

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
TWELFTH INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS
OF LINGUISTS

VIENNA, AUGUST 28—SEPTEMBER 2, 1977

Editors:

WOLFGANG U. DRESSLER
WOLFGANG MEID

Assistant Editors:

OSKAR E. PFEIFFER
THOMAS HEROK

Innsbruck 1978

61/9790

Wortbildung**Word Formation****Formation des mots**

HERBERT E. BREKLE

**Reflections on the Conditions for the Coining,
Use and Understanding of Nominal Compounds**

As the title of my paper implies the main topic for consideration is going to be pragmatic factors which may be at work in actual word-formation processes. There will be no attempt to make a sharp division between derivational and compounding processes — the main reason being that in many cases nominal composition includes derivation (cf. *field worker*; *fault finder*, *troublemaker*; *toothpick*; *egghead*, etc., etc.).

You will appreciate that in my treatment of this topic I shall as a matter of principle not be going into the comprehensive and lively discussion which has been going on in recent years about the where and how of word-formation processes and their lexically more or less stable and idiomatic products (derivatives and compounds) within one or the other grammatical model. Suggestions and arguments from within this discussion will be taken into account, however, if they are relevant to the topic.

Preparatory to our discussion of the pragmatic aspect of actual word-formation processes I should first of all like to take a critical look at the distinction between so-called lexicalised compounds („feste Komposita“) — which are an established part of the vocabulary of a speech-community and for this and other reasons have a firm place in the lexical component of the grammar of a language — and so-called non-lexicalised compounds („unfeste Komposita“ or „Zusammenrückungen“) which only have the status of a word to a limited degree¹. Behind such a view — which has a firm place in the history of word-formation research — there is quite obviously the assumption that only those word-combinations are to be regarded as “real” compounds which on the one hand can be described as derivatives and/or compounds according to their morphological appearance but which must, on the other hand, have an established place in the lexicon of the language. Correspondingly, non-lexicalised compounds — which are characteristically also referred to as nonce-compounds² („Augenblickskomposita“) — are seen “as characteristics of the syntax and not of the vocabulary” (Eggers 1973: 83). As we shall see more clearly later, this distinction between lexicalised and non-lexicalised compounds, which was widespread in traditional word-formation theory, still has a contribution to make to the current discussion about the status of word-formation within a grammar and the methods of describing word-formation and word-formation processes — e.g. in connection with the lexicalist/transformationalist controversy.

¹ See my discussion of such views in Brekle (1975).

² Cf. Eggers (1973: 82); Thiel (1973: 379) speaks of “occasional compounds” and defines them as compounds “which are coined *ad hoc* in certain contexts and are correctly understood in context without belonging to normal usage”.

In earlier times, too, linguistics made a distinction between the inventory of lexical units which a speech community has at its disposal and which contains "finished" compounds and derivatives, and the possible and realisable new creations which can be coined by the application of appropriate word-formation rules in a given communication situation, the rules not being limited to purely syntactic or sentence-semantic processes, but including analogic processes, too. I shall just quote two examples from the last 150 years to illustrate this.

Friedrich Schmitthenner, whose *Ursprachlehre* (1826) contains a substantial chapter on word-formation³, distinguishes two types of lexical material in a language:

- a) "*Possibly* (potentialiter) *existing* words, or words for which the conditions are provided by the elements and derivation laws of the language, and
- b) *actually* (actu) *existing* words, or words which are found in the current vocabulary of the language". (1826: 188).

Three-quarters of a century later Georg von der Gabelentz emphasised the same facts from the point of view of descriptive method:

"Word-formation is unquestionably a part of the structure of language, consequently the theory of word-formation is part of grammar. This theory, however, is only complete if it states in which cases each word-formation pattern is permissible. [...] The compounds of a single German, Greek or Ancient Indian writer can be counted, but the permissible compounds of the three languages cannot." (1901: 121 f.)

If we leave aside terminological differences between these two positions and try to work out the common view of the authors, we discover that the basic assumption is that when speakers carry out acts of communication — more precisely, when they carry out their locutionary acts — they can draw the lexical material for their utterances from two components of their linguistic competence: firstly, from the inventory of lexical units, which — measured against an ideal competence — has a varying content and a varying degree of availability, and which stores both morphologically simple and morphologically complex units (all kind of lexicalised word-formations, that is those accepted by a speech-community; idioms, "set phrases", and suchlike); secondly, speakers — this is shown particularly clearly in children who are not yet exposed to the various standardizing strictures of a speech-community such as ours^{3a} — have at their disposal a partial linguistic competence, which allows them to produce *ad hoc* "new" word-derivations and compounds by using word-formation rules, in order to fulfil their communicative needs, i. e. *also* as stopgap solutions to particular lexical emergencies which might arise.

As a kind of interim review of our deliberations so far — and in anticipation of the objective to which I hope the arguments of this paper will lead — I want to set up first of all only the fairly general postulate that the investigation of the regularities of word-formation in a language, both their manifestations, that is "word-formedness", and the productive word-formation processes, should proceed by means of a methodically different instrumentarium in each case and perhaps also in different parts of the grammar. More explicitly this means that those morphologically complex units which are not produced by a speech-community by means of rule-application but are "called up" out of a list, come in principle under the domain of lexicography. At the same time it is clear that there are borderline cases; that many formations do not enjoy a very stable status compared with the "hard core" of the established inventory of words in the lexicon on account of their perhaps only temporary frequency of usage. There are numerous phenomena and criteria which are relevant for such decisions (lexicalisation, idiomatisation, etc.)⁴. On the other hand the lexicographer or the semanticist would be wise to take into account the deliberations and the findings of the investigator of word-formation whose research has a more

³ Cf. the new edition of Schmitthenner's *Ursprachlehre* in the series *Grammatica Universalis* Vol. 12 (1976) and Brekle (1977).

^{3a} Cf. the illuminating contribution by Panagl (1976).

⁴ Cf. Lipka (1977) and Motsch (1977) for more detailed discussion of these problems.

sentence-semantic and/or syntactic bias, as he will find the latter's discoveries regarding the internal syntactic and semantic structure and any relevant generative-transformational regularities of word-compounds and compound-types useful for the solution of his lexical-semantic problems.

In contrast to word-formation research as it has been widely practised in recent times, which in the description of the products of word-formation and the underlying regularities does not draw a sharp distinction between fully accepted formations (which are generally already (or still) in the lexicon) and "possible" formations, or formations which have perhaps already been coined as "nonce-formations", but which because of various factors have not proved capable of acceptance into the lexicon (and generally their creators do not want them to), we are pleading here for the systematic description of synchronically productive word-formation processes in individual languages, with the conditions of the creation, use and understanding of so-called "nonce-formations" as the main aim.

We are concerned here, then, with the establishment of a theory of word-formation in the strict sense; this does not necessarily mean, however, that the transformationalist — or more generally — the generativist position is being postulated as the only possible or only sensible position in this narrower and more precise meaning of word-formation⁵. In the interest of as realistic a theory of the actual word-formation processes as possible, other methods should attract the linguist's attention again — methods, such as the formation of new words by analogy⁶, which were well-known in older psychologising linguistics (e. g. Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* ('1880)).

Some of the lectures held at last year's Colloquium on Word-Formation in Wuppertal show that such considerations are by no means out of place. In particular I should like to refer to some thoughts which Magnus Ljung introduced in his at first sight very specialised paper "Problems in the derivation of instrumental verbs" (Ljung 1977). Ljung considers the necessity of a modified assessment of the nature of word-formation rules and the lexicon to be one of the conclusions to be drawn from his discussion of the problems of the derivation and semantic paraphrasability of instrumental verbs (*to hammer, to nail, to saw, to radio*, etc.). He suggests moving away from the widely accepted position according to which *the* task of word-formation rules is to produce new lexical items. Moreover Ljung regards word-formation rules — in so far as they permit the production of possible derivations and compounds, i. e. "nonce-formations" — as not fundamentally different from syntactic rules like *Extraposition, Clefting*, etc.

A critical consideration of his arguments leads us to the following conclusions: the categorisation of the items of the lexicon, which he understands as a list, as "item-familiar" for speaker and hearer, is in principle reasonable in so far as, when we speak, we do in fact have a high degree of recourse to lexical units which are familiar to us as individual "items". The output of syntactic rules and word-formation rules in the strict sense which we, too, have suggested here is characterised by Ljung⁷ as "type-familiar", i. e. speaker and hearer are not familiar with the output of these rules in their respective morphological content, which is of course not listable when the rules are productive, but they know the output only in respect of its "typical" syntactic and semantic quality, which depends on a finite number of criteria and "constraints". Ljung observes further that units which are "item-familiar" have a tendency to idiomatisation,

⁵ In the meantime a number of formally and observationally good fragments have accumulated, in which the description of productive derivation-types in German and English is treated on a sentence-semantic basis, cf. e. g. Ullmer-Ehrich (1976), Dowty (1976, unpubl.) and other literature given there. An earlier, formally less complete attempt to describe compounding processes on a sentence-semantic basis is Brekle (1970/²1976).

⁶ Cf. Motsch (1977: ch. 7), where Motsch subjects such considerations to more detailed examination, with the aim of giving generative power to the lexical component of a grammar.

⁷ Ljung takes over these two categorisations from Meys (1975).

whereas this is not the case with sentences and other "nonce-formations", which are "type-familiar". The fact that according to conditions which will be specified more precisely later many products of word-formation rules are incorporated in the lexicon despite their primary character of "type-familiarity", is not, according to Ljung, due to the peculiarity of word-formation rules, which he puts on the same level as syntactic rules, but it is due to the format, the quality of the output: what we are concerned with here is simply units which can be used in sentences like primary lexical units and which, most important of all, can be stored in the memory, unlike sentences.

Following these considerations Ljung discusses Halle's suggestion (1973) of integrating as it were the lexicon into the apparatus of the word-formation rules; in order to do this the word-formation rules would have to be made "sensitive" with respect to entries in the lexicon — without doubt an unusual constraint. If we drop Halle's "constraint" on word-formation rules, on the other hand, these rules will naturally produce a lot of "nonce-formations", words which "arise and then fall into oblivion" (Pennanen 1966: 145). So it now simply depends on the linguist's point of view, whether he regards these results as acceptable or even as desirable or not. If we, as Ljung and I suggest, systematically separate the area of those word-formations which are stored in the lexicon (which are normally more or less lexicalised) from the area of productive word-formation processes, then the relatively unlimited derivability of "nonce-formations" can really only be welcomed. At the same time it must be accepted that there will be systematically predictable constraints on acceptability and comprehensibility even with the characterisation of really productive word-formation rules I have advocated here⁸. The "constraint" with which Halle wanted to try to describe both areas of word-formation simultaneously within a lexicon which has in some way been made "generative", is then unnecessary. In a similar respect Halle's "Prolegomena" are criticised by Carroll/Tanenhaus (1975)⁹.

As I also suggest here, the two authors recommend that the investigation of word-formation processes be put in a wider theoretical framework: "... our interest in performance theory suggests that the theory of word formation may be integrated within a general theory of language use not solely a theory of language structure" (47). They suggest further that word-formation processes should not be described in the format of ordinary grammatical rules, as word-formation processes are "fundamentally unlike of grammar" (50), but the regularities of such processes should instead be described by means of "word-formation rule schemes" which do not have the formal characteristics of strict grammatical rules; they should deliver the morphonemic form and simply a schematic definition of the semantic structure of word-formations. Like most investigators of word-formation Carroll/Tanenhaus work on the assumption that compounding processes have as their source structures similar to sentences, but that the transition to constructions which are classifiable as surface compounds takes place by means of so-called "rule-schemes" which are not describable as grammatical rules. These "rule-schemes" are similar in form and function to topicalisation rules as already suggested and formulated in detail in Brekle (1970/²1976: 128ff.).

The contradiction between Carroll/Tanenhaus' "antigrammatical" approach¹⁰ and Ljung's suggestion, which I support, does not have to be an absolute one. In the first place it depends on which grammatical model you are working with; in principle it can be so structured that so-called "rule-schemes" can also be accommodated in the system (I agree with the authors that a description which is transformationalist in the narrower sense is not adequate; but this does not mean that a generative solution on a semantic basis within a more broadly conceived grammar (cf. Brekle 1970/²1976: 54ff.) is out of the question). In the second place the objection can be

⁸ Cf. Brekle (1970/²1976: Ch. 5, e. g. 161 et passim); cf. also Neuhaus (1971).

⁹ This work only came to my attention shortly before I completed this paper. I should like to thank Frans Plank (Technische Universität, Berlin) for making the work of Carroll/Tanenhaus available to me.

¹⁰ "... we are laid to claim that word formation rules are not rules of grammar" (1975: 5f.).

made against Carroll/Tanenhaus that the systematic location of their "word-formation rule-schemes" within a performance theory is still unclear; it is to be feared that important syntactic and sentence-semantic generalisations would be lost through such a solution.

Although there is no systematic examination of the production of in the strict sense "genuine" derivations and compounds ("nonce-formations") available yet, it can still be maintained that we can produce such word formations without difficulty under suitable circumstances in our everyday speech; and our communication-partners will normally have no difficulty understanding them¹¹. In one point, however, I cannot agree with Ljung when he says that the undoubtedly complex conditions under which neologisms are incorporated into the lexicon as conceptually more or less fixed terms should not be investigated by linguists. Certainly such investigations do not belong in the realm of systematic linguistics in the narrower sense, but I still see here a rewarding task for a number of disciplines on the borders of linguistics, such as socio-, psycho- and pragmatolinguistics. The findings of these disciplines could contribute towards solving some of the problems of political communication in our society.

There are references to this distinction between lexicalised and non-lexicalised word-formations also in Stein (1977). Among other things in connection with the changes in accent distribution in multiple compounds she makes the terminological distinction between "lexical compounds" and "syntactic compounds". Stein makes the same distinction with respect to derivatives; for example, she regards the English *-er*-derivatives *baker*, *reader*, *writer*, which can occur without *of* + NP following, as "lexical derivatives" (this kind of derivative has in addition the often discussed systematic semantic specialisation expressed by the feature [+habitual]; derivatives which are obligatorily followed by *of* + NP — e. g. *the baker of this delicious cake*, *he is a constant blamer of authority* — are logically classified as "syntactic derivatives".

Finally I should like to quote a criticism within the framework of our discussion of the delimitation of these two areas of word-formation — especially from a communicative-functional point of view. In his comprehensive and very detailed paper at last year's Colloquium on Word-Formation at Wuppertal Wolfgang Motsch pleads "for the description of word formations on the basis of the lexicon" (Motsch 1977). It is not possible here to discuss the problems of Motsch's special lexicalist solution. Within the first of his five arguments in favour of a lexical treatment of word-formation processes Motsch asserts "that word formations are not primarily to be regarded as constructions which are formed for particular speech situations" (Motsch 1977: ch. 2). He goes on to explain that with a very great proportion of "new" word-formations there is a tendency to be stored as units in the lexicon.

It is obvious that there is a contradiction here — at least in degree — to the thesis I have just presented, according to which "new" word-formations are coined primarily for communication requirements and purposes in actual speech situations and normally without any intention of extending the lexicon. The difference of our position from that of Motsch cannot be explained by theoretical considerations alone, but if we look at our everyday communication we can observe empirically that we — depending on our individual preferences and degree of competence — produce numerous "nonce-formations" daily, formations which we do not for a moment consider will be taken over as new items into the accepted vocabulary of a larger group. If empirical investigations confirm this assumption — and there is no doubt in my mind that they will (cf. footnote 11) — we can question Motsch's idea that "a word-formation newly created by a speaker [is] generally intended as the offer of a new concept for a temporary or long-term social inventory of concepts". One factor here is how narrowly or how widely we want to understand the word "temporary"; on the other hand the normal use of the word "concept" as a fairly stable linguistic projection of facts, ideas, etc., would not be compatible with our thesis.

¹¹ Cf. Thiel (1973). She bases her investigation on a corpus of words taken from the press; of 1331 compounds 62.1% turn out to be neologisms or occasional compounds. (Cf. footnote 2 above).

I am aware that the discussion so far is not detailed enough to clarify even in outline the whole complex of questions and their implications. However, I should like to underline the demand that future word-formation research devote its particular attention to the production of word-formations and the word-formation rules involved, along with their systematic constraints. Many of the recently intensely controversial questions about the position of word-formation processes and regularities within a grammatical model might then — at least in part — turn out to be pseudo-problems.

A methodical consequence to be drawn from this position is — as I have already indicated — that the linguistic processes which are receiving our particular attention here, the processes which lead to “nonce-formations”, must be described by means of a generative system of rules. There are indications that such “new” word-formations (derivatives and compounds) are directly produced and understood as such in normal, unproblematical communication and that they do not have to develop according to the syntactic matrix-constituent-sentence scheme postulated by Lees (1960)¹². More recent approaches make clear that a purely syntactic-transformationalist framework is unsuitable for the description of word-formation processes, that generative-sentence-semantic models (Montague, etc.) can be expected to allow a basically satisfactory analysis and perhaps even a psychologically realistic explanation of word-formation processes¹³.

In the remainder of this paper I should like to try — even if only in a relatively unsystematic or rather programmatic way — to name some criteria and factors which seem relevant for the production, use and understanding of “new” word-formations which are not part of the normal vocabulary of a speech-community¹⁴. We may assume that such basically pragmalinguistic conditions, which can also be regarded as components of a performance theory yet to be constructed, are not valid in all areas of word-formation. I therefore exclude the area of productive word-derivation processes, which extends far into the area of actual syntax (e.g. nominalisations, infinitive and gerund constructions and other constructions which have to be treated in a similar way transformationally), and limit myself to productive nominal compounding processes. For understandable reasons I shall base what I have to say on the facts of the German language; generalisations with reference to more than one language cannot be expected in this area anyway, unless we try to set up maxims for the use of “new” compounds in the sense of Grice’s conversation postulates. This is evidently the intention of Carroll/Tanenhaus (1975: 51) with their “minimax principle”: “The speaker always tries to optimally minimize the surface complexity of his utterances while maximizing the amount of information (underlying structure) he effectively communicates to the listener.” The authors assume that every word-formation pattern is semantically, or better pragmatically motivated by this and/or by their “Semantic Gap Hypothesis”.

Whether the “Minimax Principle” can in fact be assigned the status of a universally valid principle can be left open for the moment. The content of this principle as a factual statement of the communicative value of word-formations has been well known for a long time¹⁵. In

¹² Cf. Ullmer-Ehrich (1977: 212) for some relevant thoughts. Furthermore the plea was made in Brekle (1970/21976: 58) to describe word-formation processes on a sentence-semantic basis relatively independently of the processes of sentence production.

¹³ Cf. Dowty (1976, unpubl.); Ullmer-Ehrich (1977); Brekle (1970/21976).

¹⁴ I agree with Carroll/Tanenhaus (1976: 47) that, in order to produce a tolerably realistic description of word-formation processes, pragmatic factors, which would seem to be essential for the establishment of a performance theory, must be taken into consideration. This necessity is probably felt even more keenly in the area of word-formation than in the area of sentence formation.

¹⁵ Cf. Brekle (1970/21976: 40f.), Vendler (1967: 125) and von der Gabelentz (1901: 466f.) for a relatively early formulation of this discovery: “In place of the sentence: „Er ging daran zugrunde, daß er seine Kräfte zersplitterte“, we can say „Er ging an Kräftezersplitterung zugrunde“ [...] How the mind must condense its material before it can compress it like this! And how the hearer has to strain his mind in order to unravel correctly the material thus compressed!”

individual cases of communication, or with individual or group-specific stylistic preferences this principle is not necessarily valid. And when there is an accumulation of word-formations — in particular in the cases of compounds and multiple compounds¹⁶ — rather like in the use of syntactic recursivity (e.g. multiple sentence-embedding), there seems to be a borderline area which, in the interests of comprehensibility, is normally not crossed (except in certain special technical, “terminologised” communication types, e.g. in German “officialese”).

But now let us go on finally to a few thoughts on the pragmatic side of nominal composition.

It is almost trivial to remark that every speaker is led by a bundle of different communicative and other interests when he carries out speech acts; but that he also — depending on the particular restrictions on his linguistic competence and his communicative competence as a whole, and their translation into actual speech — prefers to use certain groups of lexical units, certain word and sentence formation types and certain degrees of complexity of the same.

In the area of nominal composition special communicative interests or needs can have the effect that a speaker designates a phenomenon he has perceived or imagined by means of an *ad hoc* compound, — whether because there is an objective gap in the lexicon of the language concerned (cf. Carroll/Tanenhaus’ “Semantic Gap Hypothesis”) for a morphologically concise term to describe certain facts, objects, etc., or because he has no access to the “mot juste” because of a weakness in performance at the moment of speaking. He will organise the qualities of the particular phenomenon which are subjectively relevant to him in the framework of a propositional structure in such a way that they represent the conceptual structures of his perception or apperception as adequately as possible in the form of semantic constituents within a familiar word-formation pattern which is characterized by certain relational constants such as *similarity, instrumentality, location, etc.* A topicalisation operation is necessarily involved in this in the sense that the speaker selects one semantic constituent of this propositional structure in such a way that it represents a possible generic name (= determinatum of the compound) of the phenomenon he wishes to describe; depending on the semantic-syntactic regularities or restrictions of the particular word-formation pattern one of the remaining constituents emerges as the determinant of the compound. We can observe processes of this kind especially clearly in the word-formations of child language. A convincing discussion of relevant examples can be found in Panagl (1976). He reports formations from his own observations, such as *Bleistiftbrett* (“*Brett* for drawing lines with a *Bleistift*”; = “ruler”), *Umrührkakao* (“Cocoa that needs stirring”), *Arbeitszimmertisch* (“table situated in the study”; = “desk”). From my son (age 4;8) I can report a three-part nomenclature for the appearance of mountains in the Alps: *Schneeberge* (“snowy mountains”), *Felsenberge* (“rocky mountains”), *Wollberge* (“woolly mountains” = “mountains covered with woods, meadows, giving them — at some distance — a woolly appearance”).

Without having to analyse these examples further, it is clear that children translate those perception qualities of their environment which they find significant into “new” compounds in order to designate and classify phenomena semantically and syntactically.

It can also very probably be assumed that in these and similar cases the “Minimax Principle”, which we discussed briefly above — minimisation of morphosyntactic effort for the maximum communication of semantic material — applies here.

It is well-known and also intuitively reasonable that a speaker, according to his communicative needs and his linguistic possibilities of satisfying them, can and must rely to a large extent on the total situation and the narrower context of his neologisms when he forms “new” compounds. Here it is hardly possible to give reasonably general conditions and factors which make a positive contribution to safeguarding the hearer’s comprehension. It is probably the case very often that a speaker, by means of a compound which is felt by all concerned to be

¹⁶ Cf. Stein (1977) for a short discussion of various aspects of multiple compounds.

appropriately formed, invents a morphologically concise name for the relevant aspects of objects, facts, events, etc. which he can show his partners in a communication process *ad oculos*. Often hypostatization effects are also involved in so far as configurations of qualities which have previously not been seen objectified go through a process of objectification and are perhaps raised to the level of a new entity¹⁷. Another possibility of safeguarding comprehension can be employed by the speaker if he characterises a phenomenon by means of syntactically explicitly formulated descriptions (relative clauses, etc.) and then sums up his characterisation with a compound expressing the relevant aspects, as it were a cumulation point of his efforts.

In individual cases it can certainly be in the interest of a speaker, a group or an institution, if certain phenomena are to be found in the private, semi-public or public sector respectively, to anchor these terminologically or conceptually for a length of time in the consciousness of group-members or the public by means of a neologism. In extreme cases, if the social influence of the word creator or creators concerned is powerful enough, such neologisms can — depending on how long the phenomenon concerned remains known — be incorporated into the vocabulary of the speech community. It is superfluous to give examples of this phenomenon, which we meet every day in the press — especially in the political, technological and economic fields. The fact that factors of language economy, hypostatization and even propoganda purposes play a role in this does not need special emphasis, either. Hans Bayer has devoted a comprehensive, historically well-documented chapter to aspects of this kind — including social, cultural and economic motives — in his work *Sprache als praktisches Bewußtsein* (1975)¹⁸. He expressly criticises a merely morphological, syntactic or systematically semantic description of word-formation processes; in order to discover the factors which are effective in actual word-formation processes, he demands in addition the consideration of the motives which drive the individual, who is in his turn embedded in social and economic norms, how the individual comes to terms linguistically with his environment and his experience. He sums up by saying that word-formation processes cannot be adequately enough described without consideration of the actual social events in which they operate and through which they — at least in the interpersonal context — are determined.

As I have already indicated, the results of compounding processes — whether genuine “nonce-formations” or compounds which enjoy a certain period of use — can serve or be made to serve a society. In any case there seems to be a tendency to hypostatize a part of reality which is seen — generally consciously — in a particular way and in this sense to create a “piece of frozen reality”. The purposes can be of an aesthetic nature, but with poetic compounds we will have to distinguish between those issuing from more or less current word-formation patterns and those resulting from “rule-changing creativity”. There are other aims and purposes in the technological and economic sphere; here the aim within individual technologies or sciences is to guarantee as unambiguous terms as possible for long series of products, these terms often being coined according to fixed word-formation rules, sometimes artificially created ones.

In the political sphere — especially in practical politics, which to a not inconsiderable extent has propaganda as its aim — the hypostatizing effect of compounds is exploited too, along with their semantic connotations, which are often consciously coloured (there may be differences in the extent to which such mechanisms are used in different political systems). Here is just one example taken from a topical politico-economic sphere in my country: interested political and industrial institutions like to use the compound *Entsorgungspark* — or alternatively the somewhat more neutral word, *Wiederaufbereitungsanlage* — in order to describe installations in which on a large technical scale highly radio-active waste — burnt out burning rods from atomic

¹⁷ Cf. Lipka (1977) for a more detailed discussion of such processes in connection with idiomatisation and lexicalisation in word-formation.

¹⁸ Chapter 6: „Wortbildung-Sprechtätigkeit-Lebenspraxis. Zur Dialektik der Wortbildungsprozesse.“

reactors — is fed back and used again. The compound *Entsorgungspark* is obviously to be classified as a fraudulent euphemism: it is not a kind of park, in which society is „entsorgt“ from atomic waste, as the naive are expected to believe; on the contrary, additional *Sorgen* (“worries”) are created.

With these remarks I have drawn attention to a number of problems which word-formation research can look into in the future. There is the more cause for hope as this branch of linguistics has in recent years been beginning to free itself increasingly from its sleepy existence of structuralist and pre-structuralist times, but also from the straitjacket of the dictates of all-too-strict systemlinguistics (e. g. generative transformationalism). To prevent misunderstandings: I am not pleading for more or less anecdotal descriptions of isolated, interesting aspects of word-formation. The degree of methodological reflectedness in present-day language theory and grammatical research should be preserved in their various largely mutually compatible approaches and integrated into a more comprehensive and empirically more adequate theory of language which includes pragmatic and performance considerations.

*Herbert E. Brekle, Lehrstuhl für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Regensburg,
Universitätsstraße 31, D-84 Regensburg*

Bibliography

- Bayer, Hans. 1975. Sprache als praktisches Bewußtsein. Grundlegung einer dialektischen Sprachwissenschaft. Düsseldorf: Schwann (especially ch. 6. „Wortbildung-Sprechtätigkeit-Lebenspraxis“).
- Brekle, Herbert E. 1970/²1976. Generative Satzsemantik im System der englischen Nominalkomposition. München: Fink (Internationale Bibliothek für Allgemeine Linguistik, Bd. 4).
- Brekle, Herbert E. 1975. „Zur Stellung der Wortbildung in der Grammatik“ in: Rix, H. (ed.) Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.—14. September 1973. Wiesbaden: Reichert: 26—39.
- Brekle, Herbert E. 1977. „Die Stellung der Wortbildung in F. Schmitthenners (1796—1850) Grammatiksystem“ in: Brekle H. E./Kastovsky D. (eds.) 1977: 32—38.
- Brekle, Herbert E./Kastovsky, Dieter (eds.) 1977. Perspektiven der Wortbildungsforschung. Akten des Wuppertaler Wortbildungskolloquiums, 9.—10. Juli 1976. Bonn: Bouvier.
- Carroll, John M./Tanenhaus, Michael K. 1975. “Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Word Formation” in: Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism (eds. M. E. Grossman, L. J. San, T. J. Vance) Chicago Linguistic Society 1975, 1: 47—62.
- Dowty, David R. 1976. (unpublished paper) “Toward a Semantic Theory of Word Formation in Montague Grammar” (mimeo).
- Drachman, G. (ed.) 1976. Akten der 3. Salzburger Jahrestagung für Linguistik. Tübingen: Narr.
- Eggers, Hans. 1973. Deutsche Sprache im 20. Jahrhundert. München.
- von der Gabelentz, Georg. 1901. Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse. Leipzig.
- Halle, Morris. 1973. “Prolegomena to a theory of word-formation” in: Linguistic Inquiry 4: 3—16.
- Lees, Robert B. 1960. The Grammar of English Nominalization. Bloomington.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1977. „Lexikalisierung, Idiomatisierung und Hypostasierung als Probleme einer synchronischen Wortbildungslehre“ in: Brekle, H. E./Kastovsky, D. (eds.) 1977: 155—64.
- Ljung, Magnus. 1977. “Problems in the derivation of instrumental verbs” in: Brekle/Kastovsky (eds.) 1977: 165—79.
- Meys, W. 1975. Compound adjectives in English and the ideal speaker-listener. Amsterdam.
- Motsch, Wolfgang. 1977. „Ein Plädoyer für die Beschreibung von Wortbildungen auf der Grundlage des Lexikons“ in: Brekle/Kastovsky (eds.) 1977: 180—202.
- Neuhaus, H. Joachim. 1971. Beschränkungen in der Grammatik der Wortableitungen im Englischen. Dissertation, Saarbrücken.
- Panagl, Oswald. 1976. „Aspekte der kindersprachlichen Wortbildung“ in: Drachman, G. (ed.) 1976: 79—101.
- Paul, Hermann. 1880/⁸¹1968. Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Pennanen, E. 1966. Contributions to the study of back-formation in English. Acta Academiae Socialis, Ser. A, Vol. 4. Tampere.

- Schmitthenner, Friedrich. 1826. Ursprachlehre. Entwurf zu einem System der Grammatik ...
Frankfurt/M.: Hermannsche Buchhandlung. Reprinted with an introduction by Herbert E. Brekle as
vol. 12 (1976) of *Grammatica universalis*. Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt: Frommann.
- Stein, Gabriele. 1977. "The Place of Word-Formation in linguistic description" in: Brekle/Kastovsky (eds.)
1977: 219—35.
- Thiel, Gisela. 1973. „Die semantischen Beziehungen in den Substantivkomposita der deutschen Gegen-
wartssprache“ in: *Muttersprache* 83: 377—404.
- Ullmer-Ehrich, Veronika. 1977. *Zur Syntax und Semantik von Substantivierungen im Deutschen*.
Kronberg/Ts.: Scriptor.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.