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Reviewed by LAURIE BAUER, Victoria University of Wellington

This collection of twenty papers, focused on the notion of the lexeme, is dedicated to Bernard Fradin, who has done much to make lexeme-centered morphology a major focus in France in particular and in Europe more generally. The book not only highlights the breadth of Fradin’s influence across Europe and the United States, but it also brings together a number of thoughtful pieces on the nature of the lexeme, potential problems with a lexeme-based morphology, and benefits of such a theory.

In the introduction (v–xiv), the editors set out the notion of lexeme (deriving in particular from the work of Matthews, e.g. 1972) and provide a brief summary of the papers, focusing on the thematic parts into which the book is ordered. The lexeme of Fradin and his colleagues (see e.g. Fradin 2003) contrasts with the grammeme, which includes classes such as prepositions and articles (contrast Bauer 2019, where there is a lexemic level). Initialisms are apparently not lexemes (74), even though they may inflect (e.g. All the FBIs in the world could not stop a determined assassin). Fradin’s lexeme also contrasts with the flexeme (a.k.a. the inflecteme), so that the lexeme is characterized in terms of its semantic and syntactic behavior, while the flexeme is characterized by its inflectional behavior. Homophones may share inflectional behavior (different lexemes but same flexeme) or may have different inflectional behavior (different lexeme and different flexeme). The term series is used in a way unfamiliar in Anglophone morphology for a paradigm of morphological forms linked by the same affix or morphological process, so that employee, payee, retiree form (part of) a series.

The book is ordered into four parts. The first of these is entitled ‘Lexemes in standard descriptive and theoretical lexeme-based morphology’ and contains papers by MARK ARONOFF (3–17), GILLES BOYÉ (19–41), and FRANZ RAINER (43–65). This is really a set of papers that do not belong elsewhere in the collection, but they are nonetheless worth reading. Aronoff sketches his own intellectual journey from the structuralist morpheme to the lexeme, and shows why mor-
phology has always fit uneasily into the generative paradigm. This is, thus, a chapter in the history of linguistics rather than a piece of morphology, but it is related to morphological themes and puts some of the work of the last part of the twentieth century into perspective. Boyé’s piece is a standard investigation into whether numerals in French count as lexemes or grammemes (he concludes that they are lexemes), but is notable for the amount of detail it provides on the linguistic behavior of numerals in French. Teachers of French language would benefit from this piece, as would the more theoretically inclined. Rainer’s chapter is in the tradition of chaque mot a son histoire and traces the history of his example lexemes capitalist and capitalism through various languages, but with a focus on French. It becomes quite clear that the meanings that are associated with the lexemes cannot be derived from the individual word-parts (morphemes), but must belong to the lexemes as units.

The second part is called ‘Lexeme formation rules’ (LFRs)—which are the rules that Aronoff (1976) called word-formation rules. The authors in this section are concerned with the factors that LFRs have to take into account and what the limits of the LFRs might be. Delphine Tribout and Dany Amiot (69–86) deal with distinguishing lexeme formation from coercion, extending coercion to operating over word-class boundaries. Georgette Dal (87–118) looks at whether adverbial -ment in French (whose behavior is in many ways similar to adverbial -ly in English) is class-changing, and thus, whether it is involved in an LFR or an inflectional rule. She makes a strong case for the latter interpretation and looks at parallels in other European languages. Florence Villoing and Maxime Deglas (119–58) look at the way in which lexeme formation in a lexifier language may be reanalyzed in a creole. Their data are from the change between French and Guadaloupe Creole. And, finally in this part, Pavel Štichauer (159–72) argues that clippeds from nominalizations in French (e.g. intro from introduction) and Italian are constrained by the semantics of the resultant noun. Only if the semantic structure is appropriate may clipping take place. This factor has not, as far as I am aware, been previously considered as a potential influence on the creation of new forms.

The third part, ‘Trouble with lexemes’, is theoretically rather more coherent, with papers by Olivier Bonami and Berthold Crysman (175–202), Hilaria Cruz and Gregory Stump (203–34), Hans-Olav Enger (235–55), Alain Kihm (257–76), Andrew Spencer (277–301), and Anna M. Thornton (303–21). The two major problems seen here are how to represent the information that must be connected to lexemes in a formal theory of grammar (Bonami & Crysman and Spencer) and the fact that lexemes and their behavior are sometimes more complex than a textbook view might imply (Cruz & Stump and Kihm). For example, Cruz and Stump present evidence for a class of complex lexemes in San Juan Quiahije having elements that act independently in syntax and that can carry different inflectional marking, and Kihm argues for a copular lexeme with a zero variant of the stem in Haitian Creole, the stem allomorph being selected by the nature of the predication in which it arises. Enger looks at unexpected parallels in gender marking across languages, and Thornton investigates the notion of flexeme in the light of overabundance in inflectional paradigms.

The last part is called ‘Problems with lexeme formation rules’, comprising seven papers. Again the coverage is broad rather than focused. Chiara Melloni and Bianca Basciano (325–63) examine reduplicating compounds in Mandarin, in which both lexemes and roots seem to be reduplicated. Nabil Hathout and Fiammetta Namer (365–99) examine French parasynthetic compounds, attempting to show that the ParaDis model that is being developed in France provides a better way of dealing with them than previous models. Hélène Giraud (401–21) considers work done in the masked priming paradigm and concludes that it does not support, as is generally believed, the notion that access to complex words is via morphemes. Rather she prefers an approach based on paradigmatic structures. This is potentially one of the most important papers in the book, since it attacks the core of a well-developed research paradigm. Fabio Montemmi (423–65) looks at allomorphy at the break between base and affix, and proposes a model that not only avoids morphemes, but also allows for variable outputs in morphology. Two papers, by Ingo Plag, Marios Andreou, and Lea Kawaletz (467–86) and Christoph Schwarze (487–508), provide contrasting approaches to modeling the semantics of complex words, one
within a frame-semantic framework, one within a lexical-functional grammar framework, the
first eschewing underspecification, the latter embracing it. Finally, Jana Strnadová (509–25)
looks at the semantics of noun + adjective and noun + de + noun constructions in French, con-
cluding that they are rarely used as equivalents.

Even apart from the themes that provide the framework for the presentation in the book, there
are some recurrent concerns in this collection. The first of these is the question of the nature of the
lexical entry, and what information is required within it. Part of this appears as if it is a matter of
notation, although one notation seems to be more generally adopted than any other, but the nota-
tion is simply a way of presenting the material, and there seems to be much agreement on the ac-
tual content (Kihm, Plag et al., Schwarze, Spencer). Part of this agreement is because (most of)
the authors are referring to the same literature, and part of it is because it is not contentious: lex-
emes have a phonological form, grammatical behavior, and meaning, for example. But Rainer ar-
gets that the meaning of a lexeme involves all kinds of shades of implications, and that such
nuanced meaning is important, as it can change as the lexeme moves from one language to an-
other or changes over time. Unfortunately, there is remarkably little concentration on this kind of
semantic information. No doubt the question is just too hard and not amenable to formalization:
we are all aware of the shortcomings of ordinary dictionaries that try to grapple with such infor-
mation. But if there is to be a renaissance in the study of word meaning, it has to come out of mor-
phology—perhaps particularly out of derivational morphology, since the meaning associated
with inflection is given by the grammatical system—and there is little sign of it here.

A second theme is the problem of allomorphy. Strictly speaking, this should be a nonproblem
in a theory that does not recognize the morpheme, since allomorphy is traditionally the study of
variation in the form of morphemes (thus Hockett 1958:272 talks of allomorphs of morphemes).
However, other definitions are possible, and whichever definition is chosen, there are some inter-
esting points about variation in exponence made here. In different chapters we discover that the
allomorphy of French cardinal numbers is not predictable from the phonological environment
alone but must be specified for constructions with cardinals (Boyé), and that the allomorph of the
copula in Haitian Creole is dependent on ‘the syntax and semantics of the predicate headed by the
copula’ (Kihm)—which means that statements of allomorphy may need to be far more complex
than they are typically viewed as being, and we are presented with an ingenious analysis whereby
allomorphs of derivational affixes are ranked constraints, with the default allomorph being the
one that emerges when no specifically mentioned factors occur (Montermini).

The problematic nature of the lexeme is highlighted in several papers, with illustrations of a
lexeme having multiple parts (e.g. Melloni & Basciano), of inflection treating something that
may look like a syntactic construction or a compound verb or a modified verb as the lexeme to
which it is attached (Cruz & Stump), and of lexemes entering into distinct inflectional paradigms
even when the word forms are synonymous (Thornton). An English example that raises similar
questions is the nature of agentive nominalizations from verbs such as wash up. We find not only
washer up, but also washer upper and even, in some varieties, washer upperer. The derivational
affix sometimes is added to the head of the construction, sometimes is added to the right of what
we might assume to be the lexeme, and sometimes is reduplicated. All of these examples make
 clear in a very direct way that the nature of the lexeme is not always as simple as it is made to ap-
ppear in textbooks.

The final theme to which I should like to draw attention here is the claim that a morphological
description based on lexemes is mutually exclusive with one based on the morpheme (see 44,
376, 401–2). It is not necessarily obvious that such a dichotomy has to hold: indeed, the editors
(viii) cite Corbin (1987) as using both in the same model. Although there is plenty of evidence
that there are places where the classical morpheme does not allow a coherent analysis of words
(see e.g. Matthews 1972, Anderson 2015, Bauer 2019, and the morphological papers collected in
Joos 1958, where many such problems are acknowledged), this excludes the morpheme only if
we accept the principle that all morphological description must be couched in terms of the mor-
pheme, and that the morpheme must be universal.

Not only does that ignore the possibility that the morpheme may give rise to a typology of lan-
guages, with some languages being effectively described in terms of the morpheme while others
cannot be (see e.g. Bauer 2003:238), but it also ignores the possibility that particular constructions might be treated in terms of morphemes while others cannot be. While it may be the case that Latin dominus ‘master.NOMINATIVE.SG’, dominō ‘master.DATIVE.SG’ are not easily treated using only the classical morpheme (see e.g. Bauer 2019:21), a pair such as English dog, dogs—where the final <s> (/z/) is the only exponent of the meaning ‘plural’ and is recurrent with that meaning, and where <dog> is the only exponent of the meaning ‘dog’ and is recurrent with that meaning, and there are no other elements in the words—is perfectly analyzable using morphemes. Since even a lexeme-based model has to view the <s> as the exponent of plurality and has to view dog as the stem to which that exponent is suffixed, denying that the morphemic analysis is justified here when all of the conditions of a morphemic analysis are met looks like a matter of terminological quibbling. Saying there is no morpheme /z/ in such an instance is a theoretical necessity to the extent that the analyst wants all word structure to be analyzed in the same way with the same theoretical prerequisites.

The morpheme was so popular in early-twentieth-century linguistics (viii) because it was so useful, and theoreticians, like caregivers, have to be careful not to throw out the proverbial baby with the bathwater. Based on some of the analyses presented here, there may be an argument that lexemes and morphemes are associated with different types of semantics. Rainer argues persuasively that changes in the meaning of a lexeme are associated with the lexeme (and not with the morphemes involved). But the type of meaning he discusses is what he terms (63) ‘conceptual change’. A word capitalist as a noun and/or adjective containing the suffix -ist (that is, the strictly morphological information) remains consistent throughout the changes. Plag et al. argue for a detailed meaning attached to nominalizations such as English confoundment. While they attribute the precise meaning of the noun to a polysemous affix, the meaning might equally be attributed to the lexeme, with the combination of stem and affix constraining the possible meanings of a nominalization. The fact that such words are nominalizations of verbs is something that could be attributed uniquely to the morpheme. The authors in this collection evidently feel that the field has moved beyond such discussions; I would suggest that consideration of such matters may not be redundant.

As a festschrift, this collection ticks all the boxes by showcasing the theoretical and practical advances that derive from the work of the honoree. There is not a bad paper in the collection, and while the writers do not agree among themselves, there is something for anyone interested in a lexeme-based morphology (or indeed, any model of morphology, whether lexeme-based or not) to consider and discuss. As a collection of papers, independent of the reason it has been put together, it illustrates the kind of work that is going on in Francophone morphological study, of which the Anglphone world is largely ignorant and from which it could benefit. The book contains papers from leading Francophone morphologists whose work is worthy of wider appreciation. As a book about lexemes, it illustrates profusely some problems and advantages of a lexeme-based morphology from multiple viewpoints. It does not necessarily present a coherent view on all topics, but one sufficient to give both people working within such a model and people working within different models an insight into areas of potential difficulty and areas of real strength.

The book is also available online under a Creative Commons license, and can be found at http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/165 where its ISBN is 9783961108 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1402520). Perhaps because the book has not been professionally typeset, the line length is a little too great and the typeface a little too small for comfortable reading, but this may be less important in the electronic version.
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Reviewed by Patrick Hanks, University of Wolverhampton

R. M. W. Dixon is one of the world’s most original, thought-provoking, and productive linguists. He has written studies of the aboriginal languages of Australia, South America, and elsewhere. His theoretical work, in particular A new approach to English grammar on semantic principles, which appeared in 1991, played an important role in reintroducing the notion of meaning to linguistics after it had been lost sight of during the heyday of generative grammar.

Now, he has written a characteristically robust book on English dictionaries. It is with some regret, therefore, that this review must report that, although D has an important point to make, he has written a muddled book—or rather, two quite different books in approximately alternating chapters. The important point that D wishes to make is that English dictionaries in general—even dictionaries aimed at foreign learners of English—fail to provide guidance on the phraseology that is associated with each word. D argues that ‘[a] dictionary should tell you when to use one word rather than another’ (his very first sentence in an introductory section entitled ‘Prologue: The work in advance’; p. ix). Chs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 13, and 15 develop this argument. Interspersed with these are seven chapters (4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14) that constitute a historical survey of English monolingual dictionaries. Neither the historical survey nor D’s polemic on what dictionaries ‘should’ do benefits from being juxtaposed in this way.

Let us look first at the historical survey. D’s main contribution here is to correct the widespread misconception that the first monolingual dictionary in English was Robert Cawdrey’s Table alphabeticall of 1604. Eight years earlier, in 1596, Edmund Coote had published The English schoole-maister, part of which is devoted to glosses of about 1,680 words recently imported to English from Latin. D attributes this error of historiography to the American lexicographer Mitford M. Matthews (1933). In actual fact, the error (if that is what it is) can be traced back to James Murray’s Romanes lecture of 1900.

Within lexicography, two very different approaches to recording and explaining the lexicon of a living language may be distinguished. In both cases, the aim of the lexicographer is to compile an inventory of the words in a language. The first possible approach is to explain the meaning of words in light of their origin and history. The second is to establish the meaning of each word in terms of its present-day usage. Both are valid—for different kinds of dictionary users—but only the second of these approaches is relevant to D’s polemical aim, which means that almost half of his book is irrelevant to his declared purpose.

Nevertheless, there is a point to be made here, although it could have been made more succinctly. The extraordinary fact is that during the European Enlightenment in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the belief became established that etymology guarantees meaning. Putting it another way, scholars working on the lexicon, having noticed (correctly) that in contemporary languages many words have several different meanings, assumed (incorrectly) that the oldest meaning of a word would be its most literal meaning. For this reason, for over 300 years armies...