

CONSTRUCTION-DEPENDENT MORPHOLOGY

GEERT BOOIJ*

1. LEXICAL INTEGRITY

A basic issue in theories of the interface between syntax and morphology is to what extent syntax has access to the internal morphological structure of words. Anderson (1992) is one of the morphologists who proposed that syntax has no access to word-internal morphological structure. This restriction is known as the principle of Lexical Integrity, and has been formulated by Anderson as follows:

- (1) *Principle of Lexical Integrity*
«The syntax neither manipulates nor has access to the internal structure of words» (Anderson 1992: 84)

In recent work on the interface between syntax and morphology by Ac-kema and Neeleman (2005), essentially the same position is defended. In their model of the grammar, sentence grammar and word grammar are different parts of the grammar that only touch each other at the level of lexical insertion where the features of syntactic nodes have to match those of (simplex or complex words). For instance, it is necessary for a proper account of agreement phenomena for syntax to have access to the feature of nouns for the morpho-syntactic category of Number. However, it is not relevant how this feature is expressed morphologically. For instance, it does not matter if the plural suffix of Dutch nouns is *-s* or *-en*. We only need to know if a noun is singular or plural.

The principle of Lexical Integrity as formulated in (1) excludes two kinds of syntax-morphology interaction: manipulation of parts of word-internal structure, and access to word-internal structure. As to the first, I fully agree that syntax cannot manipulate word-internal structure. For instance, syntax cannot move part of a word to another syntactic position. We need this part of the Lexical Integrity principle in order to explain why

* Universiteit Leiden

in Dutch and German the rule of Verb Second that places finite forms of verbs in second position in root clauses, cannot strand the prefix of a complex verb such as *doordénken* 'to think through completely', whereas the particle in particle verbs such as *dóordenken* 'to continue thinking' can be stranded:

- (2) a. Jan door-dacht het probleem / *Jan dacht het probleem door
'John thought about the problem thoroughly'
b. Jan dacht door over het probleem
'John continued thinking about the problem'

Thus, this part of the Lexical Integrity principle serves as a test to find out if a sequence of morphemes is a word or a phrasal lexical unit (cf. Bresnan and Mchombo 1995). For instance, particle verbs in Germanic languages, though clearly lexical units, cannot be words since the particle can be separated from the verb in certain syntactic configurations (Booij 1990). Hence, we have to conclude that they are not words, but phrasal units.

The second form of interface that is excluded by Anderson's version of the Lexical Integrity principle is for syntax to have access to word-internal structure. It is this part of the principle that I will take issue with. I will argue that there are syntactic constructions that can only be properly accounted for if the word-internal structure of one the word slots of those constructions is specified. That is, we have to allow for access of syntax to word-internal morphological structure.

In this paper, I will discuss three types of construction in Dutch for which access to word-internal structure appears to be necessary: the partitive construction, the possessor construction, and constructions with pluralized numerals. These three types of construction will be discussed in sections 2-4. In section 5, I will show how these observations lead to a revision of the principle of Lexical Integrity, and support the theory of Construction Morphology as defended in Booij (2005, ms.).

2. THE PARTITIVE CONSTRUCTION

Dutch features noun phrases in which a quantifier is followed by an adjective suffixed with *-s*. A short overview of this construction is presented in Booij (2002: 52-54). The following examples illustrate this construction:

- (3)
- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| a. | leuk 'nice' | iets leuk-s 'something nice' |
| | mooi 'beautiful' | niets mooi-s 'nothing beautiful' |
| b. | onbehoorlijk 'indecent' | genoeg onbehoorlijk-s 'enough indecent things' |
| | akelig 'nasty' | voldoende akelig-s 'sufficient nasty things' |
| | zoet 'sweet' | wat zoet-s 'something sweet' |
| | mooi 'beautiful' | veel mooi-s 'a lot of beautiful things' |
| | geschikt 'fit' | weinig geschikt-s 'something less fit' |
| | gemeen 'nasty' | meer gemeen-s 'more nasty things' |
| | zoet 'sweet' | minder zoet-s 'less sweet things' |
| c. | smerig 'dirty' | allerlei smerig-s 'all sorts of dirty things' |
| | onaangenaam 'unpleasant' | allerhande onaangenaam-s 'all sorts of unpleasant things' |
| d. | aardig 'nice' | een heleboel aardig-s 'a lot of nice things' |
| | goed 'good' | een massa goed-s 'a lot of good things' |
| | ellendig 'miserable' | een hoop ellendig-s 'a lot of misery' |
| e. | gemeen 'nasty' | wat voor gemeen-s 'what kind of nasty things' |

As shown in (3d-e), the quantifier may consist of more than one word. That is, certain lexicalized word combinations also function as quantifiers.

The quantifiers *iets* and *niets* in (3a) do not occur before nouns, unlike the quantifying expressions in (3b-e):

- (4)
- | | | |
|----|---------------------|----------------------|
| a. | *iets boeken | 'something books' |
| | *niets boeken | 'nothing books' |
| b. | genoeg boeken | 'enough books' |
| c. | allerhande boeken | 'all sorts of books' |
| d. | een heleboel boeken | 'a lot of books' |
| e. | wat voor boeken | 'what kind of books' |

The quantifiers in (3a-b) and (3d) can also be used as NPs by themselves, without a complement. The quantifiers in (3c) and (3e), on the other hand, require a complement:

- (5)
- | | | |
|----|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Ik zag iets | 'I saw something' |
| b. | Ik heb genoeg | 'I have enough' |
| c. | *Jan zag allerlei | 'John saw all kinds of things' |
| d. | Jan kocht een heleboel | 'John bought a lot' |
| e. | *Wat voor kocht Jan? | 'What kind of things did John buy?' |

semantically the *A-s* word is the head of the NP, and denotes a non-animate entity. This is clear from the examples (3b-e). For instance, the NP *veel goeds* quantifies over the non-animate entity 'what is good'. Thus, we have to conclude that the *A-s* word is the head of the NP, and hence an N. This is supported by the observation that the *A-s* word behaves as a neuter noun: quantifying adjectives such as *veel* 'much' and *weinig* 'few' have the form without final schwa that is only used before singular neuter nouns in indefinite NPs.

The analysis in which the *A-s* word is the head of an NP implies that the quantifiers *iets* 'something' and *niets* 'nothing' are special in that they can be combined with a noun of the *A-s* type, although they do not combine with other nouns. The occurrence of these nouns as specifying quantifiers in NPs thus depends on the presence of a specific type of complex word, a noun that consists of an adjective followed by the suffix *-s*. On the other hand, the occurrence of the suffix *-s* after the adjective depends on the presence of one of these quantifiers. Hence, this is a clear case of mutual dependency between morphology and syntax. This implies that in this syntactic construction, the internal morphological structure of the nominal head has to be visible. It is only before nouns of the morphological form *A-s* that *iets* and *niets* can appear in the specifier position of NPs. This shows that syntax may need access to morphological structure.

As argued by Van Marle (1996), we may consider the affixation of the suffix *-s* to adjectives in this context as a case of category-changing inflection because it is quite similar in its behaviour to the inflectional categories «participle» and «infinitive». In the case of participles, word forms are created that have both verbal and adjectival properties (cf. Haspelmath 1996). Infinitives have both verbal and nominal properties. For instance, Dutch phrases headed by infinitives have the external distribution of NPs: they behave as neuter nouns since they select the definite article *het* which is the correct definite article for neuter nouns in singular NPs. Yet, internally such infinitives still have verbal properties since they allow for NPs without prepositions for expressing their arguments, although this is admittedly not the preferred construction:

- (7) *het je* *moeder een cadeautje gev-en*
 the your mother a present give-INF
 'giving your mother a present'

(the preferred construction is *het geven van een cadeautje aan je moeder*, with the arguments expressed by PPs). Similarly, the nouns of the form

A-s appear to keep certain adjectival properties. First, they combine with adverbs, as in (8):

- (8) iets heel mooi-s 'something very beautiful'
 bar weinig verstandig-s 'something not very wise'

The first example contains the word *heel* that only has the meaning 'very' when used as an adverb. Since *heel* is an adverb here, it must be licensed by an adjective, which is the stem of these nouns of the form *A-s*. Secondly, they allow for comparative adjectives as bases, and thus license the occurrence of *dan*-phrases which require the presence of a comparative form (cf. Hoeksema 1996: 63):

- (9) Het is iets grot-er-s dan mezelf 'It is something bigger than myself'

These *A-s* nouns are also similar to infinitives in that they may lexicalize. Similarly, lexicalized participles have lost their verbal properties, and are «pure» adjectives. Lexicalized infinitives function as ordinary nouns, and the same applies to lexicalized nouns of the form *A-s*.

- (10) Het et-en staat op tafel
 The eat-INF stands on table
 'The food is on the table'
 Het nieuw-s verraste ons
 The new-s surprised us
 'The news surprised us'

Such lexicalized *A-s* nouns can occur wherever neuter nouns can appear. That is, their occurrence is not restricted to the partitive construction. Other examples of such nouns are *lekkers* 'sweets' and *moois* 'beautiful things'. Given the analysis of *A-s* nouns as the head of an NP, we explain why the category of the lexicalized words of the *A-s* form is that of nouns.

In sum, the partitive construction discussed here requires the use of a specific suffix with category-changing power. The use of these nominalized adjectives is restricted to the partitive construction. This interdependence between the partitive construction and this type of inflection can be represented straightforwardly by means of a schema that specifies the general properties of this construction, including the morphological shape of the head word:

(11) Partitive construction

[Q [A-s]_N]_{NP} where Q = *iets, niets, weinig, veel, een hoop, een massa*, etc.

Such a schematic representation makes use of the insight that both syntactic constructions and morphological constructions can be represented by means of schemata (cf. Goldberg 2003 for syntactic constructions, and Booij 2005, ms. for morphological constructions). Syntactic and morphological constructions can be unified into more complex schemas that express how morphology and syntax depend on each other. The occurrence of the suffix *-s* in the partitive construction is thus a case of Construction-Dependent Morphology (CDM). Cases of Construction-Dependent Morphology thus support the idea of Construction Grammar and Construction Morphology that both syntactic and morphological patterns should be represented in terms of constructions of varying degrees of abstractness, because syntax and morphology appear to be mutually dependent. The existence of CDM provides clear evidence that the notion «lexicon» has to be replaced with the notion «constructicon» (cf. Goldberg 1995, Jackendoff 2002).

The suffix *-s* is used as a nominalizing suffix in some other cases as well. In these cases, however, the base of the word in *-s* is a noun. It can be used for deriving names for languages from the noun that denotes the area or the speaker of the language, as in:

- | | | | | |
|------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| (12) | Amsterdam | 'Amsterdam' | Amsterdam-s | 'the language of Amsterdam' |
| | Griek | 'Greek (a person)' | Griek-s | 'the Greek language' |

In this case, the suffix *-s* creates neuter nouns, as in the case of the deadjectival *-s*. However, in this use, the suffix *-s* is a clear case of derivation, because there is complete shift of category from N to A.

A third nominalizing use of *-s* is to be found in the construction *op zijn N-s*, in which N is usually a proper noun:

- | | | |
|------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| (13) | op zijn Amsterdam-s | 'in a manner typical of Amsterdam' |
| | op zijn Geert-s | 'in a manner typical of Geert' |
| | op zijn hondje-s | 'in the manner of a dog' |

This latter construction has the form of a PP, in which the preposition slot and the determiner slot are lexically fixed as *op* 'on' and *zijn* 'his' respectively. The possessive *zijn* 'his' must be realized here in its weak clitic form [zən]. The slot for the final noun of the PP must be specified

as $[N -s]_N$. The N is usually a proper noun: the last example in (13) is a lexicalized expression. Again, this use of the suffix *-s* is hence restricted to a particular constructional idiom.

In dealing with the partitive construction (11), the prohibition on syntax having access to word-internal structure as formulated in principle (1) could be maintained, if instead of referring to the presence of a specific suffix *-s*, we refer to a morpho-syntactic property of the words that are produced by adding the suffix *-s* to adjectives. Let us see if this is feasible.

Suppose that we specify infinitives as $[+V +N]$, and participles as $[+V +A]$. This expresses the dual nature of these morphological categories, as discussed above. In such an approach we might assume that nouns of the form *A-s* carry the feature combination $[+A +N]$. This will enable us to specify the construction and its constituents without referring to the presence of a specific suffix. Instead we would refer to the presence of the feature combination $[+A +N]$:

(11)' $[Q \dots [+A +N]_N]_{NP}$

Thus, we could maintain the claim that syntax has no access to word-internal structure.

The problem for this solution is that there are more classes of nouns in Dutch with both adjectival and nominal properties. For instance, we can also nominalize adjectives by means of the suffix *-e* resulting in either animate nouns of common gender, or non-animate nouns of neuter gender. In both cases, the nominalized adjectives keep the possibility of co-occurring with adverbs such as *heel* 'very' and *zeer* 'very', as in (cf. Booi 2002: 50-52):

- (14) *de heel goed-e van de twee kandidaten*
'the very good one of the two candidates'

het zeer plezierig-e van deze aanpak
'the very pleasant aspect of this approach'

Therefore, it does not suffice to specifying the partitive construction by referring to the feature combination $[+A, +N]$ since that feature combination also holds for deadjectival nouns ending in *-e* that cannot occur in the partitive construction:

- (15) **iets goed-e* 'something good'
 **niets plezierig-e* 'nothing pleasant'

That is, we have to refer to the presence of a specific suffix *-s*, for a correct characterization of this construction, and hence syntax needs access here to the internal morphological structure of words..

In the following two sections, we will see that there are more constructions in Dutch for which maintaining the strong version of Lexical Integrity as given in (1) is not possible.

3. POSSESSOR MARKING

Another example of this interaction between morphology and syntax in Dutch is the use of the suffix *-s* in the specifier position of noun phrases. A summary of the relevant facts can be found in Booij (2002: 34-35). Dutch nouns do not exhibit morphological case marking; this system disappeared in the transition from Middle Dutch to present-day Dutch. There are, however, relics of the case system; one of them is that the suffix *-s* (historically the genitive singular case marker) can be used for a number of nouns in the specifier position of a noun phrase:

- | | | |
|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| (16) | Jan-s hoed | 'John's hat' |
| | Amsterdam-s rijke verleden | 'Amsterdam's rich history' |
| | vader-s fiets | 'father's bicycle' |
| | jouw moeder-s kamer | 'your mother's room' |
| | dominee-s studeerkamer | 'reverend's study' |
| | ieder-s huis | 'everybody's house' |
| | iemand-s vriend | 'someone's friend' |
| | niemand-s schuld | 'nobody's fault' |

These words ending in the suffix *-s* have the function of possessor. The only nouns that can be used with this kind of possessor marker are proper names, some of the nouns that can be used as forms of address, like *vader* 'father', *moeder* 'mother', *buurman* 'neighbour', and *dominee* 'reverend', and quantifying personal pronouns such as *iemand* 'someone'. Since a noun like *directeur* 'director' cannot be used as a form of address in Dutch, unlike a noun such as *dominee*, the phrase **directeurs kamer* 'the director's room' is ill formed. However, not all nouns that can be used as a form of address can appear in this construction. You may address a Dutch policeman as *agent*, but the phrase *agents fiets* 'the policeman's bike' is nevertheless impossible.

These *s*-marked nouns cannot be preceded by an article if they are marked as a possessor by means of *-s*. A phrase like **de dominees fiets* 'the

minister's bicycle' is therefore ill-formed, unlike its English gloss. Moreover, the words with *-s* in (16) can only be used in pre-nominal position: a sentence like **Deze hoed is Jans* 'This hat is John's' is ungrammatical which also shows that *-s* does not function as a genitive marker. This kind of grammatical pattern is therefore best qualified as a specific construction with two subschemas for the two types of nouns that can be used: proper names (including names of address) and quantifying personal pronouns:

- (17) [(possessive pronoun) + proper name *-s*]_{Spec-NP}
 [quantifying personal pronoun-*s*]_{Spec-NP}

It is a constructional idiom that is productive to the extent that the slot for proper names is an open one, into which all proper names can be inserted. The optional slot in the first line of (17) accounts for phrases such as *jouw moeders kamer* 'your mother's room' in which a possessive pronoun precedes the proper name / name of address *moeder*.

The remarkable property of this construction, like the one discussed in section 2, is that it is a mixture of syntactic and morphological information: the occurrence of the possessive suffix *-s* is limited to a lexically restricted and syntactically defined structure. We cannot solve this violation of the «no-access» part of Lexical Integrity by not referring to the presence of the suffix *-s*, but to some morpho-syntactic feature instead, because there is no independently motivated feature that could play this role. Note in particular that a feature such as [+ genitive] is not appropriate since this feature cannot be motivated independently for Dutch as a morpho-syntactic feature.

4. PLURALIZATION OF NUMERALS

In many languages, the category number is expressed on nouns, adjectives, and verbs. On the other hand, marking ordinal numerals for number is quite rare. It is more common for numerals to impose plural marking on the head noun that they modify. In many European languages, ordinals with a cardinality higher than 1 require plural marking of the head noun (Hurford 2003). Plural marking of numerals, on the other hand, is quite exceptional. It does occur in Finnish, where this kind of plural marking receives a specific semantic interpretation, «*n* group(s) of» (Hurford 2003: 585-87):

- (18) yksi kenka: yhdet kengät
 one.SG shoe.SG one.PL shoe.PL
 'one shoe, nom sg.' 'one group (a pair) of shoes'
- kahdet paperit
 2.PL paper.PL
 'two sets of papers'

Dutch also features plural forms of ordinal numerals and some other quantifiers. Before I will discuss the details, let me remind the reader that some ordinal numerals in Dutch have a noun-like status, which is apparent from their having a plural form. This applies to Dutch numerals such as *honderd* 'hundred', *duizend* 'thousand', *miljoen* 'million', and *miljard* 'billion' which can also be used as noun phrases by themselves; on the other hand, the word *tien* 'ten' cannot be used in its plural form in the same context:

- (19) honderd-en boek-en
 hundred-PL book-PL
 'hundreds of books'
- duizend-en begroett-en de koning
 thousand-PL greeted-PL the king
 'thousands of people greeted the king'
- *tienen / tientallen mensen zongen een lied
 'tens of people sang a song'

The use of the plural forms of all other numerals is restricted to a number of specific constructions, which are exemplified in (20):

- (20) a. *number of parts*
 Het schip brak in drie-en
 The ship broke in three-en
 'The ship broke into three pieces'
- b. *appositive collective*
 wij / ons drie-en
 we / us three-en
 'the three of us (subj. / obj.)'
- c. *collective adverbial*
 met ons / jullie / hun drie-en
 with us / you / their three-en
 'the three of us / you / them together'

- d. *collective adverbial*
 met zijn drie-en
 with his three-en
 'the three of us / you / them'

Example (20d) is a prototypical case of a constructional idiom. It has the form of a PP, headed by the preposition *met*, followed by the NP [*zijn* Numeral-*en*]. In this NP the slot for the possessive pronoun is fixed as *zijn* (the 3rd pers. sg. possessive pronoun), whereas the slot for the numeral is open and can be filled with all sorts of numeral. Thus we have Dutch sentences like

- (21) We komen morgen met zijn twintig-en
 we come tomorrow with his twenty-en
 'We will come tomorrow with twenty persons'

Note the incongruence between the person and number of the subject (1st pers. pl) and that of the possessive pronoun (3rd pers. sg.). The examples in (20c) are variants in which there is agreement in person and number between the subject of the sentence and the possessive pronoun in the collective construction. So there are two different collective constructions that are identical except that the possessive pronoun can either be a variable (and thus subject to the normal agreement constraints for possessive pronouns), or a fixed possessive pronoun *zijn*.

In addition to ordinal numerals the plural quantifiers *all-en* 'all' and *beid-en* 'both' can also be used in the constructions (20b-d). In these cases, the stem of the plural form does not occur as a word by itself.

We should note that these plural numerals cannot be used as subjects (with the exception of the noun-like numerals mentioned above). Thus, a sentence like (22a) is ungrammatical, although there is no clear semantic cause for this, as shown by the grammaticality of (22b):

- (22) a. *Drie-en gingen naar huis
 Three-en went to home
 'Three people went home'
- b. Duizend-en keerden huiswaarts
 Thousand-en went home
 'Thousands of people went home'

This illustrates once more how this productive use of pluralized numerals is restricted to very specific syntactic contexts.

The reader will have noted that in the glosses for the Dutch examples I did not make use of the morpho-syntactic feature *PLURAL*, but mentioned the concrete Dutch suffix *-en* instead. The reason for this is that it is indeed the specific plural suffix *-en* that is required by this construction. Dutch has two competing plural suffixes, *-s* and *-en*. The choice between these two suffixes is determined by a prosodic output condition: the plural noun should end in a trochee. Hence, the suffix *-en* is selected after stems ending in a stressed syllable, and the suffix *-s* appears after stems ending in an unstressed syllable (Booij 2002). However, in the numeral constructions discussed here, the suffix is always *-en*, even when the last syllable is unstressed. For instance, the plural for the number 7 is *zeven-s* /zɛvəns/, as is the case when we talk about grading (*Jan kreeg twee zeven-s* 'John got two grades 7'). However, in the uses listed in (20), the plural of *zeven* is *zevenen* /zɛvənən/. The same applies to the number *negen* '9' /neɣən/: its plural is normally *negen-s*, but in these constructions it is *negen-en*.

Additional evidence for the claim that it is the specific suffix *-en* that has to be referred to is that this suffix is also used in a construction in which no plural semantics is involved. This is the class of time expressions such as the following:

- (23) Het is bij zess-en
 It is at six-en
 'It's about six o'clock'
 We komen na negen-en
 We come after nine-en
 'We will come after nine o'clock'
 Ze vertrokken voor en-en
 They left before one-en
 'They left before one o'clock'

These observations imply that we have to specify the presence of a specific suffix *-en* in the different constructions exemplified in (20). For instance, the constructional pattern for phrases like that in (20d) is:

- (24) [[met]_P [z'n [[x]_{Numeral} -en]_N]_{NP}]_{PP} 'the x of us / you / them'

The form *z'n* is meant to represent the weak form [zən] of the 3rd. pers. sg. possessive pronoun. It is only the weak form of the pronoun that can be used in this context. This once more underscores the constructional idiom status of this pattern: two slots of this PP are lexically fixed, and in the slot for the numeral, the presence of a specific suffix, the suffix *-en*

is specified as well. The words *allen* 'all, plural' and *beiden* 'both' will be specified in the lexicon as having the structure $[[x]_{\text{Numeral}} -en]$, and hence they can also be used in this construction.

The constructional dependency of morphology is also illustrated by the related phenomenon that these numerals can appear in a diminutivized and pluralized form in such collective constructions, as illustrated in (25):

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| (25) | Wij twee-tje-s
We two-DIM-PL
'The two of us'
Met zijn drie-tje-s
With his three-DIM-PL
'The three of us/you/them' | Wij beid-je-s
We two-DIM-PL
'The two of us' |
|------|--|---|

The presence of the diminutive suffix expresses endearment, and conveys a suggestion of cosiness. Again, it is only possible to diminutivize numerals in these specific constructional idioms.

Representations such as (24) make use of the idea that both syntactic and morphological constructs can be represented by means of templates or schemas. Thus, these phenomena can be seen as evidence in favour of Construction Morphology.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The syntactic constructions discussed in the preceding three sections throw some light on the interface between syntax and morphology. These constructions show that syntax may need access to the internal structure of words, since these constructions can only be used if a specific suffix is present. Hence, the part of the Lexical Integrity hypothesis that forbids syntax to have access to word-internal structure appears to be incorrect. These facts also speak against the theory of A-morphous Morphology (Anderson 1992) that claims that word-internal structure is not visible, neither for morphological operations nor for syntax

Furthermore, these constructions show that syntactic and morphological constructions may be mutually dependent. Therefore, we need a constructicon rather than a lexicon in order to account for this mutual dependency. The facts discussed here also imply similar representational formats for syntactic and morphological constructs. Thus, the basic idea of Construction Morphology as defended in Booij (2005, ms.) that mor-

phological patterns can be represented as schemas, just like syntactic constructions, received further support.

The detailed study of specific constructions of a particular language may thus throw light on general issues concerning the architecture of the grammars of natural languages.

REFERENCES

- Ackema, P. and A. Neeleman (2005), *Beyond Morphology: Interface Conditions on Word Formation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, S. R. (1992), *A-morphous Morphology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Booij, G. (1990), *The Boundary Between Morphology and Syntax: Separable Complex Verbs in Dutch*, in Booij, G. and J. van Marle (eds.), «Yearbook of Morphology 1990», Dordrecht, Foris, 45–64.
- Booij, G. (2002), *The Morphology of Dutch*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Booij, G. (2005), *The Demarcation of Derivation and Compounding: Evidence for Construction Morphology*, in Dressler, W.U. et al. (eds.), *Demarcation in Morphology*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 111–32.
- Booij, G. (ms.), *Construction Morphology*.
- Bresnan, J. and S. A. Mchombo (1995), *The Lexical Integrity Principle: Evidence from Bantu*, «Natural Language and Linguistic Theory», 13, 181–254.
- Broekhuis, H. and A. Strang (1996), *De partitieve genitiefconstructie*, «Nederlandse Taalkunde», 3, 221–138.
- Goldberg, A. (2003), *Constructions; a New Theoretical Approach to Language*, «Trends in Cognitive Science», 7, 219–24.
- Haspelmath, M. (1996), *Word-Class Changing Inflection and Morphological Theory*, in Booij, G. and J. van Marle (eds.), «Yearbook of Morphology 1995», Dordrecht, Kluwer, 43–66.
- Hoeksema, Jack (1996), *Adjectivale inflectie op -s, geen geval van transpositie*, in Hoekstra, E. and C. Smits (eds.), *Morfologiedagen 1996*, Amsterdam, Meertens Instituut, 46–72.
- Hurford, J. (2003), *The Interaction Between Numerals and Nouns*, in F. Plank, (ed.), *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 561–620.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (2002), *Foundations of Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Marle, J. van (1996), *The Unity of Morphology. On the Interwovenness of The Derivational and The Inflectional Dimension of The Word*, in Booij, G. and J. van Marle (eds.), «Yearbook of Morphology 1995», Dordrecht, Kluwer, 67–82.

SUMMARY: Alcune costruzioni sintattiche dell'olandese richiedono la presenza di un suffisso specifico. Questo dimostra che la sintassi ha accesso alla struttura interna della parola, e che il principio di Integrità Lessicale come formulato in Anderson (1992), che impedisce alla sintassi di avere accesso alla struttura interna di parola, è troppo forte. I costrutti morfologici e sintattici appaiono essere in mutua dipendenza, e ciò rende necessario un «costruttivo» anziché un lessico. Questi fatti rafforzano anche la Morfologia Costruzionale poiché questa teoria fornisce un formato comune di rappresentazione sia per le parole complesse (i costrutti morfologici) che per i costrutti sintattici.