

Pragmatics In Nominal Compounding*

Lecturer **Abdulghani Majeed Jassim**

Abstract

The present paper sheds light on the interdependent relation between compounding and pragmatics. Different approaches to analyze compounds are examined. These are descriptive, semantic, typological, generativist, and pragmatic; all confirmed that the set of compounding semantic relations is infinite. The reference to pragmatic information is crucial, since it leads both the speaker and hearer to question if compound interpretation can be formalized at all. The most important problems in any pragmatic theory to compounding are redundant compounds, indirect compounding relations, and lack of generalization. Pragmatics and extralinguistic knowledge help the speaker and the listener reduce multiple ambiguities and inherent vagueness of these compound forms in ways that a purely grammatical/semantic description does not. Pragmatic theories stress the importance of context in compound interpretation, social, cultural and stylistic background of the speaker and hearer.

Key words: Pragmatics, compounding, grammatical/semantic

* Al-Mansour University college

1- Introduction

Different definitions have been given to the process of compounding or compounds. But mostly speaking, these definitions can be classified as morphological and semantic. The morphological definition, as stated by Abed (1996:8f)¹, focuses mainly on the isolation feature of the compounded elements. That is, it concentrates on their ability to stand independently on the one hand, and other formal or external features (like orthographic, phonological, and grammatical) on the other. Bauer(1983:29) himself adopted this traditional way of defining compounds when he defines a compound as *“a lexeme containing two or more potential stems that have not subsequently been subject to a derivational process”*. From a semantic point of view, Quirk, et. al. (1972: 1020) state that compounds can be seen to *“be isolated from ordinary syntactic constructions by having a meaning which may be related to but cannot simply be inferred from the meaning of its parts”*². Though the semantic definition seems to be more appropriate than a morphological one, Quirk, et. al. (1985:1567) and many other linguists like Katamba (1993:292) believe that a definition comprises the two approaches will be more useful. This is clear in Quirk, et. al.'s. definition, namely, *“a compound is a lexical unit consisting of more than one base... functioning both grammatically and semantically as a single word”*(op.cit.). Some compounds are compositional, where the meaning of the resultant compound is derived from the meanings of its parts. Others are not compositional. Such compounds must be listed in the dictionary with their meanings and memorized. Their meanings may need something beyond semantics; in fact, it needs pragmatics.

The term *“pragmatics”* is used here in a wider sense to refer to the use of language, not structure, the influence of the speaker's knowledge of the world, *“the speaker's and hearer's common knowledge of their material culture”* (Lees,1968:117), and the beliefs about the structure of the real-world and its interpretation. Levinson (1983:5-35) and Yule (1996:3-8, 133) argue that pragmatics determines our choice of wording and our interpretation of language

within the social context. This is drawn from the fact that as there are rules for generating grammatical structures or compounds, there are also linguistic conventions for the appropriate use of language in various contexts. This leads one, as concluded by Abed (1996:66), to believe that it would seem reasonable to leave the appropriate interpretation of compounds to the pragmatic component of grammar than to write it into the processes of word-formation. This conclusion is based on Adams' admission that her classification of compounds 'relationships a will be more powerful than it is if "the knowledge of the world" is added(1973:63).

The present paper presents an account of the interdependent relationship between pragmatics and nominal compounding.

2- Nominal Compounding

In a compound that is made up of two words, such as *tree house*, the second word of the construction is called the "head" of the construction. Syntactically, the head is the dominant constituent of the construction, which means that the inflectional properties of the compound are inherited from the head element. Semantically, the head of a compound specifies the class of entities to which the compound belongs (Katamba 1993:56). Therefore, *tree house* will function as a noun because the head is also a noun and the compound as a whole will refer to some sort of house because the head noun refers to a house. The first word of the compound, *tree*, is called the "modifier" element of the construction because it modifies the referent of the head noun in some way: *tree house* is a house that has been built on a tree.

2.1 Approaches Of Compound Analysis

Different approaches of classifying compounds are found in the literature of compounding. The following is an account of the most influential ones:

1- Bloomfield's categories of endocentric and exocentric compounds

Leonard Bloomfield (1933:309-12) suggests two main descriptive approaches for the classification of compounds: the analysis of the relation of the members to each other and the analysis of the relation of the compound as a whole to its members. The former line of analysis follows syntactic considerations, where Bloomfield distinguishes between syntactic and asyntactic compounds. In the case of syntactic expressions the members stand to each other in the same grammatical relation as words in a phrase. Thus, for example, the members of *blackbird* have the same grammatical relationship of adjective and noun as the phrase *black bird*. In the case of asyntactic constructions, the members exhibit a relationship which is unparalleled in the syntax of the language: *door-knob* is asyntactic because there is no English phrase such as **door knob*. Unfortunately, Bloomfield does not elaborate upon the difference between syntactic compounds and phrases — why should we have syntactic compounds if the same grammatical relations are expressed in a phrase and vice versa? The explanation leads to semantic implications which follow from the relation of the members to the compound as a whole — a line of enquiry which Bloomfield clearly separates from syntactic criteria.

2- Jespersen's semantics-based classification of compounds

Otto Jespersen (1954:135-41) raises the question of why we have compounds at all, instead of the free syntactic combination of the same elements. The answer, according to Jespersen, lies in the conciseness of compounds. However, the construction does not say anything about the way in which the relationship between the two members of a compound should be interpreted, that has to be inferred from the context. This means that theoretically there is a relatively large number of possible interpretations for a given compound, but lexicalised constructions have become the name for one specific thing, thereby giving up their potential meanings.

3-Marchand's descriptive categories of exocentric compounds

Hans Marchand (1969:14-23) devotes a substantial part of his monograph to the examination of the compounding process in his

study on English word formation. He analyses the compound as a morphological unit with two parts, the determinant and the determinatum. In English, the former generally precedes the latter. However, Marchand calls attention to compounds such as *pickpocket*, *blackout* and *overall* here the determinatum is missing. In such cases the determinatum is “*implicitly understood but not formally expressed*” (p. 11). Marchand calls these combinations compounds with a zero determinatum or refers to them simply as exocentric compounds where the determinatum “*lies outside the combination*” (ibid.). Marchand does not brush aside the question of exocentric compounds with a couple of general remarks but in fact classifies its types in a whole chapter (pp. 37–45). His classification is somewhat confusing, however, as there is no main linguistic consideration — semantic, syntactic or morphological — on which his classification is based but is rather a subjective pick of certain types of compounds, analysed from primarily a diachronic point of view.

4-The emergence of metaphorical compounds in Adams’s typology Valerie Adams (1973:56-83), in her discussion of nominal compounds, classifies these constructions into nine categories, which bear close resemblance to the compound classes of Jespersen (1954). Her categories are the following: subject–verb (*bee sting*), verb–object (*drug addict*), appositional (the compound is a combination of A and B: *nation state*), associative (the compound can be paraphrased as ‘B is part of A’: *lambswool*), instrumental (one of the constituents denoted the instrument or cause involved in an action: *sleeping pill*), locative (one of the constituents describes the place/time/situation of the other: *living room*), resemblance (the first element denotes something to which the referent of the second is compared: *piggy bank*), composition/form/contents (one of the elements specifies the other in the terms of some concrete feature: *fur coat*), adjective–noun (*best man*). One of the problems with her classification — which she acknowledges (p. 62) — is that it is a combination of syntax and semantics, thus allowing many loopholes to enter the system: an adjective–noun combination such as *frozen food* could just as well be placed into the composition/form/contents class.

5-Levi's generativist account

Probably the most far-reaching work on the semantics of nominal compounds within the generativist tradition is Levi's (1978) analysis of complex nominals. In Levi's definition, the term "complex nominal" encompasses three sets of expressions: (1) noun-noun nominal compounds such as *apple cake* and *doghouse*; (2) nominalizations such as *government intervention* and *city planner*; and (3) nominals containing non-predicating (attributive only) adjectives such as *electrical engineer* and *musical talent*. What all the three types of nominals share is a head noun preceded by a modifying element. Levi claims that all complex nominals are derived by two syntactic processes: predicate nominalization and predicate deletion. In the latter case, the nominal compounds are a result of syntactic transformation in which clauses such as "cake with apples" surface as nominal compounds such as *apple cake*. The semantic relations between the member elements of the compound represent one of the nine recoverably deletable predicates such as *cause, have, make, use, be, in, from* and *about*. These predicates are deleted at surface structure but the interpretation of the compound is made possible by using the reconstituted relative clause. One of the problems of Levi's proposal is the difficulty of classifying compounds based on this taxonomy since they might be interpreted by more than one recoverably deletable predicate (p.173). A classic example is *alligator shoes* are taken as "shoes from alligator skin" rather than "shoes worn by alligators" (cf. *horse shoes*) or "shoes for walking on alligators" (cf. *beach shoes*) or "shoes for wearing during the alligator time" (cf. *winter shoes*). However, Levi was aware of this problem and proposed that multiple ambiguity can be done away with the help of pragmatic clues. Although grammatically all of these interpretations are possible, the context and encyclopaedic knowledge greatly reduce the range of variants.

6-Selkirk's word structure rules

Elizabeth O. Selkirk (1982:19) places compound formation within the generative framework by arguing for a context-free word structure rule for generating compound word structures and proposes the general rewrite rule of $N \rightarrow \{N A V P\} N$ for the generation of English

nominal compounds. She points out that the majority of English compounds is syntactically and semantically right-headed: “[f]or the most part, though, English compounds are right-headed endocentric constructions” (ibid.). The head of the compound is determined by the Right-Hand Head Rule, proposed originally by Edwin Williams (1981). However, Selkirk points out that the Right-Hand Head Rule is not a universal feature of language since languages such as French or Vietnamese abound in left-headed constructions. Thus right-headedness is a part of English grammar, “a parameter which is set for the language” (p. 21). Selkirk claims that Williams’s rule needs to be revised, as it cannot accommodate English verb-particle constructions where the head is on the left. Selkirk slightly modifies the rule by suggesting that the head of a compound will be rightmost element that is characterised by the same “feature complex” as the compound as a whole.

7- Brekle’s pragmatics-oriented word formation theory

E. Brekle (1978:73ff, cited in Benczes(2006:32)) argues that new word formations are coined primarily for communication purposes in actual speech situations and are not intended to expand the lexicon. He makes reference to the “Minimax Principle” as a governing criterion of German compounding (which is possibly universal): the speaker tries to minimize the surface complexity of the utterance while at the same time aims to maximize the information that is communicated to the hearer. This idea of language economy also emerged in Downing (1977:822)who remarked that one of the functions of compounds is to serve as a means for “telegraphic speech”: *cradle song* is a compact, shortened version of ‘a song to lull a child in the cradle to sleep’. Given the problematic nature of uncovering the underlying deleted verb of nominal compounds, Bauer (1979:45f) proposes that a knowledge of the world is essential to reach a correct interpretation of a compound expression. This — to a certain extent— can be formalised by the semantic description of the lexemes making up the compound expression. Thus, the semantic make-up of *flour* contains the notion of ‘something ground’, while *wind* contains ‘force’. These help us to differentiate between the meanings of *flourmill* (‘a mill where flour is ground’) and *windmill* (‘a mill powered by wind’), respectively.

8- Adams revisited

The scope of Adams's (2001; cited in Benczes(2006:37f)) study is the realm of complex words, in which a significant part deals with compound formation. A short section (pp. 81–2) looks at exocentric compounds (where exocentricity is based upon semantic criteria). Adams claims that such constructions are small in number and are formed on the basis of three patterns: (1) the relation between the elements is similar to that of verb and complement, as in *pickpocket*; (2) the elements are a combination of adjective and noun as in *highbrow*; and (3) the elements are a combination of noun and noun, as in *spoonbill*. While her categorisation is quite generalised, Adams(p.82) does make an interesting comment: “*Many examples [of exocentric compounds] are likely to be encountered as modifiers within noun phrases, as in ‘a free-lance writer’, ‘long-nose pliers’, ‘a maidenhair fern’, ‘break-neck speed’, ‘stop-gap measures’*”(bold mine). She also claims (p. 88, n5) that exocentric compounds are very similar to metonymic expressions confined to a particular speech situation (as in ‘the mushroom omelette is waiting for its bill’) — which most probably does apply to many unlexicalised constructions which have a meaning only on the spur of the moment (as the much-quoted example of *apple-juice seat* in Downing 1977:).

2.2 Endocentric Vs. Exocentric

Endo- and exocentricity are concepts associated with both syntactic and semantic headedness. It is a general assumption that the majority of English compounds follow the Right-Hand Head Rule (Williams ,1981:284) — which defines the head of a morphologically complex construction as the right-hand member — and accordingly are endocentric from a syntactic point of view, even this rule, as stated by Abed(1996:77) ,is not universal since there are many languages do not follow it.. Semantic endocentricity means that English composite constructions are hyponyms of the second, right-hand element. There are, of course, plenty of exceptions which fail to abide by these suppositions. Compounds whose right-sided element does not specify the class of entities to which the word belongs are called exocentric compounds, such as *redskin*, which does not

denote a type of skin but a person with a skin of a reddish colour. Moreover, Jackendoff (1975:655) claims that there are many factors influencing the prediction of endocentric compounds. These factors are familiarity of items combined, the underlying elements, the speaker's knowledge about the language, and the knowledge about the outside world (or pragmatics of the situation). This clearly justifies Abed's claim that endocentric compounds are also of different types of difficulty (ibid.:135).

Different terms are given for exocentric compounds, e.g., "metaphorical", "metonymical", "idiomatic", and "synecdochic" (see Benczes,2006:9f).Some exocentric compounds are called "bahuvihi", a term taken from Sanskrit. Quirk, et. al. (1985;1576) sum up these compounds as follows:

The term "behuvrihi" refers not to their patterns of formation but to the relation they have with their referents. Neither constituent of such a compound refers to the entity named but ... the whole refers to a separate entity (usually a person) that is claimed to be characterized by the compound, in its literal or figurative meaning.

Additionally, Marchand (1968:14) decides that the meaning of bahuvrihi compounds can be expressed in the following statement: "someone or something marked by what is expressed in the composite determinant". Abed (1996:25) confirmed that this statement is powerless unless knowledge of the world is referred to. His quoted example is redskin, which means (1) a person , (2) a potato , and (3) an apple.

3- Pragmatic Principles In Compounding

According to Kiefer (2001:277), Much less is known about the pragmatics of compounds. Morphopragmatics is concerned with the pragmatic effects of ad hoc compounds: lexical compounds with their predictable meanings fall outside its scope. Bardovi-Harlig &

Mahan-Taylor (2003:38) presents the importance of pragmatic differences between the speaker and the hearer as follows:

The consequences of pragmatic differences, unlike the case of grammatical errors, are often interpreted on a social or personal level rather than as a result of the language learning process. Being outside the range of language use allowed in a language, or making a pragmatic mistake, may have various consequences .A pragmatic error may hinder good communication between speakers, may make the speaker appear abrupt or brusque in social interactions, or may make the speaker appear rude or uncaring. Unintentional insult to interlocutors and denial of requests have been identified as other potential pragmatic hazards.

Two theories have particularly been concentrated on this relationship between compounding and pragmatics. In the first theory, compounds have been investigated mainly with respect to their discourse function. For example, compounds have a special discourse referential function; they are used when a pronoun (for place or time) would not suffice to establish referential identity between two expressions. The best example is *Strauss' election-campaign team*.

The default interpretation of compounds apparently arises from the lexicon or the grammar (see Lascarides & Copestake,2011:7ff) . For instance, there is an obvious generalization that when a noun that refers to a solid substance combines with a noun that refers to a solid artifact, the compound refers to the artifact made of the substance (like *plastic toy , wrought iron, mahogany dresser*).On the other hand, some compounds can only be interpreted in context. Downing (1977:823) gives an attested example where someone was asked to sit in the apple juice seat in a situation where there was a table already set with a glass of apple juice by one place. Here, *apple*

juice seat , as informed by Downing, means “seat with a glass of apple juice in front”, but obviously this meaning cannot be listed in the dictionary/lexicon. Even if a compound has an established meaning or interpretation , in context there may be another possibility. For example, it is wrong to understand *garbage man* to mean ‘a man made out of garbage’ by analogy with *snowman*. The same is true for *milkman*, *batman* , *boatman* , and *chairman*³. Examples like these have led linguists like Adams (1973), Downing (1977) and Bauer(1983) to the suggestion that nominal compounds should be assigned a representation where the relationship between the two parts of the compound is left unspecified and further interpretation should be left to the pragmatic component. Levi (1978:238) suggests the basic function of pragmatics (or pragmatic principles) by stating that:

The basic function of these principles, when used in conjunction with the syntactic and semantic constraints on compound nouns formation, seems to be one of helping the listener to select from the grammatically possible semantic structures the one reading that is contextually most plausible, and then (or, more probably ,simultaneously) to figure what real world objects could be appropriately named by such a form. The speaker’s task, on the other hand, is closely related to that of the listener, in that the speaker must choose a compound form in such a manner as to permit relatively prompt and accurate identification by the listener of the intended referent.

Although it is completely true that both pragmatics and context play a central role in interpreting novel compounds and that there are pragmatic constraints on the possible interpretation, there are serious objections that this is the only mechanism involved. This gives no explanation of the fact that the majority of compound nouns behave in a semi-regular manner. Some compounds which should be allowed on pragmatic grounds do not occur: for instance, **blacksmith hammer* and other such

compounds are not acceptable when taken as referring to an instrument used by a person with the given occupation. Furthermore, languages vary in productivity with respect to compounding. For example, Arabic has a restricted use of compounds; majority of them are compositional since they are **المركب الإضافي**, whereas a limited set are not compositional since they are **المركب المزجي** and **المركب الاسنادي** (see Abed,1996:71-76 ; and Al-Jurf,2005:145-56). This variety leads to relatively different need for pragmatics. As suggested by Levi (1978:241), one of the most important pragmatic principles is that the modifying constituent must *“denote some truly distinctive feature which will isolate the appropriate subset from all others, two corollaries of this principle are that this feature must not express either negative relations or redundant information”*. Compounds like *pants-cloth* and *swamp-water* would appear odd because, in view of our knowledge , all pants are traditionally made of cloth and swamps naturally have water. In contrast, compounds like *swamp-lotus* and *pants-leather* are functional names , since swamps are also the habitat of the lotus and pare not made from leather. These modifiers are distinctive enough to constitute a special subset. It is important here to state that not all English compound nouns in English contain negative relations. All Arabic compounds, in contrast , are all with positive relations.

To continue with Levi (and also mentioned by Adams (1973: 84), it is necessary to state that the modifier member need not encode all information about the referent, only the most salient characteristic is needed to identify the substance name with the compound. For example, coconut milk-durian is a particular kind of dessert that customary contains the ingredients of sticky rice, sugar, and water. Such information would not , therefore, be effective in distinguishing this dessert from any other desserts made from coconut milk. It is the selection of durian as a modifier that serves this purpose, since the inclusion of this fruit made it unusual or marked.

Also, as the second theory of the relationship between compounding and pragmatics, newly coined compounds, in virtue

of their innovative nature, have a foregrounding function .In this respect, Séaghdha (2008:11)states that “*yet despite the relative case with which human speakers and hearers handled novel compound, modeling the inferential processes involved has proven very challenging*”. This is then asserted by affirming that “*it is not sufficient to simply associate particular constituent words with particular semantic relation*”(ibid.:12). This function can be observed particularly well in poetic language, in technology language in advertising , and in journalism (especially in headlines)⁴. Furthermore, and except in technology, most ad hoc compounds are many-ways ambiguous. The inherent ambiguity of compounds is often exploited in poetry, in political discourse , and in jokes. This is clearly examined by Séaghdha(2008:12f)⁵:

Reasoning about (novel) compound meaning involves working with at least two levels of semantics :lexical and relational. Reasoning at the lexical level involves processing information about the meanings of constituent words and comparing them to the constituents of other known compounds. The relational level involves (social , cultural ,...)knowledge about how particular kinds of entities tend to interact in the world and which semantic relations tend to be expressed in language(emphasis mine).

4- Pragmatic Aspects Of Compounds

There are two important aspects for compounds (and also for single words) , namely, the existence of entities and nameability. As a general rule, and as stated in Bauer (1983:85),a word will not be formed unless it denotes something/somebody existent .This rule is very important regarding that the lack of existence of a given form is often used as an argument against the productivity of word-

formation. This particularly leads to the acceptance of Jackendoff's claim that

Part of a speaker's knowledge of the English lexicon is the way in which the meanings of compounds are related to the meanings of their constituents: thus we would say that somebody did not know English if he (seriously) used garbage man to mean a man made of garbage (1975:655)(bold and italics are mine)

Furthermore, Bauer (1983:86) stresses that a compound should not only denote something, it must denote something which is nameable as well. When the name of a compound is formulated, there must be an acceptance from the linguistic community. From the speaker's and hearer's points of view, and as mentioned by Levi (1978:241-44), creating a new compound should be pragmatically measured. That is, substances are likely to be named in terms of some regular, habitual, or permanent association or relationship, rather than in terms of some totally transitory features. The compound *person-drive car*, for instance, refers to a person who drives regularly to earn his living, but not to anyone else who drives a car at some point in time (in general, the former is assumed to drive a car more frequently than the latter). Thus, a teacher who is driving a car to school could not be called by the compound as such.

The speaker must observe the convention that the newly-created or formed compound should be endocentric (or compositional), as much as possible, as commonly used now in computer terms compared with chemical or medical ones. He also must observe that the head noun chosen must describe not assert a superset from which the modifier (or the first element) will refer only to a more narrowly-defined subset. Selecting a pronominal modifier constitutes the most difficult and important task in forming compounds since the referent contained in the chosen modifier should be easily picked out by the listener. And

the pronominal modifier must refer to the distinctive features which will isolate the chosen subset from others. These distinctive features must not be negative and redundant. For example, even *water lake* denotes something nameable, but its existence is questionable since its possible readings carry redundant and negative information .

It is necessary to note that classifying a given compound with entity or quality which it is not associated with does not narrow down the class of referents to any useful degree. This is because there is typically an infinite variety of individuals who do not have a particular quality , and an infinite variety of qualities which a given individual does not have.

From the listener's viewpoint, he must take into his account the fact that when the speaker devises or creates a particular compound, there is something existent in the real world and that it is also nameable .The listener must also assume that the modifier is chosen to denote a positive rather than negative and redundant aspects of the relevant subset, and must go on from there to pick out the most likely referent from the given form and context (see Yule,1996: 6-10).

5- Types Of Pragmatic Knowledge

Bauer (1979:46-9) examines the different types of pragmatic information required. With the help of context, he specifies three types of information(see also Abed,1996:67-9):

(1).Knowledge of the world

Some of this knowledge can be formalized in the semantic description of the individual lexemes, but not all of it. For instance , based on our knowledge of pineapples radios, and the possible relations that can hold between them, we might decide that a *pineapple radio* is probably(see Séaghdha,2008:11) :

- A radio that looks like a pineapple.

- A radio contained in a pineapple .

Rather than :

- A radio used for eating pineapples.
- A radio owned by a pineapple.

Similarly, it is presumed that our appropriate interpretation of *music clock* is (a clock that makes/produces music) is due to our experience with such type of clock , but neither

- a clock that is activated by music.

Nor

- a clock that is powered by music .

is possible. These two interpretations are possible only for *electricity music*. Our basic experience raises the claim that if there is a possibility in our technology, but not in our competence, to generate a clock functioning by using music as its energy source. It is possible to call also this device a music clock by generating it in the same way as *electricity clock* and *steam iron*. According to Yule (1996:85f), our ability to arrive automatically at interpretations of the unwritten and unsaid must be based on pre-existing knowledge structures or patterns , which are known as *schemata*. One of the most common types of these schemata is cultural schemata. In other sense, it is almost inevitable that our background knowledge schemata will be culturally determined. The best examples are the following Arabic compounds: أبو بكر ، حضرموت، معدي كرب، تأبط شراً، شجرة الدر، امرؤ القيس.

(2).Knowledge of the artifacts connected with the society

This is particularly noticeable in exocentric compounds denoting plants, birds , etc. In addition to their existence and function, it is important to know what these compounds resemble. Once these compounds are formulated and accepted in the vocabulary of language, there will be no necessity to be aware of the original basis for the comparison, as in *lyre-bird* , *razor grinder*, *redlegs deadline*⁶ ,and *lady's- smock*. The best Arabic examples are عباد الشمس ،ابن أوى .The knowledge of pragmatics in which extralinguistic knowledge is applied may be generally tied to the social and cultural background

of the speaker who is using compounds. For example , the compound *m b an* (*mother-house*) , rather than *mia b an* (*wife-house*) as perceived in another language such as English, is created for a housewife in Thai , as mentioned in Singnoi (2000:284) , and refer to the duty or career of married women. This compounding is based on the traditional ,cultural function of Thai women ,i.e., as mothers who raise their children by themselves and do the housework at the same time. The function of being a mother is more dominant than that of wife. Therefore, it is not surprising that the compounds such as *ph ^ b an* does not necessary denote a father who does the housework as his career, but denotes a married man. Another example is that compounds like *vehicle-pig* , *vehicle-buffalo* , *vehicle-cow* and the like are interpretable as vehicles for carrying those kinds of animals, while the compound *vehicle-horse* is not a kind of vehicle for carrying horses, rather it is a kind of vehicle that is dragged by horses. This is a reflection of our knowledge , rather than the linguistic fact, that we do not use animals such as pigs, buffaloes, and cows to drag vehicles , but we do use horses. This is a reflection of cultural competence rather than of linguistic competence. It is also true , in many cases, nothing less arbitrary than stylistic factors appear to have influenced the choice between versions of the same compounds , as in *grandfather* , *grandmother* compared with *grandpapa* and *grandmam*, respectively .Although both are grammatical and synonymous , only the former is considered polite and formal.

(3).knowledge of the qualities associated with members of a compound

This is particularly useful when one of the elements compounded is a name of animal like *dogfight* , *lion's share*, *camel's patience*, etc. The best representative is *Jesus bug* for the insect *water-boatman*. This implies not only knowledge of the artifacts connected with the society and their qualities , but also knowledge of the Bible to the extent that it must be known that Jesus walked on the water (Bauer,1979:47). It is necessary to demonstrate that these qualities are/are not subject to change from one society to another and within

the same society during different periods of time. The Arabic best examples are مكة المكرمة ، أصحاب الكهف ، أصحاب الفيل:

Most compounds require knowledge of their referents before they can be fully-understood, and compounds which are of different degrees of lexicalization are different, in fact, in their needs to pragmatics. For example , even *ticket-holder* and *scene-stealer* are of the same structure , but the former needs less knowledge than the latter.

6- Conclusion

The main findings of the present paper are :

- 1- Different approaches are found to analyze compounds .These are descriptive , semantic, generative, typological , and pragmatic. Actually this order represents the ways linguists and morphologists approached the idea of compositionality in compounds.
- 2- It is clear from the relevant literature that all types of compounds (endocentric and exocentric) need the knowledge of the world, as inferred from Jackendoff (1975:655). But this need is relative ,i.e., some compounds are with one possible interpretation ,while other with more than three.
- 3- Pragmatic rules for language use are often subconscious, and even native speakers are often unaware of pragmatic rules.
- 4- It is the pragmatic principles (or functions) that the speaker must observe in order that the conjoined words in a compound form can correctly identify the intended referent to the listener. Among these main principles or functions are context of situation, social and cultural background, stylistic background .

NOTES

[Note 1] Abed presents a detailed account of those linguists adopted the morphological definition like Jespersen (1940), Bloomfield (1933), Zandvoort (1975) ,etc. Also , some linguists like Nakov(2011:4) and Quirk , et. al. (1985:1567f) regard this type of definition grammatical.

[Note 2] “*Since both compounds and phrases are made up of words, determining which combinations of words are compounds and which*

combinations are syntactic phrases is not always straightforward” (Katamba,1993:66).It will depend to an even greater extent on which forms to be recognized as compound words ,and hence, part of the province of morphology and the lexicon, and which forms as phrases and, hence, the domain of syntax. This matter is examined in details within the lexicalist hypothesis of lexical morphology. Katamba states that “the key difference between words-in particular compound words- and syntactic phrases lies in the fact that , whatever internal structure a compound has, that structure is inaccessible to the rules of syntax(ibid.:299).

[Note 3] For a detailed analysis of x-man compounds, see Abed(1996:33-37).

[Note 4]In this respect, Master states that compounds “are especially prevalent in professional texts in science and technology, business, medicine, law, and other areas of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). The difficulty usually lies in decoding the compounds rather than in understanding the individual words in the compound”.

[Note 5] Séaghdha(2008:12ff) affirms that the same ways of examining the semantic relations (and then their pragmatic principles) are now used in computational linguistics. His book is a valid example of this fact where chapters 4, 5, 6 , and 7 are devoted to identify the semantic relations among novel compound nouns. See also Nakov(2011) and Nakov & Hearst (2011) .

[Note 6] This is Katamba’s example (1993:72) where instances of productivity and creativity are examined. For this compound, during the American Civil War, a *deadline* was the line round the perimeter fence beyond which soldiers were not allowed to go. A soldier who wandered beyond that line risked being shot dead for desertation. As for *redlegs* , it may be true that poor whites working in the hot sun as labourers on plantations in Tobago did literally have legs which were *red*; nevertheless the compound *redlegs* is semantically opaque. See also Nakov & Hearst (2011:3ff).

REFERENCES

- Abed, A.Q.(1996) "Analysis of Errors Made by Advanced Iraqi Students of English in Using Endocentric Noun-Noun Compounds. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Baghdad: University of Baghdad.
- Adams, V. (1973) *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.
- Adams, V. (2001) *Complex Words in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Al-Jurf, R. (2005) *A Contrastive Analysis of English and Arabic for Translation Students*. Al-Riyadh: Alobeikkan Printing Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003) "Introduction to Teaching Pragmatics, *English Teaching Forum*, July, pp.37-39.
- Bauer, L. (1979) "On the Need for Pragmatics in the Study of Nominal Compounding". *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp.45-50.
- (1983) *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Benczes, R. (2006) *Creative Compounding in English: The Semantics of Metaphorical and Metonymic Noun-Noun Combination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*. Chicago IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brekke, Herbert E. 1978. Reflections on the conditions for the coining, use and understanding of nominal compounds. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Linguists*, Wolfgang U. Dressler and Wolfgang Meid (eds.), 68–77. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beitrage zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Downing, P. (1977) "On the creation and use of compound nouns", *Language*, Vol.53, no.4, pp.810-842.
- Jackendoff, R. (1975) "Morphological and Semantic Regularities in the Lexicon". *Language*, vol.51, no. 3, pp.659-71.

Jespersen, O. (1954) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*,

Part VI: *Morphology*. London: Bradford and Dickens.

Katamba,F.(1993) *Morphology*. Houndmills : Macmillan Press Ltd.

Kiefer,F.(2001) "Morphology and Pragmatics". In Spencer, A. & Zwicky,

A. *The Handbook of Morphology*.pp. 272-81.

Lascarides,A.& Copestake,A.(2011) "Pragmatics and word meaning".

Retrieved from :

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download>

?doi=10.1.1.79.4332&rep=rep1&type=pdf. Access date

23Sept,

2011.

Lees, R. (1968) *The Grammar of English Nominalization*, 5th ed.

Mouton:

The Hague.

Levi, J. (1978) *The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals*.

NewYork:

Academic Press, Inc.

Levinson,S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Marchand, H. (1960) *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English*

Word-Formation: A synchronic-diachronic approach(2nd ed.).

Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Nakov,P.(2011) "Noun Compound Interpretation Using Paraphrasing Verbs: Feasibility Study". Retrieved from [http://biotext](http://biotext.berkeley)

[.berkeley](http://biotext.berkeley)

[.edu/papers/mwe2008.pdf](http://biotext.berkeley.edu/papers/mwe2008.pdf). Access dated : 20 Sept,2011.

Nakov,P. & Hearst,M.(2011) "Using verbs to Characterize Noun-Noun Relation".Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc>

[/download?doi=10.1.1.70.7874&rep=rep1&type=pdf](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.70.7874&rep=rep1&type=pdf)

Access

Dated 20 Sept, 2011.

Master, P.(2003) "Noun Compounds and Compressed Definitions",*English*

Teaching Forum , July, pp.2-10.

- Quirk,R.,Greenbaum,S.,Leech,G. & Svartvik,J.(1972) *A Contemporary English Grammar*. London: Longman.**
----- **(1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.**
- Séaghdha,D. (2008)*Learning Compound Noun Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.**
- Selkirk, E. O. (1982) *The Syntax of Words* [Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 7]. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.**
- Singnoi,U.(2000) “Nominal Constructions in Thai.Unpublished PH D Dissertation”. Oregon : The University of Oregon.**
- Spencer,A. & Zwicky,A.(2001) *The Handbook of Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.**
- Williams,E.(1981) “On the Notions ‘Lexically Related’ and ‘Head of a Word’”. *Linguistic Inquiry*,vol.12, no.2, pp.245-74.**
- Yule, G.(1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford : OUP.**

البراغماتية في الأسماء المركبة

م. عبدالغني مجيد جاسم*

المستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى بيان العلاقة المتداخلة بين ظاهرة المركبات اللغوية و البراغماتية حيث تم دراسة عدة مناهج لتحليل المركبات اللغوية و التي صنفت على أنها وصفية و دلالية و تيبولوجية و براغماتية. وأكدت جميع تلك المناهج على إن العلاقات الدلالية بين أجزاء المركبات اللغوية هي علاقات غير منتهية و هذا دليل واضح على غزارتها وإنتاجيتها. وأشارت الدراسة إلى إن الحاجة للمعلومات البراغماتية أمراً لا بد منه، خصوصاً إنها تؤدي يكلاً من المتكلم و المستمع إلى الاستدراك كون التفسير المقترح للمركبات مقبول و متفق عليه. ولعل من أهم المشاكل التي واجهت النظريات البراغماتية للمركبات اللغوية هي المركبات المتكررة و العلاقات الدلالية غير المباشرة و انعدام العمومية بين تلك العلاقات. وأظهرت النتائج أيضاً أن المعلومات البراغماتية و ما بعد اللغوية فعلياً كلا من المتكلم و المستمع إلى تجنب الغموض اللغوي المتداخل و التعميم المتأصل بتلك المركبات و التي لا يمكن لأي نظرية نحوية أو دلالية بيان ذلك جلياً. و شددت الدراسة على أن النظريات البراغماتية قد أكدت الأهمية المتزايدة للسياق في تفسير المركبات اللغوية و بيان الآثار أو الخلفيات الاجتماعية و الثقافية و الأسلوبية بين المتكلم و المستمع.