

An Integral Linguistic View on the Lexical Integrity Principle and its Exceptions: A Case Study of Japanese Phrasal Compounds*

Keita IKARASHI

Nagaoka University of Technology, Japan

Ryohei NAYA

University of Tsukuba, Japan

Abstract: Japanese has the Lexical Integrity Principle (LIP) in its system, making it impossible for syntax to get into the intra structure of morphological elements like compounds: hence, instances like *[*taihenkookyuu*]-*hoteru* ([very high.class]-hotel), where the bracketed syntactic phrase causes incorrectness. Nevertheless, we observe compounds called phrasal compounds which violate the LIP. Although such compounds have been noticed in some studies, they have not been analyzed comprehensively. Eugenio Coseriu's theory, by contrast, enables us to reveal the nature of phrasal compounds. Based on his integral linguistic theory, this paper demonstrates that phrasal compounds in Japanese can be classified into two distinct types. The first type is part of the speaker's idiomatic knowledge. Specifically, it resides in the norm of Japanese, and succeeds in evading the exclusion by the LIP. The second type is judged as being incorrect at the historical level due to the LIP, but a contextual motivation at the individual level suspends such incorrectness, making it appropriate.

Keywords: Lexical Integrity Principle, compounds, suspension (sublation), norm, system

1. Introduction

Morphological theories, particularly in the generative framework, assume the Lexical Integrity Principle (hereafter the LIP), a principle where no syntactic operation is applied to the intra

* We express our sincere gratitude to Professor Emma Tămăianu-Morita for her invaluable comments and suggestions.

structure of lexical units (see Lapointe (1980) and Anderson (1992) for its often-cited definitions; see also Botha (1981)). Therefore, the LIP implies that phrases cannot appear within morphological complexes, such as compounds. For example, the compound *blackboard* cannot accommodate a phrase such as *very black* as its left-hand element, thus rendering *[*very black*]-board not permissible (cf. Shimamura 2014: 15) (the brackets indicate a syntactic phrase and the hyphen indicates the connection between left-hand and right-hand elements of a compound). Put differently, words exclusively serve as atoms in syntax, which is responsible for phrase structuring.

Lexical integrity has served as an important litmus test for the distinction between words and phrases in both descriptive and theoretical studies. Moreover, the LIP provides the basis for theorizing about the model of grammar (Trips & Kornfilt 2017 and Bosque 2020). For the lexicalist frameworks, the LIP is a part of the motivation for hypothesizing that words and phrases are formed in distinct, autonomous generative components (Di Sciullo & Williams (1987), Anderson (1992), Ackema & Neeleman (2004) among others); words are formed in the lexicon (or the word-formation component) and then fed into syntax. If a theory does not assume two distinct realms of words and phrases, its grammatical architecture needs to ensure lexical integrity in some way (see Booij (2009) for a constructionist view on the LIP, and Morita (2020) for the analysis of certain anti-LIP compounds in Distributed Morphology). Accordingly, the LIP has intrigued morphologists and, especially, those who work on the issues related to the morphology-syntax boundary (Bosque 2020), whether one argues for or against the autonomy of morphology as a word-formation component from syntax.

With this background, a wide range of languages have been

studied in terms of the LIP, and it has been found that while most morphological phenomena follow the principle, some do not. Among the languages with both phenomena is Japanese, to which our discussion will be devoted. To begin, let us consider the Japanese compound *kookyuu-hoteru* (high.class-hotel), for instance. As with the case of the English compound observed above, the non-head constituent of this compound cannot be replaced with phrasal elements such as *taihen kookyuu* (very high.class), where *taihen* modifies *kookyuu*; [*taihen kookyuu*]-*hoteru* ([very high.class]-hotel) results in an illegitimate compound (Kageyama 2016: 491). The same intended message should be conveyed in, for example, phrasal forms like [*taihen kookyuu na*] *hoteru*, where *na* is an inflectional ending of *kookyuu da* (high.classCOP) ‘be high class’ for its prenominal form; the bracketed part serves as a phrasal modifier for the noun *hoteru*.

The brief observation given above would be enough to posit the existence of the LIP in Japanese (cf. Ito & Sugioka 2002: 7-8). Nevertheless, there are cases which look incompatible with the principle. Kageyama (1993), for example, points out that some types of the right-hand constituent of compounds allow syntax to be involved in their intra structure: *tukuri* (making) is a word which accepts phrasal elements as its left-hand constituent when used as the head of the compound. The following instances sound natural even though the phrases, indicated by the brackets, show up in the structure of the compounds:^{1,2}

¹The compounds in (1) and (2) contain *-zukuri*, a phonological variant of *tukuri*, as a result of sequential voicing, or *rendaku* in Japanese, which voices the word-initial voiceless consonant of the second constituent of a compound (see Tsujimura (2014: 56-65) for an introductory outline of this phenomenon). Sequential voicing, though not observed in all types of compounds, serves as an indication of compound-hood.

- (1) [*utukusii mati*] -*zukuri*
 beautiful town -making
 ‘construction of a beautiful town’
- (2) [*umi-no mieru ie*] -*zukuri*
 sea-GEN see house -making
 ‘to build a house from which one can see the sea’

In (1), the adjective *utukusii* modifies the noun *mati*, which creates the noun phrase (i.e. a syntactic element); this noun phrase is compounded with *zukuri*. Additionally, the bracketed constituent in (2), part of the compound, is a syntactic phrase where *umi no mieru*, as a relative clause, modifies *ie*. These examples suggest that *tukuri* (or *zukuri*), if used as the head of a compound, allows syntax operations to access lexical units, creating obvious exceptions to the LIP. These compounds, which involve the syntactic phrases in their left-hand position, are called *phrasal compounds*, the phenomenon which is our prime focus for this study.

Some previous studies have dealt with such exceptions to the LIP (cf. Kageyama 1993, 2016, Nishiyama 2015, 2017). Insightful as they are, these studies do not show us a general picture of the phenomenon. They have not, for example, fully investigated how exceptions find a way around the limitation imposed by the LIP to come into being. Of course, they show us partial answers to these kinds of issues, but they are not comprehensive, and thus remain unsatisfactory. For example, a certain type of phrasal compound remains untouched by the reason that it is supposed to be licensed not by morphological, but by extralinguistic (i.e. pragmatic or

² The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of examples in this article: ACC = accusative, COP = copula, DAT = dative, GEN = genitive, NOM = nominative, PAST = past tense, SFP = sentence final particle.

rhetorical) factors.

For one thing, this situation would stem from the theories that these previous studies adopt for analyzing the phenomenon in question. These theories are basically morphological ones, and naturally zero in on, for instance, morphological rules. Thus, they presumably cannot help but put aside phenomena involving factors such as pragmatic or rhetorical ones.

To overcome this situation and get a better understanding of exceptions to the LIP, it would be inevitable to have recourse to linguistic theories covering the speaker's creative use of linguistic expressions as well as rules of individual languages. Among such linguistic theories is, we assume, Eugenio Coseriu's integral linguistic theory. Coseriu, as a part of the tremendously wide range of his works, painstakingly segments the speaker's linguistic competence which, without his theory, would be too complicated to grasp in its overall organization. We assume that his framework shows us a way that leads to the understanding of a general picture of exceptional cases to the LIP in Japanese.

Although adopting the integral linguistic view, we rely on insights and intuitions of previous studies, which particularly provide us with a good starting point to embark on a course of analysis. Thus, the next section overviews some analyses by previous studies, particularly Kageyama's (1993) and his later work (Kageyama 2016), classifying phrasal compounds into two general types and elucidating problems that should be tackled to achieve our goal. Section 3 then introduces some of Coseriu's ideas that give us a foundation to investigate phrasal compounds. Sections 4 and 5 deal with each type, introducing other notions crucial to our analysis. While Section 4 analyzes a type of phrasal compounds of which Kageyama gives a relatively detailed analysis, the other type dealt with in Section 5 is yet to be discussed at length. Thus, Section 5 allocates more space for the

discussion on the latter type than that on the former type in Section 4. Section 6 concludes this paper.

Lastly, we will touch on the scope of our discussion. The LIP violations are observed in other morphological complexes than compounds in Japanese (cf. Kageyama 1993, 2016). The target of this paper is, however, limited to phrasal compounds to make the discussion simple. This paper seeks to introduce a fundamental view to capture exceptions to the LIP on the basis of phrasal compounds. We assume that the perspective provided below would be applicable to other LIP violation phenomena, but pursuing such a possibility is left for future research.

2. Types of Phrasal Compounds: Insights from Previous Studies

Some studies point out that the Japanese morphology follows the LIP (cf. Ito & Sugioka 2002: 7-8), but related phenomena do not seem to have created a vigorous debate, and exceptional cases to the principle, targeted in this paper, have yet to be investigated comprehensively. Despite this situation, some studies provide us with significant insights in launching a comprehensive study on the phenomenon. Here, we will scrutinize Kageyama (1993), which, to our knowledge, is the first study to analyze exceptional phenomena to the LIP in Japanese at length.³ We also touch on his later work (Kageyama 2016) that also provide us with significant insights.

While Kageyama (1993, 2016) admits that Japanese follows the LIP, he provides a wide range of compounds violating the LIP. Some of the examples Kageyama (1993: 326) shows are as

³ To our knowledge, Nishiyama (2015, 2017) is another study which investigates phrasal compounds in Japanese in detail. However, his (theory-dependent) analysis has little direct relation to our concern here (see also footnote 8). We will merely touch on Nishiyama (2015, 2017) as necessary.

follows:⁴

- (3) [*maborosi-no tyosya*] *-sagasi*
phantom-GEN author -searching
'searching for the phantom author (of a book)'
- (4) [*huruhonya-no nyooboo*] *-gorosi*
used bookstore-GEN wife -killing
'a murder of the wife of a used bookstore's owner'
- (5) [*kanemooke-no moozya*] *-atukai*
moneymaking-GEN mad -treating
'treating (a person) as lucrepath'

(Example (5) is part of a sentence Kageyama shows.)

In (3)-(5), the left-hand bracketed constituents of the compounds include the nouns with the genitive marker *no* (e.g. *maborosi-no* (phantom-GEN) in (3)), which modify the subsequent nouns (e.g. *maborosi-no tyosya* (phantom-GENauthor) in (3)). The bracketed constituents, thus, are syntactic phrases, clearly violating the LIP.

Phrasal compounds like those in (1), (2) (in Section 1) and (3)-(5) can be found or created relatively easily. The LIP, however, puts a strict limitation on the creation of these kinds of compounds. According to Kageyama (2016: 496), while non-head (i.e. left-hand) constituents “can be replaced freely and productively by other phrasal expressions,” heads of phrasal compounds are restricted. This means that phrasal compounds can normally be created only from a certain type of head elements. For example, Kageyama (1993) assumes that *tukuri* (in Section 1), *sagasi*, *korosi* (whose *rendaku* form is *gorosi*), and *atukai*, atypical head words that allow a phrasal constituent to appear in the left-hand

⁴ Kageyama (1993) also provides a variety of suffixes which can be attached to phrasal constituents. These examples, however, are out of our focus, so that they are not dealt with here. See Kageyama (1993) for details.

position. Put differently, words other than these kinds do not inherently work as a head which takes a phrasal element as its left-hand constituent. A question arising here is why this type of word, despite the LIP, tolerates a syntactic phrase as its left-hand element. Kayeyama’s (1993) answer is as follows: words like *tukuri*, *sagasi*, *kokorsi*, and *atukai* are registered in the lexicon (as part of the speaker’s linguistic competence), or “lexically designated” (Kageyama 2016: 496), as words which, by nature, allow phrasal compounds when used as a head.⁵ In other words, we may say that *X-zukuri*, for instance, is remembered by Japanese speakers as a compound where a phrasal element can occur in X.^{6,7}

This is Kageyama’s main idea in dealing with phrasal compounds. Furthermore, he, though sporadically, shows us his

⁵ Kageyama (2016: 497) regards the head word *tukuri* as “suffix-like.” We will, however, simply treat it as a word.

⁶ Kageyama (1993, 2016) also provides superficially exceptional compounds to the LIP. For example:

- (i) *titi-no* *haka* *-mairi*
 farther-GEN grave -pray
 ‘visiting my father’s grave’

At first glance, *titi-no* (my father’s) modifies *haka* (grave), making the syntactic phrase *titi-no haka*. Thus, the compound in (i) appears to be a phrasal compound. Kageyama, however, does not regard it as a genuine phrasal compound. He assumes that *titi-no* modifies not *haka*, but the compound *haka-mairi*, to represent with brackets, *titi-no [haka-mairi]* (this analysis is, in fact, compatible with our intuition). Such a modification is, according to Kageyama, feasible because of certain morpho-semantic characteristics in Japanese. If this is the case, examples like *titi-no haka-mairi* fall outside our scope of investigation since no violation occurs in the assumed structure.

⁷ Nishiyama (2017), roughly speaking, seems to pursue the same course as Kageyama. He hypothesizes the construction [_{XP} Mod X]-X for phrasal compounds, mentioning that “instantiations of this construction are independent of the mechanism for compounding” (Nishiyama 2017: 164).

insightful intuition, which should be a good starting point to figure out what type of phrasal compounds exist and how each type of compound is created. Specifically, he mentions two types of his own judgment toward phrasal compounds.

First, he shows his judgment to examples like those given in (1)-(5), saying that they are never unnatural in Japanese (Kageyama 1993: 328); in other words, they sound like common expressions in Japanese. This assessment seems to lead Kageyama to assume that words like *tukuri* are registered in the lexicon as head words of compounds which can take a phrasal element as their left-hand constituent.

While examples which sound natural to his own ears are, as shown above, analyzed to some extent, Kageyama does not provide a detailed analysis to the other type of phrasal compounds, for which he gives a different judgment from the first type. Let us first look at the following examples (cited from Kageyama (1993: 327)):

- (6) Book title:
 [kokugo-ni haitta bongo] -ziten
 national language-DAT enter.PAST Sanskrit -dictionary
 ‘Dictionary of Sanskrit words getting into Japanese’
 (ed. by Tsusho Byodo, 1978, Sankibobussyorin)
- (7) Newspaper article (the underlined part is a phrasal compound):
[24ka moyoosareta bizin-kontesuto] -kaizyoo
 24th be.held.PAST beautiful.person-contest -venue
 de tenagedan-ga bakuhatu si...
 at grenade-NOM explosion do...
 ‘A grenade has exploded at a venue of beauty contest held on 24th...’
- (8) Utterance of an animated character (the underlined part is a

phrasal compound):

<i>kore-ga</i>	<u>[<i>Masuo-niisan-no</i></u>	<i>tottekita</i>	
this-NOM	Masuo-elder.brother-GEN	collect.PAST	
<u><i>matutake</i></u>	<u><i>-gohan</i></u>	<i>na</i>	<i>no?</i>
matsutake.mushroom	-rice	COP	SFP

‘Is this rice dish cooked with the matsutake mushroom collected by Masuo?’
(*Sazae-san*, aired on TV)

All of the compounds in (6)-(8) contain syntactic phrases which consist of nouns modified by relative clauses. In (6), *kokugo-ni haitta* ‘(which) got into the national language (i.e. Japanese)’ modifies the noun *bongo* ‘Sanskrit,’ making the syntactic phrase *kokugo-ni haitta bongo* ‘Sanskrit words which got into the national language.’ This syntactic phrase then is compounded with *ziten* ‘dictionary.’ The resultant compound, thus, violates the LIP. In (7), *24ka moyoosareta* ‘be held on 24th’ serves as a relative clause attached to *bizin-kontesuto* ‘beauty contest,’ a compound consisting of *bizin* and *kontesuto*. The resultant noun phrase *24ka moyoosaretabin-kontesto* ‘a beauty contest held on 24th’ then makes a compound with *kaizyoo* ‘venue.’ This compound also infringes the LIP. *Matutake-gohan* ‘matsutake mushroom rice’ in (8) is a well-established compound. Its left-hand constituent—*matutake*—is modified by the relative clause *Masuo-niisan-no tottekita* ‘that Masuo collected,’ resulting in the LIP violation.

According to Kageyama (1993: 328), these examples should be treated as isolated data rooted in the specific contexts and even may sound like “a slip of the tongue.” In addition, giving examples like [*kani-ryoori to onsen*]-*koosu* ([crab-dishes and hot spas]-course) ‘tour for crab dishes and hot spas’ (p. 496), Kageyama (2016) states that “[t]heir usage [...] seems limited to catchphrases in fliers for commercial advertisement” (p. 497).

Judging from these descriptions, Kageyama would assume that head words like those in the above examples, unlike those in (1)-(5), are not registered in the lexicon and these phrasal compounds are temporarily created, sometimes, with certain stylistic effects.

To sum up, Kageyama's analysis and his intuitions, though only sporadically mentioned in his works, tell us that there are two types of phrasal compounds. One is that they are licensed by head words which, by nature, allow a syntactic element to appear in the left-hand position (e.g. *tukuri*, *sagasi*, *korosi*, *atukai*). These words should be registered in the mental lexicon. Phrasal compounds rooted in these words are judged as fully natural as Japanese; they do not feel as if they violate the LIP even though the violation is obvious. This type of phrasal compounds can be regarded as idiomatic in the sense that we can posit idiomatic frames like *X-zukuri* where X can be a phrase. Thus, we will call them *idiomatic phrasal compounds* or idiomatic PCs. The other type of exceptions is that they sound, in some sense, awkward and isolated and, in extreme cases, are judged to be a slip of the tongue. Unlike idiomatic PCs, the second type would not be created from any head words which are lexically designated as words allowing a syntactic constituent to be in the left-hand position. This would mean that the second type is only created for some context-specific purposes, and outside such specific contexts, this type of phrasal compounds would not come into being. These compounds are, as it were, nonce words. Let us thus call the second type *nonce phrasal compounds* or nonce PCs.⁸

Now that phrasal compounds turned out to be twofold, we

⁸ Unlike Kageyama, Nishiyama (2015, 2017) mainly pays attention to the left-hand constituent of phrasal compounds, providing semantic and pragmatic conditions which are imposed in creating such a constituent. Our classification of phrasal compounds is, however, based on characteristics of their head words. Thus, we will not get into details about his analysis here.

can get into details of their nature. Specifically, we will address the following questions which the above classification of phrasal compounds gives rise to.

Question 1:

According to Kageyama, head words of idiomatic PCs are lexically designated as words which can take syntactic phrases in their non-head position. We intuitively agree with his idea. However, there seems to be room for further investigation. That is, what relationship do the LIP and idiomatic PCs, both of which are mutually exclusive by nature, establish in the Japanese language? We will reach a better understanding of their nature if we clarify how idiomatic PCs establish their positions in the language by evading the restrictions of the LIP which plays a central role in word formation.

Question 2:

Nonce PCs, unlike idiomatic PCs, do not depend on any words allowing the phrasal compound structure, and are created temporarily in individual contexts. Since they are not legitimated by the Japanese language, nonce PCs truly violate the LIP. Kageyama merely shows his intuitions without analyzing the mechanisms which bring them about. Then, what makes it possible to create nonce PCs?

We will now introduce Coseriu's integral linguistic theory to answer these questions. After introducing some basic notions of his theory in the next section, Section 4 deals with idiomatic PCs, and answers Question 1. In doing so, we rely on the distinction between *Norm* and *System* made at the individual language level. Section 5 then answers the other question, clarifying how nonce PCs are created and licensed in discourse. It develops our analysis

by introducing *Suspension* (*Aufhebung*, sublation), which takes place at the discourse level.

3. Some Fundamental Notions of Integral Linguistics for the Analysis of Phrasal Compounds

One of the most crucial aspects of Coseriu's view (particularly in analyzing phrasal compounds) is that he makes a distinction between levels of language: the universal level, the historical level, and the individual level.

As Coseriu (1985: xxviii) puts it, “the «universal» aspects apply to language in general, to everything linguistic, the «historical» aspects to the language of a particular community, the «individual» aspects to certain bits of discourse or to kinds of discourses.” He gives clues to understand these levels from observations of our daily linguistic activity (see, for example, Coseriu (2007[1988]) for more exemplifications for each level):

When we say of a child that it cannot yet speak, we obviously refer to speaking as such, not to speaking a particular language. Likewise, when listening to a dialogue between persons whom we are unable to observe and whom we do not understand, we might, for instance, conclude that these persons are engaged in an argument. [These are examples for the universal level.] If we realize that English, French, or German is being spoken, we perceive the historical level of language, and if we understand that X utters, for instance, a request, gives an order, or asks a certain question, we perceive the individual level of language as discourse. (Coseriu 1985: xxviii)

In addition to the distinction of levels of language, Coseriu also makes a threefold distinction between points of view. The first distinction should be made “between language as activity and language as the knowledge underlying this activity, as the

knowledge which is in a «concrete» and «actual» way realized in this activity” (Coseriu 1985: xxvii). Activity, however, should be understood cautiously in that it is not carried out merely within the range of existing knowledge. Coseriu’s explanation of this is as follows:

Language as activity, which, by the way, must be understood as ‘speaking and understanding,’ does not exhaust itself in the mechanical realization or application of an already existing knowledge. It is in the proper sense ἐνέργεια, *actus*, that is, a creative activity, which makes use of δύναμις, an already acquired knowledge, in order, however, always to say something new, something in one way or another unique; and to the extent to which it is creative, inasmuch as it manifests ‘facts of speech’ in the narrower sense, it goes beyond its own δύναμις and produces new, virtual knowledge, facts which can be taken over in the δύναμις for further speech acts.

(Coseriu 1985: xxvii)

In addition to this distinction, language, which is a productive activity, should also be viewed from its product (or ἔργον). More specifically:

This can be observed most clearly and directly in the case of ‘texts’; a text is nothing but the product of a speech act or of a sequence of speech acts, or, rather: these speech acts themselves as a product, which can be either retained in memory or recorded and preserved in a material, in taped, written, or printed form. (Coseriu 1985: xxvii)

Coseriu finally combines the three levels and the three points of view into nine cells, as shown below, which, for instance, enable linguists to understand natures of their research targets (the table is cited from Coseriu (1985: xxix), with modifications).

POINTS OF VIEW			
LEVELS	ἐνέργεια Activity	δύναμις Knowledge	ἔργον Product
Universal	Speaking in general	Elocutional knowledge	Totality of utterances
Historical	Concrete particular language	Idiomatic knowledge	(Abstracted particular language)
Individual	Discourse	Expressive knowledge	Text

Table 1. Levels and Points of View in Coseriu's Model of Language

Although we have the overall structure of levels of language and points of view, only some parts are relevant to our discussion (i.e. idiomatic knowledge and expressive knowledge). The next section, thus, picks up cells that are crucially related to our analysis. For explanations about the other cells, see, for example, Coseriu (1985, 2007[1988]).

4. Idiomatic PCs and the Norm at the Historical Level

Kageyama (1993) proposes that head words of idiomatic PCs like *-zukuri* (or *tukuri*) of [*utukusii mati*]-*zukuri* 'to build a beautiful town' are registered in the lexicon. In other words, idiomatic PCs can be said to reside in the speaker's knowledge on Japanese, that is, what is shown in the scheme in Section 3 as the idiomatic knowledge, the knowledge of how one speaks a particular language (see Coseriu (2007[1988]: 83)). As mentioned earlier, we assume that his basic idea is, intuitively speaking, correct. For a better understanding, however, we can go further into details about idiomatic PCs. The LIP, as shown in Section 1, works as a

morphological rule in Japanese, which indicates that this morphological principle is at the historical level (or in the idiomatic knowledge). Then, why can idiomatic PCs be registered in the lexicon without being excluded by the LIP, which, by nature, are incompatible with phrasal compounds? This section seeks to identify the relationship between idiomatic PCs and the LIP, which makes it possible for idiomatic PCs to exist in the Japanese idiomatic knowledge (Question 1 in Section 2).

The answer to this question is straightforwardly provided by Coseiru's further distinction made at the historical level. The speaker's idiomatic knowledge can be further divided into: System and Norm.⁹ See the following citation from Coseriu (1967: 39-40):

The *norm* includes all that which is not necessarily functional (distinctive) in the "technique of discourse," but which is nevertheless stereotyped traditionally (socially), which is common and current usage in the linguistic community. The system, on the other hand, embraces everything which is objectively functional (distinctive). The norm corresponds, more or less, to language as a "social institution"; system is language as an ensemble of distinctive functions (oppositional structures). As a corollary, norm is a formalized ensemble of traditional actualizations; it includes that which "exists" already, that which has been actualized in linguistic tradition; system, on the other hand, is an ensemble of possible actualizations: it also embraces that which has not been actualized, but which is virtually in existence, that which is "possible," that is to say, that which can be created in accordance with the functional rules of the language.

The distinction between system and norm enables us to go into more details about the LIP and idiomatic PCs than the point

⁹In addition to System and Norm, Coseriu makes a further distinction: Type. For Type, see Coseriu (2007[1988]).

which previous studies have reached. The LIP is a principle or morphological rule which has to be followed in creating morphological complexes like compounds. It is thus reasonable to say that the LIP constitutes an essential part of the system of Japanese. Since it exists in the system, compounds with phrasal elements in them, as previous studies admit, are considered to be generally prohibited in Japanese.

However, there is a way to slip by the restriction by the LIP: the norm. There are cases that are realized in discourse in forms the system does not expect; they are permitted by norm. Among such cases is the English word *ox*, whose plural forms would be *oxes* from the system, but in effect is *oxen*; the norm chooses *oxen* as a plural form for *ox* (Coseriu 1975: 68-69, Coseriu 2007[1988]: 269-270).

We assume that the same is true for idiomatic PCs. Idiomatic PCs disobey the LIP. Nevertheless, it does not sound as conspicuous as an anomaly (contrary to nonce PCs) with no feeling of digression from the principle (of course, we can theoretically recognize such digression).¹⁰ In other words, idiomatic PCs digress from the system but are correct realizations in discourse. This feature is similar to examples like *oxen*. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that idiomatic PCs are established in the Japanese norm—a form “which has been actualized in linguistic tradition,” or which is an earlier model used repetitively (see Coseriu (1975: 85)). The answer to Question 1 in Section 2 is, thus, as follows: the LIP works in the Japanese system, while idiomatic PCs are put in the Japanese norm.¹¹

¹⁰ See the following citation from Coseriu (2007 [1988]: 81-82) for a related explanation: “Das korrekte Sprechen fällt als solches nicht auf; es realisiert den Nullwert der bloßen Entsprechung.”

¹¹ There is another type of phrasal compounds which should be associated with the Norm. Kageyama (1993, 2016) provides us with the following example:

5. Nonce PCs as a Phenomenon at the Individual Level

5.1. General Discussion

Unlike idiomatic PCs, for which Kageyama (1993, 2016) provides us with a good foundation to identify their nature, nonce PCs have not been given enough analyses, only to find themselves designated as an isolated phenomenon, or a mere slip of the tongue. Thus, here we will allocate much more space for their investigation than in Section 4.

Unlike idiomatic PCs, nonce PCs do not consist of head words which, by nature, allow syntactic phrases to appear in the left-hand position: the left-hand syntactic constituents in (6)-(8) in Section 2 are not productively replaced by other syntactic phrases. Moreover, nonce PCs sound like, as reflected in their name, a nonce word. This indicates that nonce PCs are not a part of the idiomatic knowledge, or specifically the Norm. Thus, the norm provides nonce PCs with no foundation to elude the restriction imposed by the LIP. That is why Kageyama (1993), as shown in

-
- (i) [akai hane] -bokin
red feather -fund.raising
'a Red Feather drive for charity'

(Kageyama 2016: 495, with slight modifications)

Akai hane, the left-hand element of the compound, constitutes a phrase with *akai* modifying *hane*. Thus, the compound in (i) is, strictly speaking, a phrasal compound. However, *akai hane* is a fixed expression referring to a symbolic red feather for a certain kind of charity (see also Nishiyama (2017:164)). Although we have a similar expression, [*midori-no hane*]-*bokin* (green-GEN feather-fund.raising) 'a Green Feather drive for charity,' the left-hand element of the compound in (i) cannot be replaced freely with other phrasal expressions, such as *[*kuroi hane*]-*bokin* (black feather-fund.raising) and *[*kiiro-no hane*]-*bokin* (yellow-GEN feather-fund.raising). Unlike head words of idiomatic PCs like *tukuri*, *bokin* is not a head word which takes any phrasal element in the left-hand position. Thus, [*akai hane*]-*bokin* as a whole is assumed to exist in the norm as an idiomatic expression.

Section 2, provides us with his different judgments toward each type, according to which idiomatic PCs sound natural as Japanese while some nonce PCs sound like “a slip of the tongue.” However, it is necessary to think more carefully about the judgment on nonce PCs for greater understanding. The examples in (6)-(8) in Section 2 are from a book title, a newspaper article, and an utterance by a character of a TV cartoon. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that these expressions are created carefully and purposefully. If so, they cannot be thought to be a mere slip of the tongue. Now, a contradiction is surfacing: nonce PCs sound awkward in the sense that they violate the LIP, but for some reason, are still appropriately used in a particular context. Informally speaking, nonce PCs are ‘bad’ at the historical level, but ‘good’ at the individual level. Here, Coseriu’s classification of the speaker’s judgment is helpful to make the issue clearer.

Coseriu distinguishes three kinds of judgments, each of which corresponds to the three levels of language. See the following table (which is cited from Coseriu (1985: xxxiv) with modifications):

LEVELS	JUDGMENTS
Speaking in general (Universal)	congruent / incongruent
Concrete particular language (Historical)	correct / incorrect
Discourse (Individual)	appropriate / inappropriate

Table 2. Three Types of Judgment

The judgment corresponding to the universal level is assumed to be irrelevant, at least, to the discussion in this paper. We will thus limit ourselves to the judgments that correspond to the other two

levels: correct / incorrect and appropriate / inappropriate. “«[C]orrect» utterances are those that agree with («conform to») the corresponding idiomatic knowledge” (Coseriu 1985: xxxiv). Appropriateness, on the other hand, is considered to be “the suitable realization of [...] expressive knowledge in speech” (Coseriu 1985: xxxiv), “knowledge about how certain discourses should be constructed in certain situations” (Coseriu 1985: xxix).

Coseriu’s classification of judgment makes it possible to make the intuitive form of our characterization of nonce PCs (i.e. it is ‘bad’ at the historical level, but ‘good’ at the individual level.) into a theoretical one. That is, nonce PCs are incorrect, but appropriate. A question arising here is whether it is possible that incorrect expressions are used appropriately. The answer is yes. Take one example from Coseriu (1985: xxxv) and Coseriu (2007[1980]: 52). A native speaker might use his/her language incorrectly when talking with non-native speakers who are assumed to be unable to fully understand the speaker’s language. For instance, Coseriu (2007[1980]: 52) gives the German sentences *Du gehen?*; *du schon gegessen?*, consisting of infinitive and participle respectively. Examples like those given here are incorrect, but the incorrectness is considered to be necessary so that the non-native speakers can understand the speaker. In this sense, the examples are incorrect but regarded as appropriate. According to Coseriu, the incorrectness at the historical level is *suspended* at the individual level, so that incorrect expressions are appropriately used in the text (see Coseriu (2007[1988]: 176)). See the following citation for more detail about suspension (*Aufhebung*):

Texte folgen nicht unbedingt in jedem Punkte den Regeln einer Sprache; Abweichungen von den Regeln einer Einzelsprache sind immer möglich. Und was noch wichtiger ist: Diese Abweichungen werden in der Regel nicht als solche interpretiert, sondern sie

erscheinen als völlig annehmbar, wenn sie durch die Gestaltung des Textes oder durch eine Textfunktion motiviert sind. Es handelt sich dabei um eine sehr allgemeine Erscheinung, die man folgendermaßen formulieren könnte: Der Text kann Regeln der Einzelsprache aufheben, die dann in diesem besonderen Text nicht gelten, und zwar a) entweder schlicht wegen der traditionellen Gestaltung des betreffenden Textes oder b) aufgrund einer Motivation, die wir in dem betreffenden Text finden.

(Coseriu 2007[1980]: 50)

We are now in a position to clarify the mechanism to construct nonce PCs. As noted earlier, nonce PCs are incorrect due to the LIP, a deviation from a rule of the Japanese language. However, some contextual motivation suspends the incorrectness, making appropriate nonce PCs, or making such a deviation tolerable. This is the mechanism to create nonce PCs—the answer to the second question given in Section 2 (though still too abstract at this moment).

Thus, to reach a deeper understanding of this type of phrasal compounds, it is necessary to look into the contexts in which they appear and identify contextual motivations that ensure their appropriate use. Below, we would like to observe nonce PCs at length, revealing contextual motivations leading to suspension. Before starting with the observation, however, we should be careful not to misinterpret the role of suspension. Suspension does not eliminate incorrectness arising from the violation of the rule (it does not change incorrectness into correctness); incorrectness is still recognizable in appropriateness. See the following citation:

Das Wort *aufheben* soll hier im übrigen so verstanden werden, wie es in der Philosophie verwendet wird. “Aufgehoben” heißt also nicht etwa “eliminiert”; das Nicht-Korrekte bleibt im Angemessenen durchaus als solches erkennbar, es wird nur

to be exact. His explanation then led the comedian to create [*hobo senzyu*]-*kannon*, where *hobo* modifies *senzyu* (i.e. about one thousand arms) to make the expression accurately reflect the number of the deity's arms.

The LIP would prohibit such a modification, as observed in *[*taihen kookyuu*]-*hoteru* ([very high.class]-hotel) in Section 1, but in fact, this compound in (9) is easily accepted in this specific context, although it still sounds funny or, intuitively speaking, weird in some sense. It would be unreasonable to suppose that *X-kannon*, where *X* can be a phrase, is part of the idiomatic knowledge, because we do not know and productively create other cases where *kannon* is compounded with phrases. In this sense, [*hobo senzyu*]-*kannon* is not handled in the same way as compounds like *X-zukuri*, an idiomatic PC; it is assumed to be temporarily created in this specific context with the suspension of the incorrectness caused by the LIP violation.

The contextual motivation which triggers off the suspension would be to elicit laughs from the audience, a common job of comedians. The comedian uttering the compound supposedly wanted to accurately describe the number of the deity's arms by responding to the monk's explanation so that he could make others laugh by jokingly denying others' belief that *senzyu-kannon* is an accurate compound as a name for the deity. Furthermore, the weirdness of the compound itself, caused by the violation of the LIP, might contribute to eliciting laughs. These motivations at the individual level are assumed to suspend the deviation from the LIP at the historical level, making the incorrect compound sound appropriate.

5.2.2. Informativeness

The example in (9) is created on the basis of the well-established compound *senzyu-kannon* by adding the modifier to the left-hand

element. A similar process is observed in Kageyama's (1993) nonce PC examples given in Section 2, which are repeated below:

(10) Book title:

[*kokugo-ni haitta bongo*] *-ziten*
 national language-DAT enter.PAST Sanskrit -dictionary
 'Dictionary of Sanskrit words getting into Japanese'

(ed. by Tsusho Byodo, 1978, Sankibobussyorin)

(11) Newspaper article (the underlined part is a phrasal compound):

[*24ka moyoosareta bizin-kontesuto*] *-kaizyoo*
 24th be.held.PAST beautiful.person-contest -venue
de tenagedan-ga bakuhatu si...
 at grenade-NOM explosion do...

'A grenade has exploded at a venue of beauty contest held on 24th...'

(12) Utterance of an animated character (the underlined part is a phrasal compound):

kore-ga [*Masuo-niisan-no tottekita*
 this-NOM Masuo-elder.brother-GEN collect.PAST
matutake] *-gohan na no?*
 matsutake.mushroom -rice COP SFP

'Is this rice dish cooked with the matsutake mushroom collected by Masuo?'
 (*Sazae-san*, aired on TV)

In these examples, the compounds without the modifications of the left-hand elements are, or sound, fixed: *bongo-ziten*, *bizin-kontesuto* or *bizin-kontesuto-kaizyoo*, and *matutake-gohan*. These basic compounds, thus, would have been initially available to the addressers to convey their messages. However, we suppose that these initially-available compounds might not be satisfactory by themselves in view of the communicative purposes (although the

contexts with which Kageyama (1993) provides us are not enough to completely understand the addressers' intentions). For instance, *bongo-ziten*, with no modification, is more likely to sound as if it dealt with Sanskrit words in general, not Sanskrit words becoming Japanese. *Bongo-ziten*, as it is, would not be an appropriate title if it focuses on Sanskrit words getting into Japanese. In other words, *bongo-ziten* is less informative as the reader cannot appropriately imagine its content. The modification of the left-hand element is one of the solutions to overcome this defectiveness. Thus, ensuring informativeness of the compound is assumed to be a motivation which gives rise to the suspension in (10).¹³

The same is true for (11). (11) is from a newspaper article. Such an article would be expected to be informative enough to specify, for instance, when the event depicted happened. [*Bizin-kontesuto*]-*kaizyoo* would provide relatively enough information as it identifies the place where the incident (i.e. the explosion of a grenade) happened, but still, readers might wonder when it happened, the information which newspaper readers usually expect to be provided. This expectation is assumed to serve as a

¹³Although we checked the content of the book after knowing the title through Kageyama (1993), the interpretation and explanation in the text are based on our intuition or guess at the time of reading the book title without looking into the content (particularly the preface of the book). The author, however, seems to give the title in a different process. According to the preface of the book, the author learned Sanskrit through university lectures held by a professor with profound knowledge on related fields. At that time, the professor was regularly writing, for a magazine, papers titled "kokugo-ni haitta bongo"(Sanskrit words getting into Japanese). Impressed with the work by the professor, the author seems to have come up with the book title. If so, *kokugo-ni haitta bongo* is a fixed, idiomatic phrase for the author, and hence, it serves as, as it were, a (idiomatic) word rather than a phrase. We will, however, place importance on our interpretation in the text, not the author's (presumable) intention, because there is normally no room for readers of the book, like us, to know that *kokugo-ni haitta bongo* is an idiomatic phrase at the moment of seeing the title.

motivation which leads to the suspension of the incorrectness caused by the modification of the left-hand element, leading addressees to regard this nonce PC as appropriate.

Informational defectiveness in (12) is more obvious. *Matutake-gohan*, a quite familiar compound, would not make sense by itself in this particular context. We guess that the animation character would recognize that the food in front of him/her is matsutake mushroom rice, so that the question *Kore-ga matutake-gohan na no?* ‘Is this matsutake mushroom rice?,’ which lacks the modification for the left-hand element of the compound, would become absurd because he/she asks about what he/she already knows. Of course, if using phrases, not compounds, the speaker has a wide range of choices to ask whether the rice dish served for the speaker is cooked with the matsutake mushroom collected by Masuo. For example:

- (13) [*Masuo niisan-no tottekita matutake* *de tukutta*] *gohan*
with make.PAST

Here, *detukutta* is inserted immediately after *matutake*, meaning ‘(which someone) cooked with matsutake mushroom.’ The resultant bracketed relative clause then modifies *gohan*. The overall structure in (13) is, thus, no longer a compound, but a noun phrase headed by *gohan*. But phrases like that in (13) do not seem to designate matsutake mushroom rice, but rather another kind of rice, probably because the speaker avoids the compound *matutake-gohan*, which is more than likely to be used in referring to the food in question. To avoid these problems which arise by following the tradition at the historical level, he/she is likely to have no choice but to use the already-existing compound (i.e. *matutake-gohan*) and violate the LIP with the left-hand element modified by the relative clause. This situation would motivate the

appropriate use of the incorrect phrasal compound.

5.2.3. Irony

So far, we have pointed out that joke and informativeness serve as motivations to bring about suspension. We can, however, find another contextual motivation which makes it possible to create nonce PCs. One of the authors remembers that he previously uttered a roughly similar expression to the following example:

- (14) [*notte nai basu*]-*dai-o harau ka*
ride.on not bus -fare-ACC pay.for SFP(doubt)
'I'll pay for the bus fare even though (my son) hardly used
the bus (in this month).'

He has a son who went to preschool. The school owns a bus which he used to go there. Every month, the parents paid for the bus fare. In a certain month, the son missed a lot of days of school because of a bad cold. They, however, were asked to pay for the same amount of bus fare as usual even though he had less opportunities to use the bus. When learning of this fact, the author jokingly told his wife something like that in (14) with ironic intent. The compound *basu-dai* 'bus fare' was used repeatedly in talking about bus fare in those times, so that using this compound would have been natural in this context. At the same time, however, the author wanted to put his ironic intent on the compound, coming up with example (14) with the LIP violation (*nottenai*, a relative clause, makes a noun phrase with *basu*). Normally, compounds like that in (14) will be turned down as incorrect because of the LIP, but the ironic (and humorous) intention suspends the incorrectness, making the compound in (14) sound appropriate.

5.2.4. Naming

The nonce PCs we have dealt with until now are assumed to be created by adding modifications to the left-hand elements of fixed compounds. However, nonce PCs do not always build on such fixed compounds. See the following example:

- (15) [*kozakana to aamondo*] *-senbee*¹⁴
small.fish and almond -rice.cracker
'rice cracker with small fish and almond flavor'

Without any specific contextual clue, one seems likely to interpret the sequence of the words to describe two kinds of foods, namely *kozakana* 'small fish' and *aamond-senbee* 'almond-flavor rice cracker'—a structure which has no violation of the LIP (*to* 'and' serves to coordinate the word *kozakana* and the (ordinary) compound *aamondo-senbee*). The example in (15) is, though, a name for the product of rice cracker, which forces us to regard the example in the following fashion. The coordinate conjunction *to* 'and' combines *kozakana* 'small fish' and *aamondo* 'almond,' forming the bracketed syntactic constituent *kozakana to aamondo*. This constituent then is compounded with the right-hand element *senbee* 'rice cracker,' resulting in a phrasal compound. Unlike nonce PCs like [*hobo senzyu*]-*kannon*, which contains the pre-established compound *senzyu-kannon*, the nonce PC in (15) does not rely on such a fixed compound; the entire compounding structure is newly constructed in discourse.

If one wants to avoid the LIP violation, the genitive marker *no*, for example, is available to refer to the same object: [*kozakana to aamondo no*] *senbee*, where the bracketed part is a genitive

¹⁴ A rice cracker product by *Iwatsuka Confectionery* (available as of July 4, 2021)

phrase modifying *senbee* and which is no longer a compound, but a syntactic phrase. Although this phrase is preferable as it is constructed in conformity with rules in the Japanese system, it is assumed to be less preferable as a name for the product. Bauer (2003: 135), for example, states that compounds, but not phrases, have the naming function:

Like derivatives, compounds provide names for entities, properties or actions. This is opposed to providing descriptions, which is the function of syntax. A derivative like *judo-ist* and a compound like *judo-man* both provide a name for the person concerned, as opposed to a syntactic phrase like ‘an expert in judo,’ which provides a description.

Japanese shows a similar tendency (cf. Shimamura 2014). The phrase [*kozakana to aamondo no*] *senbee* might, thus, be too descriptive to sound like a name for goods (of course, it is possible to name goods by deviating from this general tendency on purpose). There might have been two needs in creating the name for the product in question: on the one hand, the title must sound like name, not description, and, on the other hand, two distinct features of the product—*kozakana* and *aamondo*—should be expressed in one name. Since we intuitively understand these contextual demands for naming of the product, the nonce PC [*kozakana to aamondo*]-*senbee* sounds appropriate, suspending its incorrectness.

5.2.5. Peripheral Cases of Nonce PCs

The last example differs from the above examples in the structure of the left-hand constituent. This time, we will first show the example in Japanese characters:

(16) 回転しない寿司¹⁵

This expression refers to the style in which Japanese sushi restaurants serve sushi to customers. Traditionally, a sushi chef directly serves sushi to customers who sit at the bar and order what they want to eat. But recently, another style has become famous in Japan. Sushi restaurants install round conveyor belts on which small plates with sushi items on them come close, one after another, to customers sitting next to the conveyor. If they feel like trying sushi items passing in front of them, they pick them up from the conveyor belt; this style, contrary to the traditional one, does not require customers to order the sushi they want to eat (but they can order sushi items if, for example, they do not find their favorite items on the conveyor). This style is usually called 回転寿司 *kaiten-zushi* (go.round-sushi), which means that sushi items go round (on the conveyor belt).¹⁶

However, the sushi restaurant chain creating the advertising phrase in (16) has tactfully combined the traditional and the *kaiten-zushi* styles, developing a new one. The restaurant installs conveyor belts (though not round) as ordinary *kaiten-zushi* restaurants, but sushi items do not go round on the belts continuously and randomly. Instead, customers, as in traditional sushi restaurants, order items which they want to eat (but unlike traditional restaurants, customers do so with a touch-screen tablet installed to each table). Then sushi plates are brought to the

¹⁵ An advertising phrase of the sushi restaurant chain *Uobei*. The data was collected by one of the authors at one of the chain restaurants in Tsukuba city on May 14, 2019. The data is, though the design is slightly different, also on their website (<https://www.genkisushi.co.jp/uobei/store/list.php>, accessed July 5, 2021).

¹⁶ The form *zusi* occurs here because of sequential voicing, or *rendaku*, of *susi*. See the following discussion.

customers' table on conveyor belts.¹⁷ The restaurant looks like a *kaiten-zushi* restaurant, because of which the example in (16) would include the words 回転 and 寿司 in its structure, but sushi items “no longer go round” randomly on the conveyor belts, which is reflected in the phrase 回転しない *kaiten si nai* (go.round do not) ‘(something) does not go round.’ Thus, example (16) nicely reflects the notable characteristics of the new style.

In addition, we need to further consider its structural characteristic before starting to discuss the morphological aspect of the example. 回転しない寿司 provides us with two possible structures due to Chinese characters used in it: 寿司 can be pronounced in two different ways depending on the overall structure. When 寿司 is pronounced as *susi*, the example is not a compound but a syntactic noun phrase. Furthermore, in this case, *susi* has its own accent, as shown in (17), which suggests that *susi* is an independent word, not part of a compound (the location of accent is marked by “ ’ ”).

(17) [kaiten si nai] susi’ ([go.around do not] sushi)

This structure, which is not a phrasal compound but a fully legitimate noun phrase with a relative clause (i.e. *kaiten si nai*), is not relevant to our discussion. On the other hand, the other possible structure is a subject of our interest. We can also pronounce 寿司 as *zusi*, a *rendaku* form (see fn. 1), which indicates that 寿司 constitutes part of a compound. The accentuation pattern also follows ordinary phonological rules of compound, as follows:

¹⁷ More accurately, Shinkansen bullet train-style containers on conveyor belts bring sushi to customers.

(18) [kaiten si nai?]-zusi

When the head word of a compound consists of one or two mora(e), the accent of the compound is normally put on the last mora of the left-hand constituent; if such a head word has its own accent, the word loses it in compounding (Kubozono 1995). In addition to *rendaku*, the accentuation pattern suggests that the compound structure is at issue in pronouncing 寿司 as *zusi*. *Susi* is a two-mora word whose accent is originally put on the last mora, as shown in (17). However, *zusi* in (18) loses its accent. Additionally, the accent falls on the last mora of the left-hand constituent, that is, *kaiten si nai* (go.around do not)‘(something) does not go around.’

If [*kaiten si nai*]-*zusi* is a compound, the LIP violation is obvious since *kaiten si nai* is a syntactic phrase with the light verb *si* ‘do’ and the negation *nai* ‘not.’ Note in passing that this nonce PC is a quite peripheral case in phrasal compounds. According to Kageyama (2009: 518-519), the non-head constituents are “categorially limited to NPs with adjectival or other modifiers [as in, for instance, (1)-(5)], or coordinated NPs” as in (15). On the other hand, *kaiten si nai* in (16) is a verbal phrase, which makes example (16) an extremely rare nonce PC. This irregular form would be possible precisely because of nonce PCs. They would be capable of accommodating even non-NP element, such as a verbal phrase, through the power of suspension, in which contextual motivations, we assume, overcome structural irregularity as well as incorrectness.¹⁸

¹⁸ We are not sure if the sushi restaurant chain actually intends the syntactic phrasal structure or the phrasal compound structure with 回転しない寿司. At least our first interpretation at the time of encountering it is, however, the latter (of course, some may prefer the former interpretation). For one thing, the visual design made us think it to be a phrasal compound. 回転寿司 is written

We are now in a position to begin to analyze a contextual motivation to create [*kaiten s inai*]-*zusi*, a nonce PC. The new sushi restaurant style in question, as noted earlier, has two remarkable features.

The sushi restaurant looks similar to ordinary *kaiten-zusi* restaurants since it installs conveyor belts; it is, however, different from them in that sushi items on small plates do not go around on the conveyor belts randomly and continuously, but customers, as in traditional sushi restaurants, order sushi they want to eat. Using *kaiten* and *zusi* in the advertising phrase is a good tactic because these words together remind customers of the normal *kaiten-zusi* style.

Furthermore, the negation of *kaiten* with *si nai* plays a significant role in implying the big difference from this ordinary style: contrary to one's expectation, sushi items, though a kind of *kaiten-zusi* restaurant, do not go around, which we guess makes customers wonder how sushi is served and ideally attracts their interest.

The intention to bring about these rhetorical effects is

horizontally. *しない* in relatively smaller font size is then vertically inserted in between 回転 and 寿司. Because of the vertical insertion of *しない*, the distance between 回転 and 寿司 is kept to be at a minimum and thus they could still have strong semantic and structural relation (if *しない* were put horizontally, such distance would be much longer and, concomitantly, semantic and structural relation between 回転 and 寿司 might wane). Such a design led us to guess that 回転寿司, a fixed compound, serves as a base form, to which *しない* is added later; hence, 回転寿司, even though its sequence is broken into two parts by *しない*, still retains the status as a compound. Again, we do not know which structural interpretation is originally intended by the creator of the phrase. Yet, we value the fact that we, as a recipient of the message, intuitively came up with the phrasal compound structure, as in the way explained here.

assumed to give a strong motivation to suspend the incorrectness caused by the insertion of *sinai* between *kaiten* and *zusi*, thus making the compound appropriate.

6. Conclusion

The LIP, a principle where no syntactic operation is applied to the intra structure of lexical units, is established in the Japanese system, because of which, as previous studies point out, Japanese normally does not allow morphological complexes to include syntactic constituents in their structures. Closer observations, however, result in finding exceptional cases to the LIP. One of the exceptions is a phrasal compound. Although few studies have been devoted to its analysis, Kageyama (1993, 2016) provides us with precious insights for the investigation of phrasal compounds. Based on his research, we divided phrasal compounds into two general types: idiomatic phrasal compounds and nonce phrasal compounds. Both of these types are presumably difficult to be analyzed comprehensively in the frameworks previous studies adopt, as their focus is on the morphological system.

We, therefore, introduced Coseriu's integral linguistic theory, on the basis of which we developed our analysis. While the LIP is in the system, idiomatic PCs belong to the norm. Thus, they succeed in eluding the restriction by the LIP, and as a consequence, idiomatic PCs, as Kageyama (1993) notes, sound fully natural as Japanese. On the other hand, nonce phrasal compounds are incorrect at the historical level, but appropriate at the individual level. We proposed that this characteristic is attributed to the fact that they are created by suspending incorrectness through appropriateness, at the individual level. Our proposal was attested by the several examples where motivations such as joke, informativeness, and irony play crucial roles in causing suspension.

Phrasal compounds in Japanese have not been fully analyzed, and as a consequence, their general picture remains unclear. However, we demonstrated that an integral linguistic view casts new light on them, clarifying their position in the speaker's linguistic knowledge and their relation to his/her creative activity in discourse.

REFERENCES

- ACKEMA, P. and A. NEELEMAN (2004): *Beyond Morphology: Interface Conditions on Word Formation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- ANDERSON, S. R. (1992): *A-Morphous Morphology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BAUER, L. (2003): *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*, 2nd ed., Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- BOOIJ, G. (2009): "Lexical Integrity as a Formal Universal: A Constructionist View", in S. Scalise, E. Magni, and A. Bisetto (eds.): *Universals of Language Today*, Berlin, Springer, pp.83-100.
- BOSQUE, I. (2020): "Lexical Integrity in Morphology", in R. Lieber (ed.): *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Morphology*, vol. 2, New York, Oxford University Press, pp.1137-1156.
- BOTHA, R. P. (1981): "A Base Rule Theory of Afrikaans Synthetic Compounds", in M. Moortgat, H. van der Hulst and T. Hoekstra (eds.): *The Scope of Lexical Rules*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.1-77.
- COSERIU, E. (1967): "Lexical Structure and the Teaching of Vocabulary", in *Linguistic Theories and their Application*, London, George G. Harrap, pp. 9-52.
- COSERIU, E. (1975): "System, Norm und Rede", in U. Petersen (trans. and ed.): *Sprachtheorie und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft: 5 Studien*, München, Wilhelm Fink

- Verlag, pp.11-101 [Original: 1952, *Sistema, norma y habla*, Montevideo].
- COSERIU, E. (1985): “Linguistic Competence: What Is It Really?”, *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. xxv-xxxv.
- COSERIU, E. (2007): *Sprachkompetenz: Grundzüge der Theorie des Sprechens*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen [1988, Tübingen, Francke].
- COSERIU, E. (2007): *Textlinguistik: eine Einführung*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen [1980, Tübingen, Narr].
- DISCIULLO, A.M. and E. WILLIAMS (1987): *On the Definition of Word*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.
- ITO, T. and Y. SUGIOKA (2002): *Go no Shikumi to Gokeisei* (Structure of Words and Word Formation), Tokyo, Kenkyusha.
- KAGEYAMA, T. (1993): *Bunpoo to Gokeesei* (Grammar and Word Formation), Tokyo, HituziSyobo.
- KAGEYAMA, T. (2009): “Isolate: Japanese”, in R. Lieber and P. Štekauer (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 512-526.
- KAGEYAMA, T. (2016): “Lexical Integrity and the Morphology-Syntax Interface”, in T. Kageyama and H. Kishimoto (eds.): *Handbook of Japanese Lexicon and Word Formation*, Boston/Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 489-528.
- KUBOZONO, H. (1995): *Gokeesei to On'inkoozoo* (Word-Formation and Phonological Structure), Tokyo, Kuroshio.
- LAPOINTE, S.G. (1980): *A Theory of Grammatical Agreement*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- MORITA, J. (2020): “Where Does a Phrasal Compound Come from?—An Antilexicalism Model”, paper presented at the 36th Northwest Linguistics Conference

[<https://osf.io/bfj3x/> (July 18, 2021)].

- NISHIYAMA, K. (2015): “Nihongo no Kuhukugoogo (Japanese Phrasal Compounds)”, in T. Nishihara and S. Tanaka (eds.): *Gendai no Keetairon to Onseegaku/On'inron no Siten to Ronten* (Views and Issues of Contemporary Morphology and Phonetics/Phonology), Tokyo, Kaitakusha, pp. 78-95.
- NISHIYAMA, K. (2017): “Phrasal Compounds in Japanese”, in C. Trips and J. Kornfilt (eds.), pp. 149-183.
- SHIMAMURA, R. (2014): *Go to Ku to Nazuke Kinoo: Nitieego no “Keeyoosi + Meesi” kee o tyuusinni* (Words and Phrases and the Naming Function: With a Focus on “Adjective + Noun” forms in Japanese and English), Tokyo, Kaitakusha.
- TRIPS, C. and J. KORNFILT (2017): “Further Insights into Phrasal Compounding”, in C. Trips and J. Kornfilt (eds.), pp. 1-11.
- TRIPS, C. and J. KORNFILT (eds.) (2017): *Further Investigations into the Nature of Phrasal Compounding*, Berlin, Language Science Press.
- TSUJIMURA, N. (2014): *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*, 3rd ed., New York, Wiley-Blackwell.