

Elements in doubt between dependency and independency

Camiel Hamans
European Parliament, Brussels

Recently Kastovsky (2009) suggested “that compounding, affixation, clipping, and blending should be regarded as prototypical patterns arranged on a scale of progressively less independent constituents ranging from word via stem, affixoids, affix, curtailed word/stem to splinters as constituents of blends, and finally acronyms (letter combinations).”

In this paper ‘combining forms’ and processes of clipping and blending will be studied to argue in favor of a dependency cline and secondly to show how this cline works.

Essential for all these three morphological formations is a process of secretion:

(1) combining forms	(2) clipping	(3) blending	
entrepreneur	information info	picture + element	pixel
info-preneur	airplane plane	frugal + google	froogle
home-preneur			

First will be discussed how the resulting segments have been isolated. It will be shown that the processes of truncation are less irregular than it may seem. Preferred word and syllable structures turn out to be essential.

Subsequently secretion usually appears to form a part of a process of reanalysis.

At the moment a form has been reanalyzed, it may be seen as a composite, a syntagma and therefore ‘may acquire derivative force’ (Marchand 1969:211).

(4) composite
sequel
prequel
sidequel

This process resembles productive blend formation, where a first blend has been analyzed as a syntagma as well

(5) blend as basis for a series
Spanglish
Danglish
Polglish

Clipped compounds may function in a similar way (Hamans 2009)

(6) clipped compounds
infotainment
docutainment
meditainment

Here the notion of (in)dependency comes to play a role.

The clipped form *info* is already a free form whereas the clipped segments *medi* and *tainment* still have a higher value on the scale of dependency, just as *preneur* (1) and *quel* (4).

In the final part of this paper the relation between ‘derivative force’ and ‘(in)dependency’ will be studied in detail, as to come to a refinement of Kastovsky’s scale (and against Hamans (2008) where clipped forms are described as nouns). (306 words)

References:

Hamans, Camiel (2008), 'Why clipped forms should be accepted as nouns'. In: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 50: 96-109.

Hamans, Camiel (2009), 'Het belang van paradigmatische productiviteit. Over blends, clippings en andere oddities'. In: Ronny Boogaart a.o. (eds.) *Woorden wisselen. Voor Ariane van Santen bij haar afscheid van de Leidse universiteit*. Leiden: Stichting Neerlandistiek Leiden: 37-51.

Kastovsky, Dieter (2009), 'Astronaut, astrology, astrophysics': About Combining Forms, Classical Compounds and Affixoids.' In: Rod W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja and Jukka Tyrkkö (eds.) *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX2)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project: 1-13; also www.lingref.com document #2161.

Marchand, Hans (1969), *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. München: C.H. Beck.