

Motivation in unfamiliar morphological blends from names and nouns.

This paper is an attempt at investigating meaning construction in unfamiliar morphological blends within a comprehensive framework of analysis which brings together insights from structural studies (e.g. Gries 2004, Gries 2006), psycholinguistics (Lehrer 2003), pragmatics (Cacchiani 2007a), natural morphology (Thornton 1986) and the theory of naturalness (Dressler 1987, 1999) within a usage-based model which combines insights from Kemmer 2003, Langacker 1987, 1991, and Ruiz de Mendoza's 1998ff Combined Input Hypothesis.

After a preliminary discussion on the reasons for coining new blends despite their relative degree of morphotactic and (to a much lesser extent) morphosemantic complexity, and, in particular, on the need to be relevant and on the search for effectiveness. The focus will be on unfamiliar blends from nouns and names (e.g. *Appletizer* < apple + appetizer, *Governator* < governor + terminator, *Brangelina* < Brad Pitt + Angelina Jolie, *Billary* < Bill + Hillary) and serving as identificatory and descriptive nouns or names (in the sense of Anderson 2007), on the assumption that selecting nouns and names alike depends on different types of knowledge on the part of the coiner and on his/her direct or surrogate experience of the related reference. The other way round, understanding such blends depends on different types of knowledge on the part of the listener/addressee and on his/her direct or surrogate experience of the related reference. Ruiz de Mendoza's 1998ff in particular will enable us to discuss different types of (re)motivation (and expected degrees of morphosemantic complexity) within blends that would otherwise be grouped together. To take one example, different types of relations between SW₁ and SW₂ establish in blends like *Brangelina* and *Billary*, which can be motivated on the basis of conceptual integration of different relevant features selected from the source inputs. To take one example, *Brangelina* seems to be created exploiting what we might call a pre-established constructional schema (cf. Langacker 1991), or, a pre-figured schema traditionally considered to be an extremely common pattern used to identify couples in American English (Marchand 1969), viz. the morphological blend of Name(male) + Name(female). Positive connotations further attach to the couple on the basis of the underlying frames and scripts. By contrast, *Billary* could, but doesn't identify the Whitehouse couple. Rather, it is used within the relevant context to as a derogatory for Hillary Rodham Clinton, seen as an unattractive career woman, which is motivated by the speaker's social and moral evaluation of her behaviour on the basis of a set of culturally significant keywords (in the sense of Williams 1983), in turn related to a set of culturally shared values and stereotypes within the Western culture e.g. *work*, *job*, *career*, *home*, *glass-ceiling*.

- ANDERSON, J.M. 2007, *The Grammar of Names*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- ANDREWS, S., 1986, "Morphological influences on lexical access: lexical or non-lexical effects?" *Journal of Memory and Language* 25, 726-740.
- BAAYEN H., in press, "Corpus linguistics in morphology: morphological productivity".
- BURANI C., A. CARAMAZZA, 1987, "Representation and processing of derived words", *Language and Cognitive Processes* 2, 217-227.
- BISETTO A, S. SCALISE, 2005, "The classification of compounds", *Lingue e Linguaggio* 5/2, pp. 319-332.
- COLÉ P., C. BEAUVILLAIN, J. SEGUI, 1989, "On the representation and processing of prefixed and suffixed derived words: a differential frequency effect", *Journal of Memory and Language* 28, 1-13.
- DRESSLER W.U. *et al.*, 1987, *Leitmotifs in Natural Morphology*, Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- DRESSLER W.U., 1999, "What is *natural* in Natural Morphology (NM)?" *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 3, 135-144.
- GRIES S.Th., 2004, "Shouldn't it be *breakfunch*? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English", in M. Achard and S. Kemmer (eds), *Language, Culture and Mind*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, pp. 415-428.
- GRIES S.Th., 2006, "Cognitive determinants of subtractive word formation: a corpus-based perspective", *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17 (4), 535-558.
- KEMMER S., 2003, "Schemas and lexical blends", in T. Berg *et al.* (eds), *Motivation in Language: From Case Grammar to Cognitive Linguistics. A Festschrift für Gunter Radden*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 69-97.
- LANGACKER, R.W., 1987, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- LANGACKER, R.W., 1991, *Concept, Image, and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- LEHRER A., 2003, "Understanding trendy neologisms", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 15 (2), pp. 369-382.
- LEHRER A., 2008, "Blendalicious", in J. Munat (ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Text and Context*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 115-133.
- MARCHAND H., 1969, *The Categories and Types of Present Day English Word-Formation*, Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA F.J., 1998, "On the nature of blending as a cognitive phenomenon", *Journal of Pragmatics* 30/3. 259-274.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA, F.J., O. DIEZ, 2002. Patterns of conceptual interaction. In *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, R. Dirven and R. Pörings (eds), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 489-532.
- RYDER M.E., 1994, *Ordered Chaos. The Interpretation of English Noun-Noun Compounds*, Berkeley, University of California.
- SPERBER D., D. WILSON, 1986, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- ŠTECKAUER P., 2005, *Meaning Predictability in Word Formation. Novel, Context-free Naming Units*, Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- STEIN G., 2007, *A Dictionary of English affixes: Their function and meaning*, LINCOM Europa, München.
- TAFT M., 1979, "Recognition of affixed words and the word-frequency effect", *Memory and Cognition* 7, 263-272.
- WILLIAMS R., 1976/83, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana Press, London.