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Compounding is considered a highly productive and widespread device in Germanic languages and especially in German (Gaeta/Schlücker 2012, p. 2). The definition of compounding varies for different languages and it raises rather complex questions concerning the delimitation from other word-formation processes and multi-word expressions (Gaeta/Schlücker 2012, pp. 11–14), (Martincová 2015), (Schlücker 2019), (Schlücker/Finkbeiner 2019). Additionally, it accentuates the issues of the definition of word and morph and the role of lexicalization (cf. definition of compounding in (Fabb 1998), (Gaeta/Ricca 2009). In recent time, there has been an increasing interest in translation research of German compounds into different languages (Cordeiro et al. 2019), (Clematide et al. 2018), however, comprehensive research for Czech is still lacking.

The main purpose of this paper is to give an overview of the equivalents of some deverbal German compound nouns in Czech, focussing on the broad spectrum of their structures. The study is based on compounds with action nominals as the last part, specifically with substantivized infinitive (1) or deverbals ending in suffix -ung (2) and (3):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | |
|  | *das* | *Flur-platten-klirr-en* | | |
|  | the-nom | hallway- | tiles- | clatter-inf |
|  | ‘clatter of hallway tiles’ | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | |
|  | *die* | *Risiko-bewertung* | |
|  | the-nom | risk- | assessment |
|  | ‘risk assessment’ | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | |
|  | *die* | *Eil-meldung* | |
|  | the-nom | express- | message |
|  | ‘breaking news’ | | |

Data were obtained from the parallel corpus InterCorp of CNC (Institute of the Czech National Corpus FF UK 2022), the compound nouns were automatically selected from the list of lemmas sorted by frequency by means of the morphological analyse (SMOR 2002). The compound nouns with the highest and lowest frequency were examined.

For the German compounds, the number and type of parts of the compound were distinguished. For Czech equivalents, the type of the structure, number of words, (dis)continuality of the parts in the sentence, evtl. variations of the equivalents were examined, cf. the German (4) and Czech (5) examples:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | | |
|  | Dynamit-fisch-en | über | einem | Korallen-riff | |
|  | blast-fishing--inf | over | a |  | coral-reef |
|  | ‘blast fishing over a coral reef’.’ | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Czech | | | | | | |
|  | lovit | na | korálových | útesech | ryby | dynamit-em |
|  | to fish-inf | over | coral | reefs | fishes | dynamite-inst |
|  | ‘to catch fish on coral reefs with dynamite’.’ | | | | | |

Besides the expected constructions such as noun+noun.GEN (6), noun+prepositional phrase, adjective+noun (7), infinitive constructions and dependent clauses (8) form a significant part of the equivalents. An important feature that is also characteristic for the structural differences between these two languages is the contextual ellipsis in equivalents (e.g. 9).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | |
|  | *das* | *Brötchen-back-en* | |
|  | the-nom | bun- | baking-inf |
|  | ‘baking buns’ | | |
| Czech | | | |
|  | *pečení* | *hous-ek* | |
|  | baking | buns-gen |  |
|  | ‘baking buns’ | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | | |
|  | *die* | *Fehl-anpassung* | | | |
|  | the-nom | faulty- | | adaptation | |
|  | ‘maladaptation’ | | | | |
| Czech | | | | | |
|  | *špatná* | | *adaptace* | | |
|  | faulty-adj | | adaptation | |  |
|  | ‘maladaptation’ | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | |
|  | *bei-m* | *Salat-wasch-en* | | |
|  | while-dat | lettuce- | washing-inf | |
|  | ‘while washing lettuce’ | | | |
| Czech | | | | |
|  | *když* | *omýva-la* | | *salát* |
|  | as | wash-past.f | | lettuce |
|  | ‘as she was washing lettuce’ | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | | |
|  | *das* | *Zoll-verfahr-en* | | | |
|  | the-nom | customs- | | proceeding-inf | |
|  | ‘customs procedure’ | | | | |
| Czech | | | | | |
|  | *(daný)* | | *režim* | |  |
|  | (mentioned) | | procedure | |  |
|  | ‘(this) procedure’ | | | | |

This approach also allows to characterizethe role of lexicalization: the most frequent compounds have usually a higher degree of lexicalization in comparison with the compounds with the lowest frequency. Furthermore, the equivalents in Czech mirror this relation, cf. the high frequent compound(10) *Inverkehrbringen,* which corresponds with the lexicalized multi-word expression (11) *uvedení na trh* (with perfective verbal noun), but also with the other, less frequent aspectual version (12) *uvádění na trh* (with imperfective verbal noun).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. German | | | | |
|  | *das* | *In-verkehr-bring-en* | | |
|  | the-nom | into- | cirulation- | placing-inf |
|  | ‘placing on the market’ | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Czech | | | |
|  | *uvedení* | *na* | *trh* |
|  | introducing-nom.pfv | on | market |
|  | ‘placing on the market’ | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Czech | | | |
|  | *uvádění* | *na* | *trh* |
|  | introducing-nom.ipfv | on | market |
|  | ‘placing on the market’ | | |

References

Clematide, Simon/Lehner, Stéphanie/Graën, Johannes/Volk, Martin (2018): A multilingual gold standard for translation spotting of German compounds and their corresponding multiword units in English, French, Italian and Spanish. In: Mitkov, Ruslan/Monti, Johanna/Corpas Pastor, Gloria/Seretan, Violeta (eds.): Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 126–145. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.341.06cle.

Cordeiro, Silvio/Villavicencio, Aline/Idiart, Marco/Ramisch, Carlos (2019): Unsupervised Compositionality Prediction of Nominal Compounds. In: Computational Linguistics, 45(1), pp. 1–57. https://doi.org/10.1162/coli\_a\_00341.

Fabb, Nigel (1998): Compounding. In: Spencer, Andrew/Zwicky, Arnold (eds.): The Handbook of Morphology. Oxford, pp. 66–83.

Gaeta, Livio/Ricca, Davide (2009): Composita solvantur: Compounds as lexical units or morphological objects? In: Italian Journal of Linguistics, 21(1), pp. 35–70.

Gaeta, Livio/Schlücker, Barbara (eds.) (2012): Das Deutsche als kompositionsfreudige Sprache: Strukturelle Eigenschaften und systembezogene Aspekte. Berlin: De Gruyter (Linguistik--Impulse & Tendenzen, 46).

Institute of the Czech National Corpus FF UK (2022): InterCorp v15: Corpus InterCorp – German. Prague. http://www.korpus.cz.

Martincová, Olga (2015): 42. Multi-word expressions and univerbation in Slavic. In: Müller, Peter O./Ohnheiser, Ingeborg/Olsen, Susan/Rainer, Franz (eds.): Word-Formation. DE GRUYTER, pp. 742–757. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110246254-044.

Schlücker, Barbara (2019): Compounds and multi-word expressions in German. In: Schlücker, Barbara (ed.): Complex Lexical Units. De Gruyter, pp. 69–94. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110632446-003.

Schlücker, Barbara/Finkbeiner, Rita (2019): Compounds and multi-word expressions in the languages of Europe. In: Schlücker, Barbara (ed.): Complex Lexical Units. De Gruyter, pp. 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110632446-001.

SMOR (2002): Institut für Maschinelle Sprachverarbeitung, University of Stuttgart (IMS). https://www.cis.lmu.de/~schmid/tools/SMOR/.

# Contact information

**Jana Kocková**

Institute of Slavonic Studies, Czech Academy of Sciences

[kockova@slu.cas.cz](mailto:kockova@slu.cas.cz)