Blending, from English to Arabic

Blending, from English to Arabic

By

Ekhlas Ali Mohsin

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Blending, from English to Arabic

By Ekhlas Ali Mohsin

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6930-6
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6930-0

To
My Great Family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables x

List of Figures xiv

List of Abbreviations xv

Preface xvi

1. Introduction 1
    1.1. Preliminaries 1
        1.1.1. Overview of Blending in English 4
        1.1.2. Overview of Blending in Arabic 9
    1.2. The Motivation of the Book 12
    1.3. Structure of the Work 12

2. Data and Methodology 14
    2.1. Datasets 14
        2.1.1. The Established Arabic Blends 14
        2.1.2. The Novel Invented Arabic Blends 16
    2.2. Methods of Data Collection 17
        2.2.1. The Survey 17
        2.2.2. The Experiment 17
        2.2.3. The Stimuli 18
        2.2.4. The Informants 20
        2.2.5. Debriefing 20
    2.3. Results and Processing of the Data 21
        2.3.1. The Established Arabic Blends 21
        2.3.2. The Novel Invented Arabic Blends 22
        2.3.3. Variation in the Diacritisation and Vowelisation of the Responses 24
        2.3.4. Filtering of Datasets 28

3. Blending in English 34
3.1. Introduction 34
3.2. Theoretical Background on Blending in English 34
3.3. Definition and Form-Related Issues 39
3.4. A View on the Productivity of Blending 41
3.5. English Blend-Formation Features and Tendencies 45
3.5.1. Cut-off Points in Source Words 46
3.5.2. Proportional Contributions from Source Words to Blends 53
3.5.3. Stress Patterns of Blends 58
3.6. Summary of Blend-Formation Tendencies in English 64

4. Blending in Arabic 66
4.1. Introduction 66
4.2. Classification of Arabic Blends 66
4.3. Tendencies in Classical Arabic Blend-Formation 68
4.4. Summary of Blend-Formation Literature in Arabic 71

5. Results and Discussion 72
5.1. Introduction 72
5.2. Analysis, Discussion, and Features of Established Arabic Blends 73
5.2.1. Analysis and Discussion of Established Blends 73
5.2.2. Features of Arabic Blends 83
5.2.3. Analysis and Discussion of Established Arabic Blends in the Light of the Features of English Blends 85
5.2.4. Summary of Tendencies for Forming Established Arabic Blends 97
5.3. Analysis and Discussion of Novel Invented Arabic Blends in the Light of English Blending Tendencies 98
5.3.1. Cut-off Points in Source Words 99
5.3.2. Proportional Contributions from Source Words to Blends 145
5.3.3. Stress Patterns of Blends 151
5.4. Further Observations 159
5.4.1. Cases of Homophonous Responses 159
5.4.2. Cases of Blends with Reversed Ordering of Source Words 163
5.4.3. Cases of Blends with New Added Short Vowels 164
5.4.4. Cases of Sandwich Blends 167

6. Conclusions 170
6.1. Preliminaries 170
6.2. Summary of Findings 171

Appendices 173
A. IPA Mapping for Arabic Consonants and Vowels 173
B. Blends from Classical Arabic 175
C. Blends from Modern Arabic 179
D. The List of Stimuli Used in the Methods of Data Collection 181
E. Analysis of Established Arabic Blends in Terms of the Four Identified Blending Features 182

Bibliography 185

Notes 194

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Sample blends of Classical and Modern Arabic 15
Table 2.2: Stimuli used in the survey and experiment 19
Table 2.3: Most frequent responses to each word pair in the survey 23
Table 2.4: Most frequent responses to each word pair in the experiment . 23
Table 2.5: Overview of responses excluded from the survey dataset 32
Table 2.6: Overview of responses excluded from the experiment dataset 32
Table 2.7: Overview of the refined dataset of the survey as related to diacritisation 33
Table 3.1: Stress assignment in blends with polysyllabic source words... 64
Table 4.1: Analysis of typical Arabic blends as to RC-WP features 69
Table 5.1: Analysis of blends in Classical Arabic 74
Table 5.2: Analysis of blends in Modern Arabic 78
Table 5.3: Locations of fracto-lexemes in SWs of the novel blends in Modern Arabic 81
Table 5.4: Patterns of established Modern Arabic blends 82
Table 5.5: Analysis of sample established blends in terms of their conformity to the blending features of Arabic 85
Table 5.6: Combinations of cut-off points in SWs of established Arabic blends 87
Table 5.7: Types of fusion at the split points in the CON blends 88
Table 5.8: Locations of cut-off points in SW1s and SW2s of established Arabic blends 88
Table 5.9: Locations of cut-off points in all of SWs of established Arabic blends 89
Table 5.10: Proportional contributions from SWs to the root-and-pattern blends 91
Table 5.11: Proportional contributions from SWs of CON blends 92
Table 5.12: Stress patterns of established blends (syllabic size of blends X syllabic size of SWs) 94
Table 5.13: (Non-)identity of stress patterns of established blends 96
Table 5.14: Combinations of cut-off points in SWs of responses to the survey (MoA1) 102
Table 5.15: Combinations of cut-off points in SWs of responses to the survey (MoA2) 103

Table 5.16: Comparison between the most frequent combinations of cut-off points in SWs of responses to the survey based on MoA1 and MoA2 105
Table 5.17: Types of fusion at the split points in blends from the survey (MoA1) 106
Table 5.18: Types of fusion at the split points in blends from the survey (MoA2) 106
Table 5.19: Comparison of the most frequent types of fusion at the split points in responses from the survey based on MoA1 and MoA2..... 107
Table 5.20: Patterns of fracto-lexemes in SWs of responses to the survey (MoA1/MoA2)..... 108
Table 5.21: Locations of cut-off points in SW1s and SW2s in responses from the survey (MoA1) 109
Table 5.22: Locations of cut-off points in SW1s and SW2s in responses from the survey (MoA2) 110
Table 5.23: Locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the survey (MoA1)..... 112
Table 5.24: Locations of cut-off points in all of SWs of responses to the survey (MoA2)..... 113
Table 5.25: Comparison of the most frequent locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the survey based on MoA1 and MoA2 . 114
Table 5.26: Locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the survey (MoA1)..... 115
Table 5.27: Locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the survey (MoA2)..... 116
Table 5.28: Comparison of the most frequent locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the survey based on MoA1 and MoA2..... 117
Table 5.29: Combinations of cut-off points in SWs in responses to the experiment (MoA1) 118
Table 5.30: Combinations of cut-off points in SWs in responses to the experiment (MoA2) 120
Table 5.31: Comparison of the most frequent combinations of cut-off points in responses from the experiment based on MoA1 and MoA2 . 122
Table 5.32: Types of fusion at the split points in blends from the experiment (MoA1) 123
Table 5.33: Types of fusion at the split points in blends from the experiment (MoA2) 124
Table 5.34: Comparison of most frequent types of fusion at the split points in responses from the experiment (MoA1/MoA2) 125

Table 5.35: Patterns of fracto-lexemes in SWs in responses to the experiment (MoA1/MoA2) 126
Table 5.36: Locations of cut-off points in SW1 and SW2 in responses from the experiment (MoA1) 127
Table 5.37: Location of cut-off points in SW1 and SW2 in responses from the experiment (MoA2) 128
Table 5.38: Locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the experiment (MoA1) 130
Table 5.39: Locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the experiment (MoA2) 131
Table 5.40: Comparison of the most frequent locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the experiment based on MoA1 and MoA2 132
Table 5.41: Locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the experiment (MoA1) 133
Table 5.42: Locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the experiment (MoA2) 134
Table 5.43: Comparison of the most frequent locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses from the experiment based on MoA1 and MoA2 135
Table 5.44: Comparison of the most frequent combinations of cut-off points in the cut-off data based on MoA1 and MoA2 136
Table 5.45: Comparison of types of fusion at the split points in the cut-off dataset based on MoA1 and MoA2 137
Table 5.46: Patterns of fracto-lexemes in the cut-off dataset 138
Table 5.47: Comparison of locations of cut-off points in SW1 of the cut-off dataset based on MoA1 and MoA2 139
Table 5.48: Comparison of locations of cut-off points in SW2 of the cut-off dataset based on MoA1 and MoA2 140
Table 5.49: Comparison of locations of cut-off points in all of SWs in responses to the cut-off dataset based on MoA1 and MoA2 142
Table 5.50: Comparison of locations of cut-off points as related to the size of SWs in responses in the cut-off dataset based on MoA1 and MoA2 144
Table 5.51: Proportional contributions from SWs to blends from the survey 147
Table 5.52: Proportional contributions from SWs to blends from the experiment 149
Table 5.53: Proportional contributions from SWs to blends from the proportional contribution dataset 151

Table 5.54: Stress patterns of blends from the survey (syllabic size of blends X syllabic size of SWs) 153
Table 5.55: (Non-)identity of stress patterns of blends from the survey .. 154
Table 5.56: Stress patterns of blends from the experiment (syllabic size of blends X syllabic size of SWs) 155
Table 5.57: (Non-)identity of stress patterns of blends from the experiment 157
Table 5.58: Stress patterns of blends from the stress pattern dataset (syllabic size of blends X syllabic size of SWs) 158
Table 5.59: (Non-)identity of stress patterns of blends from the stress pattern dataset 159
Table 5.60: Homoforms in the whole data 161
Table 5.61: Reversed blends in the whole dataset 163
Table 5.62: Blends with new short vowels 165
Table 5.63: Most frequent word pairs whose responses have new short vowels 167
Table 5.64: Sandwich blends from the survey 168
Table 5.65: Sandwich blends from the experiment 169

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Analysis 1 of the blend *fantabulous* 56
Figure 3.2: Analysis 2 of the blend *fantabulous* 56
Figure 3.3: Analysis 1 of the blend *chunnel* 57
Figure 3.4: Analysis 2 of the blend *chunnel* 57
Figure 5.1: Analysis of the blend /rak.madʒ/ 90
Figure 5.2: Analysis of the blend /qab.ta:.ri:x/ 91
Figure 5.3: Analysis of the blend /lamr/ 146
Figure 5.4: Analysis of the blend /ma.wa:ʔ/ 146
Figure 5.5: Analysis of the blend /dʒubz/ 146

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Adverb	Adv.
Blend	Bl.
First mode of analysis	MoA1
Non-Arabic Words	n-Arb.W
Noun	N.
Object	O.
Plural	pl.
Prepositional Phrase	PP
Second mode of analysis	MoA2
Source word	SW
Subject	S.
Syllable	Syl.
The Contemporary Corpus of American Language	COCA
The feature of concatenative joining	CON
The feature of root contribution	RC
The feature of word-pattern	WP
The Oxford English Dictionary Online	OED
Verb	V.
Word Formation Rules	WFRs

PREFACE

This book aims to address the gap in the field of studying Arabic blends. It examines their structure in the light of the blend-formation tendencies that have been identified based on examining some prosodic features of blends in English.

Blends in Classical Arabic are generally formed by joining the first two root consonants of each source word and imposing the prosodic pattern *CaCCaC* on them. Typical examples of Classical Arabic blends are /ʕab.dar(ij)/ "someone from the family of Abdul Dār" < /ʕabd/ "slave" and /da:r/ "house", and /ʕab.qas(ij)/ "someone from the family of Abdul Qays" < /ʕabd/ "slave" and /qajs/ "a male name"—names for Arab tribes in the 6th Century AD. However, such Classical blends are a few. However, the numerous blends that have been formed in Arabic in recent times do not appear to follow this root-and-pattern template. Examples are /faw.sˤawt(ij)/ "supersonic" < /fawq/ "above" and /sˤawt(ij)/ "sound", and /qab.ħarb/ "pre-war" < /qabl/ "before" and /ħarb/ "war".

The literature on Arabic linguistics does not show an in-depth investigation of the structure of modern Arabic blends; hence, this book aims to uncover the regularities that are found in these modern formations and in that way contributes to understanding the structure of Arabic words in general and blends in particular. The book also explains to what extent the blend-formation tendencies identified in English apply to blend formation in Arabic.

The main blend material used in this book consists of established blends found in the literature on Arabic word-formation and novel blends created by native speakers in tasks specifically set up to address the assumption made in this book. The established Standard Arabic blends were examined to identify any tendencies in their formation that seem to be specific to Arabic and to, afterwards, determine if such tendencies are also found in the novel blends.

Quantitative analysis of the established and novel Arabic blends demonstrates that there is a high degree of resemblance between modern Arabic blends and English blends as far as their prosodic features are concerned.

This book is the revised version of my PhD Thesis in Linguistics and English Language at Newcastle University. I would like to dedicate this

book to my Great Family (Parents, Husband, Sister, and two Sons). Many thanks go to Dr William van der Wurff and Dr Adam Mearns who were my supervisors for the PhD. I would like also to thank my examiners Dr Elisa Mattiello and Dr Carol Fehringer for their invaluable comments and encouragement to publish my thesis as a book. Thanks and gratitude go to Dr Bashaer Al-Otaebi and Dr Maha Jasim for their comments and support.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminaries

It is noticed in our daily life as well as on several TV shows or series that speakers of Arabic use a technique by which they join two words in one word to jointly convey the meanings of the base words. One word was /laj.su:n/, which the person using it explained as a soft drink made from /laj.mu:n/ "lemon" and /ja:.na.su:n/ "anise". Another word was /ja.ta.ɣa:.ðˤam/; the person using it said it was formed from /ja.ta.ɣa:.dˤa:/ "ignore" and /ja.ta.ʕa:.ðˤam/ "increase". My household also made a good source for forming blend words for me. My eldest son (born in Baghdad in 2004, living in the UK ever since 2013) when he was 10 years old, formed the blend *fewseum* referring to a "museum" visited by "few" people, without being aware of the word *Newseum* (in Washington DC), which has a similar pattern: *new* + *museum*. Another word which was *Monsday* formed by my youngest son (born in Baghdad in 2011, living in the UK ever since 2013) explained to me that it referred to a trip that extended from *Monday* to *Wednesday*. My husband and I were not an exception for we also had our own blends in Arabic, English or French. My husband formed the blend /tˤan.tˤa.wi:l/ in Iraqi dialect with the meaning "extremely, hugely tall" from <tˤan.tˤal> "a mythical creature that is huge, tall and scary" and <tˤa.wi:l> "tall". One of my blends in Arabic was /ɣa.ʃa:ʔ/ "dinner" from /ɣa.da:ʔ/ "lunch" and /ʕa.ʃa:ʔ/ "supper", in English was *Hollangium* referring to Baarle-Hertog, a village divided at the borders between *Holland* and *Belgium*, which I also Arabised into /ho.lan.dʒi.ka:/ < /ho.lan.da:/ and /bal.dʒi:.ka:/, and in French was *jouge* "red cheek" from *joue* "cheek" and *rouge* "red".

These attempts at forming novel blends were the initial reason for starting this book. The knowledge I have about English blends and Arabic blends made me think of comparing the methods used in this process in these two languages.

The linguistic phenomenon of blending, which is one of the means of adding neologisms to the lexicon, is widely recognised in English. Blending in English is a productive process of word formation whereby a new word is formed by joining parts of at least two other words as, for instance, the blend *brunch* which is formed by joining parts of the words

breakfast and *lunch*, *motel* from *motor* and *hotel*, and *smog* from *smoke* and *fog* (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 462). Blends in English are formed in such a way that at least one of the two words is shortened (Algeo 1991, 10). For instance, the blend *brunch* is formed by joining the segments *br-* and *-unch* from the words *breakfast* and *lunch* respectively, with both words therefore shortened. Other cases of English blends involve a kind of overlap where both words have the same graphemes/phonemes at the joining point (Algeo 1977, 49). An example of this type is the blend *slanguage*, which is formed by joining the two words *slang* and *language*, where the string *-lang-* is found in both source words and therefore constitutes an overlap. There are also cases where one word or part of one word is inserted inside the other word, with or without truncation (Algeo 1977, 49). An example of this type of blends is *chortle*, formed from *chuckle* and *snort*, with the segment *-ort* from the second word *snort* being inserted inside the first word *chuckle*, replacing the segment *-uck-*.

The form of English blends was previously thought to be unpredictable and irregular ((Bauer 1983, 225); (Marchand 1969)), but recent research (e.g. (Lehrer 2003); (Gries 2004a); (Gries 2004b); (Bat-El and Cohen 2012); (Bauer 2012)) has shown that their formation, in fact, shows a considerable amount of regularity and predictability. These recent works have focused on the question of how and why English blends are formed the way they are rather than another way, and what the general tendencies for their formation and structure are.

For the purpose of this book, three blend-formation features that have been identified in the literature on English blending are used as a basis for an examination of Arabic blends to assess the extent to which they also apply in Arabic.

These features are: (1) the cut-off points in the source words; (2) the proportional contributions from the source words to the blend; and (3) the stress pattern of the resulting blend. These features are the most investigated ones in English and the tendencies that have been identified based on them were supported by evidence from large amounts of data.

The success achieved in identifying tendencies and regularities in English blend formation raised the question of to what extent the same kinds of patterns exist in blending in other languages. There has indeed been some comparative work on blending, as in Renner, Maniez and Arnaud (2012) on English and Serbian, Kubozono (1990) on Japanese and English, and Renner (2019) on English and French. There has also been scholarly research on blending in other languages, as in Berman (1989), Bat-El (1996), and Pham (2011) on Hebrew, Fradin (2000) on French, Piñeros (2004) on Spanish, Thornton (1993) and (2000) on Italian,

Ronneberger-Sibold (2006) and (2010) on German, Ralli and Xydopoulos (2012) on Greek, Konieczna (2012) on Polish, and Borgwaldt, Kulish and Bose (2012) on Ukrainian. However, the majority of studies have focused entirely on English, as in Algeo (1977), Cannon (1986), Cutler and Young (1994), Kelly (1998), Bertinetto (2001), Kemmer (2003), López Rúa(2004), Hong (2005), Bat-El (2006) (2006), Lehrer (2007), Brdar-Szabó and Brdar (2008), Cook and Stevenson (2010), Tomaszewicz (2012), Bat-El and Cohen (2012), Beliaeva (2014a) and (2014b).

Since detailed analysis is necessary to uncover the relevant patterns (as shown by the fact that they were not recognised even in English until rather recently), progress at this stage is most likely to come from comparisons of the patterns found in English with those in other languages. In this book, the other language chosen for comparative purposes is Arabic. This language also has words that are formed by joining parts of other words, as in the blend /rak.madʒ/ "to surf" formed from /ra.kab/ "ride" and /mawdʒ/ "waves", and the blend /ħaj.na.ba:t/ "a creature that is an animal and a plant" formed from /ħa.ja.wa:n/ "animal" and /na.ba:t/ "plant". Nevertheless, blend formation in Arabic has received very little linguistic attention so far.

It is fair to say that there is a big gap in the literature on Arabic blends. In traditional grammars of Arabic, blends in Standard Arabic are described and classified based on other word-formation processes. However, these studies do not present a systematic account of blends analysed in terms of modern linguistic work on blending. Additionally, research on blends in Modern Standard Arabic is scarce, even though there has been a recent increase in the use of novel blends, especially in the domains of science, where blends are formed to refer to particular inventions, and in the media, where blends are used in comic shows, often to express sarcasm. To the best of my knowledge, there is no systematic linguistic analysis of the process of new-blend formation in Modern Arabic. The lack of such an analysis of this phenomenon in Arabic constitutes the major motivation for investigating blend formation in Arabic in this book.

Because systematic linguistic research on Arabic blends is almost non-existent, this book takes as its basis the results achieved in research on English blends and uses these as a guide to explore the so-far untrodden path of Arabic blending. Hence, this book aims to investigate the extent to which the features and tendencies identified as related to English blend formation can also be identified in blend formation in Arabic. The book is concerned with examining (novel) blends formed by Arabic speakers in the light of the already identified English blend-formation features and tendencies to assess the applicability of these tendencies in the context of

blend formation in Arabic.

Arabic, a Semitic language, is very different from English. No previous research has jointly investigated blend formation in these two languages. However, when comparing two different languages like English and Arabic, and based on Kaunisto's (2013, 6) statement that "[It] might be interesting to examine the structural aspects of blend words in different languages in a contrastive or comparative fashion", I propose that analysing Arabic blends in terms of English blend-formation tendencies would be beneficial. This is because it helps explore the extent to which linguistic resemblances or similarities can be identified.

The investigation of the structure of blends in Arabic aims to provide insight into the nature of blending as a word-formation process in this language. It also leads to identifying the prevailing blend-formation tendencies in Arabic. The study also helps explore if there are any regularities in blend formation in Arabic that can contribute to the study of the morphological structure of the Arabic word. This book shows empirical results since it not only analyses existing blends but also investigates the formation of novel blends elicited from Arabic speaking informants.

The two main questions at the heart of this book are as follows:

1) Are there any Arabic-specific tendencies that can be identified in the blends investigated?
2) To what extent do blend-formation tendencies identified based on the three main features of English blends also apply to blend formation in Arabic?

It is essential at this point of the book to start with giving a brief overview of both blending in English (section 1.1.1) and blending in Arabic (section 1.1.2) since they are the two major languages under investigation in this field.

1.1.1. Overview of Blending in English

This section presents an overview of the process of blending in English focusing on the analysis of features of blends proposed by Renner (2006).

Blending in English is generally recognised as "a very productive source of words in modern English" whereby a new word, namely a blend (word), is formed by joining parts from two or more words which are commonly referred to as source words (SWs) (Bauer 1983, 236-7). Examples are the blends *brunch* < ***br****eakfast* and *l****unch****, motel* < ***mo****t****o****r* and

h<u>otel</u>, and *smog* < ***sm****oke* and ***fog***, where the parts in bold type form the blend and the bold parts that are underlined are points of overlap.

The words involved in the process of blending are most often referred to as "source words", but other terms are sometimes used such as "parent-words" (Bergström 1906), "constituent words" (Kelly 1998), "etymons" (Cannon 2000), "source lexemes" (Borgwaldt and Benczes 2011), or "base words" (Bat-El and Cohen 2012). The segments that constitute a blend are usually called "splinters" ((Marchand 1969); (Lehrer 1996); (López Rúa 2012); (Ronneberger-Sibold 2012); (Beliaeva 2014a); (Beliaeva 2014b)), "sub-morphemic splinters" or "fracto-lexemes" (Renner 2014). These splinters are commonly joined to each other concatenatively; however, there are cases of blends in which part of one word is inserted within another, as is the case with the blend *chortle* < ***ch****uck****le*** and *sn****ort***, in which cases the blend may involve more than one segment from the source words. Such cases of blends have been referred to as "sandwich blends" ((Algeo 1977); (Renner 2014)), "interposed blends" (Cannon 1986), "discontinuous blends" (Lehrer 1996), "infixed blends" (Danks 2003), "intercalative blends" ((Kemmer 2003); (Borgwaldt, Kulish and Bose 2012); (Konieczna 2012)), "embedded blends" (Shaw 2013), or "central replacement" blends ((Beliaeva 2014a); (Beliaeva 2014b)).

Another important term that is encountered in studying blends is the joining point. This is the boundary point between the fracto-lexemes of a blend. It is also referred to as the "breakpoint" (Kelly 1998), "switching point" (Bertinetto 2001), "crossover point" ((Bauer 2012); (Borgwaldt, Kulish and Bose 2012)), "splice" (DiGirolamo 2012), or "split point" ((Gries 2012); (Renner 2014)).

This book, to maintain consistency, uses the term "source words" to refer to the words from which a blend is formed, "fracto-lexemes" to refer to the segments of the source words that form the blend, "sandwich blend" to refer to a blend formed by the non-continuous joining of fracto-lexemes, and "split point" to refer to the border point between fracto-lexemes. One further important term is "cut-off point", which is used to refer to the point inside the source word where it is cut or shortened to give the fracto-lexeme.

Traditional accounts of the process of blending generally focus on one or a combination of the following points: (1) describing blending in terms of graphemes, or sometimes phonemes; (2) determining whether the fracto-lexemes are originally in the initial or final positions within their source words; and (3) the number of source words involved in the process, which is minimally two source words but occasionally three (e.g. *compushity* below, and *turducken* < *turkey* + *duck* + *chicken*) and only

rarely more than three.

Algeo (1977, 48) defined blending as the process of combining two, or more, word forms where at least one of them is shortened. This definition, therefore, involves one of the points specified above, which is the minimum number of source words required to form a blend. Additionally, it indicates that the process of blending involves shortening in at least one source word. Later, Kaunisto (2000, 49) offered a definition based on the type of word-parts that are joined and stated that, in the process of blending, orthographic, or phonemic, items from the source words are joined together to form a blend.

Gries (2004a, 416), on the other hand, presented a more detailed definition, which involved specifications of the type and location of the parts of the source words that are joined, in addition to the minimum number of source words required in the process. Gries (2004a, 416) defined blending as the process of "fusing parts of at least two source words" where usually the fore part from the first source word combines with the hind part from the second source word with "some phonemic or graphemic overlap of the source words". Gries' (2004a, 416) definition applies to blends like *motel* but not like *brunch*. The former is formed by joining the fore part *mot-* from *motor* and the hind part *-otel* from *hotel* with the segment /-əʊt-/ as the overlap point; whereas the latter is formed by joining the fore part *br-* from *breakfast* and the hind part *-unch* from *lunch* without any point of overlap, making it partially adhere to Gries' (2004a, 416) definition.

Research on English blends has shown that there are several tendencies governing blend formation in English, which have been identified and further investigated. This book focuses particularly on the tendencies that have been considered most frequently in the literature.

These tendencies can be identified by examining specific definitional criteria that have been presented in the literature as characteristics that distinguish blends from other types of neologism. For example, Renner (2006) compared various, and sometimes conflicting, definitions attempting to identify the prototypical characteristics of English blends. Accordingly, Renner (2006, 139) specified three major types of "restrictions" that can be used to identify blends. These restrictions are morphological, semantic and morpho-phonological. Renner (2006) tested the validity of these restrictions on English blends and classified blends into three groups ranging from the most typical, where all three of his restrictions apply, to the least typical, where only one of the restrictions applies. What follows gives an outline of Renner's restrictions on English blend-formation.

The first restriction that Renner (2006) discusses is the morphological restriction whereby the truncation pattern of the source words corresponds to "an apocope" of the first source word and/or "an apheresis" of the second source word. Renner (2006, 139) gives three examples to explain this restriction, where three truncation patterns are identified. The first is the blend *brunch*, with the first source word ***br****eakfast* undergoing apocope and the second source word *l****unch*** apheresis. The second example is the blend *morphosyntax*, with the first source word ***morpho****logy* undergoing apocope and the second source word ***syntax*** being present in its entirety. Finally, the third example is the blend *claymation*, with the first source word ***clay*** being present in its entirety and the second source word *ani****mation*** undergoing apheresis.

Renner's (2006) truncation patterns correspond to the pattern of analysis proposed by Plag (2003) where the first source word is represented as AB and the second source word as CD, and accordingly, the types of blends given above can be represented as follows:

AB+CD= AD (apocope and apheresis)
AB+CD= ACD (only apocope)
AB+CD= ABD (only apheresis)

Renner (2006, 140) states that there are cases that are not accounted for by these three patterns and are not referred to as blends but as "clipped compounds" because they do not fit into any of these three patterns. Renner (2006, 140) mentions that this term is adopted by Bauer and Huddleston (2002, 1635), Bauer (2003, 47), and Gries (2004b, 645-647). Examples include *modem* < ***mod****ulator* and ***dem****odulator*, and *sitcom* < ***sit****uation* and ***com****edy*. These are both instances of biapocope, which, according to the patterns given above, correspond to AB+CD=AC, where both source words undergo apocope.

The second restriction that Renner (2006, 140) specifies is semantic, whereby a blend should reflect the meanings of its source words. For example, *smog* is formed from the source words ***sm****oke* and ***fog***, and semantically refers to a combination of smoke and fog. This restriction does not apply to *motel* since the semantics of the source words is not reflected in the blend word, in that it is not both a motor and a hotel, or a combination of a motor and a hotel, but rather an abbreviated compound where the first source word modifies the second, as stated by Plag (2003, 122).

In terms of semantics, English blends can be divided into two groups: coordinate and determinative (Bauer 2012, 12). The former shows a paradigmatic relation between the source words, as in the blend *smog* < *smoke* and *fog*, and the latter a syntagmatic relation, as in the blend *motel*

< *motor hotel* (Dressler 2000, 5).

For Renner (2006), the coordinate blends exhibit four semantic relationships. These are hybrid blends, like *tigon* < *tiger* and *lion*, addition blends, like *semantax* < *semantics* and *syntax*, polyvalence blends, like *spork* < *spoon* and *fork*, and tautologous blends, like *rucus* < *ruction* and *rumpus*. These semantic relations range from the most prototypical category of blends to the least, where hybrids are the most prototypical and tautologous the least. On the other hand, Bauer (2012, 19) states that the determinative blends have "a semantic structure more similar to endocentric compounds".

Most English blends, both attributive and coordinative, have the semantic characteristics of non-argumental compounds. An attributive blend is a hyponym of the second base word, and at the same time, the first base word has a "contextually plausible relationship to the second", e.g. *daycation* < *day vacation* is a one-day vacation (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 483).

When it comes to the coordinative compounds, there are two types: appositive and compromise blends. The first type denotes "the intersection of two types of entity or action", e.g. *fictomercial* < *fiction commercial* is a work of fiction and a commercial at the same time. The second type denotes a hybrid entity or a concept, e.g. *broccoflower* < *broccoli* and *cauliflower* is a kind of vegetable that is somewhere between broccoli and cauliflower.

Blends with argumental-compound semantics are affixal, and can be either object-referencing, e.g. *agrimation* < *agriculture automation* "automation of agriculture", or subject-referencing, e.g. *kidfluence* < *kid influence* an "influence by kids" (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 483-4).

There is a further miscellaneous group of so-called blends that cannot be so easily interpreted. These are the opaque cases of blends, such as *Boyzilian* < *boy* and *Brazilian*, "the name for a bikini wax for men", and idiosyncratic-word-play blends, such as *Internot* < *internet* and *not*, "a person who refuses to use the internet" (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 485).

Other than these last two types, blends are interpreted in the same way as compounds (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 485). In consideration of the features and categories of coordinative blends, this book is focusing on a particular type of blends, where there is a paradigmatic relation between the source words.

The third restriction is morpho-phonological, whereby a blend is characterised by "interpénétration" (French for *entanglement*, *nesting*, *telescoping*). This characteristic applies in English to cases of blends with

overlapping fracto-lexemes where at least one element of these fracto-lexemes is common to both source words (Renner 2006, 141). For example, in *motel*, the part <ot> /ɔʊt/ is shared by both *motor* and *hotel*, at both levels: orthography (*m**ot**el* < ***mot**or* and *h**otel***) and phonology (/m**ɔʊt**ɛl/ < /**mɔʊt**ə/ and /h**ɔʊtɛl**/).

However, there are cases of blends where this kind of entanglement is incomplete because they can be interpreted either on the orthographic level or on the phonological level, but not, simultaneously, on both (Renner 2006, 141). For instance, from an orthographic perspective, the <o> in the blend *smog* is considered to be common to both source words, *smoke* and *fog*, but phonologically, it is not, since the grapheme <o> represents /ɔʊ/ in *smoke* and /ɔ/ in *fog*. On the other hand, the blend *skyjack* contains the diphthong /aɪ/, which is part of the phonology of both source words, *sky* and *hijack*, but is represented by different graphemes (<y> versus <i>).

Cases of blends that have shared elements (whether on both, the orthographic and phonemic, levels or on either level) exhibit a kind of entanglement referred to as ambimorphemic (Renner 2006, 141). Other examples of ambimorphemic entanglement are the blends *acu**p**ressure* < ***acup**uncture* and ***p**ressure*, *pla**net**esimal* < ***planet*** and *infi**nite**simal*,[1] and *bo**t**ox* < ***bot**ulin* and ***t**ox**i**n*. Nevertheless, Renner (2006, 141) mentions that the literature on English blending does not identify this restriction as a definitional criterion for blends, possibly because it would exclude cases of blends like *brunch*, where no element can be found in both source words.

Renner's (2006) restrictions form a specific scheme for examining the structure of English blends, where several features are considered at different linguistic levels: morphological, semantic and morpho-phonological. The most commonly investigated features of the structure of English blends are those that are relevant to the morphological and morpho-phonological restrictions, which are subject to investigation in this book. As a result of research into the structure of English blends in terms of these features, many blend-formation tendencies have been identified in the literature and presented in section 3.5.

1.1.2. Overview of Blending in Arabic

In the traditional literature on blending in Arabic (e.g. (Ibn Manẓūr 1883); Ibn Fāris (1979), (1997), and (2001); (Al-Farāhīdi 1988); (Al-Rāzi 1999); (Al-Zubaydi 2003)), the word-formation process of blending is referred to as *al-naḥt*. Al-Farāhīdi[2] (1988, 60) was the first Arab linguist to discuss this linguistic phenomenon and to refer to it by this term, which literally

means “carving, cutting, trimming, shortening, reducing, adjusting, constructing”. To avoid confusion and to maintain consistency when referring to Arabic neologisms that correspond, by definition, to those formed by the process of blending in English, the term “blending” is used instead, and hence an Arabic neologism formed by this process is referred to as “a blend”.

Blending in Arabic is generally defined as the formation of a word by joining letters taken from two consecutive words or taken from a sentence, in such a way that the new word conveys the same meaning as that of the original words ((Al-Maghribi 1908, 21); (Al-Farāhīdi 1988, 60)). Moreover, it is generally said that, when forming an Arabic blend, a formal relationship is established between the blend and the source words so that the letters of the blend all come from the source words (Al-Mūsā 1966, 65-7).[3]

Examples of Arabic blends mentioned in the literature about this process are shown in (a)-(d) below.

a) عَبْشَمِي /ʕab.ʃam(ij)/ “someone belonging to the family of /ʕab.di ʃams/ “the slave of the sun”,[4] from عَبْد/ʕabd/ “slave” and شَمْس /ʃams/ “sun”, which was a name for an Arab tribe in the 6th century AD.
b) جَعْفَدَ /dʒaʕ.fad(a)/ meaning someone is saying may Allah make me redemption for you”,[5] جَعَلَ /dʒa.ʕal(a)/ “made” and فِداء /fi.da:ʔ/ “redemption”.
c) عَبْدَرِي /ʕab.dar(ij)/ “someone belonging to the family of /ʕab.did.da:r/”,[6] from عَبْد/ʕabd/ “slave” and دار /da:r/ “house”, which was a name for an Arab tribe in the 6th century AD.
d) دَمْعَزَ /dam.ʕaz(a)/ meaning someone is saying may Allāh perpetuate greatness for you, from دام /da:m/ “perpetuate” and عِزّ /ʕizz/ “greatness”.

To understand how words, in general, are formed in Arabic, it is important to have an idea about the structure of the word as well as the process of derivation in Arabic.

Words in Arabic are characterised by a non-concatenative morphology ((McCarthy 1981); (Watson 2002, 200); (Ouhalla 2012, 41)) whose basic units consist of a root and a derivational or inflectional pattern ((Cavalli-Sforza, Soudi and Mitamura 2000, 86); (Saiegh-Haddad and Henkin-Roitfarb 2014, 9)). In this process, the consonantal root forms the base that is mapped into a pattern consisting of a prosodic template, which is also referred to as the “derivational vocalic morpheme” (Ouhalla 2012, 41-2).

Because they cannot be realised in isolation from each other, the root and the pattern are unpronounceable bound morphemes.

The root consists of a sequence of consonants that conveys the essential meaning (Bentin and Frost 1995, 273). They are mostly triliteral sequences such as /ktb/ "write", /drs/ "study", and /rsm/ "draw". Quadriliteral sequences are also possible, though less common, such as /trdʒm/ "translate", while biliteral sequences such as /ħdʒ/ "pilgrim" are rare.

The patterns mostly take the form of vocalic/prosodic patterns that are spread over a consonantal base (Ouhalla 2012, 41). That is, patterns have "slots for the root consonants" to fill when forming the words (Saiegh-Haddad and Henkin-Roitfarb 2014, 9). This indicates that the vocalisation of Arabic words does not take place at the level of the root but rather at the level of the word pattern where phonemic and morphosyntactic diacritics represent the vowels of the prosodic pattern ((Ouhalla 2012, 41); (Saiegh-Haddad and Henkin-Roitfarb 2014, 18)).[7]

A well-known example that shows how the root consonants are combined with a prosodic pattern is that of the root /ktb/ "write" combined with the two patterns *CaCaC* and *CaaCiC* (Ouhalla 2012, 41). The consonant slots in the prosodic patterns are filled by the root consonants (Saiegh-Haddad and Henkin-Roitfarb 2014, 9). The first prosodic pattern gives the word /ka.tab/ "he wrote" and the second prosodic pattern gives the word /ka:.tib/ "(male) writer".

Even though few blends have been identified in Classical Standard Arabic, an increasing number of novel examples can be found in Modern Standard Arabic. Neologisms formed by blending in Arabic enjoy growing popularity, especially in the media (Abdul-'Azīz 2002, 52-3) and in scientific fields such as chemistry and biology (Takeda 2011, 13). As has been pointed out, blending in Arabic, just like in English, is used to facilitate expression by means of reduction and brevity ((Al-'Ālūsi 1988, 18-21); (Takeda 2011, 13)), by forming one word from two or more words while preserving the meaning of the original words ((Al-Shihābi 1959) ; (Al-Khaṭīb 2003, 439)).

Ibn Fāris (1979, 271), a traditional linguist, defined blending simply as the process of forming one lexeme from two or more lexemes. However, this definition does not provide specific details about how the process operates. Some further detail on the outcome of blending is given by Al-Farāhīdi (1988, 60), who described it as the process of "joining two consecutive lexemes to form a new lexeme from which a verb is derived", showing an awareness that the blend has the potential of acting as the base

for verb creation.

Modern and contemporary linguists define blending as a process of forming "one unique lexeme" by joining "letters taken from two lexemes or from a sentence" where the meanings of the original lexemes are conveyed by the new lexeme (Al-Maghribi 1947, 13). This definition goes further to refer to the selection of two or three words from a sentence to form a blend following the identified pattern for forming blends from any word pair. Although forming blends from words taken of sentences is not identified in English, the new Arabic word still conforms to the pattern of forming blends in Arabic. In this case, and this book, in particular, these blends are analysed as being formed from these source words, not from the sentence, since not all words in the sentence contribute to forming the blend.

1.2. The Motivation of the Book

This book is based on the assumption that there is, to some extent, a resemblance between the blend-formation tendencies of Arabic and those of English. To identify the nature and degree of any resemblance between the blends of these two languages, blends from Arabic were examined in the light of English blend-formation tendencies.

In recent years, different types of blends have also appeared in Arabic. These types look more like the result of concatenating word parts, the way it is done in blends in English and other languages. Although this process seems to be relatively new in Arabic (and is condemned by some traditional Arab grammarians), there are already substantial numbers of words of this type and new ones that can regularly be encountered in the media. The study of such new blends and the principles governing their formation still needs to commence. This book aims to contribute to such a start.

Moreover, the lack of a systematic, quantitative analysis of this phenomenon in Arabic constitutes the major motivation for investigating blend formation in Arabic in this book, which has led to posing the main assumption in this book, which is: Blend-formation features and tendencies that are identified for blend formation in English can, to some extent, be applicable to blend formation in Arabic.

1.3. Structure of the Work

The remainder of this book consists of five chapters. Chapter 2 outlines the methodology, describing the datasets (section 2.1), the methods of data