

Jackendoff, Ray & Audring, Jenny. 2020. *The texture of the lexicon. Relational morphology and the parallel architecture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. xiii + 312.

Reviewed by Markus Hamunen

1 Introduction: the basic architecture of the theory

Jackendoff and Audring's book (RJ&JA henceforth) proposes a descriptive theoretical representation of an individual's synchronic knowledge of language. Adopting an explicitly mentalist perspective (p. 6)¹ the book analyzes how linguistic long-term memory is structured, how it works to generate utterances, and how it is acquired and maintained. *The Texture of the Lexicon* is not a basic coursebook on morphology but closer to the representation of full-blown linguistic theory. Consequently, the reader benefits greatly from some background knowledge of domain-oriented linguistic tradition (phonology, morphology, syntax), especially of its theoretical evolution with linguistics (at least since Chomsky).

The book is written in an instructive and logical manner; dedicated readers will easily follow the storyline. Central terms appear in the title of the book: *texture*, *lexicon*, *Relational Morphology* and *Parallel Architecture*. Next, I introduce the book's basic ideas.

First, according to RJ&JA, language is located in an individual's brain and cognition. The name for this "place" is *lexicon*, and language is simply a structured and constantly restructuring warehouse of different kinds of linguistic items (i.e. words, idioms, phrasal syntax, and various schematic items). Making a sharp distinction between lexicon and grammar is not novel (e.g. "[g]ränsen mellan grammatiken och ordboken kan inte dras på något allmängiltigt sätt"; Collinder 1943: 10–11)², but it highlights one of the main differences between the view of mainstream generative grammar and RJ&JA's theory (more on dichotomies, p. 5). Traditional linguistic domains do not constitute separate modules but locate in one place, in the lexicon. The motivation for the term is that the lexicon traditionally stores items without any derivative processes, as in mainstream generative grammar. However, it can be called something else as well (cf. *constructicon* in Lyngfelt et al. 2018).

¹ Plain page numbers (or other references) refer to the book under review.

² "The line between the grammar and the lexicon cannot be drawn in a universally applicable way."

Second, RJ&JA's view of language is declarative and holistic rather than derivational and modular in the sense of mainstream generative grammar, which can be explicated by RJ's Parallel Architecture (e.g. Jackendoff 1997). It puts together domain-specific features of linguistic items into one ensemble but separates tiers connected with interface links (some modularity, after all). Examples will illustrate this (see pp. 14–15, ex. 8–9).

- (1a) Semantics: [LIKE (CHILD₁₀); SILLY, IMMATURE]₁₁
 Morphosyntax: [AN₁₀ aff₇]₁₁
 Phonology: /tʃaɪld₁₀ ɪʃ_{7/11}
- (1b) Semantics: [LIKE (FOOL_{1,12})]₁₃ (1c) Semantics: FOOL₁
 Morphosyntax: [AN_{1,12} aff₇]₁₃ Morphosyntax: N₁ (or [N N]₁)
 Phonology: /fu:l_{1,12} ɪʃ_{7/13} Phonology: /fu:l₁
- (2) Semantics: [LIKE (X_x)]_y
 Morphosyntax: [AN_x aff₇]_y
 Phonology: /...xɪʃ_{7/y}

Now, examples (1a) and (1b) represent instances of English *-ish* words, *childish* and *foolish*, respectively. The principle of Parallel Architecture is demonstrated in a notational convention to mark linguistic information on semantics, morphosyntax, phonology, and possibly other relevant information (e.g. orthography, register, metrics) to separate tiers, each tier having its primitive units and combinatorial principles. Other *-ish* words include *devilish*, *doggish*, *sheepish*, *thuggish*, etc. with *mutatis mutandis* similar notational composition. Example (2) illustrates the schema: a generalization over the set of *N-ish* words in English. Crucially, in RJ&JA's theory, schemas are like any other stored lexical items, be they productive or unproductive (Chapter 2.5–2.6).

The correspondences marked with indices in these examples represent the functional mechanism within the Parallel Architecture: interface links and relational links. The examples connect structural elements and wholes between tiers (e.g. coindex 10 between CHILD₁₀ – N₁₀ – /tʃaɪld₁₀/) **within** a lexical item making up Saussurean-type signs, i.e. form–meaning pairs. As mentioned, signs can also be schematic, as in example (2), which has abstract notations or empty slots to fill (category label X, coindex variables x and y, and the stem's phonological string unexpressed with three dots). The latter linking type represents correspondences **between** two or more lexical

items; see coindex 1 between *fool* (1c) and *foolish* (1b). These linking mechanisms explicate Relational Morphology's essence, representing how individual linguistic items are composed to form signs and how signs connect with each other in the lexicon. Eager readers can examine RJ&JA's theoretical description and notational solutions in full.

RJ&JA (p. 6–7) explicitly associate their theory with several other schema- and constraint-based frameworks (vs. rule- and derivation-basing in mainstream generative grammar) such as Construction Grammar, Construction Morphology, and RJ's own previous work on Conceptual Semantics (see also Nikanne 2018) and simpler syntax, and moreover, the authors call for “a major reconceptualization of linguistic theory” (p. 3). However, skeptical readers may wonder if there is still room to say something original. As Cognitive Linguistics consists of more or less closely connected theoretical “dialects” (or cousin theories) with several shared interests, it is healthy to ask whether individual approaches are basically compiling the same jigsaw puzzle. With this slight reservation, I may highly recommend the book especially to those scholars working as specialists within some close framework to stimulate further discussion.

2 The overall composition of the book

The book is divided into three parts with three chapters in each part; most chapters have compact and informative summaries at the end. I will next give a brief chapter-by-chapter summary, raising notable issues according to my subjective reading.

Part I (“The theory”) with Chapters 1–3 sets out the fundamentals. In Chapter 1 (“Situating morphology”) RJ&JA present the theoretical rudiments behind the model, locate the theory in the current Cognitive Linguistics sphere and introduce notational conventions.

Chapter 2 (“The functions of schemas”) outlines the difference between mainstream generative grammar type derivational/irregular distinction, which is the version of lexicon–grammar dichotomy. Convincingly, RJ&JA break this distinction down with schemas, both productive (*-ish* schema in ex. 2) and nonproductive. The former corresponds to procedural rules in mainstream generative grammar, the latter to irregularities or lexical redundancy rules. RJ&JA's productive schemas have close parallels in Construction Grammar (i.e. constructions) and Cognitive Grammar (i.e. constructional schemas).

The mechanism of unification in Construction Grammar is also the same (p. 29); one structure (e.g. 1c) is superimposed over the other (e.g. 2), preserving their unique features without feature duplication. Nonproductive schemas are not for producing novel instances. Instead, they capture common features among listed items in the lexicon. One example of non-productivity in a scheme can be seen in (3) (see p. 42, ex. 18a).

- (3) Semantics: [GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURE]x; Name: Y_y]_z
 Morphosyntax: [N N_y N_x]_z
 Phonology: /...y ...x/]_z [e.g. *Loon Lake, Salty Mountain, Deep River*]

In (3), the double underline represents the open variable which can actualize as “whatever” – it is an actual name part, and productive – but the single underline represents the closed variable – it is limited set of geographical or topological terms, and, hence, nonproductive (see more, pp. 36–38, 40–46).

The crucial principle behind productiveness of schemas, presented by RJ&JA, is the Relational Hypothesis: “*All* schemas can be used relationally. A particular subset of them, the productive one, can *also* be used generatively” (p. 52, bolding omitted; see also p. 4). For example, schema (2) has both a generative role in that a language user can produce novel items with it (e.g. *lemonish, kittenish, schoolmarmish*) and a relational role in that it maintains relations between particular *-ish* words on one hand and between stems or bases (e.g. *lemon, kitten, schoolmarm*) and the [_A ...*-ish*] scheme on the other. This relational principle is a serious, and cordially welcomed, attempt to reach for internal horizontal network relations in the lexicon, as well. Moreover, in their theory, RJ&JA (p. 52–54), specifically highlight relational roles as central notions over generativity.

Chapter 3 (“Motivation in the lexicon”), closing part I, sheds light on some cognitive background behind the technical apparatus sketched previously. Motivation as a central theme divides into inheritance and relational links.

First, inheritance, well-known in Cognitive Linguistics, refers to “vertical” relationships between a general schema and its specific instances, that is, how a schema supports instances. For example, (1a) inherits the properties of (2) – parts, their combinatory principles and linking – but as it fulfills the schematic blueprint, it emerges to be more than just an instance of a schema and the sum of its parts. This can be seen in (1a) from the idiosyncratic meaning ‘silly, immature, one who behaves against normative expectations.’ Invoking psycholinguistic phenomena such as processing and

acquisition, RJ&JA argue against impoverished entry inheritance (Chapter 3.3), which means that instances (e.g. *foolish*) just point to their “progenitors” (i.e. *fool*, *-ish*) without repeating their information (storage compression strategy). RJ&JA also argue against exemplar theories (Chapter 3.4.1), that is, in the extreme version, every single experience would be recalled (maximal token memorizing strategy). Instead, RJ&JA favor full entry inheritance which does not restrain stored information between peers or progenitors and descendants but merely supports redundant information and repetitive storage strategy as an optimal functional mechanism for cognition (Chapter 3.4).

Second, as demonstrated above, relational linking (Chapter 3.5) takes care of “horizontal” relationships between items, and according to RJ&JA, cognitive motivation here is based on associative connections of relative sameness or contrast between lexical items. Connections are redundant as in inheritance, and mutually symmetrical motivation holds.³ Inheritance is an inherently domain-general cognitive relation, and RJ&JA suggest so-called same-except relations as domain-general for relational linking, as well. If not earlier, here some readers may recall analogy (NB p. 77; see also § 3.2 in this review). All in all, chapter 3 represents a clearly articulated argumentation founded on the idea that items in the lexicon are connected both in “vertical” and “horizontal” linking, which form richly textured and redundant network with moderate cognitive load. Each item sort of ignites its near milieu in the network. This holds the lexicon together.

Part II (“Using and refining the tools”) with Chapters 4–6 digs deeper into the empirical morphological phenomena. It elaborates the fundamentals in Part I and serves as a test field for genuine linguistic phenomena. In Chapter 4 (“Formalizing morphological phenomena”) RJ&JA focus mainly on diverse topics in derivational morphology such as canonical derived suffixal or prefixal words (Chapter 4.1, e.g. *wide* – *widen*); zero morphology, such as conversion (Chapter 4.3, e.g. *butter*_N – *butter*_V); base-modifying morphology, such as blends (Chapter 4.9, e.g. *spoon* + *fork* = *spork*) and truncations (e.g. *math* ‘mathematics’); stem allomorphy (Chapter 4.10, e.g. *goose*_{SG} – *goose*_{PL}); infixation (Chapter 4.11, e.g. Tagalog: *sulat* ‘write’ – *sumulat* ‘write’ Agent focus); and reduplication (e.g. Warlpiri: *kurdu* ‘child’ – *kurdukurdu* ‘children’).

³ The relation between schema and instance is bidirectional but not symmetrically mutual, i.e. a schema permits an instance, while an instance implements a schema.

I will, again, leave most of the details for the reader. However, I offer two examples from RJ&JA's toolkit to demonstrate how theory and notation evolve. First, according to Relational Morphology, different linking relations are at the core of the theory. Terms such as sister words (e.g. *altruism* – *altruist*) and sister schemas (e.g. $[_N X\text{-}ism] - [_N X\text{-}ist]$) are coined for the lexical items that cannot be understood as derivational cognates or structures for each other (Chapter 4.8). They share structure but not fully. Consistent with principles of Relational Morphology sister schemas are, nonetheless, linked to each other in a parallel way, like sister words, as in (4) (cf. p. 108, ex. 47).

(4) Semantics:	a. IDEOLOGY _β	b. [ADHERENT (IDEOLOGY _β)] _z
Morphosyntax:	$[_N - aff_9]_β$	$[_N - aff_{10}]_z$
Phonology:	$/\dots_\alpha \text{ ɪzəm} /_β$	$/\dots_\alpha \text{ ɪst}_{10} /_z$

In (4a) and (4b), α and β are linked variable coincides standing for relational links between variables in schemes (cf. x, y, z, etc. between words). This notational solution expresses the theoretical principle that links serve equally between words, words and schemas, and schemas.

Second, (5) shows a notational example for the same-except relation in English Umlaut cases (p. 118, ex. 70).

(5) Semantics:	a. GOOSE ₁	b. [PLUR (GOOSE ₁)] ₂
Morphosyntax:	N ₁	{N ₁ , PL} ₂
Phonology:	$/g^*uw^*s/_1$	$/g^*i^*s/_1,2$

The star notation (* *) in (5) denotes that in two or more lexical items, phonological strings outside the stars are the same, whereas between the stars they differ. Here again, descriptive notation consistently follows theoretical principles.

The topic of Chapter 5 (“Formalizing inflection”) is apparent. Inflection (e.g. gender, number, case, tense, etc.) uses the identical morphophonological mechanisms as derivation (see Chapter 4), but certain notational clarifications are made in morphosyntax. From the inflectional point of view, the word *fool*'s (1c) morphosyntax is $\{N_1, SG_2, NOM_3\}_4$ and phonology $/fu:l_{1,2,3}/_4$ with respective interface links. Two innovations can be seen. First, inflectional classes are presented as feature values (cf. category labels, e.g. $[_N N]$ in 1c) shown within curly brackets (also 5b). Second, as the word *fool* is a clear portmanteau, values can be in an unordered set shown by commas. This much fixing is justified when taking into account morphological characteristics of

inflection. However, as RJ&JA (p. 139) admit as well, this leads to the slight notational peculiarity that suggests category labels are part of the feature set in inflected derivatives such as the word instructions: morphosyntax {[_NV₁₉ aff₂₀]₂₁, PL₈}₂₂ and phonology / /instruct₁₉ ion_{20/21}s_{8/22} (see p. 139, ex. 14). This could perhaps be corrected by representing the whole morphosyntax as categories, some having alternative values; converting categories to values; or representing morphosyntax twice, as categories and as values connected by interface links. There is no straightforward solution to this.

Inflection differs from derivation in two important ways: by forming relatively tight structural matrixes (paradigms) and by having an organic connection to phrasal syntax (p. 133–134).⁴ According to the principles of Relational Morphology, RJ&JA illustrate the internal cohesion of paradigms by sister words and sister schemas. Furthermore, sisters are connected by symmetrical relational links and mothers and daughters (schemas and instances) by inheritance and unification. Configurational principles are demonstrated by English (regular and irregular) and German (weak and strong) verb paradigms (Chapter 5.3–5.4). The message is straightforward: the paradigm is a linked web or matrix of schemas having important relational and generative roles, not derivation in form-by-form manner from a stem (the authors express some agnosticism, though; see p. 157–159). Again, if not earlier, here one aware of the history of morphology would ask for field theories (see § 3.1 in this review).

On the descriptive level, the inflection–syntax interface (external morphosyntax) remains somehow scarce (p. 134–135, 140). Also, concerning many-to-many mappings within form–meaning pairings (signs), allomorphy remains untouched while polysemy gets some attention (Chapter 5.7). However, theoretical mechanisms such as relational sameness, splitting the interface semantics–morphosyntax–phonology in two or more depending on a relation type (polysemy, homonymy, allomorphy), seems justifiable in RJ&JA’s description.

Chapter 6 (“Morphologically conditioned phonological alternations”) focuses on some separate and selected morphophonological alternations (devoicing in Dutch and German: [pa:rt] ‘horse’ but [pa:rdən] ‘horses’

⁴ To be precise, derivation also has connections to syntax – e.g. valence changing verbal derivation has a straightforward influence on a verb’s ability to unify certain argument structure constructions that represent blueprints for syntax. Of course, this is a connection to syntax from a distance or different angle than inflection. Inflection depends more directly on usage context and derivation depends on conceptual structure.

in Chapter 6.5, vowel alternation in English: *harm[ə]ny* : *harm[a]nic* : *harm[oo]nious* in Chapter 6.6, etc.). With these phenomena RJ&JA aim at assuring readers that the combination of Parallel Architecture and Relational Morphology forms a valid approach to the unified linguistic theory. Nevertheless, RJ&JA here take a fearless leap between system (e.g. phonology) and usage (e.g. phonetics).

As phonology is about theory of discrete units in a single language system or langue (phonemes, syllable templates etc.), phonetics is about gradient and analog phenomena in individuals' performative idiolect or parole, to stretch the difference between system/usage distinction. Hence, the phonology–phonetics interface is remarkably different from that of intra-sign interfaces such as phonology and other tiers, or they represent different “worlds” while still somehow the same entities (sounds). RJ&JA's solution is that phonetics includes both physical acoustic and articulatory features (p. 171–172), and phonology and phonetics are connected by interface links. Moreover, generally, certain phonetic space is divided into respective regions in phonological space (e.g. closed articulator ↔ [–continuant]). Hence, the leap from phonetics to phonology (comprehension) is made through the digitization of phones (p. 171) while the leap from the opposite direction (production) would by similar logic be made through the analogization of phonemes. These leaps might require some more philosophical consideration, but they still open the interesting gate to performance, for example, indexical (in the Peircean sense) phonetic features or “phonosemantics” in dialog. That could be a relevant extension to test PA.

Part III (“Beyond morphological theory”) with Chapters 7–9 concludes the book. In Chapter 7 (“Language processing and language acquisition through the lens of Relational Morphology”) RJ&JA offer some external evidence for the Parallel Architecture and Relational Morphology framework by examining the brain, a clear continuation of the system–usage interface of the previous chapter. First, RJ&JA set out some crucial processing operations (production and comprehension) such as long-term and working memory, general promiscuity of processing, and lexical access (activation, priming; Chapter 7.2–7.3). They suggest that, as descriptive composition, mental computing of language would also be parallel, for example, as decomposition and whole-word retrieval work simultaneously either reinforcing each other or competing (Chapter 7.4). Chapter 7.5 is especially illustrative in demonstrating how four different lexical item types might be mentally processed.

Second, according to RJ&JA, acquisition (Chapter 7.6–7.9) is usage-based and follows the same argumentative lines as in Cognitive Linguistics in general: learning is opportunistic and progressive. First, learners recognize similarities between words to propose sister groups. Then, they hypothesize possible schemas and, finally, figure out the productivity of each schema. Structural similarities provoke relational links and build the language network. Here, RJ&JA coin the new term *Structural Intersection* for the procedure behind schema building (p. 224). Skeptical readers may ask whether it is the learner or, better, the linguist who “warrants” (p. 225) a schema, post hoc. In other words, RJ&JA do not address the degree of learner consciousness in schematizing.

Chapter 8 (“Applying the tools to other domains”) brings more evidence from outside the strict morphophonological sphere, namely from syntax (Chapter 8.1–8.2), spoken language varieties (Chapter 8.3), and even orthography (Chapter 8.4) and metrics (8.5). The trick is to establish new relevant tiers with their own primitives and combinatorial principles. Interface links do the rest. Associations to music, geography, and the physical and social worlds are offered (Chapter 8.6). Even though this last substantive chapter is very preliminary, it encourages testing Parallel Architecture-cum-Relational Morphology machinery in other domains.

Chapter 9 (“Coda: What have we done?”) summarizes well the RJ&JA’s message. However, it is not a quick shortcut to the book: the reader should at least familiarize themselves with Part I of the book before reading the coda. RJ&JA respond to some stated constraints of the theory, such as possible falsifiability (not effective in a Popperian sense), local failures (fixable by theoretical innovations), and the theory’s applicative scope and limitations (mostly for future research). The coda could also have offered discussion on RJ&JA’s linguistic method, the nature of data in more or less autonomous linguistics, and general ontological and epistemological issues concerned (e.g. what language such theories actually describe).

3 Some further remarks

Next, I will note several wider topics that emerged during my reading process and might position RJ&JA’s work into broader context within linguistics. I consider these deficiencies of the book, since its goal was to develop a

thoroughly “unified linguistic theory” (p. 197). However, it is impossible to fit every, even every theoretically crucial, aspect into one single book.

3.1 History dismissed?

It is characteristic for Cognitive Linguistics to position itself strongly as a linguistic counter to mainstream generative grammar and to promote its theoretical innovations against it. Such positioning is seen also in RJ&JA’s book. However, this leads to a broader historical context and previous research remaining totally or partially absent and hence to lack of historical continuity. I will raise three prominent historical lines that deserved to be mentioned in RJ&JA’s book.

First, the descriptive tradition of morphology includes three lines of thinking. Chronologically, these are Word-and-Paradigm (WP), Item-and-Arrangement (IA) and Item-and-Process (IP). The classic presentation for IA and IP is Hockett (1954) and for WP it is Robins (1959; see also Matthews 1991: Chapter 10; Karlsson 1985). RJ&JA’s book is one version of the clash between WP and IP models. The book would have benefited from bringing this general setting forth, first, to shed some light on the historical canvas, and second, to demonstrate how the rule vs. schema approach connects to the rivalry between IP and WP. Moreover, RJ&JA’s Parallel Architecture and Relational Morphology model is a clear derivative from WP (even though it has, definitely, features from IA and IP, as well), as are all schema-based morphological models (e.g. Booij 2010). It would be profitable to advance WP tradition by explicating this connection.

Second, as links and relations are as, if not more, crucial than items themselves in RJ&JA’s model, another scholarly predecessor deserved to be mentioned. Namely, Kenneth (and Evelyn) Pike’s tagmemics use metaphorical terms *particle* (IA), *wave* (IP) and *fields* (WP), respectively, to describe different aspects of linguistic structure and structuring (Pike 1967: Chapter 12, 14; 1982: Chapter 3–5). Since RJ&JA’s theory emphasizes relational links and redundant network of the lexicon, the field metaphor is a very apparent connection to relevant previous studies. In fact, in the 1970s and 80s, a promising but somewhat scattered orientation towards field theory existed, in morphology and in general (see, e.g. Anttila 1975; 1977b; 1980; 1985, and references therein). Anttila’s output is topically very relevant, and, moreover, his papers are exceptionally knowledgeable, sensible and informative of the history of linguistics.

Third, Pike's notation in tagmemics has certain clear parallels to notational fashions in RJ&JA's book and in some other branches in Cognitive Linguistics (see e.g. Pike 1982: 75), even though overall conception of the language in tagmemics slightly differs from that of Cognitive Linguistics. Furthermore, RJ&JA anchor to the Saussurean sign. Why not Peircean? These issues could be clarified more clearly in order to attach RJ&JA's work to the broader history of linguistics. Here, attention must be drawn to the Gestalt tradition in general and linguistics specifically (see Anttila above), which would deserve more attention, not only from RJ&JA but in the Cognitive Linguistics paradigm in toto. In this respect, Anttila (1991) is still remarkable both topically and educationally to anyone with an interest in scholarly revival. An impressive illustration for a Gestalt/cognitive linguist to knowing one's background is von Slagle (1974, and references therein).

3.2 Analogy: the central concept dismissed?

Along with forgotten research history, the concept of analogy (see Anttila 1977a) has not really achieved the status it would deserve. I would suggest that especially cognitivist readers check the term *analogy* via the index (of subjects and authors) in RJ&JA's book and then take a couple of prominent books within Cognitive Linguistics to do the same exercise. Readers will probably discover – assuming the term even occurs in the text – that analogy has been understood mainly proportionally within the Cognitive Linguistics approach.

However, most of the central concepts and some other wordings in RJ&JA's theory point straight to analogy: *schema* (productive or non-productive), *relational role*, *generative role* (of the item), *paradigm*, *pattern*, *redundancy*, *same-except relation*, *sameness*, *similarity*, *sisters* and *sister groups*, *full entry inheritance*, *Structural Intersection*. Briefly, the point is that always, when there is conceived analogical relation (whatever relative similarity between two or more entities or phenomena), there is also an invariant level that compresses that sharedness. Now, as the proportional chain grows longer, it is impossible to draw the demarcation line in any other way than by artificially choosing whether the analogical relation has been conceived proportionally (“horizontally” comparing, e.g. individual words) or by invariance (“vertically” instantiating by a schema).

In cognitive psychology, this has been understood perhaps better than in current Cognitive Linguistics, for example, “schema induction can be

viewed as the final step in analogical transfer” (Holyoak 1985: 69) and “analogy-making and categorization are just two names of the same phenomenon” (Hofstadter & Sander 2013: 100). The literature on analogy is vast, but at least two references are worth mentioning in this context. Itkonen (2005) demonstrates the importance of analogy for linguistics in general. Becker (1990) is a straight-forward application of analogy, particularly in morphology, including crucial theoretical parallels with RJ&JA.

4 Conclusions

RJ&JA’s book is smoothly written. It has a consistent progression for even novice readers to keep up. The proofreading and editing have been excellent, as understanding strict formal descriptions requires a clean copy. Representing horizontal relations between items beside vertical schema–instance relations, the book emphasizes the rhizome- and chiasm-like character of the language system. It demonstrates, for its part, how current cognitively oriented langue-linguistics sees the system. In that respect, RJ&JA’s book is a representative instance of that schema. For the readers’ benefit, the book is not **grabbish* but very much *grabbable*.

References

- Anttila, Raimo. 1975. *The indexical element in morphology*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 12). Innsbruck.
- 1977a. *Analogy*. (Trends in linguistics. State-of-the-art-reports 10). The Hague: Mouton.
- 1977b. Dynamic fields and linguistic structure: A proposal for Gestalt linguistics. *Die Sprache* 23. 2–9.
- 1980. Field theory and morphology. *Lingua Posnaniensis* XXIII. 15–19.
- 1985. Dynamics in morphology: Tomus 35(1–2). In Herman, J. & Kiefer, F. (eds.), *Acta linguistica academiae scientiarum hungaricae*, 3–30. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- 1991. *Field theory of meaning and semantic change*. (L.A.U.D. A 301). Duisburg: Universität Duisburg Gesamthochschule.
- Becker, Thomas. 1990. *Analogie und morphologische Theorie*. (Studien zur Theoretischen Linguistik 11). München: Wilhelm Fink.
- Booij, Geert. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Collinder, Björn. 1943. Deskriptiv och historisk språkforskning [descriptive and historical linguistics]. In Nyberg, H. S. (ed.), *Orientering i språkvetenskap* [Orientation to linguistics], 9–35. Stockholm: Bokförlaget natur och kultur.
- Hockett, Charles J. 1954. Two models of grammatical description. *Word* 10(2–3). 201–234.
- Hofstadter, Douglas & Sander, Emmanuel. 2013. *Surfaces and essences: Analogy as the fuel and fire of thinking*. New York: Basic Books.
- Holyoak, Keith J. 1985. The pragmatics of analogical transfer. In Bower, G. H. (ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation, part 19*, 59–81. New York: Academic Press.
- Itkonen, Esa. 2005. *Analogy as structure and process: Approaches in linguistics, cognitive psychology and philosophy of science*. (Human cognitive processing 14). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. *The architecture of the language faculty*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1985. Paradigms and word forms. *Studia gramatyczne* VI. 135–154.
- Lyngfelt, Benjamin & Borin, Lars & Ohara, Kyoko & Timponi Torrent, Tiago. 2018. *Constructicography: Constructicon development across languages*. (Constructional approaches to language 22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matthews, P. H. 1991. *Morphology*. 2nd edn. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nikanne, Urpo. 2018. *Conceptual semantics: A micro-modular approach*. (Constructional approaches to language 23). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1967. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. Second, revised edition. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- 1982. *Linguistic concepts: An introduction to tagmemics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Robins, R. H. 1959. In defence of WP. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 58(1). 116–144.
- Slagle, Uhlan von. 1974. *Language, thought and perception: A proposed theory of meaning*. (Janua Linguarum, Series Maior 98). The Hague: Mouton.

Contact information:

Markus Hamunen
South-Eastern Finland University of Applied Sciences
e-mail: markus(dot)hamunen(at)xamk(dot)fi