence, such a sentence is indeed a lexicalized expression, e.g. [Ban de bom] demonstratie ‘ban the bomb demonstration’ with the lexicalized sentence Ban de bom ‘Ban the bomb’. In the case of an AN sequence as left constituent of a nominal compound, it can be a non-lexicalized phrase as well (cf. blote-vrouwenblad with the non-lexicalized constituent blote vrouwen ‘nude women’). This follows from the idea that there is a template AN in the lexicon of Dutch, a constructional idiom with open positions.

The similarity in behaviour between NPs and nominal compounds, in combination with the lexicalization of such NPs, also plays an important role in the debate on the proper analysis of certain kinds of nominal lexical expressions in Romance languages (cf. Scalise 1992) and Greek. For instance, Ralli (1992) showed that Greek word combinations such as atomika vomma ‘atomic bomb’ have the status of loose or phrasal compounds (AN constructs with a relational adjective followed by a bare noun), because they behave as syntactic atoms (cf. also Ralli and Stavrou 1998 for a detailed analysis) except that there is internal inflection: the adjective agrees with the noun. Ralli & Stavrou (1998: 258) therefore conclude that these AN constructs have to be generated by the syntax. However, if we extend the notion of lexicon, and enrich it with constructional idioms, it is clear that such AN constructs will be accounted for by a template of the form [A N]_{AN} in the lexicon of Greek.

3. Particle Verbs

Particle verbs or separable complex verbs (SCVs) are combinations of a preverb and a verb that function as complex verbs. Preverbs in Modern Dutch and German are
quite similar in their behaviour. Most of them derive from adpositions and adverbs. In addition, there are some nouns and adjectives that pattern in the same way as preverbs. Preverb-verb sequences in these languages differ from prefixed verbs and verbal compounds in that the preverb is separable from the verb. Dutch and German have two different word orders, XvSOV in main clauses (where V stands for the finite verb), and SOV in embedded clauses. This difference in word order has the effect that preverbs can be stranded at the end of the main clause, as a result of finite verb movement to second constituent position of the verbal part of the separable verb complex. I will now illustrate the separability of the preverbs by means of examples from Dutch (Booij 2002: Chapter 6):

(5) ... Hans zijn moeder opbelde / Hans belde zijn moeder op ‘Hans phoned his mother’
... de fietsen neerstortte / De fietsen stortte neer ‘The cyclist fell down’
... Jan het huis schoonmaakte / Jan maakte het huis schoon ‘John cleaned the house’
... Rebecca pianospelde / Rebecca speelde piano ‘Rebecca played the piano’
... dit resultaat ons teleurstelde / Dit resultaat stelde ons teleur ‘This result disappointed us’

In the first example, the word op ‘up’ that combines with the verb, is also used as an adposition. In that case, the non-verbal element is also referred to as a particle, and the combination is referred to as a particle verb. Particle verbs form a productive class of separable complex verbs (SCVs). In the second example, the word neer ‘down’ is also used as an adverb. The next two examples show that adjectives (like schoon) and nouns (like huis) can also occur in SCVs. In the last example, the word teleur ‘sad’ does not occur as an independent word. The fact that SCVs are felt as word-like units is reflected by Dutch orthography, which requires SCVs to be written as one word, without internal spacing, if the two constituents are adjacent.

The separability of SCVs also manifests itself in the position of the infinitival particle te that occurs between the two constituents of SCVs, as in op te bellen, and in the form of the perfect/pasive participle, with the prefix ge- in between the particle and the verbal stem: op-ge-beld. In derivational morphology, SCVs behave similarly; for instance, the ge-nominalisation of opbellen is opgebel, with the prefix in between the particle and the verbal stem.

A number of these particles correspond to bound morphemes with an identical phonological form; these are real prefixes that cannot be separated from the verbal stem. These prefixed verbs carry main stress on the verbal stem, not on the prefix,
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whereas the SCVs carry main stress on the non-verbal constituent. Thus we get minimal pairs like the following:

(6) SCV                  prefixed verb
    dóorboor 'to go on drilling'    doorbóor 'to perforate'
    ómblaas 'to blow down'          ombláas 'to blow around'
    ónderga 'to go down'            ondergá 'to undergo'
    óverkom 'to come over'          overkóm 'to happen to'
    vóorkom 'to occur'              voorkóm 'to prevent'

Similar facts can be cited for German (Stüebs & Wunderlich 1994, Lüdeling 2001): the preverbs can be stranded and they can be separated from the verb by means of zu 'to' and by the participial prefix ge-.

As is the case for phrasal verbs in English (cf. Brinton 1988), the meaning of the preverb-verb combination (PV-V) in Dutch and German is often not fully predictable, and this implies that at least these combinations are lexical units of some sort. Typically, the preverbs contribute to the aspectual properties of the PV-V, in particular inherent aspect (Aktionsart) such as telicity, or progressive aspect, and thus they may also influence the syntactic valency of the verb, because syntactic valency depends on the Aktionsart of a verb. For instance, the Dutch verb lopen 'to walk' is intransitive, whereas the SCV aflopen can be used as a transitive verb, as in the VP de straten aflopen 'to tramp the streets'. In this respect, preverbs are quite similar to verbal prefixes, which also influence the aspectual and syntactic properties of a verb.

A second domain in which the unitary character of the PV-V combination manifests itself is that of word formation: PV-Vs can feed word formation, both compounding and derivation, as illustrated by the following examples from Dutch (with SCVs in the left column):

(7) deverbal suffixation
    aanbied 'to offer'             aanbieder 'offerer', aanbieding 'offer'
    aankom 'to arrive'            aankomst 'arrival'
    aantoon 'to prove'            aantoonbaar 'provable'
    aantrek 'to attract'          antrekkelijk 'attractive'

deverbal prefixation
    invoer 'to introduce'         erinvoer 'to reintroduce'
    uitgeef 'to publish'          heruitgeef 'to republish'
    uitzend 'to transmit'         heruitzend 'to retransmit'
compound with verbal left constituent

doorkies 'to dial through'  
doorkiesnummer 'direct number'

doorkijk 'to see through'  
doorkijkbloes lit. 'see through blouse,  
transparent blouse'
oberg 'to store'  
opbergdoos 'store box'

Preverb-Verb sequences thus raise the issue of how to demarcate syntax and morphology. On the one hand, PV and V do not form a syntactic atom, as is clear from their separability in various syntactic contexts. Yet their behaviour is similar to that of complex, morphologically derived verbs in the sense that they clearly form lexical units of some sort, expressing aspectual notions and having derivational effects like affecting the valency of the verb.

A syntactic analysis of SCVs has been proposed by Hoekstra et al. (1987). In this analysis, the preverb is analysed as the underlying predicate of a small clause (or verbless clause). This analysis is parallel to that of resultative secondary predicates which can also be raised to the matrix clause. Compare the following surface structures:

(8) ... Jan [zijn moeder tj, [op, bel]v
  John his mother  up calls

... Jan [zijn moeder tj, [boos, maakt]v
  John his mother  angry makes

A problem for such a syntactic analysis is that in most cases the preverb does not necessarily have the same meaning as the corresponding word used as a predicate. For instance, the meaning of op as a predicate is 'finished', but this meaning is not present in the PV-V opbellen 'to phone': zijn moeder op cannot be paraphrased as 'his mother is up', as in the corresponding ...Jan de pap op at 'John ate up the porridge'. Instead, op expresses telic aspect, not only in this particular example, but quite generally when used as a preverb. In other words, these predicates have often been grammaticalized into preverbs, and in most cases the underlying structure as proposed in the syntactic analysis is no longer the synchronic, but only the historical origin of PV-Vs.

There are also various lexicalist analyses of SCVs in the literature. One analysis is to consider them as prefixes, and then to somehow account for their deviant behaviour (their separability) by relaxing the principle of Lexical Integrity. This is the line taken by Neeleman & Weerman (1993) for Dutch. This will not do for phrasal verbs in English, however, since the particle of a phrasal verb cannot be interpreted as a suffix: suffixes are normally heads, and determine the category of the whole expression, unlike particles.
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There are two other important observations about Dutch SCVs that seem to speak in favour of a morphological analysis. First, the addition of a particle may have the effect of category change since particle verbs can also be formed productively on the bases of adjectives and nouns. The power to change category is generally assumed to be a prerogative of morphological operations, in accordance with the Projection Principle which says that syntactic structure is a projection of lexical properties. The following examples illustrate the category-determining power of particle attachment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectival Base</th>
<th>Particle Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>helder 'clear'</td>
<td>ophelder 'to clarify'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoog 'high'</td>
<td>ophoog 'to heighten'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knap 'tidy'</td>
<td>opknap 'to tidy up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leuk 'nice'</td>
<td>opleuk 'to make nicer'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Base</th>
<th>Particle Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoop 'pile'</td>
<td>ophoop 'to pile up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luister 'lustre'</td>
<td>opluister 'to add lustre to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som 'sum'</td>
<td>opsom 'to sum up'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all these examples, the corresponding particle-less verb does not exist independently, and hence it is the combination with the particle that makes these adjectives and nouns function as verbs. Note, however, that these formations differ from verbalizing prefixation in that the adjectives and nouns themselves are turned into verbs. This is clear from the fact that they occupy the verb second position in main clauses, without the particle, as is shown by the following examples:

(10) De fabrikant hoopt de prijzen op. 'The manufacturer raised the prices'

In other words, we have to assign the structure \([(hoog)]_v\) to the second part of the verb ophoog, and the structure \([(hoop)]_v\) to the second part of ophopen.

A second, related argument for a morphological view of particle verbs is that the addition of a particle may change the syntactic valency of the verb. In many cases, the SCV is transitive, whereas the verb itself is intransitive. Again, the Projection Principle implies that changes in syntactic valency must be due to lexical operations. The following examples illustrate the valency change effect:

(11) bel (optionally transitive) 'to phone'
    juich (intransitive) 'to cheer'
    loop (intransitive) 'to walk'
    iemand opbel 'to phone somebody'
    iemand toejuijch 'to cheer somebody'
    de straten afloop 'to tramp the streets'
**rijd** (intransitive) 'to ride'  
**woon** (intransitive) 'to live'  
**zit** (intransitive) 'to sit'  
**de auto inrijden** 'to run in the car'  
**een vergadering bijwoon** 'to attend a meeting'  
**een straf uitzitten** 'to serve one's time'

The notion *constructional idiom* can be used to do justice to both the syntax-like and the morphology-like properties of SCVs. The basic claim is that SCVs all have the following syntactic structure:

(12) \[ \{ X[\_] \}_{v} \] where \( X = P, \text{Adv}, \Lambda \) or \( N \)

By assigning a V'-node to SCVs, we represent their phrasal nature, and hence their syntactic separability. The node \( V' \) indicates a first level of projection above the V-node. It cannot be equated with the VP-node in the classical sense, because we must be able to distinguish between SCVs and VPs that contain NPs: in standard Dutch, VPs of embedded clauses cannot be raised to their matrix clauses, unlike SCVs. Note, furthermore, that the left constituent is a single lexical category, and does not form a phrase. This correctly implies that they cannot be modified.

In structure (12), the verbal position is open, and can in principle be filled by any verb. The non-verbal constituent, however, is specified. That is, there are as many different constructional idioms of this kind as there are words that can fill the left position. For instance, we will have the following constructional idioms:

(13) \[ ([a]_{p}[x]_{v})_{v}, ([d]_{p}[x]_{v})_{v}, ([o]_{p}[x]_{v})_{v} \]

that give rise to particle verbs that begin with *af, door,* and *op* respectively, with a fixed terminal node for the particle constituent. This has two advantages. First, the notion *particle* has no role outside the construction under discussion here, and therefore such words need not be specified independently as particles in the lexicon. Secondly, if a specific particle verb combination is no longer productive, we will not have the corresponding constructional idiom in the lexicon, but only a list of the individual existing cases of that type. Note that there are also cases where the verb only occurs in the SCV-construction, cases like *nabooten* 'to imitate' and *omkaken* 'to fall down'. In these cases, we no longer have an instantiation of a constructional idiom, but of a lexical idiom, with all terminal nodes fixed. Finally, note that these representations correctly predict that the preverb cannot be modified: they do not project a phrase of their own.

For each constructional idiom of this kind, its meaning will also be specified. For instance, the meaning of the constructional idiom *door-V* will be specified as 'to go on V-ing', and the constructional idiom *af-V* will be specified as 'to finish V-ing'.

---

**Note:** The text contains Dutch words and phrases, which are translated into English to facilitate understanding. However, some context and nuances may be lost in translation.
What about those SCVs that do not take an existing verb in the open position, but an adjective or a noun? The obvious step to take is to specify constructional idioms of the type:

\[(\text{op}[x],_{j})_{v}\]

This means that adjectives can be converted to verbs by inserting them in the slot after the particle op. This makes the conversion of adjectives dependent on their occurrence in SCVs, and this is correct since, except for the particle context, conversion of adjectives to verbs is not productive in Dutch (De Vries 1975: 165). Moreover, this approach enables us to express the dependency of A to V and N to V conversion on specific particles. It is indeed the case that the particle op is used productively in this construction, but this does not apply to all particles. It is only the particles op, uit, and af that can combine with adjectives; as for nouns, they can only be used as verbs in combination with af, in, na, and uit:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{adjective} & \textbf{verb} \\
diep ‘deep’ & uitdiep ‘to deepen’ \\
fris ‘fresh’ & opfris ‘to refresh’ \\
zvak ‘weak’ & afzvak ‘to weaken’ \\
\textbf{nouns} & \textbf{verbs} \\
aap ‘monkey’ & naaap ‘to imitate’ \\
beeld ‘image’ & afbeeld ‘to represent’ \\
huwelijk ‘marriage’ & uithuwelijk ‘to marry off’ \\
polder ‘id.’ & inpolder ‘to drain, to impolder’
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This analysis provides us with the possibility of interpreting PV-V combinations as derivationally related to the verbal part. Since they express various aspectual notions, and may have gained in frequency at the expense of the older bound aspectual prefixes, we might think of them in terms of a derivational type of periphrasis. Periphrastic constructions are then seen as a specific subcategory of constructional idioms, namely constructional idioms that are used instead of synthetic forms: they must be used instead of one grammatical word for the expression of specific kinds of grammatical information. Is this the case for PV-Vs, do they replace derivational morphology? The answer appears to be yes. The point is that in languages such as German and Dutch the use of affixes to form derived verbs is very restricted. For instance, Dutch has only one productive verbalizing suffix, -izer, which is exclusively attached to non-native stems. The only verbalizing prefixes of Dutch are be-, ver, and on-, ‘de-‘, and they are not very productive, unlike most of the particles. In other words, it appears that preverbs have taken over the function of verbalizing aspectual prefixes.
This is also supported by the observation given above that Dutch preverbs are also used in combination with nouns and adjectives which are then converted to verbs.

In sum, the constructional idiom approach to complex predicates with preverbs can do justice to the fact that they function as derivational periphrasis. This account is also fully in line with the lexical analysis of such complex predicates in Uralic languages and in German, as argued for in Ackerman and Webelhuth (1997, 1998).

4. Conclusions

The notion *derivationl periphrasis* defended in this paper expresses the insight that syntax may also have a role in constructing lexical units in a productive way. The notion *constructional idiom* appeared to be essential for a proper account of multiword units that function as lexical units, but also exhibit formal properties that show them to be phrasal in nature. This leads to the conclusion that the lexicon of a language does not only contain the list of existing words of that language, its morphological rules, and its idiomatic phrases, but also a set of constructional idioms that indicate how certain types of multi-word expression can be made. The syntactic module will then determine how the units from the lexicon, both words and larger lexical units, will be combined into well-formed expressions. This obviously raises the question how to demarcate the lexicon from the syntactic module, and how to model the interface between the two. Should we replace the notion *lexicon* with the notion *constructional idiom*? I hope to have made it clear that this is an important issue on the research agenda of linguistics.
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