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1. Laurie Bauer
(Victoria University of Wellington)
Lexical blending: core and periphery

Although blends like smog and motel appear to form a fairly well-defined group, in most ways they seem to be subject to variable constraints on their form which mean that there are more or less prototypical blends, and that blends tail off into other constructions (such as clipping compounds and neoclassical compounds) from which it may be difficult to distinguish them. This paper is a summary of things we might know about blends, and why they are so difficult to deal with.

2. Paula López Rúa
(University of Santiago de Compostela)
Beyond All Reasonable Transgression: Lexical Blending in Alternative Music

In agreement with Lehrer’s (2007) remark that the most frequent domains for blends are the media and commercial sectors, this paper approaches the issue of blend formation by analysing a subcorpus of blends naming bands and singers who can be ascribed to alternative musical styles. Drawing on previous works by Bauer (1983), Plag (2003), López Rúa (2004), Lehrer (2007), or López Rúa (in press), this contribution analyses the main trends in blend formation in this subfield from the point of view of form, underlying structure (both grammatical and semantic) and purpose. Thus, as regards the number and type of constituents, several subgroups are identified and illustrated, from three-constituent blends (Chromelodeon) to typical two-constituent items (full word + splinter: Soulitude; splinter + full word: Euthanasea; two splinters: Gorbage; two overlapping words: Daemonarch; embedded items: Insanity), or items combining words with other types of constituents, including neoclassical combining forms or recovered bound morphemes (UFOetry, Destroys’y’us, I’mmortal, Youthanasia). The criterion of the degree of phonemic integration of the combined elements is also resorted to in order to obtain a cross-classification of items, from those exhibiting less integration under the shape of union or clustering of constituents (Con-Dom, Sunpocrisy), to those illustrating different degrees of fusion understood as sound and spelling overlap (Melodisaster, Stigmatheist, Pantomind, The Beatscuits, Thrashfusion, Ricanstruction, Abwhore).

The most common lexical categories involved in the creation of these items are also commented on and illustrated; therefore, combinations of noun + noun or adjective + noun forming a “syntactic compound” (Lehrer, 2007), as in Sexorcist or Medievil, were found to be more frequent than combinations of noun + noun or adjective + adjective in “coordinate compounds” (Musilosophy, Degradead). Lastly, as regards semantic analysis, which is closely linked to creative purpose, the corpus also reveals that formal combinations of items which simply parallel combinations of meanings (as in Flametal for a band whose music mixes flamenco and metal) are far less frequent than blends where outrageous semantic combinations are used to reinforce the images of negativity, sacrilege, madness, death or chaos which define a band’s ideology (Atheretic, Warmgaggedon, Assassininner), or to show their spirit of contradiction and their wish to break all the rules, including the rules of language (Sinocence, Wreckreation, Enerlia, Lullacry).

In conclusion, the analysis of this subfield of human interaction reveals that lexical blending is a powerful aesthetic device to catch the audience’s attention by striking the eye and the ear. However, it also arises as a handy tool to satisfy intellectual and social needs, since the items thus formed convey valuable information about the artists’ views on life, music, society, culture or their art, and contribute to representing the subculture those artists belong to, thus reinforcing group bonds.

3. Isabel Balteiro
(University of Alicante)
Blends in Proper Names in English Fiction for Young Audiences

The present paper deals with one of the most frequent and productive word-formation processes nowadays which is commonly referred to as (lexical) blending, that is, with instances of lexical units which have been formed by fusing parts of two or more words. Considering that the process is said to have begun in Middle English with writers such as Shakespeare, e.g. glaze (glare+gaze) and that precisely their role in fiction has been often disregarded, we would like to pay attention to its role in literature in present day English. For such purposes, our main focus are blends in proper names and charactonyms in English fictional characters, mainly those addressed to young audiences such as those found in cartoons, fairy tales, comics or even novels, for example. Following previous classifications, this paper analyzes (1.) the orthographic, morphologic and phonemic structure of the result element, that is, not only (1.1.) the number of source words, (1.2.) the amount and type of material taken from each of the words and hence its similarity with each of the source words, (1.3.) whether the fusions occur at syllabic, morphemic boundary or at a non-boundary, (1.4.) the type of phonemic or graphemic overlap (also known as juncture or conflation, be this consonantal, vowel-consonantal or of a vowel type), (1.5.) the phonological similarity
between the blend and its sources, but also (2.) its semantic and stylistic implications, in general and more particularly in the work in which it is used. Apart from those, the relation between meaning and form is also analyzed. Thus, questions such as whether the amount of material contributed by each of the source words depends on their semantic importance as well as whether the source words are transparently recoverable are also considered.

4. Giorgio Francesco Arcodia (University of Milan Bicocca) & Fabio Montermini (University of Toulouse / CNRS)
Morphological and prosoditic properties of reduced compounds

Compound words in which one or both members are a reduced form of an independent lexeme are quite common in the World’s languages. Some examples are given in (1):

(1)
It. palazzo + ghiaccio > palaghiaiccio
   (‘palace + ice, skating arena’)
Ru. voennyj + komitet > voenkom
   (‘military + committee’)
Arm. razmakan + nav > razmanav
   (‘military + boat’)
Chin. qi’è + guànlì > qi’guǎn
   (‘enterprise + management’)

The lexical blends we shall deal with in this talk include what Billings (1998) defines stump compounds, i.e. a compound in which only the first word is shortened (as It. palaghiaiccio), and also compounds of clipped forms, i.e. compounds made of “chunks” of two or more words (e.g. Russian voenkom).

In this talk, we shall analyse the morphological and prosodic properties of such compounds in some languages displaying different prosodic and morphological features, especially in the domain of compounding. Compounding may be considered as the grammaticalization of a more general cognitive ability, i.e. the capacity of expressing complex concepts via the juxtaposition of two (or more) words, with no overt grammatical material linking them (cf. e.g. Dressler 2005; Bauer 2006). If compounding is to be considered, above all, a grammatical concept, it is not surprising to find in languages both compounding processes consisting in the simple juxtaposition of two independently attested lexeme forms and compounding processes involving some systematic phonological modification of one or both members. Those modifications may include the emergence of linking elements (and, more generally, sandhi phenomena), restressing, etc. Formally, compounding of the latter type may be represented as a constructional scheme (cf. Booij 2007) specifying both the combination of two lexeme forms and the phonological modification which one or both forms should undergo. In this perspective, there is no substantial difference between canonical compounds and reduced compounds of the type illustrated in (1). In two unrelated languages as Chinese and Russian (and, possibly, many others), for such type of compounds reduction corresponds to the alignment of the form of a lexeme on the format of the minimal word of the language. From the point of view of the output as well, reduction of one or both members has often the effect of making the whole compound more similar to a prototypical word of the language; in Chinese, this is represented by a disyllabic unit (Feng 1998; cf. ex. 1). Lastly, we shall address some issues concerning headedness, morphological features inheritance and morphological behaviour of reduced compounds, and we will compare them with “canonical” compounds in the languages considered.

5. Ewa Konieczna (University of Rzeszów)
Lexical blending in Polish : the result of the internationalization of Slavic languages

This paper is an attempt at investigating the nature of lexical blends in contemporary Polish, seen as the consequence of the internationalization of Slavic languages that took place after 1990 (Waszakowa, 2005), understood not only as borrowing individual morphemes, or lexemes predominantly from English but also as an increasing tendency to rely on word-formation processes productive in the English-speaking word and virtually non-existent in Polish until recently, such as clipping and lexical blending. Lexical blending is going to be analyzed in the context of clipping whose productivity is growing in modern Polish, and which is seen by some researchers as one of the necessary prerequisites for the occurrence of portmanteau words (Szabo & Brdar, 2008). This type of shortening became more productive in Polish only in recent decades, as evidenced by Kapron-Charynska (2005), who refers to it as reductive irregular derivation, following both well-established tradition of Polish word-formation (Grzegorczykowa, 1979; Puzynina, 1998) and the latest works (Jadacka, 2001; Wróbel, 2001).

As lexical blending is quite alien to Polish morphological tradition, there is a lot of disagreement concerning the status and definition of this phenomenon, beginning from the refusal to acknowledge blending as a separate word-formation process (Kapron-Charynska, 2005; Waszakowa, 2005) and ending with the recognition of the need to treat it as an autonomous mechanism, distinct from compounding (Ochmann, 2004). However, even those linguists who do not dismiss the idea of blending in Polish entirely, usually assign to this category only those coinages in which overlapping takes place and which consist of the initial and final splinter, e.g. cygarosy < cygara ‘cigars’ + papierosy ‘cigarettes’. In spite of that, this paper aims to prove that other coinages, e.g. those without overlapping, i.e. buldowilk < buldog ‘bulldog’ + wilk ‘German shepherd’, or those consisting of a
full word and final splinter, e.g. wojskobus < wojsko 'army' + bus 'bus' should also be referred to as blends because they have got the same internal structure as lexemes defined as blends in English, e.g. infotainment (no overlapping), or oldraulic (full word + final splinter), respectively.

Blends in Polish still do not enjoy a high productivity ratio and it is doubtless if they ever will, however, their number is definitely growing, especially in the mass-media language, abounding in expressive nonce-formations, such as olszewski ‘Prime Minister Olszewski behaving as if he were Soviet’ < Olszewski (one of former Polish Prime Ministers) + bolszewik ‘Soviet’, or roborole ‘poor actors playing in second-rate films’ < robole ‘proles’ + role ‘parts’. When it comes to ‘older’ blends, that is those which passed beyond the stage of idiosyncrasy, and became institutionalized (in the sense of Bauer, 1983), there is some disagreement concerning the status of those splinters which are reused, cognitively entrenched as a result of their growing frequency and which, consequently, become models for further extension (Kemmer, 2003). An example of such a splinter can be narko from narkotyk ‘drug’ to be found in narkobiznes < narko + biznes ‘business’, naronoworodek < narko + noworodek ‘infant’ and in many others. As both in Polish and in English word-formation such splinters are usually treated either as affixoids or combining forms, (Waszakowa, 2005; Algeo, 1991; Warren, 1990; Lehrer, 1996, 2008; Bauer, 1998) an attempt will be made to provide arguments for and against these two approaches, both of cross-linguistic and language-specific nature.

Talking about lexical blending in the context of internationalization of the Polish language, one may not ignore the fact that some of blends are hybrids, accompanied by the presence or absence of graphemic adaptation of the borrowed element, as in Prywatyzacja ‘dishonest privatisation’ < prychwatyzacja (Russian) ‘the act of grabbing’ + prywatyzacja ‘privatisation’ and ofst słownik ‘offset dictionary’ < offset + słownik ‘dictionary’, respectively. Given that, the purpose of this paper will be also to look into the ratio of native to foreign lexical elements in Polish blends and to investigate if and to what extent the structure of English blends is imitated in Polish.

As, for example, in Lehrer’s corpus (Lehrer, 1996) the commonest type of blends was a full word followed by a splinter, and from a semantic point of view, blends based on a syntactic relationship between their elements (head + modifier) outnumbered those with two (or rarely more) coordinate elements, the aim pursued here will be to determine if the same tendencies can be observed in the Polish language.

The core of analysis in this paper is based on the corpus of 234 blends coming from a number of dictionaries of neologisms, slang and modern Polish, for example Słownik bibliograficzny języka polskiego (2005-2009), or Nowy słownik poprawnej polszczyzny (2002), as well as from the corpus collected by the author herself from current national Polish newspapers and magazines.

6. Angela Ralli & George J. Xydopoulos (University of Patras) Blend formation in Modern Greek

In this paper we discuss the mechanism of blend formation in Modern Greek (MG). Unlike English, lexical blending in MG appears to be less productive than other word-formation processes like derivation, compounding or abbreviation (for English see e.g. Bauer 1983 and Kubozono 1990). As reported by Kouitita-Kaimaki & Filatouras (2001), the majority of MG blends are found in dialects other than Standard Greek. However, vocabulary found in sublanguage varieties of MG reveals that blending is quite productive among younger speakers. For instance, a lot of blends can be detected in marginal or ludling vocabulary, e.g. ksanthó (blonde) + vúrlo (stupid) > ksúrlo (“a blonde stupid woman”), ápílta (dirty) + potír (glass) > ápílltír (“a glass we use repeatedly at home without washing it”) or tzip (jeep) + tisúpura (seabream) > tiszúpura (“a 4x4 seabream”) (see e.g. Arvaniti 1998, Xydopoulos 2008, and references therein, also www.slang.gr).

Existing accounts of blending in MG analyze blends chiefly as morphologically distinct from both compounds and abbreviations (e.g. acronyms). To a first approximation, it is true that blends are not compounds as they (a) lack an (overt) compound marker, (b) they do not obey the bare-stem constraint, and (c) they do not display the [stem | stem] or [stem | word] structures standardly found in (Greek) compounds (see Ralli 2007, 2008, 2009, Ralli & Karasimos 2009). Blends and compounds in MG appear though to have the common property of joining the same lexical categories: N+N (coordinate & subordinate), A+N (subordinate), V+V (coordinate).

A careful examination of MG blends shows that the whole process aims at preserving what makes the second constituent structurally and semantically recognizable. To this end, the system allows the second constituent to delete up to one syllable (or only the onset) out of its original structure. Furthermore, the second constituent is possibly the structural head since it keeps the original inflection (gender, category, and other morphosyntactic features); thus, blending agrees with the right-hand headedness of the language, which also characterizes compounds. The first constituent, on the contrary, allows more drastic deletion, as in some cases it can just keep its initial segment (e.g. poltó + mantó > półto “overcoat”).

On the basis of the observations made above and given that MG is particularly rich in compounding (Ralli 2007), we will argue that blending in MG is a mixed type of compounding and clipping (cf. Bat El 1996 for Hebrew). The basic hypothesis that we will explore is that speakers create compounds, but in specific situations they delete some of their segments. Deletion may affect both constituents, where the second constituent keeps its structure, more or less, while the first loses the maximum of its structure, up to the point where it is semantically intact.
identifiable. The truncated part of the first constituent cannot exceed two syllables (the compound-marker nucleus and one more). The whole process serves the communicative and functional needs of specific sublanguages as it reduces the length of the output compound word and masks its constituents. Following the assumptions made so far we will also investigate several particularities of blending in MG, such as: (a) the kind of syllabic material that can be deleted from both constituents; (b) the different types of blends (if any); (c) their inflectional pattern and if there are any blends that change inflection with respect to that of the second constituent; (d) the mechanism behind the reduction of compounds to blends (i.e. semantically redundant material of the first constituent is always deleted, as for instance, the semantically empty compound marker).

7. Keumsil Kim Yoon
(William Paterson University)
Lexical Blending in Language Contact: A Study of Korean-English Hybrid Blends

In the wake of economic and technological globalization, we are rapidly entering a situation where language contact is unavoidable. For example, English has been regarded as the language of the Global Village and learned avidly by many speakers of other languages including native speakers of Korean. Consequently, English words or English-like words are frequently occurring in their daily language use, a linguistic phenomenon referred as code-mixing or lexical borrowing. This occurrence leads to another linguistic phenomenon, namely “bi/multilingual blending.” That is, lexical blending occurs not only within a language but also across languages.

This paper is concerned with blends created and/or used by native speakers of Korean. Their creation and/or use of blends is very intriguing due to the characteristics of the Korean lexicon.

Traditionally, Korean lexicon consisted of native Korean words and Sino-Korean words borrowed from Chinese or re-borrowed from Sino-Japanese. More recently however, its scope has been significantly broadened by foreign elements that come mostly from English (National Institute of Korean Language Studies, 2007). In spite of their avid use of blends, interested observers would note that the meanings of many new words containing English/foreign elements are not immediately understandable due to unparallel graphemes and phonemes of the languages in contact and various word-formation processes.

The objective of this paper is two-fold: to provide the researchers with data on blends that have been understudied (i.e. blends within the Korean language, blends of Korean and foreign language element that this paper calls “bilingual/multilingual blends” or “hybrid blends”), and to offer a constructive frame for further studies on lexical blending. To this end, the paper takes the following steps. First, it presents briefly main characteristics of Korean lexicon for those who do not know about Korean language. Then, the paper examines blends extracted from a Korean book titled “New Words” (Jeong, Park, & Kim 2007) that lists 2,473 items, and classifies them in two categories: languages and blending types. Next, the paper discusses the different types by addressing a critical issue in non-immediacy of understanding, and relate them to various contexts of occurrence and semantic properties. Finally, the paper presents a working-theoretical frame for future research by raising three questions as to what the principal typological categories of most novel multilingual blending would be, whether or not there would be any productivity constraints on multilingual blending, and what would determine the institutionalization or disappearance of new hybrid blends.

8. Christian Bassac
(University of Lyon)
On the semantics of blends

Blends are a challenge for semantics: by definition, blending is not rule-governed, only parts of words (at least one word is clipped) are joined, yet most blends are understood, some of them easily. The aim of this paper is to show how. Our hypothesis is that a Generative Lexicon as defined in Pustejovsky (1995) can help fix holes in compositionality in words created by blending in English. So the analysis provided here concentrates on the tools used in a semantic analysis of blends. These are classically, a rich lexical decomposition, variable instantiation, inheritance in a type lattice, selective binding.

In what follows X and Y are the visible subparts of the words (possibly unclipped words) the blend XY is made up with, α and β are the parts that have been clipped, with various possibilities of overlapping including α=β, X(α) and (β)Y are then the unclipped “bases”. We first want to show how the clipping processes of apocope and apheresis of the bases can be formalized via the use of three combinators of Combinatory Logic (Hindley and Seldin 2008), B, K, I defined respectively as B=det λxyz.x(yz), K=det λyx.x, and I being the identity function.

Several factors ease the interpretation of blends: first, the order in the graphic/phonological shape of parts of words joined is regular, with apocope on X(α) and apheresis on (β)Y (the only case of frams in our corpus is a-dork-able). Second, generally two words are joined (the only blend of 3 words in our corpus is afflu-fem-za). Yet the theoretical status of the clipped parts α and β is puzzling: what is their semantics? We analyse them as partial functions $\alpha =_{det} \lambda x (x - \alpha)(X)$ and $\beta =_{det} \lambda x (\beta - x)(Y)$.

The meaning of the blend is then obtained by one of the following three semantic operations:
1) Union of elements of Constitutive and/or Formal roles via inheritance of base types:
The meronyms of XY are inherited from those of X(a) and (β)Y. Example: spoon has type cutlery. Fork has type cutlery and Spork has type cutlery. The interpretation is then [ci are meronyms of Xa and βY, R is the telic predicate common to Xa and βY:

\[ \lambda x \exists c_1, \exists c_2, \ldots \exists c_n \{ XY(x) \wedge \text{artifact}(x) \wedge \text{has part}(x, c_1) \wedge \text{has part}(x, c_2) \ldots \wedge \text{has part}(x, c_n) \wedge R(\ldots) \} \]

This class includes: chaise, tomato, tobacco, gerritism, deservention, etc. The type artefact is frequent but not the only one, witness kid, adult, adolescent, or rural.

2) Variable instantiation of the arguments of predicates encoded in different roles of the qualia structure, which accounts for ambiguity. For instance, given the (complex) telic of βY=activist (recovered from T=ivist) which is: T=[A= act(e_1,x:h)AF=promote (e_2,x:h,y)].

A black activist can be understood either as an activist who is a black man, via instantiation by X of the human argument x of the (A)gentive of the (T)elic of BY (other examples are actoresactivist, hackercactivist, slackeractivist, etc.), or an activist who promotes the cause of blacks (via instantiation of the last argument y of the (F)ormal of the (T)elic) of BY.

Other members of the class are: gayneighbourhood, cybersabotage, brandvandalism, barketarchitecture, manmanny, work/milk…./alcoholic, pollietepolitician, renovationeviction, etc. Several subclasses can then be built depending on the nature of the variable instantiated.

3) Selective binding: the modifier is Xa or βY. The element modified is encoded in the Formal, and the modifier is X(a) in culeutensil, (cute utensil) jumboumbrella, hecticvegetarian, treebodyvegetarian (American Dialect Society word of the year 2003), globalobesity, anecdotaldata or BY (totukery).

All this supports the hypothesis that lexical blending, though a conscious process of word creation, is in many ways similar to rule-governed morphological (notably compounds) or syntactic (modifier+head) constructions and that the comprehension of blends is by no means left to guesstimates.

9. Suzanne Kemmer (Rice University) & Louis Wei-lun Lu (National University of Taiwan / Rice University) Exploring Lexical Blending: A Cognitive Grammar Account

This paper seeks to explore the difference between lexical blends and compounds from a Cognitive Grammar perspective (Langacker 2008 inter alia). It will be argued that the construct of uni- and bi-polar organization in CG can account for the differences between the two morphological phenomena. We argue that typical compounds such as jar lid and alligator shoes are exclusively organized in a bi-polar fashion that involves putting together two independent symbolic units to form a larger symbolic assembly, which happens at both the semantic and the phonological pole. On the other hand, lexical blends such as frappuccino ‘cappuccino frappé’ and shamanter ‘athlete who is classified as an amateur but earns money like a professional’ not only include the bi-polar symbolic operations exhibited by compounds but also take on some uni-polar characteristics that are purely phonological. Blends show aspects of uni-polar organization in two ways. First, the linguistically realized parts of the source lexemes serve to prompt the whole phonological forms of their source lexemes. This is a kind of metonymy, i.e. part-whole, relation at the phonological pole. Secondly, the fusion of two source lexemes can be sanctioned by phonotactic schemas, as has been discussed in Kemmer (2003). Blends generally take some phonological material, whether segmental or syllabic or both, from their two source lexemes. Common phonological elements from the source lexemes are abstracted into phonological schemas. Blends thus have a uni-polar layer of schemas absent from compounds.

By analyzing examples of lexical blends in terms of their uni- and bi-polar organization, we account for some of the observed properties of blends vis-à-vis compounds, and make predictions regarding their relative frequency and processing. We show how lexical blends are somewhat similar to compounds in that both involve symbolic relations as well as integration and composition of two elements into a word; however, lexical blends can be distinguished from compounds by the purely phonological operations during the process of fusion, which are uni-polar in nature.

The approach taken integrates blends into morphological processes in a more satisfying way than “building-block” theories of morphology, which do not readily subsume blends. Further, the usage-based account we provide situates both compounds and blends into a cognitively plausible framework that incorporates processing and frequency, aspects increasingly recognized as relevant to grammar.

10. Margarida Basilio (Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro) Expressive lexical blends: productivity and creativity in lexical constructions

Lexical blends are frequently defined as lexemes formed from parts of lexemes (Kemmer 2003, Bauer 1988). Among lexical blends, however, we find constructions as diverse as Ptg. democrudura ‘false democracy’, from democracia ‘democracy’ and (dila)dura ‘dictatorship’, formed from parts of lexemes, and pilantropia ‘roguery disguised as
philanthropy”, from pilantra ‘rogue’ and filantropia ‘philanthropy’, in which whole lexemes merge into one another. I’ll focus on the second case, which I call expressive lexical blend (henceforth ELB). I’ll argue that ELBs are different from other blends in that (a) they are formed from whole lexemes; and (b) they result from the creative use of a schema.

ELBs iconically represent the inclusion of the modifier’s semantics into the meaning of the base word. Once perceived, ELBs bring both source words to mind: the felicitous merge leaves the least phonological interference capable of clearly evoking the modifier while maintaining the full presence of the host word. For example, in Ptg literatura “trashy literature”, both lxi “trash” and literatura “literature” are fully recognized; in Eng glitterati, the added g gives access to both glitter and literati.

ELB formation can be described as the incorporation of a modifier to a host word of similar phonology, so that the modifier is revealed by a small phonological difference between the two words. What makes ELBs interesting is that the modifier merges into the host word, which leads to an interpretation of the whole in which the modification is not understood as an addition to the meaning of the host word, but as a part of its meaning; in ELBs, what might have been an external comment is presented as an inner reality.

ELBs are a good case for the productivity/creativity question in word-formation. Productivity is a rule based concept and creativity has been used in the literature in the same sense. Also, unexpected constructions are generally set aside as illegitimate (Beard, 1998). According to Veale, however, “Linguistic creativity may sometimes seem like superficial word-play, yet... it has the power to change the way we see and represent the world” (2006:1). As a first approach to word-formation creativity, we can see in ELBs that a linguistic schema reveals unexpected results with expressive power; that is, ELBs can and do change the way the world is conceptualized in our habitual words. So, the question arises as to where creativity lies, in the schema or in its use.

In the paper, I describe the structure of ELBs, bringing examples from literary and usual language; and I discuss some of these questions involved in productivity and creativity in word formation.

11. Ada Böhmerová (Comenius University)
Dynamic Impact of Borrowing English Blends on Word-Formation Principles in Slovak, With Some Cross-Linguistic Considerations

The topic of my paper is the dynamic impact on Slovak of borrowing English blends, resulting not only in the lexical borrowing and assimilation of such loans, but even in word-formative interference.

As a Central European language often referred to as the lingua franca of the Slavic world for its high intelligibility by the speakers of other Slavic languages, Slovak’s word-formatively marked by highly respecting the integrity of lexical units, allowing only for rather limited modification of the base in derivation (some consonantal changes or dropping the final vowel), for shortening, and for a minimum of contractions (literary or poetical, most of them by now archaic). Nevertheless, the linguistic principle of considerable lexical integrity in Slovak has recently been challenged by borrowing English blends. In the paper it is argued that one of the reasons is that the knowledge of English has become more widespread, and the receiving linguistic community is more aware of the word-formative structure of such lexical units and the way of their formation. Another reason can be seen in the fact that blending is perceived as lexically trendy and communicatively highly attractive due to its economy of expression, non-conventionality, creativity and linguistic playfulness. Consequently, the general socio-cultural and socio-linguistic context of informality and communicative dynamism allows for, or is even conducive to, “violating” the until recently rather rigorously applying principle of lexical integrity, and on analogy with English this provides the framework for the formation of blends in Slovak, too, thus extending the so-far existing inventory of the word-formation processes in Slovak by blending (though not yet treated as a word-formative process by Slovak linguists, but only as ad-hoc formation).

In the theoretical part of the paper we argue for the potential predictability of the rise of blending as a word-formative process in languages. We also give theoretical reasons for distinguishing between the cases in which the word-formative bases or elements gradually merged within the historical development and the cases of blending, or blending proper.

The data research is based on identifying blends borrowed from English and present in the Slovak National Corpus, in representative dictionaries of the Slovak language, in the media, and in professional and colloquial language. Incorporating into the research also the results of our earlier investigations, we then focus above all on the most recent developments in borrowing blends from English into Slovak, their assimilation and communicative roles, as well as on the neological blends formed in Slovak, their onomatological structure, typological classification, semantic content, the socio-linguistic areas of their rise and usage, their word-formative potential and their systemic position among the products of other word-formative processes in contemporary Slovak. Our findings are compared with the available data and the relevant linguistic situation in several other Central European languages, i.e. with the presence of blends borrowed from English, with the existence of blending in these languages, its word-formative potential, and the communicative roles of blends.
12. Silvia Cacchiani (University of Modena)
Motivation in unfamiliar morphological blends from names and nouns

This paper is an attempt at investigating meaning construction in unfamiliar morphological blends within a comprehensive framework of analysis which brings together insights from structural studies (e.g. Gries 2004, Gries 2006), psycholinguistics (Lehrer 2003), pragmatics (Cacchiani 2007a), natural morphology (Thornton 1986) and the theory of naturalness (Dressler 1987, 1999) within a usage-based model which combines insights from Kemmer (2003), Langacker (1987, 1991), and Ruiz de Mendoza’s (1998ff) Combined Input Hypothesis.

After a preliminary discussion on the reasons for coining new blends despite their relative degree of morphotactic and (to a much lesser extent) morphosemantic complexity, and, in particular, on the need to be relevant and on the search for effectiveness. The focus will be on unfamiliar blends from nouns and names (e.g. Apple+itizer < apple + appetizer, Governor < governor + terminator, Brangelina < Brad Pitt + Angelina Jolie, Billary < Bill + Hillary) and serving as identificatory and descriptive nouns or names (in the sense of Anderson 2007), on the assumption that selecting nouns and names alike depends on different types of knowledge on the part of the coiner and on his/her direct or surrogate experience of the related reference. The other way round, understanding such blends depends on different types of knowledge on the part of the listener/addressee and on his/her direct or surrogate experience of the related reference. Ruiz de Mendoza’s (1998ff) in particular will enable us to discuss different types of (re)motivation (and expected degrees of morphosemantic complexity) within blends that would otherwise be grouped together. To take one example, different types of relations between SW1 and SW2 establish in blends like Brangelina and Billary, which can be motivated on the basis of conceptual integration of different relevant features selected from the source inputs. To take one example, Brangelina seems to be created exploiting what we might call a pre-established constructional schema (cf. Langacker 1991), or, a pre-figured schema traditionally considered to be an extremely common pattern used to identify couples in American English (Marchand 1969), viz. the morphological blend of Name(male) + Name(female). Positive connotations further attach to the couple on the basis of the underlying frames and scripts. By contrast, Billary could, but doesn’t identify the Whitehouse couple. Rather, it is used within the relevant context to as a derogatory for Hillary Rodham Clinton, seen as an unattractive career woman, which is motivated by the speaker’s social and moral evaluation of her behaviour on the basis of a set of culturally significant keywords (in the sense of Williams 1983), in turn related to a set of culturally shared values and stereotypes within the Western culture e.g. work, job, career, home, glass-ceiling.

13. Camiel Hamans (European Parliament)
How unique are blends

Morphological processes are usually rule-governed and therefore more or less regular. Blending, however, seems to be rather irregular as is illustrated by some classical examples of blending, or portmanteau words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>brunch</th>
<th>breakfast + lunch</th>
<th>smog</th>
<th>smoke + lunch</th>
<th>Chunnel</th>
<th>channel + tunnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these forms the first segment or cluster of the first word is combined with the final part of the second word, although a form like chunnel can also be explained as a combination of the whole consonantal skeleton of the form channel plus the vowel of the word tunnel.

These examples and especially the two possible ‘derivations’ of the form chunnel show that the process of blending is not a very regular one. For instance the span of the input segments seems to be unpredictable. Together with the specific meaning of the resulting form this brings Fradin (2000) to claim that blends are unique. It is impossible for a blend such as chunnel to become a model for analogical productivity.

In another subcategory of blends such as under (2) the source words seem to have been analysed as quasi-compounds, which are composed of possible words or morphemes that subsequently form the building blocks of new “compounds”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oxbridge</th>
<th>Ox(ford) + (Cam)bridge</th>
<th>stagflation</th>
<th>stag(nation) + (in)flation</th>
<th>advertorial</th>
<th>advert(isement) + (edit)orial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frath (2005) compares these blends with forms such as under (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hamburger</th>
<th>software</th>
<th>Watergate</th>
<th>Camillagate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of this comparison he claims a special kind of word formation to operate here: ‘composition with a difference’.

In this paper it will be shown that there is no difference between ‘composition with a difference’ and blend formation as has been active in the examples under (2). Furthermore it will be claimed that there is only one form of blend formation, which may result in a productive morphological process, that quite often may function as a major source of combining forms (Cannon 1996). This implies that blends are no longer unique.

Examples from French, English and Dutch will be produced to support this claim.
In the last few years, many French dictionaries of portmanteau words have been written. Most of the time these dictionaries are humorous books, yet they are complex. Indeed, be it by the various formats they are published in, or the authors’ wishes regarding the scope of their works, many parameters come into play when working on a typology of these dictionaries. In order to give an accurate description, we have to introduce and define the notion of diversion in a lexicological and lexicographical study.

We chose to name these books diverted dictionaries because their authors divert, hijack lexical and lexicographical norms, as R. Galisson (1987) says: “nous détournons le dictionnaire”. Our goal is to set a typology for diverted dictionaries by observing their structures. That necessarily calls for an exploration of portmanteau-word dictionaries. For the time being, our corpus includes about 20 portmanteau-word dictionaries among the 60 diverted dictionaries we have found.

In this article, we will draw a picture of portmanteau-word dictionaries by studying both the material format they are published in and the goal that the authors aim at in writing such books. Writing a “dictionary of words that don’t exist” may not seem very productive since no one could use it the same way they use classic dictionaries. However, portmanteau-word dictionaries provide useful information to their readers. These dictionaries push the readers to use their own knowledge of the language so they can understand the meanings of the words, but also the lexical creation mechanisms. This is the reason why linguists tried to write portmanteau-word dictionaries in order to help learners of the French language to acquire new words quickly and in a playful way. Other portmanteau-word dictionary writers use their books against academic institutions (such as the French Académie Française). The idea they defend is that these academic institutions neglect to create some words that have the right to exist.

Yet, these accusations are always parodic and have to be taken in a humorous way. So, all the authors of portmanteau-word-dictionaries ask their readers to create portmanteau words themselves so they can add them in future books. This is quite unique in the dictionary-making field. For instance, Mais que fait l’Académie ? has been written by 200 co-writers during a competition launched in a newspaper in 2002. 200 lexical blends were selected and published as a dictionary.

The use of portmanteau words in the creation of such dictionaries is quite relevant. Indeed, the authors do not choose to forge new words out of nothing but they rather choose to blend two words to create a third one. This allows them to ask the readers to participate, as we said earlier, but it also allows the readers to understand the processes of lexical blending and lexical creation. Even if the objective of the authors is not pedagogical, the idea that R. Galisson (1984) pointed out in the introduction of his Distractionnaire also runs for every portmanteau-word dictionary: “Notre distractionnaire veut attirer le regard et la réflexion sur cette double réalité: la langue contient de multiples significations possibles et cachées […] et la plupart des gens se privent de ce plaisir parce qu’on ne leur a pas appris qu’il existait.”

Several studies on lexical blends (e. g. Marchand 1969, Adams 1976, Kemmer 2003) have highlighted the lack of popularity and the infrequency of these word coinages. This paper addresses the major issue of the nature and lifespan of lexical blends in English in the second half of the twentieth century. A bare twenty-five entries have been found in the Second Barnhart Dictionary of New English edited in 1980, which, nonetheless, constitutes a representative cross-section of lexical blends of American origin from the 1960s and 1970s. They include the following: beautyutility, beefalo, beefish, blaxploitation, compander, embourgeoisification, extencisor, Frenglish, happenstential, infump, jargonaut, quackupuncture, replicar, scrapnel, Sensurround, scuzzy, slimnastics, snurfing, spork, superfecta, swingle, Uncle Tomahawk, volcanicleastic, yakow and Yinglish. Our research demonstrates that a large number of blends are rarely found in corpora or in newspaper archives and, furthermore, that they are thinly represented in major lexicographical works. Our main hypothesis is that most blends, apart from those used in scientific or technical contexts, tend to have a very short life and are soon superseded by other coinages or even by other existing words.

We consider cases such as snurfing (a blend of snow and surfing) as a short-lived lexical experience. This sport originated in the U.S.A. in the 1960s and the lexical coinage was soon replaced by the compound word snowboarding. One of the reasons of its rapid decline may be found in the not-so-pleasant phonological associations with words such as scurf or turf. We also consider the case of jargonaut and the fact that two other forms already exist in the language, jargonist and jargoneer, with the same meaning (“one that is addicted to jargon”). Rather convoluted coinages appear not to become widely used. This is the case of spork: the blend is introduced as a trademark or propriety name and once the product has ceased to be popular, the word itself does not occur in corpora. On the other hand, we argue that occurrences of the adjective scuzzy tend to crop up mainly in fiction, which denotes a high degree of institutionalization and lexicalization of this rather popular blend. Research results in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)
and in the British National Corpus (BNC) cast some light on the question of the lifespan of this sub-group of lexical blends: only two (blaxploitation and scuzzy) out of the twenty-five are sufficiently represented in these corpora with proportionally equivalent occurrences. The others occur rather infrequently or are not attested at all.

16. Ewa Tomaszewicz
(Higher School of Philology of Wrocław)
OO Faithfulness in the phonological structure of blends

Within the framework of Optimality Theory the studies of blends view their phonological structure as an effect of a resolution of conflict between (a) the markedness constraint against the recursion of PWd and (b) OO Faithfulness constraint demanding maximization of segments from both source words (cf. Bat-El 1996, 2006, Piñeros 2000, 2002). Well-formed blends have a phonologically simplex structure complying with (a) due to their satisfaction of markedness constraints relating to word internal phonotactics and metrical well-formedness (Bat-El 1996: 241, 244). The number of segments from the source words preserved in the blend has been viewed either as a side effect of satisfaction of the above mentioned markedness constraints (Bat-El 1996, 2006) or as determined by the number of potential segmental correspondents that the blend can have in its both source forms (Piñeros 2000, 2002).

The present proposal further develops the idea that the phonological structure of blends, when studied within the OO Correspondence framework (McCarthy 1993), involves correspondence relationships between the blend and its source forms. However, evidence from my analysis of over 300, mainly polysyllabic, English blends suggests that OO Faithfulness at segmental level gives priority to the recursion of PWd and PWd, i.e. Burzio’s (1994:244, 2000:44) Metrical Consistency requirement and Oostendorp’s (2004:45) Prosodic Syllable Integrity constraint, extended in this paper to the context of English blends. The paper argues that as a morphological operation, blending is based on two MWd’s whose simultaneous phonetic realization is mediated by their prosodic structure because it is the similarity of prosodic structure between the SF’s, rather than segment affinity that decides which segments participate in correspondence relationships and which phonetic substrings of the SF’s will surface in the blend. e.g. fantabulous placing foot initial syllables in the overlap vs. *fantulous or *fanulous based on segment correspondence. Predictability of the phonetic shape of English blends follows from the constraint dominance hierarchy below.

MC (seg) >> PHON MARK >> PSI (seg) >> MAX (seg) SF-BL

Satisfaction of the constraint PSI (seg), which requires the segments that have correspondents in both the SF’s not to be moved out of their prosodic positions in the inputs, enables the blend to be faithful to both its source forms by replicating the main stress of SF (the right hand word) and preserving the stress of SF (the left hand word) either as weak or strong preservation, e.g. (glócali)(zátio)n / (lóca)l + (glóbali)(zátio)n, (òppor)(túnivo)re / (òppor)(túnity) + (òmnivo)re and (bránda)(lizma) / (brándø) + (vándø)a(lizma). Non-satisfaction of this constraint reduces OO Faithfulness near the left edge, i.e. within the portion where the blend is expected to have segmental correspondents in SF, by bringing about changes such as stress shift and loss of feature identity or building an extra PW domain within the prosodic structure provided by SF, e.g. a(páthéis) / (ápathy) + (átheis)t, (pròmo) (táinmen)t / pro(mó)tio)n + (énter)(táinmen)t, (cámø) (córde)r / (cámara) + re(córder).

Assuming after Burzio (2000:48) that all morphologically based phonological effects result from a small number of constraints in a ranking schema involving interaction of IO Faithfulness, OO Faithfulness and phonological markedness I suggest the following ranking schema for English blends: OOF SF, >> PHON MARK >> OOF SF. The proposed ranking schema applies to all blends where SF bears some lexically specified prosodic property (IO Faithfulness), e.g. the position of the right-hand foot boundary in a certain class of Latinate suffixes (cf Burzio 1994, 2000) or lexical stress, e.g. (gíra)(ffíti)/gi(ráffe) + gra(ffíti) vs.*gíra(ffíti). The above schema is also borne out by evidence obtained from OO Correspondence based analysis of Polish blends and it explains why non-identity effects in blends occur always near the left edge.

17. Stefan Gries
(University of California at Santa Barbara)
Quantitative corpus data on blend formation: psycho/cognitive-linguistic perspectives

The results of intentional word-formation processes such as blends, (complex) clippings, abbreviations, acronyms, and the like have always played a somewhat subordinate role in morphological theory and analysis. On the one hand, this has been motivated from a theoretical perspective, namely by the fact that the conscious production of such new lexical items was argued to reveal less about general rule-like processes that were assumed to play an important role in linguistic theorizing and come with much fewer exceptions. On the other hand, this has to some degree also been motivated from a more empirical perspective, namely by the fact that data for at least some of these formations are hard to come by and are highly irregular, which in turn has led to somewhat pessimistic statements about how much in terms of meaningful generalizations can be said about such formations and their reflection of some morphological system.

In this talk, I will adopt a more empirical and more optimistic perspective. On the basis of a large corpus of blends and complex clippings and different kinds...
of corpus-linguistic, computational, and statistical findings, I will discuss a variety of results bearing on the formation of blends. For example, I will discuss how graphemic and phonological characteristics of the source words of blends affect blend formation at at least two levels:

- at the level of choosing source words to blends, such that words that are more similar to each graphemically and phonologically have a higher chance of being blended;

- at the level of how chosen words are blended and how blend coiners walk the fine line between the force to shorten source words but also maintain the source words’ recognizability; more specifically,

  • how blend coiners choose how much material to use in each source word;
  • how blend coiners decide where to split up words (to ensure recognizability);
  • how blend coiners decide where to split up words (in terms of phonological / syllabic structure).

In that connection, I will also make a brief plea to recognize the role that word play or other ‘fun’ factors play in word formation, but also in the lexicalization of larger and more complex linguistic units, namely in the domain of clause-level constructions. On the basis of a very small case study, I will want to argue that, just like the study of very specialized idiomatic syntactic patterns/constructions has facilitated the birth of a new approach to grammar/syntax – Construction Grammar – so can the quantitative study of morphological ‘oddities’ foster morphological studies more generally.

18. Paul Cook & Suzanne Stevenson
(University of Toronto)
Computational methods for automatically determining the source words of English lexical blends

Numerous linguistic investigations of lexical blends have identified a variety of properties related to blends and their source words (e.g., Kelly, 1998; Lehrer, 2003; Gries, 2006), such as that the first source word of a blend tends to be shorter and more frequent than its second source word. Drawing on these observations, we propose a statistical computational method for automatically identifying the source words of English lexical blends, for example, determining that puggle (a type of dog) is formed from pug and beagle. For a given blend, we begin by (automatically) identifying all pairs of words in a lexicon that could have formed the blend based on orthography. We then score each of these candidate word pairs according to a set of statistical features that indicate their “goodness” as the source words for the blend under consideration. For example, pug and beagle would be scored as a “good” source word pair for puggle, while pugnaciously and ogie would receive a low score. These features are easily extracted from corpora and lexicons, and incorporate observations such as those discussed above. For example, for a candidate word pair, if the first word is longer than the second, the pair will receive a lower score than otherwise. On a test set of 324 blends that were not seen while developing the model, our method achieves 40% accuracy for the task of identifying both of a blend’s source words. Interestingly, our features related to the frequency of a candidate source word and the words in its neighbourhood (the set of words that begin/end with the same prefix/suffix that the candidate source word contributes to the blend) have the greatest impact on the performance of our system.

We also present results for a preliminary approach to the task of automatically determining whether a given word is a lexical blend or not. Our proposed approach is based on the hypothesis that a blend will have a candidate source word pair that is “good” according to our statistical features, while a non-blend likely will not.

The ultimate goal of this research is the automatic inference of the semantics of lexical blends. Because a blend is often a hyponym of its second source word (e.g., a webinar – web seminar – is a type of seminar), identifying the second source word of a blend can be very informative as to its semantics. Here we show that our method for blend source word identification identifies the second source word with an accuracy of 60%, which is much higher than the accuracy for identifying both source words. As the next step towards our research goal, we intend to investigate methods for automatically determining the semantic relationship between a blend’s source words. To do so, we will first need to develop an appropriate categorization scheme for blend semantics, perhaps similar to that of Algeo (1977), which distinguishes syntagmatic blends such as webinar (web seminar) from associative blends such as puggle (pug and beagle). A system for automatic semantic interpretation of blends has potential applications in natural language processing tasks such as automatic machine translation.

19. Christine Smith (University of Caen)
The phonaesthetics of blend-words: the role of sound symbolism and metonymy in lexical blending in English

Common blends used today in standard English include podcast [Pod+broadcast], frenemy [friend+enemy], gaydar [gay+radar] and tanorexia [tan+orexia]. Word blending is hailed as one of the most productive word formation types in present day English, whilst at the same time enjoying a relatively low rate of lexicalisation. This paradox – in itself fairly common in terms of word-formation - mirrors two contrasting features of blends. On the one hand, since they do not rely on the syllabic or morphemic structures of the parent words, blend-words often seem morphologically arbitrary. On the other hand, some older longer-lasting blends have a certain «snappiness» to them (Pinker 2003), suggesting they...
tap into some deep-seated cognitive patterns: in other words, as this papers shows, some blends rely heavily on sound symbolism as with smog [smoke+ fog]. An overview of past and current theories of blends (also called amalgam, fusion word, coalescence word, portmanteau word) brings to the fore different perspectives on classification and typology. In the face of the apparent lack of clearcut constraints on the formation of blends, some motivation must explain why brunch appears rather than *breaklunch or smog rather than *foke, or even why an ideal candidate such as shoe-boot, a cross between two types of footwear, does not become *shoot.

Haploglogy which occurs in a number of instances as in tanorexia, sometimes relying on additional phonetic assimilation as in manbag (man+bag) can only be a contributing factor. With the help of a synoptic table of some 100 or so common blends, this paper considers morphological [origin and word-class of parent words] and phonological criteria (syllable structure, stress pattern, consonant cluster, vowel alternation) for the classification of blends based on their parent words. A semantic study then refines the classification of blends: most are generally seen to represent a hybrid genre, a cross between two distinct referent types such as in cankle [calf+ankle] or the much commented on plumcot [plum+cot], but the relation between parent words (which range from redundant to antonymic) as well as the phonaesthetic structure of the blend-word can shed some additional light on these semantic patterns. We argue there is a strong case for drawing a parallel between blends and words based on sound symbolism or phonaesthesia. Indeed, some blends such as smog or spam and spim [spen+I.M.] can be analysed into submorphemic elements (sometimes called « splinters ») - which can be equated with phonaesthemes and vowel alternation - rather than into clipped words or fragments of words supposedly underlying. As evidenced by (probable) past blends, now lexicalised and opaque, such as chartle (chuckle+snort), prissy [prim+sissy], mingy [mean+stingy], splitter [sputter+splitter], squiggle [squirm+wiggle] the submorphemic elements in a word can make up meaning autonomously.

This paper takes a pluridisciplinary view on blending, offering a synoptic table of blends and using phonomorphological and phonosemantic perspectives to discover the phonaesthetics of blends and the metonymic rather than metaphorical processes involved in sound symbolism.

20. Outi Bat-El & Evan Cohen (University of Tel Aviv) Stress in English Blends: A Constraint-based Analysis

The talk will provide generalizations regarding the stress patterns in English blends and propose a formal analysis within the constraint-based approach of Optimality Theory (Prince and Smolensky 1993).

Fischer (1998) and Cannon (1986) provide different though partially overlapping generalizations regarding the stress pattern in English blends. Fischer claims that the stress pattern of the blend is identical to that of the right base word (e.g. fertilizer + irrigation => fertilization), while Cannon attibutes the stress pattern to the longer word in the base (e.g. hänckerchief + kerchoo => hänckerchoo). We will argue that Fischer’s generalization applies when the number of syllables in the two base words is identical, while Cannon’s generalization holds when the number of syllables in the two base words is different.

The above generalizations are provided in (1), where \( W_1 \) = the word on the left of the base, \( W_2 \) = the word on the right of the base, and \( BS_1/BS_2 \) = the blend’s stress adopting the pattern of \( W_1/W_2 \). Notice that (1a) and (1b) follow Fischer’s claim, and (1b) and (1c) follow Cannon’s.

(1) Stress patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If ... then ...</th>
<th>Base words</th>
<th>Blend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a. W_1 = W_2 \Rightarrow BS )</td>
<td>fertilizer + irrigation</td>
<td>fertilization (*fertilization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b. W_1 &lt; W_2 \Rightarrow BS )</td>
<td>investing + encyclopedia</td>
<td>investopedia (*investopedia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c. W_1 &gt; W_2 \Rightarrow BS )</td>
<td>hänckerchief + kerchoo</td>
<td>hänckerchoo (*hänckerchoo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The generalizations in (1) can be stated as follows: The stressed syllable in the blend corresponds to the stressed syllable in \( W_1 \), unless \( W_1 \) is longer than \( W_2 \), in which case it corresponds to the stressed syllable in \( W_2 \).

We will propose a formal analysis couched within the framework of Optimality Theory, adhering to faithfulness constraints that refer to the metrical structure of the word in terms of the number of syllables and stress (2a), and the head of the word, i.e. the primary stressed syllable (2b and 2c).

(2) Constraints

A. Faith metrical structure (FaithMStruc)
The metrical structure of the blend is identical to that of both base words

b. FaithHead\( W_1 \) (FHW_1)
The stressed syllable in the blend corresponds to the stressed syllable in \( W_1 \)

C. FaithHead\( W_2 \) (FHW_2)
The stressed syllable in the blend corresponds to the stressed syllable in \( W_2 \)

We will show that the ranking FaithMStruc >> FaithHead\( W_1 \) >> FaithHead\( W_2 \) accounts for the typical and most common types of blends.
Two Experiments on Processing Lexical Blends

Arpita Bose (University of Arizona)

Two Experiments on Processing Lexical Blends

As lexical blends become more common in word-formation processes (at least in English), hearers and readers should be able to process them more quickly than at a time when they were rare and when blends like divalicious, tankini, and Carsmetics, might have met with complete cluelessness. However, since blends have become common, interlocutors may be able to identify the underlying words and interpret their meaning more quickly than previous experiments showed. We carried out several experiments, some timed, some untimed, to determine whether there is evidence for rapid, possibly even automatic recognition of the compound underlying the blends, such as Diva + delicious [advertisement for the restaurant Diva], tank + bikini (bikini with a tank top), and car + cosmetics (a garage for detailing cars) in the examples above. The hypothesis was supported.

A stem completion task was suggested by research on implicit memory. Subjects were presented with a blend on a computer screen and required to push the ‘yes’ button as soon as they recognized the underlying compound. Pushing the button stopped the machine and computed the time needed by the subjects. Each subject then spoke into a tape recorder the compound that he or she identified. Two groups of subjects saw different blends, although the lists were matched for types of blends. Each group served as a control for the other group. At the end of the computer part of the experiment, subjects were presented with a list of 80 items: 2 or 3 letters that could begin an English word were presented and subjects were asked to complete the stem to form a word. For example, BRE--- could be completed by bread, break, breed, breakfast, etc. Our hypothesis was that the blend that subjects has previously seen would serve as a prime for the stem, even if the relevant part of the blend was a splinter. This was confirmed. The percentage of stem completions for the primed items was significantly greater for subjects who saw a blend as a prime than for the control group that saw a different set of blends, even when subjects did not identify the compound.

The second experiment was a lexical decision task where the target word to be identified was preceded by a masked prime consisting of a blend which contained either a splinter or word from the following lexical item to be identified. (Masked primes are present for a fraction of a second, and subjects were not aware of their presence.) Controls were identical words and unrelated words. (Half the items presented to subjects were non words.) We hypothesized that items primed by blends would be identified more slowly than identical primes and faster than unrelated words. This result was confirmed, but the result was not statistically significant at the .05 level. This suggests that processing blends does not happen quickly and automatically – it requires some time. Possible explanations for the process are suggested. Pragmatic factors such as the function of novel blends to attract attention to themselves may show that it is desirable to slow down the process of identifying, interpreting, and appreciating blends.

21. Gordana Lalić-Krstin & Sabina Halupka-Rešetar (University of Novi Sad)
The order of constituents in Serbian blends: some experimental data

The paper has two objectives. First, it presents the results of an experiment conducted in order to see whether Kelly’s hypothesis (Kelly 1998) that the order of constituents in lexical blends depends on their prototypicality holds in a language in which blending as a word-formation process is relatively new and not as yet firmly entrenched. Native speakers of Serbian were asked to coin blends using two source words, one of which rates high on the prototypicality scale and the other ranks low. To avoid the bias produced by the preferred modifier-head order, a coordinative semantic structure was targeted by asking the subjects to produce a blend which would refer to a hybrid between the entities denoted by the source words (e.g. a hybrid between an apple and a mango). Second, the obtained blends are compared with results from studies dealing with structural patterns of Serbian blends in order to compare the observed patterns and tendencies regarding their frequency.

22. Adrienne Lehrer (University of Arizona)
& Csaba Veres (University of Bergen)

Two Experiments on Processing Lexical Blends

23. Tetiana Kulish (University of Postdam), Arpita Bose (University of Windsor) & Susanne Borgwaldt (University of Braunschweig)

Ukrainian Neologisms

Languages use various word-formation processes to coin neologisms. Two major ones are compounding and derivation. Blending on the other hand is less common and has received considerably less attention in the literature (but see e.g. Fisher 1998 & Lehrer 2007).

This study explores word-formation in Ukrainian, in...
particular lexical blending, by using a novel object naming task designed to elicit neologisms. By taking the same pictorial stimuli and instructions that Borgwaldt and Benczes (2009, in revision) used to research word formation in German and Hungarian, the design allowed us to compare response patterns across Slavic, Germanic and Finno-Ugric language families.

Fifteen Ukrainian native speakers (age range 20-35 years) participated in a novel object naming task. Stimuli were 70 digitally manipulated pictures of hybrid objects. Sixty hybrid objects were composed of two identifiable parts, e.g. an animal that was half chicken, half fox. The remaining 10 pictures depicted objects whose respective shapes had been manipulated, e.g. an apple shaped like a heart. Participants were asked to come up with names for the non-existent objects, receiving the following instructions “You will be seeing things that do not exist in reality. How would they be called in Ukrainian if they existed?”

The Ukrainian participants preferred using noun-noun blends to refer to the novel objects (53%). Other response patterns consisted of noun-noun compounds (18%), noun-infix-noun compounds (10%), adjective-noun blends (3%), adjective-noun compounds (3%), verb-noun compounds (1%), noun-diminutive suffix (3%), noun-diminutive suffix-noun compounds (1%), and noun-noun-diminutive suffix blends (3%). The remaining responses were metaphorical nouns (2%), adjectives (1.5%), and adjectives with diminutive suffixes (1.5%).

These results contrast with the data collected by Borgwaldt and Benczes (2009, in revision). They observed, that in German the stimuli elicited overwhelmingly noun-noun compounds (92%), while in Hungarian, the preferred constructions were also noun-noun compounds (59%), but there were significant numbers of adjective-noun compounds (28%). In both languages the prevalence of blending was relatively low (5% in German, 6% in Hungarian).

Lexical blends have been observed in Ukrainian scientific terminology (Misyats’ 2007; Onufriyenko 1994), e.g., bionika (biology + electronics) or avtobus (automobile + oil), as well as in mass media and advertising (Herman 2005), e.g., kuchmonomika (Kuchma, former Ukraine’s president + economics), describing the economic policies of president Kuchma’s regime.

The Ukrainian results are in line with Lehrer (2007: 129) who observed that lexical blends often occur in classificatory terminology (e.g. when new plants or animals are cultivated and combine the features of other plants/animals). By analogy, this was also the case in our task. While lexical blends could be considered the most equivalent (i.e. iconic) name for blended objects, the cross-linguistic differences in response patterns demonstrate that the choice for neologisms’ morphological structures seems to be motivated to a larger extent by language-specific and possibly also participant-specific factors that will be discussed in detail.

24. Carlos-Eduardo Piñeros
(University of Auckland)
Why portmanteaus are not subtractive

Based on a corpus of one hundred Spanish portmanteaus (e.g. vallejarto ‘annoying vallenato song’ < vallenato ‘a type of Colombian music’ + jarto ‘annoying’), this paper argues that, in spite of the seemingly arbitrary fashion in which the Source Words (SWs) are spliced, this process is principle-governed and its output largely predictable. Although it is generally accepted that the generation of portmanteaus involves subtraction (Pharies 1987, Bat-El 1996, Fradin 2000, Gries 2006, Fradin 2009), we contend that such neologisms are generated through an additive process and that the shortening undergone by one or both of the SWs is not actual clipping but merely a mirage created by the blending operation, which consists of superimposing one of the SWs upon the other one (Piñeros 1998, 1999, 2004). As a result of this operation, some of the phonological segments of the portmanteau cannot be said to belong exclusively to one morpheme, but are better analyzed as ambimorphemic, including those that do not agree in some of their features with their correspondents in one of the SWs. Observe in the illustration in (1) that when jarto is superimposed upon vallenato, the last four segments of the latter word are eclipsed by the segmental string of the former; yet no part of either word has been clipped because there are some segments of the portmanteau – those written in boldface – that stand for segments in both SWs, including j (IPA [j]), which differs from n in various features. From this standpoint, the segments that seem to have been lost have actually not been deleted. They are merely concealed, as a result of overlapping.

(1) Portmanteau

We also contend that portmanteaus are endowed with a syntactico-semantic head, which plays a key role in determining the shape of the output. Syntactically, the noun vallenato is the head of vallejarto because it is the element that determines that the latter word is a noun as well. Semantically, vallenato must also be the head because vallejarto denotes a type of vallenato. The importance of the syntactico-semantic head is that it serves as the frame upon which the other SW is superimposed. Given that the non-head typically overlaps upon one of the peripheries of the head, we hypothesize that overlapping is due to an imperative to align word edges, with the specific edge of alignment to be determined by phonological affinity. Another reason why the distinction between head
and non-head is needed is that there is a faithfulness asymmetry. With greater prosodic faithfulness granted to the syntactico-semantic head, portmanteaus tend to replicate the prosodic constituency of the overlapped word; on the other hand, with greater segmental faithfulness granted to the non-head, the segmental string of the overlapping word tends to be more accurately preserved. Our corpus also provides decisive evidence that the SWs must be surface rather than underlying forms because their derived prosodic and segmental properties are passed on to portmanteaus. Lastly, our account recognizes that, despite responding to principles that resemble those that are operative in the regular morphology (i.e. constituent alignment and prosodic and segmental faithfulness), the creation of portmanteaus is subject to a higher pragmatic imperative – prompt recoverability of the SWs – which takes precedence over all other principles and is the ultimate criterion by which coiners determine the effectiveness of their creations as witticisms.

25. Elke Ronneberger-Sibold
(Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

Blending between grammatical competence and universal cognitive abilities : Contrasting blends in German, Chinese, and Farsi

In this paper, blending is considered as a creative technique, i.e., as an intentional morphological operation, which resembles regular compounding insofar as it combines existing words into new ones, but which deviates from the regular patterns of compounding in several formal and semantic respects. Unlike compounds, blends are not fully predictable from their input, they are less transparent than possible corresponding regular compounds or periphrastic constructions, and they cannot be judged according to grammaticality. Thus, the ability to produce and understand blends is not part of grammatical competence in the strict sense. The fact that these operations are nevertheless successfully performed by language users is due to certain universal cognitive abilities, for instance the ability to distinguish between figure and ground in a complex perception, and to identify a sound shape by certain features, such as its rhythmical contour or its onset. Following (with some modifications) Natural Morphology (e.g., Dressler/M. Kilani-Schoch/Klampfer 2003), it is assumed that these universal cognitive abilities are the same that young children apply before the development of grammatical morphological competence for naming referents and for coping in production and perception with words too long for them. Thus, blending as a creative technique relies on two bases: grammatical competence and universal cognitive abilities. Moreover, even extralinguistic features such as writing systems, language policies, the degree of literacy of speech communities, and their prevailing attitude towards linguistic innovations have an influence on the creation of blends.

The complicated interaction between (1) structural, possibly typologically relevant characteristics of individual languages, (2) universal cognitive abilities, and (3) extralinguistic conditions is being studied in a large-scale project contrasting blends in German with two radically different, non-Standard-Indo-European languages, namely Chinese (Beijing variety) and Farsi, the national language of Iran. The study concerns the different subtechniques of blending (e.g., whether the blended words are shortened or left intact, etc., cf. Ronneberger-Sibold 2006) as well as the phonetic and semantic characteristics of the blends themselves, especially their rhythmical and syllabic shape. The paper will present first results of the study.

In Chinese, blending is heavily constrained by the strictly syllable-based linguistic structure of words and by the ideographic writing system, both of which do not allow for any blending subtechnique based on individual phonemes. In Farsi, the fact that vowels are not systematically spelt might be considered as an obstacle to blending in the written language. Also, a rather conservative linguistic attitude prevails among Iranian language users. The paper will show, however, how, especially in the new media, language users circumvent these obstacles by relying, among others, on universal cognitive abilities such as evaluating the similarity of sound shapes. Sometimes, they even take advantage of what might appear as an obstacle in a quite unexpected way, thereby proving the creative potential of blending.
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