THE UNIVERSITY
of LIVERPOOL

SEPARATING BLENDS:

A FORMAL INVESTIGATION OF THE BLENDING PROCESS IN ENGLISH AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ASSOCIATED WORD FORMATION PROCESSES

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements
of the University of Liverpool for the degree
of Doctor in Philosophy
by Debbie Danks

September 2003

Declaration

This work is original and has not been submitted previously in support of any degree, qualification or course.

Signature

_____

To my Gran

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor and friend, Antoinette Renouf, for her support, patience, understanding, knowledge, humour and for helping me to realise my potential. Her task has been an unenviable one and I will always be grateful for her perseverance in this challenge.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Michael Hoey, whose belief in me extended way beyond my own. His help, ideas and encouragement have been invaluable.

The staff (both past at present) at The Research and Development Unit for English Studies have always been a great source of help. In particular, my thanks go to Ceri Davies, Andrew Kehoe, Mike Pacey, Alex Collier, Jay Banerjee, Karen Li and Linda Miller. I appreciate their support, encouragement and assistance with the use of the Unit's corpora, databases and language processing software.

Thanks must also go to the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council for funding this Ph.D in English word formation.

On a personal note, my eternal gratitude and love goes to my Mum and Dad who have been a phenomenal source of both emotional and financial support. A particular thanks to my mum for her cajoling skills!

I would also like to thank my sister, Nikki, my Auntie Sue, my Uncle Chris and my Gran for always being ready to discuss my work or take my mind away from it, as befitted the situation.

Thanks go to my friends – in particular Becky Hoare, Rishma Vidyasagar, Jason Boulter and Jamie Probin – for listening to me whine and making me laugh. Thanks also to Mark Morriss for the music and to Joss Whedon for the distractions.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to Richard Tatham, for his love, support, emotional blackmail and for generally putting up with me.

Abstract

Blending is an occasional but enduring part of English word formation. It is a creative, non-morphological process and is important not only for its own sake but also in the production of new affixes and, thereby, the growing inventory of the English language. There have been few in-depth studies of this phenomenon and none using real data on a large scale.

This research takes a corpus-based approach, focussing in particular on the grey areas between blends and related word formation processes. As such, this is a formal rather than functional study. There is still much scope for research that tackles the psycho-linguistic aspects of why and how blends are coined and by whom. Similarly, work requires undertaking regarding socio-linguistic issues, including an exploration of the domain, genres and prolific coinage periods of different kinds of blends. Additionally, a user-survey which addresses the questions of if, how, why and which blends are perceived as different from 'normal words' by native speakers would undoubtedly yield interesting results. However, it is difficult to undertake these kinds of research whilst blending remains an ill defined and hazy process. Consequently, this study presents a workable definition of a blend and separates blending from related word-formation processes, including clipping, compounding, neo-classical compounding, acronomy and affixation.

In developing this corpus-based classification, new subcategories of blending are devised to better account for phenomena encountered. Other, closely-related, types of word formation are differentiated from blending either by definition, through the implementation of a proposed rule, or through the application of a range of criteria.

Numerous case studies are undertaken which show the proposed criteria to be largely successful. New categories of word formation are introduced to account for borderline blends which cannot be classified with regard to the definitions, rules or criteria.

Finally, a workable typology of blends is arrived at, which can account for all sub-categories of blending dealt with in this research.

Table of contents

Chapter 9. Applying the criteria   295

List of tables

Chapter 1:

An introduction to the blending process in

English word formation

1.1   Blending – a punderful process

Undeniably, blends are a usual and useful part of everyday language. Blends such as *brunch* (*breakfast* + *lunch*), *motel* (*motor* + *hotel*), *smog* (*smoke* + *fog*), *banoffee* (*banana* + *toffee*) and *chunnel* (*channel* + *tunnel*) are generally regarded as 'normal' words by most speakers of the English language. Indeed, Marchand (1960: 367) highlights that 'the result of blending is, indeed, always a moneme, i.e. an unanalysable simple word.'

There is, though, a more interesting side to these types of words, as highlighted by Algeo (1977: 61) when he comments that blends are '...coined not alone for their usefulness, but partly, and in some cases principally, for their cleverness.' Similarly, Pound (1914: 6) points out that 'many genuine conflations are punning in nature.' It is this clever and funny aspect of blending that renders it such an attractive process, to not only the linguist but also to advertising executives, script writers and to bad joke composers alike!

One measure of the contemporary popularity of blends is that, often, the biggest laugh in a comedy series or film comes from a timely introduction of a blend. (One such example that stands out in my mind is from "The Simpsons", when Homer sells his soul for a doughnut and, upon eating the final mouthful, utters 'Mmmm, *sacrilicious*' (from *sacrilegious* + *delicious*)!) Similarly, it is usual for the biggest groan over the Christmas dinner table to be provoked by a blend acting as a punch line for a cracker joke (e.g. 'Why couldn't the ghost see?' 'Because he had forgotten his *spooktacles*').

Indeed, once one is "tuned in" to the blending process, it is surprising how often one notices blended words in the general language. Because of the attention grabbing nature of such words, they often occur in newspapers and magazines (see appendix 1, sub corpora 1 and 3, for examples of blends from various newspapers and magazines), as well as in advertisements. They are also a regular part of both scripted and natural spoken language (see appendix 1, sub corpus 4, for many examples). However, most blends are ephemeral[1]; they are coined for a particular purpose and once that purpose has gone then the word no longer is needed. This means that coinages such as *sacrilicious* are not going to be reinforced and consequently will never cross over into common usage. Because of this, many linguists regard blending as a minor process of word-formation and, consequently, there has been scant research into this area.

1.2   Research on blending

In 1914, Pound noted that 'blend words have never been treated separately, i.e., for their own sake, at much length' (p1). Nearly a century later this is still the case.

Indeed, along with Bergström's (1906) dissertation, Pound's (1914) paper is still probably the most sizable study of blends currently in the public forum. More recent papers with a focus on the blending process include Algeo (1977), Soudek (1978) and Cannon (1986 and 2000), and books on word-formation which have sections

---

[1] There are, of course, exceptions to this rule, including the aforementioned *brunch*, *smog* and *electrocute*. These blends all provided a needed name for a previously un-named common object or concept and, thus, made the crossover into everyday language.

concerning blends that are worthy of note include Adams (1973 and 2001), Bauer (1983) and Algeo (1991).

I am not going to provide an exhaustive literature review at this stage. Instead, in order to avoid repetition and for ease of comprehension I have chosen to incorporate the relevant literature into each of the chapters. However, while all of these works contain interesting examples and pertinent insights, none of them are nearly exhaustive.

Cannon is one of the few (relatively) recent linguists who has focused closely on the blending process in his 1986 paper 'Blends in English word formation'. He concluded his *Scholar's analysis* section with the following question:

> Our abbreviated review of the scholarship reveals a disquieting fact: recent books on word formation are still devoting little or no attention to blends... Are blends so slippery, ill-defined, and close to other word-forming categories that scholars are hesitant to describe them?
>
> (Cannon, 1986: 736)

The answer to this still seems to be "yes". My aim is to change this situation, through defining blends and separating them from 'other word-forming categories'.

1.3   Data gathering – the method utilised throughout this
          research

One problem with most of the above studies stems from the fact that they were pre-corpus linguistics[2]. Consequently, they did not have access to nearly enough blends from which to draw reliable conclusions (Cannon (1986), for instance, was working from just 132 blends). One result of this was that the words they did have were, perhaps, not indicative of the full scope of blending:

> It is long established that corpus based studies force the linguist-analyst to come face-to-face with a number of phenomena that might easily be overlooked in an armchair type study.
>
> (Bauer and Renouf, 2001: 101)

However, in these days of corpus linguistics such problems can be rectified. As Baayen (1994b: 450) highlights, investigating 'word use in a very large text corpora, such as the newspaper corpora that are becoming available' is a more 'reliable way to gauge the productivity of word formation rules' than 'dictionary based counts'[3].

Baayen goes on to comment that 'these collections of daily issues, often comprising tens of millions of tokens, can be scanned for the use of neologisms or very low-frequency items', which was the method used for gathering all of the blends presented in appendix 1, sub-corpus 1. The corpus utilised contains over 400,000,000 words

---

[2] Indeed, some pre-date the Oxford English Dictionary and, thus, could not even draw upon that wealth of data.

[3] Many of the brief studies of blends have been based on examples gleaned from dictionaries.

from the Guardian Newspaper, between 1984 and 1988, and the Independent Newspaper, from 1988 to 1999, inclusive. This is the corpus used in the Research and Development Unit for English Studies at the University of Liverpool, and henceforth shall be referred to as 'the Independent newspaper corpus'.

The tools for analysis utilised to extract the relevant data from the corpus are the same ones used by Bauer and Renouf (2001), who explain:

> Analytical tools developed in the AVIATOR project (Renouf 1993) and the ACRONYM project (Renouf 1996; Collier and Pacey 1997) were used to extract the new words occurring in each quarter of this ten year period.
>
> (Bauer and Renouf, 2001: 101)

This corpus yielded not only a sizable proportion of the blends referred to (see appendix 1), but also generated all of the comparative data for analysis used throughout this thesis.

Blends found throughout the course of my research in places other than the corpus have also been noted and are included in appendix 1 (sub-appendices 2, 3 and 4).

1.4   Background information – a brief history of blends

It is generally accepted that blending is an ancient process (cf. also Pound, 1914, Soudek, 1978 and Cannon, 1986):

By indulging the neologistic licence of marrying any two words whose union promises to be fruitful, the benefactors of language who gave us 'flabbergast', 'chortle', 'cattalo' et al., were employing a method of augmenting speech as old as language itself.

<div align="right">(Berrey, 1939: 3)</div>

Writers have been consciously coining blends to create an effect for many centuries. Blending was used by both Spenser (who composed *foolosophy* and *niniversity*) and Shakespeare (*rebuse* from *rebuke + abuse*). However, one of the earliest writers to theorise on blends was Lewis Carroll, who did this famously through the character of Humpty Dumpty:

'Well, "slithy" means "lithe" and "slimy"... You see it's like a portmanteau - there are two meanings packed into one word.'

<div align="right">(Lewis Carroll, 1872: 102)</div>

Subsequently, blending has been discussed under a number of different headings. Paul (1890) dealt with blends under the label of 'contamination' (*Wortkontamination*). Jesperson (1947) regarded many blends to be instances of compounded meaningful letter clusters, or 'sound symbolism'. Bolinger (1965) theorised that most blends were merely slips of the tongue, but labelled deliberate blends as 'contractions'. Indeed, Wentworth (1933: 78-79) somewhat curiously listed thirty different names for blends in his paper 'twenty-nine synonyms for 'portmanteau word'', the most common of which were 'amalgam', 'fusion', 'composite', 'conflation', 'coalesced word' and 'telescope word'. However, over the last three

decades, or so most linguists have settled upon the term 'blend' to describe the product of the process, and this is also the label favoured in this thesis.

It should also be noted that the term 'splinter' is used to describe the "bits" of whole words that feature in the blends. For instance, the blend *banoffee* is composed of an initial splinter *ban* from the source word *banana* and a terminal splinter *offee* from the source word *toffee*. (Formation patterns of both splinters and blends will be returned to in sections 1.5.4 and 1.5.5, below.)

Many of the earlier linguists to theorise on blending considered "intentionality" as being central to blending. Some deemed that true blends were accidental (cf. Bergström, 1906, Jesperson, 1922, Bloomfield, 1933 and Bolinger, 1965 and 1968), whereas others maintained that they must be conscious formations in order to separate them from analogies (e.g. Pound, 1914). Cannon (1986: 730), however, points out that 'such an arbitrary, psychological differentiation cannot be accommodated within a modern taxonomy'. In view of Cannon's objection, along with the fact that intentionality is extremely difficult to measure, this study will not attempt to distinguish between conscious and accidental blends.

1.5   Classifications and definitions of blends

The first point that needs to be highlighted is that there is a debate regarding the place

of blending[4] in theories of word formation, with regard to morphological productivity. This debate affects both the definitions and classifications of blends, and also helps to shed further light on the reasons for the gap in literature about the blending process.

1.5.1   Creativity versus productivity

Some linguists who deal with blending take it for granted that it is a productive process of word formation:

> In spite of its importance and **productivity**, blending, on the whole, has been a relatively neglected field of study.
>
> > (Soudek, 1978: 463, my emphasis)

However, many morphologists do not consider blending to be productive (cf. Schultink, 1961, Aronoff, 1976 and 1988, Uhlenbeck, 1981 and Van Marle, 1985). These linguists differentiate between morphological productivity and creativity. For instance, Lyons (1977: 549) defines productivity as "a design feature of the language system" and creativity as " a language user's ability to extend the system by means of motivated, but unpredictable, principles of abstraction and comparison". Thus, most

---

[4] The same debate also concerns the processes of clipping compounding and acronomy (and sometimes, neo-classical compounding, clipping and compounding phonesthemes). These patterns of word formation will be returned to in chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5.

of these linguists regard blending as belonging within the scope of creativity rather than productivity[5].

The result of this is that studies of productivity in word formation tend to ignore the blending process. Furthermore, it is rare for research to concentrate solely on 'creativity' in word formation because, as highlighted by Lyons (1977) it is so 'unpredictable'.

There is, though, one notable work of recent years that deals with 'creativity'; Van Marle's (1985) *On the Paradigmatic Dimension of Morphological Creativity*. However, Van Marle successfully avoids discussing blending by removing it from the scope of creativity as he defines it:

> ...'blendings', 'clippings', 'acronyms', etc. are not only considered irrelevant to morphological productivity..., but to morphological creativity as well.
>
> (Van Marle, 1985: 102)

It can, thus, be concluded that there is no general consensus regarding the place of blending within the scope of productivity and creativity. Some linguists (e.g. Soudek, 1978, Bauer, 1983 and Cannon, 1986) do regard blending as a productive process; others think it is better classified as belonging within the scope of morphological creativity (e.g., Schultink, 1961, Aronoff, 1976 and 1988 and Uhlenbeck, 1981)

---

[5] Methods of measuring productivity within blending will be returned to and discussed at length in Chapter 8.

whereas others still exclude it from the realm of either of these things (Van Marle, 1985).

1.5.2   Blending and morphology

Van Marle does have a strong justification for excluding blending from the scope of morphological creativity:

> Clearly, our claim that the formation of 'blendings', etc. must not be classed under the denominator of morphological creativity, is tantamount to saying that we do not consider 'blendings', 'clippings', etc. to display any morphological structure at all. That is, we regard words such as <u>smog</u>, <u>radar</u> and <u>bus</u> as simplex, which is to say that the various coining-devices by means of which the words can be formed are best captured by the notion of <u>lexical creation</u>.
>
> (Van Marle, 1985: 102, emphasis in original)

As such, Van Marle is of the mind that blends do not fall within the jurisdiction of morphology at all. Soudek (1978) and Bauer (1988) concur with this opinion:

> The complex character of blending... utilizes often unpredictable splinters instead of existing morphemes.
>
> (Soudek, 1978: 465)

It is extremely doubtful whether such words [blends] can be analysed into morphs, and thus whether they form a real part of morphology.

(Bauer, 1988: 39)

These points are sound. As Soudek highlights, because of the nature of the splintering process, blends do not adhere to the rules of morphology. Frequently morphological boundaries are ignored, as blends often utilise only part of a morpheme in their formation. The result of this is that, while blending is undoubtedly a process of word formation, it is improbable that it is a part of morphology[6].

It is worth noting, though, that Aronoff (1976) discusses elements such as *cran*, *boysen* and *huckle* (from *cranberry*, *boysenberry* and *huckleberry*) within his theory of morphology:

None of these items occur independently or in any other words. There is thus no noncircular way of assigning meanings to the morphemes. Their meanings are intimately connected with those of the individual words in which they occur.

(Aronoff, 1976: 10)

Aronoff terms such items 'cranberry morphs', which clearly implies that he sees them as a part of morphology. I, however, would see *cran* as a splinter of the source word *cranberry*. He does not describe these 'cranberry morphs' in any depth, and the scope

---

[6] Again, this presents a reason why studies of word formation rarely deal with blending – word formation is frequently equated with morphology, and it is dubitable that blends are a part of this.

of the forms that he would allow under this heading is unclear, but if Aronoff can incorporate *cran* into a theory of morphology it is possible that splinters and, therefore, blends, can be accounted for also. It is clear that further work needs carrying out on this area. However, for the purposes of this study, I reject Aronoff's position that *cran* should be analysed as a morph and regard blending as being outside the scope of morphology.

1.5.3   Linguistic definitions of blending

Having decided that blending should be classified as a process of word formation, but not as a part of morphology, it is time to consider specific definitions of blends. Rather than define what a blend actually is, many linguists just give examples of classical blends, such as *chunnel*, *smog*, *brunch* and *banoffee*. Linguists who are directly concerned with the formation of words, though, often do proffer their own definitions, including:

> Blending is compounding by means of curtailed words.
>
> (Marchand, 1960: 367)

> A blend is a new lexeme formed from parts of two or more other lexemes.
>
> (Bauer, 1988: 238)

A blend is a word made by joining two or more forms but omitting at least part of one.

(Algeo, 1991: 10)

[Blends are] arbitrary portions of words clipped off and stitched together.

(Trask, 1994: 39)

However, frequently the definitions do not get any deeper than the above, which raise more questions than they answer regarding the nature of how these 'curtailed words' blend together, and if both elements actually have to be 'portions' of words – or, indeed, words at all.

1.5.4   The nature of the curtailments in blends

Some linguists who have concentrated more extensively on blends do make an attempt to define the nature of the word portions within blends. Adams (1973) uses the term 'splinters' to label these and describes them as follows:

Usually splinters are irregular in form, that is, they are parts of morphs, though in some cases there is no formal irregularity, but a special relationship of meaning between the splinter and some 'regular' word in which it occurs.

(Adams, 1973: 142)

This is a valuable description of the relationship between a splinter and its source word. However, it does not begin to deal with the process of how a word is reduced

to a splinter or how one should differentiate between a splinter and other non-word forms, such as clips, affixes and combining forms.

Bauer (1983) is equally vague when he attempts to describe the process of splinter creation specifically in blended forms:

...in blending, the coiner is apparently free to take as much or as little from either base as is felt to be necessary or desirable.

(Bauer, 1983: 235)

However, he is rather clearer when describing the phenomenon of 'clipping', to which splintering is closely related[7]. Bauer (1983) defines clipping as follows:

Clipping refers to the process whereby a lexeme (simplex or complex) is shortened, while still retaining the same meaning and still being a member of the same form class... It does not seem to be predictable how many syllables will be retained in the clipped form.

(Bauer, 1983: 233)

I wish to adopt this formal description for splinters as well as clips.

Bauer (1983) goes on to cite three major ways in which a lexeme can be shortened to a clip:- The most common is for the beginning of the base to be retained - e.g. *bi* (from *bisexual*), *deli* (from *delicatessen*), *porn* (from *pornography*), etc. The next

---

[7] Clips will be explored at length in the next chapter, and a section 2.1.1 is devoted to the differences between splinters and clips.

most common type is when the clip retains the final part of the lexeme, as in *Cong* (from *Viet Cong*) and *loid* (from *celluloid*), etc. The least common type is when the lexeme loses both its ends but retains the middle, as in *jams* (*pyjamas*) or, as cited in Adams (1973), *fridge* (*refrigerator*) and *flu* (*influenza*) etc. I see these types of formation as applying to splinters as well, and will term splinters retaining the beginning of the base as "initial splinters", splinters retaining the final part of the base as "terminal splinters" and splinters retaining the middle as "mid splinters".

I have also found an example of a fourth type of shortened form, which is when the curtailed word retains the beginning and end of its root but loses the middle:- *alium*, from *aluminium* is (as in '*magnalium*', cited by Potter, 1969). This type is rare but, as it is a viable curtailing method, must be considered in a list of splinters that can be utilised in the blending process. I will refer to such splinters as "not-mid" splinters.

Now that the different splintering patterns have been described, it is possible to go on to examine how crucial splinters are to blends.

1.5.5   How crucial is splintering to the blending process?

All of the cited examples of blends so far have been made up of two splinters (initial splinter + terminal splinter). However, there have been other possible blending formation patterns suggested within the literature, which differ with regard to the cruciality of splinters within the blending process. The first of these possibilities regards whether blends have to be made up of two splinters, or whether one of the

elements can be a complete word. The second suggested possibility is that any word containing a splinter should be analysed as a blend. The third possibility is that a blend can contain no splinters at all. The final possibility is that a blend does not need to be made up of two splinters, but simultaneously does not need to contain a word. I shall discuss these possibilities one by one:

1.5.5.1   The possibility of a blend containing a splinter and a word

I have already concluded that it is possible for an initial splinter to combine with a terminal splinter in order to form a blend. However, many linguists include splinter + complete word forms as blends:

> A blend is a word made by joining two or more forms but omitting at least part of one.

> (Algeo, 1991: 10)

Algeo, thus, allows for a blend to include a complete word as long as the joining element is a partly omitted form (a splinter). Bauer (1983) is not so certain and tends to think that <u>both</u> words have to be incomplete:

> ....under blends, there is a set of formations whose precise status in the taxonomy is difficult to discern. These are words which function like blends,

but which keep one of the two bases intact. As a result it is not clear whether they are in fact blends or compounds made up of one instance of clipping and one unaltered lexeme.

(Bauer, 1983: 236)

Bauer, thus, would not be sure how to classify forms such as *breathalyser* (*breath + analyser*), *boxercise* (*box + exercise*) and *contrail* (*condensation + trail*). However, because in an initial splinter + word or word + terminal splinter formation there is necessarily something lost from one of the words, to my mind this means that the one word is blending into the other at the point of fusion. As such, I am inclined to label them as blends.

1.5.5.2 The possibility of <u>any</u> form containing a splinter being classified as a blend

Adams (1973) takes a different view from Bauer, stating that all 'words containing splinters [she] shall call blends' (p142). This is too open and could lead to forms such as *computertech* (with *tech* as a splinter of *technology*) becoming classified as a blend, when clearly there is no blending going on at the point where the two words fuse. Consequently, I reject the possibility that the mere inclusion of a splinter means that a word should be classified as a blend.

1.5.5.3 The possibility of a blended form containing <u>no</u> splinters

There is a further possible case of a blend which contains no curtailment at all, just complete words which overlap at the point of fusion, such as *Japanimation* and *slanguage*. In some ways these would seem to be the ultimate blend as the two source words truly do blend together so as to disguise the point of fusion. I accept such forms as blends.

1.5.5.4 The possibility of a blend that is not made up of two splinters <u>and</u> does not contain a word

The final possibility that must be considered is that blends can contain elements other than splinters and words. Forms such as *untertainment, poethon, aquarobics, dictaphone* and *flurry* all appear in the Independent newspaper corpus. All of these forms contain splinters of source words (*entertainment, poet, aerobics, dictate* and *hurry*) which either lose something or share something at the point of fusion with the attached element, so blending is clearly taking place. However, the attached elements are neither splinters or words but, rather, bound forms; *un-* and *-thon* are affixes[8], *aqua-* and *-phone* are neo-classical combining forms[9] and *fl-* is a phonestheme[10].

---

[8] See chapter 6.

[9] See chapter 5.

[10] See chapter 2.

Furthermore, not all of the free-standing source elements utilised in blends can be analysed as simplex words[11]. Blends in the corpus include both complete and splintered acronyms[12], as in *Ufocals* (from the over lapping complete acronym *ufo* and simplex word *focals*) and *gaydar* (from the simplex word *gay* plus a splinter of the acronym *radar*). Similarly, compounds[13] are also utilised in blends, as in *Generation X-ploitation* (from the compound *Generation X* plus a terminal splinter of *exploitation*).

The best classification of such forms will be discussed at length in the ensuing chapters, but it is clear that any working definition of a blend should allow for the source elements to be drawn from complex lexemes and bound forms as well as splinters and simplex words. (For ease of reference, when I refer to splinters, simplex lexemes, complex words and bound forms collectively I shall call them elements.)

1.5.5.5   Conclusions on the necessity of splintering in the blending process

With regard to the necessity of splinters within blends - as long as there is an overlap at the point of fusion, any combination is possible and curtailment is not necessary. If there is no overlap, though, curtailment of at least one of the source elements is

---

[11] Of course, it is worth noting that while compounds and acronyms are not excluded by the term 'word' in the way that affixes, combining forms and phonesthemes are, they are not generally considered as "normal" words.

[12] See chapter 3.

[13] See chapter 2.

essential and that curtailment must come at the point of fusion. I thus have my working definition of what makes up a blend.

1.6 My working definition of a blend

A blend occurs when two (or possibly more) elements "blend" together, so that at the point(s) of fusion something is either lost from at least one source element, or shared by both.

Consequently, any combination which means that there would be nothing either shared or lost from either source element at the point of fusion (irrespective of whether something was lost from one of the source elements elsewhere) would not result in a blended form. This has implications for the ordering of the elements within the blend.

1.7 The ordering of the elements within blends

Irrespective of the ordering and the nature of the elements in the blended form, if there is an overlap at the point of fusion then theoretically any two elements in any order can be blended together. Consider this made up exchange:

Q   "Are you ready for your psychology, sociology and biology exams next week?"

A   "I don't know, I seem to have the ologitters!!"

This would perhaps be an unlikely reply but, in spite of the fact that it is actually made up of the nightmarish combination of a final combining form + word, *ologitters* is a theoretically possible form, its meaning is fairly transparent and there is a clear blend at the point of fusion.

However, if there is no overlap then the ordering of the elements within the blend is crucial. As highlighted with the example *computertech* in section 1.5.5.2 above, the mere presence of a splinter does not mean that the resulting form is a blend. The blending process requires that the curtailment must come at the point of fusion. This means that if the end of the first element in a blend is complete (i.e. an entire (simplex or complex) word, an intact initial bound form or even a terminal or not-mid splinter) the second element must lose its initial part (i.e. a mid or terminal splinter) in order to "run into" the first element. Similarly, if the beginning of the second element is intact (i.e. a complete (simplex or complex) word, a final bound form or an initial or not-mid splinter) then the first element must lose its final part (i.e. an initial or mid splinter) in order to blend into the second element.

With this in mind, it is possible to work out which combination of elements could result in a non-overlapping blend and which could not. The table below shows all possible combinations of elements and notes whether the non-overlapping resulting form could be a theoretically possible blend or not.

Table 1: Theoretically possible (T) or impossible (X) non-overlapping blending formation patterns

2nd el→ 1st el ↓	A Full Word	B Initial Splinter	C Terminal Splinter	D Mid Splinter	E Not-mid Splinter	F ICF[14]	G Prefix	H FCF[15]	I Suffix	J Phonestheme
1. Word	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Initial splinter	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
3. Terminal splinter	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. Mid splinter	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
5. not-mid splinter	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
6. ICF	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Prefix	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
8. FCF	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. Suffix	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
10. Phon-estheme	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X

As the shading on the table highlights, there is a pattern to all of the combinations proposed as theoretically possible (indicated by a **T**). If a combination of elements begins with an initial or mid splinter or ends with a mid or terminal splinter (however

[14] ICF stands for initial combining form.

[15] FCF stands for final combining form.

unlikely that combination may be) the resulting form would be analysed as a blend. Conversely, non-overlapping combinations that do not either begin with an initial or mid splinter or end in a mid or terminal splinter would not be classified as a blend.

1.8   Structural sub-categories of blends

The above table, then, could be used as a basis for composing a formal typology of blends in English word formation. As Soudek (1978) points out, there have been few attempts at such sub-categorisations, and those that there have been have not been adequate:

> Blending appears to have eluded the attention it deserves as a highly complex word-formation type with intricate sub-classes... [A few linguists have attempted] to employ various criteria which could lead to a classification of blending into several subtypes. So far this task has been approached with only partial success.
>
> (Soudek, 1978: 463-464)

The best of the structural typologies proposed are Algeo's (1977) and Soudek's (1978). However, these are not without problems. Soudek's subcategories only allow for initial splinters and terminal splinters, rather than mid and not-mid splinters. This means that his typology will not allow for blends such as *australwink*, from *Australia* + *periwinkle* (cited by Cannon, 1986), and the aforementioned *magnalium*. Also, his categories only deal with initial splinters as first elements and terminal splinters as

second elements, which means that forms made up of two initial splinters[16], such as

Pokemon (from *pocket monsters*), cannot be accounted for. Most crucially, though,

Soudek only allows for initial splinters, terminal splinters and words rather than a full

range of elements. This means that his typology excludes blends such as *aquarobics*

and *dictaphone*.

Algeo's (1977: 48-50) structural sub-categorisation is more inclusive. He speaks of

elements, rather than just words and splinters. However, like Soudek, he does not

include mid and not mid splinters within his typology and, perhaps more worryingly,

does account for acronyms.

However, in response to the above table, it is possible to propose a typology of blends

superior to the ones suggested by either Soudek or Algeo. This is because the above

table details the theoretically possible two element blends and accounts for a range of

different types of splinters occurring as either the first or second element. It also deals

with bound forms as well as splinters and complete words (both simplex and

complex).

The first step of the proposed typology requires that a form is analysed as a blend with

reference to the working definition detailed in section 1.6, above. If this is the case, it

can then be classified with regard to the above table. Blends should be categorised

into forms with overlap (O) and blends without overlap (XO) and given a letter and

number according to their element composition. For instance, *smog* and *motel* are

both initial splinter + terminal splinter overlapping blends so their typology reference

---

[16] Such forms will be dealt with at length in chapter 3.

would be 2(O)C, *Japanimation* would be an overlapping word + word 1(O)A blend, *dictaphone* would be a non overlapping initial splinter + final combining form blend whose typology reference would be 2(XO)H and *breathalyser* is a non overlapping word + terminal splinter 1(XO)C blend.

1.9   Problems with the suggested typology

This seems, then, to be a workable typology. However, although it may have more virtues than previously suggested systems of sub-categorisation, it does not stand up to more than a surface examination. This is because it cannot successfully differentiate blends from the products of other, related, processes. This is a problem common to all suggested typologies:

> In order to arrive at a workable typology of blending, the first logical step should be an attempt to characterize the make-up of blended lexical units. Such a characterization will have to include specific formal features which would distinguish the category of blends from formations such as compounds, clipped compounds, acronyms and other units whose make-up is often similar but not identical with that of blends.
>
> (Soudek, 1978: 463)

Because my proposed typology can account for initial splinters being in the second position in a blend it does not exclude clipped compounds. Conversely, my typology cannot differentiate between splinters, such as *-unnel* from *tunnel*, and affixes, such as

-thon (originally from *marathon*)[17]. Nor can it account for blended compounds, such as *old boy racer* (from *old boy* + *boy racer*) or *mouse potato* (from *mouse* + *couch potato*).

The problem, however, does not really lie with the proposed classification, but rather with the description of blending. In order to have any kind of effective typology, the working definition underpinning the categorisation process must be able to separate out blends, but without being too restrictive as to exclude certain viable blending patterns. This is the biggest challenge to any linguist dealing with blending.

1.10   Differentiating between blending and other processes of word formation

Almost every linguist who has ever dealt with blends in any depth has noted that the main problem is that blends are, in Cannon's (1986: 736) words, 'so close to other word-forming categories that scholars are hesitant to describe them':

> The distinction between fusion forms and related forms better classified otherwise is sometimes hard to draw.
>
> (Pound, 1914: 6)

---

[17] Chapters 7, 8 and 9 will deal with this problem in detail.

Generally speaking, the category of blends is not well-defined, and tends to shade off into compounding, neo-classical compounding, affixation, clipping and... acronyming.

(Bauer, 1983: 236)

Unconventional word-formations do not fall into discrete categories whose identification and distribution is easily achieved.

(Cannon, 2000: 963)

One solution to this problem would be to dispense with the category of blends altogether. This, though, is not viable as no other process can account for words such as *slanguage* (from *slang* + *language*), *sexational* (from *sex* + *sensational*), *flustrated* (from *flustered* + *frustrated*) and *decruitment* (from *de-* + *recruitment*). Indeed, neither should definitions, such as the one proposed in section 1.6 above, be dismissed because they are valuable for describing not only the typical blend (like the descriptions cited in section 1.5.3) but in fact the overwhelming majority of blends.

However it is clear that before any workable typology can be proposed, blending must be unambiguously separated from other related processes of word formation. Thus, the aim of this research is to propose definitions and criteria that can help to distinguish between blends and other types of word formation.

1.11   Organisation of this thesis

Chapter 1 has introduced the blending process. The history of blends and typical definitions were briefly discussed and the method of data collection and extraction used in this research was described. The different kinds of splinters were examined and the way that they combine with each other and other elements to form blends was analysed. At this point, a working definition of blending was proposed, and a table of theoretical blending patterns was compiled. A typology based on this table was suggested, but then rejected on the grounds that the sub-categories did not have the scope to deal with all blending patterns and that the formal characterisation underpinning the typology did not sufficiently separate the category of blends from other related formations. This was found to be a feature common to all descriptions of blending and, consequently, the aim of this research was proposed: to distinguish between blending and related word formation processes.

Chapter 2 begins the procedure of separating blends from other types of word formation by examining the areas of clips, compounds and phonesthemes. These three methods of word formation are dealt with together because differentiating between them and blending is almost a matter of definition. The first method to be dealt with is clipping, in section 2.1. Formally, the splinters within blends are very similar to clips so it is important to differentiate between the two types. This, though, is not difficult as clips and splinters have different functions so they can be separated with reference to the working definition put forward in section 1.6, above. It is accepted that splinters can become clips, but it is also suggested that this happens only after they have become productive affixes first. Compounds, which are dealt with in

section 2.2, can also be largely separated from blends as a matter of definition, with the only real problem area being between compounds and blends where the splintering occurs at a morphemic boundary. However, an applicable criterion is proposed to differentiate between the two processes in such cases. The last aspect of word formation to be dealt with in chapter 2 (section 2.3) is phonesthemes which, again, can be separated from the splinters within blends largely as a matter of definition.

Having explored the overlap between blends and both clips and compounds, chapter 3 deals with the grey area between blends and clipping compounds. The chapter begins by separating clipping compounds from compounds of clips as, unlike clipping compounds, compounds including clips can be differentiated from blends as a matter of definition. Eight factors for analysis are established that can help to separate typical blends from typical clipping compounds, and ten borderline blends / clipping compounds are examined with reference to these factors. However, clipping compounds are eventually accepted as a sub-set of blends (in the manner of both 3+ element blends and infixed blends).

Chapter 4 begins by describing the different types of acronyms, defining the prototypical acronym and establishing that the main overlap is between blends and orthoepic acronyms that draw upon more than just initial letters. Unlike clipping compounds, acronyms are ruled out of the scope of blending and two essential differences between blends and acronyms are proposed. Seven secondary differences are also established that can help distinguish between blends and acronyms. It is, though, accepted that there are a few very borderline forms for which there is no

certain classification, and a new word formation category of non-specifically abbreviated compounds is introduced to deal with these forms.

The concern of Chapter 5 is to separate splinters from combining forms. The area of combining forms is acknowledged as a tricky one. Consequently, much of the chapter deals with linguistic definitions of combining forms with regard to whether or not they must have a classic origin, the different elements they can combine with and the terminology used to describe them. A recognised problem is differentiating between combining forms and affixes and it is stated that any such borderline forms will be dealt with as affixes – the result of which is that there is only a small overlap between splinters and combining forms but a large overlap between splinters and affixes. Most of the areas of overlap specific to blends and combining forms can be clarified as a matter of definition, apart from the grey area concerning combining forms that are more reminiscent of one specific word than the usual meaning. Again, in these cases an applicable rule is proposed that can separate splinters from general combining forms.

Chapter six begins the process of separating blends from derivations. Derivational affixes are described and differentiated from inflectional affixes. Minor grey areas between blends and derivations are discussed and clarified. Most of these can be resolved as a matter of definition. One type which cannot be cleared up as easily is when affixes are specifically reminiscent of one particular derivation rather than of the general meaning. This type is examined in some detail and a criterion is established to help decide whether a given borderline case should be analysed as a splinter or derivational affix. Finally, the most problematic grey area of all is

introduced, which regards when splinters become productive affixes. The question is posed as to when a well-used splinter should be re-classified as a productive derivational affix.

Chapter 7 contains case analyses of four typical splinters and two splinter-originating affixes in order to establish the differences in the functions of the two distinct types.

Based upon the findings in the case analyses of Chapter 7, Chapter 8 establishes five main criteria that can help to differentiate between splinters and splinter-originating affixes.

In Chapter 9, the criteria established in Chapter 8 are applied to seven borderline splinter / affix strings in order to determine the best synchronic classification. The criteria are proved to be effective to this end.

Chapter 10 is the conclusion. The aim of this research, as established in Chapter 1, is revisited. It is concluded that blending has indeed been separated from related word formation processes, through a combination of original definitions, exhaustive analyses, the introduction of further categories and, primarily, the establishing of new criteria. The typology proposed in Chapter 1 is revisited and refined. Finally, areas requiring further research are suggested.

Chapter 2:

Overlaps between blending and other word-formation processes that can be separated primarily as a matter of definition

Section 1: Separating blends from clips

Section 2: Separating blends from compounds

Section 3: Separating blends from compounded phonesthemes

An introduction to chapter two:

As outlined in the previous chapter, the most difficult aspect regarding the study of the blending process in English word-formation is deciding where the borders lie between blends and other categories of words.

As highlighted in section 1.10, Bauer (1983) states:

> Generally speaking, the category of blends is not well-defined, and tends to shade off into compounding, neo-classical compounding, affixation, clipping and .... acronyming.

> (Bauer, 1983: 236)

This chapter will begin the process of attempting to separate out blending from these associated word-formation processes, starting with the least problematic areas of clips, compounds and compounded phonesthemes.

2.1   Separating blends from clips

Clips are shortened stand-alone versions of one source word, such as *flu* from *influenza* and *bra* from *brassiere*. Blends are words which fuse two (or more) different sources. There is therefore no real grey area between clips and the finalised

blend, but rather between clips and the splinters that make up the blends. As such, the purpose of this discussion is actually to separate splinters and clips.

2.1.1   The difference between splinters and clips

Part of the confusion about the difference between clips and splinters may stem from the fact that linguists often use the terms interchangeably (cf. Algeo, 1977: 50 and Bauer, 1998a: 408). This is because the process of clipping is actually identical to the process of splintering, as highlighted by the following definition which is equally applicable to either phenomenon:

> ...the process whereby a lexeme (simplex or complex) is shortened, while still retaining the same meaning and still being a member of the same form class. (Bauer, 1986: 233)

As said in section 1.5.4 above, clips and splinters are formed in the same ways; by retaining the beginning of a word, e.g. *deli* (from *delicatessen*); by retaining the final part, e.g. *loid* (from *celluloid*); by losing the beginning and the end but retaining the middle, e.g. *fridge* (from *refrigerator*), or; (rarely) by losing the middle but retaining either end, as in *alium* (from *aluminium*, as cited by Potter, 1969: 81). Neither clips or splinters have to be graphically identical to their corresponding parts in the original source word, but can appear as a phonic approximation, for instance *mike* (from *microphone*) and *fax* (from *facsimile transmission*).

However, in spite of the fact that the formation process for clips and splinters is identical, they do not fulfill the same role in word formation. Splinters need to combine with another element in order to form a word, which is not the case with clips:

> ...the process of CLIPPING [is one] in which a word is created by extracting an arbitrary portion of a longer word of identical meaning... Note, by the way, that such formations are true words; they are *not* 'abbreviations'.
>
> (Trask, 1994: 21-22)

The point here is that the product of the clipping process is 'a word', and this is the essential difference between clips and splinters. Clips are autonomous, free lexemes whereas splinters are bound lexemes which cannot stand alone and can only be used when fused with another (either bound or free) form.

2.1.2   Blends that contain clips

When splinters do fuse with another element (assuming the fusion is at the point where the splintering has taken place) the resulting form is necessarily a blend, which is not true of clips. For instance, compare the splinter + word form *bisquick*, from *biscuit* + *quick*, with the clip + word form *fridgecake*; *bisquick* is clearly a blend, whereas *fridgecake* is best classified as a compound[18]. However, this is not to say that blends cannot contain clips. As with any other element, a clip can be the form with

---

[18] See section 2.2 for a detailed exploration of compounding.

which the splinter fuses. For instance, *saxploitation* is made up of a clip (*sax* from *saxophone*) plus a splinter (*-ploitation* from *exploitation*), and the resulting form is a fairly straightforward blend.

Indeed, because clips function as free standing lexemes, the splinter utilised in a blend can actually have a clip as its source word. For instance, the word *Filmogs* (which appears in the February 2002 edition of the film magazine *Empire*) is a blend of the word *film* with the splinter *-ogs*, which comes from *biogs*, which is itself a clip of the original source word *biographies*! This, though, is not problematic for, as Trask pointed out, clips 'are true words' (1994:22) and so it is normal that blends should draw upon splinters from clips as they do from any other class of word. As such, clips should not be treated as different from normal 'words' in any system of analysis.

2.1.3   Splinters that become clips

The difference between splinters and clips is fairly straightforward – splinters are bound lexemes whereas clips are free-standing. However, sometimes splinters can become clips. This is through a process whereby a splinter becomes highly productive, either because it is used in many different new forms, because it is used in a few very high profile words or, more often than not, because of a combination of these two factors. The highly productive splinter then becomes re-classified as an affix (see chapters 7, 8 and 9 for an in-depth exploration of this phenomenon). Occasionally, an affix can become so familiar that it is regularly used and easily understood on its own, rather than solely as bound with another lexeme – as with, for

instance, *ology* (as in 'he is studying some form of *ology*') and *ism* (as in 'sexism, racism, or any other kind of *ism* is a bad thing').

This change in usage can occur with affixes which started life as splinters. However, because splinter-originating affixes necessarily had source words, if they are continually used as free-standing lexemes they becomes re-classified as clips. For instance, the clip *burger* started off as a splinter of *Hamburger*, became lodged in the public consciousness through high profile forms such as *beefburger*, *chickenburger* and *cheeseburger* and, over time, became used autonomously as a word in its own right. Of course, this does not mean that *burger* can no longer be used with other lexemes to make a new word, just that any new forms (such as *quornburger*) would be classified as compounds rather than blends, derivations or neo-classical compounds. Indeed, types such as *beefburger* and *cheeseburger*, which were blends at the time of formation, have become re-classified synchronically as compounds. It is possible that the forms *cyber* and *dino* are, at present, in the process of undergoing this change (as will be discussed later in this section).

There is, then, a cline of familiarisation and productivity between splinters and clips and, as such, there is no line that a splinter crosses whereby it then becomes re-classified as a clip, but rather a grey area in which the best classification is not clear. However, I would suggest that splinters do not become clips without going through the middle ground of becoming an affix. Therefore, the grey area is actually between (splinter-originating) affixes[19] and clips rather than between actual splinters and clips,

---

[19] Again, see chapters 7, 8 and 9 for in in-depth exploration of splinter-originating affixes.

and is therefore not entirely relevant to this study. However, there are certain obvious criteria that can help to differentiate between a splinter-originating affix and a clip.

2.1.4   Criteria for deciding whether a given form is best analysed as a splinter-originating affix or as a clip.

Affixes are bound lexemes and clips are free lexemes, but any form that is in a grey area between the two is clearly functioning in both ways. Therefore, one aspect worth examining when deciding if a form is best analysed as a clip or an affix is in which of these two ways it functions more often. This can be done by gathering data regarding a form's token[20] frequency and percentage of total tokens in which the form is functioning as a clip as opposed to as an affix:

2.1.4.1   Token frequency and percentage of total tokens for which a form functions as a clip.

This can be analysed by examining how many tokens of a particular form appear in a fixed corpus, and by working out in what percentage of these tokens the form is functioning as a free lexeme. For instance, in the 400,000,000 word Guardian and Independent Newspaper corpus, as used in the Research and Development Unit for

---

[20]The term 'token' refers to the number of times any given form ('type') appears. For instance, the splinter -*unnel* from the source word *tunnel* appears in two different types in the corpus; *chunnel* (from *channel tunnel*) and *dunnel* (from *dome + tunnel*). *Chunnel* appears in the corpus on 367 different occasions and *dunnel* occurs just once. Therefore, there are two different -*unnel* types with 368 tokens between them.

English Studies at the University of Liverpool, there are 3757 tokens in which *burger* is used to denote a fried meat product, excluding all of the *Hamburger* forms[21] (see appendix 2 for the list of *burger* types and their corresponding number of tokens).

Out of these 3757 tokens, 3181 of them are of *burger* (or *burgers, burger's, Burger, Burgers* and *Burger's*) being used as a free-standing word. This means that in 84.7% of the relevant tokens in the corpus, *burger* is functioning as a clip, rather than as an affix. It is clear, then, from both the high frequency of non-bound tokens and from the high percentage that these non-bound forms make up of the overall tokens that the best synchronic analysis of the form *burger* is as a clip rather than as an affix.

When this criterion is applied to the forms *cyber* and *dino*, the results are less conclusive. In the corpus there are 2506 tokens of *cyber* forms[22] (again, see appendix 2 for the list of *cyber* types and their corresponding number of tokens). 380 of these tokens are of *cyber* (including *Cyber* and *Cyber's*) acting as a free-standing word. This means that 15.16% of the total *cyber* tokens in the corpus are of *cyber* acting as a clip. This is not a huge percentage, as compared to the 84.7% of *burger*, but 380 tokens does seem rather too many to be easily dismissed.

On a preliminary examination, there seems to be an even greater number of free-standing *Dino* tokens in the corpus, with 849 examples including case and plural variations[23] (see appendix 2 for the list of *dino* types and their corresponding number

---

[21] *Hamburger* is regarded as the original source word, so its presence is irrelevant.

[22] Not including *cybernetics* which is regarded as the original source word.

[23] Not including *Dinosaur*, regarded as the original source word.

of tokens). These are made up of 673 tokens of *Dino*, 29 of *Dino's*, 126 of *Dinos*, 18 of *dino* and 3 tokens of *dinos*. However, closer contextual analysis reveals that only 21 of these tokens are actually acting as clips of the source word *dinosaur* and, as such, are relevant in this discussion.

The reason for this is that out of the 673 tokens of *Dino*, only 6 were used to refer to *Dinosaurs*. *Dino* is a common first name and, consequently, the majority of these tokens were referring to specific people, such as the film producer *Dino de Laurentiis*, the author *Dino Buzzati*, the poet *Dino Campana* and lots of miscellaneous people including *Mr Dino Patsalos* and *Dino Sadler, aged 24, of Brentwood Road, Dunstable*! The same was the case for all 29 of the *Dino's* tokens.

Although less common, *Dinos* is also a name, and out of the 126 tokens it was used as such in 125 of them (to refer to, for instance, the architect and urban planner *Dinos Doxiadis*, the sportsman *Dinos Alexopoulos* and artist *Dinos Chapman*). Only one of the *Dinos* tokens, then, could be seen as being a clip of *dinosaur*, in which the entry read 'Dinos with attitude: Jurassic Park has been brought into the living-room'.

Of the 18 *dino* tokens, 7 of them were also names (in entries such as 'Dean Martin (dino Crocetti), actor and singer' and 'St Bernar dino Realino'). However, 11 of these tokens were used to refer to dinosaurs and, as such, are relevant to this discussion. All three of the *dinos* tokens are applicable here also.

Thus, with only 21 relevant tokens, *dino* is used as a free-standing lexeme in a considerably fewer number of cases than was *cyber*, but the total number of

applicable *dino* tokens in the corpus is only 96, which means that 21.88% of the relevant *dino* tokens are free-standing, as compared to *cyber*'s 15.16%.

When analysed with regard to the criterion of token frequency, then, *cyber* looks more like a clip than *dino*, but when examined in light of the percentage of total tokens for which a form is free-standing, *dino* functions in a more clip-like manner. Both, however, look as if they are functioning as affixes rather than clips when compared to *burger*.

Token frequency and percentage of total tokens are not the only factors that should be taken into account when deciding if a form is best analysed as a splinter-originating affix or a clip. Because the fundamental difference between these elements is that one is bound and the other is free, it follows that if an affix is used out of a combination it would be marked out as unusual in some way. Thus, a further test could be to look at the contexts surrounding instances of these free standing forms and see how often this is the case.

2.1.4.2   Contextual clues as to whether a form being used as a free-standing lexeme is in some way unusual

Because clips are, to quote Trask (1994), 'true words', they should need no special attention or explanation. However, if a splinter-originating affix is being used in a manner that is alien to its normal function (i.e. as a free-standing lexeme) it follows that the token would stand out as in some way special. There are different ways in

which the uncharacteristic usage may be signalled, but typical ways could include the token being written in quotation marks or having its meaning either discussed or in some other way elucidated within the context. For instance, there is one token in the corpus of *aholic* being used out of combination. Taken out of context, this token could be cited as evidence of *aholic* behaving as a clip. However, in context it is clear that this is not the case, as the token is within a discussion on affixes, and *aholic* is cited as a suffix. Conversely, the usage of the form *burger* within the corpus is not in any way generally discussed or marked as strange and its meaning is not explained or even hinted at.

When examined with regard to this criterion, *cyber* seems to behave less as an affix than as a clip. Virtually all of the 380 tokens of *cyber* as a free-lexeme are not marked out as strange by either an overt discussion of their meaning or by any special punctuation. There are contextual clues to the meaning (usually through reference to computers, the internet or virtual reality) within the surrounding contexts for many (but not most) of the tokens, but these do not appear to be forced references. In fact, the majority of the free-standing *cyber* tokens are not in any way marked as strange.

Conversely, there were contextual clues to the meaning of every single one of the 21 free-standing *dino* tokens.

Of the six *Dino* tokens which were used to refer to *Dinosaurs*, five had the full word, 'dinosaur', in the same article. These examples give little weight to an argument that *Dino* is best analysed as an accepted clip, as clips should need no explanation. The remaining example occurred in March 1998 and referred to a 'Dino Bumper Ride',

which is clearly the name of a fairground ride. It is usual for fairground rides to be decorated to a theme and it seems a reasonable supposition that the ride will come complete with a visual representations of dinosaurs that will act as an explanation of the name[24]. These six tokens of *Dino*, then, provide no real evidence here that the best analysis is as an accepted clip. The same is also the case with the one applicable token of *Dinos* for, as cited above in section 2.1.4.1, the context makes explicit the meaning through a reference to 'Jurassic Park'.

Similarly, out of the eleven appropriate tokens of *dino* in the corpus, seven have the word 'dinosaur' in the same sentence. The other four also have something that helps explain the meaning of *dino* ('prehistoric', 'Jurassic Park', 'The Lost World' and 'Godzilla'). Thus, the reader is not expected to access the meaning of *dino* without a prompt in any of these examples. The same is found again with the three *dinos* tokens. One has the word 'dinosaur' in the same sentence and the other two have 'Jurassic Park' in the paragraph.

All of this, then, points to the fact that *dino* is not yet at the point where it should be analysed as a fully-fledged clip.

---

[24] Of course, this explains the contextual clues for the actual ride. However, as this name was cited in a newspaper article there are no accompanying visual clues when it is encountered as a written label.

2.1.4.3 Conclusions regarding the criteria for deciding whether a given form is best analysed as a splinter-originating affix or as a clip

In order to get the truest picture of whether a form is best analysed as a splinter-originating affix or as a clip, these three criteria should be taken into account alongside each other. For instance, *dino* as a free-standing lexeme only has 21 tokens and in each of these instances there are contextual clues to their meaning. Thus, in spite of the fact that almost 22% of the *dino* forms function as autonomous words, overall *dino* is not behaving as a clip and the most accurate analysis would be as an affix. *Cyber*, however, functions in a more typically clip-like manner, with 380 free-standing tokens which, generally, are not marked out as in any way unusual or requiring explanation. Therefore, in spite of the fact that *cyber* is only free-standing in 15.15% of its total tokens (which is a small percentage as compared with *burger*'s 86.7%) the best analysis of *cyber* is as a clip – though it is clearly not as well established a clip as *burger*.

However, as stated above in section 2.1.3, because splinter-originating affixes and clips are on cline of familiarisation and productivity, there is no line whereby an affix becomes a clip, but rather a grey area in which the best classification is not clear. It seems to me that *dino*, and perhaps still *cyber*, may be within this grey area. This could mean that they are crossing over from being affixes to becoming clips, although it is impossible to be certain that they will ever actually make a complete transition.

Many forms, such as *fest, phobia* and *mania*, are used equally often in combinations and as free-standing lexemes[25].

2.1.5 Separating blends from clips – a conclusion

Many linguists have noted that there is an overlap between blends and clips (for instance, Bauer, 1983, Cannon, 1986 and Quinion, 1996). Conversely, I propose that the observed grey area has always actually been between clips and the splinters within blends, rather than with the blends themselves. However, in spite of the fact that splinters and clips are formed by the same process, they actually function in very different ways. Indeed, because splinters must be bound and are not always understandable out of context, whereas clips are free-standing and as easily understandable as any other word, I do not actually believe that there is a direct cross over between the two forms, and that the grey area is in fact between splinter-originating affixes and clips. Clips can play a part in blending, in that splinters can attach to them or be formed from them. This, though, is not a cross over area as the resulting blend is the same as it would be if a splinter attached to or was formed from any normal word. Thus, I believe that blends can fairly reliably be separated from clips, and that any overlap is actually between clips and affixes.

---

[25] One conclusion that could be drawn from this fact is that perhaps it is enough to merely note the different functions a form may have, rather than try to decisively label it as one element or another. This, though, is clearly not the concern of this thesis, although I shall return to this point in chapter 10.

Another process of word formation that is said to have an overlap with blending is that of compounding. As with clips, however, I do not see this overlap as being a particularly complicated one, as the next section shall highlight.

2.2   Separating Blends from Compounds

It is generally agreed in linguistic literature that compounding, along with derivation, is the most productive process in English word formation (see, for instance, Bauer: 1983, Van Marle: 1985 and Trask: 1994). It is therefore unsurprising that many linguists have noted that blending 'tends to shade off into compounding...' (Bauer, 1983: 236). This section attempts to resolve the perceived overlap between blends and compounds.

2.2.1   Defining compounds

Bauer (1983) provides a basic definition of the term compounding:

> Compounding, or composition, is, roughly speaking, the process of putting two words together to form a third

(Bauer, 1983: 11)

He cites *oil-paper, paperclip, paper aeroplane, wastepaper* and *wastepaper basket* as examples of the phenomenon. It is clear that he has picked these different examples

to highlight the fact that compounds can be written as a simple word (e.g. *paperclip*), can include a space (*paper aeroplane*), can include a hyphen (*oil-paper*) or can be written in a combination of these ways, and can also draw upon more than one source word (e.g. *wastepaper basket*). He goes on to clarify:

> Such words are called **compounds**, independent of the form class ('part of speech') of the new word, the number of elements involved, whether they are written as one or two words or whether they are hyphenated and so on.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 11, emphasis in original)

Because a compound does not have to be written as all one word, and because it can draw upon more than two source words, it is sometimes difficult to decide what is a compound and what is in fact a lexical string. For instance, *scarecrow* is clearly a compound, whereas *stone the crows* is more of a lexical string, that is, a string of independent lexemes that are often found together and express one notion. Many forms are somewhere in the middle of these two elements, for instance, *old age pensioners*. However, deciding whether there is a significant difference between compounds and lexical strings and, if so, what the difference is and the criteria for deciding between the two is a matter for further study. For the sake of this thesis, compounds and lexical strings will be dealt with together under the term compound.

2.2.2   Similarities between blends and compounds

Many descriptions of the compounding process could be seen as equally applicable to

that of blending. For instance, Trask's (1994) description of compounding, as 'combining two existing words into a single new word' (p19), clearly shows how similar the creation processes behind compounding and blending are.

Blends, like compounds, are most often written as one word but can appear in other orthographic forms. There are examples within the Independent Newspaper corpus of them being written with a hyphen (e.g. *egg-cellent*, *rap-sploitation*) or, on rare occasions, even with a space (for instance *docu drama*).

Another similarity between blends and compounds is that, once formed, either can become the base to which affixes attach. Trask notes that 'occasionally a new word is derived by combining two existing words with a suffix, as in *blue-eyed*, *bookkeeper*, *sky-diving* and *plastic-coated*' (p19). Similarly, there are many examples of affixed blends within the Independent corpus include *sexploiting*, *chortled* and *electrocution*.

Brown's (1851) early comments on compounding also highlight more similarities between blends and compounds:

> The compounding of words is one principal means of increasing their number; and the arbitrariness with which it is done or neglected in English is sufficient of itself to make the number of our words a great uncertainty.
>
> (Brown, 1851: 187)

As with blends, it is difficult to predict which source words will be compounded together. Because of this arbitrary nature it is impossible to ever produce an exhaustive list of compounds in the language, just as it is with blends.

However, in spite of all these similarities, there are some key differences which render the blending process as one which is discrete from that of compounding.

2.2.3   Key differences between blends and compounds

Another of Brown's (1851) observations on compounding serves to highlight one of the differences between blends and compounds:

> Such terms [compounds], however, have the advantage of explaining themselves in a much greater detail than others, have little need of definition
>
> (Brown, 1851: 187 [sic])

Blends, conversely, are not always self-defining. In fact, Cannon (1986) argues that the most typical blend is the one that cannot be unpicked when taken out of context:

> Most of our blends are not self-defining. Rather, they are usually a new, technically simple but otherwise unanalyzable morpheme
>
> (Cannon, 1986: 746)

I am not sure that the data within corpus presented in this study would support the claim that 'most' blends are unanalysable, but certainly some are less transparent than others (usually depending on a reader's / hearer's background, education and specialist field). It is, however, unarguable that *some* blends do not explain themselves out of context and, unlike Brown's compounds, are in need of definition – for instance, no-one would be able to decipher with any degree of certainty both elements of the blends, appearing in the Independent Newspaper corpus, *cyxploitation* (from *cycle + exploitation*), *bit* (from *binary + digit*) or *probot* (from *prostate + robot*) without the aid of either context or specialist prior knowledge.

A further facet of blending which separates it from compounding is that, as Bauer's, Trask's and Brown's above definitions and observations have all hinted, compounding only draws upon words. Blends, however, can come from non-words too. The blends *demote* and *poethon* draw upon affixes, while the forms *aquarobics* and *syntegrity* blend splinters with neo-classical combining forms. Clearly, because compounds only draw upon complete words, the process of compounding cannot combine a word with a bound form as, if it did, the result would actually be classified as either a derivation or neo-classical compound.

This fact highlights the definitive difference between blends and compounds – that blends, unlike compounds, must involve some form of reduction (be it through the splintering or sharing of letters or sounds) at the point of fusion.

Cannon's (1987) opening comment on his section on blending acts as a good conclusion to the discussion regarding the similarities and differences between

compounding and blending. He notes that the patterns of blending and compounding are closely related, and that some linguists do not actually differentiate between the two:

> Except that there is always a reduction, together with the fact that a blend is a fusion of its source words, we might analyze items like *motel* as compounds, as some scholars have done.
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 144)

However, Cannon's quote does make clear that there <u>is</u> a significant difference between blending and compounding. In blends 'there is always a reduction' whereas, to quote Bauer (1983: 11), compounding is 'the process of putting two words together'. In compounds, the two words just sit next to each other whereas the source elements in blends run into each other – they 'fuse'.

2.2.4   Possible cross-over areas between blends and compounds

Even though blending is removed from the scope of compounding by definition, there are still some possible cross-over areas between the two processes:

2.2.4.1   Compounds which draw upon blends as a source word

Because blending is a process of word-formation, once a blend is formed it behaves as

a normal word. This means that established blends, as with any other generally known word, can be one of the source words in a compound. An example of one such compound in the Independent corpus is *Eurochunnel* (which is a compound of a clip and a blend!)

2.2.4.2   Blends which draw upon compounds as a source word

As pointed out by Cannon (1986: 749), 'a few blends employ compounds as their source words'. This, then, is a further area of overlap between blends and compounds. Forms can either blend two compounds (as in *old-boy-racer* from the compounds *old-boy* plus *boy-racer*), or blend a compound with a similar word (be it similar in meaning, as in *standing applause* from *standing ovation* plus *applause*, or similar phonetically and/or graphically, as in *Generation X-ploitation* from *Generation X* plus *exploitation* and *old age mentioners* from *old age pensioners* plus *mention(ers)*).

Only 'a few' blends do tend to draw upon compounds as a source word. Indeed, out of the full corpus of 1150 blends presented in this thesis, only thirty-one utilise compounds. One reason for this could be because compounds and blends both have more than one source word, so a blend of a compound necessarily has at least three sources and often more (for instance, *world wide wait* comes from the four source words *world wide web* plus *wait*, even though only three of them remain in the final blend). Because of this, the resulting form can often seem more like syntactic string than a word. However, as the final form is actually a blend of two items that function

as a single word, such forms are still in the domain of word formation and should be analysed as simple blends drawing upon compounds as (at least one of the) source words.

There is though a rather more problematic area of overlap between blends and compounds, which is when a compound is splintered at a morpheme boundary in order to enter into a blend. Algeo (1977: 51) highlights this phenomenon, and exemplifies what he identifies as 'clipping at morpheme boundaries' with the forms *Oxbridge* (*Oxford* + *Cambridge*) and *Paratroops* (*parachute* + *troops*). Of this phenomenon he says:

> In such cases, it may be difficult to be sure whether a form is the result of blending or of composition from the constituent morphemes. For example, *slumlord* is explained by *Webster's Third* as a combination of *slum* and *landlord*; and, although that explanation is doubtless correct, the distinction in such cases between blending and compounding under the analogical influence of another form is a fine one.
>
> (Algeo, 1977: 51)

This is an astute observation. It is clear that words such as *banoffee* and *chunnel* are rather more obviously blends than forms such as *breadloser* (from *breadwinner* plus *loser*, as used in the Independent Newspaper corpus) and Algeo's cited *slumlord*. As Algeo goes on to observe:

Words formed by shortening along morpheme boundaries are less clear examples of the blending process than are words formed by shortening that does not follow such boundaries.

(Algeo, 1977: 51)

However, in spite of the fact that they are 'less clear examples', they are still easily classifiable as blends. For instance, both *ox* and *bridge* are morphemes, but they are not the relevant morphemes in the blend *Oxbridge*, which is a blend of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, rather than a compound meaning 'a place for cows to cross'. Thus a good test to distinguish blends with splintering at morphemic boundaries from compounds is the test of "missing meaning". If something that is not present in the final form has to be referred to in order for the true meaning to be understood then the best classification is as a blend. For instance, a *breadloser* is not simply 'one who loses bread', but is in fact drawing upon the compound *breadwinner* to mean 'one who fritters away the household income'.

Consequently, even though blends with splinterings at morpheme boundaries (usually from compounds) are accepted as a less clear cut area than blends in which the splintering 'does not follow such boundaries', there is an applicable rule that can separate blending from compounding.

2.2.4.3   Syntactic blends

Forms such as *old-boy-racer* and *world wide wait* have been analysed as blended words, rather than syntactical blends. This is not to say, though, that syntactic blends do not exist. Bergstrom (1906: 204) cites *As best as you can* as a mixture of *As you can best* and *As well as you can*, and Cannon (1986: 726) offers *nothing else but a miracle* as a syntactic blend of *nothing but a miracle* and *nothing else than a miracle*.

Many of the early studies on blends concentrated largely on syntactic blendings, and considered them as far more frequent than word blendings; for instance:

> Word-blendings are by no means so numerous as syntactical ones, which last seem to be rather increasing in number than otherwise. [sic]
>
> (Bergstrom, 1906: 30)

Cannon (1986) also comments on this early trend, and suggests a reason for it:

> Early studies concentrated on syntactic blends rather than on blend words, as the *OED* was not yet available to produce its treasure of lexical data.
>
> (Cannon, 1986: 726)

Even as late as 1968, Bolinger was commenting that 'the blends most likely to stick are the ones that bring whole phrases together.' (1968: 103)

However, while I accept that syntactic blends do exist and are a part of the blending process, this study is concentrating on 'the blending process in English word-formation', and syntactic blends are not in the domain of word-formation. As Cannon (1986: 726) notes, 'syntactic blends are again a wide-open area for investigation', and an in-depth study into the syntactic blending process would be worthwhile, but it is not the area under investigation in this study.

2.2.4.4 Blends separated from compounds

In conclusion, then, blends can generally be separated from compounds as a matter of definition because the elements in compounds are free-standing lexemes whereas either the elements in a blend overlap or at least one of them must be a bound splinter. Occasionally, however, it may be difficult to differentiate between a free-standing word and a splinter which breaks off at a morphemic boundary. In such cases, though, there is an valid test that can be applied to separate blends from compounds. As explained in section 2.2.4.2 above, the test of "missing meaning" will indicate the best classification of a borderline blend / compound in that if something that is not present in the final form has to be referred to in order for the true meaning to be understood then the best classification is as a blend. If this is not the case then the best analysis is as a compound.

Now that blends have been differentiated from compounds it is possible to move onto the next area for examination, which concerns the relationship between blends and compounded phonesthemes.

2.3   Separating blends from compounded phonesthemes

A further type of grey area between blends and other types of word formation is typified by words such as *flimmer, glob* and *plop*. These are words that are made up from letter clusters or, to use a term coined by Firth (1930), 'phonesthemes' which evoke similar words with similar meanings. For instance, the *fl-* in *flimmer* has associations with words such as *flame, flicker* and *flare* and the *-immer* with *shimmer* and *glimmer*. These words are often dealt with under the heading of 'sound symbolism' (a term coined by Jesperson (1922)), and many linguists regard such forms as having at least a close relationship with blends.

2.3.1   Linguists who regard words made up of phonesthemes as

         definite blends

Across time, linguists have often regarded words such as *glimmer, glob* and *plop* as blends. As far back as 1912 Woods cited *blash* in his paper *Some English Blends* (p179), in spite of the fact that he could not identify the actual source words. He explained that the *bl* may come from *blow* or *blaze* and '*-ash* from such words as *splash, plash, dash, flash.*' He also cited *Plop* as a blend of *pl-* from words like *plunge, plunk, plump* and *plout* with '*-op* from such words as *flop, drop, pop.*' Woods clearly believed that blends do not need to have actual source words but rather can be made up of letter clusters which evoke similar words with similar meanings.

Over sixty years later, Adams (1973) seemed to concur with this opinion. She is so confident that sound symbolism words are a part of blending that she actually discusses these as her first class of blends (p140), under the heading 'blends which contain elements which may remind us of other words similar to them', and uses the words '*squirl - squiggle/squirm* + *swirl/twirl/whirl*' and '*flimmer - flare/flame/flicker* + *glimmer/shimmer*' (p139) to illustrate the phenomenon.

However, this notion that the splinters within blends do not need to have a specific source word but instead can stand for a several words simultaneously seems incongruous with Adams's stated 'special relationship of meaning between the splinter and some 'regular' word in which it occurs', which she reasons is essential to a blend (Adams, 1973: 142). Having accepted the necessity of the 'special relationship' between a splinter and its source word, it follows that splinters, by their nature, represent specific individual words (or elements). Thus, it is only possible to be certain that a word is a blend if the source elements are identifiable (at least in context). With this in mind, it seems strange that Adams considers that splinters can stand for several 'similar words with similar meanings' and simultaneously that they have a special relationship of meaning with a source word, when these two things cannot really co-exist.

2.3.2 Linguists who regard words made up of phonesthemes as possible blends

Some linguists deal with words made up of phonesthemes as blends, but are less certain of their classification. Pound (1914) has a section dealing with words 'apparently or certainly of blend origin' in which she cites some relevant forms:

> scurry, perhaps from *skirr*, or *scour*, and *hurry*. *flaunt*, which may merge *fly*, *flout*, and *vaunt*. *squirm*, from *squir* merged with *swarm* and *warm*.
>
> (Pound, 1914: 4)

The fact that she deals with these words in the section including 'apparent' blends perhaps intimates that she is less certain of her classification of such forms as blends than was Woods. Indeed, Pound explicitly acknowledges that these forms are not straightforward blends, and that they are in a "cross-over" area:

> ... the subject of blending sometimes crosses onomatopoeia, or imitation of natural sounds. Words of the type of *myowl*, *squark*, possibly Carroll's *burble* if from *murmur* and *bubble*, *squuunch*, *splatter*, *flump*, i.e. *fall plump* (*thump*, *bump*, etc.) might fairly be styled echoic or onomatopoeic blends.
>
> (Pound, 1914: 12)

However, in spite of Pound's seeming uncertainty (expressed by the mitigating 'might fairly'), her best solution is still to label these 'onomatopoeic' words as blends.

Jesperson (1922) coins the term 'sound symbolism' to describe letter clusters and discusses 'echo-words', such as *plunge, plump, plunk*, etc., as a separate phenomenon to blending (pp 313-314). However, he also believes that 'blends are especially frequent in words expressive of sounds or in some other way symbolical', and cites *blot* as a blend of '*blemish, black* + *spot, plot, dot*' (pp 312-313). Jesperson clearly believes, then, that words made up of sound symbolism letter clusters can be classified as blends, and he makes no real suggestions as to how these blends differ from his echo-words.

Bolinger (1965) takes up and expands upon Jesperson's idea of sound symbolism:

> It is not necessary, then, to look for resemblance between sound and sense when treating of 'sound symbolism' in the broadest meaning of the expression – 'sound suggestiveness' might express it better. More often than not there is or has been at one time such resemblance, but it is never alone in binding together the word and the idea; for once the kinship is established it is as real as if it had been truly adequate to begin with, and the word becomes, in its own right, a bridge to still further associations.
>
> (Bolinger, 1965: 192)

Bolinger uses this 'sound suggestiveness' to explain the how the word *fresh* came out of the *fr-* set of words, exemplified by '*freeze, frigid* and *fright*', and acted as 'a bridge' to words such as '*rash* and *brash*' (see1965: 192), without relating the phenomenon to blending. However, like Jesperson and Pound before him, he does consider that sound symbolism clusters also play a part in the blending process:

A knowledge of the constellations involved is fundamental to an understanding of blends, as they oftenest occur not between two isolated sounds but between two (or more) sounds either or both of which belong to a constellation'

(Bolinger, 1965: 195)

It seems, then, that both Jesperson and Bolinger believe that words made up from symbolic letter clusters may or may not be blends, and neither of them suggest criteria to help decide how best to classify such forms.

2.3.3   Sound symbolism words as phonestheme compounds

While Algeo (1977) deals with words made up of letter clusters in his paper on blends, he does see them as distinct from blends of individual words. He suggests that, unlike in classical blends, the actual identity of the source words is not of vital importance if such forms are...

... thought of as blends, not of individual words but rather of classes of words. Thus *glop* 'viscous liquid, unappetizing food, offensive sentimentality' might be explained simply as a blend of *glob* and *slop*, but it more likely combines the head of words like *gland, glare, glass, glean, glib, glide, gloam, gloat, glob, gloom, glottal, glub, glub, glue, glum* and *glut* with the body of words like *chop, drop, flop, lop, plop, slop* and *sop*. Other symbolic forms like *glunk*

and *gloop* or *blop* make it likely that *glop* has its origin not in a blend of two forms only, but rather as a combination of PHONESTHEMES.

(Algeo, 1977: 60)

The fact that these kinds of words should be thought of as drawing upon 'classes of words', rather than as 'a blend of two forms only' makes sense and renders the fact that the actual source words cannot be identified with any degree of certainty as no longer problematic. Algeo's suggestion that these 'symbolic' forms are best thought of as 'a combination of phonesthemes' is, thus, accepted.

However, I would suggest that when Algeo proposes such words should be 'thought of as blends... of classes of words', he is misapplying the term 'blend'. Phonesthemes are a group in their own right. While they are not actually autonomous words or even morphs, they are imbued with meaning which evokes a whole "class" of words. What they do not have is the 'special relationship of meaning' (Adams, 1973: 142) to link them to one specific word – a quality that is so intrinsic to a splinter. Thus, because there is no specific source word, these phonesthemes are not losing anything when they join with each other to form a word and are actually staying intact. This means that there is no blending (or even overlapping) taking place at the point of fusion, but rather two pre-existing forms are just sitting next to each other, a fact which rules out these forms from the scope of blending. Indeed, because phonesthemes have intrinsic meaning without reference to any specific prior word they actually have more in common with combining forms than with splinters.

Therefore, I would suggest that the best possible classification of forms such as *flimmer*, *glob* and *plop* is certainly as a combination of phonesthemes, but rather than being a blend of these symbolic letter clusters they are in fact a compound of pre-existing bound forms. I believe such forms are best labelled as compounded phonesthemes.

2.3.4 Blends made up of a phonestheme plus a splinter

There is still one area where there can be a cross-over between blends and phonestheme compounds, which is when a form is made up of a phonestheme plus a splinter. As Bolinger (1965) points out, words can be made up of 'two (or more) sounds either or both of which belong to a constellation' (p195), and if only one of these 'sounds' belongs to a constellation, it does not necessarily follow that the other one will as well. For instance, in the word *flurry* the *fl-* is fairly obviously a phonestheme, but the *-urry* is perhaps best identified as a splinter of the word *hurry*. In this case, in spite of the fact that the *fl-* is standing as a complete entity, the *-urry* has lost the beginning of its source word and, thus, is blending with the *fl-*. One of the elements does lose something at the point of fusion and, consequently, the resulting form is a blend.

These forms are not problematic and should be analysed as a straightforward blend of a splinter with a phonestheme.

2.4   Chapter two – a conclusion

Concluding this chapter, it is perhaps appropriate to return to the opening quotation:

> Generally speaking, the category of blends is not well-defined, and tends to shade off into compounding, neo-classical compounding, affixation, clipping and .... acronyming.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 236)

This chapter has highlighted that there are aspects of blending which overlap with facets of the associated processes of compounding, clipping and also phonestheme compounding. However, most of these could be cleared up as a matter of definition, and for those that could not, it was possible to compose applicable rules to help differentiate between the different processes.

According to Bauer, then, this leaves neo-classical compounding, affixation and acronyming. However, before these three processes are analysed with relation to blending, there is one further process that should be dealt with. Having separated blends from clips and compounds, it makes sense to go on to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 3:

Separating blends from clipping compounds

3.1   The difference between blends and compounds which include clips

Blends and compounds which include clips are discrete processes of word formation because splinters and clips are definitively different. Clips are autonomous, free lexemes which are regularly used in place of their source word, whereas splinters are bound forms which must be used in combination (see section 2.1.1 on separating blends from clips). It, therefore, follows that compounds made up of clips, such as *Brit pop* and *Jag mag*, or compounds with one element that is a clip, such as *fridgecake* and *cheeseburger*, are immediately identifiable as different from blends, which are fusions including either one or two splinters (such as *guestage*, from *guest + hostage*, and *snurfing*, from *snow + surfing*, respectively). The compounds *Brit pop*, *Jag mag*, *fridgecake* and *cheeseburger* are obviously made up of two autonomous word forms that 'sit next to each other'. They do not require contextual clues, prior knowledge or explanation of missing word parts in order for the reader / hearer to understand their meaning. The source elements in the blends *guestage* and *snurfing*, however, do not merely 'sit next to each other' but fuse together, and in order to make sense of the final form, at the very least, the readers / hearers must rack their brains to access the missing word parts. Blends do not, then, need separating from 'compounds which include clips', as these forms are definitively different from blends and, in fact, function in the same way as normal compounds and should be classified as such.

There is, though, another type of word, typified by *romcom*, which at first impression may seem to be a compound made up of clips but, under closer examination, reveals

itself to be the product of a different process of word formation which has far more in common with blending. *Romcom* is an example of a 'clipping compound' (Bauer, 2002).

3.2 Defining clipping compounds

Bauer (2002) coined the term 'clipping compound' and provides a definition:

> There are [forms] where both words of a phrase are back-clipped[26] to form a clipping compound: *elint* (← <u>_electronic</u> <u>_intelligence</u>), *kidvid* (← <u>_kid's</u> <u>_video</u>).
>
> (Bauer, 2002: 1635)

According to this definition, then, 'clipping compounds' are composed of two initial clippings[27]. However, in an earlier work, Bauer (1983: 233) pointed out that 'clipped forms are also used in compounds, as in *opart* (< *optical art*) and *org-man* (< *organization man*)' with full words. Adams (2001) agrees with this stance:

> [shortened forms] are subject to ... compounding with unshortened words: *op art*, *con trick* or with other shortened forms: *biopic*, *cyborg*, from *cybernetic* and *organism*, 'an integrated man-machine system' (OED), *hi-fi*, *sci-fi*, *sitcom*.
>
> (Adams, 2000: 142)

---

[26] What I have termed 'initial clips', Bauer (2002: 1635) terms 'back-clippings'. These are forms such as *doc* from *doctor* and *deli* from *delicatessen*, which retain the initial part of the source word (hence my label 'initial clips') and lose the back of the word (hence Bauer's term 'back-clippings').

[27] As opposed to from two initial clips, which are forms like *Brit* and *pop* that are established and autonomous in usage.

The same logic that led me to include splinter + word formations within my definition of blends (see section 1.5.5.1) dictates that these clipping + word formations require analysis and should be included within the scope of 'clipping compounds'. I, therefore, accept Bauer's (1983) and Adams's (2000) position that such forms can be composed of clipping + clipping or clipping + word. With all of this in mind, it is possible at this point to suggest a description of a clipping compound as "a form composed of either 'initial clipping + initial clipping' or of 'initial clipping + word'". A description, of course, is not the same as a definition and, in order to "define" clipping compounds it is necessary to examine them, and their similarities to blends, more closely.

Bauer's (2002) definition and labelling of forms such as *elint* and *opart* is the only one I have been able to find. However, other linguists do cite instances of such forms and discuss them under various headings, including 'shortenings' (e.g. Adams, 2001: 141), 'unabbreviated shortenings' (Cannon, 1987: 110), 'clippings' (Algeo, 1991: 9) and, indeed, 'blends' (Adams, 1973: 137). They do not, though, directly give such forms a particular name. Cannon (2000) is among the linguists who do not give these compounded clippings a specific label, but he does suggest a reason why I have been unable to find suggested linguistic terms for such forms:

> Perhaps because scholarly probing of acronomy and clipping has been limited, terminology is not well established.
>
> (Cannon, 2000: 958)

Thus, in the absence of any other suggested label for forms such as *sci-fi*, *sitcom* and *opart*, I am adopting Bauer's (2002) term 'clipping compounds'.

In spite of the lack of suggestions regarding names for these forms, all of the examples cited in linguistic literature are very similar, and in every instance the clippings (in keeping with Bauer's (2002) definition) are initial clippings. Also, when a cited clipping compound includes a word the latter is always the second element.

One further characteristic of clipping compounds is that they do not contain 'clips' as I have defined them (see section 2.1.1). While *vid* may be generally recognisable as standing for its source word *video*, a reader / hearer would be unlikely to be able to identify *el* as standing for *electronic* or *int* as meaning *intelligence* without the help of any contextual clues. Similarly, while *vid* is the expected shortening of *video*, *el* is not the shortening one would expect from *electronic*, with *elec* surely seeming a more likely choice, and *intel* would be a more predictable curtailment of *intelligence* than *int*. As such, these 'clippings' cannot be seen as being the same as clips. Indeed, I would argue that *vid* actually is a clip, as it is regularly used in place of its source word[28] and is immediately understandable, and that *kid* is best analysed as a straightforward word. Thus, the best analysis of *kidvid* is not, in fact, as a clipping compound but, rather, as a straight forward compound drawing on a clip as one of its source words.

---

[28] There are 39 examples within the Independent Newspaper corpus of *vid* being used as a direct alternative for the source word *video*, and the majority of these examples provide no contextual explanations for the clip within the context.

This, then, means that, unlike clips, clippings such as *el* and *int* are not definitively different from the splinters used in the formation of blends and, therefore, clipping compounds require close analysis in order to see how they are different from blends.

3.3　　Differentiating blends from clipping compounds

It is very difficult to differentiate between blends (e.g. *dunnel* from *dome* + *tunnel*) and clipping compounds (e.g. *elint* from *electronic intelligence*). Bauer (1983) states of clipping compounds:

> In these cases it is difficult to know whether the resultant formation should be treated as a clipping or a blend; the border between the two is not always clear.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 233)

Indeed, many definitions of blends do not mark them as separate from clipping compounds, for instance:

> blending is compounding by means of curtailed words
>
> (Marchand, 1960: 367)

> A blend is a word made by joining two or more forms but omitting at least part of one.
>
> (Algeo, 1991: 10)

These explanations are not helpful in differentiating between blends and clipping compounds as they describe both processes of word formation.

Conversely, Cannon's (1987) definition of blends does definitively separate them from clipping compounds:

> Blends fall into 2 groups. More numerous is the old traditional kind, where both source words share 1 or more letters/sounds that often prevent us from determining which word has provided the shared element... The second group is illustrated by *brunch*, which also involves the fusing of the first part of 1 item with the last part of a second item, but with no shared element.
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 144)

For Cannon, blends either have to have an overlap or be composed of an initial curtailment with a terminal curtailment. This means that an initial curtailment plus either a full word or another initial curtailment <u>cannot</u> be a blend and, thus, could be classified as a clipping compound. However, this is not as helpful as it seems because there are problems with Cannon's definition of a blend. I agree that any form in which 'both source words share 1 or more letters/sounds that often prevent us from determining which word has provided the shared element' should be analysed as a blend. This means that initial curtailment + initial curtailment forms such as *chaord* (from <u>*chaos*</u> + <u>*order*</u>, cited by Branwyn, 1997), *dinter* (from <u>*dinner*</u> + <u>*inter*</u>*view*, cited by Potter, 1969) and *Telex* (from *telprinter* + <u>*ex*</u>*change*, cited by Cannon, 1987)

should be analysed as blends[29]. I do not, though, agree that non-overlapping blends must take the form of initial splinter + terminal splinter as I do not feel that complete word + splinter forms, such as *stalkarrazzi* (from *stalk* + *paparrazzi*), and splinter + complete word forms, such as *reprogenetics* (from *reproductive* + *genetics*), can reliably be classified as anything other than blends (see section 1.5.5.1). Therefore, Cannon's definition turns out not to help in differentiating between blends and clipping compounds.

Trask's (1994:39) definition of blending, as a process whereby 'arbitrary portions of words [are] clipped off and stitched together', on the surface seems to be more helpful. If the splintering from the source words in blends is 'arbitrary', then many of the already cited clipping compounds could be seen as being removed from the scope of blending. Although the clippings *sit* from *situation* and *com* from *comedy* in the clipping compound *sitcom* may not be so well established that they function as autonomous clips, the retained portions, *sit* and *com*, <u>are</u> predictable, not arbitrary. The same applies to the clippings in *lit-crit*, *org-man*, *slo-mo*, *biopic* and *romcom*.

However, as discussed in section 3.1, *el* is, in fact, an arbitrary clipping of *electronic* and, thus, Bauer's (2002: 1635) suggested clipping compound *elint* would not be removed from the scope of blending by Trask's (1994) definition. Indeed, while the splintering process is generally 'arbitrary', there is no reason to see this randomness as criterial. The splintering from the source words *digital* and *entertainment* in the

---

[29] It is particularly strange that Cannon goes onto cite *telex*, which must be a blend by his own definition, as an example of a 'shortening plus word' (1987: 136) – especially in light of the fact that if it is not to be analysed as a blend, it is certainly a shortening plus shortening, rather than a shortening plus word!

blend *digitainment* and from *celebrity* and *debutantes* in the blend *celebutantes* are reasonably predictable. I prefer Adams's definition of blending:

> Usually splinters are irregular in form, that is, they are parts of morphs, though in some cases there is no formal irregularity, but a special relationship of meaning between the splinter and some 'regular' word in which it occurs.
>
> (Adams, 1973: 142)

This definition, though, does not help to differentiate between clipping compounds and blends either. The 'special relationship of meaning' that I believe to be so crucial to splinters is also evident in the clippings, with *el* standing in direct place of *electronic* in *elint* and *rom* clearly bringing to mind *romantic* in *romcom*.

This then, might, lead to the conclusion that there is, indeed, no difference between blends and clipping compounds.

3.3.1   Are blends and clipping compounds the same?

There is much to suggest that clipping compounds and blends are in fact the same type of word formation. Both involve the compounding of shortened parts of words, both can be comprised of two shortened elements or a shortened element plus a complete word, the curtailed elements do not have to be transparently recoverable, the curtailing can be unpredictable and the shortened elements have 'a special relationship of meaning' with their source word. Indeed, Adams (1973: 137) seems to

believe that clipping compounds and blends are the same thing, as she states that 'compounds of clipped elements ... fall within the range of words which I call blends'.

This is a logically appealing solution. However, intuition dictates that forms such as *banoffee* from *banana* + *toffee* or *skousers* from *skirt* + *trousers* are somehow more 'blend-like' than forms such as *sci-fi*, *sitcom* and *slo-mo*. In spite of the fact that there is no graphic or phonic overlap, the separate elements in *banoffee* and *skousers* seems to fuse together seamlessly, whereas in *sci-fi*, *sitcom* and *slo-mo* the elements appear more separate and seem to sit next to each other, rather than fuse.

Indeed, perhaps Adams too was uncomfortable with the conclusion that blends and clipping compounds are the same because in her subsequent 2001 work she deals with forms such as *biopic*, *hi-fi* and *opart* under the heading 'shortening[30]' rather than as blends (see Adams, 2001: 141-142).

As such, it is difficult to conclude that *skousers* and *sitcom* are the result of the same word formation process. Thus, further exploration into how best to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds is necessary.

---

[30] She does not, though, explain how these forms are different from blends.

3.3.2 Investigating the factors that may help to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds

There are several factors that may help to distinguish between a clipping compound and a blend. These are stress patterns, internal meaning relations, whether the form is a contraction of a pre-existing item, if the word is made up of purely initial clippings, if the elements rhyme, if the original source words of the clippings are transparent, whether there are two syllables in the final form and whether the clippings are at syllable junctures from the initial source words. I will now examine each of these factors in turn:

3.3.2.1. Stress patterns

When discussing blends and what he came to term clipping compounds, Bauer (1983: 233) acknowledges that 'the border between the two is not always clear'. He does, though, suggest one possible way of differentiating between blends and clipping compounds:

> Perhaps the easiest way to draw the distinction (although it might be a bit *ad hoc*) is to say that those forms which retain compound stress are clipped compounds, whereas those that take simple word stress are not. By this criterion *bodbiz, Chicom, comsymp, Intelsat, midcult, pro-am, sci-fi* and *sitcom* are all compounds made of clippings.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 233)

This is an appealing criterion and does help to separate the likes of *romcom*, *sci-fi* and *amtrac* (*amphibious tractor*) from *dunnel, snurfing* and *guestage*. However, some clipping compounds, such as *elint* and *biopic* can take simple word stress[31]. Similarly, a few blends, such as *mobus* (from *motor + omnibus*[32], cited by Bergstrom, 1906: 15) and *ausform* (*austenitic + deform*, cited by Cannon, 1986: 740) can be pronounced with compound stress. As such, although examining a form's stress pattern may give a clue as to whether it is best classified as a blend or a clipping compound, this is not a infallible measure.

3.3.2.2   Sense relations between elements

It follows logically that because these forms are called 'clipping compounds', and because one suggested criterion for differentiating between these forms and blends is that they will have compound rather than simple word stress, clipping compounds should have far more in common with compounds than with simple words. Blends, conversely, once formed act as simple lexemes. It is thus worth looking at the make-up of typical compounds and examining whether any given borderline blend / clipping compound follows typical compounding patterns.

---

[31] This, of course, can vary dependent on individual pronunciation. For instance, *biopic* can be pronounced either as *bi'opic*, when it takes single word stress, or as *'bio, pic*, when there is a primary and tertiary stress which is closer to compounds stress.

[32] Of course, *mobus* would be synchronically analysed as *motor + bus* so would be an initial curtailment + word form, rather than initial curtailment + terminal curtailment. As such, it could be considered as a clipping compound itself.

Structurally, compound nouns consist of a head element, the rightmost constituent in English, and a modifier that precedes the head. The head term usually picks out the category denoted, so an *apple-knife*, for example, is a kind of knife, not a kind of apple.

(Clark et al, 1986: 7)

This is a commonly held opinion (cf. Marchand, 1969: 54, Allen, 1978: 105 and Williams, 1981, 248) which, although does not characterise all compounds in English (see Bauer and Renouf, 2001), is generally held to describe most compounds.

This modifier-head relationship is apparent in the structure of nearly all of these overlapping initial clipping + initial clipping or word forms – for instance, in *romcom* the type of *comedy* is *romantic*, in *sci-fi* the type of *fiction* is *science* and in *amtrac* the *tractor* is *amphibious*. Conversely, in *chaord* (one of the only two initial curtailment + initial curtailment forms examined so far that is decisively <u>not</u> a clipping compound but a blend) *chaos* does not describe the type of *order*, but in fact the two sources are antonymous. This, then, looks to be a good criterion.

However, I have come across one clear example in which non-overlapping compounded initial curtailments do not display this modifier-head relationship, which is in the form *zedonk*, from *zebra* + *donkey*. Also, many blends do have this sense relation between the elements – in *chunnel* and *dunnel* the head *tunnel* is modified by *channel* and *dome* respectively, in *motel* the *motor* describes the type of *hotel* and in *snurfing* the type of *surfing* is *snow surfing*.

It is, though, not usual to find other types of sense relations between the elements in blends. They can be synonyms (as in *guestimate* from *guess* + *estimate*), antonyms (the aforementioned *chaord*) or co-hyponyms (as are *labrador* and *poodle* in *labradoodle*). Thus, although a modifier-head relationship may be fairly common within blends, it is not criterial, whereas it seems that all but the exceptional clipping compound contains this manner of internal sense relation between the elements.

Perhaps, then, one factor that may help to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds could be whether or not the internal relationship between the elements is one of modifier-head − if it is then the form could be either a blend or a clipping compound but if it is not then the form is probably not a clipping compound.

The next factor, of whether or not the form is a reduction of a pre-existing form, is related to this.

3.3.2.3   Pre-existence of the source item as a phrase

Cannon (1987: 110) considers that what I have termed 'clipping compounds' fall within the scope of what he calls 'unabbreviated shortenings':

> Unabbreviated shortenings ... involve reduction of a source item to 1 or more of its parts, as opposed to sequential reducing of a compound to a letter word or syllable word.
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 110)

His unabbreviated shortenings, then, cover a range of what I see as different processes from clips to some blends, and include clipping compounds. What is essential under his definition is that a single pre-existing source item is reduced (as in *chunnel* from *channel tunnel* and *sitcom* from *situation comedy*), rather than two separate words being curtailed and compounded (as in *chaord*).

Algeo's (1991) stance is very similar to Cannon's. The only place in which Algeo (1991) deals with compounded clippings is under his heading of 'Clipping'. He makes no overt reference to the fact that some of his 'clippings' are compounds of initial splinters, some are initial splinters + terminal splinters and others are single items. For instance, *amtrac* from *amphibious tractor*, *blacketeer* from *black marketeer*, and *copter* from *helicopter* are all dealt with as the same kind of 'innovative clipping' (1991: 9). Obviously, I am only concerned with the 'reduction of a source item' into more than one of its parts in this discussion - such forms are often referred to as 'contractions' (see, for instance, Bolinger, 1965: 195).

It is likely that most clipping compounds have been formed by reducing a pre-existing source item. It makes sense that the terms *science-fiction* and *slow-motion* came before *sci-fi* and *slo-mo*.

However, this is also the case with some blends – as I have already stated, *channel tunnel* predates *chunnel* as a widely used term. Cannon (1987) considers that forms such as *chunnel* are not actually blends, and cites *prosage* as an unabbreviated shortening due to the pre-existence of the source item *protein sausage* (1987: 144).

Algeo (1991: 9) agrees, citing *blacketeer, bascart (basket cart)* and *computerate (computer literate)* as instances of clipping rather than blending. Although Algeo does not make explicit his reasons for this classification, it seems likely that the reason is because they appear to be contractions of pre-existing forms. However, I find Algeo's and Cannon's classifications to be problematic. To me, *prosage* clearly follows the same formation pattern as *varactor* (from *varying* + *reactor*), which Cannon cites as a blend (1986: 743). Both are composed of initial splinter + terminal splinter, neither have any graphic or phonic overlap and, if anything, *prosage* "sounds" more like a simple lexeme than *varactor*. Thus, I cannot accept that *prosage* is not a blend if *varactor* is. Indeed, in a subsequent work, Cannon (2000: 957) seems to rethink this stance himself, as he cites *chunnel* as an example of a blend in which 'the two words may be syntagmatically related, forming a compound'.

Even if reliable conclusions can be drawn on the pre-existence of a source item, classifying a word on the basis of this would been have implications on whether language can be dynamic. For instance, as discussed in section 2.1.3, *burger* was initially a splinter from *hamburger* and, thus, when *beefburger* was first coined it was a blend. However, as *burger* became frequently used and well known it became a combining form and, eventually a clip. A synchronic analysis of the formation pattern of the word *beefburger* would be as a compound. However, if words were to be classified on the basis of the motivation for their formation *beefburger* would still be seen as a blend, which seems unsatisfactory as a reflection of how ordinary users of the language are behaving.

As such, while it does seem likely that the majority of clipping compounds generally come from one pre-existing source item, this criterion should be treated with caution. It is hard to prove if the source words did exist as one item before the shortened form. Also, while it is probably less common for blends to come from a known pre-existing item than it is for clipping compounds, if blends are to be analysed on their formation patterns (as they are in this thesis) rather than on the basis of their motivation for formation, forms such as *computerate, blacketeer, bascart* and *prosage* must be analysed as blends and, thus, blends too can come from pre-existing phrases. Consequently, although whether or not a form appears to be a contraction of an existing source item may be a helpful point to consider, it cannot be seen as a fool-proof criterion.

3.3.2.4   "Initial clipping + initial clipping" versus "initial clipping + word"

Although Bauer (2002: 1635) defined clipping compounds as forms 'where <u>both</u> words of a phrase are back-clipped' [my emphasis], I tentatively described them as "a form composed of either 'initial clipping + initial clipping' or of 'initial clipping + word'" (see section 3.1, above). My reason for widening the scope of clipping compounds was to incorporate forms such as *opart* and *orgman* which, according to the suggested differentiating measures proposed so far, behave as clipping compounds in that they take on compound stress, have a modifier-head relationship and are very probably contractions of a pre-existing source item. However, the inclusion of initial

clipping + word forms as clipping compounds presents further problems when differentiating them from blends.

As this section has brought to light, there is a large area of overlap between blends and clipping compounds. Bauer (2002), who introduced the term, proposes a method of differentiating between the two forms:

> There is some evident resemblance between clippings and blends, but what distinguishes a blend from a clipping is that it always begins with the first part of the first source base and ends with the final part of the second.
>
> (Bauer, 2002: 1637)

This is not to say that Bauer does not believe that blends can include full words – his blends are sorted into: initial splinters + word (his type i); word + terminal splinters (type ii); initial splinter + terminal splinter (type iii), and; blends with overlapping central parts (type iv) (p. 1636[33]). This is because, when type i and ii blends do occur, they still begin 'with the first part of the first source base' and end 'with the final part of the second', in spite of the fact that one of the two bases remains intact – consider, for instance, his cited type [i] '*paratroops* (*parachute* + *troops*)' and type [ii] '*breathalyser* (*breath* + *analyser*).

Bauer's (2002) proposed means of differentiating between clipping compounds and blends, then, requires that clipping compounds are only composed of initial clippings.

---

[33] This is a summary of Bauer's blend types in my own words. I do not use his terminology.

(He does not make clear whether mid clippings[34], such as *tec* from *detective* (p. 1635), are possible components in clipping compounds). This, of course, reflects a change of opinion from his earlier work, when he observed 'clipped forms are also used in compounds, as in *opart* (< *optical art*) and *org-man* (< *organization man*)' (Bauer, 1983: 233), but it does make it far easier to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds.

However, although I acknowledge that a typical blend 'begins with the first part of the first source base and ends with the final part of the second', I do not agree that forms which do not fall within this criterion are necessarily exempt from blending. The afore-mentioned forms *chaord* and *dinter* include the ending of neither base but, because of the shared *o* in *chaord* and *int* in *dinter*, the two elements overlap and fuse. Indeed, this would be an example of Bauer's (2002: 1636) type iv blend where 'the central part is common to the two bases', which means that Bauer's own proposed measure to differentiate between blends and clipping compounds actually rules out something that he would call a blend.

Also, I find Bauer's (2002: 1635-37) implicit suggestion that an initial splinter + word form (his cited *paratroop*) should be analysed as a blend, but a form made up of two initial curtailments (his cited *elint*) should not, to be problematic. This is because, in order that two elements "blend" together, the focal point when considering whether or a not a word is a blend must necessarily be the point of fusion. In both *paratroop* and *elint* the first element loses the end of its source word in order to join with a complete

---

[34] Bauer (2002: 1635) uses the term *ambiclipping* to describe what I call midclippings. His label comes from the fact that *ambi* means "both" and in his *ambiclippings* both the beginning and end of the original base are clipped, leaving just the middle portion (hence my term 'mid splinter / clip')

beginning of another word. They, thus, have the same method of fusion. Therefore, while it may make sense to consider the character of the clippings throughout the entire form in clipping compounds, by the nature of blends it is only the point of fusion that can be criterial as to whether or not the final form should be analysed as a blend. This point will be further analysed below, but the relevance at this point is that I do not find Bauer's (2002) description of how blends are different from clipping compounds to be logical.

Another problem with Bauer's (2002) premise is that it also rules out infixed forms from the scope of blending, such as Lewis Carol's famous *slithy* (*slimy* + *lithe*) and Adams's (1973: P152) suggested *bushler* (*butler* + *usher*), as they do not begin with 'the first part of the first source base' and finish 'with the final part of the second' but, in fact, start and finish with the beginning and ending of the same base.

When all of this is taken along-side the fact mentioned above that *orgman* and *opart* fulfil the first three criteria discussed for clipping compounds, it is perhaps best to conclude that Bauer's (2002) suggested criterion is not a strong enough one to differentiate between clipping compounds and blends with any degree of certainty.

However, it is certainly true that most of the instances cited in literature, such as *sci-fi*, *hi-fi* and *sitcom*, and most of the examples that have intuitively struck me as less blend and more compound like, such as *romcom* and *flo-mo* (from *flowing motion*, as used in 'Empire' film magazine, February 2002), are composed of two initial splinters. Therefore, while a form composed of just initial splinters can be a blend, and a form composed of initial clipping + word can be a clipping compound, it is

perhaps typical that a form made up of two initial curtailments should be analysed as a clipping compound.

3.3.2.5   Internal rhyme

One obvious property of many of the clipping compounds cited is that the two curtailed elements often rhyme, for instance, *lit-crit*, *sci-fi*, *hi-fi*, *slo-mo*, *flo-mo* and *romcom*. Clearly, this is not the case in all of the clipping compounds, such as *sitcom* and *amtrac*, but it is a typical feature.

What is more, none of the blends I have come-across within the full course of my research have elements that entirely rhyme with each other, the nearest examples being *refujews* (from *refugees* + *jews*), where the final *u* of the initial splinter rhymes with the *jew* of the second element, and *nunsense* (from *nun* + *nonsense*), which, when pronounced in certain accents, is a near rhyme. Indeed, far more common is that one of the elements will rhyme with the part of the source word that has not been included in the final form from the other element. For instance, the second splinter in a blend sometimes rhymes with the discarded part of the first source word, as in *hesiflation* (cited by Cannon, 1986: 741) where the terminal splinter *flation* from the second source word *inflation* rhymes with the discarded *tation* from the first source word *hesitation*. Similarly, the first element (often, in such cases, a complete word) sometimes rhymes with the missing part of the second source word. These are pun blends, such as *sexcapades* (*sex* + *escapades*), *mootant* (*moo* + *mutant* – a "mutant cow") and *laardvark* (*lard* + *aardvark* – a "fat aardvark") and tend to include (either

graphic and phonic or just phonic) central overlaps, which actually separates them from clipping compounds and renders them as blends by definition.

As such, if a relevant form contains two elements that rhyme with each other it is almost a certain indication that the best analysis is as a clipping compound[35], and if it contains an element that rhymes with the missing part of the source word it is an almost certain indication that the best analysis is as a blend.

3.3.2.6   Transparency

As discussed in section 3.3.2.1, above, clipping compounds are essentially compounds and, as such, have fairly transparent meanings, which indicates that the original source words are easily accessible. Readers / hearers are either usually familiar with the forms because of widespread usage (as is the case with *sci-fi* and *slo-mo*) or can easily work out the etymology and, therefore, meanings of the components (as in *romcom* and *lit-crit*). Some forms are, of course, harder to unpick than others (for instance, *flo-mo*, from *flowing* motion, is less accessible than *psywar*, from *psychological warfare*) but, as a general rule, the etymology and meanings of clipping compounds are fairly transparent. This is, though, not always the case for blends.

Linguists cannot agree on whether the meaning of a typical blend should be easily accessible:

---

[35] Obviously, vice-versa does not apply – if the elements in a form do not rhyme this does not necessarily mean that the best analysis is as a blend.

The clearest examples of blends, however, are like the ones that Humpty Dumpty mentions, where the etymological route of the word is only clear when specifically explained.

(Bauer, 1983: 234)

Clearly, the major parts of the source words should be preserved. Nor should the blend be too unanalyzable, and/or its connotations be unknown to the speaker/writer... The original flash of wit or insight needs to be recapturable by a blend's new user, who needs to know how to spell and pronounce the blend.

(Cannon, 1986: 739)

Cannon's position seems to be the more appealing one as, in order for a blend to be effective, its meaning must be understandable, at least in context. The context, however, may provide the specific explanation to which Bauer refers, which means that blends, out of context, may or may not be transparent.

As a generalisation, blends which include complete words, be it as the first element (as in *breathalyser*), the last element (as in *Eurasia*) or as both, overlapping elements (as in *slanguage*) tend to be fairly transparent. Blends which are made up of two splinters, however, tend to be less accessible out of context – for instance, Bergstrom's (1906: 51) cited *argle* (from *argue* + *haggle*) and Cannon's (1986: 743) *varactor* (from *varying* + *reactor*). Hardest of all to understand are one syllable blends made up of two splinters, such as *smog* (*smoke* + *fog*), *spam* (*spiced ham*),

dawk (*dove* + *hawk*) and *preet* (*pretty* + *sweet*), which would not be analysable out of context or without prior knowledge of the forms.

Thus, transparency of etymology and meaning is another helpful measure in differentiating. If the meaning of a relevant form is clear and it is easy to trace back to its source elements it is perhaps more likely to be a clipping compound – especially if it is a form composed solely of curtailments. This, however, is possibly the least certain factor analysed yet, though, so must be taken alongside all of the other factors.

3.3.2.7 Number of syllables

The above discussion of the blends *smog*, *spam*, *preet* and *dawk* highlights a further difference between blends and clipping compounds – clipping compounds cannot be only one syllable (or they would not be compounds!)

All of the clear cut examples cited of compounded curtailments (*sci-fi*, *sitcom*, *slo-mo*, *hi-fi*, etc.) have two syllables.

However, some compounded initial curtailment forms do have three syllables, such as *biopic* (*biographical picture*), *pokemon* (*pocket monster*) and *aldehyde* (*alcohol* + *dehydrogenatum*). I have also come across relevant forms with more than three syllables, including *animagi* (from *animal* + *magic*, in *Harry Potter and The Prisoner of Azkaban*) and *coamoxiclav* (from *combination* + *amoxycillin* + *clavinic acid*). All of these three+ syllable forms, though, when analysed in light of the above factors,

perhaps are more blend-like and are certainly less clear examples of clipping compounds.

Consequently, the number of syllables within a relevant form is a fairly reliable indicator of whether a form is a clipping compound or not – if the form has two syllables it could be either a blend or a clipping compound, if the form has more than two syllables it is very unlikely that the best analysis is as a clipping compound and if the form has one syllable then it is not a clipping compound.

3.3.2.8   Clippings as the complete first syllable from the source words

One last apparent aspect of typical clipping compounds is that, generally, both of the elements in the finalised form are the complete first syllables of the source words – for instance, *sitcom* comprises the intact initial syllables *sit* from *situation* and *com* from *comedy* (cf. also *romcom, flo-mo, amtrac, lit-crit* etc.). It is worth noting that this factor is not actually a more specific form of factor four as a form does not have to be composed of two initial clippings in order to be made up of two complete first syllables from the source words. For instance, *orgman* fulfils this criterion as *man* is the complete first syllable of *man*, whereas it is not characterised as typical in light of factor four as it is not composed of two initial clippings.

While blends can also follow this pattern of fusing two intact syllables from the source word (for instance *liger*, from *lion* + *tiger*, and *galumph*, from *gallop* +

triumph), it is almost always a joining of an initial splinter with a terminal splinter, rather than two initial curtailments. Of course, the main reason that there is no clear cut example of a blend without overlapping elements being composed of two initial syllables is that such forms are the borderline blend / clipping compound forms that I am discussing in this section. This, then, is a somewhat circular argument which draws on a characteristic description to become criterial and then feedback into the definition. As such, to claim that a blend cannot be composed of two complete initial syllables from the source words as these forms must be clipping compounds would be to resolve the issue by definition rather than argument and, as the above analyses have brought to light, the area of clipping compounds is not clear-cut enough for this to be a satisfactory resolution. Still, it is very probably the severing of both clippings at the first syllabic junctures that actually leads to the feeling that curtailment + curtailment forms such as *romcom* and *lit-crit* are different to blends such as *liger* and *gallumph*. Consequently, whether or not a form is composed of two curtailed and compounded initial whole syllables from the source words must be a good indicator that the best analysis is as a clipping compound.

This, though, does not characterise all clipping compounds. The first syllable of *fiction* is *fic*, rather than the *fi* that appears in *sci-fi*, and while the *fi* of *hi-fi* remains orthographically intact as the first syllable of *fidelity*, it undergoes a phonetic change when it enters the form *hi-fi* (as, indeed, does the *fi* in *sci-fi*). Similarly, if the form *zedonk*, from *zebra* + *donkey*, were to have been made up of two compounded entire first syllable clippings from the source words it would have been *zebdonk* instead.

Thus, although the prototypical clipping compound may be said to comprise two compounded whole first syllables from the source words (and, therefore, the prototypical blend does not), clipping compounds do not always follow this pattern. Again, then, this is a feature to look out for but cannot be said to be criterial and must be taken alongside all of the other factors.

3.3.3 A conclusion regarding the factors that may help to separate blends from clipping compounds

I have concluded that none of the above eight factors were reliable enough indicators on their own to supply a certain means of differentiating between blends and clipping compounds in every case. However, when taken together they provide a more accurate picture. The more of the factors that characterise each form, the more likely it is that the form should be best analysed as a clipping compound.

For ease of reference, below is a brief recap of the eight factors worth considering when deciding how best to classify a form between being a blend or a clipping compound:

Factor 1:   does the form have compound stress patterns?

Factor 2:   does the form display a modifier head relationship between the elements?

Factor 3:   does the form have source words that comprise a pre-existing compound or phrase?

Factor 4:   is the form made up of two initial curtailments?

Factor 5:   is the form composed of elements that rhyme with each other?

Factor 6:   Do the elements within the form have transparent etymologies and meanings?

Factor 7:   Does the form have two syllables?

Factor 8:   Is the form made up of two compounded complete first syllables from the source words?

Of course, it is necessary to note that it is difficult to be certain with factor 3, and factors 1 and 6 can be, to an extent, subjective. Also, as concluded within the discussion of factor 5, if a form contains an element that rhymes with the missing part of the source word then the best analysis is as a blend. Therefore, such forms would not be eligible for consideration as clipping compounds and so this facette of factor 5 does not need to be analysed alongside the other factors.

The table below contains my analysis of ten of the forms up for consideration against the eight factors, plus three blends (*chunnel, ausform* and *banoffee*) in order to provide a point of comparison:

Table 2 : Borderline forms tested against differentiating factors between blends and clipping compounds

Borderline form	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Total
lit-crit	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
slo-mo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes	Yes	7.5
Sitcom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
sci-fi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
Amtrac	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Maybe	Yes	Yes	6.5
Mobus	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes[36]	6
Opart	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	5
Biopic	Maybe	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Maybe	No	No	3
Elint	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	3
Chunnel	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	3
Zedonk	No	No	No	Yes	No	Maybe	Yes	No	2.5
Ausform	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	2
Banoffee	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0

The above table, then reflects a cline from the prototypical clipping compound, *lit-crit* (which came out as a clipping compound according to all eight criteria, as would *romcom*) to forms such as *biopic*, *elint*[37] and *zedonk*, which are probably best analysed as straightforward blends. Indeed, one of the control blends, *chunnel*, came out with the same score as *elint* and *biopic* and had a higher total than *zedonk*, which further indicates that forms characterised by less than half of the discussed factors are probably best analysed as blends. The forms that have totals of around 5 and 6 are

---

[36] Although this is only true synchronically. When Bergstrom cited it as a blend in 1906, *bus* was not a well-used word in its own right but rather a terminal splinter from *omnibus*.

[37] I am aware of the irony of the fact that, in spite of adopting Bauer's (2002: 1635) term *clipping compound*, I have now dismissed both his stated examples, *elint* and *kidvid*, from the scope of clipping compounds!

clearly in the middle of the grey area between clipping compounds and blends, and it is perhaps telling that these forms are the initial curtailment + word forms that I included in my table analysis.

Thus, while I have not been able to come up with one set criterion that definitively separates blends from clipping compound, if a borderline form is subjected to an analysis with regard to the above eight factors it is likely that a best classification will become apparent.

However, while a cline, rather than two distinct areas with a clear cut-off point, is, perhaps, inevitable when trying to differentiate between certain areas of word formation, it is not the ideal solution. This, taken alongside the fact that while it may make sense to consider the character of the clippings throughout the entire form in clipping compounds, by the nature of blends it is only the point of fusion that can be criterial as to whether or not the final form should be analysed as a blend, raises a further question. While I do believe that clipping compounds are a viable class of word formation (as I have managed to find characteristic differences that separate them from typical blends) are they best analysed, in fact, as a subset of blends?

3.4   Clipping compounds as a sub-set of blends

Introducing subsets into blending which are removed from the prototypical blend is not new. Most linguists agree that infixed forms such as *slithy* (from *slimy* + *lithe*), *ambisextrous* (from *ambidextrous* + *sex*) and *bushler* (from *butler* + *usher*) belong

within the remit of blending. Some linguists also cite examples of blends that come from more than two source elements, such as Adams's (1973: 159) *Everscepistic* from *Everest + sceptic + septic + pistic* and Cannon's (1986: 738) *synopticon* from *synopsis + topic + lexicon* – although these are unusual and often feel artificial or forced. However, three+ source blends are viable and, although they are not typical, I do accept them as a part of blending (see section 4.5.5 in the next chapter). Still, while it is generally agreed that infix and three+ source forms are a part of blending, most linguists do not allow for them in their definition of blending. Bauer's (2002: 1637) premise that a blend 'begins with the first part of the first source base and ends with the final part of the second' is an example of this.

To get around this, many linguists (including myself) regard infix blends and three+ source blends as sub-sets of blends, which are possible but not prototypical. I propose that clipping compounds are another such subset.

This is an appealing solution as, in spite of the characteristic differences discussed above, the one set criterion that would definitively separate blends from clipping compounds remains elusive, unlike with phonesthemes, clips and compounds. This is because clipping compounds fulfil the criterion for blending, identified in section 1.6.

A blend occurs when two (or possibly more) elements "blend" together, so that at the point(s) of fusion something is either lost from at least one source element, or shared by both.

As mentioned above, it is the point of fusion of the elements that is at the heart of blending. Although clipping compounds may not overlap, the point of fusion between clipping compounds and blends with non-overlapping elements is identical. Thus, while *romcom* may seem less "blendlike" than *banoffee*, there is nothing to suggest that they are not formed by the same process of word formation – especially when *biopic* and *elint* are compared with the blend *ausform* (*austenitic* + *deform*).

3.5 Separating blends and clipping compounds – a conclusion

Clipping compounds, then, cannot be definitively separated from blends because they are formed by the same process. However, prototypical clipping compounds and blends can be differentiated by using the eight factors explained above. This is not, though, entirely satisfactory because it is difficult to differentiate between less prototypical forms, due to the fact that they are on a cline. With this in mind, the best conclusion is that there is a set of words, labelled 'clipping compounds', that are characterised by the above eight factors, but that these forms are, in fact, members of a sub-set of blends.

I do not, however, include many examples of clipping compounds within the corpora of blends presented in this thesis. This is solely because I arrived at the conclusion that they were a part of blending late in my research and, as such, have not been noting examples of them throughout the duration of my studies.

Chapter 4:

Separating blends from acronyms

Acronyms have much in common with clipping compounds as they are both made up of compounded initial parts of words. Having examined the similarities and differences between clipping compounds and blends it makes sense to go on to analyse the relationship between blends and acronyms.

4.1 Defining acronyms

As with most labels in word formation, the term 'acronym' is used by different linguists to cover a range of disparate formations. Most linguists, though, are agreed on the features of the prototypical acronym:

4.1.1 Prototypical acronyms

Most definitions of acronyms within linguistic literature are similar:

> An **acronym** is a word coined by taking the initial letters of the words in a title or phrase and using them as a new word, for example *Strategic Arms Limitation Talks* gives *SALT*.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 237)

> Something of an extreme in such reduction processes is represented by the creation of ACRONYMS, in which a word is derived from the initial letters of a whole phrase. Examples of this include *radar* (from *Radio Detection And*

Ranging), laser (from *Light Amplification by the Stimulated Emission of Radiation), NATO* (from *North Atlantic Treaty Organisation), WASP* (from *White Anglo-Saxon Protestant*) and *AIDS* (from *Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*).

(Trask, 1994: 22)

These definitions are helpful as they go some way towards describing the prototypical acronym, exemplified by *SALT, NATO* and *AIDS*.

However, as is the case with some of Trask's cited examples, such definitions are too simplistic to describe all acronyms. Points not covered in the above definitions include the fact that non-lexical words from the source phrase such as *and* and *on* are sometimes included in the acronym (as in Trask's cited *radar*) and sometimes left out (as in *ASH* from *Action on Smoking and Health*, also cited by Trask, 1994: 22). Similarly, both initial letters in a hyphenated word can be utilised (as in *WASP*) or the second one can be ignored (as in *BASIC* from *Beginners' All-purpose Symbolic Instruction Code*, again cited by Trask, 1994: 22). All of these features, which are common within acronymy but are not typical of the blending process, will be discussed in more detail below.

Crucially for this thesis, though, is the fact that some acronyms can draw upon more than just the initial letters of their source words in their construction. Adams (2001: 141-142) points out that acronyms 'may include other than initial letters to make them more word-like: *radar* 'radio detecting and ranging''. Formations such as this are unpredictable because the amount of each source word retained or omitted is not

constant between forms. Such words, unlike the other acronyms cited above, are not so much incompletely characterised by most linguistic definitions of acronymy as incorrectly described, because they do not only draw upon initial letters. Consequently, such words should not be seen as prototypical acronyms but, rather, forms which blur the borders between the respective territories of blending and acronymy, which will be explored at more length below.

One factor that is common to all of the above examples is that they are pronounced as words. Cannon (2000: 957) labels such acronyms as 'orthoepic, or letter sounding'.

The prototypical acronym, then, is orthoepic, is composed of the initial letters from a longer source phrase, can be written in capital letters, can omit initial letters belonging to non-lexical words from the acronym and can take one or both initial letters from hyphenated words to be included in the final form.

4.1.2 Alphabetic acronyms

As Cannon (2000: 957) highlighted, though, there is another type of form regularly discussed within the boundaries of acronymy, that is composed of initial letters but is not orthoepic. This is often referred to as an 'initialism' (Bauer, 1983: 233) or as an 'alphabetic acronym' (Cannon, 2000: 957). Examples of such alphabetisms include *RAF* from *Royal Air Force* and *RSPCA* from *The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*.

Linguistic opinion seems to be split as to whether or not initialisms (or 'alphabetisms', Algeo, 1991: 9) are a part of acronymy. Some linguists deal with alphabetisms and acronymy separately:

> ... to be an acronym the new word must not be pronounced as a series of letters, but as a word.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 237)

> acronyms ... are pronounced as words rather than as sequences of letters
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 105)

Adams (2001:141), conversely, regards alphabetisms as being within the scope of acronymy, stating that acronyms 'may be pronounced as a series of letters' or 'as words'. It seems likely that the way most users of the language regard acronyms supports Adams's position – the now widely used form *TLA* actually stands for 'three letter acronym'[38], thus implicitly accepting that initialisms can be acronyms.

In contrast to his 1987 stance, Cannon (2000) agrees that alphabetic and orthoepic acronyms are the same. He explains his reasoning:

> Some scholars classify the first of these as an **initialism**, reserving the term *acronym* only for the orthoepic type (e.g. Bauer 1983: 233). **However, the two types are not separate;** some shortened forms have a pronunciation which combines alphabetic pronunciation with orthoepic rules ...

---

[38] *TLA* appears six times in the independent corpus (in October 1988, April 1994, March 1998, March 1999 and twice in September 1999), I noted an example of it in the Sunday Times (26/08/01), and it is used frequently to refer to 'acronym overload' in educational circles.

Furthermore, one entity can be labelled with both [orthoepic and alphabetic] kinds of acronyms.

(Cannon, 2000: 957, emphasis in original)

Cannon cites *jeep* from *GP* 'General Purpose' as combining alphabetic and orthoepic pronunciation and *AWOL* as an example of an acronym which can be pronounced either as a series of letters or orthoepically[39].

Cannon's (2000) reasoning explains his change of opinion and seems sound. However, the only real overlap between blends and acronyms involves orthoepic acronyms. This is because only orthoepic pronunciation requires the extra sounds which are acquired from the inclusion of the extra letters from contributing words, and this is the source of the overlap between the two processes. (Blends that draw upon acronyms as a source element and acronyms which include blends are possible but non-problematic exceptions to this, as discussed in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 below). Thus, while I do not rule out alphabetisms from the scope of acronymy, the only acronyms relevant in this comparison with blended forms are orthoepic ones.

4.1.3　　Acronyms drawing on more than just initial letters

As mentioned above, although it may not be a prototypical feature, some acronyms draw upon more than just the initial letters of their source words. Indeed, Bauer (1983) states that this is not an infrequent occurrence:

---

[39] *UFO* and *OAP* are two further examples of acronyms which I have heard pronounced both alphabetically and orthoepically.

... common is the case where more than one letter is taken from the beginning

of one or more of the words in the phrase which is the base of the acronym

(Bauer, 1983: 238)

One form which draws upon more than one letter from the source words is what

Aronoff (1976: 20) refers to as '*syllable words*'. Cannon (2000: 957) expands upon

this notion, stating 'one form of orthoepic acronym is made by combining initial

syllables of the constituent lexemes' and cites *Navregs* from *Naval Regulations*

(2000: 957), *VOLAR* from *Volunteer Army* (1987: 108) and *comint* from

communications intelligence (1986: 731) as examples of such acronyms. However, as

discussed in the previous chapter, under the system of analysis put forward in this

thesis, these forms would be analysed as clipping compounds rather than acronyms

(see also section 4.5.4. below).

Forms which draw on more than just initial letters from at least some of their source

words, but that are not 'syllable words', do, though, present problems for

classification. Such forms include the afore-mentioned *radar* (*radio detecting and*

ranging), *ofsted* (*office for standards in education*), *Creep* and *Fin-Creep* ([*Financial*]

Committee to Re-Elect the President, both cited by Algeo, 1991: 9). Acronyms are

often formed in this way because the source words are regularly manipulated so that

the final form is as effective as possible:

In order to create an acronym which is not only pronounceable but euphonious or suggestive of some other meaning, the letters of the source form are sometimes chosen at will and vowel letters may be added

(Cannon, 2000: 958)

Because of this manipulation, the formation of acronyms which draw upon more than just initial letters is unpredictable. It is this unpredictability that renders attempts to describe their formation process, and to separate this process from that of blending, as challenging. This, then, brings us to the next area for analysis – the overlap between acronyms and blends.

4.2   Overlapping areas between blends and acronyms

There are several overlapping areas between blending and acronymy, and some are much simpler to clarify than others. The first area is when a blend includes an acronym.

4.2.1   Blends which contain acronyms

Although it does not seem to be a common phenomenon, some blends within the corpus presented in this thesis contain an acronym as one of their source elements. These acronyms can be either orthoepic, as in *gaydar*, from *gay + radar* (which appears in the Independent corpus), alphabetic, as in *o-a-ensioners*, from *oap +*

pensioners (cited by Bergstrom, 1906: 59) or can be pronounceable as either a series

of letters or a word, as in *ufocals*, from *ufo* + *focals* (also from the Independent

corpus).

These forms are not problematic and should be analysed simply as blends which draw

upon acronyms as one of their source elements.

4.2.2   Acronyms which contain blends

I have found no examples of acronyms which include a blend as one of their source

words. However, this type of formation is theoretically possible as blends, once

created, may act as any other simplex lexeme. Therefore, it would not be surprising

to find acronyms such as *chasa* from *chunnel health and safety association* or *BPAP*

from '*Banoffee Pie Appreciation Party*' in the future!

4.2.3   Acronyms including clippings of more than one letter

The most problematic overlapping area between blends and acronyms occurs when

acronyms include several letters or whole syllables from one or more of their source

words. This is because such forms blur the distinction between acronyms and blends:

In some cases it may no longer be clear whether the new word is an acronym

or a blend: consider, for example, *linac* (LINear ACcelerator). It is certainly

unusual for blends to use the beginnings of the two words which are to be blended, but it cannot be ruled out as impossible.

<div align="right">(Bauer, 1983: 238)</div>

Of course, blends which 'use the beginnings' of their source elements <u>have</u> been accepted as possible within this thesis, and generally fall under the subcategory 'clipping compounds'. Indeed, Bauer's example *linac* would be best classified as a clipping compound, as it is characterised by five of the eight 'clipping compound' factors (see section 3.3.3). Thus, it would seem that the actual grey area is between acronyms and the blending sub-category clipping compounds. As a result of this, suggested measures to differentiate between acronyms and more prototypical blends become unhelpful.

For instance, Cannon (2000) suggests that there are two essential differences between acronymy and blending. The first is that 'blending almost always combines the initial portion of one source item with the terminal portion of the second source item' (pp 952-953) whereas 'an acronym is always formed from the initial elements of its constituents' (p 957). The second is that in a blend 'the two words may be syntagmatically related, forming a compound' (he cites *chunnel*) 'or paradigmatically related items which are in opposition' (he cites *brunch*), whereas in an acronym 'constituents are always syntagmatically related' (p957). However, as the overlap in question is between acronyms and the blend sub-set clipping compounds, these differences are not helpful because clipping compounds are also formed from the initial elements of their constituents and are usually syntagmatically related.

When analysing the overlap between blends and clipping compounds the solution proposed was that clipping compounds actually belong within the scope of blending, as a subset of blends. This, then, leads to a question of whether acronyms are best regarded as an extreme type of clipping compounds and, thus, still within the scope of blending.

4.3   Do acronyms belong within the scope of blending?

A few linguists do regard acronymy as belonging within the scope of blending:

> Another method, popular at present in coining trade names is the formation of a new name from initials, as "Sebco" extension drills, made by the Star Expansion and Bolt Company... Possibly this method may be viewed as blending in an extreme form.
>
> (Pound, 1914: 10)

> The very large and productive class of acronyms belongs [as a] subclass of blends.
>
> (Algeo, 1977: 50)

The logic and appeal of this suggestion is clear. Blends and acronyms are both formed from compounded non-meaning bearing letters or letter clusters from two or more source words. Thus, if acronyms, like clipping compounds, can be regarded as the result of an extreme form of blending the problem of separating the two processes

is not a relevant one. Most linguists, though, do not regard this as a satisfactory solution as the method of formation of the prototypical blend (e.g. *banoffee*) and the prototypical acronym (e.g. *AIDS*) seem too far removed from each other to be classified as the same process. Indeed, in his more recent works, Algeo (1991: 9) changes his mind from his 1977 position and no longer deals with acronymy as a part of blending but as a method of 'shortening' in its own right.

However, the fact that most linguists do not deal with blends and acronyms as the same thing is not a sufficient reason to deem them as different processes of word formation. Indeed, most linguists do not consider clipping compounds to be blends either, whereas I do regard them to be products of essentially the same process. Conversely, many linguists do deal with acronyms and clippings (and, therefore, clipping compounds) together (cf. Adams, 2001: 141, Cannon, 2000: 956 and Algeo, 1991: 9). All this, again, presents the question that if clipping compounds are to be regarded as blends then is it not best to consider acronyms as such also?

The problem with an affirmative answer to this is that prototypical blends (*banoffee*) and clipping compounds (*romcom*) seem to have far more in common with each other than do prototypical clipping compounds (*romcom*) and prototypical acronyms (*AIDS*). This is because there are two major differences between blends (including clipping compounds) and acronyms. The first is that blends are transparent (at least in context) whereas the etymology of acronyms cannot be understood without the aid of a specific explanation. Related to this is the second major difference – the clippings within acronyms do not have the 'special relationship of meaning' with their source words that is so central to the splinters within blends. While both blends and

acronyms draw upon non-meaning bearing parts of words in their formation (e.g. *ban* from *banana* and *offee* from *toffee* in the blend *banoffee* and *A* from *acquired*, *I* from *immune*, *D* from *deficiency* and *S* from *syndrome* in the acronym *AIDS*), in blends these non-morph splinters become imbued with the meaning of their source word and take it with them into a new form. Acronyms, however, include none of the meanings of the words from which they take their letters – hence, the lack of transparency. Instead, the retained letters just stand for their source word in a new label (as in *AIDS*), rather than retaining or putting across the meaning of that word. Because of these differences, acronymy cannot be regarded as belonging within the scope of blending.

4.4   Two essential differences between acronyms and blends

The above discussion lead to the conclusion that there are two essential differences which separate acronyms from blends. The first is that, unlike blends, the components of acronyms do not retain a special relationship of meaning with their original source word. Consequently, a hearer / reader cannot unpick the meaning of an acronym without the aid of either a specific explanation or prior knowledge because of the lack of this special relationship. This results in the second essential difference between blends and acronyms which is that acronyms are not transparent, even in context, whereas for a blend to be effective it is essential that the hearer / reader must be able to access the source words in order to understand the meaning. Because of these key differences acronyms cannot be regarded as a type of blend, but must be seen as the result of a separate process.

Indeed, as well as these two essential differences between blends and acronyms there are a variety of characteristic factors which help to further separate the two processes. It may be helpful to regard the already discussed lack of a special relationship with the source word and lack of transparency as the primary differences and the further characteristics as secondary differences. I will now briefly discuss these secondary differences, which typify acronyms but are not common within blends.

4.5 Secondary factors which help to separate acronyms from blends

4.5.1 Word stress

As discussed above in sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.3, the overlap between blends and acronyms is more specifically between orthoepic acronyms and the blend sub-set clipping compounds. It was concluded in the previous chapter that one of the ways in which clipping compounds are different from prototypical blends is that they take compound stress; for example, *sitcom*, *sci-fi* and *litcrit*. Orthoepic acronyms, however, are pronounced as single words and, like prototypical blends, have simple word stress; for example, *NATO*, *Aids* and *radar*.

Thus, in spite of the fact that prototypical blends have single word stress, if a borderline blend / acronym is pronounced with single word stress it is likely that the

best analysis is as an acronym. Conversely, if the form is pronounced with compound stress then the best analysis is probably as a clipping compound and, therefore, as a blend.

4.5.2   Orthographic representation

One separating factor that has been apparent through the orthographic representation of the cited acronyms within this chapter is that it is common for acronyms to be written with capital letters. Cannon (1987: 109) states that 'all-capital acronyms' are common. Indeed, of the eleven straight forward acronyms quoted from the literature so far in this chapter, seven were represented as all capital acronyms by the linguist that cited them (*SALT, NATO, WASP, AIDS, ASH, BASIC* and *AWOL*), as opposed to only two written entirely in lower case (*radar* and *laser*). This would seem to support Cannon's opinion of acronyms:

> Most are all-capital and abbreviate only the first letter of each key word in the full form.
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 151)

There is, though, a further typical orthographic representation of acronyms, which is when the first letter is written as a capital and the rest are lower case. This method accounts clearly for *Creep*, one of the remaining two cited examples, and has a clear influence on the last instance *Fin-Creep* ([*Financial*] *Committee to Re-Elect the President*, both cited by Algeo, 1991: 9). Indeed, the data from the Independent

Newspaper corpus indicates that it is common for acronyms to be written with a capital initial letter. For instance, the acronym *Aids* appears 22,529 times written with only a capital *A*, which is a far greater number of instances than the equivalent 641 occurrences of the all capital *AIDS*. The corresponding lower case *aids* does not occur at all (perhaps in order to avoid confusion with the plural of *aid*). The corpus reveals a similar phenomenon for the acronym *Nato*. The all capital version occurs 808 times, which is far more often than the all lower case variant which only has seven entries. However, *Nato* with only an initial capital occurs 28,451 times in the corpus.

This initial letter capitalising is not always the most common pattern, though. The all capital *AWOL* occurs in the corpus 182 times, which is more than its equivalents *Awol*, with 56 entries, and *awol*, with only 14 entries. Conversely, *radar* and *laser* occur by far the most in the all lower case variant, with 3678 and 2720 entries respectively, compared to 313 and 635 instances for their initial capital and 37 and 58 occurrences respectively for the all capital equivalents. One explanation that could, perhaps, account for the differences in the orthographic representation of acronyms with regard to capital letters is the degree of assimilation of the word into the language. If a word is clearly an acronym, as in *AWOL*, it is most often written in capitals to provide the reader with a clue that the capitalised letters are taken from source words. This is why alphabetic acronyms, such as *RAF* and *RSPCA*[40], are almost always written entirely in capitals. However, when an acronym becomes frequently used within the language and the meaning of the acronym is familiar to the reader without necessary reference to the source words, as in *Aids* and *Nato* (and

---

[40] *RAF* appears 10,621 times in its all capital form, compared to 54 entries for *Raf* and only 1 for *raf*. Similarly, *RSPCA* occurs 1963 times in the corpus, whereas the all lower case and initial capital equivalents appear just once each.

perhaps, more recently, *Sars*), it ceases to be most frequently written as an all capital acronym. However, an initial capital remains to remind the reader that it is an acronym and, as such, is not the same as a simplex lexeme. The next step, as exemplified by the most typical orthographic representations of *radar* and *laser*, is when the acronym is not marked out as different by the use of any capital letters. This occurs when the acronym has become entirely assimilated into the language as a simplex lexeme to the extent that many users do not regard the form as any different to a 'normal' word. For instance, when asked to explain what a *laser* or *radar* is, the majority of people (including myself) would not resort to listing the source words – indeed, most users of the language who know perfectly well what *lasers* and *radars* are cannot actually identify the source words.

Most acronyms, however, never move far enough away from their etymology to be assimilated into the language as a simplex lexeme so it is common for the orthographic representation of acronyms to involves capital letters, be it throughout the acronym or as an initial letter. This, however, is not at all a usual feature of either blends or clipping compounds[41]. As such, if a borderline form is written either in all capitals or with an initial capital letter then the best analysis is probably as an acronym.

It is necessary to highlight the fact that, obviously, this is only a graphic difference and will not help hearers to distinguish between blends and acronyms.

---

[41] Unless, of course, the blend or clipping compound is at the beginning of a sentence.

4.5.3   Composition of initial letters

Cannon's (1987: 151) above cited characterisation of acronyms involved not only them being mainly 'all-capital' but also that they 'abbreviate only the first letter of each key word in the full form.' Clearly, this is true of the prototypical acronym (see 4.1.1 above) but the borderline forms relevant in this chapter are the ones which do not fall neatly into this characterisation. However, this is still a relevant factor as although a formation may draw upon more than all initial letters from its source words, if the form is composed of mainly initial letters then the best analysis is probably as an acronym. For instance, *radar*, from <u>ra</u>dio <u>d</u>etection <u>a</u>nd <u>r</u>anging, utilises an *a* which is not an initial letter, but four out of the five letters do come from the first letters of the source words so *radar* is best classified as an acronym.

Within my whole corpus of 1150 blends (including clipping compounds) presented in this thesis (see appendix 1), I have not found any clear cut example of a single letter splinter. This is because blends have to be transparent, at least in context, and one letter is not enough to communicate the source word to the reader / hearer. Thus, even if one or more of the source words are represented in the final form by more than just the first letter, if a word is composed of mainly initial letters then the best analysis is as an acronym.

4.5.4　Complete syllables

The above section concluded that acronyms are made up of mainly single, initial letters from source words, which means that it is not usual for acronyms to include complete syllables. Conversely, as discussed in the previous chapter, the blend sub-set clipping compounds (such as *romcom*, *amtrac* and *slo-mo*) are generally composed of entire syllables from the source words.

Algeo (1991) agrees with this distinction. On the topic of the difference between acronyms and clippings (in which he includes what I have labelled clipping compounds) he states:

> If a word is made up chiefly from syllables or groups of letters, it would usually be called a clipping. Acronyms are clippings in which most of the parts are reduced to single letters. A form like *loran* 'long-range navigation' is often called an acronym, but it is close to a form like *sitcom* 'situation comedy', which is usually called a clipping.
>
> (Algeo, 1991: 9)

Algeo's stated *loran* illustrates that the distinction between clipping compounds and acronyms can be a hazy one. However, if the distinction is made between Algeo's suggested 'syllables' and 'groups of letters', then it becomes easier to draw a boundary between acronyms and clipping compounds. The clipping compound *sitcom* is clearly composed of entire syllables from both source words. However, *loran* does not draw upon any complete syllables but rather the initial letter of the

116

final word and the first two letters from each of the first two words[42] – which must be the 'groups of letters' to which Algeo refers. It has already been accepted that acronyms can and do draw upon two consecutive letters from source words rather than just initial letters (e.g. *radar*, from _ra_dio _de_tecting _a_nd _ra_nging, and *Creep*, from _C_ommittee to _Re_-_E_lect the _P_resident). Thus, if acronyms can be seen as drawing upon 'groups of letters' but not entire syllables the distinction becomes more clear.

This is not to say, however, that acronyms never include entire syllables. *Fin-Creep*, from _Fin_ancial _C_ommittee to _Re_-_E_lect the _P_resident, has already been cited as an acronym (Algeo, 1991: 9) and includes the complete graphic syllable *fin* from *financial*. However, *Fin-Creep* does not exclude itself from Algeo's characterisation of an acronym as it is not 'chiefly' composed of syllables and 'most of the parts' (just) are 'reduced to single letters'. Because of this, *Fin-Creep* could certainly not be classified as a clipping compound. Still, the analysis of *Fin-Creep* as an acronym is an uneasy one and will be returned to in section 4.7 below.

Overall, if a word is composed of mainly complete syllables the best analysis is as a clipping compound, and therefore as a blend, rather than as an acronym. However, such a distinction raises questions about the best classification of formations composed of complete syllables from more than two source words, which is the subject of the next section.

---

[42] Another way of viewing the composition of *loran* is that the '*ran*' is taken entirely from '*ranging*'. This does not seem as likely as it would mean that the final word, '*navigation*' is not represented at all. However, even if '*ran*' is analysed as belonging entirely to '*ranging*' it is still not a clear cut example of a complete syllable as the phonetic pronunciation of the first syllable of '*ranging*' is '*rain*' rather than '*ran*'.

4.5.5   More than two source words

One further obvious difference between all of the acronyms and clipping compounds cited so far is that the clipping compounds have only had two source words whereas the acronyms have had three or more. This, then, points towards a clear cut separating factor – that blends and clipping compounds have two source elements and acronyms have at least three. However, this may be a little too simplistic. It has already been concluded in the previous section that, while occasionally it may be possible for acronyms to draw upon complete syllables, they cannot be composed entirely of syllables from their source words. This means that a formation such as Adams's (1973: 137) cited *tacsatcom*, from *tactical* + *satellite* + *communications*, could not be classified as an acronym in spite of the fact that it has more than two source words. Could it, though, be classified as a blend?

The fact that blends can have more than two source words has already been mentioned (see 3.4 and 4.4). Such forms are certainly not usual – indeed, Cannon (1986: 745) hypothesises that 'the three source blend may not be viable today' – but they are possible. As such, it is feasible that the best classification of a form such as Adams's *tacsatcom* is as a blend made up of three elements. This is, in fact, how Adams herself classifies it (1973:137).

Of course, under my system of classification, if *tacsatcom* were to be classified as a blend it would be under the sub-set of clipping compounds. This does seem to be rather a convincing classification as *tacsatcom* fulfils four of the eight clipping compound criteria as put forward in section 4.3.3 of the last chapter: It has compound

stress patterns; it displays a modifier head relationship between the elements; it has

source words that comprise a pre-existing compound or phrase and the elements

within the form have reasonably transparent etymologies. *Tacsatcom* does not fulfil a

further two of the factors only because it has three source elements rather than two,

but it is made up of initial curtailments and all of these curtailments are complete first

syllables from the source words. Thus, if three+ source forms are to be allowed

within the scope of clipping compounds, *tacsatcom* fulfils six of the eight criteria[43],

falling short only on factor 5 (is the form composed of elements that rhyme with each

other?) and factor 7 (does the form have two syllables?)

Indeed, the classification of *tacsatcom* as a clipping compound rather than as an

acronym is called for in light of the two essential differences between blending and

acronymy: *Tacsatcom* would be regarded by most users of the language, in most

natural contexts, as reasonably transparent. This is because the three curtailments do

retain a 'special relationship of meaning' with their source words; the remaining

letters do more than stand for their source word in a new label – they actually

communicate the meanings of their source words. As such, *tacsatcom* must be

labelled as a clipping compound and, thus, formations with more than two source

words are not necessarily acronyms and can in fact be blends.

The acceptance of forms made up of more than three elements into the scope of

blending does, then, seem necessary. However, this serves to further blur the

boundary between blending and acronymy rather than to clear it up. Pound (1914)

---

[43] The criteria for clipping compounds does not require re-writing in order to account for three+ source clipping compounds as the factors characterise prototypical clipping compounds, which only have two elements. However, it is necessary that those particular factors be overlooked when the form in question has more than two elements or else the factors would become a matter of arbitrary definition rather than reason.

who, as discussed in section 4.3, regards the whole of acronymy as an extreme method of blending, cites several three+ element forms which are very difficult to classify. *Yomarco*, from *young married couples* (p15), *Marenisco*, from *Mary Relief Niles Scott* (p15), and *Nabisco*, from *National Biscuit Company* (p19), are perhaps more acronym-like than blend-like. None of them are transparent and the curtailments do not obviously retain a special relationship of meaning with their source words (although this is less clear cut with *Yomarco* and *Nabisco* than with *Marenisco*). All take single word stress and are cited by Pound as being written with an initial capital letter. However, not one of the three involve solely an initial letter from any of their source words and all include a complete syllable from a source word, so they are by no means typical acronyms.

Pound also cites *Solsuanna* (p15), from *Sol*, *Susan* and *Leanna*, and *Frolaset* (p19), from *front-laced corset*, which are examples of a different kind of formation again. In these forms, the final elements are terminal curtailments rather than initial curtailments so the second and third elements really do blend (*suanna* and *laset*). This means that the final formations appear as compounds of either a word + a blend (*Solsuanna*) or a clipping + a blend (*frolaset*) and, thus, do not fall entirely within the scope of either acronyms or blends.

The problematic nature of the classification of such forms will be returned to in section 4.7, but it is sufficient to note at this point that, while it is usual for clipping compounds to be made up of two elements and for acronyms to be composed of more than three, this is not always the case. There are several different types of formation which are composed from three or more source elements that do not fall neatly within

the scope of acronymy, so characterising all forms composed of three or more elements as acronyms is far from fool-proof.

4.5.6   Resemblance to pre-existing words

It has already been established that one of the primary differences between blends and acronyms is that acronyms are not transparent. However, there are instances when acronyms are, in Adams's (2001: 142) words, 'devised to be semantically indicative of the referent of the longer form'. Trask (1994) gives examples of such acronyms and comments on the wide-spread nature of this trend:

> Nowadays the coining of acronyms is practically an industry: no new organisation can be named, no new technical term can be created, unless an appealing acronym is instantly available. Hence we have the computer language *BASIC* (from *Beginners' All-purpose Symbolic Instruction Code*, a name laboriously constructed to provide the required acronym), *ASH* (*Action on Smoking and Health*), *ASLEF* (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) and *ORACLE* (*Optional Reception of Announcements by Coded Line Electronics*), among very many others.
>
> (Trask, 1994: 22)

This does not render the acronyms transparent, however, and the identity of each of their source words remains elusive without the aid of an accompanying explanation.

It is just that, in such acronyms, the final form is contrived to have certain connotations:

> The antismoking and antipollution organisation *GASP* illustrates the kind of
> name that is selected because of its predetermined impact on the hearer/reader,
> even before the supposed source-words are chosen.
>
> (Cannon, 1987: 107)

This trend is not usual in blending as it can lead to misunderstandings. In Bauer's (1983: 234) discussion of possible phonetic blends from the source words *dove* and *hawk*, he rules out *duck* and *hook* 'as real possibilities because of blocking'. Bergstrom (1906: 15) does note an example of a blend resembling a pre-existing word (*contract* from *concrete* + *abstract*), but explains that this is not a general occurrence:

> The resulting word may, though rarely, *formally coincide with another*
> *previously existing word of quite different meaning*
>
> (Bergstrom, 1906: 28, emphasis in original)

The cited *contract*, however, is not really an example of the phenomenon being discussed here as, although *contract* is a pre-existing word, its connotations are clearly not being drawn upon in the blend of the source words *concrete* and *abstract*.

I have, though, found a small number of blends in which the resulting form seems to have been chosen because it is the same as a previously existing word. For instance, the fact that the Prince Regent's pet name for the eponymous character in the third

series of *Black Adder* is *Bladder* has clearly been contrived for comedic purposes. Similarly, the blend *SerVe*, from *Serena* + *Venus*, has clearly been chosen as the name of the branded bottled water marketed by the Williams sisters for its tennis connotations. However, contrived blends of this type seem to be unusual and still seem to be essentially different to contrived acronyms. This is because the source words in such acronyms appear to be, in Trask's (1994: 22) words, 'laboriously constructed to provide the required acronym'. Cannon agrees, and draws attention to not only the manipulation of the source words but also of the included and excluded letters:

In order to create an acronym which is not only pronounceable but euphonious or suggestive of some other meaning, the letters of the source form are sometimes chosen at will and vowel letters may be added.

(Cannon, 2000: 958)

However, in blends such as *Bladder* and *SerVe*, no such "laborious construction" is necessary and the fact that the given source words could result in a relevant pre-existing word seems to be a happy co-incidence. For instance, the term *Black Adder* pre-dates the pet name *Bladder* by two whole series and, presumably, *Serena* and *Venus* were not so named in order to provide a handy brand label! As such, while blends can occasionally take the same form as relevant pre-existing words, they do not appear to require the same degree of manipulation as the equivalent acronyms and, consequently, do not seem as contrived. Also, it should be re-stated that it is very rare for a blend to have the same form as a pre-existing word and even less usual for that word to have relevant connotations for the resulting blend – indeed, *Bladder*

and *SerVe* are the only two clear examples of this phenomenon within blending that I have come across.

Therefore, it can be concluded that a manipulation of the source words to provide an evocative pre-existing word as the final form is a factor that is fairly common within acronymy but not at all usual within blending.

The next factor to be discussed is related to this phenomenon, and helps to further differentiate acronyms such as *ASH, ASLEF* and *ORACLE* from blends.

4.5.7   Inclusion of letters from all source words

The fact that acronyms, such as Trask's (1994: 22) cited '*ASH* (*Action on Smoking and Health*), *ASLEF* (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) and *ORACLE* (*Optional Reception of Announcements by Coded Line Electronics*)', do not always include letters from non-lexical words has already been briefly discussed (see section 4.1.1 and 4.5.1). Bauer (1983) comments on this phenomenon and suggests a reason for it:

> ...the phrase from which the acronym is taken is treated with a certain amount of freedom to permit the acronym to arise... It seems that the interests of the acronym are the deciding factor in what the "initial letters" of the phrase will be taken to include.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 237)

124

The result of this is that, often, source words are not represented in the final acronym at all. This is a fairly common phenomenon within acronymy but is not at all typical in blending. Indeed, throughout my research I have found no clear cut examples of a blend or even a clipping compound in which a source word is not represented in the final form.

This, then, seems to be a fairly simple separating factor. However, forms that do not include letters from entire words do exist which are neither clear cut examples of acronyms or blends (including clipping compounds), but rather seem in a grey area between the two. The '*Of* ' words, such as *Ofsted* (from *Office for standards in education*) and *Offer* (from *Office for electricity regulation*) are examples of such forms. The next section will analyse these forms in some detail with regard to all of the discussed primary and secondary separating factors.

4.6   The '*Of*' forms – grey area case analyses

'*Of* ' words are becoming increasingly common in the English language. In addition to *Ofsted* and *Offer*, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* (1999) cites *Ofgas* (*office of gas supply*), *Oftel* (*Office of telecommunications*) and *Ofwat* (*Office of water services*). Additionally, *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words* (1997) includes *Ofbank* (*Office for the regulation of banking*), *Ofrail* (*Office of the railway regulator*) and *Oflot* (*Office for the regulation of the National Lottery*). Other than *Oflot*, all of these forms appear in the Independent Newspaper corpus, as does *Ofmilk* (which is not cited in

any of the dictionaries consulted). The token frequency of these forms vary greatly, from *Ofbank* with four tokens and *Ofmilk* with six to *Oftel* and *Ofgas*, with 2865 and 1832 tokens respectively. Thus, because, there are several different '*Of*' forms and because some of these have a high token frequency, the '*Of*' forms have become familiar to contemporary users of the language.

It is difficult to judge whether such forms are best analysed as acronyms or blends. Forms such as *Ofsted* and *Offer* seem to be characterised by many of the factors of acronymy discussed, whereas *Oftel*, *Oflot* and *Ofgas* seem to have more in common with the clipping compounds discussed in the last chapter. It does not, though, seem satisfactory to conclude that in some cases '*Of*' is an initial splinter in a blended form whereas in other parallel cases it is a non-meaning bearing acronym element when it is formed in the same way and used to mean the same thing.

Possibly because of the familiarity of the '*Of*' formations, examining these words in the light of the two essential differences discussed in 4.4 is a difficult task. '*Of*' always stands for the same word, *office*, so it is easy for readers / hearers to unpick the meaning of many of the '*Of*' forms through accessing the source words. This is especially true when the '*Of*' is attached to an entire word, such as *gas* or *bank*, or to a transparent complete syllable initial clipping, such as *lot*. It is, however, arguable that the transparency of '*Of*' is a direct result of the frequency with which it is synchronically used in English and that readers/hearers can access the meaning because, over time, they have learned it rather than that they have been able to unpick it either through a specific context or because of '*Of*' having that 'special relationship of meaning' with its source word that is so central to blends. Indeed, it is doubtful

whether there is actually such a special relationship of meaning between the '*Of*' of

such forms and the source word *office* because '*Of*' does not merely stand for 'a place

of work' but rather 'a regulatory body'. As such, it is difficult to be sure whether the

'*Of*' words are best analysed as acronyms or not with regard to the primary

differences between acronymy and blending.

With regard to the first discussed secondary factor of single word stress, different '*Of*'

forms are pronounced differently. *Ofsted* and *Offer* take single word stress, whereas

Oflot, *Oftel*, *Ofgas*, *Ofwat*, *Ofrail*, *Ofbank* and *Ofmilk* are better characterised as

taking compound stress. This indicates that *Offer* and *Ofsted* are best analysed as

acronyms and the rest as clipping compounds. However, with regard to a propensity

to include capitals in the orthographic form, all are best analysed as acronyms. Only

ofsted, *oftel* and *ofrail* appear at all in the Independent corpus written entirely in small

case letters, with three, one and one token(s) respectively, compared to 14, 66 and 1

token(s) respectively for the all capital equivalents and 1470, 2798 and 15 tokens

respectively for the forms written with an initial capital letter. All of the forms (other

than *Oflot*, which does not appear in the corpus at all) are written most often by far

with an initial capital letter, and appear more frequently written entirely in capitals

than without any capitals.

Only *Offer* is characterised by the third factor common to acronyms, which is that

they are composed primarily of just initial letters from the source words. Indeed, all

of the other '*Of*' forms do not include a single initial letter. All do, however, include

an entire first syllable, which is the fourth secondary factor, as *Of* is the first syllable

of *office*. Indeed, every form other than *Ofsted and Offer* is composed of two

complete initial syllables (even when the initial syllable is the complete word, as is the case with *milk*, *gas* and *bank*). Similarly, only *Ofsted* and *Offer* have more than two source elements, which is the fifth factor typical of acronyms, whereas the other forms have only two, which is typical of clipping compounds. None of the '*Of*' forms are contrived to resemble pre-existing words, which is the sixth factor. According to these factors, then, most of the '*Of*' forms are best characterised as clipping compounds. However, with regard to the seventh factor, not one of the '*Of*' forms include letters from all of the source words, which make them appear more acronym than blend like.

Thus, when examined in light of the two primary separating factors it is difficult to decide whether the '*Of*' forms are transparent and have a special relationship of meaning with their source words. When analysed with reference to the seven secondary factors, *Offer* is best characterised as an acronym in light of five of them, *Ofsted* by four of them and all other forms by two factors. This then points to two distinct possibilities. The first is the already discussed possibility that in the cases of *Offer* and *Ofsted* '*Of*' is a non-meaning bearing acronym element, whereas in the other forms '*Of*' is an initial splinter, in spite of the fact that it is formed in the same way and used to mean the same thing. The other possibility is that these forms, along with some of the more problematic forms already discussed, do not quite belong within the scope of either blending or acronymy, but are in an as of yet un-named, indistinct area which draws upon both of these, and other word formation processes.

4.7   Non-specifically abbreviated compounds

Most borderline acronym blend forms can be reliably classified when examined in light of the two essential separating factors detailed in 4.4 above, and if this does not make clear a best classification the form can be further analysed with reference to the seven secondary factors. Occasionally, however, a best classification will still not be apparent after an analysis has been undertaken in light of all the above factors, as is the case with the '*Of*' forms. When this occurs, it is possible that the form in question should not be analysed as either a blend or an acronym but rather as a non-specifically abbreviated compound.

The majority of the borderline blend forms discussed so far in this thesis (with the exception of straightforward clips and compounds) can be described as falling under the heading 'abbreviated compounds' as they all involve shortened elements being stuck together. When the best classification for a form is clear, e.g. blend, acronym, clipping compound or compounded phonesthemes, the method of abbreviation is apparent and specific. However, when a shortening has taken place that is difficult to classify, or when several different types of shortening have taken place in the same form, the resulting formation could be labelled as a non-specifically abbreviated compound. This would have the effect of providing a label for the miscellaneous shortened and compounded forms that do not fall neatly within the pre-established areas and would, thus, prevent, keen linguists from over or under stretching boundaries in order to simplify their own theories of word formation.

With this in mind, forms such as the aforementioned *Fin-Creep*, *Solsuanna* and *Frolaset*, as well as the '*Of*' words, are perhaps best classified as non-specifically abbreviated compounds. Further examples of formations that belong in this area include *abzyme*, from *antibody* + *enzyme*, as cited in the Oxford Dictionary of New Words (1997), and *Cablinasian*, from *Caucasian* + *Black* + *Indian* + *Asian*, as coined by golfer Tiger Woods to describe his ethnicity (cited by Metcalf, 2001).

The inclusion of the area of non-specifically abbreviated compounds, alongside the more traditional specific classifications, should ensure that not only all of the borderline blend-acronym forms but also all of the "almost but not quite" blended forms can be classified without having to "bend them" in order to fit them into a synchronic description of English word formation.

Chapter 5:

Separating splinters from combining forms

Most of the areas of word formation examined so far have displayed an overlap with the blending process. However, the remainder of this thesis is not just concerned with merely separating entire blends from the products of distinct word formation processes. Instead, the focus falls on differentiating the splinters within blends from other bound forms – specifically combining forms and affixes – as well as with differentiating blends from words containing these bound elements.

This chapter will focus specifically on the relationship between splinters and combining forms. However, before it is possible to analyse the similarities and differences between splinters and combining forms, it is necessary to define combining forms.

5.1   What are combining forms?

Bauer (1983) provides a definition of combining forms:

> There are a number of elements in English Word Formation which, while they function as affixes in some places, appear to be distinct from affixes in other facets of their behaviour. These elements, usually Greek or Latin in origin, are what the *OED* terms **combining forms**. Examples are *astro-*, *electro-*, *hydro-*, *-crat*, *-naut*, *-phile*, *-phobe* and so on.

> (Bauer, 1983: 213, emphasis in original)

There is, however, some dissension in the literature as to whether final elements such as *-crat* and *-phobe* can be described as combining forms. Whilst many linguists (including Adams, 1973, Bauer, 1983, 1998a and Warren 1990) believe that combining forms can be either initial or terminal, Warren (1990: 112) points out that some (e.g. Quirk et al 1985 and Hansen et al 1985) 'claim that combining forms are almost obligatorily initial'. This seems to be a strange stance as both initial and final combining forms display the same characteristics, both in terms of etymology and usage (as outlined below). In light of this, the definition of *combining forms* in this study will extend to cover terminal elements, such as *-phobe* and *-phile*, as well as initial elements, such as *astro-* and *electro-*.

Bauer (1983: 213) goes on to discuss the characteristic usage of combining forms. He notes that 'they are sometimes added to lexemes just like any other affix' and cites *musical* (which is made up of lexeme + affix) and *musicology* (lexeme + combining form) as cases in point. However, he states that these elements cannot be analysed as affixes as that 'line of argument leads to the embarrassing conclusion that there are lexemes made up of a prefix and a suffix with no root; these are words like *biocrat*, *electrophile*, *galvanoscope*, *homophile*, *protogen*.' As will be discussed in section 5.6.1, affixes only attach to free-standing lexemes and not to other affixes, which means that these combining forms display behaviour which separates them from affixes.

Furthermore, combining forms cannot be analysed as simplex lexemes as they do not function as stand alone words:

The... elements we are concerned with here are not free standing elements of English.

(Bauer 1998a: 410)

The result of this is the conclusion that, as Lehrer (1995: 135) puts it, 'combining forms are bound, but they are stem-like'. These characteristics of combining forms render them problematic for the linguist seeking a consistent and comprehensive theory of word formation:

Combining forms are morphemes of a rather specific kind. Being neither proper roots, nor proper affixes, they upset the morphologists' neat subdivision of morphemes into roots and affixes.

(Warren, 1990: 112)

Combining forms, then, are elements used in English word formation that are bound, but are not affixes, and are stem-like, but are not free-standing. Bauer (1983), though, does not see that this has to be problematic and suggests that, rather than deciding how best to fit combining forms into the 'neat' root-affix subdivision theory of word formation, they should be recognised and analysed with regard to their etymology:

My own preferred solution is to accept these combining forms for what they are etymologically: elements of the classical languages which are used in English word-formation.

(Bauer, 1983: 216)

When combining forms are used in English word formation, the resulting word is often referred to as a neo-classical compound. Indeed, often linguists deal with combining forms under the heading of 'neo-classical compounds' (cf. Adams, 1973, and Bauer, 1983), rather than giving them a section in their own right. Thus, in order to answer the posed question as to what combining forms are, it is first necessary to examine the area of neo-classical compounding.

5.1.1   What are neo classical compounds?

Neo-classical compounds are typically composed of an initial combining form, such as *micro-* or *tele-*, and a final combining form, such as *-scope* or *-phone*, which make up neo-classical compounds, such as *microscope, telescope, microphone* and *telephone*. Bauer (1983: 216) explains that neo-classical compounds draw upon 'elements of the classical languages which are used in English word-formation' and elucidates:

> It is because these elements are put together by speakers of English that it is possible for coiners to mix Greek and Latin as in *television*. Hence it is that

such words are termed not 'classical compounds', but **neo-classical compounds**.

Words such as *television* and the previously cited forms *telescope, microscope, telephone* and *microphone*, then, are all straightforward examples of neo-classical compounds. However, while such forms may act as a prototype of a neo-classical compound, as Bauer (1998a) points out, not all words that include combining forms are quite as easy to categorise:

Rather than having a clearly defined set of neoclassical compounds, it seems that neoclassical compounding acts as some kind of prototype, from which actual forms may diverge in unpredictable ways.

(Bauer, 1998a: 409)

One of the unpredictable divergences concerns the nature of the elements to which the combining forms attach. Linguists cannot agree as to whether the term should be reserved for words formed exclusively from an initial combining form and a final combining form, such as *microscope* and *telephone*, or whether it can be extended to a lexeme made up of a word and a combining form, such as *bio-science* and *megacity* (cited by Bauer, 1983: 216). For instance, Bauer (1983) shies away from using the term 'neo-classical compound' to refer to words such as *megacity*, whereas Adams (1973: 129) explains that neo-classical compounds can be words 'in which the first

element is a combining form and the second a full English word' (or vice versa). She cites *pornojournalism* as such a form.

It is difficult to decide which of these two positions is the more appealing. The standpoint that neo-classical compounds must be composed of two combining forms leads to uncertainty regarding how best to classify lexeme + combining form types. Conversely, if neo-classical compounds can include elements which are not neo-classical combining forms, such as free standing English lexemes, then the resultant form cannot really be seen as being a compound of neo-classical elements, but rather a compound including a neo-classical element!

For ease of reference, I shall continue to refer to lexemes which include combining forms as neo-classical compounds, regardless of whether it is made up of two combining forms or a combining form and a free-standing lexeme. I do, however, recognise the distinction between these two types and am not entirely comfortable with them sharing the same label.

There is another fundamental problem with the term *neo-classical compound*, even when referring to words composed of an initial combining form and a final combining form. This difficulty comes from the fact that many linguists believe that some combining forms do not have their etymology from within the classical languages and, therefore, cannot be said to be neo-classical.

5.1.2 Do combining forms have to come from the classical languages?

Almost all of the examples of combining forms cited in the literature and, indeed, in this discussion so far, are classical in origin. This is because, as Warren (1990: 113) states in her discussion of combining forms, 'typically they are neo-classical'. However, most modern linguists agree that not all elements considered as combining forms come from Greek or Latin:

> Although some scholars and dictionaries refer to these as neo-classical compounds, since they are most often based on Latin or Greek forms, combining forms are common with non-classical morphemes as well, such as -*scape*, e.g. *moonscape*.
>
> (Lehrer, 1995: 135)

This is not an unusual standpoint. Warren (1990: 129) also gives examples of non-classical combining forms, including -*(a)holic* and -*(a)thon* (which will be discussed at more length in chapter 7). Indeed, the *Complete Oxford English Dictionary* (Second Edition: 1994) includes combining forms that are not classical in origin, and agrees with Lehrer and Warren that -*athon* should be analysed as a combining form. It therefore seems that combining forms are typically classical in origin, but are generally regarded as not being exclusively so.

Again, for ease of reference in this discussion I will continue to refer to words containing combining forms as neo-classical compounds for the time being, regardless of whether the combining forms have classical origins. I am, however, not comfortable with the term *neo-classical compound* being used to refer to words which do not contain a classical combining form, as will be discussed further below, in section 5.3.5.

5.1.3. Conclusions on the characteristics, origins and usage of combining forms in English word formation

Having reviewed descriptions of combining forms in the literature, examined both the way they function in word formation and the terminology used to describe the resulting words and having discussed their origins, it is possible, at this point, for me to give a tentative description of combining forms and their functions in English word formation: They are always bound forms which are used in combination either with each other or with free-standing lexemes. They generally come from Greek or Latin, but many linguists believe that modern combining forms exist also. Words including combining forms are often referred to as neo-classical compounds, in spite of the fact that frequently only one (or neither) of the elements in the final compound is classical in origin.

This description encapsulates current views of the nature and characteristics of combining forms. It does not, though, help to clarify precisely what should and should not be termed as a combining form or neo-classical compound and, as such,

does not seem adequate. Warren (1990) encountered similar problems during her more in-depth discussion of combining forms, and summarises:

> It is obvious from this survey that there are certain word components which linguists intuitively feel are neither affixes nor roots. It is also obvious that there is as yet no uniform terminology for these elements, nor any generally valid description of them. For example, some linguists insist on their classical origin; others include in the category native morphemes too; some emphasize the ability of these word components to occur in words without proper roots; others ignore this interesting aspect of their character.
>
> (Warren, 1990: 115)

Like Warren, I feel that contemporary descriptions of combining forms (including my own) provoke as many questions as they answer. This is because, if combining forms can join with free-standing lexemes as well as other combining forms, and if they are not to be classified solely on the basis of their etymologies, differentiating between neo-classical compounds and products of other types of word formation becomes problematic. Bauer (1998a: 403-404) shares this 'unease' concerning the 'analysis of neoclassical compounds', and asserts that 'neoclassical compounding is not a well-defined category' as it 'has a fuzzy boundary'.

The hazy boundary between neo-classical compounding and other word formation processes can be highlighted through a consideration of the terminal strings -aholic and -athon. As discussed above, Warren (1990) and Lehrer (1995) consider both to be combining forms, whereas Cannon (1986) and Quinion (1996) agree that the best

analysis of both strings is as suffixes. Even more confusingly, the *OED* regards -*athon* as a combining form but simultaneously classifies -*aholic* as a suffix. It is thus difficult to be sure whether the best analysis of words such as *swimathon* and *workaholic* are as neo-classical compounds or as derivations. Similarly, if combining forms do not have to be classical in origin, then what actually is the difference between compounds and neo-classical compounds? Consequently, then, it is necessary to explore how best to differentiate words including combining forms from other processes of word formation and, most specifically, from compounds and derivations.

5.2 How can words including combining forms be differentiated from the products of other processes of word formation?

In that this whole thesis is concerned with separating blending from other processes of word formation, and in that this chapter has a specific focus on differentiating between splinters and combining forms, it seems strange to become concerned with how neo-classical compounds are different from compounds and derivations. However, it is not possible to examine specific overlaps between blends and words containing combining forms until such words have been differentiated from the more dominant and productive processes of compounding and derivation, for it is these two processes that neo-classical compounding is regarded as having the most in common with:

This type [neo-classical compounding] is claimed to show behaviour that

makes it clearly distinct from both affixation and compounding. A close examination of actual words suggests that this picture is oversimplified.

(Bauer, 1998a: 403)

As such, it is necessary to examine the similarities and differences between neo-classical compounds and both derivations and general compounds, and to see what influence the similarities brought to light have on the overlap between neo-classical compounding and blending. Of these two areas, it is less problematic to differentiate between general compounding and neo-classical compounding and, thus, I will deal with this first.

5.2.1 Differentiating compounded combining forms from general compounds

As said in sections 5.1 and 5.1.1 above, combining forms are often compounded together to form a word. As a result of this, Lehrer (1995: 135) concludes that combining forms, like general free-standing lexemes, are 'stem-like'. Of course, when two stems are joined together to make a new word, the result would generally be analysed as a compound, which is why there is an overlap between general and neo-classical compounding. Bauer (1998a) agrees that there is a case for dealing with neo-classical compounds as general compounds because of this 'stem-like' quality, and points out that combining forms are imbued with a level of meaning that is more common to words than to the other main bound form type of affixes:

The argument for calling them compounds is that in... (neoclassical) words, such as *sociology*, the *soci(o)-* element is treated as a stem, not as a prefix [and] that the element *socio-* has a semantic value or density more similar to that of lexemes than to that of many prefixes

(Bauer, 1998a: 407)

However, in spite of these similarities, Bauer (1998a) sticks to his original premise; that while there is a definite similarity between the two processes, there are essential differences:

[Neo-classical compounds] differ from native compounds (a) in having a linking element of a kind that is not found in native compounds and (b) in using stems from classical languages rather than stems from English

(Bauer, 1998a: 406)

In addition to these two distinctions, Bauer's (1983) definition of compounding also highlights a third, and a perhaps more crucial difference:

Compounding, or composition, is, roughly speaking, the process of putting two **words** together to form a third.

(Bauer, 1983: 11, my emphasis)

As exemplified by Bauer's definition, it is generally agreed that both of the elements that make up a compound should be analysable as free-standing 'words' in their own right. Conversely, as discussed in section 5.1 above, combining forms are bound

elements. They cannot be used as stand-alone lexemes and are therefore not analysable as 'words'. This means that compounded combining forms, or even instances made up of a combining form and a word, are definitively different from conventional compounds and can easily be separated from them through the application of the following rule: If a word is not made up of two elements that function as free standing lexemes, then it is not a compound.

Differentiating between compounds and neo-classical compounds, then, can be resolved as a matter of definition. However, separating combining forms and affixes, which is the subject of the next section, is not as straightforward.

5.2.2 Differentiating combining forms from affixes [44]

In general, the characteristics of combining forms which separate them from affixes are the same ones which suggest to linguists that words containing combining forms could be classified as compounds. For instance, Bauer (1998a: 407) claims that combining forms have 'a semantic value or density more similar to that of lexemes than to that of many prefixes'. However, the fact that Bauer qualifies this statement with the word 'many' intimates that some affixes cannot be separated from combining forms with reference to this factor. Indeed, he is more explicit about this fact in his 1983 work when he states that *hyper-* (which he cites as a combining form) and *super-* (which he cites as a prefix) have the same semantic value, and concludes 'it is

---

[44] Due to the logical flow of the analysis in this thesis, it has been necessary to present this section on combining forms before the section on affixes. This causes obvious problems as I am here discussing differentiating factors between combining forms and affixes before I have defined an affix. At this stage I can only apologise, hope the reader can follow my line of reasoning and refer the reader forward, if necessary, to the next chapter for my characterisation of affixes and of derivations.

clear that this distinction in terms of semantic density is no more than a tendency' (1983: 125). This, along with the fact that, as Bauer (1998a: 420) himself points out in an endnote, semantic value 'is not... a measurable concept', means that level of semantic density is not really satisfactory as a separating factor.

The other factors that are claimed to separate combining forms from derivational affixes are that combining forms are stem-like and can attach to other combining forms whereas affixes only attach to free-standing lexemes. However, because combining forms can also attach to free-standing lexemes this is not an entirely clear cut method for differentiating them from affixes.

Indeed, most linguists do have problems separating combining forms from affixes, and there is certainly dissention within the literature as to how best to classify individual forms. For instance, Marchand (1969), Cannon (1986) and Quinion (1996) all cite *-(a)thon* as a suffix, and Soudek (1978), Kolin (1979) and Bauer (1983) similarly discuss *-(a)holic* as a suffix, whereas, as discussed above, Lehrer (1995) and Warren (1990) both classify *-(a)thon* and *-(a)holic* as combining forms. In fact, this trend is not confined merely to non-classical combining forms. Trask (1994) cites *mega-* as a prefix, whereas Adams (1973), Bauer (1983) and Warren (1990) all analyse *mega-* as a combining form. Furthermore, while Marchand (1969) and Adams (1973) deal with *pseudo-* as a combining element, Bauer and Renouf (2001) cite *pseudo-* as a prefix, and its absence from Warren's (1990) list of combining forms is notable.

Lehrer (1995:135) points out that in many cases even dictionaries do not agree as to whether a form is best classified as a combining form or an affix. Certainly, a cursory examination of contemporary dictionaries reveals this to be the case, with *meta-*, *retro-* and *super-* being listed in the Concise Oxford English Dictionary (1999) as combining forms and in the Collins English Dictionary (1994) as prefixes. Perhaps more interestingly still is the case of the contrasting analyses of *-thon* and *-athon* within the same dictionary. The Complete Oxford English Dictionary (Second Edition, 1994) defines:

-athon: a combining form, barbarously extracted from marathon, used occasionally in the U.S. (talkathon, walkathon) rarely in Britain, to form words denoting something carried on for an abnormal length of time.

However, the same dictionary gives *-thon* a separate entry, and changes its classification:

-thon, suffix. Var. *-athon*

This case highlights how arbitrary the analysis of any give form as either an affix or combining form can be.

Lehrer (1995: 135) also highlights the fact that many dictionaries include 'prefixes of Latin and Greek origin'. Forms classified in this way in both the Oxford and Collins dictionaries include *extra-*, *trans-* and *ante-* (from Latin) and *hyper-* and *hypo-* (from

Greek). Thus, even a classical etymology is not enough to ensure a classification as a combining form.

This survey, then, highlights how difficult it is to differentiate between combining forms and affixes. However, it is not possible to ignore the category of combining forms as they do display behaviour that marks them out as distinct from affixes. They do have 'stem-like' qualities and, referring back to Bauer's (1983: 213) point discussed in section 5.1 above, combining forms cannot be analysed as affixes as that 'line of argument leads to the embarrassing conclusion that there are lexemes made up of a prefix and a suffix with no root; these are words like *biocrat, electrophile, galvanoscope, homophile, protogen.*'

In conclusion, then, while words including combining forms have characteristics in common with both compounds and derivations, it is easy to separate compounding from (what is generally referred to as) neo-classical compounding. However, in spite of the fact that combining forms and affixes have qualities that render them distinct elements, on an individual basis it is not always possible to decide indisputably on the best possible analysis.

It is clear that further, in-depth work needs to be carried out in order to provide a clear picture of the similarities and differences between combining forms and other processes of word formation, much in the manner that this thesis is attempting to separate out blending. However, for the sake of this study, while I accept that combining forms are an element in their own right I am unable to differentiate unequivocally between them and affixes. Consequently, many of the points I make in

the remainder of this study about the similarities and differences between affixes and splinters apply also to the relationship between combining forms and splinters. Where it is necessary to label an individual bound element as either a combining form or an affix, I follow the analysis in the Oxford English Dictionary, although I am aware of the fallibility of such analyses.

However, before I turn to analysing the similarities and differences between splinters and affixes, there are some areas of overlap specific to combining forms and splinters that should be highlighted.

5.3 Areas of overlap between blends and neo-classical compounds and between combining forms and splinters

The first area to be commented on is, perhaps, better described as an area of influence of neo-classical compounds on blends, rather than one of overlap, and concerns the combining vowel typical in compounded combining forms.

5.3.1 Blends containing elements fused with a combining vowel

One of Bauer's (1998a: 406) cited differences between neo-classical and native compounds, as discussed in section 5.2.1, is that neo-classical compounds have 'a

linking element of a kind that is not found in native compounds'. This 'linking element' is a vowel which combines the two elements. The most typical combining vowel is *o*, but any vowel or phonological element which works as a vowel, including *er* (as in Bauer's (1983: 214) cited *sniperscope*), can function in this way.

It is, perhaps, necessary to briefly discuss the status of this combining element. Bauer (1998a: 406) identifies a problem regarding 'how best to analyse the linking *-o-* in words like *photograph.*' He suggests 4 possibilities; a) 'it is viewed as a linking element'; b) 'it is viewed as part of the first element, on the grounds that when the first element is attached to lexemes, it takes the *-o-* with it (*photoluminescence*)'; c) 'it is viewed as part of the second element, on the grounds that when the second element is attached to lexemes, it takes the *-o-* with it' (*phraseograph*), and; d) 'it belongs both to the initial and final elements (as in [b] and [c]), and the sequence of *-oo-* is morphophonemically simplified to a single *-o-*'. He does not 'solve this problem', but does point out:

> Of these (c) is perhaps the least likely, but while (a) is the point of view usually taken by lexicographers, (b) appears to commend itself to native intuitions, in the sense that clippings invariably keep the *-o-*, for instance (*photo*).
>
> (Bauer, 1998a: 406)

My preferred position is that the solution is best regarded as a compromise between (a) and (b). This would allow for the opinion that often the initial element does terminate in a vowel, but when this is not the case a linking vowel is introduced to

help the word flow. If this solution is accepted then different analyses of linking

elements for words including the same combining form would be acceptable. For

instance, the combining vowels in the following *-scope* words should all be analysed

differently; in *telescope* the combining *e* should be regarded as belonging to the first

element *tele-*, in *sniperscope* the terminal *er* of the first word acts as the combining

vowel and in *biographoscope*[45] the medial *o* does not seem to belong to either element

and is merely a linking element included for the sake of euphony.

Because combining vowels do enable elements to flow into each other when creating

words, it is unsurprising that they have been adopted in some blends. Adams (1973:

151) observes that the shape of many blends 'are reminiscent of the neo-classical type

of compound', citing *escalift* (from *escalator + lift*), *medicare* (from *medical + care*),

ruddervator (from *rudder + elevator*) and *breathalyser* (from *breath + analyser*) as

cases in point. When analysing such blends she concludes:

> All echo the stem + vowel + stem pattern of neo-classical compounds, which
>
> is perhaps becoming established as a preferred shape for neologisms.

(Adams, 1973: 151)

Undeniably, Adams's cited blends are reminiscent of the shape of neo-classical

compounds, and it is possible that their formation was influenced by neo-classical

compounding. However, in all of her four cited examples the linking vowel can be

analysed as belonging to one of the splinters: The *a* in *escalift* can be analysed as the

terminal *a* of the splinter *esca-* from *escalator*; the linking *i* in *medicare* is the last

---

[45] cited by Adams (1973: 188)

help the word flow. If this solution is accepted then different analyses of linking elements for words including the same combining form would be acceptable. For instance, the combining vowels in the following -*scope* words should all be analysed differently; in *telescope* the combining *e* should be regarded as belonging to the first element *tele-*, in *sniperscope* the terminal *er* of the first word acts as the combining vowel and in *biographoscope*[45] the medial *o* does not seem to belong to either element and is merely a linking element included for the sake of euphony.

Because combining vowels do enable elements to flow into each other when creating words, it is unsurprising that they have been adopted in some blends. Adams (1973: 151) observes that the shape of many blends 'are reminiscent of the neo-classical type of compound', citing *escalift* (from *escalator + lift*), *medicare* (from *medical + care*), *ruddervator* (from *rudder + elevator*) and *breathalyser* (from *breath + analyser*) as cases in point. When analysing such blends she concludes:

> All echo the stem + vowel + stem pattern of neo-classical compounds, which is perhaps becoming established as a preferred shape for neologisms.
>
> (Adams, 1973: 151)

Undeniably, Adams's cited blends are reminiscent of the shape of neo-classical compounds, and it is possible that their formation was influenced by neo-classical compounding. However, in all of her four cited examples the linking vowel can be analysed as belonging to one of the splinters: The *a* in *escalift* can be analysed as the terminal *a* of the splinter *esca-* from *escalator*; the linking *i* in *medicare* is the last

---

[45] cited by Adams (1973: 188)

letter of the splinter *medi-* from *medical*; the *er* which acts as the combining vowel in *ruddervator* belongs to the first word *rudder* and the linking *a* in *breathalyser* is the first letter of the final splinter *-alyser* from *analyser*[46]. This means that it is impossible to be sure whether these formations were influenced by the shape of neo-classical compounds or whether the resemblance is a mere coincidence suggested by the placement of the splintering.

However, the Oxford Dictionary of New Words (1997) includes three blends which utilise a combining vowel in their formation that cannot be accounted for by any of the source words. *Urgicentre, Surgicentre* and *Emergicentre* all exhibit the combining vowel *i*, which cannot be analysed as having originated from *urgent, emergency, surgery* or *centre*. Indeed, although these forms are splinter + word forms that are best analysed as blends, they display the stem + vowel + stem pattern of neo-classical compounds. As such, it is apparent that blends can be made up of elements fused with a combining vowel and, thus, can be said to be influenced by compounded combining forms.

5.3.2 Splinter + combining form blends

One area in which there could be seen to be an overlap between blends and compounds including combining forms occurs when a form is composed of either an initial combining form plus a terminal splinter or an initial splinter plus a terminal combining form. Adams (1973: 157) cites examples of such blends, including

---

[46] Although such an analysis requires that the combining vowel is viewed as part of the second element which, as Bauer (1998: 406) points out, does not seem likely.

astrodemic (from the initial combining form *astro-* + a terminal splinter of *epidemic*), *electrolier* (from the initial combining form *electro-* + a terminal splinter of *chandelier*), *appestat* (from an initial splinter of *appetite* + the final combining form *-stat*) and *calligraphone* (from an initial splinter of *calligraphy* + the final combining form *-phone*). Several such types appear in the Independent Newspaper Corpus, including *aquabatics* and *aerobatics*, which are both composed of an initial combining form (*aqua-* and *aero-*) plus the splinter *-batics* from the source word *acrobatics*.

Forms such as these could be seen as belonging in a grey area between blends and neo-classical compounds as they contain splinters typical of blends, and combining forms typical of neo-classical compounds. Indeed, these kinds of words have a lot in common with neo-classical compounds as they involve a combining form joining with another bound form. However, I believe that the best analysis of such types is as blends. This is because the splinters involved are neither free-standing lexemes or combining forms, which means that words such as *calligraphone* and *electrolier* do not fit neatly into any definition of neo-classical compounding, even if such a definition allows for non-classical elements. Furthermore, because the splinters do lose part of their source words at the point of fusion with another element, they do fit into definitions of a blend. Thus, words such as *astrodemic* are best regarded as blends drawing upon combining forms as one of the source elements.

5.3.3   Splinters which contain combining forms

Of course, once formed, a neo-classical compound acts as any other free-standing lexeme. This means that any given neo-classical compound may be used as the source word for a splinter just as readily as could any other free-standing lexeme. An example of such a form is *Hello!tocracy*, which appeared in 'The Sunday Times Culture' section (10/03/2002). This is made up of the base *Hello!* (referring to the magazine of the same name) and the splinter *-tocracy* of the neo-classical compound *aristocracy*. It is clear that the second element is a splinter of a neo-classical compound, rather than just a final combining form, as the terminal constituent is *-tocracy*, rather than merely *-(o)cracy*. In other words, the *t* (and probably the *o*, dependent on your point of view regarding the status of the linking element – see section 5.3.1, above) are retained from *aristocracy* as well as just the entire final combining form. A similar form *cyberstocracy*, made up of the clip *cyber*[47] and the terminal splinter *-stocracy*, appears in the Independent Newspaper corpus.

The fact that the *-tocracy* is a splinter of *aristocracy*, rather than just a combining form, is not just relevant from a categorisation of word-formation processes perspective, but is also important semantically. This is because *-cracy* means merely "system of rule or government", whereas *-tocracy* brings with it the aristocratic connotations of "privilege and high rank". Thus, the meanings of *Hello!tocracy* and *cyberstocracy* have different nuances than would their equivalents *Hello!cracy* and *cybercracy*. Accordingly, both orthographically and semantically, the best analysis of

---

[47] *cyber-* was analysed at length in chapter 2, and it was decided that the best classification was as a clip (see section 2.4.3).

such forms is as blends which draw upon neo-classical compounds as one of their source elements.

Indeed, it is not only through splinters of neo-classical compounds that combining forms can become included in a splinter. As discussed in section 1.1, blends, once formed, act as any simplex free-standing lexeme, which means that they themselves can become the source words for further splinters. The result of that is if a combining form is fused with a splinter to make a blend, and that blend is then used as the source word for a further splinter, the combining form can be a part of a new splinter. This is the case in the blend *aerobathon*. *Aerobathon* is composed of an initial splinter *aeroba-* from the blend source word *aerobatics* (the formation of which was discussed above in section 5.3.2) and the suffix *-thon*.

Blends, then, can contain splinters (of other blends or of neo-classical compounds) which contain combining forms. This, however, is not really a problematic overlap as splinters containing combining forms are really in essence the same as any other splinter and the resultant form is easily classifiable as a blend.

There is, however, a closely related phenomenon that presents more difficulties for classification. This is when a splinter of a neo-classical compound does not just include a combining form but actually is the combining form, which is the next area of overlap.

5.3.4   Combining forms that are reminiscent of one particular word involving the combining form

It is not uncommon for a combining form to become more usually associated with one specific word of which it forms a part rather than with its original meaning. Take, for instance, *phone*; *-phone* is a final combining form which is Greek in origin and means "sound". However, to just about every native speaker of English, *phone* stands for *telephone*. The same is true of *tele*, which has come to be associated specifically with the neo-classical compound *television*.

Of course, *phone* and *tele* would not be analysed as splinters, but rather as clips as they are used as free-standing lexemes. This does not mean, though, that this phenomenon cannot occur within splinters as well. Algeo (1977) cites *para-* as an example of a combining form which has become more reminiscent of one specific word (*parachute*) than of its general meaning "to shield or defend" and is, thus, used as a splinter of that word within blends:

> Blending can even give a new meaning to a morpheme. The blendings based on *parachute* that produced *parakite, paraglider, paratroops, parastreak ...* and the like have had the effect of creating the sense 'parachute' for the combining form *para-*.
>
> (Algeo, 1977: 52)

Bauer (1998a) makes a similar observation regarding the combining form *gastro-*:

> Since the combining form *gastro-* means 'having to do with the belly', the semantics of the word *gastrodrama* ('a theatrical performance in which food is an important ingredient') indicates that it must have *gastro-* clipped from *gastronomy*.
>
> Bauer (1998a: 408)

Words such as *parakite* and *gastrodrama*, then, are best analysed as blends in spite of the fact that they appear to be composed of a combining form and a free-standing lexeme. The reason for such a classification is that *para-* and *gastro-* are not, in these instances, actually functioning as combining forms but rather as splinters of the source words *parachute* and *gastronomy*.

This is a tricky area as it is not possible to provide a black and white criterion to help distinguish when a combining form is standing for one particular source word rather than putting across its more general meaning. However, as discussed in section 5.2 above, forms including combining forms have a lot in common with native compounds and, in this case, the rule that can be applied to general compounds (see section 2.4.2) is also applicable here:

> a good test to distinguish blends with splintering at morphemic boundaries from [in this instance, neo-classical] compounds is the test of "missing meaning". If something that is not present in the final form has to be referred

to in order for the true meaning to be understood then the best classification is as a blend.

Thus, as *parakite* and *gastrodrama* would not be understandable without reference to *parachute* and *gastronomy*, the best classification of these forms is clearly as a blend.

5.3.5 Productive splinters that become re-analysed as combining forms

The final and most problematic area of overlap between splinters and combining forms occurs when a splinter of a certain source word becomes used in a variety of different blends and, over time, becomes lodged in the consciousness of the native speaker as a regular bound word beginning or ending. The forms *-holic* and *-thon* are the products of such a process. They were originally splinters of the source words *alcoholic* and *marathon* respectively used in formations such as *workaholic* and *walkathon*, which at the point of coining would have been analysed as blends. However, over time the forms *-holic* and *-thon* became widely used and, thus, became familiar and regular bound word endings. It is possible that such forms, then, become analysed as combining forms.

However, as was discussed at length in section 5.2.2, linguists find it very difficult to decide whether such bound forms are best analysed as combining forms or affixes. My own preferred solution is to analyse them as affixes. The reason for this is that if *-holic* and *-thon* are to be analysed as combining forms, then the only label available

to classify words such as *workaholic* and *walkathon* is 'neo-classical compounds' and, as mentioned above in section 5.1.2, I am uncomfortable with analysing as a neo-classical compound any word that does not contain a classical combining form.

Indeed, while I do not feel that I am in a position to state this opinion with any degree of certainty due to the amount of work I believe still needs to be carried out regarding the definition and characterisation of combining forms, my intuition is that modern bound elements should be classified as affixes and the term *combining form* should be reserved for bound elements of classical origin. I am, though, aware that one result of such a classification system would be that forms made up of a modern prefix and a modern suffix, such as *dinoholic*, would exist. This, of course, would give rise to Bauer's (1983: 213) dreaded 'embarrassing conclusion that there are lexemes made up of a prefix and a suffix with no root'. However, I am not convinced that such compositions do not occasionally occur anyway – take, for instance, this made up sentence: "*When I first met Charlotte she was a beatnik, and then she was a straightnik. She is now, thankfully, a postnik*". *Postnik* is made up of a prefix and a suffix, but is perfectly understandable and its occurrence would not be unthinkable.

One way around this problem would be to widen the scope of derivations to include such forms. My preferred solution, though, would be to describe 'affixation' and 'combination' as different functions, and to classify the role of an element with regard to its usage in any given form. This is because classifying an element itself is far more limiting than having different categories of usage and allowing for elements to function within these different categories. This point will be returned to in chapter 10.

However, for the sake of this thesis, I shall deal with modern productive bound forms, such as *-aholic* and *-thon*, as affixes rather than as combining forms, and the grey area between splinters and such productive affixes shall form the basis of chapters 7, 8 and 9. Before, though, the grey area between splinters and productive splinter-originating affixes can be examined, it is necessary to define and characterise derivations and the affixes within them, and to look at the less problematic areas of overlap between splinters and affixes. This, then, is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 6:

Separating blends and derivations

Having examined the similarities and differences between splinters and combining forms, this chapter will go on to examine the crossover between splinters and affixes and, therefore, between blends and derivations. Derivation, to quote Yule (1985: 55), 'is by far the most common word-formation process to be found in the production of new English words'. Perhaps partly because of the frequency with which this pattern of word-formation is used, derivation is the process which has the greatest degree of overlap with blending[48]. This chapter explores the different ways in which blends and derivations can overlap and considers the factors that influence which of these two patterns best classifies a word. Criteria are proposed that can help to categorise a word as either a blend or a derivation, with the purpose of reducing the grey area between these two word-formation patterns.

6.1   What is a derivation?

Perhaps because derivation is such a common process of word formation, it is rare that a definite description of the term is actually provided in the literature. Instead, writers tend to launch straight into the discussion of the process. Trask (1994), however, does offer a very short and simple definition:

---

[48] A further reason for this is that blending and derivation, as discussed, are poles on a cline, whereas compounding (the second most common type of word formation) excludes almost all blending by definition. Thus, there is little possible overlap between compounding and blending (as discussed in chapter 2).

Another important way of obtaining new words is by DERIVATION – that is, by adding prefixes and suffixes to existing words.

(Trask, 1994: 20, emphasis in original)

One problem with this definition is that it calls upon the notoriously problematic concept of "words". Bauer (1983: 8) is one of the many linguists who speak of 'the difficulties in providing a definition of a 'word'':

The definition of the word has been, for a long time, a major problem for linguistic theory because, however the term 'word' is defined, there are some items in some languages which speakers of those languages call 'words' but which are not covered by the definition.

(Bauer, 1983: 8)

Even within a single language, the referent of the term varies according to the technical interests of the user. However, the difficulty surrounding the definition of "word", though, is not a reason to abandon the notion. The unit of "a word" is intuitively appealing – as Bauer (1983: 8) points out, 'speakers of a language, even illiterate speakers, have a feeling for what is, or is not, a word'. Also, "word" is such a generally used term that abandoning it would be impractical. However, it is still a problematic term, and any definition of derivation that calls upon the notion of a word without defining the scope of the term is not helpful.

Algeo (1991) puts forward a definition of derivation that is similar to Trask's, but more explicit about the kinds of "words", in this case, <u>bases</u>, to which the rule can be applied:

a derivative combines a base with one or more affixes.

(Algeo, 1991: 5)

A base is the term for any free-standing word. It can include all free-standing roots and stems[49] and can be a simple, unanalysable word (such as *king*), an inflected word (such as *kings*) or even a derived word (such as *kingdom*). Clips, acronyms, compounds, clipped compounds, neo-classical compounds and, indeed, blends, once formed, all act as bases. Splinters, neo-classical combining forms and affixes themselves are bound forms and do not function as bases. Basically, to quote Bauer (1983: 21) 'a **base** is any form to which affixes can be added' (emphasis in original)[50]. From here on, when the term "word" is used it refers to a "base", unless otherwise specified.

Algeo's definition is more specific than Trask's in terms of the nature of the form that the affixes are added to, but Trask's is more clear on what types of affixes are added ('prefixes and suffixes'). Neither, however, attempt to define affixes, prefixes and

---

[49] As a matter of interest it may be worth highlighting that not all roots and stems are free-standing. Indeed, as was pointed out several times in the last chapter, the characteristic that defines combining forms is that they are bound morphs which function as stems. This, however, is not entirely relevant, as the point being made is that bases include all stems and roots that <u>are</u> free-standing.

[50] For a more detailed discussion of bases, stems and roots see Bauer, 1983: 21-22.

163

suffixes, which is surely necessary before a working definition of a derivation can be proposed.

6.1.1 What is an affix?

Affixes are bound forms which do not function as free-standing words and only occur when they are attached to bases. They are different from combining forms as combining forms can attach to either bases or to other combining forms. It can, however, be difficult to differentiate between combining forms and affixes when they are both attached to free-standing lexemes (see section 5.2.2). In such cases, I suggest that, especially in the absence of a classical origin, the best analysis is probably as an affix (see section 5.3.5). However, when my discussions render it necessary to refer to the classifications of forms, I will follow the classifications as set out in the Oxford English Dictionary[51].

An affix is either a prefix, suffix or infix. A prefix attaches to the front of a base, e.g. *un-* (as in *unlikely, unready* and *unbeliever*) and *fore-* (as in *forerunner, foreground* and *foreman*). A suffix attaches to the end of the base, e.g. *-dom* (as in *kingdom, girldom* and *gangsterdom*) and *-ward* (as in *homeward, outward* and *afterward*). An infix attaches inside a base, but this process is rarely used in English. There are no forms in the English language that have the sole function of being an infix and, thus, there are no accepted infixes (as *un-* and *fore-* are accepted prefixes and *-dom* and

---

[51] Unless, of course, the actual classification of the forms are the subject of the discussion.

-ward are accepted suffixes). When infixation does occur it is different from prefixation and suffixation, in that actual words, rather than bound forms, are attached. The instances of infixation that do occur are more or less completely accounted for by swear-words being inserted into the middle of a base to act as an intensifier, a well known example of which is Eliza Doolittle's *absobloominglutely*. Bauer (1983: 90) also cites formations involving the words *fucking* (e.g. *imfuckingpossible*) and *bloody* (e.g. *kangabloodyroo*).

Because of the rarity of infixation in English word-formation, only prefixes and suffixes will be considered from here on.

Suffixes tend to be the most widely used form of affix (cf. Sapir, 1921:67-68 and Adams, 1973: 161-163). Bauer (1994) explains the preference for suffixes over prefixes and for prefixes over infixes:

> There is a general preference in the languages of the world for suffixes as opposed to prefixes. This preference has been explained in terms of language processing. As a rule, the beginning of a word is very important for lexical recognition, and the ends of words are more important clues for recognition than the middles of words.
>
> (Bauer, 1994: 45)

Another explanation for why suffixes are more widely used can be drawn from Crystal (1996: 224), who comments that suffixes can be derivational (as in the

aforementioned *-dom* and *-ward*) or inflectional (such as the past tense *-ed* or the pluralising *-s*) but states that prefixes are purely derivational. From this view point, it would follow that suffixes are more widely used because they have more functions.

The point that affixes (or, at least, suffixes) can be either derivational or inflectional highlights a further problem with both Trask's and Algeo's definition of a derivation. They both state that a derivation is a word plus an affix, which is true, but their definitions do not take into account that a word plus an affix can also be an inflection. Therefore, any working definition of a derivation should make a distinction between derivation and inflection.

6.1.2   The distinction between derivation and inflection

As with the distinction between many different but related types of word-formation, derivation and inflection are best viewed not as two entirely distinct categories but rather as on a cline (see Bauer, 1983: 35). However, because blends have overlaps with derivations but not with inflections, it is only the typical derivations that are of concern in this study. Therefore, the middle areas between inflections and derivations can be ignored and only the prototypes referred to.

Aronoff (1976) outlines briefly what he sees as the 'grammatical' nature of inflection that separates it from the word-formation process of derivation:

166

Inflection is generally viewed as encompassing the "purely grammatical" markers, those for tense, aspect, person, number, case, etc.

(Aronoff 1976: 2)

Adams's (1973: 12) position is similar and, in her opinion, the distinction is that 'the function of [inflectional affixes] is to indicate relationships between words' whereas the function of derivational affixes 'is to signal the formation of new words'.

Bauer (1988) concurs with this view, and states:

An **inflectional affix** is one which produces a new word-form of a lexeme from a base. A **derivational affix** is one which produces a new lexeme from a base.

(Bauer, 1988: 12, emphasis in original)

This seems to be a helpful characterisation of the basic distinction between an inflectional and a derivational affix.

A test for derivation has been proposed (see Matthews, 1974: 49-50 for the clearest account) whereby if an affixed word can be replaced (at least sometimes) by a simplex lexeme then it is a case of derivation, not inflection. Bauer (1983) illustrates:

Frustration and *writer* in:

Frustration made him stop writing his book

The writer received a well-earned prize

can be replaced by *pain* and *boy* respectively, and can thus be said to be instances of derivation. Whereas *kisses* in

He always kisses his mother goodnight

cannot be replaced by a simple source form, and must thus be considered to be an instance of inflection.

(Bauer, 1983: 27)

Bauer (1983: 40) does, though, point out that, while this test is useful, it is not foolproof. He cites *colder* as an example, which can be replaced with the 'simple source form' *cold* in some sentences (for example, the first one below), but not in others (the second sentence below):

It's getting colder

Siberia is colder than Denmark.

(Bauer, 1983: 40)

However, while this test is not fool-proof, when all that is of concern is the prototypical derivation and inflection, it is helpful (and thus should not be discarded).

Adams (1973: 12) observes a further difference between inflection and derivation. She states that "grammatical' elements of the language', which include inflections, 'form groups which are relatively small, and stable in membership'. In comparison:

...the class of derivational affixes is much larger than that of the inflectional affixes, its members are less interdependent, and new ones emerge now and then.

(Adams, 1973: 13)

From the above, then, it becomes clear that there are distinct differences between derivational and inflectional affixes. Inflectional affixes have a grammatical function and they indicate the relationships between words. They are not syntactically replaceable by simplex lexemes and are generally regarded as a closed set. Conversely, derivational affixes can usually be syntactically replaced by simplex lexemes and new affixes can occur. Derivational affixes produce new words from bases and, in order for this to happen, they come imbued with a meaning rather than a grammatical function. In fact, Bauer (1988: 79) points out that derivational affixes can have several (related) meanings, and the more nuances of meaning an affix has, the more prototypically derivational it is.

Thus, the differences between prototypical derivational affixes and inflectional affixes are clear, and a definition of derivations can be composed.

6.1.3   My definition of a derivation

Having examined basic definitions of derivations in the literature, the definitions and functions of the different affix types and the differences between inflection and derivation, it is possible to put forward the working definition of a derivation that will be adopted in this study:

A derivation occurs when a derivational prefix is attached to the front of a base or when a non-inflectional suffix is attached to the end of a base.

6.2   Overlapping areas between splinters and affixes, and between blends and derivations

Having now defined the process of derivation, it is possible to examine the hazy areas between derivations and blends and to analyse the cases when it is less clear which of these two types a form is best classified as. There are several ways in which blends can overlap with derivations, and this is what is to be explored in the remainder of this chapter.

6.2.1   Derivations with blends as the base form

In Motsch's paper on *Problems of word structure theories* (1990: 80), he comments that it can be difficult to classify a word on the basis of its structural composition because many words are coined using more than one device[52]. In particular, he says that 'difficulties arise with the prominent role of affixation among other kinds of devices involved in morphological processes.' This implies that a word may not merely be coined through only the blending or derivation process, but can actually draw upon both.

This is not surprising because, as discussed in section 1.1 above, a blend, once coined, acts as a simple moneme, and one affix or another will always be able to attach to any such base. This means that blends, in the words of Cannon (1986: 740), '....can be inflected like any other noun or verb'.

The result of this is that a derivation can be composed of a blend plus an affix. For example, the singer Jane McDonald could be introduced as an *exdocusoap* personality, or a sinister travel lodge may be described as *Bates Motelesque*. Indeed, there are examples of such forms in the corpus, including; *anti-Chunnel* (from the prefix *anti-* plus a blend of *channel* and *tunnel*), *Mock-rockumentary* (from the prefix *mock-* plus a blend of *rock* and *documentary*) and *Mandelblairian* (from a blend of the names *Mandelson* and *Blair* plus the suffix *-ian*). This, however, is not a tricky area and the resulting form would be classified as a derivation with a blend as the free-standing base form.

---

[52] This subject has already been touched upon in section 4.7 – 'Non-specifically abbreviated compounds' and will be returned to in the conclusion.

6.2.2   Blends containing a splinter from a derivation

A similar phenomenon occurs when one of the elements in the blend is a splinter from a derivation and, as such, comes with a derivational affix intact. There are many such examples in the corpus, including *advertorial* (from the simplex lexeme *advert* plus a splinter from the derivation *editorial*), *Sperminator* (from the simplex lexeme *Sperm* overlapping with a splinter from the derivation *terminator*) and *edutainment* (made up of a splinter from either *educate*, *education* or *educational* plus a splinter of the derivation *entertainment*). Again, this is not a problematic area and the resulting form would be classified as a blend with a derivation as one of its source words.

An interesting aspect of the blends which contain splinters from derivations is that in all of the examples in the corpus it is the terminal splinter that remains tagged to a derivational suffix. One possible explanation for this could be the previously discussed preference for suffixes over prefixes (see section 6.1.1). Indeed, even the initial splinters whose original source words could be analysed as derivations are likely to have come from a base + suffix form, rather than prefix + base form; it is just that initial splinters, by their nature, lose their ending so it is not always possible to be certain whether they were part of a derivation or a simplex lexeme, as is the case with the blend *edutainment* cited above.

This is not to say that prefixes do not appear in blends; just that when they do they stand alone as the first element, as opposed to remaining attached to a base that they had formerly been fixed to. There are two slightly different varieties of this phenomenon within the corpus. The first is when the initial element of the blend is a

prefix that is not identifiable as belonging to any specific derivation, such as *untertainment* (from *un* plus *entertainment*) and *demote* (from *de* plus *promote*). The prefix must attach to a splinter rather than a full word in order that the resultant form be classified as a blend rather than a derivation. This variety is dealt with as a part of the next section, 6.2.3.

The second variety occurs when the initial source word of a blend begins with a prefix, and it is this part of the word that is retained to represent the full derivation in the amalgamated form, as is the case in *e-male* (from the derivation *e-mail* plus *male*) and *foreploy* (from the derivation *foreplay* plus *ploy*). Such words are similar to the specifically resonant combining form blends, such as *electrolier* and *gastrodrama*, discussed in section 5.3.2 of the last chapter. The prefix, which itself is a splinter of a longer derivation, could theoretically attach to either a splinter or a full word, but I have only found examples where the prefix attaches to a word. Consequently, in all of the examples of this type, the finalised word appears to take the form of prefix + base, which is a classic derivational pattern. Thus, this type is problematic and is dealt with, along with its base + affix equivalent, at length in section 6.2.4 below. However, it is necessary to draw attention to this type here as it is, in essence, a blend containing a splinter of a derivation.

The basic difference between these two varieties is that in the second one, exemplified by *foreploy*, the prefix acts as a splinter and requires the hearer/reader to access a specific source word in order to obtain full understanding. Conversely, in the first variety, exemplified by *untertainment*, the hearer/reader is not required to identify a

specific source derivation and only needs to be familiar with the utilised prefix. It is this variety of blend that is of concern in the next section.

6.2.3   Splinter + affix forms

The third area, then, in which there can be seen to be an overlap between blends and derivations occurs when a form is composed of splinter and an affix, be it prefix + splinter or splinter + suffix. Such words include the aforementioned *untertainment* and *demote*, as well as *aerobathon*, which is composed of an initial splinter, *aeroba-* from *aerobatics*[53], and a suffix, *-thon*[54]. Forms such as these could be seen as belonging in a grey area between derivations and blends as they contain splinters typical of blends, and affixes typical of derivations.

However, because splinters do not function as free-standing word forms, the above examples do not fit into prototypical definitions of derivations. Conversely, because the splinters do share or lose something at the point of fusion with another element, they do fit into definitions of a blend. It would, therefore, seem that the best classification of such forms is as blends.

---

[53] As discussed in section 5.3.3 of the previous chapter, the fact that this splinter contains a combining forms does not affect the analysis of the finalised word as a blend.

[54] The classification of *-thon* as a suffix has already been touched on in section 5.3.5 of the previous chapter, and will be explored at length in the next chapter.

6.2.4 Forms where the affix evokes an association with one particular word in which it previously occurred

Towards the beginning of my research I thoroughly briefed my family on the formation of blends and told them to make a note of any that they came across. One evening, my sister (who happens to be a primary school teacher) rang me up excitedly and told me that she had coined a blend. She told me that her class were doing a project on slugs and that they had a tank in the classroom containing soil, leaves and slugs that she had named a *sluggery*, which, she explained, was a blend of *slug* and *wormery*. I explained to her that -*ery* is actually a suffix that denotes (amongst other things) a place where the specified item lives or is reared, as in *rookery* and *rockery* as well as *wormery*, and that she had actually coined a derivation. Upon being told this, my sister said that "her" *sluggery* was not a derivation as it was she who had coined it and she intended it as a blend of *slug* and *wormery*!

This anecdote illustrates the next grey area between blends and derivations; when a word contains an affix that is more closely associated with a previously existing word containing the same affix than with the usage in general.

This area of overlap is similar in essence to the one between combining forms reminiscent of one particular word and splinters, discussed in section 5.3.4 of the previous chapter. However, there are some different issues involved with specifically associated affixes than there were with the equivalent combining forms, which I shall highlight during this discussion.

6.2.4.1   Are such forms simultaneously derivations and blends?

Adams (1973: 140) believes that while words such as my sister's *sluggery* are derivations, they could also be classified as blends. She cites *folknik, straightnik, scribacious* and *verbacious* as examples of this type and, while acknowledging that they are suffixed words and therefore derivations, she also includes them in her section on blends, stating:

> ...the *-nik* of the first two reminds us particularly of the word *beatnik*, and the *-acious* of the last two, with their sense of 'over-communicative', recalls *loquacious*.
>
> (Adams, 1973: 140)

It seems, then, that in Adams's view a word can be simultaneously a blend and a derivation. This may be true from a psycholinguistic standpoint, but this thesis is concerned with the place of blending in a theory of word formation and, from this perspective, I do not accept the above as a satisfactory conclusion. Blending and derivation are two distinct processes of word-formation and, while it is theoretically possible that a word can be in a cross-over area between the two, I do not believe it to be possible that a word can be simultaneously a blend and a derivation unless it is a derivation with a blend as the base form (discussed above in 6.2.1). So what is the best way of classifying these forms?

6.2.4.2 Should these affixes be classified in the same way as the equivalent combining forms?

In section 5.3.4 of the previous chapter, it was concluded that combining forms which are more reminiscent of one particular word involving the combining form than of the general meaning should be classified as blends. It does not, however, follow that the same will be true of the equivalent affixes as there are key differences between affixes and combining forms. When discussing combining forms, Bauer (1998a) points out:

> ...the elements are potential stems in the language of origin and are still analyzable as such in English.
>
> (Bauer, 1998a: 410)

This result of this is that a combining form's meaning is more like that of a word than that of an affix. As Bauer (1998a: 407) puts it, combining forms have 'a semantic value or density more similar to that of lexemes' than to that of affixes. Consequently, it is easier to spot when a combining form has connotations that are not a part of its general meaning than it is for an affix.

6.2.4.3 Affixes with multiple connotations or meanings

There is one further reason why it is more obvious when a combining form is communicating the connotations of a source word rather than its own meaning than it

is in the case of an affix. This is because, as pointed out by Bauer (1988: 79) and discussed in section 6.2.2 above, a derivation can have several meanings. Therefore, when a new form seems to have more in common with one specific previous form utilising the same affix than with another form, it could just be because the two more similar forms share a particular nuance of meaning.

In fact, an affix can have two completely separate meanings, as is the case with -*nik*. One meaning of -*nik* is reminiscent of *beatnik* (in forms like *peacenik* and *straightnik*) and the other is from *Sputnik* (in forms like *Yanknik* and *pupnik*). Indeed, these meanings are so separated that there is discussion as to whether or not they can actually be viewed as instances of the same affix:

> It is not necessarily obvious whether it will be preferable to list such forms as different affixes or as slightly different (or radically different) meanings of a single affix.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 256)

With this in mind, the -*acious* in *scribacious* and *verbacious* and the -*nik* in *folknik* and *straightnik* do not seem so separated from their general meanings (as defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary*) of 'given or inclined to' and 'a person or thing involved in or associated with the thing or quality specified' respectively, to merit being classified as anything other than derivations involving an affix with a particular nuance of meaning that has more in common with the meaning of some similarly affixed words than with others. Indeed, because an affix can convey many nuances of the same meaning, can have more than one distinct meaning or, if these meanings

become too disparate (as in the *beatnik* and *Sputnik* types), can be classified as two separate affixes, it would seem reasonable to conclude that any instance of Adam's suggested blend/derivation type can reliably be classified just as a derivation. However, there are some exceptional forms which serve to highlight the fact that this is a generalisation rather than a hard and fast rule.

6.2.4.4   Exceptional affix + word forms that should be classified as blends

As pointed out in section 6.2.2, there are some forms, such as *e-male* (from the derivation *e-mail* plus *male*) and *foreploy* (from the derivation *foreplay* plus *ploy*), which are apparently composed of affix + word but cannot be understood without reference to a specific source derivation. This is because the prefixes *e-* and *fore-* in the forms *e-male* and *foreploy* are not actually communicating just their usual nuances of meaning, but are actually putting across the connotations of specific source words. Consequently, *e-* and *fore-* can be seen as retaining the special relationship of meaning with their source derivations *e-mail* and *foreplay* that is so essential to the splinters within blends and, as such, must be analysed as splinters.

Consequently, while the best analysis of forms such as *sluggery* and *peacenik* is as derivations, *foreploy* and *e-mail* should be classified as blends. This may seem strange as they are both composed of an affix and a word, and in both cases it can be claimed that the affix is more reminiscent of one particular derivation than with the meaning in general. However, the basic difference between forms such as *peacenik*

and ones such as *foreploy* is as follows: The meaning of *peacenik* can be accessed without reference to the associated *beatnik* as long as the reader/hearer has knowledge of the meanings of the suffix *-nik.* However, in order to grasp the full meaning of the blend *foreploy*, the hearer/reader must recognise *foreplay* as the specific source word. Therefore, while the *-nik* of *peacenik* is still recognisable as a suffix, *fore-* is functioning as a splinter.

6.2.4.5   An applicable rule to provide the best classification of forms where the affix evokes an association with one particular word in which it previously occurred

The above discussion, then, points to the fact that the same rule applies in these instances as with compounds (see section 2.4.2) and combining forms (section 5.3.4). In order to differentiate between a splinter and an affix which evokes a particular derivation, the best test is the one of "missing meaning". If something that is not present in the final form has to be referred to in order for the true meaning to be understood then the best classification is as a blend. However, unlike the equivalent combining forms, because affixes often have many different nuances of meaning, the best analysis in most cases is as a derivation.

6.2.5   Splinters that become productive affixes

Although the above discussion of the overlapping areas in sections 6.2.1 to 6.2.4 brought to light several problematic areas for classification, all of these were able to be resolved either as a matter of definition or through an applicable rule. However, the final grey area between affixes and splinters, which concerns splinters that actually become productive affixes, does not prove as easy to sort out. It is, though, the most important overlapping area and, consequently, is the subject matter for most of the rest of this thesis.

This overlapping area is concerned with the process whereby a splinter within a certain blend becomes much used and, over time, starts to behave more in the manner of an affix[55] than a splinter. When this happens, forms that were once classified as blends because they contained that splinter become reclassifiable as derivations:

> ...blends have a role in developing new affixes. Whether or not one perceives one's creation as a blend, if a splinter of that creation is not already an affix and if hearers/readers reinterpret the splinter as an affix, it may be on the way toward becoming a new affix, which might become productive.... Blending was the original, principal process in developing *-burger, -cade, -mat, -rama, -tel, -teria, -(a)thon,* and other morphemes, as well as *burger* as a free morpheme.
>
> (Cannon, 1986: 734)

---

[55] As discussed in the previous chapter, some linguists regard these such productive splinters as combining forms. However, I shall deal with them as affixes (see section 5.3.5).

Quinion (1996) also observes that there is a 'process in which blends can give rise to new prefixes and suffixes which then affect the classification of later creations' and adds many more such affixes to the list, including *info-* and *-gate.*

It may seem strange that splinters can 'cross over' and become affixes because blending and derivation, as processes of word formation, are generally regarded as being at different ends of the productivity cline[56]. However, even Van Marle (1985), who discounts blending from any theory of productivity, allows for this crossover. When speaking of the differences 'between productive and non-productive morphological processes', Van Marle accepts that:

> ...the <u>diachronic</u> <u>study</u> <u>of</u> <u>language</u> might contribute considerably to our understanding of the peculiarities of these differences. For the diachronic investigation of language has shown that in the course of time both (i) productive processes may become non-productive, and (ii) non-productive processes may become productive.
>
> (Van Marle, 1985: 66, emphasis in original)

Having, then, accepted that splinters can and do become affixes, the next step is to examine some splinters that have made the crossover and compare them to splinters which have not. Such an analysis should help to establish the ways in which splinter-originating affixes behave differently from actual splinters. Having done this, it should be possible to compose criteria which can assist with the classification of a

---

[56] As will be explored at length in chapter 8

borderline splinter/affix (henceforth referred to as a string) as either a splinter or an affix.

This analysis, then, is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 7:

Case studies of splinters and

splinter originating affixes

This chapter contains detailed case analyses of prototypical splinters and of accepted splinter-originating affixes. The purpose of these case studies is to establish the ways in which splinter-originating affixes behave differently from typical splinters in order to establish criteria that will assist in the classification of a borderline string as either a splinter or an affix. The case studies are of the splinters *labrado-* (from *labrador*), *-oodle* (from *poodle*), *-unnel* (from *tunnel*) and *-inator* (from *terminator*) and of the splinter-originating affixes *-(a)thon* and *-(a/o)holic*.

7.1   Method of analysis

The data for these analyses, like much of the data used throughout this thesis, comes from the finite 400,000,000 item corpus of words featured in the Guardian Newspaper between 1984 and 1988 and words from the Independent Newspaper between 1988 and 1999 inclusive. Data analysis tools, as developed in the "Research and Development Unit for English Studies" at the University of Liverpool, are utilised (see section 1.3 for details).

In each case study, the analysis of the splinters or affixes is presented with regard to five different factors:

1) Definitions and classifications in dictionaries and linguistic literature when available, and the ease of providing a definition without reference to the source word.

2) The number of instances in which the string occurs within the corpus.

3) The different kinds of orthographic form of the string.

4) The kinds of elements the string attaches to.

5) Any relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements.

These aspects were decided upon thorough empirical analysis. I have not looked only for these five factors and then presented these features as the basis of my criteria, as that would be circular. Rather, through my examination of the data, these five factors have simply become apparent as the ones which would provoke the most fruitful analyses. Also, for the sake of a clear and logical analysis, my data has to be organised in such a way that it renders my line of argument accessible to the reader. Consequently, the case analyses throughout this chapter are presented with regard to these five different factors.

7.1.1 A clarification of the five factors of analysis and the expectations they give rise to

The first part of factor one regards previous definitions and classifications in dictionaries and linguistic literature (when applicable). Definitions and categorisations of the strings are looked up in dictionaries and references to them in the literature are surveyed. The second part of this factor requires that a definition of the string be attempted without reference to the source word.

The second factor concerns the number of occurrences of the string within the corpus.

This aspect is not as simple as it seems, and requires a section dedicated to the discussion of its methodology (see section 7.1.1.2 below). However, before I provide this clarification I will briefly explain the remaining three factors for analysis.

The third factor has to do with variations in the orthographic form of the string. This just means that different spelling variants are analysed.

The fourth factor involves analysing the strings with reference to the kinds of elements that they attach to. This is relevant because (as discussed in section 6.1) affixes should only attach to free-standing lexemes, whereas (as highlighted throughout chapter 1) splinters can attach to any element. At this point it is necessary to highlight that my analysis is primarily orthographic. I analyse every instance in respect of the category of the joining element and, when relevant, with regard to the combining mechanisms, but this is purely of the written form. There is no analysis of the phonetic makeup of each word, due to the constraints of time and space and also because the corpus I am working from is a written one. Consequently, there is no proof that many of the coinages I am dealing with have ever existed in the spoken realm. However, the influence of sound on even written forms is undeniable and, as such, I often make comments about phonic aspects of words. It is also worth pointing out that the phonetic analysis of a word is different to the orthographic equivalent in only a handful of cases and, when relevant, I will draw attention to these cases in my discussions.

The fifth factor concerns internal relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements, as such relationships can be seen as providing a motivation for

the coinage. These relationships can be orthographic, phonic, syntactic, semantic or a combination of these aspects. For instance, *motel* could be analysed syntactically as a contracted lexical string of the item *motorist's hotel*. This blend is perhaps further motivated by the graphic and phonic overlap at the point of fusion as the *ot* (of *motel*), ends the initial splinter *mot* of *motor(ist's)* and begins the terminal splinter *otel* of *hotel*. Another kind of internal relation is apparent in the blend *banoffee*. *Banoffee* contains two splinters of the co-hyponyms *banana* and *toffee*, and *banoffee* once formed becomes the third co-hyponym of the super-ordinate 'types of (desert) food'.

Having described factors 1, 3, 4 and 5, it is now necessary to discuss factor 2, that concerns the number of occurences of the string within the corpus.

7.1.1.1   What is meant by 'the number of occurrences'?

As pointed out in a footnote to section 2.1.4, the number of types refers to the number of forms that occur, and one form is one type, whereas the number of tokens is concerned with the number of times the forms occur. Therefore, if *Swimathon* appears 3 times in the corpus and *Telethon* appears 93 times, then these are two different *-thon* types with 96 tokens between them. When the strings are analysed with regard to how many times they occur in the corpus, it is number of types that is of interest. This is not to say that the number of tokens of a given string is not relevant, as tokens will be discussed in the ensuing analyses. It is just that the primary concern is the number of types.

For the purpose of this study, words are considered as instances of the same type if they both sound the same and mean identical things. For instance, *phone-aholic*, *Phoneoholic* and *Phonoholic*, in spite of the case and spelling differences, are treated as the same word. They sound alike, and a person using any one of these forms would mean exactly the same thing. However, forms that are spelt or joined differently (for example, joining forms losing a terminal *e* or using a combining hyphen) are analysed separately for two reasons. The first and minor reason regards saving space in the analysis tables. The more pertinent motivation, though, is that although the orthographic differences are not of concern with regard to the number of types, they are relevant when considering how and to what the splinters / affixes fuse.

Forms are also considered as instances of the same type if they have inflectional suffixes, but not if they have derivational suffixes. For example, if the forms *docufiction*, *Docufictions*, *docufictioned* and *Docufiction's* occurred they would all be considered as instances of the same type, but *docufiction* and *docufictional* are different types[57]. One result of this choice is that, in some cases, words considered to be of different grammatical classes are treated as instances of the same type. Some linguists may find this to be controversial. However, the stance taken in this study is that words are not imbued with grammar and, as such, do not intrinsically belong within a grammatical class but, rather, have different grammatical functions dependent on their usage. This suggestion is one which merits a thesis in its own right and is not something I am able to pursue here, although I will return to this point briefly in chapter 10. It is, though, worth mentioning here as a validation for my

---

[57] This distinction may seem a little arbitrary and perhaps, ideally, all the different variations should be treated as different types. However, this was not a practical possibility. Thus, the decision to differentiate between inflectional and derivational suffixes when deciding if instances should be counted as the same type seemed the best compromise between accuracy and expediency.

decision to treat inflected words as instances of the same type. Indeed, there could not really be much justification for treating them as separate types purely on the basis of grammatical class because, as discussed in section 6.1.2, inflectional affixes only produce new versions of words, rather than new words themselves:

> An **inflectional affix** is one which produces a new word-form of a lexeme from a base. A **derivational affix** is one which produces a new lexeme from a base.
>
> (Bauer, 1988: 12, emphasis in original)

Now that the five factors have been clarified, the rest of the chapter will be concerned with the cases analyses. I will first analyse the splinters and then move on to examine the splinter-originating affixes.

7.2   Case analyses of splinters

The first of the following case analyses deals with two prototypical splinters, *labrado-* and *-oodle*, simultaneously. The subsequent two case analyses each deal with only one splinter and move from the archetypal *labrado-* and *-oodle* to the less typical but still standard *-unnel*, and then onto the still less classical splinter *-inator*. The purpose of these case analyses is to ascertain the properties of splinters, going from the highly characteristic towards the grey areas that this thesis is concerned with.

7.2.1   A case analysis of the splinters *labrado-* (from *labrador*) and *-oodle* (from *poodle*)

The splinters *labrado-* and *-oodle* are dealt with together as they only occur separated from their source words *labrador* and *poodle* in one type in the corpus, *labradoodle*, which involves both of them. As both these strings only occur in one form and are both attached to another splinter within this blend, they can be viewed as prototypical splinters.

7.2.1.1   Definitions and classifications of *labrado-* and *-oodle*

Neither of the splinters *labrado-* or *-oodle* appear in any dictionary and they have not been discussed in linguistic literature. It is not possible to describe either of these splinters without referring to their source words *labrador* and *poodle*.

7.2.1.2   The number of types in the corpus either beginning with *labrado-* or ending in *-oodle* (excluding *labrador* and *poodle*, regarded as the initial forms)

As already mentioned, the splinters *labrado-* and *-oodle* are only found in one type in the corpus, other than in their original source words *labrador* and *poodle*. This is in

the blend *labradoodle*, which appears three times in the corpus (February 1997, March 1998 and December 1999).

7.2.1.3   Orthographic variations of *labrado-* and *-oodle*

As *Labrado-* and *-oodle* only appear once each in the corpus, there can be no variation in their orthographic representations.

7.2.1.4   An analysis of the attached elements

Both *labrado-* and *-oodle* only appear in splinter + splinter formations within the corpus.

7.2.1.5   Relationships between the splinters, their source words and the attached element

In the blend *labradoodle*, the splinters have a one letter graphic overlap on the first *o*, but no phonic overlap. The source words *labrador* and *poodle* are semantically similar to the extent that they are both co-hyponyms of *dog*.

7.2.1.6   A summary of the properties of *labrado-* (from *labrador*) and *-oodle* (from *poodle*) with regard to the 5 factors

Neither *labrado-* or *-oodle* appears in any dictionaries or linguistic literature, and they cannot be described without reference to their source words. They only appear in one type in the corpus and, as such, have no orthographic variations. In this one type they are both attached to other splinters (as they are attached to each other!) There is a both a semantic and orthographic relation between the source elements as they are co-hyponyms and have a one letter overlap in the final blend, *labradoodle*.

7.2.2   A case analysis of the splinter *-unnel* (from *tunnel*)

7.2.2.1   Definitions and classifications of *-unnel*

The splinter *-unnel* does not appear in any dictionary, is not generally discussed in the literature and it is not possible to describe *-unnel* without referring to the source word.

7.2.2.2   The number of types in the corpus ending in *-unnel* (excluding *tunnel*, regarded as the initial form)

The splinter *-unnel* is found in two types in the corpus, other than in its source word *tunnel*. These are in the blends *chunnel* (where the *ch-* is a splinter of the word

channel) and *dunnel* (where the *d-* is a splinter of the word *dome*[58]). *Chunnel* appears

in the corpus 367 times (with the first instance in December 1984) and *dunnel* appears

once (in June 1997).

7.2.2.3   Orthographic variations of *-unnel*

There are no orthographic variations of *-unnel* within the corpus.

7.2.2.4   An analysis of the attached elements

The splinter *-unnel* only appears in splinter + splinter formations within the corpus.

7.2.2.5   Relationships between the splinter, its source word and the attached elements

In the blend *chunnel*, the splinters have no graphic or phonic overlap, but both of the

source forms *channel* and *tunnel* end in the same four letters. Indeed, there is only

one letter absent from each of the source forms in the blend *chunnel* (the *a* from

---

[58] The context of *dunnel* makes the origin of the *d* explicit:
> This cool-looking, blue and green geodesic dunnel (cross between a dome and a tunnel) tent
> has an interesting triangulated structure which is more rigid and therefore capable of taking a
> load, 'such as snow', so you can tell it's a serious four-season tent.

channel and the *t* from *tunnel*). Consequently, it is a fair conclusion that the blending of the words *channel* and *tunnel* has both graphic and phonic motivations.

The source words *channel* and *tunnel* are frequently found together in the lexical string *channel tunnel*. Therefore, *chunnel* can be viewed as a blended lexical string.

In the blend *dunnel*, the splinters *d-* and *-unnel* have no graphic or phonic overlap, nor do the source forms *dome* and *tunnel*.

While the source words *dome* and *tunnel* are not as clearly semantically related as are *labrador* and *poodle* in the blend *labradoodle*, they could be regarded as co-hyponyms of *types of construction*.

7.2.2.6   A summary of the properties of *-unnel* (from *tunnel*) with regard to the 5 factors

The splinter *-unnel* does not appear in either dictionaries or linguistic literature, and cannot be described without reference to the source word *tunnel*. It only appears in two types in the corpus, has no orthographic variations and is only ever attached to other splinters. There is an obvious internal relation between the parts in one of the types, *chunnel*, and although it is a little ambiguous, the elements within the other type, *dunnel*, could be said to be co-hyponyms.

7.2.3 A case analysis of the splinter *-inator* (from *terminator*)

7.2.3.1 Definitions and classifications of *-inator*

-inator does not appear in any dictionary and is not discussed in linguistic literature.
It is not possible to describe *-inator* without referring to the source word *terminator*.

7.2.3.2 The number of types in the corpus ending in *-inator* (excluding *terminator*, regarded as the initial form)

The splinter *-inator* is found in three types in the corpus, separate from its source word *terminator*. These are in the blends *Sperminator* (in which *sperm* is a complete word), *Tobinator* (where *Tobin* is a complete word, standing for Mr Tobin, the Canadian minister) and *Tourminator* (in which *Tour* is a complete word). *Sperminator* and *Tobinator* each appear only once in the corpus (in May 1992 and March 1995, respectively) and *Tourminator* appears twice (both instances in July 1998).

7.2.3.3 Orthographic variations of *-inator*

There are several orthographic variations of the splinter of the word *terminator*. It is not always in the form *-inator*, and within the corpus it also appears as *-erminator* and

-rminator. Indeed, even if overlap is not taken into account, the splinter still has more than one form (*-inator* and *-minator*). See section 7.2.3.5 below for a deeper exploration of these variations.

7.2.3.4 An analysis of the attached elements

There are no instances of *-inator* appearing with other splinters in the corpus. It only features in word + splinter formations. However, the end of all of the attaching words overlaps with the splinter (or the source word *terminator*), so these cannot be viewed as straightforward (derivation-like) word + string forms

7.2.3.5 Relationships between the string, its source word and the attached elements

In the blend *Sperminator*, the word *Sperm* has no graphic or phonic overlap with the splinter *-inator*. However, there is an overlap of three letters (*erm*) between the attached word *Sperm* and the source word *terminator* at the point of fusion. Thus, in this blend, the splinter of *terminator* can be analysed as *-erminator* as this is the part that is retained in the blend. Consequently, it is clear that due to the *erm* overlap, the blend of the words *Sperm* and *terminator* has both graphic and phonic motivations.

In the blend *Tobinator*, the word *Tobin* has a two letter overlap with the splinter *-inator*. Also, the attached word *Tobin* and the source word *terminator* both start with the same letter. It can, therefore, be concluded that the blending of the words *Tobin* and *terminator* has both graphic and phonic motivations.

In the blend *Tourminator*, the word *Tour* has no graphic or phonic overlap with the splinter *-inator*. Indeed, if the splinter is taken as being *-inator* the presence of the *m* is inexplicable and, thus, must be re-analysed as *-minator*. However, there is an overlap on the *r* between the attached word *Tour* and the source word *terminator* at the point of fusion which means that, in this blend, the splinter can be analysed as *-rminator*. Consequently, it can be concluded that, due to the *rm* overlap, the blending of the words *Tour* and *terminator* has both graphic and phonic motivations[59].

7.2.3.6   A summary of the properties of *-inator* (from *terminator*) with regard to the 5 factors

The splinter *-inator* does not appear in any dictionary, is not cited in linguistic literature and cannot be described without reference to the source word *terminator*. It occurs in three types in the corpus and in all of these types there is a strong internal relationship between the elements which provides a motivation for the coining of the blended forms. Of the three types there are at least two, and probably three, orthographic variations of this splinter. Unlike the other three splinters analysed, in

---

[59] It is also worth noting that *tour* is phonetically similar to the *ter* of *terminator* as both involve central vowel sounds. This provides a further phonetic motivation.

all of the types in the corpus -*inator* attaches only to free-standing lexemes rather than to other splinters, but all of these attaching words have an overlap with the source word *terminator* at the point of fusion.

7.3 Conclusions on the properties of splinters with regard to the 5 factors for analysis

Factor 1 is concerned with "definitions and classifications in dictionaries and linguist linguistic literature when available, and the ease of providing a definition without reference to the source word". These case analyses have highlighted the fact that splinters do not appear in dictionaries or linguistic literature. This makes sense because if a string appears in a dictionary, it is almost certain that it is common and productive, which are not the characteristics of a splinter. Likewise, if a string is well known enough to be referenced in the literature there is a good chance that it is at least on the way to becoming a productive affix. Additionally, none of the splinters could be described without reference to the source word. Again, this is a predictable quality as splinters share a 'special relationship of meaning' with their source word, so it follows that it should be very difficult to provide a definition of a splinter without either citing or, at the very least, directly describing the source word.

Factor 2 involves "the number of occurences of the string within the corpus". All of the splinters only occur in a small number of types, with -*inator* appearing the most in just three types. Most of the types also have a small number of tokens; one of the -*unnel* and two of the -*inator* types have only one token each, the other -*inator* type

has two tokens and the one *labrado-* and *-oodle* type occurs just three times. This is clearly not criterial, though, as the other *-unnel* type, *chunnel*, appears 367 times in the corpus.

Factor 3 examines "the different kinds of orthographic form of the string". Only one of the splinters, *-inator*, has orthographic variants, but this may be in part because it is the only one of the analysed splinters which occurs in more than two types in the corpus.

Factor 4 requires an analysis of "the kinds of elements the string attaches to". Three of the splinters attach only to other splinters. The other splinter, *-inator*, joins only with complete words, but all of these attaching words overlap with the source word at the point of fusion.

Factor 5 is concerned with "any relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements". All of the types for all of the splinters display internal semantic, syntactic, phonic or orthographic relationships between the elements, although these relationships are stronger in some cases than in others.

In conclusion, then, the properties of the splinters do vary a little with regard to the five factors but a general picture of the characteristics of splinters does emerge. The analyses have brought to light the fact that some of the factors emphasize qualities more typical of splinters than others – for instance, the splinters were all the same when analysed in respect of factor 1 and were very similar for factors 2 and 5. However, the analyses with regard to factors 3 and 4 highlighted qualities different in

one of the splinters than were apparent in the other three. Perhaps, then, the fact that splinters do not appear in dictionaries and are hard to define is the most characteristic quality. This is followed by the fact that they do not appear in many types in a finite corpus and that there is usually a clear internal relationship between the elements of a type involving a splinter which provides a clear motivation for the coinage. Least characteristic but still apparent are the facts that splinters often combine with each other, rather than just with free-standing lexemes, and that they can have different orthographic varieties.

Having, then, established the properties that are characteristic of splinters, and having ranked these factors in order of the most to least typical, it is time to carry out the same exercise with regard to splinter-originating affixes.

7.4   Case analyses of splinter-originating affixes

There are only two case studies of splinter-originating affixes. This is for two reasons: Firstly, as might be anticipated, there are far more types in the corpus for the splinter-originating affixes than for the splinters, so there is more analysis to be done and far more to say about each string. Secondly, as will become apparent, the behaviour of the two splinter-originating affixes is so similar that it was possible to draw firm conclusions after just two case analyses. The two splinter-originating affixes to be analysed are *-(a/o)holic* and *-(a)thon*, as these are the two strings most generally cited in the literature as being modern affixes that originated from splinters and, thus, are likely to be prototypical. The purpose of these case analyses is to

determine the properties of affix-originating splinters with regard to the five factors for analysis, which should provide a picture of how similar or different splinter-originating affixes are to splinters (and to prototypical affixes). Once this has been done, the properties of splinter-originating affixes can be compared with the characteristics of actual splinters in order to establish criteria that can separate the two forms.

7.4.1 A case analysis of the splinter-originating affix -(a/o)holic (originally from *alcoholic*)

7.4.1.1 Definitions and classifications of -(a/o)holic

The first notable point is that, unlike the splinters analysed, -(a/o)holic appears in dictionaries. Also, the definitions make clear that -(a/o)holic can be described without referring to the initial source word *alcoholic*.

The Complete Oxford English Dictionary Second Edition (1994) defines:

> *-aholic* also *-(o)holic* used as a suffix forming nouns as *computerholic*, *newsaholic, spendaholic*, etc. (chiefly humorous nonce-words) denoting one who appears to be addicted to the object, activity, etc. specified.

Collins English Dictionary (1994) (which has the claim that it utilises the Bank of English corpus) defines:

-holic suffix forming nouns. indicating a person having an abnormal desire for or dependence on: *workaholic*; *chocaholic*. [C20: on the pattern of *alcoholic*]

The Collins and Oxford dictionaries are in agreement that *-(a/o)holic* is a productive suffix, rather than a terminal splinter of *alcoholic*.

Linguists who discuss the status of *-(a/o)holic* generally regard it as a splinter-originating suffix (see Kolin, 1979 and Bauer 1983: 236), although (as discussed at length in chapter 5) some see it as a combining form. However, no contemporary linguist regards *-(a/o)holic* as still a splinter.

7.4.1.2   Words in the corpus ending in *-(a/o)holic(s)* (excluding *alcoholic*, regarded as the initial form)

The following table contains an exhaustive list of words in the corpus that end in *-(a/o)holic(s)*, where *-(a/o)holic* is used to denote "an addict". The number on the direct right of the word indicates how many times it appears in the corpus (referred to from here-on as the number of tokens). The table is arranged alphabetically and instances of the same type but with case and plural variants are put together in the same row. Instances of the same type which employ different joining mechanisms or

different spellings are not together on the same row for the sake of space as there are too many different utilised combinations for this to be expedient. However, because of the alphabetical nature of the table, instances of the same type which are formed with different joining mechanisms or different spellings are noted in adjacent rows so are easy to recognise. The final column of the table contains an analysis of the orthographic makeup of each type.

Table 3: The words in the corpus ending in -*(a/o)holic(s)* (excluding *alcoholic*):

Upper case singular	Upper case plural	Lower case singular	Lower case plural	Analysis of orthography
		aholic 1		no attached element
		active-aholic 1		wd[60] + hyphen + *aholic*
	Ameriholics 1			spl[61] (*America*) + *holic*
			artoholics 1	wd + *oholic*
			baby-holics 1	wd + hyphen + *holic*
	bagaholic 1			wd + *aholic*
			bandaholics 1	wd + *aholic*
Bauble-aholics 1				wd + hyphen + *aholic*
		biblioholic 1		ICF[62] + *oholic*
Cashaholics 1				wd + *aholic*
			chipaholics 1	wd + *aholic*

---

[60] "wd" is used to denote a normal word

[61] "spl" is used to denote a splinter

[62] "ICF" is used to denote an initial combining form.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
Chocaholic 1	Chocaholics 3	chocaholic 8	chocaholics 15	clip + aholic
Chocoholic 1	Chocoholics 25	chocoholic 16	chocoholics 43	clip + oholic
	Chopperholics 1			wd+ holic
			cinemaholics 1	wd + holic
		clothesaholic 2	clothesaholics 1	wd + aholic
			clothes-aholics 1	wd + hyphen+ aholic
			clutterholics 1	wd + holic
			computerholics 1	wd + holic
			cookaholics 1	wd + aholic
Cupoholic 1				wd + oholic
			curryholics 2	wd + holic
		dataholic 1	dataholics 1	wd + holic
		designaholic 1		wd + aholic
		digaholic 1		wd + aholic
		ecoholic 1		ICF + holic
	Fashaholics 1			spl (fashion) + aholic
			fen-phen-aholics 1	cmpd[63] + hyphen + aholic
		fightoholic 1		wd + oholic
		food-aholic 1		wd + hyphen + aholic
		funkaholic 1	funkaholics 1	wd + aholic
	Golf-aholics 1			wd + hyphen + aholic
		hataholic 1		wd + aholic
			hood-aholics 1	wd + hyphen + aholic
	Infoholics 1		infoholics 2	clip + holic

---

[63] "cmpd" is used to denote a compound

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
			knitaholics 1	wd + *aholic*
Lactoholic 1				ICF + *holic*
		lensoholic 1		wd + *oholic*
			lotto-holics 1	spl (*lottery*) + hyphen + *holic*
		mapoholic 1		wd + *oholic*
		newsaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
		newsoholic 1		wd + *oholic*
		numeroholic 1		spl (*numeral*) + *oholic*
		phonaholic 1		wd (- *e*)[64] + *aholic*
		phoneaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
		phonoholic 1		wd (- *e*) + *oholic*
			politoholics 1	spl (*politics*) + *oholic*
			pornaholics 1	clip + *aholic*
		practisaholic 1		wd (- *e*) + *aholic*
			quoteaholics 1	wd + *aholic*
	Rageaholics 1			wd + *aholic*
			rhodoholics 1	spl (*rhododendrons*) + *holic*
		runaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
		saleaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
	Sale-oholics 1			wd + hyphen + *oholic*
	Sexaholics 1	sexaholic 3	sexaholics 2	wd + *aholic*
		sexoholic 1		wd + *oholic*
		shagoholic 1		wd + *oholic*

---

[64] wd (- *e*) is used to denote instances of a word losing its terminal *e* when joining with a terminal string.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
		shoe-aholic 1		wd + hyphen + *aholic*
Shopaholic 2	*Shopaholics* 6	*shopaholic* 47	*shopaholics* 41	wd + *aholic*
	Shopoholics 2			wd + *oholic*
			shoutaholics 1	wd + *aholic*
	Sitcom-aholics 1			Clipping cmpd+ hyphen + *aholic*
		skipaholic 1	*skipaholics* 1	wd + *aholic*
		smokoholic 1		wd (- *e*) + *oholic*
			spendaholics 2	wd + *aholic*
		spend-aholic 1		wd + hyphen + *aholic*
		sportaholic 2	*sportaholics* 3	wd + *aholic*
		talkaholic 2	*talkaholics* 2	wd + *aholic*
		tea-aholic 1		wd + hyphen + *aholic*
			technoholics 3	clip + *holic*
			teleholics 1	clip[65] + *holic*
		trainaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
Turkaholic 1				clip[66] + *aholic*
Vizaholic 1				wd + *aholic*
		wantaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
			weboholics 1	wd + *oholic*
		wordaholic 1		wd + *aholic*
Workaholic 5	*Workaholics* 15	*workaholic* 535	*workaholics* 120	wd + *aholic*
			wrapaholics 1	wd + *aholic*

---

[65] In spite of the fact that *tele* is an initial combining form meaning 'over space', in this instance it is clear that it is referring to television and is, thus, analysed as a clip.

[66] While *Turk* is a word in its own right, the context of the usage in this instance makes clear that the form is referring to an addiction to *Turkey* and not to *Turks* themselves. In any context it is clear that *Turk* refers to things *Turkish*, be it *Turks*, *Turkey* or *Turkishness* in general. Thus, *Turk* has been analysed as clip.

The corpus, thus, has 101 different instances of *-(a/o)holic(s)* added to the end of words to denote addiction / dependence, excluding the initial form *alcoholic*.

15 types appear in more than one orthographic form (because of hyphens, variant cases and plurals), accounting for 41of the 101 occurrences. These are the eight variations of *chocoholic*, the five variations of *shopaholic*, the four variations of *workaholic*, the three variations each of *clothesaholic, phoneaholic, sexaholic* and the two variations each of *dataholic, funkaholic, infoholic, newsaholic, saleaholic, skipaholic, spendaholic, sportaholic* and *talkaholic* (see the corresponding entries in the above table).

These variants are regarded as different instances of the same type (see the above discussion in section 7.1.1.2. Thus, if these forms are only counted once each, regardless of the variations, there are 72 different types in the corpus which end in *-(a/o)holic* (excluding *alcoholic*).

However, for the sake of the next section, which discusses orthographic varieties, it is the 101 different orthographic forms that are of interest, rather than the 72 types.

7.4.1.3   Orthographic varieties of *-(a/o)holic*: *-holic, -aholic* or *-oholic?*

Three different varieties of this string regularly occur; *-holic, -aholic* and *-oholic*.

Whether the string is -*aholic*, -*oholic* or -*holic* makes very little difference phonologically. -*aholic* and -*oholic* sound virtually identical and -*holic* (as will be discussed below) is generally only employed when the attaching word ends in a vowel sound. Therefore, "-*aholic*, -*oholic* or -*holic*?" is essentially an orthographic question.

The above list has 101 words ending in -*(a/o)holic(s)*. 63% of these words end in -*aholic(s)*, a further 20% end in -*oholic(s)* and in the final 17% the suffix is best analysed as -*holic(s)*. The source word that -*(a/o)holic* was originally extracted from is *alcoholic*.

The majority of the above forms end in *aholic*, which is the only one of the three alternatives that cannot be seen as coming directly from the source word *alcoholic*. The fact that -*aholic* is favoured over -*oholic* or -*holic* shows how far from the original source word this terminal string has moved.

The terminal string is analysed as -*holic* in 17% of the above words (17 words). However, the attaching elements end in either *a* or *o* in 11 of these words, so the forms still read as if they are either -*aholic* or -*oholic*. In one of the remaining 6 forms, the attaching element (the splinter *Ameri*) ends in *i*, which functions as the combining vowel. Two more end in *y* (*baby* and *curry*) which, in these instances, is clearly functioning as a combining vowel. The remaining 3 end in *er* (*chopper*, *clutter* and *computer*), which is phonetically very similar to the combining vowel *a*, and functions in the same way.

All 101 of the above words do, then, end in -*(combining vowel)holic(s)*. Thus, if the combining vowel, whatever form it takes, is not actually an integral part of this terminal string, then it must be seen as a compulsory joining mechanism. The form it does take, though, in the majority of the strings is *a*, and the most regular form of the terminal string is -*aholic(s)*. The fact that this form cannot have been lifted directly from the original source word *alcoholic* gives weight to the premise that it no longer functions as a splinter of *alcoholic* but, as dictionaries and linguists suggest, as an independent suffix. However, to address the proposed question: -*aholic*, -*oholic* or -*holic*?, the answer would have to be all three. They are interchangeable (indeed, as shown below, several attaching words can and do use the more than one of these forms), and should be regarded as alternative spellings of the same suffix. Consequently, from this point -*aholic*, -*oholic* and -*holic* will be treated together and as one, and referred to as merely -*holic*[67].

7.4.1.4   An analysis of the attached elements

Table 4, below, shows the different elements to which -*holic* attaches in the corpus and notes the number of types and the overall percentage attachment for each different element. Although, as previously discussed, orthographic differences in attaching are not of concern when calculating the numbers of types in the corpus, they are relevant when considering how and to what the splinters / affixes fuse. This means that, in this section, *clothesaholic* and *clothes-aholics*, *Sale-oholics* and

---

[67] My choice to refer to the suffix as -*holic*, rather than the more used -*aholic*, is because -*holic* does not preclude -*aholic* or -*oholic*, whereas -*aholic* does not allow for -*oholic*. Rather than continually refering to -*holic(s)*, I am using -*holic* to refer to the singular and plural generically, as well as merely the singular form.

saleaholic and *spend-aholic* and *spendaholics* will all be treated separately, as will *phoneaholic* from the other two orthographic variants *phonaholic* and *phonoholic*, which are instances of the same type as they both lose their terminal *e*. There are, therefore, 76 types of concern rather than 72 when considering the nature of the attached elements. This is merely an orthographic point as phonologically the different methods of attachment are obscured.

From a phonological stand point, element + *aholic* (e.g. *phoneaholic*), element minus terminal *e* + *aholic* (*phonaholic*) and element + hyphen + *holic* (*phone-aholic*) forms are all the same. All that is important phonologically is the nature of the attaching element (splinter, compound, word, etc.) rather than the nature of the attachment, which means that phonologically there are 72 types in the corpus. However, as discussed in section 7.1.1.2, the following discussion is to concentrate mainly on orthographic features. The discussion, though, does draw on phonology to an extent as the existence of an available pronunciation remains an important factor in the generation of the words.

Table 4: Elements attached to *-holic*:

Attached element	Number of types	Percentage
Word	44	57.9%
Word + Hyphen	11	14.5%
Clip	6	7.9%
Splinter	5	6.5%
Word Minus Terminal *e*	3	3.9%
Initial Combining Form	3	3.9%

Attached element	Number of types	Percentage
Compound + Hyphen	1	1.3%
Clipping Compound + Hyphen	1	1.3%
Splinter + Hyphen	1	1.3%
No Attached Element	1	1.3%

44 of the types (57.9%) within the corpus are of *-holic* being added to complete words. This is the most usual way in which derivations are formed.

In three of the types the attached word loses its terminal *e*, and is replaced by one of the usual combining vowels (either *a* or *o*). These forms follow general rules of English spelling, which prescribe that when a suffix beginning with a vowel that is not *e* is added to a word that ends in *e*, it is usual for the attaching word to lose its final *e* (as in *coming* and *microwavable*). It is worth noting, though, that this rule can be ambiguous and does not always apply (as in *judgement* and the alternative *microwaveable*). There are 12 types in the corpus in which the joining element ends in *e* and each type has one token a piece, apart from *phon[a/o]holic* which has two (one joining with *a* and one with *o*). Of these 13 tokens, only four have a first element that loses the final *e*. However, in five of the cases if the first element was without its terminal *e* it would not read as it was intended to (for instance, compare *rageaholic* to *ragaholic*, or *saleaholic* to *salaholic*). Therefore, it is only four out of eight tokens (50%) that do not utilise the affix spelling rule that could. Out of those four, one (*phoneaholic*) has two alternatives that do use the spelling rule (*phon[ao]holic*) and two more attach with a fail-safe hyphen (*active-aholic* and *bauble-aholics*). Therefore, it is safe to say that, when attaching *-holic* to another

element, normal English affixation spelling rules are generally (though not always) adhered to.

We saw in chapter 2 that clips function as base forms, which means that the six types (7.9%) in which -*holic* is fixed to a clip are just normal examples of derivation.

The 13 types (17.1%) that take the form of base (in these cases, word, compound or clipping compound) + hyphen + terminal string are neither typical of derivations nor blends, but can be classified as either (see the discussion in section 8.4.3). The choice of a hyphen in some of these types is easily explained. In 4 of the instances of word + hyphen + *holic*, the attached words end in *e*; *active-aholic*, *shoe-aholic*, *Bauble-aholics* and *Sale-oholics*. A reason for the hyphen could be confusion over what to do with the final *e* when the spelling rule is fairly ambiguous, as previously discussed. In a further one of the forms, *tea-aholic*, the hyphen could be explained by the fact that the form appeared in a newspaper and the hyphen facilitates ease of comprehension: consider the alternatives *teaaholic* (with an unusual double *a*) or *teaholic* (where the sound of the combining vowel would be lost). Even *teaoholic* is not as simple to comprehend as the utilised form. The example of compound + hyphen + *aholics* is also easy to explain because the compound, *fen-phen*, actually has a hyphen in the middle of it. Thus, had a hyphen not been used, it would have been ambiguous as to whether the addiction was referring to *phen* rather than the whole form *fen-phen* (cf. *fen-phenaholics*). The remaining 7 types (*food-aholic*, *spend-aholic*, *baby-holics*, *clothes-aholics*, *Golf-aholics*, *Sitcom-aholics* and *hood-aholics*) cannot be as easily explained. However, there are numerous examples of derivations including a hyphen

(discussed below in section 8.4.3), so these seven forms, while perhaps not standing as prototypical derivations, are not atypical of the form either.

Therefore, 86.8% of the types ending in *-holic* in the corpus are formed following normal derivation formation rules.

Out of the remaining 13% of types, in 7.8% the attaching element is a splinter (or splinter + hyphen in one of the instances), so the resultant form is actually a blend. It is interesting to note that in six of the seven of these types, the terminal string is either *-holics* or *-oholic*, both of which could graphically be seen as a splinter lifted from *alcoholic*, unlike the more usually utilised *-aholic*. While it is true to say that under normal derivation rules, a suffix does not attach to anything that is not a base, blends (as discussed in chapter 6) can include suffixes in their forms. In spite of this, it does seem that 7.8% is rather a large percentage of all forms which utilise a specific affix to be classified as a blend[68]. However, it is worth remembering that *-holic* is a relatively new splinter-originating affix and it thus does not seem too unlikely that blends would draw upon this form more than they might for any given non-splinter-originating affix. Consequently, because blends can and do utilise affixes in their formation, the 7.8% of the types which are best classified as blends are largely irrelevant to the discussion of how often *-holic* functions as a typical affix. Of course, one thing that is certain, though, is that, while these forms may not detract from *-holic* acting as an affix, in these 7 types *-holic* is certainly functioning in splinter-like manner.

---

[68] Compare the affix *burger*, in which less than 1% of all types in the corpus can be classified as a blend.

The three examples (3.9%) of initial combining form + -*holic* do seem to contradict the argument that this terminal string is best analysed as a suffix. However, as discussed in chapter 5 (see sections 5.1.2, 5.2.2 and 5.3.5), many linguists classify -*holic* as a final combining form and, if such a classification were to be accepted, then the initial combining form + -*holic* forms would be seen as perfectly acceptable. My own preferred solution, as discussed in section 5.3.5, would be either to widen the scope of derivations to include such forms or to characterise 'affixation' and 'combination' as different functions, rather than to label elements as 'affixes' or 'combining forms', and to classify the role of an element with regard to its usage in any given form. Nonetheless, whether my suggestion is accepted or not, because a combining vowel is an integral part of the linking mechanism of -*holic*, it is easy to understand the motivation which would lead to the tagging of -*holic* onto the end of an initial combining form. It both looks and sounds right – even if one ultimately decides that it violates some perceived rule of word formation.

The final instance to be dealt with is the one where *aholic* appears as if an autonomous word in its own right. However, this occurrence happens within a discussion on affixes, where it is cited as a suffix. This metalinguistic mention cannot count as autonomous usage and actually gives further weight to the argument that it is a productive suffix.

To summarise, then, in 87% of the cases in the corpus, the attached element functions as a base, which means that -*holic* is behaving as a normal suffix. There is a viable explanation for -*holic* not attaching to a base in seven of the remaining ten cases, although -*holic* enters into blends in a higher percentage of total forms than would be

generally expected for an affix. This leaves the three instances in which -*holic* is attached to a combining form. These three instances are only tricky if -*holic* is viewed as a suffix (as I propose it should be) rather than as a final combining form. In any case, -*holic* functions in a distinctly non affix-like manner in only 3.9% of the types in the corpus.

Therefore, it can be concluded that, in the case of -*holic*, the characteristics of a splinter originating affix with regard to factor 4 are generally the same as the characteristics of any normal affix. However, perhaps because of its origins as a splinter, -*holic* appears in more blends than would be expected of normal affixes. It also occasionally joins with combining forms, which would generally be regarded as breaking the rules of affixation. This points to the fact that the rules of affixation do not apply as strictly to splinter-originating affixes as they do to affixes in general.

7.4.1.5 Relationships between -*holic*, its initial source word *alcoholic* and the attached elements

None of the above forms could be regarded as a contracted lexical string of the attached element + *alcoholic*.

There are no real striking semantic similarities between -*holic* and any of the attaching words, although some of the attached words do have similarities with the source word *alcohol*. For instance, *smoke* and *sex* both carry the same connotations of "vice", and *food*, *chocolate*, *curry* and *chips*, like *alcohol*, are all "things you consume

that are bad for you". However, even including such links, the majority of the types contain no real semantic relationship between the elements.

None of the above attaching forms overlap with *holic*. However, the attaching element in 17% of the 101 forms (not the 76 types) ends in either *a* or *o* and, as such, could be seen as overlapping with *(a/o)holic*.

The four *chocoholic* forms and *ecoholic* all end in *coholic*, which has a seven letter overlap with the initial source form *alcoholic*. *Smokoholic* has the same phonetic (though not graphic) overlap. However, the eleven forms of the *chocaholic*, *workaholic*, *funkaholic* and *talkaholic* types could have all had this same overlap by choosing *-oholic* over *-aholic* and yet they did not. Of course, these forms still retain some form of phonetic overlap as the pronunciation of *chocoholic* and *chocaholic* is, to all intents and purposes, generally identical. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these are written, rather than spoken, forms and it is only authorial choice that prevents these words from having a graphic overlap. With all this in mind, because the majority of forms that could have done so did not display this overlap with the initial source word *alcoholic*, this graphic overlap cannot really be viewed as a common motivating factor for the formations.

7.4.1.6   A summary of the properties of *-holic* (from *alcoholic*) with regard to the 5 factors

-holic, unlike any of the splinters analysed, does appear in dictionaries and literature

and can be described without reference to the source word. It appears in 72 types in the corpus, which is far more than the three types of the most productive of the splinters analysed (*-inator*). The number of tokens for these types range from 1 (for many of the types, including *wantaholic* and *knitaholics*) to 675 (for the *workaholic* forms). There are three different orthographic varieties of *-holic* (*-(a/o)holic*) due to the combining vowel. *-holic* attaches to bases in 87% of the types and splinters in 8% of the types. (It is worth noting that it only attaches to elements that affixes "should not" attach to in 4% of the types.) This is far more affix-like behaviour than was displayed by the splinters *labrado-*, *-oodle* and *-unnel*, but is still less affix-like behaviour, ratio-wise, than was displayed by the splinter *-inator*, in respect of factor four. Not many of the *-holic* types contained obvious internal relationships between the elements (or the attached element and the source word) that could provide a motivation for formation, as compared to the percentage of types involving the splinters analysed.

7.4.2   A case analysis of the splinter-originating affix *-(a)thon* (originally from *marathon*)

7.4.2.1   Definitions and classifications of *-(a)thon*

Like *-holic*, *-(a)thon* appears in dictionaries and definitions make clear that *-(a)thon* can be described without referring to the initial source word *marathon*.

The Complete Oxford English Dictionary Second Edition (1994) defines:

-athon: a combining form, barbarously extracted from marathon, used occasionally in the U.S. (*talkathon, walkathon*) rarely in Britain, to form words denoting something carried on for an abnormal length of time.

As highlighted in section 5.2.2, the same dictionary gives *-thon* a separate entry:

-thon, suffix. Var. *-athon*

The definition in the Collins English Dictionary (1994) is slightly different:

-thon suffix forming nouns, indicating a large scale event or operation of a specified kind: *telethon*. [C20: on the pattern of *marathon*]

This, though, is not problematic because the *-(a)thon* described in both dictionaries is clearly referring to the same suffix and, as discussed in section 6.1.2 and 6.2.4.3, derivations regularly do have different nuances of meaning.

The Collins and Oxford dictionaries, then, are in agreement that *-thon* is no longer a splinter of *marathon* and both agree that *-thon* is a suffix (although the OED regards *-thon* as a variant form of *-athon* which it classifies as a combining form). This, again, draws attention to the grey area between affixes and combining forms, discussed at length in chapter 5.

Linguists are also in general agreement that *-(a)thon* is best classified as a suffix. As discussed in 5.2.2, Marchand (1969), Cannon (1986) and Quinion (1996) all cite

-(a)thon as a splinter-originating suffix.

7.4.2.2   Number of words in the corpus ending in *-(a)thon(s)* (excluding *marathon*, regarded as the initial form)

The following table contains an exhaustive list of the words in the corpus ending in

-(a)thon(s), where *-(a)thon* is used to denote "a large scale event" or "something

carried out for an abnormal length of time". As was the case with *-holic*, the number

on the direct right of the word indicates the number of tokens. The layout and

analyses of the *-(a)thon* words follow the same format as did the *-holic* words above,

and the same points made in section 7.4.1.2 are relevant here also.

Table 5: Words in the corpus ending in *-thon* (excluding *marathon*):

Upper case singular	Upper case plural	Lower case singular	Lower case plural	Analysis of orthography
Aerobathon 15		*aerobathon* 5	*aerobathons* 1	spl (*aerobics*) + *athon*
Aerothon 1			*aerothons* 1	ICF + *thon*
		backslapathon 1		Cmpd + *athon*
		balloonathon 1		wd + *athon*
		biggestsurfathon 1		lexical string + *athon*
		bikeathon 1		wd + *athon*
		blubbathon 1		wd + *b* + *athon*
Boardathon 1				wd + *athon*
Bondathon 1				wd + *athon*
		boozathon 2		wd (-*e*) + *athon*

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
		boreathon 1		wd + *athon*
Callas athon 1				wd + space + *athon*
Campbellathon 1				wd + *athon*
		cavortathon 1		wd + *athon*
Chatathon 1				wd + *athon*
Chessathon 1		*chessathon* 1		wd + *athon*
			clapathons 1	wd + *athon*
Climbathon 4				wd + *athon*
		clubathon 1		wd + *athon*
		cocktailathon 1		wd + *athon*
		cookathon 1		wd + *athon*
Crappiethon 7				wd + *thon*
Crickathon 4				spl (*cricket*) + *athon*
		crawlathon 1		wd + *athon*
Cuddlathon 1				wd (*-e*) + *athon*
		cyclathon 1		wd (*-e*) + *athon*
Damnathon 1				wd + *athon*
Danceathon 1		*danceathon* 1		wd + *athon*
			depravathons 1	wd (*-e*) + *athon*
		dinosaurathon 1		wd + *athon*
		drinkathon 2		wd + *athon*
		dyke-athon 1		wd + hyphen + *athon*
Ergothon 1				ICF + *thon*
Eurothon 1				ICF + *thon*
		fishathon 1		wd + *athon*
		flirtathon 1		wd + *athon*
		funathon 1		wd + *athon*

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
		funkathon 2		wd + *athon*
Genethon 9				wd + *thon*
		grindathon 1		wd + *athon*
		gruelathon 1		wd + *athon*
		gurnathon 1		wd + *athon*
		healathon 1		wd + *athon*
Improthon 4				clip + *thon*
		jugglethon 1		wd + *thon*
		Kissathon 1		wd + *athon*
		llamathon 1		wd + *thon*
		lunchathon 1		wd + *athon*
Madonnathon 2				wd + *thon*
		massageathon 1		wd + *athon*
			mothathons 1	wd + *athon*
		mirthathon 1		wd + *athon*
Nerdathon 1				wd + *athon*
Poethon 7				Overlapping wd + *thon* (blend on *t*)
			raunchathons 1	wd + *athons*
Readathon 1		*readathon* 2		wd + *athon*
		rockathon 1		wd + *athon*
	Saddamathons 1			wd + *athon*
Saddammathon 1				wd + *m* + *athon*
		schlockathon 1		wd + *athon*
		schmoozathon 1		wd (-*e*) + *athon*
		schmooze athon 1		wd + space + *athon*
		sexathon 1		wd + *athon*
		shiverathon 1		wd + *athon*

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
Shoulderpadothon 1				cmpd + *o* + *thon*
Signathon 2				wd + *athon*
Singathon 1				wd + *athon*
Skateathon 1				wd + *athon*
		slap-athon 1		wd + hyphen + *athon*
		sleaze-athon 1	*sleaze-athons* 1	wd + hyphen + *athon*
		slogathon 1		wd + *athon*
Slugathon 1				wd + *athon*
		smokathon 1		wd (*-e*) + *athon*
		smut-athon 1		wd + hyphen + *athon*
		snogathon 2		wd + *athon*
		snorathon 1		wd (*-e*) + *athon*
		snoreathon 2		wd + *athon*
Spermathon 1				wd + *athon*
	Spittathons 1			wd + *t* + *athons*
		squelchathon 1		wd + *athon*
Stadiathon 1				wd + *athon*
			slogathons 2	wd + *athons*
			stompathons 1	wd + *athons*
		surfathon 1		wd + *athon*
Swimathon 3			*swimathons* 1	wd + *athon*
		talkathon 7	*talkathons* 2	wd + *athon*
Telethon 93	*Telethons* 14	*telethon* 39	*telethons* 31	clip + *thon*
Texathon 1				spl (*Texas*) + *thon*

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography
		thesp-athon 1		clip + hyphen + *athon*
		thinkathon 1		wd + *athon*
		trailathon 1		wd + *athon*
Trash- athon 1				wd + hyphen + space + *athon*
		versathon 2		wd (*-e*) + *athon*
		walkathon 1		wd + *athon*
		wankathon 1		wd + *athon*
		yawnathon 2		wd + *athon*
		yuppiethon 1		wd + *thon*

As shown in the above table, the corpus has 110 different instances of *-(a)thon* being added to the end of words to denote a large scale event of a specified type, excluding the initial form *marathon*.

12 of the words appear more than once, but with hyphens, variant cases and plurals, accounting for 27 of the 110 occurrences. There are 8 variations of *telethon* in the above list, 3 variations of *aerobathons* and 2 variations each of *aerothon, chessathon, danceathon, readathon, Saddamathon, sleaze-athon, slogathon, snorathon, swimathon* and *talkathon*. These variants are regarded as different instances of the same type and should only be counted once each.

This means that there are 95 different types in the corpus which end in *-(a)thon* (excluding *marathon*).

7.4.2.3 Orthographic variations: *-thon* or *-athon*?

The above list has 110 forms, 92 (83.6%) of which end in *-athon(s)*. In three of the other 18 cases the attaching word ends in *a*, so the final form still graphically finishes in *athon*. In five of the remaining cases, the attaching elements end in an *o*, which functions as the combining vowel in place of the *a* of *-athon*. In a further eight (7.3%) of the cases, the attaching element ends in an *e*: the four *telethon* forms, *genethon*, *crappiethon*, *yuppiethon* and *jugglethon*. In *crappiethon*, *yuppiethon* and the *telethon* cases, the final *e* (or *ie*) of the attaching elements functions as a straight-forward combining vowel. However, in the attached words *gene* and *juggle*, the final *e* is not naturally pronounced, which means that in the types *genethon* and *jugglethon* there is either no combining vowel, which would halt the flow of the word, or the final *e* of the attached words has to be pronounced. The latter of these options is surely preferable to the former for reasons of euphony. Thus, all of these forms can be seen as having a combining vowel, but this is forced in two of the cases.

There is one case, *shoulderpadothon*, where a combining *o* is used rather than a combining *a* with no apparent motivation. This form could be said to indicate that the terminal string is moving further away from its original source word of *marathon*, which does not display the form *othon*. However, because it is only one form, it is probably best put down to authorial preference or error.

The final non *-athon* ending form is *poethon*, where the attached word does not finish in anything like a vowel. However, this form is a blend as the *t* of *poet* (or *poetry*)

runs into the *t* of *thon*, and so the penultimate *e* of *poet* functions naturally as a combining vowel.

So, to address the proposed question: '*-athon* or *-thon*?', the answer would seem to be *-athon*, unless the attached element terminates in a vowel. However, in spite of this fact, from here onwards I will use the term *-thon* generically to refer to all singular and plural versions of *-thon* and *-athon*[69].

7.4.2.4   An analysis of the attached elements

The table below shows the different elements to which *-thon* attaches in the corpus and notes the number of types and the overall percentage attachment for each different element. Although there are 95 types in the corpus, 2 of the words appear twice, with spelling differences:

> *Saddammathon* and *Saddamathons*
>
> *snorathon* and *snoreathon*

Unlike case and plural variations, spelling differences are (usually) stylistic choices and require analysis, so for the purpose of this section, these forms are counted differently, which means 97 forms are of concern:

---

[69] I have followed the same line of reasoning here as with *-holic* (see footnote 10 of this chapter, above).

Table 6: Elements attached to -thon:

Attached element	Number of types	Percentage
Word	66	68%
Word Minus Terminal *e*	8	8.2%
Hyphen + Word	4	4.1%
Word With Double Final Consonant	3	3.1%
Splinter	3	3.1%
Initial Combining Form	3	3.1%
Word + Space	2	2.1%
Compound	2	2.1%
Clip	2	2.1%
Hyphen + Clip	1	1%
Lexical String	1	1%
Overlapping word	1	1%
Word + Hyphen + Space	1	1%

66 of the types (68%) within the corpus are of *-thon* being added to complete words. This is the most usual way in which derivations are formed.

In a further eleven of the types (11.3%) the attached words follow standard affix-attaching spelling rules: In three (3.1%) of these cases the attaching words double their final consonant in order to take the affix and a further eight (8.2%) lose their terminal *e*, which is replaced by the combining vowel *a*. Amongst the eight forms that follow the terminal *e* affix spelling rule there are 10 tokens, which compares favourably to the 7 tokens of the corresponding 5 types that could lose the final *e* but actually retain it (*boreathon, massageathon, sleaze-athon[s], snoreathon* and *schmooze athon*). Thus, where it would be possible, the attaching element loses its

terminal *e* in 61.5% of the types and 58.8% of the tokens. The fact that the majority of forms comply with general affixation rules of English spelling supports the premise that *-thon* functions as a normal suffix.

Because clips, compounds and lexical strings all function as base forms, the 5.2% of types in which the attached element is one of these forms are just normal examples of derivation.

The five types (5.1%) that take the form of base (in these cases, word, or clip) + hyphen + terminal string are neither typical of derivations or blends. This is, however, a pattern permitted by both of these word formation processes (see the discussion below in section 8.4.3). As with the corresponding discussion for the suffix *-holic* in section 7.4.1.4 above, the choice of a hyphen can be explained in the two types where the attached words, *dyke* and *sleaze*, end in *e*. This is not an entirely satisfactory conclusion in light of the fact that it has already been established that normal affixation rules are generally followed with respect to a terminal *e*, but it does at least present a possible solution. The remaining three types (*slap-athon*, *smut-athon* and *thesp-athon*), though, cannot really be explained. However, the argument put forward for the corresponding cases with *-holic* – that there are numerous examples of derivations including hyphens and that these three forms, while not standing as prototypical derivations, are not atypical of the form either – is relevant here also.

Thus, 89.6% of the types in the corpus ending in *-thon* are formed following normal derivation formation rules.

Out of the remaining 10.4% of types, in 4.1% the attaching element is either a splinter or an overlapping word. Consequently, these forms are classified as blends. Although it is not "normal" affix-behaviour, affixes can and do appear in blends, and because 4% is not a very large percentage of the overall forms, these types are not of great relevance to the analysis of how typically suffix-like *-thon* is.

The three examples (3.1%), *Ergoton*, *Eurothon* and *aerothon*, which are best analysed as being composed of an initial combining forms + *-thon* do seem to contradict the argument that this terminal string is best analysed as a suffix. However, this is a very small percentage of the overall types and the argument outlined in the corresponding section for *-(a/o)holic* (as discussed in section 7.4.2.4) is relevant here also.

The final instances to be dealt with are the three (3.1%) in which there is a space within the orthographic form: *Trash- athon*, *Callas athon* and *schmooze athon*. It is not normal for either derivations or blends to have a space in the middle of the form, and when this does occur it is usually because of a typing error. This explanation could account for one of the three types and, due to the hyphen, is almost certainly the case with *Trash- athon*. An alternative explanation can be proffered for two of these instances. *Callas athon* is referring to a *Maria Callas athon* and the space between *Callas* and *athon* could be there as a stylistic choice to mirror the space between *Maria* and *Callas*. The space between *schmooze* and *athon* could be there to avoid an *ea* join, although there is no obvious explanation as to why a space was chosen over a hyphen or a loss of the terminal *e*. Whatever the case, the *athon* in all of these forms functions as it has in all of the other types and the space within the form neither adds

anything to or detracts anything from the meaning. Also, because such spaces are not regular to either derivations or blends, and because these types make up such a small percentage (3.1%) of the overall total, they are largely irrelevant to the search for characteristic properties of the typical splinter-originating affix.

In conclusion, then, in almost 90% of the cases in the corpus *-thon* is functioning in the manner of a normal suffix. 3% of the cases feature a space not characteristic of either blends or derivations, but there are feasible explanations for these forms, including the fact that they could be typing errors. In 4% of the cases, *-thon* attaches to splinters, which is not really typical of affixation but is permissible to form a blend. However, in 3% of the total forms, *-thon*, attaches to combining forms which is a pattern generally regarded as outside of the scope of affixation. As with *-holic*, the best conclusion may be that while *-thon* generally functions as a regular affix with respect to factor four, it is perhaps the case that the rules of affixation do not apply as strictly to splinter-originating affixes as they do to affixes in general.

7.4.2.5   Relationships between *-thon*, its initial source word *marathon* and the attached elements

None of the above forms could be regarded as a contracted lexical string of the attached element + *marathon*.

There are no real semantic similarities between *-thon* and any of the attaching words. However, some of the joining elements, such as *walk, climb, bike, dance, chess, swim,*

juggle, *aerob* (from *aerobics*) and *crick* (from *cricket*), share the "sporting" connotations of *marathon*. Slightly more tenuously, still more of the attached words share the connotation of "physical exertion" with the source word, including *sex*, *snog*, *wank* and *bonk*.

One (1%) of the above attaching forms, *poet*, overlaps graphically (though not phonically) with *thon*. This form is a blend and this graphic overlap could be seen as being the linguistic motivation for the coinage.

More dubiously, the attaching element in four of the types (4.1%) ends in an *a*: *Madonnathon*, *Stadiathon*, *Texathon* and *llamathon*. The attached elements in these forms could be seen as overlapping with *athon*.

Three (3.1%) of the forms, *dinosaurathon*, *snorathon* and *shiverathon*, end in *rathon*, which has a 6 letter overlap with the initial source form *marathon*. However, a further 2 types *(snoreathon* and *boreathon)* could have had this same graphic overlap if the attaching element had lost its terminal *e* and yet they did not[70].

This is still, though, a relatively small percentage of total forms with a transparent relationship between the elements, when compared to the equivalent 100% of clear internal relationships for the types involving the analysed splinters. With all this in mind, the majority of the *-thon* forms cannot be analysed as having overt transparent motivations for their coinage.

---

[70] Of course, the phonic overlap remains in spite of this. Additionally, *Aerothon* and *Eurothon* have this six letter equivalent phonic overlap, which could be analysed as a motivation for their coinages.

7.4.2.6   A summary of the properties of *-thon* (from *marathon*) with regard to the 5 factors

The conclusions to be drawn from the analysis of *-thon* are much the same as those from the examination of *-holic*. *-thon* does appear in dictionaries and linguistic literature and can be described without reference to the source word. It appears in 95 types in the corpus, which is considerably more times than even *-holic*. The number of tokens for these types range from 1 (as is the case with many of the instances, including *funathon* and *llamathon*) to 177 (for the *telethon* forms). This, though, does not seem particularly relevant as 1 to 177 is a considerably smaller range of token numbers than was the case for both the splinter-originating affix *-holic* (1 to 675) and the terminal splinter *-unnel* (1 to 367).

-thon attaches to bases in 87 (90%) of the types, which is both a larger number and a slightly greater percentage than *-holic*. Of the remaining 10%, *-thon* only attaches to elements that affixes "should not" attach to in 4% of the total types. There are different orthographic varieties of *-thon*, although *-thon* has only two typical varieties as compared with *-holic*'s three. Not many of the *-thon* types displayed internal relationships between the elements (or the attached element and the source word) that could provide a motivation for formation, as compared to the percentage of types involving the splinters analysed.

7.5 Conclusions on the properties of splinter-originating affixes with regard to the 5 factors for analysis, and a comparison with the equivalent findings for splinters

With regard to factor 1 (which concerns definitions, classifications and describability), the case analyses of *-holic* and *-thon* have brought to light the fact that, unlike splinters, it is usual for splinter-originating affixes to appear in dictionaries or to be cited in linguistic literature. Also, both of these suffixes are easily describable without reference to their original source words, which was not true of the splinters analysed.

With regard to the number of occurences in the corpus (factor 2), both *-holic* and *-thon* have far more types (72 and 95, respectively) than any of the splinters analysed (which have between 1 and 3 types). The same general pattern is not as apparent with regard to number of tokens, as *-unnel* has more tokens with a greater range than *-thon*. However, both *-holic* and *-thon* have far more tokens (both in terms of number and range) than *-inator*, *labrado-* and *-oodle*.

Regarding factor 3, out of the splinters analysed, only *-inator* displayed orthographic variations, whereas both *-thon* and *-holic* had more than one regular spelling variety.

With respect to factor 4 (an analysis of the combining elements), both *-thon* and *-holic* attached to bases in approximately 90% of the types. Conversely, three of the four splinters did not attach to a base in any of their types, further highlighting the different usages of splinters and splinter-originating affixes. However, the third

splinter -*inator* attached to a base in 100% of its types, but there were only three types and all of the attaching words displayed an overlap with the source word *terminator*. As observed above, both -*holic* and -*thon* were attached to combining forms in 4% of each of their types, which is not typical of affixes. Similarly, both suffixes (and -*holic*, in particular) were attached to splinters to form blends more than is perhaps usual for affixes.

The splinter-originating affixes also revealed themselves as different to the splinters in light of factor 5. All of the types involving all of the splinters displayed internal relationships between the elements that could be seen as providing a motivation for the coinages, whereas this was not true for the majority of types including -*holic* and -*thon*.

In conclusion, -*holic* and -*thon* reveal themselves as having very similar characteristics to each other in light of the five factors. These properties are different from the ones displayed by all of the splinters in respect of factors 1 (definitions and classifications), 2 (number of instances) and 5 (internal relationships). The features of the splinter-originating affixes revealed by factors 3 (orthographic variations) and 4 (analysis of the attached element) are different to the qualities displayed by all but one of the analysed splinters, but are similar to the properties of the splinter -*inator*.

The case analyses in this chapter, then, have successfully brought to light characteristics which are common within splinters and characteristics that are displayed by splinter-originating affixes. The above discussion has also explored the differences between splinters and splinter originating affixes with regard to these

features. The next step, therefore, is to use these findings to compose criteria that can help to classify any given borderline string as either a splinter or an affix, which is the subject of the following chapter.

Chapter 8:

Establishing criteria that will separate

splinters from splinter-originating affixes

In the previous chapter, splinters and splinter-originating affixes were analysed with regard to five factors. These case analyses revealed several properties common to splinters which were not characteristic of splinter-originating affixes, and vice-versa. Now that these typical characteristics have been established, it is possible to propose criteria that will enable splinter-originating affixes to be differentiated from splinters.

The criteria shall take the five factors for analysis, highlighted in the last chapter, as its starting point. For ease of reference, these five factors are:

1) Definitions and classifications in dictionaries and linguistic literature when available, and the ease of providing a definition without reference to the source word.

2) The number of instances in which the string occurs within the corpus.

3) The different kinds of orthographic form of the string.

4) The kinds of elements the string attaches to.

5) Any relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements.

Each of these factors will be discussed in depth and a criterion based on each will be either proposed or rejected.

8.1   Factor one: Definitions and previous classifications

This first factor really has two distinct components. The first part concerns whether or not a string appears in dictionaries and/or the literature and, if it does, the previous classifications it has already received. The second part regards the "describability" of a string – in other words, how easy it is to describe without reference to the original source word. In the last chapter, factor one was revealed as possibly the most indicative factor as to whether a string is best classified as a splinter or an affix. This is because all of the splinters did not appear in dictionaries or the literature and were not easily describable. Conversely, both of the affixes were featured in the literature and dictionaries (where they were classified as affixes) and were both describable without reference to their original source words.

8.1.1   Appearance in dictionaries and linguistic literature

The first feature of this factor, then, regards whether a string has previously been described, either in dictionaries or in the literature. Logic dictates that if a string is in a dictionary, it is almost a certain sign that it is not a splinter. Similarly, if a string well-known enough to be referenced in the literature then there is a good chance that it is at least on the way to becoming a productive affix. It does not, however, follow that if a string does not appear in dictionaries and is not cited in linguistic literature then it is necessarily a splinter. This is because not every splinter or affix is going to

be discussed by linguists and, often, it takes dictionaries many years to catch up with recording linguistic trends.

When strings are featured in either dictionaries or the literature, the accompanying classifications are of interest. One reason for this is that it would be easy to take the viewpoint that all strings cited in the literature must be too well established to be considered as splinters. However, if the citing in the literature is during a discussion of blending, it is clear that the author would be intending that the string should be classified as a splinter. Consequently, the previous classifications of a string must be analysed along-side the mere fact of citation (although it is necessary to bear in mind that such classifications are by no means foolproof).

8.1.1.1   Criterion one established

Accordingly, this feature suggests the first criterion for differentiating between splinters and splinter-originating affixes. <u>Criterion one</u>, then, regards whether a string is cited in dictionaries or linguistic literature: If a string appears in dictionaries or in the literature it is likely that the best analysis is as an affix, unless the accompanying classification directs otherwise.

8.1.2   Describability of a string without reference to the source word

The second component of factor one concerns the ease with which a string can be described without reference to the initial source word. In theory, it should be very difficult to provide a definition of a splinter without either citing or, at the very least, directly describing the source word. This is because a splinter, by definition, has a source word and, in order to understand the blend, the splinter must be traceable back to this word (at least in context). The reason for this is that, as Adams (1973: 142) puts it, there is 'a special relationship of meaning between the splinter and some 'regular' word in which it occurs'. When a splinter crosses over to become an affix it does not, of course, change history and, etymologically speaking, it still comes from a particular word with a particular meaning. However, because affixes are productive, they become familiar to the reader or hearer out of their original contexts. Thus, they go from taking their original source word's meanings into many different forms to becoming autonomously imbued with that meaning, and refining it for themselves. Because of this, an affix has a semantic completeness and autonomy to a much larger extent than a splinter.   Therefore, while a splinter necessarily brings to the hearer's/reader's mind the source word in order to be effective, a splinter-originating affix can put across its meaning without the source word having to be accessed. Consequently, splinter-originating affixes should generally be describable without reference to the original source word.

As discussed in the case analyses of the last chapter, *-holic* and *-thon* are both autonomously describable (as "addict" and "large scale event" / "lasting a long time",

respectively). This is not coincidental. Consider, also, the suffixes *-gate* (as in *Camillagate* and *Squidgygate*) and *-scape* (as in *seascape* and *cityscape*). Both of these can be easily defined (as "scandal" and "scenic view", respectively) without having to refer back to the relevant source words *Watergate* and *landscape*. In contrast, the splinters *labrado-*, *-oodle*, *-unnel* and *-inator* were all unable to be described without referring to the source words *labrador*, *poodle*, *tunnel* and *terminator*.

8.1.2.1 Criterion two established

With all of this in mind, a second differentiating criterion can be established. Criterion two, then, concerns the ease with which a string can be described without reference to the original source word: If a string can be described without citing or directly describing the source word it is likely that the best analysis is as an affix; if it is necessary to refer to the source word it is likely that the best analysis is as a splinter.

8.2 Factor two: Number of instances in the corpus

In the case analyses, one of the most obvious differences between the splinters and affixes analysed was the disparity in the frequencies with which they appeared in the corpus. The splinters occurred in between one and three types, whereas the splinter-originating affixes analysed appeared far more frequently, with 72 types for *-holic* and

95 types for *-thon*. Indeed, this is what one would logically expect to find as affixes,

by their nature, are usual features of the language whereas splinters are novel and,

therefore, infrequently used. Intuitively, it thus seems obvious that perhaps the main

factor that determines whether a string is best analysed as a blend forming splinter or

a derivation forming affix is the frequency with which it is used or, rather, its level of

productivity.

8.2.1   Splinters and affixes – relative productivities

As we have already seen, in the 400,000,000 word Independent Newspaper corpus,

there is only one type ending in the splinter *-oodle*, other than the source word from

poodle. This is in the type *labradoodle*, which appears only three times in the whole

corpus. Conversely, there are over 600 types ending in the suffix *-dom*, with many

thousands of tokens. As the case analyses highlighted, the splinter-originating affixes

-holic and *-thon* are far more productive than typical splinters, but still less productive

than typical affixes such as *-dom*.

This, then, raises the question as to just how generally used a string has to be before it

crosses over from a splinter to an affix. While there is a consensus in the literature

that this can occur, there have been no suggestions as to how to identify the point

when the reclassification should take place. There has also been no exploration of the

notion of productivity, which underpins the discussion of productive splinters

becoming affixes.

In the case analyses, productivity was measured by a simple type count. There have, however, been several objections to this as a measure of productivity (see section 8.2.2.6, below). Perhaps the biggest problem with such a measure is that a type count in a fixed word corpus only provides a number directly comparable with another type count gleaned from the same corpus. Consequently, any such type count for any given string cannot be compared with another type count from a separate study.

It is clear, then, that because productivity in relation to splinters has never been examined and because there are issues surrounding the acceptance of a type count as the best measure of productivity, it is necessary to explore the notion of productivity before a suitable criterion can be composed.

8.2.2   Productivity – an exploration

In the view of many linguists, the major difference between affixes and splinters with respect to productivity is that derivation is a productive process whereas blending is not. For instance, Van Marle (1985) discusses the central place of regularity in theories of word-formation:

> ...any serious theory of word-formation should introduce a distinction between coining-devices by means of which the lexicon of a language can 'systematically' or 'regularly' be extended, and coining-devices which cannot be characterized in terms of 'systematic' and 'regular'.
>
> (Van Marle, 1985: 50)

This distinction is the central difference between blends and derivations. Blending is not systematic, regular or predictable. For instance, a blend of the words *banana* and *toffee* could just as easily have been *bananoffee, banaffee, batoffee, toffana, toffnana,* etc., as the selected, and now accepted, *banoffee*. Indeed, even though *banoffee* has become the accepted form, the orthographic variation *banoffi* is used almost as frequently, highlighting the lack of regularity even in the most well-known blends. In blending, thus, it is hard to predict the form that the splinter will take and where in the final lexeme it will attach. Indeed, splinters of the same word can take more than one form (as discussed with regard to the splinters of *terminator*, in the last chapter). Conversely, derivations are formed in a 'regular' and 'systematic' manner, in that a recognisable affix is attached to a base in a predictable way.

This distinction, as we shall see, is often considered as fundamental with regard to productivity.

8.2.2.1 Productivity related to regularity, predictability and systematic extension of the language

Splinters and affixes, then, fall on different sides of Van Marle's distinction with regard to regularity, predictability and systematic extension. This distinction is central to his theory of productivity because he takes the work of Schultink and Uhlenbeck as his starting point, of whose work he says:

...the notion of morphological productivity came to be associated with 'regularity' in their work

<div align="right">(Van Marle 1985: 45)</div>

Systematic extension of language is another factor that has been acknowledged as an important aspect of productivity. Van Marle, who translated parts of Uhlenbeck's studies, says of his later work:

> He explicitly takes the stand that the concept of morphological productivity must only be associated with those 'recipes' by means of which the lexicon can be <u>systematically</u> extended (Uhlenbeck, 1981: 12)
>
> <div align="right">(Van Marle, 1985: 45-46, emphasis in original)</div>

Predictability has also been identified as being central to productivity:

> Predictability and productiveness – the potential ability to appear in a great many words – tend to go together.
>
> <div align="right">(Adams 1973: 12)</div>

Regularity, predictability and 'systematic' extension are central also to Marchand's (1969) theory of productivity (as summarised by Kastovsky, 1986):

> ...[productivity] should only deal with the items that are synchronically analyzable as morphologically complex... ; that are not isolated, but belong to

<div align="right">245</div>

a series of similar formations, a pattern, and to a pattern according to which

new items can be produced, one that is productive.

<div align="right">(Kastovsky, 1986: 587)</div>

Consequently, the first aspect of Marchand's theory includes derivations but rules out

blends from the realm of productivity:

The result of blending is, indeed, always a moneme, i.e. an unanalysable,

simple word.

<div align="right">(Marchand, 1969: 451)</div>

The second condition, that there should be 'a series of similar formations', implicitly

involves predictability, systematic extension and regularity. This, again, is

characteristic of derivation but not of the 'isolated' blend.

It seems, then, that regularity, predictability and systematic extension are central to

productivity, which is why splinters cannot be productive but affixes can be.

However, this still does not explain what productivity is, or how to measure it.

8.2.2.2   What is productivity?

Productivity is the notion that seeks to explain why some phenomena occur or "catch

on" and why some things do not. When theorising on the acceptability of words,

Aronoff (1978) points out:

Though speakers are generally reluctant to accept new words, some new words are more successful than others.

(Aronoff, 1978: 107)

It is the relative success and failures of these new forms with which productivity deals:

> ...productivity is one of the central mysteries of derivational morphology. It is the source of the strange and persistent fact that, though many things are possible in morphology, some are more possible than others.

(Aronoff, 1976: 35)

8.2.2.3   How necessary is the study of productivity?

Historically, some linguists have rejected the need to study productivity. Harris (1951) regarded the study of productivity as impossible, because:

> The methods of descriptive linguistics cannot treat of the degree of productivity of elements, since that is a measure of the difference between our corpus (which may include the whole present language) and some future corpus of the language.

(Harris, 1951[71]: 255)

---

[71] It is, of course, worth pointing out that Harris made this statement before computer corpora were available, so this may no longer be a relevant point.

However, other linguists have argued that productivity can, in fact, be studied synchronically (for instance, Aronoff, 1980: 71-72 and Bauer 1983: 18). In their terms, the point of measuring productivity is to find 'the statistically determinable readiness with which an element enters into new combinations' (Bolinger 1968: 18), which is not dependent upon some future corpus of the language but, in fact, an enlarged sample of the present one (see also Baayen and Lieber, 1991: 811). Additionally, it could be argued that the functions of elements in the recent past are an accurate indicator of what they are likely to do in the near future. As such, it is possible to make reasonable estimations about future productivity also.

Chomsky (1970) also rejects the need to study productivity. He claims that the study of productivity is unnecessary as nominalizations cannot be regarded as being productively generated by a set word-formation rules. Bauer (1983) sums up Chomsky's position:

> The lexicalist position, as outlined by Chomsky, is that all nominalizations (and, and by implication, all compounds and derivatives) are listed independently in the lexicon, i.e. they are treated as if they were fully lexicalized or simplex lexemes.
>
> (Bauer, 1983: 75)

Bauer, though, convincingly rejects this position:

... if an all-or-nothing approach to the question of the transformationalist vs. the lexicalist hypothesis is resisted, and the concept of lexicalization is introduced, then Chomsky's "fairly substantial" evidence in favour of the lexicalist hypothesis ceases to be as substantial as it first appears, and Chomsky's arguments do not rule out the possibility of a generative approach to word-formation. But even if Chomsky's conclusions were accepted in full, a generative approach to word-formation would not necessarily be excluded. This is because Chomsky deals entirely with nominalizations, and points which are true of them are not necessarily true of all types of word-formation.

(Bauer 1983: 81)

Bauer (1983) argues that it is not possible to reject productivity altogether, pointing out that 'certain processes of word-formation, at least, are clearly productive', citing, as a case in point, the suffix *-er*, which 'can be added to any new verbal base to give a new lexeme which means 'the person who carries out the action of the verb'' (p62).

Marchand (1969) agrees that it is necessary to deal with productivity, and warns:

...the linguist who neglects this particular factor [productivity] will be counting 'dead souls' as live people.

(Marchand, 1969: 5)

In the face of evidence such as that mentioned above by Bauer, most linguists do not reject the relevance of productivity in the manner of Harris or Chomsky. However, as pointed out by Aronoff (1980), productivity is often not properly addressed:

The question of productivity has always been a difficult one for modern linguistic theories. In those areas where productivity is not a central concern, it has simply been swept under some convenient rug, or dealt with summarily, so that the field could go on to more important matters.

(Aronoff, 1980: 77)

This is clearly not satisfactory for, as is becoming apparent, productivity is a complex area. Indeed, the point of this exploration of productivity is to avoid "sweeping it under some rug" but, instead, to understand the issues surrounding this area and to make an informed decision about the best way to measure productivity in my study.

However, Aronoff (1980) is generally correct in his observation as, in fact, many of the linguists who have dealt with productivity seem to have problems defining the notion and frequently give it no more than a cursory mention.

8.2.2.4   Basic definitions of productivity

As outlined, productivity is a notion which is often referred to and seems intuitively straight forward, but it is surprisingly hard to define. Aronoff (1976) points out:

The term *productivity* is widely used in studies of derivational morphology, and there is obviously some intuition behind the usage, but most of the discussion of it is rather vague.

(Aronoff, 1976: 35)

There are many basic definitions of productivity. Thompson (1975) offers:

> ... by 'productive', then, I refer to a process which accounts for a speaker's
> ability to form and understand new words.
>
> (Thompson, 1975: 332)

This seems to be too vague and all encompassing. If this definition were to be adopted then there would be no theoretical difference between patterns that produce one form once in the language and patterns that regularly generate new forms.

Lehrer (1995) suggests a similar definition, with the added element of 'native speaker' approval:

> I take the presence of neologisms to be evidence for the contemporary
> productivity of an affix. But, in addition, I accept judgements of acceptability
> for neologisms from native speakers.
>
> (Lehrer, 1995: 135)

Native speaker 'judgements of acceptability' can be valuable and intuition is important in assessing productivity. However, these judgements are also subjective, changeable and difficult to gauge and, as such, do not function well as important deciding factors. Consequently, this definition does not stand up to scrutiny.

Bauer (1983) defines the notion of productivity in a similar way:

Basically, any process (and not necessarily just one in a word-formation) is said to be **productive** if it can be used synchronically in the production of new forms, and non-productive if it cannot be used synchronically in this way.

(Bauer, 1983: 18, emphasis in original)

However, Bauer (1983: 99) regards productivity as a cline (see also Bauer 1988 and 2001), ranging from patterns 'where only one form may exist' to the afore mentioned highly productive -er. The above definition is merely put forward to encompass the full spectrum.

While Bauer's view of productivity is more intuitively appealing than Thompson's or Lehrer's, the problem with it, from the perspective of differentiating between separate processes, is that it is all encompassing. Precisely because all word-formation processes are regarded as being productive, it is harder to draw lines between the more and less productive patterns than it would be if it were possible to say that X pattern is not productive, Y is, and these are the reasons.

8.2.2.5   Productivity as a matter of prediction

Some linguists who have carried out in-depth studies of productivity do, however, make more black and white distinctions. These linguists deal only with derivational morphology under the heading of productivity (see Schultink, 1961; Aronoff, 1976, 1978, 1980; Uhlenbeck, 1978, 1981; Van Marle, 1986; Baayen and Lieber, 1991 and Baayen, 1994a, 1994b, among others).

Such linguists have more definite ideas about the notion of productivity, and tend to reject the basic definitions:

The present study takes the view that the position of Uhlenbeck and Schultink _not_ to equate morphological productivity with the possibility to coin new words is essentially correct.

(Van Marle, 1986: 49, emphasis in original)

Anshen and Aronoff (1988) also do not connect productivity with the ability to generate neologisms, but rather see it as a matter of prediction:

...we define productivity not in terms of the number of existing forms, but rather in terms of the likelihood that new forms will enter the language.

(Anshen and Aronoff, 1988: 643)

This definition of productivity as relating to the future behaviour of word-formation patterns does seem to fit in with intuitions about what productivity should gauge. However, the problem lies with measuring productivity when it is accepted as more than a vague notion equating it with the capacity of generating any new form.

8.2.2.6   Type counts as a measurement of productivity

Aronoff (1976) describes the most basic and widely used method of measuring productivity:

> If we want to compare the productivity of two WFRs [word-formation rules], we may simply make lists of the words formed by the respective processes and add them up. The longer the list the more productive the WFR.
>
> (Aronoff, 1976: 36)

Baayen and Lieber (1991: 803) suggest that the measure is more accurate if there is 'some large and varied but fixed sample on which to base [the] counts.' Baayen (1994b) suggests that a good example of such a corpus would be a large-scale newspaper corpus:

> ...investigate words used in very large text corpora, such as the newspaper corpora that are becoming available on CD-ROM. These collections of daily issues, often comprising tens of millions of tokens, can be scanned for the use of neologisms or very low-frequency items.
>
> (Baayen, 1994b: 450)

Indeed, Renouf and Baayen (1994) successfully examined the relative productivities of the de-adjectival nominalising suffixes *-ness* and *-ity* using precisely this method.

As such, a plausible method of measuring the productivity of borderline splinter / affix strings would seem to be a simple type count based on the 400,000,000 word Independent Newspaper corpus.

This, of course, was the method of productivity used in the case analyses of the last chapter. In those cases, the results did accord with logic and intuition, but there is a possibility that this may have been because the cases analyses were of prototypical forms and, thus, were extremes. Consequently, in order to further assess the accuracy of a type count as a reliable measure of productivity these typical forms must be compared with more borderline strings. The table below contains the type counts for the affixes and splinters analysed in the last chapter, along with those for *dino-* (which was analysed as a splinter-originating affix in section 2.1.4.3), *-ploitation* (which is a splinter of *exploitation* that will be discussed further in section 8.5.1, below) and *-bilia* (considered as a borderline string from the source word *memorabilia*).

Table 7: Productivity in descending order as measured by a type count:

String	Type Count
-thon	95
-holic	72
dino-	46
-bilia	27
-ploitation	13
-inator	3
-unnel	2
labrado-	1
-oodle	1

This order does seem to accord with intuitions about the relative productivities of these strings. Thus, even when borderline strings are of concern alongside typical blends and derivations, it would seem that a type count is a good indicator of productivity.

However, there have been many criticisms of a straight type count as a measure of productivity:

> A numerical measure such as this can only tell us about the actual words of the language, those which have been formed already, and tell us nothing about the possible but not actual words, those which might be formed. What we need is a more dynamic framework, one which can deal with the potential of the system.
>
> (Aronoff, 1980:72)

and also:

> An immediate objection to this method... is that it isn't fair: it doesn't take into account the fact that there are morphological restrictions on the sorts of words one may use as the base of certain WFRs.
>
> (Aronoff, 1976: 36)

Morphological restrictions on possible bases is a topic commonly referred to in writings on productivity (see Bauer (1983), Baayen and Lieber (1991) as well as Aronoff's various studies of productivity). Likewise, Kastovsky (1986) regards

morphological scope as something that needs to be taken into account when measuring productivity:

> A rule may have a wide scope, as with certain action or agent nouns, or a narrow scope, as for example, *-burger*-words, like *hamburger, beefburger*, [sic] *cheeseburger, ?riceburger, ?potatoburger, ?dogburger, ?gooseburger, ?catburger ...*
>
> (Kastovsky, 1986: 595)

This example highlights that while some affixes (such as Bauer's cited *-er*) can have almost universal application, others (such as *-burger*) have a very limited number of bases that they can attach to, and he suggests that any measure of productivity should take these relative scopes into account.

With these criticisms of simple type counts in mind, alternative measures of productivity have been sought that can be applied to the borderline strings.

8.2.2.7   Further methods of measuring productivity

Baayen and Lieber (1991: 809) suggest what they regard as a preferable alternative to a simple type count. They state that a good measure of productivity should meet the requirements that:

1. it reflect the linguist's intuitions concerning productivity,

2. it express 'the statistically determinable readiness with which an element

enters into new combinations' (Bolinger 1948: 18), and

3. It take into account that semantically or formally idiosyncratic words have the effect of lowering the value of the productivity measure.

They suggest $P = n_1/N$ as a measure to satisfy these requirements, and explain:

...n_1 is the number of types with the relevant affix occurring exactly once in the sample (the so-called hapax legomena) and N the total number of tokens of all words with that given affix. Broadly speaking, P expresses the rate at which new types are to be expected to appear when N tokens have been sampled. In other words, P estimates the probability of coming across new, unobserved types, given that the size of the sample of relevant observed types equals N.

(Baayen and Lieber, 1991: 809)

Baayen and Lieber claim that the advantage of P is that it can predict the rate at which new types will appear when the sample is enlarged. They state:

If the sample on the basis of which P is calculated faithfully reflects the properties of the population it is supposed to represent, P can be viewed as a measure of the potentiality of the word-formation process which underlies the sample. In this sense, P is a mathematical formalization of the linguistic notion of morphological productivity.

(Baayen and Lieber 1991: 811)

The calculated P value will be between zero and one. Baayen and Lieber explain the method of analysing P :

> When P is large, many types remained to be sampled. When P is small, nearly all types have been sampled at least once. In the former case, we are dealing with a productive process, for which a large, perhaps infinite number of possible types is characteristic. In the latter case, we are dealing with an unproductive process, where the number of types is small and, of course, finite.
>
> (Baayen and Lieber 1991: 811)

Therefore, a process is more productive as P approaches 1, which renders P as a relative and, thus, comparable value (see Baayen and Lieber, 1991: 818). This is particularly appealing for the purpose of this study, which has low-frequency splinters and productive derivational affixes at either side of a cline with the borderline strings in the middle. In theory, then, the P value for the borderline strings can be ranked and compared to typical P values for splinters and productive affixes. Of course, for this to work it is necessary that the P value for affixes is greater that the P value for splinters.

The table below shows the P values for the same nine splinters, splinter-originating affixes and borderline strings as did table 7:

Table 8: Productivity in descending order as measured by P values:

String	P values
-inator	0.75
-bilia	0.4182
dino-	0.3854
labrado-	0.3333
-oodle	0.3333
-thon	0.2143
-holic	0.0549
-ploitation	0.0541
-unnel	0.0054

This table reveals instant problems with P as a measure of productivity with respect to differentiating between splinters and affixes. According to the above orderings, while the splinter *-unnel* is the least productive of all the strings, the splinter *-inator* is the most productive. Indeed, *labrado-* and *-oodle,* which each only occur in one type in the corpus, would be seen as more productive than the already accepted affixes *-holic*, *-thon* and *dino-*.

P is a more sophisticated measure of productivity than a simple type count, and Baayen and Lieber (1991) have demonstrated that it is a very successful relative measurement of morphological productivity for derivational affixes. However, it is clearly not an accurate measure of the relative productivities of splinters and affixes.

8.2.2.8   Why *P* does not work as a measure of productivity for the borderline strings

P was proposed by Baayen and Lieber (1991) as a measure of morphological productivity for affixes. It has been found to be a successful measure in the past, but that is because it has only been applied to fully fledged affixes. However, the above analysis reveals that *P* cannot successfully be applied as a measure of relative productivity between splinters, affixes and borderline strings. One reason for this may be that affixes and splinters are not similar enough as they represent the two sides of the productive cline being analysed. Another reason, however, could be because (as discussed in section 1.5.2) splinters are not a part of morphology and, consequently, a measure of morphological productivity such as *P* cannot be used to compare morphological elements to strings which are not a part of standard morphology.

Indeed, if the statistical measure of morphological productivity, *P*, is applied to some typical splinters, the relative results do not accord with any possible theory of productivity. If the *P* value is worked out for the splinter *-nomenal* from the source word *phenomenal*, which appears in the blend *morphinomenal*, it emerges as 1, which indicates it is fully productive and could not be more productive. This is because *-nominal*, as a terminal splinter of *phenomenal*, appears with only one type in the corpus and there is only one token of that one type. This shows that *P* can never be applicable as a relative value when a splinter is one of the bench marks.

Indeed, it is doubtful that *P* is a useful measure for even the most productive splinter-

originating affix. This is because of Van Marle's definition of productivity that Baayen and Lieber (1991) chose to adopt:

> By productivity as a morphological phenomenon we understand the possibility of language users to coin, unintentionally, a number of formations which are in principle uncountable.

> (Van Marle, 1985: 45, translating from Schultink, 1961)

Any splinter-originating productive affix has the potential to give rise to an uncountable number of formations, but the unintentionality here is a troublesome concept. Forms including affixes such as *dino-*, *-holic*, *-thon -gate* and *-scape* are widely used, easily coined and easily understood, but it is hard to gauge whether they can be coined 'unintentionally' or are still coined for effect.

Schultink (1961) (whose theory, as outlined above, is the one that Baayen and Lieber based P upon) gets around this problem by allowing for processes which are not productive to create many new forms:

> non-productive processes may give rise to an, in principle, 'uncountable' number of newly coined words.

> (As translated in Van Marle, 1985:47, emphasis in original)

This is how Schultink accounts for elements such as *-holic*, *-thon*, *-gate*, *-scape* and *dino-*.

However, the fact that 'non-productive processes' can give rise to an uncountable

number of formations does not accord with intuition, and is certainly not acceptable for the purposes of this study. Indeed, any definition of productivity that cannot allow for splinters to become fully productive affixes is not useful.

Thus, not only is P rejected as the measure of productivity for the borderline strings, but the notion of productivity that P sets out to measure is rejected also.

Another problem with P is that it equates a high token frequency with low productivity:

> Unproductive word-formation patterns are characterised by high frequencies of use. In fact, it is not uncommon for a less productive or unproductive affix to show up with more tokens in [any given] case than its productive counterpart.
>
> (Baayen, 1994b: 467)

While this may be true for affixes, it does not extend to the blend-originating borderline strings being analysed[72]. When blends are being examined, a high frequency of use - even with regard to tokens - is relevant to productivity. This is because the more a blend is used, the more the splinters within the blend become

---

[72] It is worth noting at this point that, in spite of the fact that the title of Baayen (1994b) is 'Productivity In Language Production', the paper only deals with affixation. This is common to most of the literature on productivity in word-formation. (The reason for this is that blends are not commonly regarded as being a result of a productive pattern of word formation because they do not follow a set of regular word-formation rules.)

accepted, known, and a part of regular language. Thus, a large number of tokens including a certain splinter can lead to that splinter becoming well known and accepted as separable from the source word which, in turn, can lead to that splinter being used in other types.

This study has revealed that the measures of productivity suitable for dealing with affixes are not applicable to splinters and, as such, cannot be applied as a measure of relative productivity between splinters and any other elements. This is why the less sophisticated methods of measuring productivity are reverted to when dealing with splinters and borderline splinter / affix strings.

8.2.2.9   Why a type count <u>does</u> work for measuring the borderline splinters

While regarding their proposed P as superior to a simple word count, Baayen and Lieber do acknowledge that productivity can also be understood as only relating to the number of types:

> Of course, the notion of productivity can also be understood in a less-specific way when the number of different types are the main object of interest.

> (Baayen and Lieber, 1991: 817)

Perhaps this 'less-specific way' refers to productivity when standard derivational affixes are not the main focus.

Zimmer goes a step further and sees the number of formations, not just number of types, as a central issue:

> the frequency with which forms of [a given] schema ... occur (both in terms of different types and tokens of the same type) may well be an important factor in establishing the productive status, for an individual speaker, of this process.
>
> Zimmer (1964: 86)

While this study concentrates more on productivity as measured by the number of types, the number of tokens are seen as important, are often referred to in many of the discussions and are acknowledged as affecting productivity also.

There are, thus, supporters for type counts as a measure of productivity. Even the objections, put forward in section 8.2.2.6, can be disregarded as only applicable to affixes and not to borderline splinter / affix strings.

Aronoff's (1976: 36) objection that a type count 'doesn't take into account the fact that there are morphological restrictions on the sorts of words one may use as the base of certain WFRs' is not relevant either. This is because the base-application scope of a string is one of the things that separates it out as borderline in the first place – if it cannot apply to at least a handful of bases it would never be anything other than a splinter. There could be an argument that a string such as -holic has more types than another element such as -unnel as there are more things you can be addicted to than things that can be converted into a type of tunnel, but that does not mean that it is

more productive within its imposed restrictions. However, it is precisely these restrictions, or lack thereof, that play a part in a splinter becoming widely used, so there is no need to discount them from the productivity measure. Also, Kastovsky's (1986: 595) cited example of 'a rule' with 'a narrow scope' was '*-burger*', which is well known to have originated from blending. Thus, a comparatively narrow rule scope is no bar to a splinter becoming a productive affix (and even, through this route, to it becoming a free-standing lexeme, as did *burger* (see section 2.1)).

There are counter-arguments to Aronoff's second objection to type counts also:

> A numerical measure such as this can only tell us about the actual words of the language, those which have been formed already, and tell us nothing about the possible but not actual words, those which might be formed.
>
> (Aronoff 1980: 72)

One response is that this study is concerned with splinters and borderline affixes and, in Aronoff's terms, forms including these strings are not actually possible to predict anyway! A more serious answer, though, is that the best way of predicting which words may be formed in the future is by examining the behaviour of similar forms in the recent past. A type count alone would not provide an in-depth enough analysis, but this alongside the other criteria (which have been / are still to be established in this chapter) would constitute a fair analysis of past behaviour and present form which would, in turn, form a sound basis for future predictions.

8.2.2.10 Productivity – the approach adopted in this study

Schultink's (1961) definition of productivity, as adopted by Van Marle (1985) and Baayen and Lieber (1991) is rejected on the grounds that any process that can, in principle, generate a countless number of forms is intuitively felt to be productive, whether or not those new forms were coined intentionally.

Thompson's (1975) and Lehrer's (1995) definitions of productivity are also rejected on the grounds that they are too general to be helpful.

Bauer's (1983) idea of productivity as a cline is accepted in principle but is not useful for the purpose of this study, as discussed in 8.2.2.4.

The most valuable definition of productivity found was put forward by Crystal (1985):

> A pattern is 'productive' if it is repeatedly used in language to produce further instances of the same type.
>
> (Crystal, 1985: 247)

This is a fairly simple definition and does not disqualify certain types of word-formation from its remit. It is, though, more helpful than the basic definitions that have been rejected as it refers to 'patterns' and repeated usage, although the level of repetition is still left vague.

What Anshen and Aronoff (1988: 643) term as their 'definition' of productivity is seen as the aim of a successful measure of productivity; to predict 'the likelihood that new forms will enter the language'.

Productivity is measured by a simple type count from the corpus, but the analyses of the synchronic statuses of the borderline strings also take into account previous definitions and classifications, ease of describability, the methods of attachment, lexical status of attached element and the semantic, syntactic, phonic and orthographic qualities of the attached element. All of these factors must be examined before any firm decisions can be made, which means that productivity cannot be seen as relating to type count alone and as separate to the other criteria.

8.2.3   Criterion three established

With all of this in mind, a third differentiating criterion can be established. Criterion three, then, concerns the productivity of a string, in terms of the number of types in the corpus: The more types there are in the corpus involving a string the more likely it is that the best analysis is as an affix. Conversely, if a string does not appear in many types in the corpus the best analysis is as a splinter.

It is, though, difficult to decide on a cut off point as to when a string should be analysed as a splinter and when it should be analysed as an affix. Examining table 7 above, the least productive cited string analysed as an affix (dino-) occurs in 46 types and the most productive included splinter (-ploitation) occurs in 13 types. Based on

this, a good rule of thumb may be that any string which occurs in more than 45 types should be analysed as an affix and any string that occurs in less than 15 types should be analysed as a splinter. Strings occurring in between 15 and 45 types can, of course, be ranked but it is likely that a decision cannot be made about their status purely by reference to this criterion alone.

Of course, the reason that there is more than one criterion is that all of the criteria should be examined alongside each other to come up with a best-fit classification. Consequently, the fact that criterion three cannot immediately classify strings with between 15 and 45 types does not detract from its value.

However, what may detract from the worth of this criterion is the fact that, as mentioned in section 8.2.1, a type count in a finite word corpus only provides a number directly comparable with another type count gleaned from the same corpus. I have, however, found no way round this and can only suggest that if this analysis were to be replicated with a different fixed corpus, type counts for both splinter-originating affixes (such as *-thon* and *-holic*) and splinters (such as *-inator* and *-ploitation*) should be used as benchmarks for comparison.

8.3 Factor three: Orthographic variations

The third factor concerns variations in the orthographic form of the string. This just means that any different spelling variants are analysed. One expectation regarding this may be that splinters should have a higher ratio of different orthographic varieties than the splinter-originating affixes. This is because the spelling of an affix should be lodged far more in the public consciousness than the equivalent for a splinter. Another standpoint, however, may be that because a splinter will only occur a few times in the corpus there is not much scope for different spelling variations, whereas because an affix will appear far more frequently it has far more scope for having a number of different orthographic forms.

Indeed, these mixed predictions were reflected in the case analyses. The splinters *labrado-*, *-oodle* and *-unnel* all displayed a constancy of form, but then they all only appeared in either one or two types. The other splinter, *-inator*, appeared in three types with three different orthographic variations. *-holic* also had three different regular orthographic forms and, the other suffix, *-thon* had two normal varieties (with a third, *-othon*, appearing on one occasion).

It is, thus, hard to see that variations in orthographic forms is a characteristic specific to either splinters or to splinter-originating affixes. Consequently, factor three will not be established as a criterion and instead will be abandoned as an aspect for analysis.

8.4   Factor four: Analysis of the attaching elements

This factor concerns the classification of the attached elements and the features of the point of fusion, such as the application of relevant suffix spelling rules and the usage of a hyphen.

8.4.1   What percentage of the attached elements can be analysed as bases?

A further difference between splinters and splinter-originating affixes regards the elements that they attach to. Affixes attach exclusively to bases (see section 6.1), with a rare exception being when they attach to a splinter to form a blend. As was found with the analyses of -*holic* and -*thon*, the picture is not quite so black and white with splinter-originating affixes. Perhaps because such forms were once splinters, they demonstrated a higher tendency than would be normally expected of affixes to attach to splinters to form blends. Also, because of the confusion surrounding the differences between modern affixes and non-classical combining forms (see chapter 5), it is also not unheard of for splinter-originating affixes to be attached to combining forms. However, these are the exceptions and not the norm (both -*holic* and -*thon* attached approximately 90% to bases). Therefore, splinter-originating affixes can be analysed as attaching primarily to bases.

Splinters, conversely, can attach to any type of bound or free element. Therefore, a high percentage of type attachments to bases often indicates that the best classification

with *-inator* which attached to bases in 100% of its types. However, often when splinters attach to full words there is an overlap with the source word at the point of fusion (again, apparent in the *-inator* blends), which means that the type is not formed the same way as a derivation. This, of course, is not always the case with splinters, which can attach to full lexemes without overlap, but splinters are more likely to display such an overlap with the original source word than are splinter-originating affixes. Consequently, anything other than a high percentage of attachments to bases without an overlap with the string or original source word does indicate that the best analysis is as a splinter.

8.4.2   If the string is a terminal one, are regular suffix spelling rules adhered to?

Another thing worth examining, if the string is terminal rather than initial, is the point of fusion. If the elements that a terminal string combines with often adhere to relevant typical suffix spelling rules, such as losing a final *e* or doubling a final consonant at the fusion point, then there is a good chance that the string should be analysed as an affix. For instance, the data for the splinter-originating affix *-holic* contained four instances of the attaching word losing its final *e* (in *phonaholic*, *phonoholic*, *practisaholic* and *smokoholic*). Similarly, the data for the suffix *-thon* included two instances in which the attaching word doubled its final consonant at the fusion point (*Saddammathon* (from *Saddam Hussein*) and *blubbathon* (from *blub*)). However, these spelling rules were not universal for the splinter-originating affixes. Some forms had joins where these spelling rules could have been applied but were

not, for instance *active-aholic*, *Danceathon*, *shagaholic* and the alternative *Saddamathons*.

Conversely, none of the splinters in the case analyses attached to any bases which followed these spelling rules. This, though, does not necessarily mean that if such spelling rules are adhered to then the string must be a suffix. One reason for this is that splinters often attach to other splinters and, thus, a loss of a final *e* from the first element may just be a part of the splintering process. Similarly, a doubling of a final consonant would not absolutely rule out the possibility that the attached bound form is a splinter as it is not uncommon for blends to include elements that cannot be accounted for orthographically by either of the source words (as exemplified by the final *i* in the aforementioned alternate *banoffi*).

However, both the case analyses and logic indicate that the application of these spelling rules would seem to be more characteristic for forms involving suffixes than splinters and, as such, does provide another feature to look out for. Of course, it should be noted that this is merely an orthographic feature and does not affect the phonics of the final word.

8.4.3   Is a hyphen used at the point of fusion?

Another way that a string can attach is by using a hyphen. The appearance of a hyphen as a joining mechanism is not typical of either blends or derivations, but can occur in either (as is the case with *de-criminalise* and *pro-legalisation* for affixes and

lorry-tel and *busnapper* (both cited by Adams (1973, 142 and 153) for splinters). Intuitively, it may seem that a hyphen would be used proportionately more with splinters than with affixes because splinters, by their nature, represent a word that they are a part of and are not usually separated from. As such, splinters are more "uncharted territory" and it could therefore seem more likely that a failsafe hyphen would be used with them than with the more familiar affix. Indeed, it has long been held that hyphens are often utilised in writing to join elements that are not generally used together or, as Kennedy (1942) put it, forms which are not 'well-established':

Tying two words together with a hyphen is not determined merely by long-standing custom or very general usage; it often depends on the relationship of the two words under consideration. As a rule, we hyphenate compound verbs and adjectives, such as *to fire-guard*, *double-edged*, or, if they have become well-established, we write them solid, as in the [p86] case of *to fireproof*, *wholehearted*.

(Kennedy, 1942: 85-86)

This intimates that when words become well established a hyphen is no longer needed and, thus, supports the above premise that splinters (which are less well established than affixes) are more likely to join with a failsafe hyphen.

However, none of the splinters analysed in the case studies of the previous chapter did utilise a hyphen at the point of fusion. Conversely, a hyphen was used in 6% of the *-thon* types and in 18 of the holic *-types*. Indeed, although it is not usual, derivations can include hyphens at the point where the free standing word form joins with the

affix; Marchand (1969) cites derivations featuring hyphens, including *ante-war, anti-Calvinism, de-louse* and *bagpipe-like*, and Bauer adds *mid-, re-, co-* and *non-* to the list of prefixes that sometimes use a hyphen to combine (but often do not).

With all of this in mind, there does not really seem to be a pattern as to when hyphens are employed. Certainly, Howard (1990: 75) is of the opinion that 'those damned little dashes cause more trouble than they are worth' and advises 'you should not take hyphens seriously' (p77). Consequently, I have noted but ignored hyphens in my analyses as they do not reliably help to indicate one way or another with regard to whether a string should be analysed as a splinter or affix.

8.4.4 Criterion four established

With all this in mind, a fourth differentiating criterion can be established. Criterion four concerns both the analysis of the attached elements and whether or not normal spelling rules are utilised. However, the above discussion has made clear that the first of these two aspects is a less problematic differentiating factor than the second. Thus, rather than composing two separate criteria from factor four (as was the case with factor one) criterion four should be seen as made up of a main and a sub criterion.

Criterion four, then, specifies that if a string has a high percentage of type attachments to bases, the best analysis is likely to be as an affix; if a string has anything other than a high percentage of attachments to bases, the best analysis is almost certainly as a splinter.

Sub-criterion four (4b) is only relevant for terminal strings and concerns typical suffix spelling rules; if the attachment of a terminal string generally involves the joining words losing final *es* or doubling final consonants then it is likely that the best analysis is as a suffix.

8.5   Factor five: Relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements

The fifth factor concerns internal orthographic, phonic, syntactic and semantic relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements. It has been highlighted that blends generally have a clear motivation, in that there is usually some form of discernable relationship between the elements that are blended together:

> ...the etyma that are to be blended cannot be randomly selected, but should have some semantic and/or phonological similarities, ranging to partial rhyme. Also, the two etyma usually share a part which occurs only once in the blend, as in *sexploitation*, where a surplus *ex* from *sex* or *exploitation* is deleted.
>
> (Cannon, 2000: 952)

Conversely, because affixation is such a common process of word formation, it follows that the constituents of a derivation rarely require (or, indeed, display) such internal syntactic, semantic, orthographic or phonic relationships. Indeed, affixes attach fairly indiscriminately to any semantically relevant free-standing word form of

attach fairly indiscriminately to any semantically relevant free-standing word form of the right grammatical class. For instance, the bases combining with the suffix *nik* in the derivations *underclassnik*, *exploitnik*, *nudenik* and *refusenik* all have little graphically, phonologically, syntactically or even semantically in common with the original *beat* of *beatnik*; similarly the combining words in *e-Christmas*, *e-billing* and *e-company* are not like the original word *electronic*.

This makes sense because when a string is a little-used splinter the forms including it would not be, in Cannon's terms, 'randomly selected' and would generally have a clear internal motivation. However, when it starts to become productive it necessarily attaches to a greater number of forms and, thus, attaches more indiscriminately. This diachronic movement is often apparent as soon as splinters become used in even a handful of types and before they can become reanalysed as affixes.

8.5.1 Internal relationships as a motivation for formation - a diachronic perspective

The following is a case study of the splinter *-ploitation* from the source word *exploitation* (as cited by Cannon (2000) above) which highlights this diachronic shift from clearly motivated forms to more indiscriminate attachments.

8.5.1.1   A case study of the splinter *-ploitation*

Before I can go on to show the diachronic movement from motivated forms to more indiscriminate types with the *-ploitation* words, it is necessary to justify my analysis of *-ploitation* as a splinter. Indeed, my own initial starting premise with the form *-ploitation* was that it was one of the borderline strings that this part of my thesis is dealing with. However, subjecting *-ploitation* to the criteria already established makes clear that this is actually still a splinter (albeit one which may well be on its way to becoming an affix, as will be discussed).

8.5.1.2   Why *-ploitation* is best analysed as a splinter

With regard to the three criteria already established, *-ploitation* is clearly a splinter. It is not cited in the dictionary and the only appearance I have found of it in linguistic literature is the above citation of Cannon (2000: 952), where his classification of the string as part of a blend, rather than as an affix, clearly intimates that he sees it as a splinter. Also, it is not really possible to describe the meaning of the splinter *-ploitation* without referring to the root word *exploitation*.

With regard to criterion four, *-ploitation* appears in 13 types in the corpus. This is considerably more than any of the typical splinters examined in the case analyses of the last chapter. However, it is a lot less than the 72 types of *-holic* and the 95 types of *-thon*. It is also comfortably below my proposed 15 type cut off for splinters (see section 8.2.3), so the fact that *-ploitation* appears in 13 types within the corpus does

These types are listed below, in chronological (rather than alphabetical) order, so as to aid the diachronic analysis in section 8.5.1.5. The number in brackets next to the *-ploitation* word shows the year and month when that word first appeared in the Independent Newspaper corpus (for instance, *sexploitation* first appeared in September 1986):

sexploitation 32 (8609)	word (ending in *x*) + *ploitation*
blaxploitation 135 (8903)	splinter (*black*) + *x* + *ploitation*
rap-sploitation 1 (9108)	word + hyphen + s */ps/* + *ploitation*
Queersploitation 1 (9205)	word + s */s/* + *ploitation*
dinosploitation 1 (9304)	clip + s */s/* + *ploitation*
Saxploitation 1 (9407)	clip (ending in *x*) + *ploitation*
rocksploitation 1 (9409)	word + s */ks/* + *ploitation*
bikesploitation 1 (9507)	word + s (produces the */ks/* sound) + *ploitation*
Generation X-ploitation 1 (9511)	compound (ending in *X*) + hyphen + *ploitation*
teensploitation 8 (9605)	clip + s */ns/* + *ploitation*
cyxploitation 1 (9801)	splinter (*cycle*) + x + *ploitation*
popsploitation 1 (9810)	clip + s */ps/* + *ploitation*
Ragesploitation 1 (9902)	word + s */s/* + *ploitation*

Before I go onto the diachronic and element internal relationships analyses, it is necessary to briefly examine the regularity of this splinter. Although "orthographic variations" has been discarded as a criterion, the different *-ploitation* varieties are relevant to the ensuing discussion.

279

8.5.1.3   Orthographic variations of the splinter -*ploitation*

The shortened terminal string of the root word *exploitation* can break off either at the *p* (-*ploitation*, as in 54% of the above types) or at the *x* (-*xploitation*, as in the remaining 46%). However, all of the -*ploitation* forms are preceded by an *s*, even when the joining element neither ends in an *s* nor can be considered as plural. It is, therefore, clear that the 56% of forms which end in -*sploitation* are using the *s* as a phonetic approximation of the last part of the *x* (the /ks/ sound), as there can be no orthographic explanation for the presence of the *s*. Thus, all the below forms are actually -/s/*ploitation*, whether the /s/ sound comes from the last part of the *x* or from an actual *s*. With this in mind, it would be more accurate to label this terminal string -[*s*/*x*]*ploitation*, but for ease of reference I shall continue to refer to it as -*ploitation*.

8.5.1.4   An analysis of the attached elements

The orthographic breakdown of the attached elements is included in the above list of the forms and is summarised in the below table:

Table 9: Elements that attach to -*ploitation*

Analysis of orthography	Number of types	Percentage
word + *ploitation*	5	38.5%
Word + hyphen + *ploitation*	1	7.7%
Clip + *ploitation*	4	30.8%
Compound + hyphen + *ploitation*	1	7.7%
Splinter + *ploitation*	2	15.4%

Two different types, *cyxploitation* and *blaxploitation*, have a splinter as the first

element. These are blends irrespective of the way that the terminal string -*ploitation*

is analysed. Neither of these has a graphic overlap, although *blaxploitation* has

phonic overlap.

In 84.6% of the types -*ploitation* is attached to a base (either with or without a

hyphen). These forms might indicate that *ploitation* is best analysed as a productive

suffix.

However, some of these forms are better analysed as overlapping blends of base +

exploitation, rather than base + *ploitation*. *sexploitation* has a complete graphic and

phonic overlap and, similarly, *Generation X-ploitation* is a perfect phonological

(though not graphic) blend. Consequently, only 69.2% of the above types should be

analysed as following standard affixation patterns, which is too low a percentage for

the string to be classified as anything other than a splinter.

It is also worth noting that none of the attaching words adhere to standard suffix spelling rules (both *rage* and *bike* retain their final *e*[73]).

It is, therefore, clear that with regard to the first four criteria *-ploitation* is clearly best analysed as a splinter. As will be made clear in the below discussion, in spite of a generally diachronic move from more transparently motivated forms to more indiscriminate attachments, *-ploitation* is still best analysed as a splinter with regard to factor five also.

8.5.1.5   A diachronic examination of the behaviour of the splinter *-ploitation* with reference to motivations for formations

The list in section 8.5.1.2 above shows the order in which the *-ploitation* types appeared in the corpus. The number of types does not seem to peak or cluster around any specific year, indicating that it was probably not a "highly fashionable" form at any one time. However, out of the fifteen and a half years of corpus, over half of all the types appeared in the final featured five and a half years (July 1994 – 1999), so it does seem to be a form that is gaining a slight momentum. This is perhaps one of the reasons why it was considered as a borderline string worthy of analysis in the first place. That said, the instances of type occurrence are fairly level and consistent, but at a low frequency.

---

[73] There would, of course, be pronunciation issues had they sacrificed the *e*; compare the alternatives *ragsploitation* and *biksploitation*

The first form, *sexploitation*, is an overlapping blend of *sex* and *exploitation*. The motivation for the coining of this is fairly transparent, as outlined by Cannon (2000: 952), with the first word ending in the same two letters that the second word begins with. *sexploitation* appears 32 times within the corpus, which is not a small number of times for a blend. This may have had the effect of people coming to know the splinter *-ploitation* as separate to its parent word which, in turn, may explain why it has been used in other blends.

It is not until two and a half years later that the splinter *-ploitation* appears outside its parent word *exploitation* in another type, and this is in the form *blaxploitation*. Again, graphically this form is rather obviously an initial splinter + terminal splinter blend. However, phonically the first element is a complete word. This means that, although there is no graphic overlap between the two elements, there is a phonic one, with the *ck* of *black* being incorporated into the *x* (the /k/ of the /ks/ sound) of *exploitation*. The phonic overlap is not total, though, as it was in *sexploitation*, as the *e* of *exploitation* is lost. Thus, although *blaxploitation* is still a fairly transparently motivated coinage, the form is moving further away from its original form of *exploitation* than it was in the first instance of *sexploitation*. *blaxploitation* appears many times in the corpus (with 135 tokens) and, as such, will almost certainly have had an influence on the coining of future types in the manner described for *sexploitation*. This method of coining by analogy is another reason why, diachronically, splinters begin to attach more indiscriminately – once a splinter becomes recognised as separate to its source word through a high token type it is

more likely to be utilised separately from its source word[74].

The next form, one and a half years on, is *rap-sploitation*. The join here is a *p-s* one, and the first one not to use an *x*. It is obvious why the coiner chose not to use the *x* (*rapxploitation* is neither easy to read or say), but it is the choice of *rap-sploitation* over *raploitation*, which would have had both graphic and phonic overlap, which is the interesting one – especially in that the source word, *exploitation*, does not even have an *s* in it. However, it is clearly phonics, not graphics, that motivate this coinage – *sploitation* has the /s/ sound of the *x* (/ks/) from *exploitation*, and the coiner must have decided that /s/ploitation* brings to mind *exploitation* more than merely *ploitation* does. I am inclined to agree with this point. Perhaps it is because the /s/ retains part of the /ks/ sound of the *x*, and with the *x* sound joined to *ploitation* the parent word is phonically complete. Therefore, retaining the /s/, especially when the *s* can also make the first element plural, gives a phonic illusion of overlap with the word *exploitation*. *Rap* can be made plural, and therefore this phonic overlap is relevant in this instance (although the failsafe hyphen does rather detract from this graphically). One other thing worth noting is that the /ps/ join is not too far removed from the /ks/ sound. With *rap-sploitation*, then, *ploitation* is moving further away still from its parent form, but the motivation for the coinage is still fairly transparent.

The fourth form, *Queersploitation*, appears nine months further on again. The pluralising / phonic overlapping *s* joining mechanism is, once again, utilised. The join here is an /rs/ one, which is further away from *exploitation*'s /ks/ sound than was the previous /ps/ join of *rap-sploitation*. The splinter *ploitation* is then moving further

---

[74] This was one of the reasons suggested for the coining of the blend *dunnel* from *dome* and *tunnel* by analogy with the high token frequency type *chunnel*.

away still from its parent form and is being used with initial elements which have progressively less and less in common with the original *ex* of *exploitation*, though the /s/ sound of the /ks/ is still there.

The next type, *dinosploitation*, also has the pluralising / phonic overlapping *s* joining mechanism, but the join here is *os*, with the *o* firmly belonging to *dino*, so the sound at the point of fusion is merely /s/. There is no graphic overlap here and, aside from the fact that the *s* can pluralize *dino*, no phonic similarities between the first element used in this form and the *ex* of the original. One explanation for this could be that the splinter *ploitation* is moving towards becoming a suffix and attaching almost indiscriminately (within grammatical, syntactic and semantic sense boundaries). However, if this were the case then the number of types would surely be larger. Another explanation is the already mentioned fact that because two of the types (*blaxploitation* and *sexploitation*) have a high number of tokens and are thus fairly well known, the ensuing types are formed on analogy with these. This would account for the reason why *-ploitation* can combined with forms that bear little or no similarity to the initial *ex*, but why a similarity is still preferred and generally present.

The next four types, *saxploitation, rocksploitation, bikesploitation* and *Generation X-ploitation* all have the original /ks/ sound at the point of overlap. In *saxploitation* (which seems to have rather obviously been formed by analogy with the more used *sexploitation*) and *Generation X-ploitation* this is in the form of an actual (graphically overlapping) *x*. In the form *rocksploitation* the *ck* of the word *rock* along with the oft-imported *s* make up the /ks/ sound, and in *bikesploitation* it is the *k* of *bike* and the pluralising / phonic overlapping *s* joining mechanism that make the sound (phonically

the *e* of *bike* is irrelevant in this join but is utilised graphically for ease of comprehension).

The next type, *teensploitation* has a /ns/ fusion. This is similar to *Queersploitation* and the same points apply.

The eleventh type, *cyxploitation*, is an interesting one. It is the only form where the first element is not transparent out of context. Also, it is the only form to both phonically and graphically import the *x* from *exploitation* rather than using the first word's ending (although *blaxploitation* does this graphically). Indeed, it is the only form to feature a phonic splinter (*cy* from *cycle*). It is also interesting that *cyxploitation* was chosen over *cycsploitation*, which would read the same and would perhaps be more transparent in meaning. This, though, can be explained by the fact that it appeared in an article about cycles so the author clearly thought it was more important that the reader be pointed towards the *exploitation* part of the meaning than the *cycle* part. However, the fact that the author was possibly not sure that the reader would get the *exploitation* connotations from merely *-ploitation* and felt it necessary to include the *x* perhaps gives further weight to the argument that *-ploitation* is still a splinter and not a productive affix.

The penultimate type, *popsploitation*, is rather like *rap-sploitation*. The only difference is the fact that the coiner here clearly did not feel the need to utilise a failsafe hyphen, which possibly indicates, again, that *-ploitation* has made a further move away from its source word.

The final type, *Ragesploitation*, is possibly the type furthest away in nature from the parent form, *exploitation*. The points made about *dinosploitation* are relevant here, apart from the fact that *rage* is clearly not meant to be read as a plural and thus the *s* must be taken as belonging to *ploitation*, even though it does not graphically appear in the parent form. It is, therefore, possible to conclude that the splinter is not actually *ploitation* at all, but is (or, perhaps, has become) */s/ploitation*, with the */s/* sound coming from either an actual *s* or the */s/* of the */ks/* sound, be it from the letters *ks* or an *x*.

In conclusion, then, the move away from *-/ks/ploitation* as the splinter towards *-/s/ploitation* does seem, from the evidence available within the fifteen and a half years of corpus, to be chronological[75].

If this chronical shift from motivated forms to more indiscriminate attachments is true with forms which are still analysable as splinters (albeit splinters which require examination as a borderline form) how much more complete this transformation must be with the splinter originating affixes. Indeed, this accords with what has already been found in the case analyses of the preceding chapter, in that only a relatively small percentage of the *-holic* or *-thon* types displayed such relationships.

There were, however, visible relationships between the typical splinters (or their source words) of the case analyses in the previous chapter, and these relationships were not just of the graphic and phonic variety displayed in the *-ploitation* types.

---

[75] The fact that *-ploitation* is moving diachronically further and further away from its source word perhaps intimates that, while it is still best analysed as a splinter, it may be on its way to becoming a productive suffix.

8.5.2 An exploration of the different types of relationships between the typical splinters, their source words and the attaching elements

The splinters in *Labradoodle*, as with many of the *-ploitation* blends, contain a graphic similarity resulting in an overlap at the point of fusion (in this case, of the letter *o*). Additionally, the *-inator* blends, *Sperminator*, *Tobinator* and *Tourminator*, also display an orthographic overlap between the elements and, again as with many of the *-ploitation* forms, have a phonic overlap as well.

A further kind of graphic and phonic similarity is found in the blend *chunnel*, where there is no overlap at the actual point of fusion but where the final blend is both orthographically and phonetically very similar to both of the source words *channel* and *tunnel*. Another kind of relationship exemplified in the blend *chunnel* is a syntactic one, as the source words *channel* and *tunnel* often appear together as a lexical string.

A final kind of relationship, displayed in the blends *dunnel* and *labradoodle*, is a semantic one as the source words are co-hyponyms (*labrador* and *poodle* of *dog* and *dome* and *tunnel* of *types of construction*).

It is easy to determine whether there is an orthographic overlap (or even similarity[76]) between a string or its source word and the attached element. It is also usually simple to ascertain whether or not there is a phonic overlap (or similarity), although this can be a little more subjective – for instance, while there is clearly a phonic overlap at the point of fusion in the type *blaxploitation*, determining whether the same is true of *zootopia* (from *zoo* + *utopia*) is more subjective.

Syntactic and semantic relationships are less easy to gauge still. For instance, as already discussed, *chunnel* has a clear internal syntactic relationship as it is a contracted lexical string. However, this is not so clear cut with a blend such as *sexpert* from *sex expert*. *Sex expert* is clearly not a pre-existing item like *channel tunnel*, but has a greater syntactic internal relationship than a blend like *Octopush* (from *Octopus* + *push*). Similarly, as discussed in section 7.2.2.6, *dunnel* could be analysed as having an internal semantic relationship, but this is clearly a more ambiguous case than with the source words in *labradoodle* and *banoffee*, which are obvious co-hypononyms. Conversely, *dunnel* has a stronger internal semantic relationship than *Octopush*. Consequently, it is sometimes difficult to make decisions as to whether or not a form should be analysed as having internal semantic or syntactic relationships.

With this in mind, because all that is of interest in this study is ascertaining whether or not the types have overt motivations, the first internal relationship that should be looked for is whether or not the elements have an overlap, as this is the easiest to

---

[76]By graphic and phonic similarities I mean obvious resemblances between the elements and the final type. For instance, in the blend *chunnel* both elements end in the same 4 letters and the final blend is only different by 1 letter from each of the source words. Another example is *funtastic*, where the first element is only different from the missing part of the terminal element by 1 letter.

judge. If types do not have an overlap then next they should be examined for obvious graphic or phonic internal similarities. If they do not exhibit these similarities then they should be analysed for syntactic relations and then, finally, semantic relations. Following this order should help to take out some of the subjectivity from the process of assessing borderline strings with regard to internal relationships.

8.5.3   Criterion five established

At this point, then, it is possible to establish <u>Criterion five</u>, which concerns the internal orthographic, phonic, syntactic and semantic relationships between the string, its source word and the attaching elements. If the majority of the types including a certain string display these internal relationships the best analysis is as a splinter, whereas if a low percentage of types have such internal relationships it is likely that the best analysis is as an affix.

8.6   Conclusions on the criteria for classifying borderline splinter / affix strings

When deciding if a string of letters is best analysed as a splinter or an affix, all of the criteria should be taken into consideration alongside each other. It is expected that some strings will fit the analyses as one thing or the other throughout and other strings will not fit so neatly. In these cases a 'best fit' decision will have to be made. The final five differentiating criteria are as follows:

Criterion 1: previous definitions and classifications

If a string appears in dictionaries or in the literature it is likely that the best analysis is as an affix, unless the accompanying classification directs otherwise.

Criterion 2: describability

If the string seems to be imbued with autonomous meaning, and you can describe it without having to refer to the source word, it is likely that the best classification is as an affix. If you cannot define the string without mentioning the source word then it is likely that it is a splinter.

Criterion 3: productivity

The more types there are in the corpus involving string the more likely it is that the best analysis is as an affix. Conversely, if a string does not appear in many types in the corpus the best analysis is as a splinter. As a guideline, strings that have less than 15 types in the corpus are likely to be splinters and strings that have more than 45 types are likely to be affixes.

Criterion 4: the nature of the attached elements

If a string has a high percentage of type attachments to bases (without overlap), the best analysis is likely to be as an affix; if a string has anything other than a high percentage of attachments to bases, the best analysis is almost certainly as a splinter.

<u>Sub-criterion 4b: adherence to typical suffixation spelling rules</u>

If the analysis is of a <u>terminal</u> string and the attached elements frequently lose their final *e* or double their final consonant, then it is likely that the best classification is as a suffix.

<u>Criterion 5: relationships between the string, its source word and the attached elements</u>

If the forms that the string attaches to are frequently similar semantically, graphically or phonically to either the string or to the source word, especially at the point of fusion, then it is likely that the best analysis is as a splinter. Similarly, if the source elements often appear as a lexical string then the best analysis is probably as a splinter. Conversely, if a string usually appears in types without such internal relationships then the best analysis is probably as an affix.

When all of these factors are taken into consideration, a trend towards a string's behaviour as either a splinter or as an affix should become apparent and a decision should be able to be made as to whether words containing that form + a free-standing word form should be classified as a blend or a derivation.

8.6.1   Ranking the criteria in order of importance

As was found with the case analyses of the previous chapter (see sections 7.3 and 7.5), the criteria should not actually be seen as being on an equal footing to each other, with some clearly being more crucial to an overall analysis than others. In the

last chapter, factor one was seen as providing the strongest differentiation between splinters and affixes. What was factor one, however, has now been split down into criteria one and two. I would suggest that criterion one is still the most important as, if a string is in a dictionary and has been classified as an affix, then there is no real chance that it is not productive enough and is far enough removed from the public consciousness to be analysed as a splinter. I would, though, argue that criterion two is not nearly as crucial as some of the other criteria.

The case analyses of the last chapter highlighted that, after factor one, factors two and five were the next most important (which have turned into criteria three and five respectively). The most important of these is criterion three, as productivity is definitively what separates a splinter from a productive affix. The third most crucial criterion, then, is number five because, as has been displayed above, there is a diachronic shift with regard to internal relationships between elements when a string moves from being a splinter towards becoming an affix. However, this criterion should be treated with a degree of caution as analysing internal relationships can be subjective.

Criterion two (which grew out of factor one along with criterion one) should be ranked fourth in importance, after criterion five. Again, a problem with this criterion is that describability can be subjective. However it is still more crucial than factor four, which concerns the analysis of the attached elements. This is, perhaps, surprising as attaching to bases is fundamental to affixes. However, as was highlighted by the case analyses, splinter-originating affixes do not adhere to the "bases only" rule quite as strictly as normal bases. Also, some splinters do attach

primarily to bases. Of course, the least crucial criterion is the remaining 4b, which is applicable only to terminal strings and is not expected to be universal.

The ranking order of the criteria, then, from most to least important is 1, 3, 5, 2, 4 and finally 4b. It is not possible to give relative weightings for these criteria, but having a rank order is useful when trying to decide a best fit analysis for strings which are shown to be splinters in light of some criteria and suffixes with regard to others.

Having firmly established and ranked the criteria, it is time to apply the criteria to several borderline splinter / affixes, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 9:

Applying the criteria

9.1   Applying the criteria – methodology

Having closely analysed the features of both typical splinters and splinter-originating affixes, and having established criteria that can differentiate between the two based upon these observations, the next step is to apply these criteria to some borderline splinters / splinter-originating affixes. Seven borderline strings have been selected which I noticed throughout the course of my research as seeming to occur more frequently than standard splinters. These strings are *compu-* (from *computer*), *robo-* (from *robot*), *-ercise* (from *exercise*), *-[u]mentary* (from *documentary*), *-tainment* (from *entertainment*), *-tastic* (from *fantastic*) and *-topia* (from *utopia*).

The seven strings have each been subjected to an individual analysis with reference to the five established criteria, in the manner of the *-holic* and *-thon* analyses in Chapter 7. (As these analyses are mainly made up of tables, take up a lot of space and are sometimes repetitive, I have put them together in Appendix 3, rather than including them in the body of the thesis). Each analysis includes a list of the types and a discussion of the features brought to light by the five criteria. Interesting characteristics of individual types that required discussion before analyses with regard to orthography or sense relations could be undertaken, are picked up in footnotes.

9.2 Analyses of the 7 borderline strings with regard to the established criteria

This chapter will deal with all seven strings together in light of the established criteria.

9.2.1 Criterion 1: previous definitions and classifications

Criterion 1 states that if a string appears in dictionaries or in the literature it is likely that the best analysis is as an affix[77], unless the accompanying classification directs otherwise. This criterion was ranked as the most important of the criteria in section 8.6.1, above

None of the seven borderline strings has its own entry in any of the dictionaries consulted[78]. However, *-topia*, standing for anything connected to *Utopia*, has been referred to in linguistic literature. Bauer (1983: 236) considers *-topia* as a <u>possible</u> example of a case leading to 'the re-evaluation of some sequence of phonemes as an affix'. It must, though, be pointed out that, unlike with *-holic*, Bauer does not consider that *-topia* is definitely best analysed as a suffix. Thus, while this is not a clear sign that *-topia* is best analysed as a suffix, it shows that it is an established

---

[77] Vice-versa does not apply.

[78] These were Websters, Collins and various editions of the OED. See the bibliography for details of each individual disctionary.

string and has been contemplated as a candidate for the cross-over from a splinter to a suffix since at least 1983.

I have found no examples of *-tastic* being referred to as an affix within <u>linguistic</u> literature. However, within the corpus there is 1 token of 1 type in which *tastic* appears without any attached element, and this occurrence happens within a discussion of suffixes. Consequently, as was the case with the equivalent autonomous *holic* type (as discussed in section 7.4.1.4), this metalinguistic mention gives some weight to a classification of *-tastic* as a productive suffix, and must be considered as a previous classification as an affix.

In light of Criterion 1, then, *-tastic* seems to be most affix-like, followed by *-topia*. Whilst it has been stated that if borderline strings do not appear in any dictionary or literature this is not a sure sign that they should be analysed as a splinter (see section 8.1.1), there is nothing to suggest in light of Criterion 1 that *compu-*, *robo-*, *-ercise*, *-[u]mentary* or *-tainment* should be analysed as affixes.

9.2.2   Criterion 2: describability

Criterion 2 asserts that if the string seems to be imbued with autonomous meaning, and you can describe it without having to refer to the source word, it is likely that the best classification is as an affix. If you cannot define the string without mentioning the source then it is likely that it is a splinter. This criterion was ranked as the fourth most important in section 8.6.1, largely because "describability" can be subjective.

298

Both *-topia* and *robo-* are best analysed as autonomously describable. *-topia* can be described as "a paradise (for as specified)" without reference to the source word *Utopia*, although it still preserves a connection with this word which, in spite of its literal translation as "no place", has also come to have connotations of joy and harmony. Similarly, *robo-* can be described without reference to *robot* but does retain a close association with its source word (for instance, a robot could be described as "a programmed machine designed to emulate"). However, because *robot* also carries "mechanical humanoid" connotations which are not necessarily present in the *robo-* forms, the meaning cannot be said to be the same. Thus, *robo-* can be regarded as autonomously describable.

-tastic can be described as meaning "excellent" or "brilliant" without referral to the source word and, thus should also be seen as being an affix in light of Criterion 2. The original form *fantastic* could be seen as sharing this meaning, but it has connotations of the implausible or unbelievable as well which the string *-tastic* does not seem to convey in any of its types (see appendix 3, A3.6). Consequently, *-tastic* has refined the meaning of the source form, as did *-holic* and *-thon*, and should therefore be considered as imbued with autonomous meaning.

-[u]mentary can also be described without reference to the source word; as "a factual programme or film about (as specified)". This is, however, also what *documentary* means, so it is not really fair to say that it is autonomously describable. This is, though, less clear cut than with *compu-*, *-ercise* and *-tainment*, which cannot realistically be described without citing the source words *computer*, *exercise* and *entertainment*.

In conclusion, *-topia*, *robo-* and *-tastic* should be classified as affixes in light of Criterion 2, whilst *compu-*, *-ercise* and *-tainment* all are best analysed as splinters. *-[u]mentary* is somewhere in between the two categorisations, but is more splinter-like than affix-like.

9.2.3   Criterion 3: productivity

Criterion 3 states that the more types there are in the corpus involving the string, the more likely it is that the best analysis is as an affix. Conversely, if a string does not appear in many types in the corpus the best analysis is as a splinter. As a guideline, strings that have fewer than 15 types in the corpus are likely to be splinters and strings that have more than 45 types are likely to be affixes.

The following table shows the number of types in which each string appears as separate to its original source word within the Independent corpus:

Table 10: Productivity of the strings in descending order:

String	Type Count
robo-	77
-tastic	48
compu-	32
-topia	31
-[u]mentary	15
-tainment	14
-ercise	8

With regard to Criterion 3, then, *robo-* and *-tastic* are best analysed as affixes and *-[u]mentary* *-tainment* and *-ercise* should be classified as splinters. Both *-topia* and *compu-* fall firmly in the middle of the suggested cut off points of 15 and 45 and, thus, cannot be classified in light of Criterion 3. While strings that fall within the grey area cannot be labelled as either splinters or affixes through the application of Criterion 3, it would be expected that they could be ranked from the most affix-like to splinter-like. However, as there is only 1 type difference in number between *compu-* and *-topia*, it is impossible to state which of the two is functioning most like an affix.

Criterion 3 was ranked as the second most important, and perhaps <u>the</u> most indicative, of the criteria in section 8.6.1, above[79].

9.2.4   Criterion 4: the nature of the attached elements

Criterion 4 proposes that if a string has a high percentage of type attachments to bases (without overlap), the best analysis is likely to be as an affix whereas if a string has anything other than a high percentage of attachments to bases, the best analysis is almost certainly as a splinter. This criterion was ranked as the fifth most important of the five criteria in section 8.6.1.

There are, then, different aspects to this criterion. The first involves the percentage of attaching elements that are bases, as this is what affixes should only attach to. However, this figure can be misleading as sometimes a string attaches to a complete base but there is an overlap at the point of fusion between the string's source word and the joining word, which means that these forms are probably best analysed as blends. The type *gendertainment* provides a good example of this phenomenon; it

---

[79] This is because criterion 1 can only indicate a best analysis as an affix, whereas criterion 3 indicates when a classification as either an affix or a splinter should take place.

could be analysed as base + *-tainment*, but because there is an overlap of the terminal *er* of *gend̲e̲r̲* with the *er* of *ent̲e̲r̲tainment* it is best analysed as an overlapping blend of *gender* and *-ertainment*. Consequently, it is the percentage of types that attach to bases without an overlap with the source word at the point of fusion that is really the most indicative figure as to the number of cases when a string is functioning in a manner typical of an affix. This, then, is the second feature of this criterion.

The third aspect for consideration in the analysis of the attaching elements is the percentage of cases in which the string is functioning in ways that are not characteristic of affixes. This is when affixes attach to other affixes or combining forms, or appear without any attached form (although this is not characteristic of splinters either – but splinters are bound by fewer rules than affixes so appearing autonomously would, perhaps, be slightly more usual for a splinter). The *-tainment* types highlight a further feature of behaviour not characteristic of affixes. *Tentertainment* cannot be analysed as base + *-tainment* as such a description cannot account for the *er*. Consequently, at the very least the form must be analysed as base + *-e̲r̲tainment* (and is undoubtedly best seen as a blend of the two whole lexemes *tent* and *entertainment* with complete overlap). The erroneous letters *er* could not be accounted for if *-tainment* were to be analysed as a suffix, so types including such erroneous letters also indicate that the string is not functioning in an affix-like manner.

The final aspect that must be considered is the total number of types that are best analysed as blend, regardless of the classification of the string (i.e. types with overlap at the point of fusion and types where the attaching element is a splinter). It is not

that affixes do not enter into blends, but (even with splinter-originating affixes) just that this should be a relatively rare function accounting for a low percentage of the types. If this is not the case, there is a good chance that the best analysis is as a splinter.

The table below shows the analysis of the seven borderline strings with reference to these four aspects:

Table 11: Analysis of the borderline strings with reference to the four aspects of Criterion 4:

	robo-	*-tastic*	*compu-*	*-mentary*	*-topia*	*-ercise*	*-tainment*
% attachment to bases	100	95.8	84.4	73.3	51.6	100	28.6
% attachment to bases without overlap	93.5	83.3	68.8	66.7	48.4	25	21.4
% of types not characteristic of affixation	0	0	0	0	19.4	0	14.3
% of types best analysed as blends[80]	6.5	14.6	28.1	26.7	32.3	75	78.6

The table has been arranged with the most affix-like strings on the left ranging to the most splinter-like on the right, with reference to the four aspects of this criterion.

---

[80] Regardless of the analysis of the string.

Both *robo-* and *-tastic* are clearly best analysed as affixes in light of all the above aspects – neither of them function in a way prohibited by affixation in any of the types, both attach to a high percentage of bases (even if the number considered is the percentage without overlap) and neither have a high percentage of types best analysed as blends.

Both *-tainment* and *-ercise* are clearly best characterised as splinters in light of Criterion 4. *-tainment* attaches to a very low percentage of free-standing bases (both with and without overlap), functions in a manner prohibited by affixation in 14.3% of the cases and over three-quarters of all types are best analysed as blends. While the analysis of *-ercise* is not quite as clear cut because all of the attached elements are bases, only a quarter of these bases attach without overlap and, consequently, three quarters are best analysed as blends. It is, therefore, obvious that *-ercise* should be classified as a splinter.

Criterion four, however, does not help to clarify the best classification of the strings *compu-*, *-[u]mentary* and *-topia*. In all respects, *-topia* seems less affix-like certainly than *-tastic* and *robo-* and also than *compu-* and *-[u]mentary*, as it attaches to the lowest percentage of bases (either with or without overlap) and has the highest percentage that should be classified as blends of all these strings. It is also the only one that ever functions in a manner not permitted by normal affixation rules. However, when compared to *-tainment* and *-ercise*, it has a low percentage of both attachment to bases without overlap and types that should be classified as blends irrespective of the analysis of the string. It, thus, cannot be indubitably analysed as a splinter. Similarly, *compu-* and *-[u]mentary* appear affix-like when compared with

-tainment, -ercise and *-topia* but splinter-like compared with *robo-* and *-tastic.*

Criterion 4, thus, highlights a range of affix-like functioning, from *robo-* to *-tainment*, as reflected in Table 11 above. A best classification is suggested for *robo-* and *-tastic* as affixes and *-tainment* and *-ercise* as splinters, but *-[u]mentary, -topia* and *compu-* remain in a grey area.

9.2.4.1 Sub-criterion 4b: adherence to typical suffixation spelling rules

Sub-criterions 4b concerns only terminal strings and states that if the attached elements frequently lose their final *e* or double their final consonant, then it is likely that the best classification is as a suffix. Because this is only a sub-criterion it was ranked as the least indicative of all the criteria (see section 8.6.1).

Obviously, this sub-criterion does not apply to the terminal strings *robo-* and *compu-*. None of the types for any of the strings contain a clear-cut case of the utilisation of such spelling rules. The nearest instances are *mousercise, facercise* and *blutopia,* in which all of the bases share or lose their terminal *e.* However, as highlighted in Appendix 3 (see A3.3), the sharing of the *e* in *mousercise* and *facercise* should be regarded as a part of the blending process. Similarly, the loss of the final *e* in *blutopia* (discussed in A3.7) is probably best regarded as a part of the splintering process so as to aid a complete graphic overlap with the source word (the loss of the *e* from *blue* means that the entire source word *utopia* is present in the final form).

Consequently, while sub-criterion 4b may be helpful in providing the best classification for some borderline blend / affix strings, it was not useful for the seven strings analysed.

9.2.5 Criterion 5: relationships between the string, its source word and the attached elements

Criterion 5 predicts that if the forms the string attaches to are frequently similar semantically, graphically or phonically to either the string or to the source word, especially at the point of fusion, then it is likely that the best analysis is as a splinter. Similarly, if the source elements often appear as a lexical string, then the best analysis is probably as a splinter. This is because blends are motivated formations and such internal relationships exhibit a clear motivation for formation. Conversely, because affixation is a far more common process, if a string usually appears in types without such internal relationships then the best analysis is probably as an affix.

Criterion 5 was ranked as the third most important of the criteria in section 8.6.1 above. The problem with this criterion is that analysing whether or not there is a syntactic or semantic relationship between the string (or source word) and the attaching element can be very subjective. Indeed, the introduction of "semi-relationships" was necessary in the string analyses (see, for instance, *compulink* in appendix 3, A3.1).

The following table shows the percentage of types for each string in which there are discernable internal relationships, in ascending order. This means that the table goes from the least internal relationships at the top to the most internal relationships at the bottom.

Table 12: Percentage of types with internal relationships between the string (or its source word) and the attaching elements, for each of the 7 strings:

String	Percentage
robo-	6.5
-tastic	25
compu-	53.1
-topia	54.8
-[u]mentary	63.3
-tainment	71.4
-ercise	87.5

This table reflects the ordering from most affix-like to most splinter-like of the strings in light of Criterion 5. *Robo-* is shown by Criterion 5 to be a clear-cut prefix and, similarly, *-tastic* is best analysed as a suffix. With the high percentage of internal relationships providing clear motivations for the coinages, *-ercise*, *-tainment* and, probably, *-[u]mentary* are all shown to be splinters with reference to this criterion. *Compu-* and *-topia*, however, are (again) more difficult to judge, with about half of their types displaying internal relationships.

9.3   Ranking the 7 borderline strings in light of the analyses

Having analysed each of the strings with regard to each of the criteria, it is possible to show in one table the different rank orders, from most affix-like to most splinter-like, suggested by each of the five criteria. Criteria 1 and 2 were not measured through a discernable number so, consequently, for these criteria some of the strings are on an equal level. When this is the case it is indicated in the below table with a "=" sign.

Table 13: The rank orders of the 7 strings with regard to each of the criteria:

Rank order	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5
1	*-tastic*	*= robo-*	*robo-*	*robo-*	*robo-*
2	*-topia*	*= -tastic*	*-tastic*	*-tastic*	*-tastic*
3	*= robo-*	*= -topia*	*compu-*	*compu-*	*compu-*
4	*= compu-*	*-[u]mentary*	*-topia*	*-[u]mentary*	*-topia*
5	*= -[u]mentary*	*= compu-*	*-[u]mentary*	*-topia*	*-[u]mentary*
6	*= -tainment*	*= -tainment*	*-tainment*	*-ercise*	*-tainment*
7	*= -ercise*	*= -ercise*	*-ercise*	*-tainment*	*-ercise*

Interestingly, the sequences suggested by criteria 3 and 5 are exactly the same. Furthermore, the order reflected by these two criteria, as shown in the above table, is not dissimilar to that reflected through criterion 4, with only *-tainment* and *-ercise* swapping places as the most splinter-like and *-[u]mentary* and *-topia* switching ranks with each other in the grey area at the middle of the table.

Indeed, even Criteria 1 and 2, (which are not based upon data from the Independent corpus) reflect a ranking that is not dissimilar to that of the other three. Both *-ercise* and *-tainment* are always ranked as most splinter-like and *-tastic* is consistently classified as a suffix. These similar rankings suggested by the five criteria, then, show that they do work well together to give a best classification.

9.4   The best classification of each of the 7 strings in light of the five criteria

Before it is possible to state the best classification of any of the borderline strings, the analyses suggested by each of the five criteria for each string should be considered together. The table below shows the analysis of each string as reflected by each criterion. When it is clear that the best analysis is as an affix or splinter, then the word "affix" or "splinter" is used in the table. When a classification is uncertain, then a question mark is used. When the analysis leans towards a classification either as an affix or splinter but is not certain, then "affix?" or "splinter?" is used to reflect this.

Instead of the table below being laid out with the criteria in numerical order, the criteria are ranked by their importance (as established in section 8.6.1). Consequently, the most significant classifications are at the top of the table, going down towards the least indicative analysis. This layout should also help to make clear the best possible classification of each string.

For ease of reference, the strings have been ordered from the most affix-like to the most splinter-like (left to right).

Table 14: The classification of each string with regard to each of the criteria:

Criterion	*-tastic*	*robo-*	*-topia*	*compu-*	*-[u]mentary*	*-tainment*	*-ercise*
1[81]	Affix	?	Affix?	?	?	?	?
3	Affix	Affix	?	?	Splinter	Splinter	Splinter
5	Affix	Affix	?	?	Splinter	Splinter	Splinter
2	Affix	Affix	Affix	Splinter	Splinter?	Splinter	Splinter
4	Affix	Affix	Splinter?	Affix?	Affix?	Splinter	Splinter

It is clear from the above table that the best classifications of both *-tastic* and *robo-* are undoubtedly as affixes. Similarly, *-tainment* and *-ercise* are unmistakably best analysed as splinters.

The classification of *-[u]mentary* is not as clear-cut as were *-ercise* and *-tainment*. However, the only criterion (4) that points towards an analysis of *-[u]mentary* as an affix is modified with a question mark and is regarded as the least important criterion. Consequently, as all the other criteria suggest an analysis as a splinter, it is easy to decide that the best classification is as a splinter. What this analysis has, though, highlighted is that *-[u]mentary* is the least splinter-like of the three borderline strings

---

[81] It is, perhaps, necessary to re-iterate that criterion one can only provide a classification as an affix – if a string is not cited in dictionaries or the literature this does not mean that it is a splinter.

which are evidently still splinters and, therefore, is perhaps the one most likely to make the cross-over to becoming a productive affix in the future.

The best classification of *-topia* and *compu-* is much less easy to reach a decision about than for the other five strings. If it is absolutely necessary to classify these strings as either splinters or an affixes, then *-topia* would be an affix and *compu-* would be a splinter. Another resolution would be to accept that such forms sometimes function as affixes and sometimes function as splinters, and to classify the function in each individual case, as opposed to classifying the generic status of the string (this point will be returned to in the next chapter). However, the solution favoured by this thesis is to accept the fact that these strings do (synchronically) belong within a grey area between splinters and affixes. Perhaps, then, a new category of bound forms should be introduced to account for strings such as *-topia* and *compu-*, which no longer function as typical splinters but are not quite affixes.

9.5   Prolific strings – a new category of bound forms

The application of the above five criteria will make clear a best classification for most borderline splinter / affix strings. However, as was the case with the grey area between acronyms and blends, it is not always possible to absolutely differentiate between splinters and affixes. The solution in the case of blends and acronyms was to introduce a new category, of "non-specifically abbreviated compounds" in order to account for the miscellaneous shortened and compounded forms that do not fall neatly within the pre-established areas (see section 4.7). One stated benefit of this was that a

new category would "prevent keen linguists from over or under stretching boundaries in order to simplify their own theories of word formation", and the same point applies here.

Therefore, there needs to be a new category of word formation to account for strings that are too generally used to be classified as normal splinters but are not (yet?) affixes. With my focus on blending, unsurprisingly I would like to label these forms as "splaffixes", but perhaps a better term would be "prolific strings". Such a category, then, would account for bound forms such as -*topia* and *compu-*.

One point worth noting is that, although prolific strings have embarked on a journey of productivity in order to be classified within this category rather than as splinters, it does not necessarily follow that the usage will maintain momentum and they will, thus, become affixes. As highlighted in section 9.2.1, -*topia* has been considered as a borderline splinter / affix since at least 1983 (see Bauer, 1983: 236), and it is still best analysed as being within this grey area. However, the introduction of prolific strings as a new category to account for forms such as -*topia* removes the pressure for a definite classification of -*topia* as either a splinter or as a suffix.

9.6   Separating splinters from splinter-originating affixes

– a conclusion

The five criteria established have been shown to be largely successful in providing a best classification for borderline splinter / affix strings. However, even after an in-

depth analysis has been undertaken with regard to these criteria, the most appropriate characterisation of some strings as either a splinter or an affix remains uncertain. In such cases, there are different possibilities. One is that a line should be drawn and the strings should be classified as either a splinter or an affix with regard to the criteria, which is possible (as stated in section 9.4, *-topia* would be a suffix and *compu-* would be a splinter). However, my preferred solution is to accept that some strings <u>are</u> in a grey area between splinters and the more productive affixes. Van Marle (1985) supports this view, and provides a reason for an acceptance of this grey area:

> Given the fact that language change comes about gradually, it is only natural that in the synchronic analysis [individual forms] may turn up for which it holds that they are on their way to becoming either productive or non-productive.
>
> (Van Marle, 1985: 66)

The bound forms within this splinter / affix grey area should be labelled "prolific strings", and should be regarded as being a middle ground between splinters and affixes.

Of course, the introduction of this new category raises questions regarding the best classification of words containing these prolific strings. As has been made clear many times throughout this thesis, forms with overlap or loss at the point of fusion are blends irrespective of the classification of the attaching element. Thus, forms involving a prolific string with either an overlapping element or a splinter (such as *photopia* or *computent*) would be analysed as blends. Words made up of two prolific

strings (such as *computopia*) could be known as "prolific string compounds", in the manner of phonestheme compounds or compounded combining forms. However, finding a suitable label for forms made up of a prolific string combined with either a free-standing lexeme, an affix or a combining form is much more difficult. For now, I suggest that they should all be labelled under the heading of "words involving prolific strings"[82]. Clearly, though, further work should be undertaken on the area of apposite terminology.

---

[82] As was the case with both "words involving phonesthemes" and "words involving combining forms" (once "neo-classical compounds" was rejected as a suitable catch-all term).

Chapter 10:

Conclusion

10.1   Recapitulation of the methodology and aim of this study

In section 1.9 of the introduction, it was stated that the greatest challenge to any linguist dealing with blending is distinguishing between this and other related word formation processes. This challenge is an even greater one for the corpus linguist as they, to re-quote Bauer and Renouf (2001: 101), 'come face-to-face with a number of phenomena that might easily be overlooked in an armchair type study'. There has not previously been an in-depth corpus-based study of blends, so the understanding of the full scope of blending and its overlap with other word-formation processes has been limited. As a result of this, the examination of the grey areas between blending and related processes in the literature has been cursory.

The aim of this thesis, as established in section 1.10, has been to propose definitions and criteria that can help to distinguish between blends and other types of word formation. The research thesis has utilised real data, drawn primarily from a 400,000,000 item newspaper corpus but also from miscellaneous relevant sources, in order to examine both the blending and other related processes in English word formation.

10.2 A summary of the findings of this research

10.2.1 Separation of blends by definition

In Chapter 1, the term *splinters* was accepted as the best label for the curtailed parts of words within blends. Different possible blending patterns were considered and, in section 1.6, the following working definition of a blend was proposed:

> *A blend occurs when two (or possibly more) elements "blend" together, so that at the point(s) of fusion something is either lost from at least one source element, or shared by both.*

The objective behind the composition of this definition was to separate out blends from other word formation processes, without being so restrictive as to exclude certain viable blending patterns. To this extent, it was largely successful. Blends were able to be differentiated from clipping and phonestheme compounding, and from most aspects of compounding, neo-classical compounding and derivation, with reference to this working definition.

10.2.2 Separation of blends by an applicable rule

In section 2.2.4.2, a test of "missing meaning" was proposed that can help to further differentiate between blends and derivations, and can complete the separation of blending from both compounding and neo-classical compounding:

If something that is not present in the final form has to be referred to in order

for the true meaning to be understood then the best classification is as a blend.

This, then, is an applicable rule that should be taken alongside the working definition when deciding whether the best classification of any given form is as a blend.

Consequently, clips, compounds, phonestheme compounds and neo-classical compounds have been distinguished from blends as a matter of definition.

10.2.3   Separation of blends by applying a range of criteria

Separating blends from clipping compounds was less straightforward. Eight factors were proposed to help distinguish between blends and clipping compounds, but it was eventually concluded that clipping compounds (like infixed and 3+ element blends) are best regarded as a sub-set of blends.

As blends composed of only initial splinterings have been allowed for within my characterisation, blending could not be separated from acronomy as a matter of definition. However, two essential differences between blends and acronyms were identified and seven further characteristics of acronomy that serve to further separate the process from blending were discussed. It was, though, concluded that while acronomy and blending are clearly distinct processes it is not always absolutely possible to draw a firm line between the two.

10.2.4 Separation of blends through the introduction of new word formation categories

In order to separate borderline acronym / blend forms, then, a new category of word formation was introduced, labelled *non-specifically abbreviated compounds*. This new category includes borderline blend / acronym forms, along with lexemes composed through the application of a range of shortening and compounding processes within a single form.

The most interesting area of overlap was between blends and derivations or, rather, between the splinters within blends and splinter-originating affixes. In Chapter 7, case analyses of typical splinters and splinter originating affixes were undertaken. Based upon these analyses, 5 criteria were established in Chapter 8 to separate blends from splinter originating affixes. In Chapter 9, these criteria were applied to 7 borderline splinter / affix strings and were shown to provide a successful means of finding the best classification for most of these strings.

It was, however, accepted that the best synchronic analysis of a borderline string can lie between splinters and affixes. Consequently, in section 9.5 a new category of *prolific strings* was introduced to provide a classification for these borderline splinter / affix strings. These prolific strings should be regarded as separate from splinters and have been ruled out of the scope of blending.

10.3   How this research has advanced knowledge of blending

The aim of this research was to separate blending from other related processes of word formation. It could not be fulfilled by simply providing a new description of the blending process, but has been achieved through a combination of measures. I have provided a definition that can generally separate out blends from other word formation processes, without being so restrictive as to exclude certain viable blending patterns. When this definition alone cannot indicate a best classification, there is an applicable rule to further separate out blending. I have also suggested criteria to differentiate between blends and other word-types such as acronyms and derivations. Furthermore, I have introduced two new word categories to account for forms still unclassifiable in light of either the definition, the applicable rule or any of the criteria.

Consequently, there is now a range of measures that can provide the best classification of any given borderline blend. This means that blending no longer has to be seen as a process that 'is not well-defined, and tends to shade off into compounding, neo-classical compounding, affixation, clipping and... acronyming' (Bauer, 1983: 236).

Now that measures are in place which can help to differentiate between blending and related processes of word formation, it should be possible to compose a typology of the blend sub-categories. As highlighted in section 1.9, Soudek believes that without this separation, such typology would not really be feasible:

In order to arrive at a workable typology of blending, the first logical step should be an attempt to characterize the make-up of blended lexical units. Such a characterization will have to include specific formal features which would distinguish the category of blends from formations such as compounds, clipped compounds, acronyms and other units whose make-up is often similar but not identical with that of blends.

(Soudek, 1978: 463)

As a result, it is now possible to revisit the typology of blending proposed in Chapter 1 and refine it so that it can reflect all of the possible structural sub-classes.

10.4   Revisiting the proposed typology in Chapter 1

In sections 1.7 and 1.8 a typology of blending was proposed, which was subsequently dismissed in section 1.9. The problem, though, did not lie with the suggested typology but, rather, with the characterisation of blending underpinning it. However, through the measures suggested in this thesis, any borderline blend form can be categorised. Consequently, it is possible to refine the typology so that it can account for any forms that are correctly classified as blends.

For ease of reference, the table from section 1.7, showing the letter and number codes of the different elements, is included again below.

Table 15: Table showing the letter and number codes of possible elements within blends

2nd el→ / 1st el ↓	A Full Word	B Initial Splinter	C Terminal Splinter	D Mid Splinter	E Not-mid Splinter	F ICF	G Prefix	H FCF	I Suffix	J Phonestheme
1. Word	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Initial splinter	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
3. Terminal splinter	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. Mid splinter	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
5. not-mid splinter	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
6. ICF	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Prefix	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
8. FCF	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. Suffix	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X
10. Phon-estheme	X	X	T	T	X	X	X	X	X	X

To recap, if a given form is best classified as a blend in light of the measures put forward in this thesis, it can be classified on the basis of its composition with regard to the above table. Blends are given a letter and number according to their element composition, and the fusion point is marked as either having overlap (O) or no overlap (XO). Initial splinter + terminal splinter overlapping blends, such as *digitainment* and *motel*, would be type 2(O)C blends, non overlapping word +

terminal splinter blends, such as *breathalyser* and *rapsploitation* would be class 1(XO)C blends, blend sub-set clipping compounds, such as *sitcom* and *litcrit* would be type 2(XO)B blends, etc.

This typology, then, accounts well for all two-element blends, either with or without overlap. This, though, is not enough. Just as clipping compounds were accepted as a sub-set of blends, so were 3+ element blends and infixed blends, therefore my typology has to be able to account for these forms also.

10.4.1   Refining the initial typology in light of my research

This typology can indeed provide a classification for 3+ element blends, since further letter references can be added to the end, and each point of fusion can be marked for overlap. For instance, Adams's (1973) suggested *alnico* (from *aluminium* + *nicol* + *cobalt*) would be classified as a type 2(XO)B(O)B (non-overlapping initial splinter + initial splinter + overlapping initial splinter), and Cannon's (1986) cited *synopticon* (from *synopsis* + *topic* + *lexicon*) would be referenced as an 2(XO)B(XO)C (non-overlapping initial splinter + initial splinter + non-overlapping terminal splinter).

Similarly, infixed blends can also be accommodated within my classification system. For instance, *ambisextrous* has an initial and terminal splinter of the first element and the second element is a full word infixed which overlaps with the terminal splinter. Therefore it would be referenced as a 2(XO)A(O)3 (initial splinter of element 1 (no overlap) full word (overlap) terminal splinter of element 2). Similarly, *bushler* (from

butler and _usher_) would be a type 2(O)B(XO)3 blend. The type references for infixed blends are immediately discernable from those of the 3+ element blends, as the infixed blends end with a number (indicating first element) rather than a letter (indicating a second or ensuing element).

One further feature that must be catered for by the typology originally proposed is the overlap between the elements. The case analyses of Chapter 7 brought to light the fact that some blends overlap either graphically or phonically but not both. Therefore, (O) should be used to indicate both graphic and phonic overlap, whereas (GO) should be used to signify a graphic only overlap and (PO) for the phonic equivalent. Thus, _labradoodle_ would be a 2(GO)C type blend and _blaxploitation_ would be referenced as a 1(PO)C blend.

10.4.2   A workable typology

Because this thesis has proposed measures to distinguish between blends and the related processes of word formation, it is possible to classify any given borderline blend form. Any word that should be analysed as a blend can be further sub-categorised with regard to its composition in light of the suggested typology. Not only does this typology allow for blends to be composed of elements other than splinters and words, it can also account for 3+ element blends, infixed blends, blends with and without overlap and blends which display only a phonic or graphic overlap. This is a considerable move forward in the classification and sub-categorisation of blends in English word formation.

10.5　Suggestions for future work

10.5.1　Studying the grey areas between the grey areas

When undertaking 'A Corpus-Based Study of Compounding in English', Bauer and Renouf (2001) concluded:

> The data we have presented may lead to a great deal of speculation: for us, it certainly raises more questions than it provides answers. But in the end, if these patterns are found in English, the grammar of English needs to be able to explain them and build them in. Ignoring them and hoping that no one will notice is not likely to help us elaborate an explanatory picture of what is happening in English.
>
> (Bauer and Renouf, 2001: 120)

This whole thesis has certainly not ignored the tricky forms, hoping no-one will notice. Instead, it has sought out blend-related lexemes which are not characterised by standard word formation patterns and has attempted to provide definitions, rules, criteria and new categories to account for such forms. However, while this research has concentrated on the processes that overlap with blending, it has not tackled the grey areas between the grey areas.

Section 2.1.4 explored the overlap between derivational affixes and clips, but it is clear that further work needs undertaking in this area. Similarly, section 5.2.2 highlighted some of the issues surrounding the problems of differentiating between

affixes and combining forms. Indeed, there is work to be done on distinguishing between compounded combining forms and typical compounds also, and decisions must be made on the nature of combining forms regarding origin and their relation to neo-classical compounding.

10.5.2   Tightening up terminology

The mention of the research still to be done on the area of neo-classical compounding highlights another area requiring further work. This is the area of terminology. As discussed in section 5.3.5, I do not consider "neo-classical compounds" to be an adequate label to describe all lexemes including one or more combining forms, irrespective of their origin. Similarly, appropriate terminology should be found to describe words including phonesthemes.

During this study, I have introduced two new categories of word formation; "non-specifically abbreviated compounds" and "prolific strings". It is likely that more appropriate terminology could be found to describe these necessary categories. Especially with regard to forms made up of a prolific string combined with either a free-standing lexeme, an affix or a combining form. My provisional suggestion was that they should be labelled "words involving prolific strings", but this is clearly as unsatisfactory as the equivalent lack of terminology for combining forms and phonesthemes. It is clear that further work should be undertaken on the area of apposite terminology.

10.5.3   Exploring the advantages of a functional over formal classification of individual lexemes

In section 7.1.1.2, the decision was made to treat words considered to be of different grammatical classes as instances of the same type. This is because the stance taken in this study was that words are not imbued with grammar and, thus, do not intrinsically belong within a grammatical class but, rather, adopt a particular grammatical status according to their usage. Interestingly enough, Hoey (forthcoming) seems to have come to a similar conclusion in his recent work. Of course, this theory in itself clearly requires further unpicking, but the point here is that the same logic could apply to classifications with regard to word formation processes.

Perhaps a completely different approach to the one taken in this thesis could also reconcile many of the grey areas between the classes of word formation; this would not be morphological or grammatical, but more of a functional approach. Forms like *-topia* (from *Utopia*) sometimes function like splinters, as is the case in the lexeme *digitopia*, sometimes they are more like combining forms, as in the form *ecotopia*, and sometimes they look most like affixes, as in *cartopia*. Similarly, *Of* (from *office*) sometimes looks like a clipping within a clipping compound, as in *Oftel*, sometimes as a typical splinter, as in *Ofgas*, and sometimes as a shortened element within an acronym, as is the case in *Ofsted*. I have tried to reconcile such cases by seeing how they function most often and by providing a diachronic explanation. (For instance, *-topia* was originally a splinter from *Utopia* which became productive, so began to attach more indiscriminately in the manner of an affix but, because of its etymology

as a splinter, can attach in ways not characteristic of affixes, such as to combining forms).

However, it may be easier to classify the functions of word formation overall rather than the individual elements. For instance, the theory could be that if an element (for instance, *dino-*) attaches to what seems to be a combining form (e.g. *dinoscope*) then in that case it is best analysed as a combining form, if it attaches to a base (e.g. *dinocave*) it is functioning as a derivation and if it is on its own it is best analysed as functioning as a clip in that particular instance. This approach would have obvious benefits in terms of not having to pigeon-hole either elements such as *-topia* and *Of-* or forms such as *phobia*, *mania* and *burger* which appear often both in combination and as free standing lexemes.

Again, clearly much work is needs to be done on this new paradigm. I do not know if it would replace or complement existing word formation theories that seek to classify given elements, such as the one put forward in this thesis. Nor do I know if it would collapse under closer scrutiny. It is possible, though, that a classification of functions, rather than of each element, would lead to a less restrictive theory of word formation that can better categorise all observable patterns. This must surely be something to strive for because, as highlighted by Bergstrom (1906) in the earliest substantial work on blending:

Language is not philosophy. We have no right to exact that it should be an application of strictly logical laws... And *right* and *wrong* are, especially as to language, relative and fluctuating concepts. Right is often what is used by the majority. What to-day is an irregularity, a solecism, may after some time be considered good and standard language, and become an idiom, which in defiance of grammatical rules has, by custom, become adopted and considered correct.

(Bergstrom, 1906: 21)

Bibliography

Bibliography

Adams, V. 1973. *An Introduction To Modern English Word Formation*. London: Longman

Adams, V. 2001. *Complex Words in English*. Harlow: Longman.

Aitchison, J. 1991. *Language Change: Progress or Decay? Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aitchison, J. 1994. *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon Second Edition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Algeo, J. 1977. 'Blends, a Structural and Systemic View'. *American Speech 52*, pp 47-64.

Algeo, J. 1991. *Fifty Year Among The New Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allen, M.R. 1978. *Morphological Investigations*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Conneticut.

Anshen, F. and Aronoff, M. 1988. 'Producing Morphologically Complex Words'. *Linguistics 26*, pp 641-655.

Aronoff, M. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. London: MIT Press.

Aronoff, M. 1978. 'Testing Morphological Productivity'. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science 318*, pp 106-114.

Aronoff, M. 1980. 'The Relevance of Productivity in a Synchronic Description of Word Formation'. In Fisink, J. (ed). 1980. *Historical Morphology*. The Hague: Mouton, pp 71-82.

Ayto, J. 1999. *20th Century Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baayen, H. 1994a. 'Derivational Productivity and Text Typology'. *Journal of Quantative Linguistics Vol. 1 No. 1*, pp 16-34.

Baayen, H. 1994b. 'Productivity in Language Production'. *Language and Cognitive Processes 9*, pp 447-469.

Baayen, H. and Leiber, R. 1991. 'Productivity and English Derivation: A Corpus Based Study'. *Linguistics 29*, pp 801-843.

Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Barber, C. 1964. *Linguistic Change In Present Day English*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Barnhart, D. K. and Metcalf, A. A. 1997. *America In So Many Words*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bauer, L. 1983. *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, L. 1988. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bauer, L. 1994. 'Types of Affixation'. In Asher, R. E. (ed). 1994. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Volume 1*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, p 45.

Bauer, L. 1998a. 'Is there a class of neoclassical compounds, and if so is it productive?' . *Linguistics 36*, pp 403-422.

Bauer, L. 1998b. *Vocabulary*. London: Routledge.

Bauer, L. 2001. *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, L and Renouf, A. 2001. 'A Corpus-Based Study of Compounding in English'. In Meyer, C.F (ed). 2001. *Journal of English Linguistics 29:2*. Boston: Sage Publications, pp100-123.

Bauer, L and Huddleston R. 2002. 'Lexical word-formation'. In Huddleston, R and Pullum, G. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, A.C. and Cable, T. 1978. *A History Of The English Language*, Third edition. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Beard, R. 1988. 'On The Separation of Derivation from Morphology: Toward a Lexeme-Morpheme Based Morphology'. *Quaderni di Semantica 9*, pp 3-59

Bergstrom, G.A. 1906. *On Blendings of Synonymous or Cognate Expressions in English*. Lund: Hakan Ohlsson.

Berrey, L.V. 1939. 'Newly-Wedded Words'. *American Speech 14*, pp3-10.

Bloomfield, L. 1935. *Language (Revised Edition)*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Bolinger, D. L. 1965. *Forms Of English Accent, Morpheme, Order*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bolinger, D. L. 1968. *Aspects Of Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, INC.

Booij, G. E. 1978. Wanneer Bestaat een woord? In Booij, G. E. (ed.). 1979. *Morfologie van het Nederlands*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie grachten. As translated in Van Marle (1985).

Booij, G. E. 1982. 'Lexical Fonologie en de Organisatie van de Morfologische Component. *Spektator 12*, pp 169-188. As translated in Van Marle (1985).

Branwyn, G. 1997. *Jargon Watch*. San Francisco: Hardwired.

Brook, G. L. 1981. *Words in Everyday Life*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Brown, G. 1851. *The Grammar of English Grammars*. New York: Wm. Wood & Co.

Bryant, M. B. 1974. 'Blends are increasing'. *American Speech 49*, pp39-46.

Burchfield, R. 1985. *The English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cannon, G. 1986. 'Blends in English word formation'. *Linguistics 24*, pp 725-753.

Cannon, G. 1987. *Historical Change and English Word Formation*. New York: Peter Lang.

Cannon, G. 2000. 'Blending'. In Booij, G, Lehmann, C and Mugdan, J. (eds). 2000. *Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*. New York: De Gruyter, pp 952-956.

Carroll, L. 1872. *Through the Looking-Glass*. London: Penguin (1994 edition).

Chomsky, N. 1961. 'Some Methodological remarks on Generative Grammar'. *Word 17*, pp 219-239.

Chomsky, N. 1964. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. 1970. 'Remarks on Nominalization'. In Jacobs, R. and Rossenbaum, P. (eds). 1970. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Massachusetts: Ginn, pp 184-221.

Clark, E.V., Hecht, B.F. and Mulford, R.C. 1986. 'Coining complex compounds in English: affixes and word order in acquisition'. *Linguistics 24*, pp 7-29.

Clarke, J. 1999. *More Grub On Less Grant*. London: Foulsham.

Collier, A. and Pacey, M. 1997. 'A Large Scale Corpus System for Identifying Thesaural Relations'. In Ljung, M. (ed). 1997. *Corpus-Based Studies in English: Papers from the 17th International Conferenceon English Language Research on Computerixed Corpora*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp 87-100.

Cruse, D.A. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. 1971. *Linguistics*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Crystal, D. 1985. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Crystal, D. 1996. *Rediscover Grammar (Revised Edition)*. Harlow: Longman.

Fenzl, R. 1966. 'Blends Selected From TIME Magazine'. *Idioma 3*, pp164-168.

Firth, J.R. 1930. *Speech*. London: Oxford University Press.

Fromkin, V. and Rodman, R. 1993. *An Introduction To Language Fifth Edition*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

George, E. 1996. *Deception On His Mind*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Hagege, C. 1990. 'Do the classical morphological types have clear cut limits?' In Dressler, W.U., Luschutzky, H.C., Pfeiffer, O.E and Rennison, J.R. (eds). 1990. *Contemporary Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp 297-308.

Hansen, B. et al. 1985. *Englische Lexikologie*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie. As referred to in Warren, B. (1985).

Harris, Z.G. 1951. *Methods in Structural Linguistics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hill, R. 2000. *Dialogues Of The Dead*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Hocket, C.F. 1967. 'Where The Tongue Slips, There Slip I'. In Halle, M. (ed). 1967. *To Honor Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton, pp 910-936.

Hoey, M. Forthcoming. *Lexical Priming – a new theory of words and language*. London: Routledge.

Howard, P. 1990. *A Word In Time*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.

Jesperson, O. 1922. *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Kastovsky, D. 1986. 'The Problem of Productivity in Word Formation'. *Linguistics 24*, pp 585-600.

Kelly, M. H. 1998. 'To "Brunch" or to "Brench": Some Aspects of Blend Structure'. *Linguistics 36*, pp 579-590.

Kennedy, A. G. 1942. *English Useage: A Study in Policy and Procedure*. New York: D. Appleton – Century Company Incorporated.

Kolin, P. 1979. The pseudo-suffix *-oholic*. *American Speech 54*, pp 74-76.

Lehrer, A. 1995. 'Prefixes in English Word Formation'. *Folia Linguistica xxix/1-2*, pp 133-148.

Lieber, R. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lloyd, J & Rees, E. 1999. *Come Together*. London: Arrow.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marchand, H. 1960. *The Categories And Types Of Present Day English Word Formation*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Marchand, H. 1969. *The Categories And Types Of Present Day English Word Formation Second Edition.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Matthews, P.H. 1974. *Morphology: an introduction to the theory of word structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Metcalf, A.A. 2001. 'Words of the year'. *Newsletter Of The American Dialect Society.* http://www.americandialect.org/woty.shtml

Motsche, W. 1990. 'Problems of word structure theories'. In Dressler, W.U., Luschutzky, H.C., Pfeiffer, O.E and Rennison, J.R. (eds). 1990. *Contemporary Morphology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp 79-86.

Paul, H. 1890. *Principles of the History of Language, rev.ed.* As quoted in Cannon (1986).

Popcorn, F. & Marigold, L. 1996. *Clicking - 16 Trends To Future Fit Your Life, Your Work And Your Business.* London: Harper Collins.

Potter, S. 1969. *Changing English.* London: Andre Deutsch.

Pound, L. 1914. *Blends: Their Relation to English Word Formation.* Heidelberg: Anglistiche Forschungen, Heft 42.

Quinion, M. 1996. 'Through The Blender new words, portmanteau style'. http://www.worldwidewords.org/articles/blend.htm

Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Renouf, A. 1993. 'A Word in Time: First Findings from Dynamic Corpus Investigation'. In Aarts, J., de Haan, P. and Oostdijk, N. (eds). *English Language Corpora: Design, Analysis and Exploitation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp 279-288.

Renouf, A. 1996. 'The ACRONYM Project: Discovering the Textual Thesaurus'. In Lancashire, I., Meyer, C and Percy, C. (eds). *Papers from English LanguageResearch on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 16)*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp 171-187.

Renouf, A. and Baayen, H. 1994. *Chronicling The* Times: *Lexical Innovations in a British Newspaper*. Nijmegen: Unpublished manuscript, Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

Rowling, J.K. 1998. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. Bloomsbury: London

Rowling, J.K. 1999. *Harry Potter and thePrisoner of Azkaban*. Bloomsbury: London

Sapir, E. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harvest.

Schulman, D. 1939. 'Blend Words and Place Names'. *American Speech 14*, pp 233-234.

Schultink, H. 1961. 'Produktiviteit als Morfologisch fenomeen'. *Forum der Letteren 2*, pp 110-125.

Soudek, L.I. 1978. 'The Relation of Blending to English Word-Formation: Theory, Structure and Typological Attempts'. In Dressler, W.U. and Meid, W. (eds). 1978. *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Linguistics; Vienna August 28 – September 2, 1977*. Innsbruck: Institut fur Sprachwissenschaf der Universitat Innsbruk, pp 462-466.

Thompson, S. A. 1975. 'On the Issue of Productivity in the Lexicon'. *Kritikon Litterarum 4*, pp 332-349.

Topping, K. 2002. *Slayer*. London: Virgin Books Limited

Trask, R. L. 1994. *Language Change*. London: Routledge.

Uhlenbeck, E. M. 1978. *Studies in Javanese Morphology*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Uhlenbeck, E. M. 1981. *Betekenis in Linguistisch Perspectief.* Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

Van Marle, J. 1985. *On the Paradigmatic Dimension of Morphological Creativity.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Warren, B. 1990. 'The importance of combining forms'. In Dressler, W.U., Luschutzky, H.C., Pfeiffer, O.E and Rennison, J.R. (eds). 1990. *Contemporary Morphology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp 111-132.

Wentworth, H. 1933. 'Twenty-Nine Synonyms For 'Portmanteau Word''. *American Speech 8*, pp 78-79.

Williams, E. 1981. 'On the Notions of 'Lexically Related' and 'Head of a word''. *Linguistic Inquiry 12*, pp 245-74.

Wood, F.A. 1912. 'Some English Blends'. *Modern Language Notes 27*, p179.

Yule, G. 1985. *The Study of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmer, K. E. 1964. *Affixal Negation in English and Other Languages.* London: William Clowes and Sons Ltd.

Dictionaries

Collins: *Collins English Dictionary* (Revised Third Edition). 1994. Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Oxford: *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (Tenth Edition) (COD). 1999. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Oxford English Dictionary (Second Edition) (OED). 1994. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (Fourth Edition) (SOD). 1993. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Oxford Dictionary of New Words (Second Edition). 1997. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Webster: *Webster's Third New International Dictionary.* 1961. London: Websters.

Appendices

Appendix 1

1150 blend corpus divided into 4 sub-corpora:

Sub-corpus 1:   495 blends from the 400,000,000
                 word Independent Newspaper
                 corpus (as used in the Research and
                 Development Unit for English
                 Studies at the University of
                 Liverpool)

Sub-corpus 2:   360 blends from linguistic literature

Sub-corpus 3:   129 blends from general literature

Sub-corpus 4:   166 miscellaneous blends

The 1150 blend corpus

The following corpus contains all of the blends encountered throughout the course of this research.

If the blend is featured in the Independent Newspaper corpus, then it is listed in sub-corpus 1.

If the blend is cited in linguistic literature but does not appear in the Independent Newspaper corpus, then it is listed in sub-corpus 2.

Blends encountered in general literature that do not feature in either the Independent Newspaper corpus or in linguistic literature, are listed in sub-corpus 3.

All other blends are listed in sub-corpus 4.

Sub-corpus 1:

495 blends found in the 400,000,000 word Independent newspaper corpus (as used in the Research and Development Unit for English Studies at the University of Liverpool)

84.3[1]

smog - smoke + fog

chortled - chuckled + snorted

Femail - Female + mail

motel - motor + hotel

floatel - floating + hotel

paratroop - parachute + troop

mimsy - miserable + flimsy

slanguage - slang + language

spam - spiced + ham

bit - binary + digit

escalator - escalating + elevator

transistor - transfer + resistor

Oxbridge – Oxford + Cambridge

mingy – mean + stingy

aerobatics - aero + acrobatics

guestimate – guess + estimate

sitcom – situation + comedy

sci-fi – science + fiction

hi-fi – high + fidelity

Intelsat – intelligent + satelite

84.4

moped - motor-assisted + pedal-cycle

faction - fact + fiction

Autogeddon - Automobile + Armageddon

Eurasia - Europe + Asia

electrocution - electricity + execution

motorcade – motorcar + cavalcade

positron - positive + electron

refujews - refugee + Jews

stagflation - stagnation + inflation

Amerindian - American + Indian

85.1

advertorial - advert + editorial

---

sextravaganza - sex + extravaganza

demote - de + promote

happenstance - happen + circumstance

breathalyser – breath + analyser

slo-mo – slow + motion

85.2

sexational - sex + sensational

camcorder - camera + recorder

shamateur - sham + amateur

Calexico - California + Mexico

computerate – computer + literate

85.3

geep - goat + sheep

Verbot - Verbal + robot

pentathlete - pentathlon + athlete

pulsar - pulsating + star

85.4

Grobot - Grow + robot

brunch - breakfast + lunch

genome - gene + chromosome

vegelate - vegetable + chocolate

86.1

Franglais - Francais + Anglais

chunnel - channel + tunnel

Japlish - Japanese + English

Liger – lion + tiger

beefalo - beef + buffalo

op-art – optical + art

86.2

sexpert - sex + expert

aldehyde – alcohol + dehydrogenatum

ecdysone - ecdysis + hormone

86.3

sexploitation - sex + exploitation

Dollywood - Dolly (Parton) + Hollywood

numberous – number + numerous

quasar - quasi + stellar

transceiver – transmitter + receiver

Butskell - Butler + Gaitskell

86.4

edutainment - education + entertainment

sexpanse - sex + expanse

Computent - Computer + competent

biome - biological + dome

87.1

Powercise - Power + exercise

psywar - psychological + warfare

beerage - beer + peerage

etorphine - ether + morphine

87.2

shoat - sheep + goat

Roaratorio – Roar + oratorio

selectorate - select + electorate

cyborg – cybernetic + organism

87.3

decathlete - decathlon + athlete

87.4

biopic - biographical + picture

88.1

sexciting - sex + exciting

Computique - Computer + boutique

ambisextrous – ambidextrous + sex

dictaphone - dictate + phone

radionics - radiation + electronics

88.2

compusion - computer + confusion

Nunsense - Nun + nonsense

cruical - crucial + critical

88.3

sextacies - sex + ecstasies

Amerenglish - American + English

icecapade - ice + escapade

Dexedrine - dextro-amphetamine + Benzedrine

Sensurround - Sense + surround

88.4

Lemsip - lemon + sip

Reaganomics - Reagan + economics

bonkbuster - bonk + blockbuster

docuverse - document + universe

89.1

squarial - square + aerial

blaxploitation - black + exploitation

89.2

Dinoseum - Dinosaur + museum

mizzle - mist + drizzle

travelator - travel + escalator

scuzzy - scum + fuzzy

lit-crit – literary + criticism

89.3

animatronics - animated + electronics

triathlete - triathlon + athlete

Tentertainment - Tent + entertainment

trip-hop - trip + hip-hop

Ameriholics - America + -holics

biathlete - biathlon + athlete

89.4

Egg-spert - Egg + expert

Frankenchrist + Frankenstein + christ

Commemorabilia - Commemorative + memorabilia

Octopush - Octopuss + push

claymation - clay + animation

90.1

banoffee - banana + toffee

banoffi - banana + toffee

boatel - boat + hotel

Madchester - mad + Manchester

tangelo – tangerine + pomelo

90.2

Paralympics - paraplegic + Olympics

90.3

Femidom - feminine condom

Poethon - Poet + -thon

infotainment - info + entertainment

Spanglish - Spanish + English

guestage - guest + hostage

elint – electronic + intelligence

90.4

subtopia - suburban + utopia

squarson - squire + parson

Bollywood - Bombay + Hollywood

dumbfound – dumb + confound

diamat - dialectical + materialism

91.1

Madstock - Madness + Woodstock

Amtrac – amphibious + tractor

91.2

snark - snake + shark

Safariquip - safari + equip

Techniquest - technical + quest

eggstasy - egg + ecstasy

eggstraordinary - egg + extraordinary

eggsecrable - eggs + execrable

Cote d'Hollywood - Cote d'azure + Hollywood

oinkment - oink + ointment

Crickathon - Cricket + -athon

Eurobics – Euro + aerobics

thyristor - thyratron + transistor

91.3

himbo - him + bimbo

rap-sploitation - rap + exploitation

decruitment - de + recruitment

slimnastics - slim + gymnastics

Texathon - Texas + -athon

91.4

Actibrush - action + brush

eggcelled - egg + excelled

carjacking - car + hijacking

Aerobathon - Aerobics + -athon

funkateers - funk + muskateers

Californicate – California + fornicate

92.1

gaydar - gay + radar

scrummy - scrumtious + yummy

Pictionary - Picture + dictionary

magalogue - magazine + catalogue

mousewife - mouse + housewife

duralumin - durable + aluminium

92.2

Eggswina - Egg + Edwina

Queersploitation - Queers + exploitation

MacDinosaurs - MacDonalds + Dinosaurs

Sinema – sin + cinema

flustrated – flustered + frustrated

92.3

Nuttercise - Nutter + exercise

slithy - slimy + lithe

Tigon – tiger + lion

Bisquick – biscuit + quick

Exercycle – exercise + cycle

92.4

Clintonomics - Clinton + economics

feminazi - feminist + nazi

Mouseschwitz - mouse + Auchwitz

Mousewitz – mouse + Auchzwitz

Duckau – duck + Dachau

93.1

phantastic - phone + fantastic

Portzilla - (Michael) Portillo + Godzilla

compulition - computer + competition

McJob - McDonalds + Job

Laparobot - Laparoscope + robot

whang - whack + bang

angiotensin - angiotonin + hypertensin

93.2

Choreopoem - choreograph + poem

Eggciting - Egg + exciting

Eggstravaganza - Egg + extravaganza

mockney - mock + cockney

Dramarathon - Drama + marathon

dinosploitation - dinosaur + exploitation

batitude - bat + attitude

punkitude - punk + attitude

Sexcapades - sex + escapades

Galumph - gallop + triumph

93.3

dinoseum - dinosaur + museum

dinorabilia - dinosaur + memorabilia

wigger - white + nigger

wigga - white + nigga

Rockney - Rock + Cockney

Gerrymander - Gerry + salamander

fantabulous - fantastic + fabulous

93.4

Japanimation - Japan + animation

advertainment - advertisment + entertainment

Sinderella - Sin + Cinderella

Dinohattan - Dinosaur + Manhattan

Snapperazzi - Snapper + paparazzi

Pornosaurs - Porn + dinosaurs

tyrannofreak - tyrannosaurus + freak

Emoticons - Emotion + icons

Arthrobics - Arthritis + aerobics

94.1

Egghibition - Egg + exhibition

three-peat - three + repeat

Jazzercise - Jazz + exercise

Boxercise - Box + exercise

Glynditz - Glyndebourne + Colditz

Goalden - Goal + golden

numeroholic - numeral + -oholic

Cartune - cartoon + tune

94.2

eggciting - egg + exciting

eggsercise - eggs + exercise

eggstravaganzas - egg + extravaganzas

Olditz - Old + Colditz

aquabatics - aqua + acrobatics

Cocacolonization – Coca-cola + colonization

Breadloser – breadwinner + loser

rurban - rural + urban

94.3

pronoia - pro + paranoia

I-way - information + superhighway

syntegrity – syn- + integrity

cutleromancy - cutlery + -omancy

floptical - flop + optical

rocksploitation - rock + exploitation

ribozyme - ribonucleic + enzyme

Frankenweenie - Frankenstein + weenie

Malandra - Malcolm + Sandra

Saxploitation - Saxophone + exploitation

rocksploitation - rock + exploitation

incentivate - incentive + motivate

Cinderfella - Cinderella + fella

Herotica - Her + erotica

Miseryside - Misery + Merseyside

Nucleonics – nuclear + electronics

palimony – partner + alimony

94.4

corpsicle - corpse + icicle

eggvertising - egg + advertising

eggverts - egg + adverts

eggvertising - egg + advertising

Egg-vert - Egg + advert

egg-cellent - egg + excellent

netiquette - net + ettiquette

photopia - photo + (u)topia

95.1

bumster - bum + hipster

sexhibitionist - sex + exhibitionist

Carisma - Car + charisma

frontlash - front + backlash

95.2

Egg-splosion - Egg + explosion

Fruitopia - Fruit + topia

gendertainment - gender + entertainment

Wimblebot - Wimbledon + bottom

Facercise - Face + exercise

snotacular - snot + spectacular

insinuendo - insinuate + innuendo

95.3

Aparthotel - apartment + hotel

freeware - free + software

Aquarobics - Aqua + aerobics

Sliderobics - Slider + aerobics

airobic - air + aerobic

confrotainment - confrontaitional + entertainment

bikesploitation - bike + exploitation

digerati - digital + literati

twigloo - twig + igloo

kidult - kid + adult

95.4

movielisations - movie + serialisations / novelisations

multiversity – multi- + university

cyberesidency – cyber- + residency

enviroscoping - environment + -scoping

genomics - genome + -nomics

chemisorption - chemistry + absorption

phallacy - phallus / phallic + fallacy

gastronautical - gastonomical + nautical

novelography - novel + biography

churkey - chicken + turkey

morphinomenal - morphine + phenomenal

Maggiolatry - Maggie + idolatry

footballogical - football + ological

cyberstocracy – cyber- + aristocracy

panoractive - panoramic + active

hermaphrodyke - hermaphrodite + dyke

comsymps - communist + sympathisers

animatronix - animated + electronix

pignapped - pig + kidnapped

phreaked - phone + freaked

curryphernalia - curry + paraphenalia

synthespians - synthetic + thespians

Whizzard - whizz + wizard

Pandographer - panda + photographer

vodkatinis - vodka + martinis

Busicom - business + communications

sexions - sex + sessions

docu-feature - documentary + feature

medium-fi - medium + hi-fi

high-lifestyle - high-life + lifestyle

e-male - e-mail + male

tongue-fu - tongue + kung-fu

troglodettes - troglodyte + -ettes

Mousercise - Mouse + exercise

Internetainment - Internet + entertainment

jellicopter - jelly + helicopter

blotterhound - bloodhound + otterhound

Beerobics – Beer + aerobics

parawing - parachute + wing

Excaliburger - Excalibur + burger

96.1

eggmail - egg + email

nutraceutical - nutrition + pharmaceutical

pleather - pvc + leather

aubergenius - aubergine + genius

Weaselzilla - Weasel + Godzilla

Mc-Hollywood - McDonalds + Hollywood

chuttled - chuckle + chortled

96.2

sexpose - sex + expose

teensploitation - teen + exploitation

Probot - Prostate + robot

Acrobot - Acrobat + robot

Eatertainment - Eat + entertainment

celebutantes - celebrity + debutantes

Hollywouldn't - Hollywood + wouldn't

celtuce - celery + lettuce

96.3

Spamela - Spam + Pamela

Hamderson - Ham + Anderson

Hoggselhoff - Hogg + Hasselhoff

Eggsistential - Egg + existential

Frankenpenis - Frankenstein + penis

Rhinosaur - Rhinoceros + dinosaur

Henmania - Henman + mania

Crossrobics – Crossbar + aerobics

96.4

Ebonics - Ebony + phonics

Timbledon – Tim (Henman) + Wimbledon

Siliwood - Silicon + Hollywood

eggstortionate - eggs + extortionate

multimediocrity - multimedia + mediocrity

Femigraine - female + migraine

femcho - female + macho

agri-tainment - agricultural + entertainment

veejay - video + Dee jay

futilitarian – futile + utilitarian

revusical - revue + musical

Shopocalypse – Shop + apocalypse

Hinglish - Hindi + English

97.1

disturbanism - disturb + urbanism

ufocals - ufo + focals

televersity – tele- + university

vactors - virtual + actors

aquaerobics – aqua + aerobics

Heaven-o - Heaven + hello

labradoodle - labrador + poodle

cybersitters – cyber- + babysitters

MAGA-zine - Magazine + AGA

Yahooligans - Yahoo + hooligans

glocalisation - globalisation + localisation

multipreneuring – multi- + entrepreneuring

MandelSound - Mandelson + Sound

Mandelteenies - Mandelson + teenies

Pinbot - Pinball + robot

Westralia - West + Australia

citrange – citrus + orange

zebrass – zebra + ass

97.2

dunnel - dome + tunnel

Eggsplosion - Egg + explosion

catisfaction - cat + satisfaction

netizen - net + citizen

mocktails - mock + cocktails

shaddict - shad + addict

trimnasium - trim + gymnasium

vagician - vagina + magician

Gollywood - Galway + Hollywood

Shagadelic - Shag + psychadelic

eyerobics - eye + aerobics

97.3

stalkarrazzi - stalk + paparrazzi

pyramidiots - pyramid + idiots

newsertising - news + advertising

permalancer - permanent + freelancer

designosaurs - design + dinosaurs

prosuming - producing + consuming

waitron - waiter + patron

pedestriacidal - pedestrian + -icidal

dinoturbation - dinosaur + disturbation

jazzercise - jazz + exercise

Henmaniac - Henman + maniac

Paddywood - Paddy + Hollywood

Kisstory - Kiss + history

Toddlerobics – Toddler + aerobics

97.4

Hollywoodn't – Hollywood + wouldn't

minumental - minimal + monumental

Mollywood - Mumbai + Hollywood

Mandelspeak - Mandelson + speak

Pokemon - pocket + monsters

informated - informed + educated

98.1

frankenchips - frankenstein + microchips

reprogenetics - reproductive + genetics

docusoap - documentory + soap

internot - internet + not

Japarazzi - Japan + paparazzi

urb-scape - urban + landscape

cyxploitation - cycle + exploitation

slogo - slogan + logo

adultescent - adult + adulescent

extranet - extra + intranet

Lutopia - Loo + utopia

digitainment - digital + entertainment

Spooktaculars - Spook + spectaculars

Untertainment - Un + entertainment

contrail - condensation + trail

Eurailpass - European + railpass

Lidar - light + radar

98.2

brainiac – brain(y) + maniac

Eggstra - Egg + extra

sexplosive - sex + explosive

jitterati - jitter + literati

Helloween - Hell + Halloween

98.3

Frankenfood - Frankenstein + food

Tourminator - tour + Terminator

Hellograph - Hello + Telegraph

blamestorming - blame + brainstorming

Grannitude - Granny + attitude

Goddesszilla - Goddess + Godzilla

Mandelblairian - Mandleson + Blair (+ -ian)

boldacious - bold + audacious

Carpocalypse – Car + apocalypse

Amsterdamage – Amsterdam + damage

98.4

irritainment - irritating + entertainment

Frankenhooker - Frankenstein + hooker

Mandellium (Dome) *- Mandelson + Millenium* (Dome)

snurfing - snow + surfing

eggsperts - egg + experts

Eggsactly - Egg + exactly

popsploitation - pop + exploitation

Danzine - Dance + magazine

Snurfing – snow + surfing

99.1

humilitainment - humiliate + entertainment

Centretainment - Centre + entertainment

Ragesploitation - Rage + exploitation

Franken-Steinman - Frankenstein + (Jim) Steinman

fat-catastic - fat-cat + -tastic (graphic blend on *t*)

Hodzilla - (Chris) *Hoddle + Godzilla*

Digimon - digital + monsters

Froudacity – Froude + audacity

99.2

Surrural - Surreal + rural

sexplicit - sex + explicit

frankenplants - frankenstein + plants

Dragazine - Drag + magazine

Pokemania - Pokemon + mania

frightmare - fright + nightmare

Blutopia - Blue + utopia

Skousers - Skirt + trousers

Bistrorganic - Bistro + organic

politoholics - politics + -oholics

Shaguar - Shag + Jaguar

Neurobics – neuro + aerobics

99.3

ecotricity – eco- + electricity

swaption - swap + option

webisode - web + episode

sexercise - sex + exercise

sexumentaries - sex + documentaries

pharm - pharmaceutical + farm

Frankenfish - Frankenstein + fish
Frankenpants - Frankenstein + pants

Fashaholics - Fashion + -aholics

Willenium - Will + millenium

99.4

e-lance - e- + freelance

e-conomy - e- + economy

e-tailing - e- + retailing

architainment - architechture + entertainment

Frankencell - Frankenstein + cell

Wabot - Walk + robot

Steptacular - Steps + spectacular

factastic - fact + -tastic (graphic blend on *t*)

santastic - santa + -tastic

rom-com - romantic + comedy

Haileywood - Hailey + Hollywood

craparrazzi - crap + paparazzi

assmosis - ass + osmosis

osteopornosis - osteoporosis + porn

glibido - glib + libido

reintarnation - reincarnation + tarnish

girafitti - giraffe + grafitti

hipatitis - hip + hepatitis
inoculatte - inoculate + latte

foreploy - foreplay + ploy

sarchasm - sarcasm + chasm

karmageddon - karma + Armageddon

Marlborot - Marlboro + rot

Nobserver - Nob + Observer

swellegant - swell + elegant

Compound Blends / Blended Lexical Strings

94.3

old age mentioners - oaps + mention(ers)

94.4

Generation X-ploitation - Generation X + exploitation

96.1

standing applause – standing ovation + applause

97.1

Spin Doctrine - Spin doctering + doctrine

98.2

Will Self-obsessed - Will Self + self-obsessed

98.4

mouse potato - mouse + couch potato

Sub-corpus 2:

360 Blends from linguistic literature

In Bergstrom (1906) :

p11:

preet – pretty + sweet

p14:

Octember – October + November

grevis – gravis + levis

p15:

contract – concrete + abstract

idensity – identity + intensity

Muringer – Murko + Meringer

shup – shut + up

Allenbury – Allen + Hanbury

mobus – motor + omnibus

p27:

begincement – beginning + commencement

p31:

dang'd – damned + hanged

p43:

galumph – gallop + triumph

p44:

Gritain – Great + Britain

plurkey – plumpudding + turkey

p45:

sinexter – sinister + dexter

p51:

ahungry – ahungered + hungry

anhungry – anhungered + hungry

argle – argue + haggle

Barsolistor – Barrister + Solicitor

p52:

bestraught – beset + distraught

p54:

circument – circular + advertisement

clantastical – clandestine + fantastical

combinise – combination + chemise

Corellinthian – Corellian + Corinthian

disastrophe – disaster + catastrophe

p56:

flunge – fly + plaunge

fustle – fuss + bustle

p58:

gustard – goose + bustard

joily – joyous + jolly

metropolypus – metropolis + polypus
   \

p59:

Tarform – tarriff + reform

O-a-ensions – old + age + pensions

Dailyicle – Daily + Chronicle

p60:

noblegant – noble + elegant

presbygational – presbytarian + congregational

principalities – principles + qualities

prohiblican – prohibitional + republican

rebuse – rebuke + abuse

p61:

shagarette – shag + cigarette

slantendicular – slanting + perpendicular

p62:

squireshop – squire + bishop

squishop – squire + bishop

squirshop – squire + bishop

superficious – superficial + supercilious

p63:

thon – that + yon

torrible – torrid + horrible

vulgularity – vulgarity + popularity

p64:

runagate – runaway + renegate

needcessity – need + necessity

p65:

prinister – prime + minister

p66:

coronotions – coronation + notions

Refereader – Referee + Reader

Panglosaxonism – Pan + Anglosaxonism

In Pound (1914)

p27:

alcoholiday – alcohol + holiday

Amerind - American + Indian

p28:

animule – animal + mule

arguficaton – argue + signification

belkupping – belk[2] + hicupping[3]

p29:

bellcony – bell + balcony

blaunders – blowings + glanders[4]

Brabanditti – Brabant + banditti

bumbershoot – umbrella + parachute[5]

bumbersoll – umbrella + parasol[6]

bungaloafer – bungalow + loafer

buzwig – buzz + big-wig

p30:

canimal – camel + animal

catalo - cattle + buffalo

chemiloon – chemise + pantaloon

combinize – combination + chemise

p31:

comrogue – comrade + rogue

crazyologist – craniologist + crazy

cusnation – cuss + damnation

---

[2] alternate spelling for belch

[3] sic

[4] erroneous *u*

[5] erroneous *b*, phonic approximation of *ch* of *chute*

[6] erroneous *b*

dastardice – dastard + cowardice

diphtherobia – diphtheria + hydrophobia

doggery – dog + groggery

donkophant – donkey + elephant

p32:

epicurate – epicure + curate

foolosopher - fool + philosopher

p33:

fratority – fraternity + sorority

fruice – fruit + juice

furicano – fury + hurricano

p34:

galdragon – galder + dragon

happenident – happening + accident

imperence – impertinence + impudence

impgel – imp + angel

Indocrat – Independent + Democrat

p35:

jayseed – jay + hayseed

kissletoe – kiss + mistletoe

Kleptoroumania – kleptomania + Roumania

p36:

Moosevelt – *moose* + *Roosevelt*

newelty – *new* + *novelty*

nicotunia – *nicotine* + *petunia*

nightinglory – *nightingale* + *morning glory*

noration – *narration* + *oration*

Omahog – *Omaha* + *hog*

p37:

plumcot – *plum* + *apricot*

politichine – *political* + *machine*

pomato – *potato* + *tomato*

prevaricaterer – *prevaricate* + *caterer*

p38:

pulmonia – *pulmonary* + *pneumonia*

pushency – *push* + *urgency*

puppyrel – *puppy* + *doggerel*

quarteroon – *quarter* + *quadroon*

raviators – *ravers* + *aviators*

p39:

sanctanimity – *sanctimoniousness* + *magnanimity*

screwmatics - *screw* + *rheumatics*

shreech – *shriek* + *screech*

shuttance – *shut* + *riddance*

silkpipe hat – *silk hat* + *stovepipe hat*

p40:

sneakret – *sneak* + *secret*

spindigo – *spin* + *indigo*

p41:

stencilhouette – *stencil* + *silhouette*

stringlet – *string* + *ringlet*

sweatspiration – *sweat* + *perspiration*

testificate – *testimonial* + *certificate*

tilge – *tea* + *bilge*

p42:

Ulsteria – *Ulster* + *hysteria*

umperor – *umpire* + *emperor*

versiflage – *verse* + *persiflage*

p43:

Wafrica – *West* + *Africa*

wegotism – *we* + *egotism*

whirlicane – *whirlwind* + *hurricane*

wildnagerie – *wild* + *menagerie*

yellocution – *yell* + *elocution*

zebrule - *zebra* + *mule*

p44:

asiotic – asinine + idiotic

austern – austere + stern

beautilitarian – beautiful + utlilitarian

cabarazy – cabaret + crazy

p45:

carnibbleous - carnivorous + nibble

criticular – critical + particular

Demopublican – democratic + republican

drummure – drum + demure

dwizzened – dwindle + wizzened

figitated –figet + agitated

flimsical –flighty + whimsical

p46:

forfaulted –forfeited + fault

giverous – give + generous

grandificent – grand + magnificent

imperent – impertinent + impudent

lovertine – love + libertine

p47:

mouncing – mounting + bouncing

mustylogical – musty + mythological

pecurious – peculiar + curious

plumpendicular – plump + perpenicular

promptual – prompt + punctual

pupmatic – pup + dogmatic

p48:

querious – queer + curious

rambust – ram + robust

rasparated – rasp + exasparated

scandiculous – scandalous + ridiculous

scatterloping – scattering + interloping

skittenish – skittish + kittenish

p49:

solemncholy - solemn + melancholy

tremense – tremendous + immense

universanimous – universal + unanimous

p50:

baffably – blandly +affably

clearn – clear + clean

delishfully – deliciously + delightfully

perzactly – precisely + exactly

p51:

besepts – besides + except

blamenation – blame + damnation

p52:

argufy – argue + signify

baffound - baffle + confound

p54:

expugn – expunge + impugn

p55:

illify – ill + villify

interturb – interrupt + disturb

previnder – prevent + hinder

p56:

quituate – quit + graduate

recollember – recollect + remember

recommember – recommend + remember

rumfle – ruffle + rumple

sclimb – scale + climb

scollage – scholar + college

scrush – squeeze + crush

p57:

smothercate - smother + suffocate

snangle – snarl + tangle

squinch – squeeze + pinch

sqush – squeeze + crush

squuush – squeeze + crush

p58:

stuffocate – stuff + suffocate

suspose – suspect + suppose

sweedle – swindle + wheedle

Theosophilander – theosophy + philander

vexasparate – vex + exasparate

In Potter (1969)

p81:

drunch - drinks + lunch

dinter - dinner + interview

foggle - fog + drizzle

smaze - smoke + haze

autotel - automobile + hotel

autel - automobile + hotel

airtel - airport + hotel

slurbs - sleazy + suburbs

queuetopias - queue + utopias

lubritection - lubricate + protection

quark - question + mark

magnalium - magnesium + aluminium

racon - radar + beacon

negatron - negative + electron

In Adams (1973):

p139:

balloonatic - balloon + lunatic

p142:

lorry-tel - lorry + hotel

p146:

stalloy - steel + alloy

p148:

Niniversity - Ninny + University

Knavigation - Knave + navigation

p149:

astronography - Astronomy + geography

ballute - balloon + parachute

p150:

escalift - escalator + lift

privilegentsia - privilege + intelligentsia

latensification - latent + intensification

fakesimile - fake + facsimile

scrollduggery - scroll + skullduggery

p151:

Yiddiom - Yiddish + idiom

ruddervator - rudder + elevator

opinionaire – opinion + questionnaire

opinionnaire - opinion + questionnaire

bomphlet - bomb + pamphlet

p152:

bushler - butler + usher

tangemon - tangerine + lemon

hurricoon - hurricane + balloon

skinoe - ski + canoe

p153:

screamager - screaming + teenager

bus-napper - bus + kidnapper

keytainer - key + container

passenveyor - passenger + conveyor

compander - compressor + expander

elevon - elevator - aileron

p154:

bromidiom - bromide + idiom

beermare - beer + nightmare

stimulighting - stimulation + lighting

daymare - day + nightmare

seavacuation - sea + evacuation

telegogue - television + demagogue

p155:

plastinaut - plastic + astronaut

permalloy - permeable + alloy

nuplex - nuclear + complex

submarisle - submarine + isle

chattire - chat + satire

p156:

singspiration - sing + inspiration

hydramatic - hydraulic + automatic

respectaburban - respectable + (sub)urban

attractivating - attractive + captivating

mirthquake - mirth + earthquake

colossapendous - colossal + stupendous

stupeficent - stupendous + magnificent

magnossal - magnificent + colossal

galvanneal - galvanize + anneal

p157:

aquacade - aqua + cavalcade

astrodemic - astro + epidemic

electrolier - electro + chandelier

appestat - appetite + stat

calligraphone - calligraphic + phone

oceanaut - ocean + naut

p158:

subservile - subservient + servile

diswrought - distraught + overwrought

aggranoying - aggravating + annoying

p159:

compucessories - computer + accessories

stimulotion - stimulating + lotion

Everscepistic - Everest + sceptic + septic + pistic

p160:

proletentiousness - proletariat + pretentiousness

telephoria - television + euphoria

educreation - education + creation

p189:

beercast – beer + broadcast

simulcast – simultaneous + broadcast

p190:

angledozer – angle + bulldozer

seacopter – sea + helicopter

ambucopter – ambulance + helicopter

In Aronoff (1976)

p21:

Transmote – trans + promote

In Algeo (1977)

p49:

filmania – film + mania

Ulsterior – Ulster + alterior

racqueteer – racquet + racketeer

cellebrity – cell + celebrity

millionheiress – millionaire + heiress

p50:

cussnation – cuss + damnation

p51:

miscevarsitation – miscegenation + varsity

p52:

steelionaire – steel + millionaire

Hungarican – Hungarian + American

booboisie – boob + bourgeoisie

pollutician – pollute + politician

daffynition – daffy + definition

stripteuse – striptease + chanteuse

p56:

Chicagorilla – Chicago + gorilla

p57:

shill - shiver + chill

stocks – stockings + socks

gasid – gas + acid

p60:

absotively – absolutely + positively

posilutely – positively + absolutely

persweat – perspiration + sweat

fertigation – fertilizer + irrigation

syphilization – syphilis + civilization

p61:

mootel – moo + hotel

ghoost – ghoul + ghost

snap – snooze + nap

dramateur – drama + amateur

In Bauer (1983)

p234:

dawk - dove + hawk

p236:

arcology - architectural + ecology

electrodelic - electro + psychodelic

molecism - molecule + organism

cremains - cremate + remains

carbecue - car + barbecue

mocamp - motor + camp

Nixonomics - Nixon + economics

In Burchfield (1985)

p44:

savagerous - savage + dangerous

In Cannon (1986)

p731:

airmada - air + armada

organule - organism + molecule

p737:

tritical - trite + critical

p738:

Synopticon - synopsis + topic + lexicon

Leilabeth - Leila + Elizabeth

p740:

Frenglish - French + English

vibronic - vibratory + electronic

ausform - austenitic + deform

dielectrophoresis - dielectric +
electrophoresis

apodization - aperture + periodization

glassteel - glass + steel

letterset - letterpress + offset

p741:

immittance - impedance + admittance

hesiflation - hesitation + inflation

gayola - gay + payola

scrapnel - scrap + shrapnel

glasphalt - glass + asphalt

desipramine - desmethyl + imipramine

psychedelicatessen - psychedelic +
delicatessen

p742:

alphametic - alphabet + arithmetic

cystathionine - cysteine + methionine

splanch - split-level + ranch

depicture - depict + picture

Dixican - Dixie + republican

yakow - yak + cow

p743:

parafoil - parachute + airfoil

linar - line + star

varactor - varying + reactor

neuristor - neuron + transistor

p745:

australwink - Australia + periwinkle

In Cannon (1987)

p144:

prosage – protein + sausage

p145:

aquatel – aqua + hotel

barococo – baroque + rococo

p146:

musicasette – music + casette

swingle – swing + single

extencisor – extensor + exerciser

diesohol – diesol + alcohol

beefish – beef + fish

In Algeo (1991)

p9:

blacketeer – black market + marketeer

bacsart – basket + cart

In Aitchison (1994)[7]

p20:

expose - expect + suppose

tummach - tummy + stomach

p21:

huskuline - husky + masculine

p86:

Noshville - Nashville + Knoxville

taquua - tequila + kahlua

sailure - success + failure

p91:

climbered - climbed + clambered

p128:

compact - collision + impact

dispendable - disposable + expendable

p139:

ducks - dollars + bucks

shell - shout + yell

p198:

ebvious - evident + obvious

frowl - frown + scowl

p199:

---

[7] all spoken blends (selection errors)

367

sleast - slightest + least

buggage - baggage + luggage

In Cannon (2000)

p955:

Ortanique – orange + tangerine + unique

.

Sub-corpus 3:

129 Blends From Non-Linguistic Literature
(Including Dictionaries)

In the Concise Oxford English Dictionary (1999):

zedonk – zebra + donkey

zonkey – zebra + donkey

camelopard – camel + leopard

In the Oxford Dictionary of New Words (1997):

abortuary - abortion + mortuary

ageful - age(less) *+ youthful*

aquacise - aqua + exercise

automagically - automatically + magically

emergicenter - emergency + center

surgicenter - surgical + center

urgicenter - urgent + center

Jargon Watch (1997, Branwyn,G.):

anticipointment - anticipation + disappointment

chronolibrium – chrono- + equilibrium

Contradictionary - contradict + dictionary

gratuitml - gratuit + html

infojaclulation - information + ejaculation

inventrepreneur - inventer + entrepreneur

Javangelist - Java + evangelist

pageversationalist - pager + conversationalist

pornetgraphy - pornography + internet

webference - web + interference

jargonauts - jargon + -nauts

adminisphere - administration + -sphere

allianceware - alliance + software

beepilepsy – beeper + epilespsy

bitraking - bit + muckraking

CaptiveX - captive + ActiveX

chaord - chaos + order

co-opertition - co-operation + competition

Cumdex - cum + Comdex

cybrarian - cyber + librarian

e-gasm - e-mail + orgasm

forelash - fore + backlash

frankenedit - frankenstein + edit

furverts - fur + perverts

geeksploitation - geek + exploitation

Generica - generic + America

Hollywired - Hollywood + wired

jpigs - jpeg + pigs

keypal - keyboard + penpal

Kobrigram - (Helen) Kobrin + -gram

meltomedia - melt + multimedia

muchomedia - much + multimedia

netsploitation - net + exploitation

neurobotics - neurobiology + robotics

notwork - not + network

panarchy – pan- + anarchy

payground - pay + playground

luser - looser + user

rumorazzi - rumor (rumour AE) + papparazzi

softlifting - software + shoplifting

swiped out - swipe card + wiped out

techflation – technology + inflation

tetwrist - tetris + wrist

voicejail - voicemail + jail

wankware - wank + software

webbleganger - web + doppleganger (note the *bb* substitution for *pp*)

world wide wait - world wide web + wait

American Dialect Society Website:
(http://www.americandialect.org/ last looked at on 17 July 2001)

1999:

birdosaur – bird + dinosaur

Coffee-zilla – coffee + Godzilla

1998:

compfusion – computers + confusion

explornography – explore + pornography

Preslyterianism – Presley + Presbyterianism

1997:

Cablinasian – Caucasian + Black + Indian + Asian

spamouflage – spam + camouflage

1996:

prebuttal – pre- + rebuttal

1995:

starter marriage – starter home + marriage

1992:

s-mail – snail + mail

1991:

velcroid – velcro + celluloid

Daily Mail:

punderful - pun + wonderful (29 September 1999)

screenager - screen + teenager (21 October 1999)

Beckingham Palace – Beckham + Buckingham Palace (27 January 2001)

SerVe – Serena + Venus (16 June 2001)

mopying – multiple + copying (17 November 2001)

sexile – sex + exile (2 March 2002)

P&Ortsmouth – P&O + Portsmouth (4 May 2002)

Hedgehog-spital – Hedgehog + hospital (13 July 2002)

The Times:

Sunday Times 'DOORS, Your Guide To The Internet' supplement – 26/08/01

Weblish – Web + English

Gubbish – Garbage + rubbish

rubbage – rubbish + garbage

Sunday Times Culture, 10/03/2002

Hello!tocracy – Hello! *(magazine)* + aristocracy

The Times Educational Supplement ('The Teacher' supplement), 19/04/02

Mathagony aunt – maths + agony aunt

The Mirror:

Svengland – Sven (Goran Ericsson) + *England* (3/9/01)

The Sun:

Emmerwhale – Emmerdale + whale (17/11/01)

Total Film:

drilliant - drill + brilliant (July 1999)

Bardwagon - Bard + bandwagon (February 2000)

Stalkabout - *stalk* + *walkabout* (February 2000)

wonderlicious - *wonderful* + *delicious* (February 2000)

fict - *fiction* + *fact* (February 2000)

Screamobilia – *Scream* + *memorabilia* (February 2000)

arachnident – *arachnid* + *accident* (May 2001)

mootant – *moo* + *mutant* (May 2001)

Hollyblender – *Hollywood* + *blender* (May 2001)

Empire:

Drewphoria – *Drew* (Barrymore) + *euphoria* (February 2000)

scarifying – *scare* + *terrifying* (June 2001)

scriptment – *script* + *treatment* (August 2001)

(Warren) *Downbeatty* – *downbeat* + (Warren) *Beatty* (August 2001)

(Erin) *Boobovich* – *boob* + (Erin) *Brockovich* (August 2001)

Scallyiens – *Scallys* + *aliens* (September 2001)

slo-mo – *slow* + *motion* (September 2001)

flo-mo – *flow* + *motion* (September 2001)

cat-napping – *cat* + *kidnapping* (September 2001)

Apeocalypse – *Ape* + *apocalypse* (September 2001)

I-quity – *I quit* + *equity* (December 2001)

Ses-Osama – *Sesame* (Street) + *Osama* (Bin Laden) (December 2001)

animerisms – *animal* + *mannerisms* (December 2001)

mutt-ley (crew) – *mutt* + *motley* (crew) (February 2002)

dramady – *drama* + *comedy* (February 2002)

filmogs – *film* + *biogs* (February 2002)

liopics – *lie* + *bipoics* (March 2002)

The Big Issue:

skatetastic - *skate* + *fantastic* (November 8-14, 1999)

TV Times:

sexcess - *sex* + *success* (15-21 January, 2000))

Come Together (Lloyd, J & Rees, E. 1999. Arrow: London):

toptastic - top + fantastic (p43)

sexellent - sex + excellent (p138)

screwpendous - screw + stupendous (p138)

screwperb - screw + superb (p138)

Maxative - Max + laxative (p191)

Nelvis - Nathan + Elvis (p196)

Others:

Spellotape - spell + sellotape (Rowling, 1998: 74)

skele-gro - skeleton + grow (Rowling, 1998: 131)

Animagi – animal + magic (Rowling, 1999: 83)

Japaneasy – Japanese + easy (Clarke, 1999: 191)

Tunagnese – tuna + bolognese (Clarke, 1999: 163)

Racon - Rachael + Connie (George, 1996: 324)

incrediball – incredible + ball (*HELLO!* Magazine – However, I am not sure which issue as I read it in the Doctor's surgery and the front page was missing)

Cinematters – cinema + matters (regular section title in *HELLO!* Magazine)

tabulous – tab + fabulous (*Q magazine*, February 2001)

smarle – smile + snarle (Hill, 2000: 14)

Buffyverse – Buffy + universe (Topping, 2002, p370)

sexperiment – sex + experiment (Topping, 2002, p380)

Sub-corpus 4:

166 Miscellaneous Blends (Not From Literature)

Written

Twogether – *two* + *together* (The title of a 1992 film)

Hemail - *He* + *email* (Newspaper Headline, cited in "Have I Got News For You", 26/11/99)

Scarbaroque - *Scarborough* + *Baroque* (in the "Larkin With Women" programme from the Stephen Joseph Theatre at Scarborough, 26/11/99)

Technoriginal - *Technological* + *original* (on year 2000 limited edition "Fairy Liquid" bottles)

Volumagic – *Volume* + *magic* ("Healthy Living Direct" catalogue, summer 2001)

meteorowlogist – *meteorologist* + *owl* (novelty colour changing owl that predicts the weather! "JND catalogue", summer 2001)

Polyversity - *Polytechnic* + *University* (Birthdays' "Ode to Students" poem)

Unitechnic - *University* + *Polytechnic* (Birthdays' "Ode to Students" poem)

Shelby – *Shell* + *furbie* (new toy, advertised on TV)

cinemail - *cinema* + *email* ("Odeon Cinema's" email information list)

Sophisticut – *sophisticate* + *cut* (a hairdressers in Rugby)

Budjet - *budget* + *Jet* (A chain of garages)

Outraspective – *out* + *intraspective* ("Faithless" album title)

caplets - *capsules* + *tablets* (Paracetamol, Lemsip, etc.)

paracodol – *paracetamol* + *codeine*

coamoxiclav – *combination* + *amoxcillin* + *clavinic acid*

funtastic – *fun* + *fantastic* ("Flamingo Land" zoo and theme park brochure)

Homedics – *Home* + *medics* (brand name)

froffee – frothy + coffee (drink on menu of coffee car in Cambridge Train Station)

yogushake – yoghurt + milkshake (drink on menu of coffee car in Cambridge Train Station)

McCafé – McDonalds + café (in a piece of writing about prices on the side of the coffee car in Cambridge Train Station)

Molenium – Mole + millennium (novelty pottery moles, presumably launched to celebrate the millennium)

Withoutabix – Without + Weetabix (stamp at end of 2001 "Weetabix" commercials)

Withabix – With + Weetabix (stamp at end of 2001 "Weetabix" commercials)

fizzically – fizz + physically (writing at end of "KP Skips" 2001 commercials)

EricSun – (Sven Goran) Ericsson + Sun (billboards at the England versus Germany football match, 1/9/01)

Seanic – Sean + scenic (name of Sean Bradbury's design company)

Descriptionary – description + dictionary (advertised in the summer 2001 "TSP Catalogue")

Lipfinity – lip(stick) + infinity ("Max Factor" lipstick)

Pizzaghetti – pizza + spaghetti ("Heinz" spaghetti with pizza pieces in it)

Centreprise – centre + enterprise (Name of computer suppliers firm)

Salsacise – salsa + exercise (2001 Tracy Shaw video)

Rocktober – Rock + October (billboard poster for musical releases, October 2001)

Scumuppance – scum + comeuppance (billboard poster for "Crime Stoppers", October 2001)

Skeletones – Skeleton + tones (Liverpool band, advertised in "The Egg Café", Liverpool, December 2001)

Delialicious – Delia + delicious (BBC advert for Delia Smith's programme, on the side of a bus, December 2001)

Spooktacular – Spook + Spectaular (advertised in Christmas 2001 "TSP Catalogue")

Essensuals – *Essentials* + *sensuals* (name of shop in Marlborough)

fanalysis – *fan* + *analysis* (bonus feature on "Evil Dead" DVD, 2002 edition)

Bankingstein – *Banking* + *Frankenstein* (in "saje instant accounts" advertisement in 23/01/02's Daily Mail)

Cowkemon – *Cow* + *Pokemon* (on "Capitalism" joke email – circulated March 2002)

submarium – *submarine* + *aquarium* (how "The Deep" advertises iteslf in brochures/ adverts, March 2002)

cerealously – *cereal* + *seriously* (summer 2002 billboard advert for "Go Ahead" cereal bars)

Sven-sational – *Sven* (Goran Eriksson) + *senational* ("Thomas Cook" email, circulated June 2002)

Written on the Internet:

hacktivism – *hack* + *activism* (www.net-mediaproductions.co.uk/hacker/)

debatabase – *debate* + *database* (www.debatabase.co.uk)

backronym - *backformed* + *acronym* (on the web, eg. www.dictionary.com)

Voycabulary - *Voyager* + *vocabulary* (Voyager dictionary service on www.yahoo.co.uk)

servent – *server* + *client* (www.limewire.com/index.jsp/glossary)

vortal – *vertical* + *portal* (www.searchenginewatch.com/sereport/00/04-vortals.html)

vectory – *vertical* + *directory* (www.searchenginewatch.com/sereport/00/08-vectories.html)

Spuffy – *Spike* + *Buffy* (www.eonline.com/Gossip/Wanda/Archive2002)

ConSteve – *Connor* + *Steve* (www.scoopme.com/tv/articles)

Scripted:

<u>From "Friends", the television series:</u>

basketeers - basket + muskateers (Series 1, Episode 24)

Mocolate - mock + chocolate (S2, E8)

Fishtachio - fish + pistachio (S2, E8)

Chromantic - chrome + romantic (S2, E19)

Monicuddle - Monica + cuddle (S3, E1)

erottery - erotica + pottery (S4, E11)

Gaygas - gay + Vegas (S4, E12)

Madlibs – mad + adlibs (S5, E5)

Chandlove – Chandler + love (S6, E24)

ministainer – minister + entertainer (S7, E20)

Blursula – blur + Ursula (S8, E7)

noodle – new + poodle (S9, E6)

fricken – fried + chicken (S9, E6)

manny – man + nanny (S9, E6)

<u>From "The Simpsons", the television series:</u>

sacrilicious - sacrilegious + delicious ("Forbidden Donought" episode)

Krudler - Krusty + Middler (name of racehorse – "Krusty Special" episode)

frogurt – frozen + yogurt

crisortunity – crisis + opportunity (episode about Marge's fear of flying)

avoision – avoid + evasion (episode where Krusty goes bankrupt)

blubber-in-law – blubber + brother-in-law (episode where Homer borrows money from Marge's sisters)

Homega Man – Homer + Omega Man (Halloween special episode "The Omega Man")

Fart – fly + Bart (Halloween special episode on "The Fly")

From "Black Books", the television series:

Colbumbo – Columbo + bum (S1, E4)

Armapocalypse – Armageddon + apocalypse (S1, E5)

Frantastic – Fran + fantastic (S1, E5)

From "Will and Grace", the television series:

Genesissy – Genesis + sissy (episode shown 14 June 2002 UK)

buttrobics – butt + aerobics (episode shown 14 June 2002 UK)

yesteryou – yesterday + you (episode shown 14 June 2002 UK)

yesterme – yesterday + me (episode shown 14 June 2002 UK)

From "Buffy The Vampire Slayer", the television series:

Scan-a-matique – Scan + cv + automatic (Series 1 Episode 8)

manimal – man + animal (S3 E4)

co-corefic – co-co + terrific (S3 E6)

icecapades – ice + escapades (S3 E12)

Buffinator – Buffy + terminator (S4 E2)

cranapple – cranberry + apple (S4 E3)

poltergasm – poltergeist + orgasm (S4 E18)

SunnyCal – Sunnydale + California (S4 E1)

mythtaken – myth + mistaken (S4 E12)

Dracubabes – Dracula + babes (S5 E1)

minionators – minions + terminators (S5 E2)

Drudzilla – Drusilla + Godzilla (S4 E14)

Mominator – Mom + terminator (S6 E6)

minitor – minister + doctor (S6 E15)

From "Angel", the television series:

poltergeistlicious - poltergeist + delicious (Series 1 Episode 5)

painbow – pain + rainbow (S1 E6)

iceolation – ice + isolation (S1 E13)

duodley – duo + medley (S2 E3)

Cherific – Cher + terrific (S2, E6)

Darsilla – Darla + Drusilla (S2, E11)

Manpire – man + vampire (S3, E6)

visionity – vision + virginity (S3, E15)

Others:

Hobohemia – hobo + bohemia (From the song "That's Why the Lady is a Tramp")

spooktacles – spook + spectacles (From the 1980s children's programme "Rainbow")

Dogtanion - dog + Dartanion (From the 1980s children's programme "Dogtanion and the Three Muskerhounds")

Muskerhounds - Musketeers + hounds (From the 1980s children's programme "Dogtanion and the Three Muskerhounds")

Rockumentary – rock + documentary (From the film "This Is Spinal Tap", 1984)

Mach – Mozart + Bach (From the film "This Is Spinal Tap", 1984)

Beelzebubbles – Beelzebub + bubbles (From the first series of "Blackadder", 1986)

Bladder – Black + Adder (From the third series of "Blackadder", 1992)

grandcicle – grandchild + icicle (From the film "Picture Perfect", 1997)

sinnuendo – sin + innuendo (From the film "LA Confidential" 1997)

homocide – homosexual + homicide (From the film "LA Confidential" 1997)

shagadelic – shag + psychedelic (From the film "Austin Powers, International Man of Mystery", 1997)

sinergy – sin + energy (From "The Curse of Monkey Island" (1997 computer game))

eraticator – eradicator + rat (From the film "Disturbing Behaviour", 1998)

zipple – zip + nipple (From the film "Austin Powers 2" 1999)

Bradistan – Bradford + Pakistan (From the film "East is East", 1999)

(Waltzing) *Maturtle* - (Waltzing) *Matilda + turtle* (From children's program "Hilltop Hospital" 8/11/99)

Splatoon – splat + platoon (From "SMTV Live", late 1990's / 2000's TV series)

fanomenal –fan + phenomenal (From a weekly letters section on "Top of The Pops Plus", 2000's/ TV series)

déjà voodoo – déjà vu + voodoo (From the film "Scream 3", 2000)

Amazombies – Amazon + zombies (From the film "Scream 3", 2000)

Kattitude – (Kittikat)cat + attitude (From a 2001 "Kittikat" advert)

Lanswering machine – Lance + answering machine (From a "Neighbours" television episode screened 3 April 2001 in the UK)

chork – chicken + pork (From the television series "Malcolm in the Middle" shown 18 May 2001 UK)

pectacular – pecs + spectacular (From the television series "Clueless", shown in UK on 2 June 2001)

unidentifairways – unidentified + airways (From the television series "People Like Us" on 23 June 2001)

anonimair – anonimous + air (From the television series "People Like Us" on 23 June 2001)

graffi-tea – graffiti + tea (From the television programme "Z For Fake", 1 July 2001)

tankini – tank (top) + *bikini* (From a quiz on the television programme "This Morning", 13 July 2001)

Rambotham – Rambo + Botham (From the television programme "Ian Botham: 100 Per Cent Beefy", 19 August 2001)

propaniacs – propane + maniacs (From the television series "King of the Hill", 29 August 2001)

grillstravaganza – grill + extravaganza (From the television series "King of the Hill", 29 August 2001)

Paulditz – Paul + Colditz (From the television series "Never Mind The Buzzcocks", 22 October 2001)

Sumoteer – sumo + musketeer (From the children's programme "Super Duper Sumos", 16 November 2001)

Scumbelina – scum + thumbelina (From the show "The League of Gentleman Live in Drury Lane", winter 2001)

Monstropolis – monster + Metropolis (From the film "Monsters Inc", 2002)

sexile – sex + exile (From the television series "Dawson's Creek", series 5 episode 1)

Brollywood – brolly + Hollywood (From "Channel 5 Lunchtime News", 25/02/2002)

fartridge – fart + partridge (From the television series "Shooting Stars", 25/02/02)

aquamazing – aqua + amazing (From the television advertisement for "The Blue Planet Aquarium", March 2002)

Coscars – Coronation Street + Oscars (From the television programme "This Morning", 25/03/02)

Corrieoke – Coronation Street + karaoke (From the television programme "This Morning", 25/03/02)

crappuccino – crap + cappuccino (From the television series "Scrubs", 18/04/02)

mouseketeers – mouse + musketeers (From the television series "Scrubs", 02/05/02)

metro – modern + retro (From the "Nissan Micra" advertisement, 2003)

simpology – simple + technology (From the "Nissan Micra" advertisement, 2003)

spafe – spontaneous + safe (From the "Nissan Micra" advertisement, 2003)

Unscripted Spoken

<u>Television:</u>

Franchesta – Franchesca + chest (Channel 5's voice over man's regular name for a character in the soap opera "Sunset Beach", 1998)

Ottercelli - otter + Botticelli (From the television programme "Trisha", 13/8/99)

fattitude - fat + attitude (From the television programme "Trisha", 30/9/99)

prawnography - prawn + pornography (From the television programme "TFI Friday", 21/01/00)

<u>Radio:</u>

shight – shiny + bright (Terry Wogan's suggestion for the next "Do you speak Micra" advert, 5/9/03)

<u>Film:</u>

abusement (park) – abuse + amusement (park) (From "The Story" DVD commentry for 1996 film "Se7en")

<u>Life:</u>[8]

flunch - flock + bunch (Mal Danks, on Sheep-banana)

Old-boy-racer - old-boy + boy-racer (Mal Danks, on her husband's driving)

impropaganda – improper + propaganda (Mal Danks)

Grannexe - Gran + annexe (David McKnight, on Granny flats)

cowmouflage - cow + camouflage (Marisol Collins, on a cow behind a bush)

scrumfy – scruffy + comfy (Rishma Vidyasagar on a style of clothing)

laardvark – lard + aardvark (Nikki Rayner on a fat aardvark)

---

[8] I have only included blends which seemed natural and that I have heard in the course of normal conversation. I have not included the many hundreds of blends made up by myself, my friends and my family whilst discussing this thesis!

Appendix 2

Types and tokens for affix / clip borderline forms

A2.1:   A list of *burger* types and corresponding token numbers from the Independent newspaper corpus

A2.2:   A list of *cyber* types and corresponding token numbers from the Independent newspaper corpus

A2.3:   A list of *dino* types and corresponding token numbers from the Independent newspaper corpus

A2.1:

burger types and their corresponding token numbers (excluding *Hamburger* regarded as the original form)

Listed below are the words in the corpus featuring *burger*. The number next to each word indicates the number of times that form appears in the corpus (number of tokens).

There are 157 forms which, after spelling, plural and case variants have been taken into account, gives 116 types.

There are 3757 tokens altogether.

3181 of these tokens are of the free-standing *burger* variants ([*Bb*]*urger*[['].*s*]).

The other 576 tokens are of *burger* being used in combination.

Therefore, in 84.67% of the tokens *burger* is freestanding.

Free Standing forms:

Burger 1193
Burgers 71
Burger's 22
burger 1040
burgers 854
burger's 1

Combined forms:

Jumbo-Burger 1
MacBurger 1
McBurger 1
McSnotBurger 1
MosBurger 2
VegeBurger 1
bowling-to-Burger 1
drinks-to-Burger 1
GibblyBurgers 1
Linda-Burgers 1
MosBurger's 1
Bardburger 1

Beefburger 5
Bischofsburger 1
CJD-burger 1
Cheeseburger 12
Excaliburger 1
Fanie-burger 1
Fatburger 1
Freudburger 1
Jungleburger 1
McHealthburger 1
Monaburger 1
Mouseburger 1
Munchyburger 2
Newmanburger 1
Shamburger 1
Starburger 1
Vegeburger 4
Yumburger 1
anti-beefburger 1
arseburger 1
bacon-bits-burger 1
bacon-cheeseburger 1
baconburger 1
beanburger 5

beefburger 72
casino-to-burger 1
cheefeburger 1
cheeseburger 83
chilliburger 1
diet-drink-and-burger 1
dogburger 1
double-burger 1
fatburger 2
filmburger 1
fishburger 1
foodburger 1
fruitburger 1
gamburger 1
greasy-burger 1
humburger 1
ice-cream-and-burger 1
jumbo-burger 3
megaburger 1
non-burger 1
ostrich-burger 1
post-burger 1
pruneburger 2
rat-burger 1

schoolburger 1
sushi-burger 1
vegeburger 4
veggie-burger 1
veggieburger 4
veggyburger 1
BSE-burgers 1
Bambiburgers 1
Beefburgers 8
Boggerburgers 1
Byngburgers 1
Cheeseburgers 1
Cornburgers 1
Duisburgers 2
Excaliburgers 1
Fergieburgers 1
Fishburgers 1
Griefburgers 2
Sausageburgers 1
Jumbo-burgers 1
Manburgers 1
Pineappleburgers 1
Presleyburgers 1
Pressburgers 1
Prizeburgers 1
Rooburgers 1
Schillaci-burgers 1
Supermanburgers 1
Turkeyburgers 3
Vegeburgers 2
Waistburgers 1
Wendyburgers 2
Wimpy-burgers 1
Wimpyburgers 1
Wordsworthburgers 1
and-burgers 1
bacon-burgers 1
beanburgers 3
beef-burgers 4
beefburgers 115
bison-burgers 1
bisonburgers 1
brontoburgers 1
char-burgers 1
cheese-burgers 1
cheeseburgers 78
chickenburgers 5
crocburgers 1
curryburgers 2
deathburgers 2

dogburgers 4
eggburgers 1
elkburgers 2
filmburgers 1
fish-burgers 1
gooseburgers 2
greaseburgers 1
harmburgers 1
horseburgers 1
ice-creams-to-burgers 1
jumbo-burgers 1
lamburgers 2
lentil-burgers 1
lentilburgers 1
loveburgers 1
manburgers 1
mega-burgers 1
monsterburgers 1
mung-burgers 1
nutburgers 2
ostrichburgers 3
proto-burgers 1
quokkaburgers 1
ratburgers 1
rooburgers 1
rubbishburgers 1
snoutburgers 1
soya-burgers 1
sproutburgers 1
sushi-burgers 1
to-burgers 1
turkeyburgers 2
twinburgers 1
vege-burgers 3
vegeburgers 7
veggie-burgers 2
veggieburgers 3
veniburgers 2
vicunaburgers 1
vodka-to-burgers 1
voleburgers 1
whammyburgers 1

Cyber types and their corresponding token numbers (excluding *Cybernetics* regarded as the original form)

Listed below are the words in the corpus featuring *cyber*. The number next to each word indicates the number of times that form appears in the corpus (number of tokens).

There are 736 forms which, after spelling, plural and case variants have been taken into account, gives 634 types.

There are 2506 tokens altogether.

380 of these tokens are of the free-standing *cyber* variants ([Cc]*yber* and *Cyber's.*)

The other 2126 tokens are of *cyber* being used in combination.

Therefore, in 15.16% of the tokens *cyber* is freestanding.

Free Standing forms:

Cyber 121
Cyber's 4
cyber 255

Combined forms:

Cyber-Anything 1
Cyber-Finn 1
Cyber-Investing 2
Cyber-League 1
Cyber-Liberties 1
Cyber-Preacher 1
Cyber-Rights 1
Cyber-Samaritans 1
Cyber-Sitar 1
Cyber-Spanglish 1
Cyber-Tit 1
Cyber-Valentine 1
Cyber-boogie 1
Cyber-cafes 2
Cyber-clan 1
Cyber-communication 1
Cyber-cops 1
Cyber-exams 1

Cyber-fantasy 1
Cyber-generation 1
Cyber-pervs 1
Cyber-pets 2
Cyber-psychic 1
Cyber-punk 1
Cyber-punk's 1
Cyber-rivalry 1
Cyber-snob 1
Cyber-snoops 1
Cyber-success 1
Cyber-video 1
Cyber-wank 1
CyberAnalysis 1
CyberAngels 11
CyberArt 4
CyberCafe 4
CyberCash 9
CyberCash's 1
CyberCoin 6
CyberCricket 1
CyberDog 2
CyberEdge 1
CyberFreeway 1
CyberMaster 1
CyberNOT 6
CyberNanny 1
CyberNet 1

CyberOctave 1
CyberPEP 1
CyberPatrol 10
CyberQueer 1
CyberRacism 1
CyberSeat 3
CyberShooters 2
CyberSitter 1
CyberSkills 4
CyberSpanglish 2
CyberStudio 1
CyberTarot 1
CyberTax 1
CyberTheatre 1
CyberTour 3
CyberTranscriber 1
CyberTrust 1
CyberWorks 5
Cyberangels 1
Cyberbabe 1
Cyberbaby 1
Cyberbar 3
Cyberbum 1
Cyberbusting 1
Cybercable 1
Cybercafe 5
Cybercafes 3
Cybercar 2

Cybercard 3
Cybercard's 1
Cybercash 1
Cybercents 1
Cyberchondria 1
Cyberchurch 1
Cybercity 1
Cyberclub 2
Cybercoin 1
Cybercon 1
Cybercops 1
Cybercrats 1 .
Cybercrooks 1
Cyberdance 3
Cyberdog 22
Cyberdog's 2
Cyberdreck 1
Cyberdrome 1
Cyberdrome's 1
Cyberdyke 1
Cyberessays 1
Cyberfanatics 1
Cyberfans 1
Cyberfeminists 1
Cyberfest 3
Cyberflex 1
Cyberfreaks 1
Cybergear's 1
Cybergrace 1
Cybergypsies 6
Cyberhippies 1
Cyberhome 3
Cyberhosts 1
Cyberhunt 1
Cybericonic 4
Cyberists 1
Cyberjaya 1
Cyberkids 2
Cyberkisses 3
Cyberland 1
Cyberlaundering 1
Cyberliability 1
Cyberlife 4
Cyberlife's 3
Cyberlion 1
Cyberlords 1
Cybermama 1
Cyberman 12
Cybermates 1
Cybermedia's 1

Cybermedicine 1
Cybermedics 1
Cybermen's 2
Cybermodels 1
Cybermonks 1
Cybernation 2
Cybernaught 2
Cybernaut 2
Cybernauts 1
Cyberpets 2
Cyberpetting 1
Cyberplonk 1
Cyberpoetry 1
Cyberpolice 1
Cyberpope 1
Cyberport 1
Cyberprofits 1
Cyberpromo 7
Cyberpromotions 1
Cyberpub 10
Cyberpub's 2
Cyberpunk 17
Cyberpunks 12
Cyberrape 1
Cyberschwartze 2
Cyberscience 2
Cybersculpture 1
Cyberseat 1
Cybersecrecy 1
Cyberseed 4
Cyberseeds 1
Cybersell 1
Cybersex 6
Cybershopping 1
Cybershrinks 1
Cybersite 1
Cybersitter 16
Cybersitter's 3
Cyberskin 1
Cyberskiving 2
Cybersleigh 1
Cybersmith 5
Cybersmith's 1
Cybersnobs 1
Cybersouls 4
Cybersp 1
Cyberspace 101
Cyberspace's 1
Cybersphere 2
Cyberstation 1

Cyberstore 1
Cyberstudents 2
Cybersurfers 1
Cyberswine's 1
Cybertalk 3
Cybertax 1
Cybertec 2
Cybertechnology 3
Cybertecture 1
Cyberterror 1
Cybertimes 1
Cybertonic 1
Cybertrader 2
Cybertrader's 1
Cybertronics 5
Cyberwar 4
Cyberwave 1
Cyberwire 3
Cyberworld 1
Cyberzone 18
Cyberzone's 1
cyber-Carnegie 1
cyber-Chancellor 1
cyber-Hepburn 1
cyber-Luddites 1
cyber-Ludwig 1
cyber-Members 1
cyber-Nazis 1
cyber-Samaritan 1
cyber-Saviour 1
cyber-accessories 1
cyber-active 1
cyber-affair 1
cyber-antics 1
cyber-assault 1
cyber-attack 2
cyber-babble 3
cyber-babe 2
cyber-babes 1
cyber-babies 1
cyber-bank 1
cyber-banking 1
cyber-banks 1
cyber-battle 2
cyber-bazaar 2
cyber-betting 1
cyber-bishop 1
cyber-boffins 1
cyber-boogie 1
cyber-bore 1

cyber-broker 1
cyber-brokers 1
cyber-bumpkins 1
cyber-burglar 1
cyber-buying 2
cyber-cafe 19
cyber-cafes 3
cyber-caff 1
cyber-cash 1
cyber-casino 1
cyber-catwalk 1
cyber-cave 1
cyber-censorship 1
cyber-cheating 1
cyber-cheats 2
cyber-children 1
cyber-citizens 1
cyber-climber 1
cyber-comedy 1
cyber-commerce 1
cyber-communities 1
cyber-community 1
cyber-community's 1
cyber-conference 1
cyber-connected 1
cyber-convention 1
cyber-cops 2
cyber-correspondents 1
cyber-courier 1
cyber-crime 6
cyber-croupier 1
cyber-cruisers 1
cyber-culture 1
cyber-cultures 1
cyber-cyclists 1
cyber-dance 1
cyber-delinquent 1
cyber-dissidents 1
cyber-doctor 1
cyber-dog 1
cyber-dollars 1
cyber-dragnet 1
cyber-drivel 1
cyber-drugs 1
cyber-energies 1
cyber-entertainment 1
cyber-evangelism 1
cyber-event 1
cyber-fashion 1
cyber-festival 1

cyber-fiction 1
cyber-film 1
cyber-flicks 1
cyber-flirtation 1
cyber-flirting 1
cyber-footwear 1
cyber-forest 1
cyber-fortunes 1
cyber-friendly 1
cyber-frogs 1
cyber-future 1
cyber-gadgetry 1
cyber-gangsters 1
cyber-geek 1
cyber-geeks 1
cyber-giant 1
cyber-glow 1
cyber-graffiti 1
cyber-guardians 2
cyber-guru 1
cyber-hacking 1
cyber-hacks 1
cyber-haves 1
cyber-heaven 1
cyber-hermit 1
cyber-hero 1
cyber-heroes 1
cyber-heroine 1
cyber-highways 1
cyber-hippy 1
cyber-history 1
cyber-idolatry 1
cyber-industry 3
cyber-invasion 1
cyber-investment 2
cyber-jammers 2
cyber-journalist 1
cyber-juggernaut 1
cyber-king 1
cyber-library 1
cyber-links 1
cyber-literate 2
cyber-literature 1
cyber-looking 1
cyber-lots 1
cyber-lover 1
cyber-mailing 1
cyber-male 1
cyber-marketing 1
cyber-material 1

cyber-means 1
cyber-media 1
cyber-metaphors 1
cyber-minutes 1
cyber-money 1
cyber-monster 1
cyber-murder 1
cyber-murders 1
cyber-nanny 1
cyber-nerds 1
cyber-nightsticks 1
cyber-nonsense 1
cyber-novelist 1
cyber-ontology 1
cyber-optics 1
cyber-palace 1
cyber-pals 1
cyber-pest 1
cyber-pets 1
cyber-pirates 1
cyber-pixie 1
cyber-playground 1
cyber-poets 1
cyber-police 2
cyber-police's 1
cyber-pond 1
cyber-porn 1
cyber-proficient 1
cyber-prophecy 1
cyber-prophet 1
cyber-punk 3
cyber-punks 1
cyber-punting 1
cyber-race 1
cyber-radio 2
cyber-realist 1
cyber-reality 1
cyber-rejection 1
cyber-relationship 2
cyber-revolution 1
cyber-rockabilly 1
cyber-sales 1
cyber-salesmen 1
cyber-sane 1
cyber-saviour 1
cyber-savvy 1
cyber-scene 1
cyber-scriptoria 1
cyber-secretary 2
cyber-seer 1

cyber-selling 1
cyber-sessions 1
cyber-sex 6
cyber-shame 1
cyber-shopping 3
cyber-shudder 1
cyber-sitter 1
cyber-skiving 1
cyber-slanging 1
cyber-sleuth 1
cyber-smut 1
cyber-society 1
cyber-solicitation 1
cyber-soul 1
cyber-space 5
cyber-spacious 1
cyber-spatial 1
cyber-speak 2
cyber-stalker 1
cyber-stalking 8
cyber-stand 1
cyber-stores 1
cyber-strategist 1
cyber-subculture 1
cyber-summit 1
cyber-sunset 1
cyber-surfers 1
cyber-surfing 2
cyber-surgeon 1
cyber-system 1
cyber-tabloids 1
cyber-tech 1
cyber-techies 1
cyber-terrorism 5
cyber-terrorist's 1
cyber-terrorists 1
cyber-thriller 1
cyber-transactions 2
cyber-travel 2
cyber-travels 1
cyber-turnstiles 1
cyber-versions 1
cyber-vigilantes 1
cyber-village 2
cyber-virgins 1
cyber-visionary 1
cyber-war 1
cyber-warren 1
cyber-warrior 1
cyber-warriors 1

cyber-washrooms 1
cyber-wealth 1
cyber-widget 1
cyber-wizzard's 1
cyber-woman 1
cyber-world 1
cyber-worship 1
cyber-zillions 1
cyber24 1
cyberTaoism 1
cyberabads 1
cyberactivist 1
cyberage 2
cyberangels 1
cyberbabble 1
cyberbabe 5
cyberbabes 1
cyberband 2
cyberbands 1
cyberbar 2
cyberbars 1
cyberberds 1
cyberblowjob 1
cyberbook 1
cyberbooks 1
cyberbooze 3
cyberborg 1
cyberboxingzone 1
cyberbrain 1
cyberbrothel 1
cyberbucks 1
cyberbuff 1
cyberbuffs 1
cyberbum 5
cyberbums 3
cyberbust 1
cybercable 1
cybercadet 3
cybercadets 1
cybercafe 44
cybercafes 28
cybercard 1
cybercash 5
cybercasinos 1
cybercast 3
cybercasting 1
cybercatwalk 1
cybercents 1
cybercharacters 1
cyberchase 1

cyberchat 1
cyberchick 1
cyberchondriac 1
cybercity 3
cyberclub 1
cybercolumnist 1
cybercomm 1
cybercommunity 2
cybercops 3
cybercrats 1
cybercredit 1
cybercreeps 1
cybercricket 2
cybercrime 6
cybercriminal 1
cybercriminals 1
cybercrooks 1
cybercrusties 1
cyberculture 2
cybercustomer 2
cyberdance 2
cyberdata 1
cyberdeck 1
cyberdefenders 1
cyberdeity 1
cyberdelic 4
cyberdemocracy 1
cyberdialogue 1
cyberdoc 1
cyberdoctor 1
cyberdog 4
cyberdoom 5
cyberdrawer 1
cyberdump 1
cybereditions 2
cyberescapism 1
cyberesidency 1
cyberfans 2
cyberfem 1
cyberfeminism 1
cyberfeminist 6
cyberfeminists 2
cyberfestival 2
cyberfiction 3
cyberflesh 1
cyberfolk 1
cyberforums 1
cyberfreak 6
cyberfreak's 1
cyberfreaks 8

cyberfriend 1
cyberfrontier 1
cybergame 1
cybergangs 1
cybergangsters 1
cybergasm 1
cybergear 1
cybergeek 1
cybergeography 2
cyberglitches 1
cybergraphics 1
cyberguide 1
cyberguru 1
cybergypsies 2
cyberhackers 1
cyberheads 2
cyberheaven 1
cyberhit 1
cyberhoax 1
cyberhome 1
cyberhooligan 1
cyberhorrors 1
cyberhost 1
cyberhouse 1
cyberhunks 1
cyberiacafe 3
cyberian 1
cyberkid 1
cyberkids 1
cyberkisses 1
cyberknife 1
cyberknights 1
cyberlabel 2
cyberland 2
cyberlaws 1
cyberlevity 1
cyberliability 2
cyberlibertarian 1
cyberlibrarians 1
cyberlife 2
cyberliterate 1
cyberlives 1
cyberloot 1
cyberlord 1
cyberlords 2
cyberlove 1
cybermama 1
cyberman 5
cybermania 1
cybermanure 1

cybermaps 1
cybermates 1
cybermedicine 1
cybermemoir 2
cybermemoirists 1
cybermen 4
cybermessages 1
cybermod 1
cybermodel 1
cybermodels 2
cybermoney 1
cybermonks 2
cybermusic 1
cybernanny 1
cybernated 1
cybernaut 12
cybernautical 1
cybernauts 11
cybernerd 2
cybernerds 5
cyberniks 1
cybernun 1
cybernut 1
cybernuts 1
cyberocean 1
cyberparties 1
cyberpartner 1
cyberpatients 1
cyberpatrol 1
cyberpeople 2
cyberperverts 1
cyberpet 15
cyberpet's 1
cyberpets 9
cyberphiles 1
cyberphobia 1
cyberphobics 1
cyberpoets 1
cyberpolitics 1
cyberpooch 1
cyberporn 12
cyberpornography 1
cyberport 4
cyberpranks 1
cyberpromo 1
cyberpsychologist 1
cyberpub 2
cyberpunk 80
cyberpunkish 3
cyberpunks 15

cyberpyramids 1
cyberqueer 1
cyberrape 2
cybersales 2
cybersalesman 1
cybersalon 1
cyberschools 1
cyberscience 1
cyberscurf 1
cybersea 1
cybersex 27
cybershop 1
cybershoppers 1
cybershopping 1
cybershops 4
cybershow 1
cybershows 3
cybersised 1
cybersitter 3
cybersleigh 1
cyberslurry 1
cyberslut 2
cybersmut 2
cybersociety 1
cybersociology 1
cybersong 1
cybersonic 1
cybersouls 1
cyberspace 923
cyberspace's 3
cyberspace-style 1
cyberspaces 4
cyberspacey 1
cyberspacial 1
cyberspatial 5
cyberspatially 1
cyberspeak 1
cyberspeed 1
cyberspider 1
cyberspiders 4
cybersquat 1
cybersquatters 1
cybersquatting 2
cyberstalker 1
cyberstalking 1
cyberstations 1
cybersteam 1
cyberstocracy 1
cyberstores 2
cyberstreet 4

cybersuburb 1
cybersuit 7
cybersurfer 2
cybersurfers 7
cybersurfing 2
cybertarianism 1
cybertax 2
cybertaxation 1
cybertechnology 2
cyberterror 1
cyberterrorism 2
cyberterrorist 1
cyberterrorists 2
cybersquatters 1
cybersquatting 2
cyberstalker 1
cyberstalking 1
cyberstations 1
cybersteam 1
cyberstocracy 1
cyberstores 2
cyberstreet 4
cybersuburb 1
cybersuit 7
cybersurfer 2
cybersurfers 7
cybersurfing 2
cybertarianism 1
cybertax 2
cybertaxation 1
cybertechnology 2
cyberterror 1
cyberterrorism 2
cyberterrorist 1
cyberterrorists 2
cybertherapy 2
cyberthriller 2
cybertour 1
cybertourists 2
cybertransmission 1
cybertransmitter 1
cybertribe 1
cybertrip 2
cybertrolley 1
cybertronics 1
cyberus 2
cybervandalism 1
cyberversion 1
cyberwar 8
cyberwarfare 2

cyberwarrior 2
cyberwave 1
cyberwaves 2
cyberwhizzes 1
cyberwidow 1
cyberwidows 1
cyberwomen 1
cyberworld's 1
cyberworld-online 1
cyberzine 2
cyberzines 2
cyberzombies 1

A2.3:

Dino types and corresponding token numbers
(excluding *Dinosaur* regarded as the original form)

Listed below are the words in the corpus featuring *dino*. The number next to each word indicates the number of times that form appears in the corpus (number of tokens).

There are 55 forms which, after spelling, plural and case variants have been taken into account, gives 46 types.

There are 926 tokens altogether. However (as discussed in section 2.1.4.1), only 98 of these are referring to *dinosaurs* so only 98 are relevant to this study.

21 of these tokens are of the free-standing *dino* variants ([*Dd*]*ino*[*s*] and *Dino's*).

The other 77 tokens are of *dino* being used in combination.

Therefore, in 27.27% of the tokens *dino* is freestanding.

Free Standing forms:

Dino 673
Dino's 29
Dinos 126
dino 18
dinos 3

Combined forms:
Dino-Roars 1
Dino-crates 1
Dino-fever 1
Dino-mania 2
Dino2000 3
Dino2000's 1
DinoLand 1
DinoMites 1
Dinocampus 1
Dinofest 2
Dinohattan 1
Dinomania 8
Dinoroarrrs 1
Dinoseum 1
Dinotopia 3
Dinovision 1
Dinowars 1

Dinoworld 1
dino-FX 1
dino-bird 1
dino-bleary 1
dino-book 1
dino-books 1
dino-comic 1
dino-crazy 1
dino-dollars 1
dino-drama 1
dino-exhibits 1
dino-fans 1
dino-fever 1
dino-fodder 1
dino-freak 1
dino-lovers 1
dino-memorabilia 1
dino-movies 1
dino-obsessive 1
dino-pic 1
dino-poop 1
dino-rhymes 1
dino-sauric 1
dino-sized 2
dino-store 1
dino-swot 1

dino-thugs 1
dinobilia 1
dinobores 1
dinocentric 1
dinomane 1
dinomania 11
dinomentary 1
dinorabilia 1
dinosploitation 1
dinoturbation 1

Appendix 3 [1]

Analyses of seven borderline splinter/ affixstrings with reference to the five criteria established in Chapter 8:

A3.1: Analysis of *compu-* (from *computer*)

A3.2: Analysis of *robo-* (from *robot*)

A3.3: Analysis of *-ercise* (from *exercise*)

A3.4: Analysis of *-mentary* (from *documentary*)

A3.5: Analysis of *-tainment* (from *entertainment*)

A3.6: Analysis of *-tastic* (from *fantastic*)

A3.7: Analysis of *-topia* (from *Utopia*)

---

[1] Appendix 3 is presented in landscape format in order to fit all of the included tables comfortably on the page.

A3.1

Analysis of the borderline splinter / prefix *compu-* (from *computer*)

Criterion 1:

Compu- does not appear in any dictionary. It comes from the word *computer* and is used to represent this word or any of its derivations (e.g. *computerised*).

Criterion 2:

It is not really possible to describe the meaning of the string *compu-* without reference to, or at least a description of, the source word *computer*.

Criterion 3:

There are 49 instances in the corpus, which sort into 32 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 16: Words in the corpus that begin with *compu-* (excluding *computer*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal Relationships
CompuAdd 4				*compu* + capitalised word	
CompuBox 2				*compu* + capitalised word	
Compucard 1				*compu* + word	
CompuCentre 1				*compu* + capitalised word	Syntactic
CompuChem 2				*compu* + capitalised clip	
Compucorp 1				*compu* + clip	Syntactic?[1]
Compudata 1				*compu* + word	Syntactic
Compudose 1				*compu* + word	
Compuforms 7				*compu* + word	
CompuForms 1				*compu* + capitalised word	
Compugraphic 1	*Compugraphics* 2			*compu* + word	Syntactic
Compulink 23		*compulink* 21		*compu* + word	Syntactic?
Compulink's 1				*compu* + word	Syntactic?
CompuMed 2				*compu* + capitalised clip	
CompuMed's 1				*compu* + capitalised clip	
CompuNet 2				*compu* + capitalised clip	Syntactic
Compunet 15				*compu* + clip	Syntactic

---

[1] Some cases have more obvious internal syntactic relationships than others. For instance, the source words *computer centre*, from *compucentre*, are a more obvious example of a syntactic string than *computer corpus/corpora*, from *Compucorp*. Thus, I am not happy about classifying both forms as having the same internal relationship. However, nor am I satisfied with the alternative claim that there is no syntactic relationship between the elements in *Compucorp*. Consequently, I have marked my uncertainty with a question mark. For the sake of the below statistics, cases such as these will be allocated half as much weighting as the clear cut cases (i.e. while *compucentre* is analysed as 1 type with an internal relationship, *compucorp* will be analysed as 0.5 of a type)

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal Relationships
CompuPhone 1				*compu* + capitalised clip	Semantic[2]?
Compupoem 1				*compu* + word	
Compupro 1				*compu* + clip	
Compuserve 241	*Compuserves* 1	*compuserve* 130		*compu* + word	
CompuServe 527		*compuServe* 2		*compu* + capitalised word	
		compu-serve 1		*compu* + hyphen + word	
Compu-Serve 1				*compu* + hyphen + capitalised word	
Compu-Serve's 1				*compu* + hyphen + capitalised word	
CompuServe's 45				*compu* + capitalised word	
Compuserve's 25				*compu* + word	
CompuServers 1				*compu* + capitalised word	
		compusion 1		*compu* + splinter (of *confusion*)	OL[3] (*u*)
	Compusonics 1			*compu* + word	
Compustat 5				*compu* + clip	
		computent 1		*compu* + splinter (of *competent*)	OL (*te*)
		computhriller 1	*computhrillers* 2	*compu* + word	(G)OL (*t*)

---

[2] There is a loose semantic relationship between the source elements *computer* and *phone*, in that they are both kinds of information technology. This relationship is not as clear cut as in, for instance, *labradoodle*, but is on a par with *dunnel* which was also analysed as having a loose semantic relationship. Again, I have marked my uncertainty with a question mark and such loose relationships will be allocated half as much weighting as firm relationships.

[3] OL is used to indicate an overlap that is both graphic and phonic. If the overlap is only graphic, (G)OL is used. If the overlap is only phonic, (P)OL is used.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal Relationships
Computicket 2				*compu* + word	OL (*t*)
		compu-till 1		*compu* + hyphen + word	OL (*t*)
Computique 2				*compu* + splinter (of *boutique*)	OL (*t*)
		computition 1		*compu* + splinter (of *competition*)	OL (*t*)
Computopia 4				*compu* + borderline string[4]	OL (*t*)
Computrace 1				*compu* + word	OL (*t*)
Computype 1				*compu* + word	OL (*t*)
Compuware 5				*compu* + clip	Syntactic
CompuWorld 1				*compu* + capitalised word	Syntactic?
CompuWorld's 1				*compu* + capitalised word	Syntactic?

Criterion 4:

The table below shows the different elements to which *compu-* attaches in the corpus and notes the number of types and the overall percentage attachment for each different element.

---

[4] *-topia* is one of the borderline strings being analysed in this study and, thus, no decision can be made here as to whether it is functioning as a splinter or a prefix. If it is a splinter, then *computopia* is a blend, whereas if it is a suffix, *computopia* would be seen as contravening normal derivation rules if *compu-* is to be analysed as a prefix. Consequently, *computopia* adds no weight to a classification of *compu-* as a prefix and, perhaps, adds some weight to the argument that it is still a splinter.

Table 17: The orthographic analysis of the 32 *compu-* types:

Attached element	Number of types	Percentage
Compu- + Word	19	59.4
Compu- + Clip	8	25
Compu- + Splinter	4	12.5
Compu- + Borderline string	1	3.1

The above table indicates that *compu-* is functioning as a prefix in 27 (84.4%) cases. However, of these 27, 5 (15.6%) display a graphic overlap between the attached free-standing lexeme and the source word *computer*. Consequently, the best analysis of these types is as a blend. This means that *compu-* is, in fact, only functioning in a manner typical of a prefix in 22 (68.8%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of *compu-*, types in which there is either an overlap between the string and the attached element or in which the attached element is a splinter (regardless of overlap) are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 9 (28.1%) of the cases.

One further aspect worth noting is that in 10 of the types the attached element begins with a capital letter, in spite of the fact that the capital falls within the middle of the form. In all these instances, the type denotes a proper noun (usually a company name) which may explain the stylistic choice. However, the capital letter in the middle of the form does have the affect of halting the flow of the word – something that is neither typical of blends or derivations, but would be particularly damaging to a seamless fusion in a blend. These capital letters, then, perhaps indicate that the types containing them would be best not viewed as blends.

Criterion 4b:

compu- is an initial string so this criterion is not applicable.

Criterion 5:

Table 18: The internal relationships of the 32 *compu-* types[5]:

Internal relationships	Out of 32	% of 32
Total amount displaying internal relationships	17	53.1
Graphic and phonic overlap	9	28.1
Graphic overlap only	1	3.1
Semantic relationship	0.5	1.6
Syntactic relationship	6.5	20.3
Have no internal relationship	13	40.6

---

[5]The statistics in the table for total amount with internal relationships and total amount without internal relationships will not add up to 32, as four different types have been allocated a 0.5 weighting for syntactic / semantic relationships with regard to displaying relationships, but cannot be seen as not having any internal relationship.

A3.2

Analysis of the borderline splinter / prefix *robo-* (from *robot*)

Criterion 1:

Robo- does not appear in any dictionary. It comes from the word *Robot* and is used to represent this word or any of its derivations (eg. *Robotic*). It is generally used to mean "a programmed machine designed to emulate as specified" but can occasionally mean "as specified for a robot" (as in *robocup* and *robodiet*).

Criterion 2:

Robo- can be described without referral to *robot* but it does retain a close association with its source word (for instance, a robot could be described as "a programmed machine designed to emulate"). However, because *robot* also carries "mechanical humanoid" connotations which are not necessarily present in the *robo-* forms, the meaning cannot be said to be the same. Thus, *robo-* can be regarded as autonomously describable.

Criterion 3:

There are 95 instances in the corpus, which sort into 77 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 19: Words in the corpus that begin with *robo-* (excluding *robot*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal Relationships
	Robo-babes 1			*Robo* + hyphen + word	
Robobank 1				*Robo* + word	
Robobar 2				*Robo* + word	
Robobastard 1				*Robo* + word	
Robobond 1				*Robo* + word	
Robo-bowler 1				*Robo* + hyphen + word	
RoboBuddha 1				*Robo* + capitalised word	
		robo-butler 1		*Robo* + hyphen + word	
	Robocandidates 1			*Robo* + word	
Robo-candidate 1		*robo-candidate* 1		*Robo* + hyphen + word	
		robocar 1		*Robo* + word	
Robocat 2		*robocat* 1		*Robo* + word	
Robochef 1				*Robo* + word	
Robocod 2				*Robo* + word	
Robocom 1				*Robo* + clip	
Robocomb 1		*robocomb* 2		*Robo* + word	
Robocommie 1				*Robo* + clip	
Robocop 125	*Robocops* 4		*robocops* 2	*Robo* + word	
			robo-cops 1	*Robo* + hyphen + word	
RoboCop 67				*Robo* + capitalised word	
Robo-Cop 2				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised word	
RoboCop's 3				*Robo* + capitalised word	
Robocop's 1				*Robo* + word	
Robocopping 1				*Robo* + word	

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal Relationships
Robo-Copish 1				Robo + hyphen + capitalised word	
			robocopulators 1	robo + word	
Robocow 1				robo + word	
RoboCup 4				Robo + capitalised word	
Robocup 2		robocup 1		Robo + word	
RoboCup's 1				Robo + capitalised word	
RoboCut 1				Robo + capitalised word	
		robo-dance 1		robo + hyphen + word	
Robodiet 1				Robo + word	
Robodisco 1				Robo + word	
Robodoc 3				Robo + clip	
Robodoctor 1				Robo + word	
Robodog 2				Robo + word	
		robo-fatty 1		robo + hyphen + word	
Robofix 1				Robo + word	
Roboflop 1				Robo + word	
Robogate 1				Robo + word	
Roboghost 3				Robo + word	
	Robogirls 1			Robo + word	
		robogolfer 1		robo + word	
Robokit 1				Robo + word	
Robokitten 3				Robo + word	
Robokitty 2				Robo + clip	
		robo-look 1		robo + hyphen + word	
Robomedic 1				Robo + word	

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal Relationships
Robo-Men 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised word	
Robomow 1				*Robo* + word	
			robo-monsters 1	*robo* + hyphen + word	
Robo-moth 1				*Robo* + hyphen + word	
		robo-mouse 1		*robo* + hyphen + word	
			robo-movements 1	*robo* + hyphen + word	
RoboMow 6				*Robo* + capitalised word	
			robonaps 1	*robo* + word	
Robophone 1				*Robo* + word	
RoboPhysio 1				*Robo* + capitalised clip	
			robo-players 1	*robo* + hyphen + word	
		robopop 1		*robo* + word	
		robo-pop 2		*robo* + hyphen + clip	
RoboPortillo 1				*Robo* + capitalised word	
		robo-punk 2		*robo* + hyphen + word	
Robo-Pup 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised clip	
Robo-Quarter-Back 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised compound	
RoboRally 2				*Robo* + capitalised word	
Robo-reporters 1				*Robo* + hyphen + word	
		robo-rhythmed 1		*robo* + hyphen + word	
			robo-rivals 1	*robo* + hyphen + word	
Robo-room 1				*Robo* + hyphen + word	

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal Relationships
		robo-sculpture 1		*robo* + hyphen + word	
Roboserve 2				*Robo* + word	
Robo-Shep 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised word	
	Roboshops 1			*Robo* + word	
			roboshops 2	*robo* + word	
Roboshow 1				*Robo* + word	
Robosis 1				*Robo* + clip	
Roboskool 1				*Robo* + mis-spelt word	
Robosoft 1				*Robo* + word	
Robo-Splurge 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised word	
Robostacker 2				*Robo* + word	
	RoboStackers 1			*Robo* + capitalised word	
			roboteachers 1	*robo* + word	OL (*t*)
Robo-Tony 1				*Robo* + hyphen + capitalised word	OL (*t*)
RoboTop 1				*Robo* + capitalised word	OL (*t*)
			robo-toys 1	*robo* + hyphen + word	OL (*t*)
RoboTroll 1				*Robo* + capitalised word	OL (*t*)
Robowhip 1				*Robo* + word	

Criterion 4:

Table 20: The orthographic analysis of the 77 *robo-* types:

Orthographic analysis	Out of 77	% of 77
Robo + Word	69	89.6
Robo + Clip	7	9.1
Robo + Compound	1	1.3

The above table indicates that *robo-* is functioning as an affix in 77 (100%) cases. However, of these 77, 5 (6.5%) display a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word *robot*. Consequently, the best analysis of these types is as a blend. This means that *robo-* is, in fact, only functioning as an affix in 72 (93.5%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of *robo-*, types in which there is an overlap between the string and the attached element are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 5 (6.5%) of the cases.

One further aspect worth noting is that in 22 of the types the attached element begins with a capital letter, in spite of the fact that the capital falls within the middle of the form. As with the equivalent forms in *compu-*, the capital letter in the middle of the form does have the affect of halting the flow of the word – something that is neither typical of blends or derivations, but would be particularly damaging to a seamless fusion in a blend. These capital letters, then, perhaps indicate that the types containing them would be best not viewed as blends.

Criterion 4b:

robo- is an initial string so this criterion is not applicable.

Criterion 5:

Table 21: The internal relationships of the 77 *robo-* types:

Internal relationships	Out of 77	% of 77
Total amount displaying internal relationships	5	6.5
Graphic and phonic overlap	5	6.5
Have no internal relationship	72	93.5

Analysis of the borderline splinter / suffix *-ercise* (from *exercise*)

Criterion 1:

-ercise does not appear in any dictionary. It may be worth noting, however, that the forms *dancercise* and *jazzercise* both feature in the Complete Oxford. *-ercise* comes from the word *exercise* and is used to represent this word.

Criterion 2:

It is not really possible to describe the meaning of the string *-ercise* without reference to the source word *exercise.*

Criterion 3:

There are 13 instances in the corpus, which sort into 8 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 22: Words in the corpus ending in -ercise (excluding exercise, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal relationship
Boxercise 5		boxercise 1		word + ercise	Semantic. OL (x)
		eggsercise 1		word + ercise	(P)OL(ggs=x)
Facercise 1	Facercises 1			word (-e) + ercise	OL (e)
Jazzercise 5		jazzercise 1		word + ercise	
Mousercise 1				Word (-e) + ercise	OL (e)
Nuttercise 1				word + ercise	OL (er)
Powercise 1		powercise 1		word + ercise	OL (er)
	Sexercises 1	sexercise 1		word + ercise	Semantic. OL (ex)

Criterion 4:

Table 23: The orthographic analysis of the 8 -ercise types

Orthographic analysis	Out of 8	% of 8
Word + ercise	6	75
Word (-e) + ercise	2	25

The above table indicates that -ercise is functioning as an affix in 8 (100%) cases. However, of these 8, 6 (75%) display a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word exercise. Consequently, the best analysis of these types is as a blend. This means that -ercise is, in fact, only functioning as an affix in 2 (25%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of -ercise, types in which there is an overlap between the string and the attached element are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 6 (75%) of the cases.

Criterion 4b:

2 of the types, *mousercise* and *facercise*, could be analysed as being made up of a word without a terminal *e* + *ercise*. This would mean that *-ercise* has attached using the standard suffix spelling rule. However, the best analysis of these types is as complete words sharing an overlap with a splinter *ercise* at the point of fusion. Consequently, the fact that these types only retain one *e* actually gives more weight to the argument that they are best analysed as blends and, thus, that *-ercise* is best analysed as a splinter.

Criterion 5:

Table 24: The internal relationships of the 8 *-ercise* types

Internal relationships	Out of 8	% of 8
Total number displaying internal relationships	7	87.5
Graphic and phonic overlap	6	75
Phonic overlap only	1	12.5
Semantic relationship	2	25
Have no internal relationship	1	12.5

Analysis of the borderline splinter / suffix -*(u)mentary* (from *documentary*)

Criterion 1:

-*(u)mentary* does not appear in any dictionary. It comes from the word *documentary* and is used to represent this word. No words ending in -*mentary*, meaning 'factual media broadcast on the subject of', feature in the Complete OED other than the initial base form *documentary*.

Criterion 2:

-*(u)mentary* is used to mean "a factual programme or film about as specified" but, as this is what the source word *documentary* actually means, it is not really fair to say that it can be described without reference to the source word.

Criterion 3:

There are 24 instances in the corpus, which sort into 15 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 25: Words in the corpus ending in -*(u)mentary/ies* (excluding *documentary*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal relationship
Chocumentary 1				clip + *umentary*	OL (*oc*)
		dinomentary 1		borderline string + [1]*mentary*	
		dyke-umentary 1		word + hyphen + *umentary*	(P) OL
		facumentary 1		splinter (*fact*) + *umentary*	OL (*c*)
		hip-hopumentary 1		compound + *umentary*	
		mockumentary 23		word + *umentary*	(P) OL
	Mocumentaries 1	*mocumentary* 2[2]	*mocumentaries* 3	splinter (*mock*) + *umentary*	OL (*oc*)
		plugumentary 2	*plugumentaries* 1	word + *umentary*	
		popumentary 1		clip + *umentary*	
Rockumentary 2	*Rockumentaries* 1	*rockumentary* 45	*rockumentaries* 8	word + *umentary*	(P) OL
		rock-umentary 1		word + hyphen + *umentary*	(P) OL
		sexumentary 2	*sexumentaries* 1	word + *umentary*	
			shockumentaries 1	word + *umentaries*	(P) OL
		soapumentary 1	*soapumentaries* 1	word + *umentary*	Semantic

---

[1] This is one of the two types in which the splinter is *mentary* rather than *umentary*. Here, the choice is explained by the fact that the initial element, *dino*, ends in a vowel, and if the *u* of *documentary* had been utilised rather than the *o* of *dinosaur* then the form, *dinumentary*, would not be transparent and would not, thus, serve its purpose.

[2] Both tokens appeared in the same article. This could, then, be a single author's stylistic choice or, perhaps more likely, a misspelling.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal relationship
		soapymentary 1		word + [3]*mentary*	Syntactic[4]
		soccumentary 1		splinter (*soccer*) + *umentary*	OL (c)

Criterion 4:

Table 26: The orthographic analysis of the 15 -(u)mentary types:

Orthographic analysis	Out of 15	% of 15
Word + (u)mentary	8	53.3
Compound + (u)mentary	1	6.7
Clip + (u)mentary	2	13.3
Borderline string + (u)mentary	1	6.7
Splinter + (u)mentary	3	20

---

[3] This is the second type in which the terminal splinter is *mentary* rather than *umentary*. The choice in this instance cannot be explained as easily as in the case of *dinomentary* as the alternative, *soapumentary*, is in fact, utilised (though four and a half years later) within the same newspaper corpus and is a more perfect blend. Also, the alternative *soapumentary* is, if anything, more transparent. However, transparency here is not an issue as the word is explained in the context:

It's a cross between a soap opera and a documentary, so the word is soapymentary or docusoap

(It is interesting to note that the alternate *soapumentary* is NOT explained – but it does occur four and a half years later by which time the splinter was, perhaps, more well used (twice the amount of *mentary* form types (12) had occurred in the corpus by the time that soapumentary was coined than at the point when soapymentary occurred (6). In a similar vein, over twice the amount of tokens had been used (57 Vs 25 by 9802 since 9308), and these are reasonably high amounts of token usage, so the splinter *umentary* by February 1998 was fairly easily recognisable)). The choice of *soapymentary* over *soapumentary* can only really be put down to an individual writer's stylistic choice. Because *soapymentary* and *soapumentary* mean the same thing and come from the same two words I have treated them as differently spelt instances of the same type.

[4] Whilst this cannot really be seen as a blend of a pre-existing item, it is certainly a lexical contraction.

413

The above table indicates that -(*u*)*mentary* is functioning as an affix in 11 (73.3%) cases. However, of these 11, 1 (6.7%) displays a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word *documentary*. Consequently, the best analysis of this type is as a blend. This means that -(*u*)*mentary* is functioning as an affix in 10 (66.7%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of -(*u*)*mentary*, types in which there is either an overlap between the string and the attached element or in which the attached element is a splinter (regardless of overlap) are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 4 (26.7%) of the cases.

Criterion 4b:

None of the above attached elements take a spelling fix when joining -(*u*)*mentary*.

Criterion 5:

Table 27: The internal relationships of the 15 -(*u*)*mentary* types:

Internal relationships	Out of 15	% of 15
Total number displaying internal relationships	9.5	63.3
Graphic and phonic overlap	4	26.7
Phonic overlap only	4	26.7
Semantic relationship	1	6.7
Syntactic relationship	0.5	3.3
Have no internal relationship	5	33.3

A3.5

Analysis of the borderline splinter / suffix *-tainment* (from *entertainment*)

Criterion 1:

-tainment does not appear in any dictionary. It comes from the word *entertainment* and is used to represent this word.

Criterion 2:

It is not really possible to describe the meaning of the string *-tainment* without reference to the source word *entertainment*.

Criterion 3:

There are 19 instances in the corpus, which sort into 14 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 28: Words in the corpus ending in -*tainment* (excluding *entertainment*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	orthography	Internal relationship
		advertainment 1		overlapping word + *tainment*	OL (*t*)
		agri-tainment 1		clip + *tainment*	
		architainment 2		splinter (*architecture*) + *tainment*	OL (*t*)
Centretainment 1				word + *tainment*	(P)OL (*entre=enter*)
		confrotainment[1] 1		splinter (*confront*) + *tainment*	
		digitainment 1		splinter (*digital*) + *tainment*	OL (*ta*)
Eatertainment 2		*eatertainment* 4		word + *ertainment*	OL (*ter*)
Edutainment 3		*edutainment* 55		splinter + *tainment*	
		edu-tainment 4		splinter + hyphen + *tainment*	
		gendertainment 1		word + *tainment*	OL (*er*)
		humilitainment 1		splinter + *tainment*	OL (*t*)
Infotainment 16		*infotainment* 94		clip + *tainment*	
		info-tainment 14		clip + hyphen + *tainment*	
Internetainment 1				overlapping word + *tainment*	OL (*t*)
		irritainment 1		splinter + *tainment*	OL (*ta*)
Tentertainment 1				word + *ertainment*	OL (*ent*)

---

[1] It is hard to imagine why this form was used rather than *confrontainment*. It is possible that it was just a mistyping. However, as there is no evidence to this effect, it is necessary to analyse it as it is, which is as a blend of splinter + *tainment*, regardless of how -*tainment* is analysed.

Criterion 4:

Table 29: The orthographic analysis of the 14 -*tainment* types:

Orthographic analysis	Out of 14	% of 14
Word + *tainment*	2	14.3
Clip + *tainment*	2	14.3
Word overlapping with *tainment*	2	14.3
Splinter + *tainment*	6	42.8
Word + *ertainment*	2	14.3

The above table indicates that -*tainment* is functioning as an affix in only 4 (28.6%) cases. However, in 1 of the 4 cases (*gendertainment*), there is a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word *entertainment*. Consequently, the best analysis of this type is as a blend. This means that -*tainment* is, in fact, only functioning as an affix in 3 (21.4%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of -*tainment*, types in which there is either an overlap between the string and the attached element or in which the attached element is a splinter (regardless of overlap) are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 11 (78.6%) of the cases.

In 2 of the cases (*eatertainment* and *Tentertainment*) the *tainment* of the terminal element cannot possibly be analysed as a suffix but rather must be analysed as a splinter of *entertainment*. This is because the *er* apparent in the types must have come from the source word *entertainment* as it cannot be analysed as belonging to the attaching words. Thus, in these 2 types *tainment* is certainly not functioning as a suffix.

Criterion 4b:

None of the above attached elements take a spelling fix when joining to -*tainment*.

Criterion 5:

Table 30: The internal relationships of the 14 -*tainment* types:

Internal relationships	Out of 14	% of 14
Total number displaying internal relationships	10	71.4
Graphic and phonic overlap	9	64.3
Phonic overlap only	1	7.1
Have no internal relationship	4	28.6

A3.6

Analysis of the borderline splinter / suffix -*tastic* (from fantastic)

Criterion 1:

-*tastic* does not appear in any dictionary. However, as mentioned in section 9.2.1, I am aware of at least one citation of -*tastic* as an affix (even though it was not from linguistic literature but was, in fact, from the Independent Newspaper). -*tastic* comes from the word *fantastic* and is used to represent this word.

Criterion 2:

-*tastic* is used to mean "excellent" or "brilliant". *Fantastic* has these connotations also, but puts across suggestions of the improbable and unbelievable as well. Consequently, -*tastic* can be seen as having refined the meaning of *fantastic* and should, thus, be analysed as being imbued with autonomous meaning.

Criterion 3:

There are 51 instances in the corpus, which sort into 48 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 31: Words in the corpus ending in -tastic (excluding *fantastic*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal relationship
		adtastic 1		Clip + *tastic*	
		appletastic 1		word + *tastic*	
		backslaptastic 1		lexical string + *tastic*	
		beat-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Boffin-tastic 1				word + hyphen + *tastic*	OL (*n*)
Boomtastic 1				word + *tastic*	
		bricktastic 1		word + *tastic*	
		caffeinetastic 1		word + *tastic*	(P)OL (*ne=n*)
		chart-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Choctastic 1				Clip + *tastic*	
Clubtastic 1				word + *tastic*	
Craptastic 1				word + *tastic*	
		dance-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Dogtastic 2				word + *tastic*	
		ego-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Factastic 1		*factastic* 1		word + *tastic*	G and P similarity[1]
Fadtastic 1				word + *tastic*	G and P similarity
Fangtastic 1				word + *tastic*	G and P similarity
		fanny- tastic 1		word + hyphen + space + *tastic*	G and P similarity
		fat-catastic 1		compound + *tastic*	

---

[1] There is no graphic or phonic overlap between the attached word and the string *-tastic* or the source word *fantastic*. However, there is a clear graphic and phonic similarity between the source word *fantastic* and the lexeme *factastic*, so this must be seen as a motivated form. Thus, graphic and phonic similarity (rather than overlap) needs to be introduced as another internal relationship.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal relationship
Flan-tastic 1				word + hyphen + *tastic*	OL (*an*)
Funtastic 1				word + *tastic*	OL (*n*)
Glastonbury- tastic *1*				word + hyphen + space + *tastic*	
		jazztastic 2		word + *tastic*	
Jurassictastic 1				word + *tastic*	
		megatastic 1		word + *tastic*	
Nafftastic 1				word + *tastic*	
		oligopo-tastic 1		Splinter (*oligopoly*) + *tastic*	
		party-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Poptastic 9		*poptastic* 12		word + *tastic*	
		pop-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
		riff-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
		rocktastic 2		word + *tastic*	
		santastic 1		overlapping word + *tastic*	OL (*anta*)
		shagtastic 1		word + *tastic*	
		slaptastic 1		word + *tastic*	
		slimtastic 1		word + *tastic*	
		sperm-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
SpinalTaptastic 1				lexical string + *tastic*	
		sport-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
		stat-tastic 1		Clip + hyphen + *tastic*	
Steptastic 2				word + *tastic*	
		tastic 3[2]		No attached element	
		teentastic 1		Clip + *tastic*	OL (*n*)

[2] In two of the three instances, there is a space between the preceding word and *tastic: fanny- tastic* and *Glastonbury- tastic*. These two are types in their own right and are dealt with as such. The third type is in a discussion of the terms *shagtastic* and *shagadelic* used in the 'Austin Powers' films. *tastic* is cited as a suffix in this instance, which inherently detracts from its autonomous usage.

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal relationship
		tinsel-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
		toupee-tastic 1		word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Tube-tastic 1				word + hyphen + *tastic*	
Tune-tastic 1				word + hyphen + *tastic*	(P) OL (*ne=n*)
Vantastic 1				word + *tastic*	OL (*an*)

Criterion 4:

Table 32: The orthographic analysis of the 48 -*tastic* types

Orthographic analysis	Out of 48	% of 48
Word + *tastic*	38	79.1
Clip + *tastic*	4	8.3
Compound + *tastic*	1	2.1
Lexical string + *tastic*	2	4.2
Word overlapping with *tastic*	1	2.1
Splinter + *tastic*	1	2.1
No attached element	1	2.1

The above table indicates that -*tastic* is functioning as an affix in 45 (95.8%) cases. However, of these 45, 5 (10.4%) display a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word *fantastic*. Consequently, the best analysis of these types is as a blend. This means that -*tastic* is, in fact, only functioning as an affix in 40 (83.3%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of -*tastic*, types in which there is either an overlap between the string and the attached element or in which the attached element is a splinter (regardless of overlap) are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 7 (14.6%) of the cases.

In 1 token of 1 type, -*tastic* appears without any attached element. However, as highlighted in footnote 2 above, this occurrence happens within a discussion of suffixes. Consequently, as was the case with the equivalent autonomous -*holic* type (as discussed in section 7.4.1.4), this metalinguistic mention cannot count as autonomous usage and actually gives further weight to the argument that -*tastic* is best analysed as a productive suffix.

Criterion 4b:

None of the above attached elements take a spelling fix when joining to -*tastic*.

Criterion 5:

Table 33: The internal relationships of the 48 -*tastic* types

Internal relationships	Out of 48	% of 48
Total number displaying internal relationships	8	16.7
Graphic and phonic overlap	6	12.5
Phonic overlap only	2	4.2
Graphic and phonic similarity	4	8.4
Have no internal relationship	40	83.3

A3.7

Analysis of the borderline splinter / suffix *-topia* (from *utopia*)

Criterion 1:

-topia, standing for anything connected to *Utopia*, does not appear in any consulted dictionary. It has, though, been referred to in the literature. Bauer considers *-topia* when he talks of cases leading to 'the re-evaluation of some sequence of phonemes as an affix' (Bauer 1983: 236) and states *-topia* as a possible example of this. While this is not a clear sign that *-topia* is best analysed as a suffix, it shows that it is an established string and has been contemplated as a candidate for the cross-over from a splinter to a suffix since at least 1983.

Criterion 2:

-topia can be described as "a paradise (for as specified)" without reference to the source word *Utopia*, but it still retains a close association with this word which, in spite of its literal translation as "no place", has also come to have connotations of joy and harmony.

Criterion 3:

There are 39 instances in the corpus, which sort into 31 types. The following table lists the types, along with an analysis of their orthography and internal element relationships.

Table 34: Words in the corpus ending in *-topia* (excluding *Utopia*, regarded as the initial form):

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal Relationship
		atopia 1	*atopias* 1	Prefix + *topia*	Semantic
Autopia 5		*autopia* 1		Overlapping ICF[1] + *topia*	OL (*to*)
Blutopia 1				Word (*-e*) + *topia*[2] (could be *utopia* rather than *-topia*)	OL (*u*)
Cartopia 2				Word + *topia*	
Computopia 4				Borderline string + *topia* (could be *utopia* rather than *-topia*)	OL (*u*)
Dinotopia 3				Prefix + *topia*	
Dystopia 4	*Dystopias* 3	*dystopia* 113	*dystopias* 17	Prefix + *topia*	Semantic
		daytopia 1		Word + *topia*	
		digitopia 2		Splinter + *topia*	OL (*t*)
		Dreartopia 1		Word + *topia*	Semantic
Ecotopia 1				ICF[3] + *topia*	
	Ectopia 5			ICF[4] + *topia*	
Flytopia 3				Word + *topia*	
Fruitopia 16				Overlapping word + *topia*	OL (*t*)
Funtopia 1				Word + *topia*	Semantic

---

[1] I have analysed *auto* as an initial combining form, as classified in the OED. However, it could also be seen as a clip.

[2] It is impossible to say whether *blue* lost its final *e* as a spelling fix to join with *-topia* or as a part of the splintering process, so that there could be a complete graphic overlap with the source word *utopia*. The first method would give much weight to the premise that *-topia* is best analysed as a suffix, whereas the second supports the fact that it is still a splinter. There is no way to resolve this and I can only note the problem. I am analysing *blu* orthographically as word minus terminal *e*, as this is clearly what it is, but intimating that this is because of a spelling fix may well be misleading.

[3] I have analysed *eco* as a clip of ecological, as classified in the OED.

[4] 9806: 'ectopia is defined as 'displacement, anomaly of situation or relation.'

U/C singular	U/C plural	L/C singular	L/C plural	Orthography	Internal Relationship
Hippietopia 1		*hippietopia* 2		Word + *topia*	
Insectopia 4				Overlapping word + *topia*	OL (*t*)
Intopia 2				Word + *topia*	
Litopia 1				Overlapping clip + *topia* (*literature*)	OL (*t*)
		my-topia 1		Word + hyphen + *topia*	
Petopia 2				Overlapping word + *topia*	OL (*t*)
Photopia 1				Overlapping clip + *topia*	OL (*to*)
Pornotopia 2		*pornotopia* 6		Clip[5] + *topia*	
Softopia 1				Overlapping word + *topia*	OL (*t*)
Subtopia 2		*subtopia* 9		Prefix + *topia*	
		technotopia 1		Clip[6] + *topia*	
Teletopia 1				Clip[7] + *topia*	
Tomtopia 1				Word + *topia*	
Uptopia 1				Word + *topia*	
Your-topia 1				Word + hyphen + *topia*	P similarity[8]
Zootopia 1				Word + *topia*	P similarity

---

[5] I have analysed *porno* as a clip, but it could be seen as an initial combining form. Both of these functions of *porno* are listed in the OED.

[6] I have analysed *techno* as as a clip, but it could be seen as an initial combining form. Both of these function of *techno* are listed in the OED.

[7] The context of this type makes clear that the best analysis of *tele* is as a clip of telecommunications:

> The Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications promoted the Teletopia project in 1982-3 in which 63 regional centres were designated to experiment with videotex, cable TV and a variety of data communications systems on a city-wide scale.

[8] Whilst neither *Your-topia* nor *Zootopia* has a straight-forward phonic overlap, they both display clear phonetic motivations (see section 8.5.3).

Criterion 4:

Table 35: The orthographic analysis of the 31 -topia types:

Orthographic analysis	Out of 31	% of 31
Word + topia	12	38.7
Word (-e) + topia	1	3.2
Clip + topia	3	9.7
Word overlapping with topia	4	12.9
Clip overlapping with topia	2	6.5
ICF overlapping with topia	1	3.2
Splinter + topia	1	3.2
Borderline string	1	3.2
ICF + topia	2	6.5
Prefix	4	12.9

The above table indicates that -topia is functioning as a suffix in 16 (51.6%) cases. However, of these 16, 1 (3.2%) displays a graphic overlap between the attached element and the source word utopia (blutopia). As discussed in footnote 2, above, it is impossible to say whether this type is best analysed as a blend or as a derivation utilising a typical spelling rule. My own feeling is that it is probably a blend, but this is disputable. If the terminal element in blutopia is analysed as a splinter of utopia, then -topia could only be said to be functioning in a manner typical to affixes in 15 (48.4%) of the types.

Irrespective of the analysis of -topia, types in which there is either an overlap between the string and the attached element or in which the attached element is a splinter (regardless of overlap) are best analysed as blends. This accounts for 10 (32.3%) of the cases. While a suffix can overlap with any element or attach to a splinter to form a blend, this should not be a usual function, so 32.3% does seem like rather a large percentage if -topia were to be analysed as a suffix.

Similarly (unless there is overlap and the final type is thus a blend), a suffix should not combine with either an initial combining form or a prefix, so *-topia* is functioning in a distinctly unsuffix-like manner in 6 (19.4%) of the types.

Criterion 4b:

As discussed already, the attaching word *blue* in the type *blutopia* loses its terminal *e*. This could either be a result of the splintering process (so as to aid a complete overlap with the source word *utopia*) or it could indicate that *-topia* has attached using a standard suffix spelling rule. I think that the first option is the more likely one, but it is impossible to be certain.

Criterion 5:

Table 36: The internal relationships of the 31 *-topia* types:

Internal relationships	Out of 31	% of 31
Total number displaying internal relationships	17	54.8
Graphic and phonic overlap	10	32.3
Phonic overlap only	1	3.2
Phonic similarity	2	6.5
Semantic relationship	4	12.9
Have no internal relationship	14	45.2