Conference report
"Morphology Days", Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium), November 22–24 2017
(Edwige Dugas)

Morphology Days is a (nearly) biennial international meeting which deals with morphology within different frameworks and in various perspectives. Previous editions of this conference have taken place in Leuven (2015), Leeuwarden (2013), Leiden (2012), Nijmegen (2011), Luik (2009) and Amsterdam (2007). While the first editions of the conference were mainly addressed to researchers working on morphology in the Netherlands and in Belgium, the last editions – including this one – included international contributions. The programme and the book of abstract is available at the conference's homepage at https://morphologydays2017.wordpress.com/program/. Organized by Philippe Hiligsmann, Kristel Van Goethem, Nikos Koutsoukos and Isa Hendrikx from the Université Catholique de Louvain, and Laurent Raiser from the Université de Liège, this edition of *Morphology Days* hosted more than 30 researchers, among which 3 plenary speakers, coming not only from Belgium but also from France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. Although both inflection and derivation (affixation) where dealt with in the talks, this conference report will only address the studies on derivation.

The *Morphology Days* conference gathered postgraduate students and young researchers as well as more "expert" ones, thus enabling interesting discussions and fruitful feedback. The conference presented a wide range of topics, approaches and methods: general and special languages, diachrony and synchrony, composition and affixation (including zero-affixation, conversion), lexematic morphology, construction morphology, distributed morphology, relational morphology, collostructional analysis, etc. This blending of different ways to study derivational processes undoubtedly provided very interesting perspectives for further research. Besides, several languages were under study; although English represented the lion's share of the presentations, Dutch, French, German, Greek, but also Japanese where among the languages examined in the talks. All in all, this *Morphology Days* meeting was particularly successful and all participants are looking forward the next edition of the conference.

Second language acquisition was at the center Hélène Giraudo's and Isa Hendrikx' talks. Hélène Giraudo (Université de Toulouse) opened the conference with a plenary talk on morphological processing and the role of morphological

structure of complex and derived words. On the basis of data coming from second language acquisition and visual word perception, Giraudo chose to take a construction morphology perspective (Booij, 2010) rather than a decomposition one, to show that systematic form-meaning correspondences are crucial for language and reading acquisition. This question of the link between form and meaning was actually a common thread linking most talks of conference.

The talk of Isa Hendrikx (Université catholique de Louvain) also dealt with language acquisition, in a usage-based Construction Morphology perspective. The author was interested in the impact of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the acquisition of intensifying constructions (e.g. *bloed-heet,* lit 'blood-hot', very hot) in French-speaking L2 learners of Dutch and she investigated the longitudinal developments in the learners' acquisition of these constructions. The diversity of the constructions available to express intensification (phrasal constructions, compounding, etc.) was assumed to complicate the acquisition process and to involve a competition between L1 and L2 constructions (Ellis & Cadierno 2009). The data used for this study was a corpus of written productions in the form of fictional e-mails on the subject of a party or holidays. Using collostructional analysis to determine the degree of attraction or repulsion of a lexeme to an intensifying construction (e.g. Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003), the author showed, among other things, that CLIL and non-CLIL learners do not use the same constructions with the same frequency.

The link between form and meaning was further examined by Serena Dal Maso (Università di Verona) and Sabrina Piccinin (CLLE, Université de Toulouse), who investigated the consistency of three morphological series in Italian: words with suffixes *-mento* (e.g. *trasferimento* 'transfer'), *-ino* (e.g. *tavolino* 'small table')*,* and *-olo* (e.g. *fruttivendolo* 'greengrocer'). The analysis of corpus data revealed that these three suffixes display various degrees of consistency, which was measured with respect to several parameters. A first group of parameters were related to the consistency of the word ending series: (i) the proportion between the number of truly affixed and pseudo-affixed words containing the same ending, (ii) the proportion between token frequency counts of affixed and pseudo-affixed words containing the same word ending, (iii) the number of meanings carried by a given suffix, (iv) the occurrence or non-occurrence of semantic bleaching, (v) possible subpatterns due to cumulation of affixes, (vi) the stability in the prosodic structure. A second group of parameters dealt with the stability of the functional features of the base: (vii) the lexical category of the base, (viii) the stability of the gender of the base.

Two groups of authors addressed the diachronic evolution of language. First, Arne Dhondt, Timothy Colleman and Johan De Caluwe (Ghent University) examined Dutch particle verbs such as *nalezen* 'proofread' from a

Construction Morphology perspective. These verbs have been analyzed by Booij as instantiations of constructional schemas with a lexically specified particle slot and an open verb slot, and an idiosyncratic meaning which differs from the meaning of the adposition (in that case, *na*) from which it is diachronically derived. Drawing on data from the Modern Dutch period (i.e. from the 17th century), the authors sought to describe the emergence of such particle verbs schemas with the particle *op* 'up' as a case study. They showed that the meaning of the particle, 'to use to its full extent by V-ing' started out in semantic contexts of consumption before spreading to other contexts.

Diachrony was also the focus of Asimakis Fliatouras' (Democritus University of Thrace) talk, where Greek language was used as a case study to (re-)examine the grammaticalization parameters traditionally described in the literature (a.o., Lehmann 1982/1995), namely: (i) phonological erosion, (ii) de- or resemanticization, (iii) de- or transcategorialization, (iv) extension, (v) paradigmatization. On the basis of evidence from Ancient Greek, the author proposed to add another parameter, namely morphological analysis. This parameter plays a role in the case of verbal stems as second constituents in exocentric compound adjectives which are detached from the compounds absorbing the external adjectival zero suffix and which become suffixes (e.g. *-o:d-is* 'who smells' > *-ó:d-is* 'diminutive'), or adverbs which have been re-analyzed as prefixes (e.g. *hupó-lefkos* 'white-like'). Asimakis Fliatouras also showed that the parameters playing a role in morphological grammaticalization are not of equal weight and he underlined the fact that the parameters are closely interrelated.

Jenny Audring (Leiden University) examined the structural ambiguity of complex words in Dutch, English and German. She showed that in some cases, complex words match two or more derivational patterns instead of only one, as in Dutch *selfie,* which can be analyzed as [_N[_{Prt} *self*]-*ie*] or as [_N[*sel*]-*fie*]. Indeed, Dutch has developed a productive suffix *-fie* 'photo of oneself with X/while doing X', which gives to the English loan *selfie* a synchronically ambiguous structure. To account for structurally ambiguous words as reflecting multiple lexical relations, the author proposed a declarative and relational model of morphology (Jackendoff & Audring, fc.), based on some of the premises of Construction Morphology (Booij 2010).

Edward Göbbel (University of Wuppertal) studied *-ie* hypocoristics (*comfy, fattie*), a phenomenon which is at the interface of derivational (e.g. *leftieness, leftie friendly*) and inflectional morphology (e.g. *comfier*), in the framework of Distributed Morphology. It was shown that most *-ie* hypocoristics are based on noun phrases and that, as a consequence, *-ie* must be analyzed as a phrasal affix. Distributed Morphology allowed the author to demonstrate that *-ie* is a head in the extension of a noun or adjective and that the phrasal hypocoristics are derived by ellipsis of the noun and cliticisation of *-ie* onto the adjective.

Camiel Hamans (Universiteit van Amsterdam) studied the phenomenon of blends in English. Whereas certain authors seem to call into question the fact that blending is a regular morphological process (Bauer 2003), other emphasize the regularity of the phenomenon (e.g. Kelly 1998, Gries 2004). The author provided evidence in favour of these analyses; the regularity of this phenomenon lies in the fact that the second source word is crucial as there is a faithfulness constraint on its phonological and metrical properties which is actually stronger that the constraints aiming at preserving the properties of the first source word.

Katrin Hein (Institute for the German Language IDS) investigated the productivity of German compounds (e.g. *papstviolett* 'pope purple', *Höhenangst*, 'fear of heights') in lexematic morphology. While the productivity of affixation processes has received much attention in the literature, that of composition is a relatively understudied domain. Taking as a starting point the observation that semantically similar words display different tendencies to occur as head words in compounds (Fleischer & Barz 2012), the author examined groups of compounds with similar head words. She also evaluated the respective roles of the different factors of productivity, such as the morpho-phonological, morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of the immediate constituents, and focused particularly on the characteristics of the head words when they occur in isolation and how it affects the productivity of the compound.

In another talk, Katrin Hein (Institute for the German Language IDS) together with Adrien Barbaresi (Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Austrian Academy of Sciences) discussed the detection and characterization of German phrasal compounds (PCs, e.g. *Man-muss-doch-über-alles-reden-können-Credo,* 'one-should-be-able-to-talk-about-everything-motto') in large web corpora, with a method based on word segmentation and data-driven learning. German PCs come in two flavours, with or without hyphen, and the authors proposed the hypothesis that the former are less expressive than the latter. It was also shown that on the web certain lexemes have a bigger probability to appear as head words of PCs, such as nouns denoting human beings, as is the case of PCs found in newspapers (Hein 2015, Trips 2016), but that PCs also show different characteristics in the two types of corpora. This study also underlined the existence of borderline cases between phrasal compounding and phrasal derivation.

Kazuya Nishimaki's (University of Tsukuba) presentation dealt with a somewhat neglected word-formation phenomenon, that of conversion. He examined the case of nouns and their so-called ren'yoo verbal form (e.g. *hasir-i* 'a run' / *hasir-u* 'to run'). Although they are generally treated as converted nouns, the author proposed an analysis based on a comparison with English and showed that these forms are similar to English gerundive nominals. As English gerundive nominals, which transform verb phrases into nouns (e.g.

to keep a house / house-keeping), they inherit their argument structure from their underlying verb phrase. As for *-ing*, the only function of the morpheme *-i* is to change the category of the base.

Finally, let us mention two groups of authors who took a different perspective on word-formation processes: Andreas Nolda, who underlined the necessity to make a distinction between the phonological and graphemic forms of words, and Edwige Dugas and Jérôme Michaud, who applied the framework of Construction Morphology to the domain of specialized languages.

Andreas Nolda (University of Szeged) examined the understudied domain of German cardinals such as *sechzehn* 'sixteen' to demonstrate that phonological and graphematic forms have their own characteristics and must be examined separately. As a matter of fact, while the written form of German cardinals can be analyzed as a case of compounding, their spoken form should rather be seen as an instance of suffixation. Evidence for such an analysis comes from the fact that German cardinals are phonetically realized in a reduced way, a phenomenon which is typical of accentless affixes. The study was couched within the framework of Pattern-and-Restriction Theory (Nolda 2012), traditionally used for the description of the spoken characteristics of word-formation and which it adapted to describe its written characteristics as well. This theory also enabled the author to present data and hypotheses which are computationally implementable.

Edwige Dugas (Université de Lille) and Jérôme Michaud (Uppsala Universitet) applied the theoretical framework of Construction Morphology to the study of specialized languages, with the patterns [super-X] and [s-X] of the vocabulary of supersymmetry in particle physics as a case study. They showed that it is possible to represent these two constructions in a "constructicon" (Jurafsky 1991) that is common to other similar constructions of the general language, in particular the [super-X] construction which forms lexemes with a meaning of 'being above' or with an evaluative meaning.

References

Booij, Geert. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Nick & Teresa Cadierno. 2009. Constructing a Second Language. Introduction to the Special Section. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 111–139.

Fleischer, Wolfgang & Irmhild Barz. 2012. *Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.

Hein, Katrin. 2015. *Phrasenkomposita im Deutschen. Empirische Untersuchung und konstruktionsgrammatische Modellierung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Jackendoff, Ray & Jenny Audring. in preparation. *The Texture of the Mental Lexicon*. Oxford: OUP.

Jurafsky, D. 1991. *An on-line computational model of human sentence interpretation: A theory of the representation and use of linguistic knowledge.* Technical report, DTIC Document.

Lehmann, Christian. 1982/1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization.* München: Lincom Europa.

Nolda, Andreas. 2012. *Konversion im Deutschen – Muster und Beschränkungen: Mit einem Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie der Wortbildung.* Habilitation thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol. & Stefan Gries. 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8(2). 209–243.

Trips, Carola. 2016. An analysis of phrasal compounds in the model of Parallel Architecture. In Pius ten Hacken (ed.), *The semantics of compounding*, 153–177. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwige Dugas, Ph.D.
Université de Lille 3 – Bât. B4
Laboratoire STL 'Savoirs, Textes, Langage'
Rue du Barreau – BP 60149
F-59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex
edwige.dugas@gmail.com