Construction Morphology, a brief introduction

Geert Booij

MORPHOLOGY

VOLUME 16   NO 1   JULY 2006   ISSN 1871-5621

Editors
Geert Booij
Jaap van Marle
Ingo Plag (Eds.)

Springer   CODEN XXXXX

Springer

Springer

INTRODUCTION

Construction Morphology, a brief introduction

Geert Booij

This issue of *Morphology* features four articles written in the framework of Construction Morphology. Each of them highlights and supports one or more assumptions that are central to this model of morphological analysis, and thus show how Construction Morphology can be fruitfully applied to a range of languages and phenomena. Preliminary versions of these papers have been presented at the 14th International Morphology Meeting in Budapest in May, 2010.

Construction Morphology, as defended in Booij (2010b), shares with Construction Grammar the idea that constructions are the basic units of description and analysis for natural languages. Morphological constructions are systematic pairings of form and meaning at the word level. For instance, the English word formation pattern $[V\text{-}er]_N$ with the systematic meaning correlate 'Agent/Instrument of V-*ing*' can be grasped by the speakers of English once they have acquired a sufficient number of words such as *baker* and *writer*, and have discovered the (paradigmatic) relationship with the verbs *bake* and *write*. The meaning of the deverbal affix *-er* is only accessible through the morphological construction that this suffix is part of.

Morphological schemas define a systematic relation between the output forms of complex words and their semantic and/or pragmatic correlates. Schemas are by definition output-oriented, and this is essential for the characterization of word formation processes whose inputs have variable shapes, whereas their output forms are subject to uniform constraints. For instance, in Japanese there is a class of innovative verbs that is subject to the output constraint that they have the shape ... $(C)V(C)V]_{Vroot}$, with a minimum of two moras. Examples are the verb *kopiru*, derived form the loan word *kopii* 'copy' and the verb *guguru* 'to conduct a Google search' derived from *guuguru* 'Google'. This is why, in a paper also presented at the 14th International

G. Booij (✉)
University of Leiden, P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
e-mail: g.e.booij@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Morphology Meeting, Tsujimura and Davis argue that Construction Morphology provides the means for a proper characterization of this class of verbs (Tsujimura and Davis 2011).

A central tenet of Construction Morphology is that the lexicon of natural languages is highly structured by means of schemas and subschemas. Morphological schemas, which specify systematic relationships between the form and meaning of sets of complex words dominate the complex words that are formed according to these schemas. Hence, schemas motivate sets of complex words, and reduce the degree of arbitrariness in the relationship between form and meaning of complex linguistic expressions. These schemas also specify how new complex words can be formed.

Schemas may be instantiated by subschemas with more specific semantic properties. For instance, compounds of Germanic languages are right-headed and therefore instantiate the general pattern $[[X][Y]]_Y$ where X and Y are lexical categories. At the same time, the subclass of NN compounds may have specific properties, for instance, that its constituents can be compounds themselves, and hence have recursive potential. At an even more concrete level, one of the positions of a compound schema may be lexically filled because the relevant word has a special meaning that is bound to its occurrence in compounds. Such compound constituents are sometimes called 'affixoids'.

An important claim of Construction Morphology is that phrasal constructs may be similar in function to morphological constructs in that they function as lexical units and provide names for concepts. Such phrasal constructs with a lexical function may be subject to specific restrictions. For instance, *dark room* is a name for a room with a specific function, for instance in photography. In that case, the adjective of this A + N sequence cannot be modified: a phrase like *very dark room* blocks the special meaning of 'dark room' (Booij 2009). The interaction between morphological and phrasal construction of lexical units is therefore an important topic of research in Construction Morphology.

The article by Amiot and Van Goethem presents an analysis of two types of NN-constructs, Dutch NN compounds of the form $[[sleutel]_N N]_N$ and French word combinations with the form $[N [clé]_N]_N$. The Dutch compound pattern $[[sleutel]_N N]_N$ is an example of a constructional idiom at the word level, and these types of compounds have been discussed in detail both by Booij and Van Goethem (Booij 2005, 2010a; Van Goethem 2008, 2010). Both words mean 'key', and share with their English equivalent that this word can be interpreted metaphorically, with the meaning 'most important'. The word *sleutel* used with this meaning has been qualified as an affixoid, as this word has a meaning bound to its being embedded in a compound.

In French, the relation between the constituents in this type of NN sequence is less tight than in Dutch. For instance, the word *clé* can be modified by an adverb, as in *element absolument clé* 'element absolutely key, absolutely key element'. This shows that notwithstanding the functional equivalence of these NN constructions with *sleutel* and *clé* respectively, there might be formal differences in that an NN construct can be morphological (Dutch), or more phrase-like, as is the case for French.

The assumption of subschemas makes it also possible to account for the grey area between compounding and derivation. In Chinese, for instance, lexical morphemes may be bound to their occurrence in compounds, and therefore may be qualified as

affixoids (Booij 2005). Their restricted occurrence can be accounted for by assuming constructional idioms in which these bound lexical morphemes are specified as filling one of the slots of a compound schema (Arcodia 2011).

Arcodia's article in this issue of *Morphology* on headedness in derivation and compounding shows how a number of problems around this notion disappear in the Construction Morphology framework. First, in the case of exocentric compounds it is not a problem that there is no head since systematic properties of compounds need not be derived from the head, but can be seen as holistic properties of the compound construction as such. For instance, in the Italian exocentric compound *porta-lettere* 'postman' the agentive meaning need not be derived from a zero head, but can be seen as a property of these [VN]$_N$ compounds as a whole. Secondly, subsets of compounds of a given language may differ as to the location of the head. In Construction Morphology the location of the head can be specified differently for different subsets of compounds, characterized by different subschemas. The 'hierarchical lexicon' of a language provides the levels of abstraction that are needed for a proper account of variation in headedness.

An important insight of Construction Morphology is that words and morphological schemas may also be related paradigmatically. This implies that complex words are not necessarily formed by concatenation, that is, by adding a morpheme to a base word. Instead, complex words may be related by means of paradigmatically related schemas. An example is the relationship between words in *-ism* and word in *-ist* such as *autism/autist*. Once we know the meaning of a word in *-ism*, we can coin a word in *-ist* with a related meaning, or vice versa. The word *autist* is not derived from *autism* by means of the addition of a suffix. Instead, what we have to say is that words of the form [x-*ism*] are systematically related to words of the type [x-*ist*]. Grandi and Pompei argue in their article on complex verbs in Ancient Greek that the various types of verb-related compounding and derivation cannot be accounted for by assuming one unique direction of derivation. Instead, there is a complex pattern of mutual, paradigmatic relationships between the various morphological patterns.

As noted above, both words and phrasal units form part of the set of lexical units of a language. Hence, we may expect interaction between these two types of construction. A telling illustration of this view of the architecture of grammar is provided by Masini and Benigni in their article on phrasal lexemes and shortening strategies in Russian. Phrasal lexemes can be shorted to single words, as in *mobil'ny* 'mobile phone' derived from the phrasal name *mobil'nyi telefon* 'mobile phone'. In addition, these shortened phrasal constructs can undergo suffixation by means of the suffix *-ka*, as in *gazirovannaja voda* 'sparkling water' > *gazirov-ka* 'sparkling water', a suffix that is also used as a diminutive suffix.

In sum, these articles provide support from various languages for a Construction Morphology approach to morphology and the lexicon.

References

Arcodia, G. F. (2011). A *Construction Morphology* account of derivation in Mandarin Chinese. *Morphology*, *21*, 89–130.

Booij, G. (2005). Compounding and derivation: evidence for *Construction Morphology*. In W. U. Dressler, D. Kastovsky, O. E. Pfeiffer, & F. Rainer (Eds.), *Morphology and its demarcations* (pp. 109–132). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Booij, G. (2009). Phrasal names: a constructionist analysis. *Word Structure*, *3*, 219–240.

Booij, G. (2010a). Compound construction: schemas or analogy? In S. Scalise & I. Vogel (Eds.), *A construction morphology perspective. Cross-disciplinary issues in compounding* (pp. 93–108). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Booij, G. (2010b). *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsujimura, N., & Davis, S. (2011). A construction approach to innovative verbs in Japanese. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *22*, 799–825.

Van Goethem, K. (2008). *Oud-leerling* versus *ancien élève*. A comparative study of adjectives grammaticalizing into prefixes in Dutch and French. *Morphology*, *18*, 27–49.

Van Goethem, K. (2010). The French construction *nouveau* + past participle revisited: arguments in favour of a prefixoid analysis of *nouveau*. *Folia Linguistica*, *44*, 163–178.