

## When “noun” meets “noun”

---

### Convenors

Steve Pepper

University of Oslo

[stevepe@iln.uio.no](mailto:stevepe@iln.uio.no)

Francesca Masini

University of Bologna

[francesca.masini@unibo.it](mailto:francesca.masini@unibo.it)

### Discussant

Martin Haspelmath MPI-SHH, Jena / Leipzig University

### Subfields

Typology, Word Formation, Semantics

### Research question

The workshop’s goal is to investigate the strategies employed by the languages of the world to create complex denotations by using two (or more) nominals.

### Description

Compounding is one of the most widespread methods of word-formation in the world’s languages. That being the case, one might expect typological studies of compounding to offer interesting insights into the nature of conceptualization. So far, however, cross-linguistic research has not been very revealing in this regard. Bauer’s (2001) investigation of an areally and genetically balanced sample of 36 languages has surprisingly few generalizations to report; Guevara & Scalise (2009), drawing on a database of 80,000 compounds, limit their conclusions to mostly formally defined scales of preference; while Štekauer, Valera & Körtvélyessy (2012) are primarily interested in the presence or absence of different types of compounding in their sample of 70 languages.

Two reasons can be posited for this state of affairs. Firstly, previous studies have aimed to cover the full range of compounding. Given that different types of compound often exhibit different properties (e.g. Mandarin has right-headed nominal compounds and left-headed verbal compounds), this can complicate the typology unnecessarily. Secondly, the purely formal point of departure of these studies leads to issues with cross-linguistic identification and the risk of excluding potentially interesting phenomena from the investigation. For example, while admitting Ger. *Eisen.bahn* [iron.track] ‘railway’, most definitions of compound exclude Fr. *chemin de fer* [track PREP iron] ‘railway’, even though the constituent meanings, the resultant meaning, and presumably also the underlying cognitive processes, are essentially identical.

This workshop adopts a different perspective, one that involves a simultaneous narrowing and broadening of scope. First of all, instead of examining the whole gamut of compounding, it starts out from the more uniform phenomenon of noun-noun compounding. This represents a narrowing of scope. Secondly, it adopts a functional rather than a formal approach to defining the object of study, which results in a broadening of scope. This is because the *function* of noun-noun compounds – to provide names for complex concepts that involve two entities – is not theirs alone.

Thus, in addition to **noun-noun compounds** (e.g. *Eisenbahn*) and **prepositional compounds** (or “phrasal lexemes”, e.g. *chemin de fer*), the same function is carried out by **relational compounds** in Slavic languages (e.g. Rus. *želez.naja doroga* [iron.ADJZ road] ‘railway’) and constructions that “compete” with them (Rainer 2013), **izafet constructions** in Turkic (e.g. Tur. *demir yol.u* [iron road.3SG] ‘railway’), **construct state constructions** in Semitic (e.g. Modern Hebrew *mesila.t barzel* [track.CON iron] ‘railway’), and **genitive-like constructions** in many languages from around the world (e.g. Malagasy *lala.m.by* [road.PERT.iron] ‘railway’).

What all of these constructions have in common is that they serve to name a complex concept via the combination of two “Thing-roots” (Haspelmath 2012), between which there is an unstated (or underspecified) relation. They are all *binominal naming constructions* (or “binominals” for short).

Viewing binominals from a functional perspective is an innovation in terms of language typology, but it is not totally without precedent. Three previous studies are especially noteworthy. Levi (1978) includes both nominal compounds and “non-predicative” (i.e. relational) adjective constructions under the cover term “complex nominal”. Rainer’s (2013) notion of relational adjectives “competing” with nominal compounds, genitives, prepositional phrases and “certain kinds of derivations” comes very close to the present conception of binominals. And so too does the use of the term “adnominal nominal modification” by Bauer & Tarasova (2013) to cover a range of constructions in which a noun is modified by another noun.

The commonality between such binominals can also be viewed in terms of Štekauer’s model of onomasiological word-formation, according to which they are all Type 3 naming units (where “the determined (actional) element is not linguistically expressed”, Štekauer 1998:10). Adopting this perspective encourages two further refinements, again involving a simultaneously narrowing and broadening of scope. The first is the exclusion of complex nominals of Štekauer’s Type 1 and Type 2 that contain an “Action-root”. As a consequence, synthetic compounds like *truck-driver* are considered *out of scope*. This is justified on the grounds that the presence of an actional element (here: DRIVE) may be expected to involve different formal and semantic parameters, which (again) would complicate the typology unnecessarily.

The second refinement is based on the recognition that nominalizing affixes, like Eng. *-er* and Slovak *-ica*, and noun classifiers like Bora *-heju* (‘hole-like object’) can play one of the “nominal” roles in a Type 3 complex nominal. At least in terms of the cognitive processes involved, there is no difference between Eng. *banker* and *bankman*, despite one being formed through derivation and the other through compounding, or between Bora *túú.heju* [nose.CM(hole)] and Indonesian *lubang hidung* [hole nose], both of which mean ‘nostril’. Consequently, nominalizing suffixes and noun classifier constructions that fulfil the basic criteria of ‘binominal-hood’ are considered *in scope*.

This approach to complex denotation cuts across traditional boundaries between morphology and syntax, and between compounding and derivation: it “divides the cake” in a new way that might reveal new insights into language and conceptualization. The goal of this workshop is to explore semantic and morphosyntactic aspects of binominals as defined here, along with frequency, productivity, and competition between different strategies, across a broad range of languages (in particular, lesser-studied and non-SAE languages) and along different dimensions (contrastive, typological, diachronic, acquisitional, cognitive).

## References

- Bauer, Laurie. 2001. Compounding. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wolfgang Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: an international handbook*, 695–707. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bauer, Laurie & Elizaveta Tarasova. 2013. The meaning link in nominal compounds. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(3). 2–18.
- Guevara, Emiliano & Sergio Scalise. 2009. Searching for universals in compounding. In Sergio Scalise, Elisabetta Magni & Antonietta Bisetto (eds.), *Universals of language today*, 101–128. Amsterdam: Springer.
- 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.
- Levi, Judith N. 1978. *The syntax and semantics of complex nominals*. New York: Academic Press.
- 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, Salvador Valera & Livia Körtvélyessy. 2012. *Word-formation in the world’s languages: a typological survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.