THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BLENDS AND CLIPPED COMPOUNDS

CAMIEL HAMANS
University of Amsterdam/Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań
CIPL, Comité International Permanent des Linguistes

Abstract

This paper wants to refute the traditional claim that blends or portmanteau words are unsystematic.

First, it will be shown that one must distinguish between two types of concatenations of portions of two words. One the hand formations that combine the first portions of the two source words and on the other words in which the first part of the first source word is combined with the final part of the second. This last group are real blends. The first one is better called clipped compounds, complex clippings or stub compounds.

Both groups show a righthand head. Clipped compounds appear to be a subcategory of compounds and follow the Compound Stress Rule. In blends the right part of the final form is also the head. However, blends copy the prosodic and syllabic structure of the second source word. Whereas compounds consist of at least two prosodic or phonological words, blends consist of only one. This leads to the conclusion that blends can best be described as an intermediate category between compounds and simplex words.

Most of the examples described in this paper come from English, however, some German and Dutch examples are also discussed. Blending operates in a similar way in these languages.

1 Introduction

According to Bauer, Lieber and Plag (2013, 458) there are two types of blends. Both types combine portions of two source words. The first type "involves the loss of medial segmental material" (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 458) or to put it differently, combines the first part of the first source word, the left source word, and the last part of the second, the right one:

(1) breakfast   +   lunch   → brunch
    smoke   +   fog   → smog
    stagnation   +   inflation   → stagflation
    advertisement   +   editorial   → advertorial

In the second type final segmental material of both source words is truncated:

(2) modulator   +   demodulator   → modem
    picture/pix   +   element   → pixel
    situation   +   comedy   → sitcom
    frozen   +   yoghurt   → froyo

"The two patterns can be formalized as in (3), where AB stands for the left base (with its two parts A and B) and CD stands for the right base, with its two parts C and D" (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 458).

(3a) AB + CD → AD
(3b) AB + CD → AC

The formalization of (3a), which says that the first part of the first source word must be combined with the final part of the second source word, leads to blends tout court. The pattern of (3b), where the first portions of the source words are combined, results in what are called 'clipped compounds' or 'clipping compounds' (Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013, 4580 or 'stub compounds' (Spencer, 1998 and Hamans 2018a). Hamans (2018a) prefers the term stub compounds, since stubs are mainly bound elements whereas clippings may appear as free forms (see Hamans 2018b). Because of this reason the term stub compound is used here.

In the remaining of this paper it will be shown that the difference between AD and AC concatenations corresponds with other formal features and that both types of concatenations are systematic.

2 Stub Compounds

Gries (2006) analyses different kinds of 'subtractive word formation' from a cognitive linguistic perspective. He convincingly demonstrates that there is a difference between blending and stub compounding. Based on a very sophisticated statistical analysis he is able to show that stub compounding is much less productive than blending. Furthermore, his figures demonstrate that stub compounds systematically preserve less material of their respective source words than blends and finally that the source words of blends are phonologically or orthographically more similar to each other than the source words of stub compounds. In addition, blends may even show an overlap as in *slanguage* from *slang* and *language*, *glas(s)phalt* from *glass* and *asphalt*, *motel* from *motorist* and *hotel* or *froogle* from *frugal* and *google*, whereas stub compounds hardly do. However, the differences Gries found are so heterogeneous that they offer little scope for further systematic research.

Another difference, already noticed by Bauer (1983, 233), is more promising. It is the difference in stress pattern. Stub compounds follow the Compound Stress Rule, whereas blends

tout court exhibit simple word stress. The Compound Stress Rule says that in a compound [[A][B]], [A] is strong (Chomsky and Halle 1968, 1-4). The compound stress rule operates in a similar way in English, German and Dutch (Booy 1995, 115, Giegerich 1985, 168 and Wurzel 1980, 309).

Stub compounds get stress on the left part of the resulting AC form, even when stress is on the second lexeme in the full, non-truncated, sequence of source words, as will be shown in the adjective + noun phrases of (4a). Stress assignment in stub compounds also leads to stress on the leftmost part of the final AC form when stress falls on for instance the second or third syllable of the first source word, as shown in (4b).

(4a)	mísper	< missing pérson
	mídcult	< middle cúlture
	fróyo	< frozen yóghurt
(4b)	sítcom	< situátion cómedy
	bíopic	< biógraphy/biográphical pícture
	cýborg	< cybernétic órganism

The examples in (4a) show that these AC formations also behave like compounds in another respect: they appear to follow the Righthand Head Rule (Williams 1981) and thus is the final form a noun, whereas the combination of source words consists of a sequence of an adjective plus a noun. In this respect stub compound can be compared to normal adjective + noun compounds such as *greenhouse*, *bluebird* and *redhead*.

The data presented above show that AC concatenations really behave like compounds, albeit that the constituent parts are not free forms but clippings. The question which now remains is how to clip or truncate the source words. Hamans (2012 and 2018a, b) discusses clipping extensively. The most frequent form of clipping is back clipping, which results in (C)(C)V(C)(C) forms such as:

(5a)	tram	< tramway
	pic	< picture
	ad	< advertisement

However, a more recent trochaic pattern also exists:

(5b)	psycho	< psychopath
	dipso	< dipsomaniac
	info	< information

Almost all clippings which appear in the examples (4a) and (4b) follow the main (C)(C)V(C)(C) pattern, only *bio* in *biopic* is an example of the recent trochaic pattern. This is not the place to discuss clipping extensively, it suffices to show that the clippings of the AC formations discussed here follow standard clipping patterns. The only difference between standard clipping and the clipping process operating in (4a & b) is that standard clipping may result in free forms, whereas the clipping process that operates here only seldom leads to a possible free form. *Bio* and *pic* are the only possible free forms so far.

3 Head of Blends

According to Gries (2012) blends, the AD type concatenations, have a head, which is usually the right part, which is the remnant of the second source word. Gries uses his semantic criteria and statistical data to reach this conclusion. However, the AD type also exhibits a formal head, as can be seen in the examples (6) and (7).

(6a) Dutch[1]
het potel (n)   'hotel for Polish workers'   < *de* Polen   + *het* hotel
het preferendum (n) 'referendum with more options' < *de* preferentie + *het* referendum
de scheit (common gender) 'mixed breed of sheep and goat'< *het* schaap + *de* geit

(6b) German
der Kurlaub (m) 'cure vacation'   < *die* Kur   + *der* Urlaub
das Sportel (n)   'sport hotel'   < *die* Sport   + *das* Hotel
die Datei (*sg.*)   'file'   < die Daten (*pl.*) + die Kartei (*sg.*)

(7a) English
simulcast (*N*)   < simultaneous (*Adj*) + broadcast (*N*)
malware (*N*)   < malicious (*Adj*)   + software (*N*)
barkitecture (*N*) 'design of doghouses'< bark (*V*)   + architecture *(N)*

(7b) German[2]
Naktivist (*N*) 'naked activist'   < nackt (*Adj*)   + Aktivist (*N*)
herrklären (*V*) 'mansplain'   < Herr (*N*)   + erklären (*V*)
Teuro (*N*) 'nickname for the expensive Euro' < teuer (*Adj*) + Euro (*N*)

(7c) Dutch
vagetariër (*N*) 'vague vegetarian'   < vaag (*Adj*)   + vegetariër (*N*)
krommunicatie (*N*) 'crooked communication' < krom (*Adj*) + kommunicatie (*N*)
alterneut (*N*) 'an unqualified healer' < alternatief (*Adj*)   + therapeut (*N*)

The examples in (6) and (7) show that the righthand part determines the gender, the number and the part of speech of the blend. The examples (6a) are simple and clear. In Dutch there are two genders, neuter and common gender. The gender of the second source word determines the gender of the blend. The German data of (6b) are somewhat more complicated. German has three genders, male, female and neuter. Again, it is the gender of the second source word which is decisive for the gender of the blend. The same applies to number as the example *Datei* (6b) shows.

In (7b & c) the second source word determines the resulting part of speech. When the second source word is a noun, then the resulting blend also is a noun, whatever the part of speech of the

---

[1] Examples from Pajerová (2018)

[2] Even the orthography of the German examples shows which part is the head. In *Naktivist* and *Teuro* the original adjectival parts *n(akt)* and *teu(er)* receive substantive *Großschreibung* 'capitalization' since the resulting blend is a substantive due to the second source word. In *herrklären* it is just the other way around: the substantive *Herr* has to give up its capital letter since the blend is a verb due to the verbal character of the righthand part, the head.

first source word is. However, when the second source word is a verb, as in *herrklären*, then the final blend is also a verb.

These examples show that blends exhibit a formal head, just as compounds. However, this does not imply that all blends must also have a semantic head. Just as dvanda compounds do not show a semantic head, see for instance *singer-songwriter*, *bittersweet* and *spacetime*, where the meaning is the sum of the meanings of the two constituent words, 'copulative' or dvanda blends such as *smog*, from *smoke* and *fog*, or *brunch* from *breakfast* and *lunch* or *Oxbridge* from *Oxford* and *Cambridge* do not exhibit a semantic head. However, all blends have a formal head, and, in this respect, blends behave as compounds.

4 Prosodic Aspects

This section shows how blends copy the prosodic and syllabic structure of the second source word. First stress assignment will be discussed. The second part of this section is devoted to syllable structure and actually discusses which parts of which source word can be combined.

4.1 The Stress Pattern of Blends

Beard (1998:57) was the first to observe that the prosodic structure of blends must be identical with that of the model, being the second source word. To put it differently: blends tend to copy the stress pattern of the head (see also Piñeros 2000 & 2002, Bat-el 2006, Bat-el and Cohen 2012, Trommer and Zimmerman 2012). The examples in (8) demonstrate the stress pattern of blends.

(8) boat*él*	< boat	+ hot*él*
frappuc*í*no	< frapp*é*	+ cappucc*í*no
flust*á*ted	< fl*u*stered	+ frustr*á*ted
advert*ó*rial	< adv*é*rtisement	+ edit*ó*rial
fertig*á*tion	< f*é*rtilizer	+ irrig*á*tion
pr*é*stinant	< prest*í*gious	+ d*ó*minant

In all these examples it is the stress pattern of the second source word that determines the stress placement on the resulting blend. The last example, *pr*é*stinant*, is most convincing. Even when the segmental material of the second source word is not preserved, the suprasegmental prosodic feature stress of this source word retains its strength. The resulting blend bears stress at exactly the same place as the second source word, on the first syllable, notwithstanding the fact that this syllable was unstressed in the first source word.

Blends appear to consist of one prosodic word[3], although they are formed as a concatenation of parts of two separate words. The prosodic shape of a blend is the same as that of the second source word. Blends simply copy the primary word stress of the second source word.

---

[3] The notion prosodic or phonological word stands in opposition to the notion grammatical word (Booij 1999,47). "Prosodic words are typically characterized as being the domain of word stress, phonotactics and segmental word-level rules" (Peperkamp 1999, 15). The size of the prosodic or phonological word does not have to correspond with the morphological word. For instance, compounds in English, German and Dutch consist of two prosodic words. (See about prosodic words also Peperkamp 1997 and Hildebrandt 2015)

4.1.1 Monosyllabic Source Words

Bat-El and Cohen (2012) discuss the relation between blending and stress assignment in English in detail. They claim that two factors play a role in determining the position of stress in blends. The first one is position, the second size.[4] Here it will be argued that position will do for almost all data.

Bat-El and Cohen (2012) agree that the main pattern of stress placement in blends is a copying process of the prosodic structure of the second source word as in (8), which means that the stressed syllable of the blend is identical to that of the second source word. Stress is position-based in these cases. However, there are exceptions they show, such as blends with a monosyllabic source word. For these blends size should determine stress assignment.[5]

(9)	blógive	< blog	+ árchive
	tankíni	< tank	+ bikíni
	momprenéur	< mom	+ entreprenéur

(10)	lúmist	< lúminous	+ mist
	cítrisun	< cítric	+ sun
	éscalift	< éscalator	+ lift

The blends in (9) simply follow the stress pattern of the second source word and and should therefore not be considered as exceptional or as counterexamples. The data presented in (10) does not indeed follow the stress pattern of the second source word, which, incidentally, is completely predictable. The second source words are monosyllabic words and thus have no lexical stress (Bat-El and Cohen (2012: 207) or metric pattern or rhythmic contour of their own. Consequently, the resulting blend has to copy the only available stress pattern or rhythmic contour, which is the pattern of the first, left, source word. There is no reason to take size as a determining factor in these cases.

However, there are a very few real counterexamples

4.1.2 Counterexamples

Usually the first source word of a blend contains fewer syllables, and is therefore shorter, than the second one (Kelly 1998). However, this is not a condition as *brunch,* from *breakfast + lunch*, demonstrates. When the size of the second source word is smaller than that of the first source word (sw2<sw1), exceptions to standard blend stress assignment may occur, as Bat-El and Cohen (2012) show. In (11) the resulting form adopts the stress pattern of the first, left, source word, whereas in (12) the stress pattern of the second source word is copied.[6]

(11)	húrricoon	< húrricane	+ ballóon
	hándkerchoo	< hándkerchief	+ kerchóo
	quálatex	< quálity	+ látex

---

[4] Size is considered to be the main factor for stress assignment in blends by Cannon (1986).
[5] Examples (9) and (10) taken from Bat-El and Cohen (2012)
[6] Examples (11) and (12) taken from Bat-El and Cohen (2012)

(12) ebónics   < ébony   + phónics
     amerásian   < américan   + ásian
     aggranóying   < ággravating + annóying

Bat-El and Cohen (2012:202) conclude on the basis of these data that there is a certain 'inter-word variation where different words follow minimally different rankings' of constraints. However, they need these different constraints because of the behaviour of blends with a monosyllabic source word, discussed above. As shown in 4.1.1, only a small group of blends resulting from monosyllabic second source words (cf. 10) does not follow standard blend stress assignment. Here the outcome is the default option. Therefore, monosyllabic source words do not require a size constraint.

The examples in (12) simply follow the standard blend stress assignment. So, only the data in (11) might be considered to contradict the normal stress copying pattern. However, some of the data in (11) are not very convincing: *handkerchoo* and *qualatex* look more an AC concatenation than an AD. They are better described as a sort of stub compounds. Real counterexamples are blends such as *hurricoon* and *ballute*:

(13) húrricoon   < húrricane   + ballóon
     ballúte   < ballóon   + párachute

It should be noted that in *ballute* the first source word is smaller in size than in the second.

For the right stress placement Bat-El and Cohen (2012) suggest a few faithfulness constraints that preserve the phonological properties of the base words at the segmental level as well as at the level of metrical structure. For the position-based view of stress assignment they suggest two constraints that state that the stressed syllable in the blend corresponds to the stressed syllable in the respective source word. In order to put the stress on the correct syllable of the right word, both constrains are ranked in the following way.

(14) FAITHHEADWR .≫ FAITHHEADWL

Since blend stress normally corresponds to that of the right constituent of the blend, the candidate that does not violate stress assignment required by FAITHHEADWR wins. For the size criteria of stress placement Bat-El and Cohen (2012: 199) suggest another constraint: FAITHMETRICALSTRUCTURE (FAITHMS), which states that '[t]he metrical structure (number of syllables and stress pattern) of the blend is identical to that of both base words'. Different rankings of FAITHMS in relation to FAITHHEADWR and FAITHHEADWL account for the difference in stress assignment.

However, the constraints Bat-El and Cohen propose can easily be simplified. As demonstrated, only blends with a monosyllabic second source word violate systematically FAITHMS, provided that this constraint is split into FAITHMSWL and FAITHMSWR. In order to produce blends with correct placement on the right source word, the ranking of these two constraints must be:

(15) FAITHMSWR ≫ FAITHMSWL

Since the second source words in the examples of (10) does not have any lexical stress or rhythmic contour, faithfulness to the metrical structure of the second source word (WR) is vacuous. Consequently, the resulting blend remains faithful to the first source word (WL). The only real counterexamples are blends such *ballúte* and *húrricoon*. These blends show the stress pattern and the syllabic skeleton of the first source word.

These examples do not belong to a single category. The source words of *ballute* follow the normal pattern: sw2>sw1. In *hurricoon* it is just the other way around, which is exceptional. One may try to explain the exceptional behaviour of these examples by pointing to the exceptionally large portion that is deleted in *parachute*, whereby even the place of stress appears to be erased, just as in *balloon*. Because of so many and serious violations the contour of the first source word may get priority. However, this explanation sounds rather ad hoc, when one realises that in examples such as (16) the phonemic content of the stressed syllable is deleted without any consequences for the stress pattern.

(16) blógive   < blog   + árchive

     préstinant   < prestígious + dóminant

     plúmcot   < plum   + ápricot

Therefore, it seems better to accept that there is a very small group of exceptions, of which most show a difference in source-word length which is exceptionally sw2<sw1. In this group an opposite ranking applies, which means that there are two rankings available in English, of which (15) is the preferred one. However, (17) also exists, which implies that there is a 'crucial non-ranking' between FAITHMSWR and FAITHMSWL.

(17) FAITHMSWL >> FAITHMSWR

The fact that there are two possible rankings, of which one is the preferred one, is not exceptional (cf. Hamans 2012 on two possible rankings for Dutch clippings of which one is the preferred ranking).

4.2 The Syllabic Structure of Blends

Stress assignment is not the only aspect which blends copy from their second source words. Usually, the syllabic structure of blends is also a copy of the syllabic structure of the second source word as the examples in (18) show (see also Arndt-Lappe and Plag 2012).

			Truncated and Inserted (in second source word)
(18a) *br*eakfast	+ l*unch*	→ brunch	onset
s*m*oke	+ f*og*	→ smog	onset
*b*oat	+ h*otel*	→ boatel	onset[7]

---

[7] An alternative segmentation for this example may be, especially when one wants to give priority to the orthographic form:

(18b) *Gr*eek/*Gr*eece + *exit*	→ Grexit	onset
*Spa*nish	+ E*nglish*	→ Spanglish	onset + nucleus
*gi*gantic	+ e*normous*	→ ginormous	onset + nucleus

(18b) *Gr*eek/*Gr*eece + *exit* → Grexit onset
     *Spa*nish + E*nglish* → Spanglish onset + nucleus
     *gi*gantic + e*normous* → ginormous onset + nucleus
(18c) *stag*nation + in*flation* → stagflation σ (= syllable)
     *Ox*ford + Cam*bridge* → Oxbridge σ
     guess + es*timate* → guesstimate σ^8
(18d) *adver*tisement + edi*torial* → advertorial $\sigma\sigma^9$
     *edu*cation + enter*tainment* → edutainment $\sigma\sigma$
     stalker + papa*razzi* → stalkerazzi $\sigma\sigma^{10}$

The examples presented here demonstrate that it is the syllabic structure of the second source word which determines the syllabic structure of the blend. If only an onset has been truncated from the second source word, then only an onset can be inserted. However, it should be noted that empty onsets can be truncated and refilled as in *glasphalt,* where the first syllable of the second source word *as* does not include an onset. A similar insertion applies to *donkephant* from *donkey* and *elephant*. The syllable *el* without onset is replaced by a syllable with an onset *donk*.

In addition, instead of a one place coda the first syllable of the blend exhibits a two-place coda, which does not make any difference in terms of syllabic structure. It also appears possible to fill a one place onset with a cluster consisting of two or three consonants as in shown in the series *glitterati* from *glitter* + *literati, clitterati* from *clitoris* and *literati* and *splitterati* from *split* and *literati*. This is not in any way contrary to the possibilities described here, since English (and Dutch) onsets can consist of more than one consonant.

If truncation leads to the deletion of a syllable, the resulting empty space must be filled with a syllable as shown in (18c). However, it is also possible to insert more syllabic material as in the following examples of Dutch:

(18e) *ana*chronisme + a*croniem* → anacroniem
                                      'acronym derived from an outdated phrase (e.g radar)'

---

*boa*t + ho*tel* → boatel
In this case a whole syllable consisting of an onset and a nucleus have been truncated from the second source word. Subsequently, the onset and the nucleus of the first source word are inserted.
Another alternative might be:
boat + ho*tel* → boatel.
In this case a whole open syllable plus the onset of the next syllable must have been truncated. Consequently, a CVC syllable must have been inserted, of which the last consonant has been resyllabified in order to become the onset of the final syllable. However, examples such as Dutch *potel* 'hotel for Polish immigrant workers' from Polen + hotel or *stutel* 'student hotel', without final -*t* at the end of the first source word, make this last segmentation unlikely.
[8] An alternative segmentation may be:
 *gu*ess + *estimate.*
In this case only the empty onset of the first syllable of the second source word has been truncated and replaced by the onset of the first source word.
[9] An alternative segmentation could be:
*adver*tisement + edi*torial* → advertorial.
However, a form such as *prefatorial*, from *preface* without a -*t* makes this segmentation unlikely.
[10] An alternative segmentation may be:
*stalke*r + papa*razzi* → stalkerazzi.
Also, in this case the deletion and insertion will affect two possible syllables.

democratie + dictatuur   → democratuur[11]
'dictatorship by a democratic chosen leader'

In *acronym* the first syllable *a* is truncated. Subsequently two syllables, *a* + *na*, are inserted.[12] The second example *democratuur* is even more complicated. In *dictatuur* the first syllable *dic* is truncated plus the onset of the following syllable *t*. Subsequently two syllables *de* + *mo* plus a following onset *kr*, spelled out as *cr*, have been inserted. The extra syllables *a* and *de* in *a*nacroniem and *de*mocratuur can be described as unparsed. In fact, such an extra, unparsed, syllable does not affect the overall picture that blends copy the syllabic structure of the second source words, of which the remnant becomes the formal head of the blend. Also, in this respect the blend remains one phonological word.

A problem that will only be touched on here is where to cut off the second source word. So far, it is clear that what has been cut off should be supplemented from the initial segment of the first source word. However, the decision whether an onset, an onset plus nucleus or a syllable or even more should be truncated seems arbitrary, although it is evident that one cannot delete a whole syllable from a monosyllabic source word. Gries (2006) shows that the recognizability or recoverability of the original source word or of similar lexical competitors – forms with a similar form and meaning – plays an eminent role in the selection of the cut-off point. Hamans (2010) points to Zabrocki's theory of diacrisis for an explanation. Zabrocki (1962 and 1969) expands the notion of minimal pair, he compares segments that differ in more respects than one phoneme or feature. He calls the corresponding parts of lexemes confusive segments or confusiva. For instance, the lexemes *crack* and *pack* which are not a minimal pair since the first one starts with a consonant cluster, whereas the initial segment of *pack* is only one consonant, share a confusivum *ack*. A successful blend must contain confusiva with both source words that are large enough to trigger recognition of the original form in the mind of the listener.

Since the speaker or the word coiner starts with truncation of the second source word, he is obliged to keep as much material of the second source word so that it can easily traced back to the full original. For a successful blend the confusivum should be large enough to be easily traceable. Subsequently the speaker must fill the truncated syllabic position(s) with corresponding material of the first source word. The segmental material taken from the first source word also forms a confusivum with the original source word and with similar lexical competitors. When this confusivum is not large enough to make it easily traceable the onset may be filled with more consonants or even an unparsed initial syllable may be added. Gries' (2006) metrical and statistical procedures may be useful to determine when a remaining part can easily be traced back. However, this is a matter for further psycholinguistic research just as the role of the overlap in blends such as *slanguage* from *slang* and *language*.

---

[11] Alternative segmentations may be proposed, such as *democra*tie + dicta*tuur* or *democrat*ie + dicta*tuur*. However, this does not make any difference for the argument

[12] One can also describe *anacroniem* as a blend where no truncation of a part of the second source word has taken place. In this case the empty onset of the first syllable of *acronym* is filled by the initial segment *an* from *anachronism*. The result is the same: an extra syllable is added to the blend. Truncation of a segment of the second source word is not mandatory as the examples *slanguage*, *guesstimate* and *glasphalt* discussed before show.

5 Blends as an Intermediate Category

In section 3 it is demonstrated that blends and compounds share the characteristic of the righthand part as their formal head. The head determines the grammatical properties of the blend. Insofar the concatenation of parts of two source words that results in a blend behaves as if it was a compound. In this respect there is no difference with stub compounds. However, phonologically blends cannot be described as a sort of compounds. The constituents of a compound form each a prosodic or phonological word (Booij 1995, 49). So, *bluebird* and *greenhouse* consist of two phonological words each just as *sitcom* and *midcult*. However, the constituents of a blend together form one phonological word, as shown in section 4. This phonological word is normally a copy of that of the second source words, the base of the righthand part.

Most of the second source words which pop up in blends are underived, monomorphemic thus simplex words. Consequently, most blends can also be described as simplexes from a phonological point of view. Since blends combine characteristics of compounds and of simplex words at the same time, they should be described as an intermediary category. Even blends which have a derived word as second source word do not contradict this observation. All the complex words that can act as second source word and that are presented here contain a vowel initial suffix. Such words form a single prosodic word, as Raffelsiefen (1999) demonstrated.

(19a) *-ish*
     Spangl*ish*   <   Spanish   + Engl*ish*
(19b) *-ial*
     advertor*ial*   <   advertisement + editor*ial*
(19c) *-ity*
     flexicur*ity*   <   flexible   + secur*ity*
(19d) *-er*
     compand*er*   <   compressor + expand*er*
(19e) *-ation*
     fertig*ation*   <   fertilize   + irrig*ation*

The resulting blends each form one phonological word, just as the second source word of which they are a phonological copy. In terms of word formation blends appear to behave as compounds, however from a phonological perspective they consist of only prosodic word.

6 Conclusion

-       There is an essential formal difference between AD-blends and AC-clipped compounds, stub compounds. Stub compounds are compounds of two clipped lexemes. Some of these clipped lexemes are already free morphemes.
-       Being compounds stub compounds have a righthand head and exhibit the compound stress rule.
-       Blends are also concatenations of parts of two source words. However, blends are composed of the initial or left-hand part of the first source word and the final or righthand part of the second source word. These parts are usually not free morphemes.

      - Blends also exhibit a formal righthand head, which suggests that blending is a form of compounding.

      - However, the compound stress rule does not apply to blends.

      - Blends form a single phonological word, which is a copy of the prosodic and syllabic properties of the second source word.

      - Therefore, blends can best be described as a borderline or intermediary case between compounds and simplex words, especially in the case of blends derived from a monomorphemic second source word.

References

Arndt- Lappe, Sabine and Ingo Plag (2012). *Phonological Variability in English Blends*, paper presented at the Conference "Data-Rich Approaches to English Morphology: From corpora and experiments to theory and back". Wellington New Zealand, 4-6 July 2012.

Bat-El, Outi (2006). "Blend". Keith Brown (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Elsevier: vol.2: 66-70.

Bat-El, Outi & Evan-Gary Cohen (2012). "Stress in English blends: A constraint based analysis". In: Vincent Renner, François Maniez & Pierre Arnaud (eds.), *Crossdisciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton: 193-211.

Bauer, Laurie (1983). *English word-formation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer. Laurie (2006). "Compounds and minor word-formation types". In: Bas Aarts and April McMahon (eds.), *The handbook of English linguistics.* Malden, MA: Blackwell: 483-506.

Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Liber & Ingo Plag (2013): *English Morphology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beard, Robert (1998). "Derivation". In: Andrew Spencer and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *The Handbook of Morphology.* Oxford: Blackwell: 44-65.

Booij, Geert (1995). *The Phonology of Dutch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Booij, Geert (1999). "The role of the prosodic word in phonotactic generalizations". In: T. Alan Hall and Ursula Kleinhenz (eds.), *Studies on the Phonological Word.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 47-72.

Cannon, Garland (1986). Blends in English word formation. *Linguistics* 24, 725-753.

Chomsky, Noam and Morris Halle (1968). *The Sound Pattern of English.* New York: Harper & Row.

Giegerich, Heinz J. (1985). "Metrical phonology and phonological structure – German and English". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gries, Stefan Th. (2006). "Cognitive determinants of subtractive word formation processes: A corpus-based perspective". *Linguistics* 17, 535-558.

Gries, Stefan Th. (2012). "Quantitative corpus data on blend formation: Psycho- and cognitive linguistic perspectives". In: Vincent Renner, François Maniez and Pierre Arnaud (eds.), *Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton: 145-167.

Hamans, Camiel (2010). "The productivity of blending: linguistic or cognitive? Or how to deal

with *administrivia* and *ostalgia*". In: Danuta Stanulewicz, Tadeusz Z. Wolański and Joanna Redzimska (eds.), *Lingua Terra Cognita II. A Festschrift for professor Roman Kalisz*. Gdansk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego: 467-490.

Hamans, Camiel (2012). "From prof to provo: Some observations on Dutch clippings". In: Botma, Bert & Roland Noske (eds.), *Phonological Explorations: Empirical, Theoretical and Diachronic Issues*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 25-40

Hamans, Camiel (2018a). "Between stub compounds and blends". In: Virginija Masiulionyté and Skaisté Volungevičiené (eds.), *Fremde und Eigene Sprachen. Linguistische Perspektive, Foreign Foreign and Own Languages. Linguistic Perspectives. Akten des 51 Linguistischen Kolloquiums in Vilnius, Linguistic Colloquium in Vilnius 2016.* Berlin: 353-371.

Hamans, Camiel (2018b). Between *Abi* and *Propjes*: Some remarks about clipping in English, German, Dutch and Swedish. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* [online].15, 2, 24-59, retrieved 28.02.2019, from http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL37/pdf_doc/03.pdf. ISSN 1336-782X.

Hildebrandt, Kristine A. (2015). "The Prosodic Word." In: John R. Taylor (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook on the Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 221-245.

Kelly, Michael H (1998). "To "brunch" or to "brench": Some aspects of blend structure". *Linguistics* 36, 579-590.

Pajerová, Kristina (2018). *Blends in het Nederlands. Blends in Dutch language.* (master thesis). Olomouc: Palacký University.

Peperkamp, Sharon (1997). *Prosodic Words.* (HIL dissertations 34). The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Peperkamp, Sharon (1999). "Prosodic Words." *Glot International* 4,4, 15-16.

Piñeros, Carlos E. (2000). *Word-blending as a case of non-concatenative morphology in Spanish.* ROA (Rutgers Optimality Archive), 343-0999.

Piñeros, Carlos E., (2002). *The creation of portmanteaus in the extragrammatical morphology of Spanish*. ROA (Rutgers Optimality Archive), 562-0602, also (2004). *Probus* 16,2, 203-240.

Raffelsiefen, Renate (1999). "Phonological constraints on English word formation.' *Yearbook of Morphology 1988*, 225-287.

Spencer, Andrew (1998). "Morphophonological Operations." In: Andrew Spencer and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *The Handbook of Morphology.* Oxford: Blackwell: 123-143.

Trommer, Jochen and Eva Zimmermann (2012). "Portmanteaus as generalized templates". Vincent Renner, François Maniez & Pierre Arnaud (eds.),*Crossdisciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton : 233-258.

Wurzel, Wolfgang U. (1980). "Der deutsche Wortakzent: Fakten-Regeln-Prinzipien". In: *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 3, 299-318.

Williams, Edwin (1981). "On the notions 'lexically related' and 'head of a word'." *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 245-274.

Zabrocki, Ludwik (1962). "Phon, Phonem und distinktives Morphem." *Biuletyn Fonograficzny* 5, 59-87.

Zabrocki, Ludwik (1969). "Phonologie und distinktive Morphologie." In: Al Graur et al. (eds.), *Actes du Xe Congrès International des Linguistes.* Bucharest : Editions de l'Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie. Vol. 1, 367-375.