

Novel words with *final combining forms* in English. A case for blends in Word Formation.

Ewa Tomaszewicz (Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa, Wałbrzych)

In this paper the notion of *final combining form* is called into question and ultimately rejected as a morphological category. Traditional morphological theories, which assume word formation to be concatenative, run into difficulty in stating the defining properties of the above notion. Typology-wise, (Warren, 1990, Fradin, 2000) this notion ranges over : (1) final elements of neoclassical compounds (e.g. *-ology*, *-ography*, *-naut*, *-phile*), (2) novel bound morphemes existing also as free roots (e.g. *-gate*, *-ware*), (3) shortened lexemes (e.g. *-(a)holic*, *-(a)thon*). While types (1) and (2) are paradigmatically well motivated in terms of symbolic morphology (Bauer, 1983:236), forms of type (3), which may seem to have a source in recurrent parts of blended words (BWs) (Bauer, 2006:503) are only roughly identifiable because it is not possible to define their exact size in terms of segmental material.

The paper examines the structure of 70 novel words with type (1) forms and a subclass of type (3) s.t. a form in question contains a Latinate suffix. The method of analysis is Output-to-Output (OO) Faithfulness approach of Output-to-Output (OO) Correspondence Theory (a subcomponent of Optimality Theory), which has already proved successful in accounting for the structure of BWs. In this approach (Bat-El, 1996, 2000, 2006, Piñeros, 2000, 2002) a BW is not a concatenation of two shortened lexemes as has been assumed in most studies (Gries 2004, Kubozono 1990, Plag 2003, Ronneberger-Sibold 2006) but its structure is based on correspondence relationships between a BW and its source words at both segmental and prosodic levels.

The present paper resolves the indeterminacy of the size of the 'alleged' *final combining forms*. This problem is actually shown to be nonexistent as all the words under consideration, when analyzed at the level of prosodic constituents, turn out to be the cases of either Latinate suffixation or BWs. The studied data include relatively few examples of genuine Latinate suffixed words. The major bulk are BWs that preserve the prosodic structure of their head source words (due to metrical consistency of Latinate suffixes) and segmentally tend to be faithful to both source words, the conflict being resolved in a usual way, i.e. by interaction of constraints on output forms. Thus, novel words that may seem to be created with type (3) *final combining forms* are in fact exclusively formed via blending. Phonologically, they represent polysyllabic strings parsed into two feet and their well-formedness is shown to be determined by a set of universal, ranked and violable constraints. Supportive evidence comes from some attested instances of primary stress shift. Although most polysyllabic BWs preserve the prosodic structure of the second (head) source word, in a few cases, in order to maximize the segmental material from the first source word, they also preserve its primary stress (e.g. *cámcorder* not *camcórder*). In the studied data the MC of a Latinate suffix is preserved due to a swap in prominence relations between the the strong and weak foot, as in *fíctomèrcial*, *mílitàinment* and also in *súrgihòlic* instead of *sùrgihólic* . Additionally, the position of the strong foot at the left periphery enhances the interpretation of the latter words as blends by pointing to their compound-like syntactic source, which is a defining feature of BWs.

Keywords: Word Formation (WF), blended word (BW), output-to-output (OO) Faithfulness, output-to-output (OO) Correspondence, metrical consistency (MC)

References

- Bat-El, Outi. 1996. "Phonologically-based Word Formation: Modern Hebrew Blends". In: Kleinhenz Ursula (ed.), *Interfaces in Phonology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 231-250
- Bat-El, Outi, 2000. "The grammaticality of 'extragrammatical' morphology". In: Doleschal Ursula, Anna M. Thornton (eds), *Extragrammatical morphology and marginal morphology*. Munich: LINCOM, 61-81.

- Bat-El, Outi, 2006. "Blends" in Brown Keith (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd edition), Oxford: Elsevier
- Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English Word Formation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological Productivity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2006. "Compounds and Minor Word-formation Types". In: Bas Aarts, April McMahon (eds), *The handbook of English linguistics*. Malden MA: Blackwell Publishers, 483-506.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1994. *Principles of English Stress*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burzio, Luigi. 2002. "Surface - to - Surface Morphology: When Your Representations Turn into Constraints". In: *Many Morphologies*, Boucher Paul (ed.), Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 142-177.
- Fradin, Bernard. 2000. "Combining forms, blends and related phenomena". In: Doleschal Ursula, Anna M. Thornton (eds), *Extragrammatical morphology and marginal morphology*, Munich: LINCOM, 11-57.
- Gries, Stefan Th. 2004. "Shouldn't it be *breakfunch*? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English". *Linguistics* 42-3, 639-667
- Kubozono, Haruo. 1990. "Phonological constraints on blending in English as a case for phonology-morphology interface". *Yearbook of Morphology* 3. 1-20
- McFedries, Paul. 1995-2006. Word Spy – Web site devoted to "*lexpionage*" at www.wordspy.com
- van Oostendorp, Marc. 2004. "Crossing morpheme boundaries in Dutch", *Lingua* 114 : 1367- 1400.
- Piñeros, Carlos-Eduardo. 2000. "Word-blending as a case of non-concatenative morphology in Spanish", [343-0999 ROA]
- Piñeros, Carlos-Eduardo. 2002. "The creation of portmanteaus in the extragrammatical morphology of Spanish" [526-0602 ROA]
- Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word Formation in English*. Cambridge University Press
- Ronneberger-Sibld, Elke. 2006. Lexical Blends: Functionally Tuning the Transparency of Complex Words". *Folia Linguistica XL / 1-2*.155-181
- Warren, Beatrice. 1990. "The importance of combining forms". In: Dressler, Wolfgang U., Hans C. Luschützky, Oskar E. Pfeiffer & John R. Rennison (eds), *Contemporary Morphology*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 111-132.