Pius ten Hacken (ed.), *The Semantics of Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. x + 254 pp.

Reviewed by Torsten Leuschner (Ghent University)

The volume under review is an elegant and instructive, if incomplete, survey of current theories on the semantics of compounding, complemented by case studies. As the editor, Pius ten Hacken, Professor of Translation Studies at the University of Innsbruck, says in his Acknowledgements (p. x), it arose from a workshop on the semantics of compounding at the 19th International Congress of Linguists in Geneva in July, 2013, and its contents largely corresponds to the papers given there. It contains 12 contributions in total, consisting of an Introduction and a Conclusion by the editor and ten papers by international specialists, which are spread out over sections, or "Parts", I-III.

Part I contains three papers in which three pioneers summarise their own theoretical approaches to the semantics of compounding. The first is Ray Jackendoff, who presents his Conceptual Semantics approach (with a focus on English noun-noun compounds) as part of the Parallel Architecture (PA) model, a broad theory of language that shares some basic assumptions with Chomskyan linguistics while treating conceptual structure on a par with syntax and phonology. The second is Rochelle Lieber, who discusses the place of compounding in her "lexical semantic" framework, a dedicated model of word-formation which starts from rules operating on lexical entries with feature-defined semantics. The third is Pavol Štekauer, whose onomasiological approach models "naming strategies" that help speakers find a pronounceable form to express a given concept on the basis of eight Onomasiological Types (not five, as in earlier versions of the theory). As ten Hacken suggests in his Introduction (p. 7f.), Jackendoff's and Lieber's approaches are both rooted in generativism and oriented towards the compositionality of word-formation products, which they model (with different emphases) from the interplay between the semantics associated with compounding rules on the one hand and the meanings contributed by lexical components on the other hand. Štekauer's model, by contrast, is part of the Prague School tradition and oriented more towards the final, lexicalised word-formation product.

Through the juxtaposition of the three frameworks, Part I prepares the reader for the remaining seven papers that refine, extend and/or compare them. Four of the seven form Part II, which is devoted to noun-noun compounds. This part begins with a contribution by Pierre J.L. Arnaud which discusses the place of French relational subordinative [NN]_N compounds like *courrier avion* 'air mail' in Jackendoff's PA model. Next is Zoe Gavriilidou, who discusses two classes of compounds in Greek (with respectively two inflected components and only one inflected component) from the perspective of Lieber's lexical semantic framework. Her paper is followed first by an investigation by Ingmarie Mellenius and Maria Rosenberg into the learnability of different compound types in Swedish first-language acquisition under Jackendoff's PA approach, and then by the only paper in the collection explicitly comparing two frameworks, viz. Jesús Fernández-Domínguez' study of different noun-noun compound types under the frameworks of Štekauer and Jackendoff. Although the two approaches

highlight different facets of meaning due to their divergent ways of handling compound semantics, each constitutes a valid framework in its own right.

The remaining three papers form Part III, which is devoted to compound types other than noun-noun. It begins with the only paper in the collection to make consistent use of corpus data, Carola Trips' study of phrasal compounds like *day-to-day management*, *chicken-and-egg situation* and *Vor-Nobelpreis-Ära* 'pre-Nobel prize era' in English and German. A paper by Barbara Schlücker on German adjective-noun compounds like *Blauhelm* 'blue helmet, i.e. UN peace keeper', *Buntwaschmittel* 'coloured-laundry detergent' and *Nuklearwaffe* 'nuclear weapon' is next; like Trips, Schlücker adopts a Jackendoff-style conceptual structure analysis to model the respective compound types and their semantics. Closing Part III is Renáta Panocová's analysis of neoclassical compounds like *ethnomycology* and *laparoscopy* in English and Russian under Štekauer's onomasiological approach, which leads her to conclude inter alia that such compounds are the products of word-formation rules in English but loanwords in Russian. After ten Hacken's Conclusion, the volume is rounded off by a collective section of references, an author index and a subject index.

Thanks to its inviting structure, the volume is more likely than other edited collections to be read through, at least more or less, from cover to cover. The natural flow of the papers (which are each between 18 and 35 pages in length) and the internal coherence of the whole are due in no small measure to the ingenuity of the editor, who not only devised the overall scheme and arranged for the three authors of Part I to have their contributions distributed to the other authors for reference ahead of the deadline (p. x), but also turns his Introduction into a model of clarity outlining the main linguistic problems of compounding in historical perspective, the distinct features and orientations of the three frameworks, and the contents of the remaining seven papers. The Conclusion adds further value by drawing the threads together in a comparison of the three frameworks, thus compensating somewhat for the near-lack of cross-framework comparisons in the seven intervening papers (except by Fernández-Domínguez, as noted above). Another reader-friendly touch is the author index, which serves simultaneously as a publication index listing page numbers in subsets: e.g. under "Bauer, Laurie", the pages mentioning Laurie Bauer are arranged in ten sub-lists, one for each publication by or involving Bauer as found in the references. Given the programmatic unity-in-diversity of the contributions, one might perhaps have wished for the papers' individual titles to be more explicit on theoretical orientation and coverage of languages. Whereas the titles of Arnaud, Gavriilidou and Mellenius/Rosenberg do state the language respectively in focus, no specific languages are mentioned in the titles of Fernández-Domínguez, Trips, Schlücker and Panocová. Overall the volume clearly does not aim for systematic cross-linguistic coverage either genetically, typologically or contrastively, nor could this have been expected from a collection oriented towards frameworks rather than languages.

But all these are minor quibbles given the surprising omission from the book of a fourth approach to word-formation which has been steadily gaining attention in recent years as well as producing original research: Geert Booij's Construction Morphology (CxM, e.g. Booij 2010). With its emphasis on more or less productive (in practice often fragmented) word-formation schemas which are holistically specified in both structural and semantic terms, on the hierarchical structure of the lexicon composed of such schemas, and on

inheritance relations between schemas at different levels in the hierarchy, CxM would have been an ideal candidate for inclusion. Yet CxM is mentioned briefly in just five papers, mostly without reference to its actual content; the only paper where CxM is taken remotely seriously is Schlücker's, but even there it disappears from the radar after less than half a page of exposition (p. 179). The editor's silence on CxM (apart from an insubstantial footnote, p. 21) suggests that the omission is not strategic. A conceivable argument in favour of omission is suggested by Schlücker (p. 179), viz. the apparent overlap of some of CxM's basic assumptions with those of Jackendoff's PA (e.g. the rejection of any fundamental distinction between grammar and lexicon). However, CxM's emphasis on constructions in the sense familiar from Construction Grammar (the term *construction* does not appear in the subject index) suggests that it is part of a different tradition and able to highlight the relationship between word-formation and syntax in a way distinct from the other three frameworks. It is therefore a pity that room could not be found for CxM in the volume, either on a par with the other three frameworks or through explicit discussion.

The omission of CxM apart, the editor is to be congratulated for a timely contribution to theorising on the semantics of compounding, including case studies from relevant European languages. Thanks to its well-thought out structure and reader-friendliness, and last but not least the high quality and general readability of the individual contributions, the volume will appeal to a wide readership from the (advanced) student to the experienced researcher, and deserves to spawn many similar collections in other subdisciplines of linguistics.

References

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