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Abstract

We present a corpus-driven approach to the study of multi-word expressions, which constitute a significant part of. As a data basis, we use collocation profiles computed from DeReKo (Deutsches Referenzkorpus), the largest available collection of written German which has approximately two billion word tokens and is located at the Institute for the German Language (IDS).

We employ a strongly usage-based approach to multi-word expressions, which we think of as conventionalised patterns in language use that manifest themselves in recurrent syntagmatic patterns of words. They are defined by their distinct function in language.

To find multi-word expressions, we allow ourselves to be guided by corpus data and statistical evidence as much as possible, making interpretative steps carefully and in a monitored fashion. We develop a procedure of interpretation that leads us from the evidence of collocation profiles to a collection of recurrent word patterns and finally to multi-word expressions.

When building up a collection of multi-word expressions in this fashion, it becomes clear that the expressions can be defined on different levels of generalisation and are interrelated in various ways. This will be reflected in the documentation and presentation of the findings. We are planning to add annotation in a way that allows grouping the multi-word expressions according to different features and to add links between them to reflect their relationships, thus constructing a network of multi-word expressions.

1. What do we study?

The availability of large corpora has changed the possibilities for linguistic research considerably: They give access to a large quantity of real life language data. It has also changed the perspective on language itself. As Sinclair and many other recent researchers have pointed out, language does not solely work by applying grammatical rules to a set of lexical items. Conventionalised chunks play an important role in the everyday usage of language and greatly shape its structure (cf. Sinclair, 1991; Hausmann 2004).

In many instances, the context of a word form, i.e., its collocations, have been studied to arrive at a better understanding of the meaning of the single word form (e.g., Hanks, 2004). On the other hand, corpus data is used to derive abstract, grammatical patterns for the usage of a word (e.g., Hunston/Francis, 2000).

Our approach is slightly different. We are interested not in single word forms but in multi-word expressions. We aim to find out which ones are common in contemporary German and to capture their behaviour and meaning. By following the evidence of corpora as opposed to intuition, it is possible to discover multi-word expressions that are not yet listed in classical handbooks of phraseology and to detect new usages and forms of known
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multi-word expressions (e.g. Moon, 1998). We try to make the most out of the evidence available by using the objective results of statistical collocation analysis for pre-structuring and taking a careful, corpus-driven approach to interpretation.

Terminology in the field of phraseology is quite diverse (for an up-to-date overview of the field cf. Burger et al., 2007), so we begin by clarifying what we consider the object of our research. Compared to phraseological approaches, which require deviation from grammatical or semantic norms as a necessary criterion, we have a broad concept of multi-word expressions, which is heavily influenced by experience with empirical language data and centres around usage. In this respect, we adhere to Firth’s contextual theory of meaning, here summarised by Tognini-Bonelli: “In the Firthian framework the typical cannot be severed from actual usage, and ‘repeated events’ are the central evidence of what people do, how language functions and what language is about.” (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 89). In the context of early first language acquisition, Tomasello explains that patterns of language use are generalised to different degrees of abstraction when people use ‘similar’ expressions in ‘similar’ situations. Consequently, there are no elements of language that do not have a communicative meaning, as they are all derived from language use (cf. Tomasello, 2006: 21). We keep this view in mind when dealing with multi-word expressions.

The German name we use for our object of research, “Usuelle Wortverbindungen” (cf. Steyer, 2000), reflects this usage-based perspective as it can be paraphrased as ‘multi-word patterns that are common in usage’. These are defined as conventionalised patterns in language use that manifest themselves in recurrent syntagmatic patterns of words (Steyer, forthcoming). Like Feilke, we believe that multi-word expressions become frozen by usage and are pragmatically bound to conventionalised contexts (cf. Feilke, 2004: 47).

To be of interest to us, multi-word expressions must neither be completely frozen nor deviate from the grammatical norm. A certain degree of fixedness, however, is important to our model, since structural stability is necessary in order for the unit to become a recognizable chunk with a distinct meaning or function in the language use attached to it.

This function is attached to the multi-word expression as a whole as opposed to its parts, but is not to be confused with idiomaticity. When studying corpus data, it quickly becomes clear that idiomaticity can hardly be an objective criterion for defining multi-word expressions. Whether the whole has a different meaning than the sum of its parts often depends on the meaning assigned to the parts. However, dictionaries show that the number of meanings assigned to a single word often differ significantly. Therefore, it would be necessary to first pin down the meaning of each component of the multi-word expression in a corpus-based way, a very difficult task, especially because, as has been pointed out by Hanks, “there are no literal meanings, only varying degrees of probability” (Hanks, 2004: 247).

For example, in German there is a multi-word expression Kapital verspielen. Kapital is commonly translated as ‘financial capital, funds’ and verspielen as ‘to gamble away’. However, in the vast majority of cases, corpus data from collocation profiles tells us that what a speaker means when using this multi-word expression is not actually ‘to gamble away money’, but rather ‘to put at risk what you have/to squander opportunities’. So, is the meaning of the whole here different from the meaning of the parts? Not if you take into account that verspielen is often used in the sense of ‘to squander/to put at risk’ and that Kapital is used in the sense of ‘opportunities/chances/potential’ in other contexts, too.

For our definition of a multi-word expression, the question, whether Kapital verspielen is idiomatic or not, is secondary. The important fact is that this combination of words is commonly used in German language and works as a functional unit in communication. From corpus evidence, you can see that it is used within a specific
pragmatic context to express criticism or admonition. This is confirmed by examining
typical contexts of the multi-word expression brought forth by collocation analysis, which
include:

*Kapital darf nicht verspielt werden*
*Kapital leichtsinnig verspielen*

Multi-word expressions can even have a specific function in language if they appear
to be completely transparent. An example would be the “aus ADJECTIVE Gründen” multi-
word expressions discussed in example 2 below.

To sum up, usage is for us the key to identifying as well as to describing multi-word
expressions. We base our research on collocation profiles computed from a very large
corpus, thus, relying on a statistical measure of typicality. For the definition of multi-word
expressions, their meaning and/or function in language use is most important.

2. How to find multi-word expressions

As stated above, our goal is to study multi-word expressions with a corpus-driven method.
Therefore, we allow ourselves to be guided by corpus data as much as possible, making
interpretative steps carefully and in a monitored fashion. We follow the dictum of corpus-
driven linguistics:

“In a corpus-driven approach the commitment of the linguist is to the integrity of the
data as a whole, and descriptions aim to be comprehensive with respect to corpus

Our corpus basis is DeReKo (Deutsches Referenzkorpus), with over 2 billion tokens
the largest corpus of written German available today. It is located at the Institute for the
German Language (IDS) and accessible via the corpus research tool COSMAS II
(http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2). In addition, we use a sophisticated analytical
method for structuring corpus data, collocation analysis (Kookkurrenzanalyse), as
developed by Cyril Belica (Belica 1995), which can also be used via COSMAS II. This
method takes a target word and, using the log-likelihood-ratio measurement, identifies the
words that appear statistically significantly in a given radius around it, its collocation
partners. Belica’s method also sub-structures the result by calculating further partner words,
which appear with the target word and its primary collocation partner. Thus, a hierarchical
structure of collocation partners for a target word is constructed, and the KWICs (keyword-
in-context lines from the corpus), which were the basis to the calculations, are clustered
accordingly. For each cluster and sub-cluster, the method also calculates a ‘syntagmatic
pattern’ from the assigned KWIC surfaces that reflects the most frequent positioning of the
target and partner words as well as other words that appear often in the cluster. For more
detailed information on this method see: Homepage of the project ‘Methoden der
Korpusanalyse und -erschließung’, (http://www.ids-mannheim.de/kl/projekte/methoden);
Tutorial Kookkurrenzanalyse (http://www.ids-mannheim.de/kl/misc/tutorial.html);
Perkuhn, 2007.)
This automated pre-structuring of the corpus evidence is an excellent starting point for our research, since the fact that word forms appear together in a statistically significant way often provides evidence for a recurrent syntactical and semantic connection between them (cf. Belica/Steyer forthcoming). We prefer using collocation analysis without lemmatisation (which would also be available using Belica’s method), as we agree with Sinclair’s statement: “There is a good case for arguing that each distinct form is potentially a unique lexical unit, and that forms should only be conflated into lemmas when their environments show a certain amount and type of similarity.” (Sinclair, 1991: 8) Starting our work at the surface level of language is a logical step since language users, too, are only confronted with the surfaces, and all categories are secondary interpretations. As we want to treat the data given to us by the objective means of corpus evidence and statistical calculation as carefully as possible and avoid jumping to conclusions based on our intuition too early, we propose several separate steps of interpretation to arrive at a multi-word expression.

Our first interpretative step is to define search patterns that are matched to the KWICs of a collocation cluster in order to group together those that have a similar, stable structure. This step is necessary, as collocation analysis calculates statistical affinity between word forms in a given radius around a target word, without taking order or filler word forms into account. Because of this, several different multi-word expressions often occur in the same cluster (if they are made up of the same word forms), or instances of the same expression are sorted into different clusters (e.g., if there is morphological or orthographic variance in the elements that make up the multi-word expression).

For the definition of our search patterns, we take clues from the syntagmatic patterns provided by Belica’s method and use mainly word forms that have appeared as

---

Figure 1: A clipping from the results of collocation analysis for the word form *Grund* as presented by the COSMAS II web interface.²

---

² This profile was calculated 28 June 2007 with the following settings: Korpusbasis: W-gesamt - alle Korpora des Archivs W; Anfrage: “Grund”; Kontext: -5, 5; Zuverlässigkeit: analytisch, Granularität: fein; Autofokus: ja; Lemmatisierung: nein; Funktionswörter ignorieren: nein; höchstens 1 Satz: ja; Zuordnung: mehrfach. Note that the collocation profile is statistical evidence and may change as weak partners may disappear and be replaced by others.
significant collocation partners of a target word. However, the patterns may also include other word forms if those contribute to the structure of the detected unit or serve to distinguish between different units.

These search patterns and their results are then bundled together into what we call ‘recurrent word patterns’. Recurrent word patterns serve to collect information about a particular structure, applying a limited set of basic generalisations, currently: orthographic variance, order of the components (especially important for multi-word expressions with verbal components), and variance in the grammatical form of the components. Note that these generalizations do not have to be applied. They should not if it turns out that a particular order or grammatical form is typical for a multi-word unit. Defining recurrent word patterns on the basis of the search patterns is, therefore, again an interpretive step.

The resulting recurrent word patterns are purely surface-based constructs, snippets of language that have a strong indication of occurring in this specific form. They are influenced by particularities of the corpus and the settings of collocation analysis and can often be seen as a set of typical realisations of more abstract multi-word expressions.

In a final step, the recurrent word patterns serve as evidence to postulate multi-word expressions. According to our usage-based approach, the main indicator for a multi-word expression is that a distinct function or meaning in language use can be assigned. Thus, multi-word expressions may (and often will) subsume recurrent word patterns from several collocation clusters and even several profiles.

When building up a collection of multi-word expressions in this fashion, it becomes clear that the expressions can be defined on different levels of generalisation and are interrelated in various ways. This has to be reflected in documentation and presentation of the findings. We are planning to add annotation that allows grouping of the multi-word expressions according to different features. In addition, we are going to add links between them to reflect their relationships, thus constructing a network of multi-word expressions.

We will illustrate our approach with two examples: One to show which interpretative steps we propose to arrive at the definition of a multi-word expression, and one to shed more light on our concept of multi-word expressions and their interrelations.

2.1 Example 1: From corpus data to multi-word expressions

The following example illustrates how we arrive at a multi-word expression from a collocation profile. Search patterns will be represented in italics and parentheses \( (\text{search pattern}) \), recurrent word patterns in squared brackets \([\text{recurrent word pattern}]\), and multi-word expressions in quotation marks “multi-word expression”.

We look at the collocation profile of the word form \textit{Grund} (‘ground/soil’; ‘reason’). For this example, we focus on the cluster of the primary collocation partner \textit{Boden} (‘ground/floor’). \textit{Boden} ranks among the strongest collocation partners of \textit{Grund}. The cluster has been sub-structured by Belica’s collocation analysis method in the following way:
This is an indicator that the word forms Boden, und, von and Ausverkauf are significant in their relationship to Grund. They should be included in the search patterns we define in order to structure the KWICs into recurring structures. Further hints for ordering, gaps, and other word forms that are frequent in the KWICs are given by the syntagmatic patterns provided by the collocation analysis method.

An obvious choice for a search pattern is (Grund und Boden), which matches almost all KWICs of the cluster. This pattern is very stable, with nearly no other word forms entering between the components. Those that appear do not contribute as modifiers or complements to the observed structure and can, thus, be neglected in a study of multi-word expressions. With this search pattern, the first recurrent word pattern can be defined, also called [Grund und Boden].

Now we observe the KWICs to further differentiate. Making use of the indicators Belica’s collocation analysis method has given us, we now look for the search pattern (von Grund und Boden) and notice two interesting facts: First, the meaning of Grund und Boden is always the same in this structure: It means ‘land, property’. Second, when inserting a gap (indicated here by the #-sign) between the components von and Grund und Boden, a regularity can be observed. In many instances, the gap contains modifiers to the ‘land’ the text deals with:

---

Figure 2: Collocation partners and syntagmatic patterns from the cluster Boden in the collocation profile for Grund.³

---

³ The profile cited in this example was calculated 17 May 2007 with the following settings: Korpusbasis: W-gesamt - alle Korpora des Archivs W; Anfrage: “Grund”; Kontext: -5, 5; Zuverlässigkeit: analytisch, Granularität: fein; Autofokus: ja; Lemmatisierung: nein; Funktionswörter ignorieren: nein; höchstens 1 Satz: ja; Zuordnung: mehrfach. Note that the collocation profile is statistical evidence and may change as weak partners may disappear and be replaced by others.
To capture this information, we use the gapped search pattern \((von \# Grund und Boden)\) to define another recurrent word pattern: \([von \ ... \ Grund und Boden]\).

A third search pattern can be defined by considering the last statistically significant partner \(Ausverkauf\) (‘sellout’): \((Ausverkauf von \# Grund und Boden)\). \(Ausverkauf\) is a complement to \(Grund und Boden\) in the meaning of ‘land/property’. Other complements, e.g., \(Erwerb\) (‘purchase’), \(Verkauf\) (‘sale’), \(Nutzung\) (‘use’) can be observed by looking at the KWICs, though those are not significant partners to \(Grund\) in this profile. The word \(Ausverkauf\) is so prominent because DeReKo is dominated by newspaper texts and the ‘sellout’ of property in the former DDR during German Reunification as well as the concerns citizens of other countries have about foreign investors were important issues. This shows that by using real live data, real life events also shape the findings. However, this does not deter from the fact that the unit is frequent in language use and should, thus, be noted as a recurrent word pattern \([Ausverkauf von \ ... \ Grund und Boden]\).

Following indication from the syntagmatic patterns provided by Belica’s method, we now try a fourth search pattern \((in Grund und Boden)\). When examining the KWICs it captures, a very interesting fact occurs: in \(Grund und Boden\) has radically different semantics than the \(Grund und Boden\)-patterns described above. It appears as a verb modifier and indicates that the action described leads to a negative state.
This different meaning and the fact that the pattern occurs frequently and in a stable fashion warrants that another recurrent word pattern is defined: [Grund und Boden].

The difference between search pattern and recurrent word pattern is not very striking in this example, as all the recurrent word patterns subsume exactly one search pattern. However, the concept becomes clearer when more clusters and perhaps more collocation profiles are examined.

It turns out that in this profile \textit{Bodens} (genitive to \textit{Boden}) is also a significant collocation partner of \textit{Grund} (though much weaker than \textit{Boden}). The cluster of \textit{Bodens} contains primarily a good number of matches for the search pattern (\textit{Grund und Boden}), a genitive variant of \textit{Grund und Boden} in the ‘land/property’ sense. This search pattern would then be added to the recurrent word pattern [Grund und Boden], as variance in grammatical form is one of the ‘allowed’ generalisations for recurrent word patterns. [Grund und Boden] is thus a generalisation over search patterns (\textit{Grund und Boden}) and (\textit{Grund und Boden}). This mechanism is especially helpful when collecting instances of patterns with verbal components that can appear in a lot of different forms.

The definition of the actual multi-word expressions happens on the basis of recurrent word patterns. Only now, an interpretation beyond the surface and syntagmatic particulars is made and the multi-word expressions are defined according to the communicative value of the observed structures. In our example, two multi-word expressions would be defined:
The reference to the recurrent word patterns from which they are derived is a key element in the description of multi-word expressions, as those link back to search patterns, which in turn point to the actual corpus data and, thus, make the process of generalisation retracable.

Each multi-word expression will be assigned a paraphrase and be enriched by more information about its particular structure and its contexts of usage. In the following example, the nature of multi-word expressions and their interrelations will be elaborated upon.

2.2 Example 2: Partially lexicalised and multi-levelled multi-word expressions

The multi-word expressions from the example above, “Grund und Boden” and “in Grund und Boden”, both belong to the group of fully lexicalised multi-word expressions. However, our method also captures partially lexicalised multi-word expressions, especially when combining the evidence from several collocation clusters and profiles. An example is given here.

The collocation profile of *Gründen* (dative plural to *Grund*) contains many adjectival collocation partners. Several recurrent word patterns can be defined that share the stable syntagmatic structure [aus … Gründen] (‘for … reasons’), e.g., [aus politischen Gründen] (‘for political reasons’), [aus zwei Gründen] (‘for two reasons’), [aus unerfindlichen Gründen] (‘for incomprehensible reasons’). Postulating a different multi-word expression for every significant adjective is not only problematic from a methodological point of view, as it is hard to make a clear cut which adjectives to include, but would also gloss over an important abstraction, the fact of syntactic as well as pragmatic similarity of the instances.

Therefore, we define a partially lexicalised multi-word expression with a slot. On a
high level of abstraction this would be “aus ADJECTIVE Gründen”. The filler is only specified grammatically here. This multi-word expression can be assigned the general meaning of “giving reasons”.

However, we are interested whether there are restrictions on the adjectives that are used as fillers and arrive at the following sub-categorisation:

Figure 6: The multi-word expression “aus ADJECTIVE Gründen” and its specialisations.

These sub-categories are chosen not so much because the adjectives themselves can be assigned the abstract labels used here but because the meaning and communicative function of each of the more specific multi-word expressions differ. For example, the multi-word expression “aus SPECIFICATION Gründen” could be paraphrased as follows: “Using this multi-word expression gives an official character to the actions that are explained and at the same time allows the speaker to be vague about the reasons for these actions by using the less-specific plural form that is mandatory for its structure. It typically appears in combination with verbs like ablehnen, absagen, and zurücktreten.”

This paraphrase clearly would not be appropriate for the parent “aus ADJECTIVE Gründen” nor for any other of the more specific multi-word expressions.

Since multi-word expressions like “aus SPECIFICATION Gründen” share structural as well as functional traits with their parent, but at the same time, have distinct functional traits of their own, it seems legitimate to propose that there are several levels of multi-word expressions in different degrees of abstraction. The number of these levels and the relationships among them is subject to further research.
3. Prospects

At the moment, we are working on a network of multi-word expressions based on words for body parts like Ohr (‘ear’), Kopf (‘head’), Auge (‘eye’), etc., as well as on examining causative multi-word expressions, starting out at the word forms of the lemmas Grund and warum (‘why’).

We strive to build up a collection of multi-word expressions common in the German language according to the usage-based criteria explained above. Important issues are to find out what constitutes the core of a multi-word expression and how slots can be specified.

We also want to study more deeply the links and relationships, surface-based as well as functional, that exist between multi-word expressions. For this, we use linguistic annotation, including structural criteria (e.g., grammatical status of a multi-word expression) as well as features that capture the typical use in the corpus like domain, situation, or genre. An important annotation will be the pragmatic function of a multi-word expression.

However, the set of possible annotations is not fixed yet and will be developed as research continues. This is typical for the way corpus-driven linguistics works: “As the main lines of description become clear, it is to be expected that a descriptive apparatus will take shape in response to the descriptive needs.” (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 179).

We plan to present our findings in a network structure that illustrates the interrelations of multi-word expressions and can also be linked to electronic dictionaries (for more thoughts about the presentation of multi-word expressions cf. Steyer, forthcoming). A network like this can be both helpful to foreign language learners and interesting for linguists.
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