

Blending in Arabic and English

Wi'am Majeed Mohammed

Al- Qassim Green University / College of Agriculture

ameeraljubawii @ yahoo . com

Abstract

This paper describes the word-formation process of blending in Arabic and English in order to point out the similarities and differences involved in the usage of such a process. It concludes that this process functions in similar ways in the two languages, though it has a wider application in English than Arabic. Another important conclusion is that in Arabic a blend may involve the contraction of three, four, or five words or even a whole sentence; whereas it is largely limited to the fusion of two successive words in English.

Key words : word-formation , blending , contrastive study .

الخلاصه

يتناول البحث واحدة من اهم عمليات تشكيل الكلمات الا وهي المزج في دراسه مقارنه في اللغتين العربيه والانكليزيه من اجل اظهار مدى التشابه والاختلاف في الاستخدام في كلا اللغتين ، وقد اظهرت النتائج ان عمليه المزج هي اكثر استخداما وتطبيقا في اللغه الانكليزيه عما هي عليه في اللغه العربيه ، كما وظهرت النتائج بان المزج في اللغه العربيه يمكن ان يشمل ثلاث اواربع او خمس كلمات او حتى مزج جمله كامله كما في الحوقله بينما في اللغه الانكليزيه تقتصر عمليه المزج على كلمتين فقط .

الكلمات مفتاحيه : تشكيل الكلمات ، مزج ، دراسه مقارنه .

1. Blending in Arabic

1.2 Definition

Scholars of *Classical Arabic Grammar* use the term (النَّحْت) "al-naht" for the word-formation process of blending; which means "carving that involves slicing, sharpening, and cutting" (ابن منظور ، ١٩٨٠). A recent term for blending is that of (الإشتقاق الكَبَّار), i.e. "the magnifying derivation" (أمين، 1949 : ٣٩١). Al-Khalīl's definition for this linguistic phenomenon is: "the obtaining of a word from two successive words and the derivation of a verb from it" (الخليل: ١٩٨٠، I. 60). A wider definition is offered by al-Mūsā who describes it as "the formation of a new word from two or more than two words to the effect that the new word takes some phonic feature from them all, and denotes them all in meaning" (الموسى ، ١٤٠٥ AH : ٦٧).

1.3 History

Blending in Arabic was first described by the great Arab linguist al-Khalīl bin Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī in his lexicon "العَيْن". This accomplished grammarian, lexicologist, phonetician, and prosodist lived in Basra during the ninth century AD, and died in (175 AH). The example he offers for blending in Arabic is the derivation of the noun (حَيَّ عَلَى) and the verbs (حَيَّلَ / يُحَيِّلُ) from the two words (حَيَّ عَلَى). Another example is (لَنْ)، derived by blending (لَا) with (أَنْ) (الخليل / العين). He also defines the function of such a process as being 'economy'. Other Medieval linguists of classical Arabic follow suit. For example, al-Farrā' describes the nominal verb (هَلَّمَ) as being a blend of (هَلَّ) plus (أَمَّ) (الفراء ، معاني القرآن ، ١٩٥٥ : 719).

A much wider approach to blending is adopted by Ibin Fāris (died: 395 AH) who maintains that the majority of Arabic lexical items whose basic structure exceeds three phonemes are blends. In his book (معجم) مقاييس اللغة (١٣٦٦ AH: 253), i.e. "Lexicon of the Standards of the Language":

"إعلم أنّ للرباعي و الخماسي مذهباً في القياس، يستنبطه النظر الدقيق؛ وذلك أنّ أكثر ما تراه منه منحوت." Know that the quadriliteral and the quinqueliteral have a way of measurement which can be deduced by fine contemplation in that the majority of these words are blends. In his book, (132: الصاحبى فى فقه اللغة), Ibnu Fāris elaborates by saying:

"العرب تتحت من كلمتين كلمة واحدة ، وهو جنس من الاختصار... و هذا مذهبنا فى أنّ الأشياء الزائدة على ثلاثة أحرف فأكثرها منحوت. مثل قول العرب للرجل الشديد "ضَبَطَر" من ضَبَطَ و ضَبَّرَ" Arabs blend from two words one word, which is one type of abbreviation. It is in our opinion that elements that exceed three phonemes are in their majority blends, such as when the Arabs call a tough person (ضَيِّطَر), from (ضَبَطَ) and (ضَبَّرَ).

In this respect, the great Arab linguist and folklorist, al-Jāhidh (died 255 AH) - eight centuries before Carl Lewis (Cf. section 23) - makes use of exotic blends in Arabic for the presentation of witty parables and funny anecdotes:

... عن أبي عبد الرحمن الثوري، إذ قال لابنه: "...أي بني، إنما صار تأويل الدرهم، دار الهم، و تأويل الدينار، يدني إلى النار". ومنه: "كان عبد الأعلى إذا قيل له: لم سمي الكلب سلوقيا؟ قال: لأنه يستل و يلقى، وإذا قيل له: لم سمي العصفور عصفوراً؟ قال: لأنه عصى و فرّ."

Abī Abdul-Rahmān al-Thawrī was quoted saying to his son, "Lo son: the true meaning of (الدرهم) - "dirham" = a shilling-like silver coin - is (دار الهم): "dārulham: the house of distress"; and the true meaning of (الدينار) - addinār = a guinea-like gold coin - is (يدني إلى النار), i.e. "yudnī ilannār = brings closer to hell". Similar to this were the words of Abdul A'lā who was asked: "Why was (الكلب) "the dog" called (سلوقي) "salūkī = a hunting dog"? He answered: "Because it (يستل) "yastallu = sneaks" and (يلقى) "yalqā = finds". "Why was (العصفور) = al-'uṣṣūr, the sparrow) called a sparrow?" Because it (عصى) "aṣā = revolted" and (فرّ) "farr = escaped".

(الجاحظ، البخلاء، ١٩٦٨ : ١٠٦)

Spoken blends in Classical Arabic remained limited to a few fixed utterances – mostly religious and relational – whose rules of formation allow no analogy. However, the rise in modern times of the need to coin new terms in the language led to the revival of this word-formation process, and to the creation of many new blends, which soon gained a wide acceptance (البطائنة، ١٩٩٩ : ١٢١). Thus Modern Arabic has now such new coinages as (برمائي)، (قروسطي)، and (متشائل). The last word is a blend from "متشائم" and "متفائل", denoting a combination of a degree of pessimism plus optimism at the same time, and is the title of a novel by the Palestinian novelist Emīl Ḥabībī (1974). Another admirable example is the blend (مشلوز) in reference to a kind of apricot (مشمش) whose kernel is as sweet as almonds (لوز) (68: ١٤١٢AH (مجاهد).

Such a tendency did not go on without opposition by certain scholars who noted that the absence of standard rules for blending could lead to confusion. The two prominent figures who led the campaign of opposition to blends were Reverend Anastās Mārī al-Karmalī and Mustafā Jawād. Al-Karmalī held the view that (266 : ١٩٧٦، الصالح):

أن لغتنا ليست من اللغات التي تقبل النحت على وجه لغات أهل الغرب كما هو مدوّن في مصنفاتها .
و المنحوتات عندنا عشرات، أمّا عندهم فمئات، بل ألوف، لأنّ تقديم المضاف إليه على المضاف معروفة
عندهم، فساغ لهم النحت. أما عندنا فاللغة تأباه وتعتبراً منه .

Our language (i.e. Arabic) is not one of the languages that accepts blending in the way the Western languages do as their lexicons show. Blends in Arabic are tens in number whereas those languages have hundreds or thousands of them because the pospositioning of the *annexing* element in relation to the *annexed* element is common in their language, so they allow blending; whereas it is disallowed and rejected in our language.

Despite such opposition, native speakers of Arabic continue coining new blends all the time, especially in colloquial speech, where we find such common words as (أشئو/أشئني/ شئو / شنو), a blend from (أي شيء) and (هو); (لسنا), from (إلى) and (هذه الساعة); and (هلق/ دلوقت) from (هذا) and (الوقت). One quite productive blends are those beginning with (أيش/شو/ شـ), from (أي شيء) which itself can function as a prefix for further blends as in (شوقت), (شلون), (شقد), (شصار/شو صار), (شعجب), and (شكو). This tendency can be explained by the fact that blends serve the two important functions of *economy* (the law of the least effort) and *the presentation of new shades of meaning*. The former important function has led one prominent scholar of Modern Arabic, al-Ghalayeeni (19٢٠, I. 226), to point out:

فكل ما أمكنك فيه الإختصار جاز نحتة.و العصر الحاضر يحملنا على تجويز ذلك و التوسع فيه .

So, whatever you can abbreviate in (its form) is allowed to be blended. The current age makes us allow it and widen it.

1.4 Types

1.4.1 Functional Categories

1.4.1.1 Verbal Blends

In such a type, a single verb is coined from a whole sentence to denote either its utterance by someone, or the occurrence of its meaning (بلاسي ، ١٩٩٩ : ٢٧٩).

(1)

جَعَفَدَ → جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ .

بَسْمَلٌ → بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ .

هَيْلَلٌ → لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ .

حَسْبَلٌ → حَسْبِيَ اللَّهُ .

سَبَحَلٌ → سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ .

سَمَعَلٌ → السَّلَامُ عَلَيْكُمْ .

طَلْبِقٌ → أَطَالَ اللَّهُ بِقَاعِكَ .

دَمَعَزٌ → أَدَامَ اللَّهُ عَزْكَ .

1.4.1.2 Adjectival Blends

In this type, a new single adjective is coined from two words to intensify their attributive load or to denote a new attribute (العلايلي ، ١٩٢٠ ، II : ٢٢٥).

(2)

ضَبْطَرٌ → ضَبْرٌ + ضَبْطٌ

الصَّدْمُ → الصَّدْمُ + الصَّلْدُ

1.4.1.3 Nominal Blends

This type allows the derivation of a new noun from two words.

(3)

جلمود → جمد + جلد

حبقر → قر + حب

ماهيّة → ما هو

تلاشي → لا شىء

1.4.1.4 Relational Blends

These blends are used in reference to persons who follow a doctrine related to two different schools of thought, or a resident of two provinces (Wright, 2005: I. 162).

(4)

طبرخزيّ → طبرستان + خوارزم

شفعتيّ → الشافعي + أبو حنيفة

حنفلتيّ → أبو حنيفة + المعتزلة

حضرميّ → حضرموت

رسعنيّ → رأس العين

بنزرقيّ → أزرق + بنيّ

تيمليّ → تيم اللات

1.4.1.5 Functional Word Blends

New functional words (i.e. particles) are derived by blending two existing functional words (السامرائي، ٢٠٠٣ : ٢٨٢).

(5)

لكنّ → لا كان

1.4.1.6 Eliding Blends

A large number of blends were coined for the purpose of elision, especially in reference to tribes whose names begin with (بني), i.e. 'sons of':

(6)

بلعبرّ → بني العنبر

بلخزرجّ → بني الخزرج

بلحارثّ → بني الحارث

The same process is used in reference to members of tribes whose names are compounds, especially those beginning with (عبد) (Wright, 2005: I. 162):

(7)

عبقسيّ → عبد قيس

عبنشميّ → عبد شمس

عبدريّ → عبد الدار

مرقسبيّ → إمريء القيس

ننونيّ → نو النون

1.4.1.7 Borrowed Blends

An increasing number of new blends in Modern Arabic are borrowed from blends that are found in other languages, especially English:

(8)

أوراسيا = Eurasia

البنزوكيمياويات = petrochemicals

الإيميل = email ; e-mail

الأفروآسيوي = Afro-Asian

الأنغلو سكسوني = Anglo-Saxon

1.4.2 Quantitative Taxonomy

Another way of classifying blends in Arabic is to take the total number of blended words as the criterial feature in the taxonomy. Four groups of such words are recognizable: two-word blends, three-word blends, four-word blends, and longer blends (الصالح ، ١٩٧٦ : ٢٤٩).

(9)

جَعْفَد → جُعِلت فداك (Two-Word Blends)

حَيْعَل → حَيَّ على الفلاح (Three-Word Blends)

مُحْبَرَم → ماء حب الرمان (Three-Word Blends)

بَسْمَل → بِسْم الله الرحمن الرحيم (Four-Word Blends)

حَوَلِق or حَوَقَل → لا حول و لا قوة إلا بالله العظيم (Longer Blends)

2. Blending in English

2.1 Introduction

The present age of information is in constant need of new words in all languages. To meet such a need, English has acquired new words by borrowing words from every other language that it has been in contact with. Apart from borrowing, English has many other ways of acquiring new words. One of the ways is blending in which two or more forms are combined by clipping and/or overlapping. Two well known blends are the words *smog* and *brunch* (Gries, 2004: 639).

2.2 Definition

A blend is any new word which is formed by fusing together elements from two other words. The meaning of the new word shares or combines the meanings of the source words. The elements are normally the beginning of one and the end of the other (Yule, 1985: 53). An example is **Oxbridge**, which is formed by putting together the first part of *Oxford* and the last part of *Cambridge* to form a new inclusive term for both universities (**Camford** also exists, but it is less common).

This process in lexical construction allows two lexical items – that do not normally co-occur according to the rules of the language – to come together within a single linguistic unit. In lexis, blending is a common source of new words, though not all becoming standard: **Interpol**, **Eurovision** (Crystal, 1997: 40).

Blending involves shortening which can take the form of a simple omission of a part of one or more words, or it can be the result of overlapping sounds or letters (Algeo, 1977: 47). Thus, the coinage of a new lexeme is done by fusing parts of at least two other source words of which either one is shortened in the fusion and/or where there is some form of phonemic or graphemic overlap of the source words (Gries, 2004: 639).

The modern usage of *blend* as a technical term among lexicologists is quite strict and many words which might be thought to be blends, such as *keypad*, *paintball* or *townhouse*, are instead regarded as compounds because the elements being put together are words in their own right. Terms like *megastore* or *hypertext* are also called compounds, because they are combinations of free-standing words with prefixes or suffixes (Stekauer, 1991: 26). So **faction** is a blend, because it combines

parts of the words *fact* and *fiction* into one, but *factoid*, 'a spurious or questionable fact', is not a blend but a compound because the second element is a suffix and does not derive from some word which happens to end in *-oid*. Some other formations - examples are *kidvid* and *nicad* - are frequently called *clipped compounds* rather than blends because the combining elements both come from the beginnings of words (*kid* + *video*, *nickel* + *cadmium*), rather than the beginning of one and the end of another (*ibid.*).

The terminology is complicated by a subsidiary process in which blends can give rise to new prefixes and suffixes which then affect the classification of later creations. An early example is the word **motorcade**, formed as a blend of *motor* and *cavalcade*, which created a new suffix *~cade* that has been used in words like *aerocade*, *aquacade* and even *camelcade* and *tractorcade*. More recent examples of such formations are taken to be compounds with this suffix, rather than blends with *cavalcade*. Similarly, the prefix *info-* deriving from *information* has become heavily used in terms such as *infoglut*, *infobahn*, *infodump* and *infonaut*; it is difficult to argue that all these are blends. Other examples are *cyber~* (created from *cybernetics*), *~thon* (from *marathon*, used first in *telethon* and now in words like *preachathon*, *operathon* and *stripperthon*); *~gate* (from *Watergate*.); *mini~*, *maxi~* and others (SOED, 2003).

2.3 History

An older term for blending technique is *portmanteau word*, which was coined by Lewis Carroll (1872) in *Alice Through the Looking Glass* to explain some of the words he made up in the nonsense poem 'Jabberwocky':

(10)

Well 'slithy' means 'lith and slimy' ... you see it's like a portmanteau - there are two meanings packed up into one word.

This term *portmanteau* is derived from the French term for a large stiff carrying case for clothes, which is hinged in the middle so that it falls open into two halves. Though many of Carroll's inventions didn't survive, a couple have become part of the language: **galumph** (*gallop* + *triumph*), and **chortle** (*chuckle* + *snort*). His term **mimsy** (*flimsy* + *miserable*) already existed in the language, but his re-definition of it has certainly affected the sense.

According to the citations provided by SOED (2003), a few such terms existed before Carroll made his inspired series of inventions: **anecdote** (*anecdote* combined with *dotage* to suggest a garrulous old age, first recorded in 1823); **squirrel** (a blend of *squiggle* and *whirl* to describe a flourish, as in handwriting, from 1843); **snivelization**, coined by Herman Melville in 1849 from *snivel* and *civilization* as a term for 'civilization considered derisively as a cause of anxiety or plaintiveness'; **squdge** (*squash* + *pudge*) dates from 1870. Some writers have suggested that there may be older examples in the language: for example, **bash** may be a blend of *bang* and *smash* and **clash** of *clang* and *crash*, but most of the candidate words are so ancient that their origins are obscure.

According to Quinion (1996: 18) a fashion for such formations began in the 1890s, perhaps influenced by Carroll, leading to an increased rate of blend-formation. As examples: **electrocute** (a blend of *electricity* and *execute*) first appeared in 1889; **prissy** (blending *prim* and *sissy*) was coined about 1895; **brunch** (*breakfast* taken nearly at *lunchtime*), first recorded in 1896; **travelogue** (*travel* + *monologue*), 1903; **mingy** (*mean* and *stingy*), from 1911; **scientifiction** (invented by Hugo Gernsback in 1916 as a blend of *science* and *fiction*); **motel** (a *motor hotel*, originally a trade name from 1925); **sexpert** (an *expert* on *sex*, 1924); **sexational** (*sex* + *sensational*, 1925); **ambisexual** (a coinage from *ambidextrous* and *sex* dating from 1929); **Jacobethan**

(*Jacobean + Elizabethan*, invented by John Betjeman in 1933); **guesstimate** (*guess + estimate*, dating from 1936); **sexploitation** (the *exploitation* of *sex* in films, first used about 1942).

A number of blends describe a language which has been heavily influenced by English: **Franglais** was an early example (French which has become corrupted by the influx of English words such as *le weekend*), **Spanglish** is Latin American Spanish containing English expressions like *el gasfitter*; **Japlish** is Japanese in which English words such as *salaryman* are imported. Other examples are **Swedlish**, **Anglicaans**, **Wenglish** (*Welsh + English*), **mockney**, a form of *mock Cockney* employed particularly by some British pop stars, and **Texican** (*Texas plus Mexican*). In another aspect, there is **slanguage**, a blend of *slang* and *language* (Wikipedia, 2008).

Many blends have been created in recent years as names for new forms of exercise regimes, many of them trade names: **Aquarobics**, **Callanetics** (the first name of *Callan Pinckney* blended with *athletics*, probably after the model of *callisthenics*), **Jazzercise** (*jazz + exercise*), **aquacise**, **dancercise**, **sexercise**, and **slimnastics**. Among sports there are terms like **parascending** (*parachute + ascending*) and **surfari**, and nonce adjectives such as **sportsational** or **swimsational** which blend words with the last element of *sensational*.

The media, advertising and show business have been responsible for an especially large number of blends: **advertorial** (an *advertisement* written as though it were an *editorial*); **docutainment** (a *documentary* written as *entertainment*, with variable felicity concerning actual events), which is also known as a *dramadoc*, from *dramatised documentary*, though this is a clipped compound, not a blend); an **infomercial** is a television *commercial* in the form of an *information* announcement; **infotainment** is a blend, in reality as well as etymology, of *information* and *entertainment*; a **magalogue** is a cross between a *magazine* and a *catalogue*; a **televangelist** is a *television evangelist*. A number of temporary or nonce formations using the quasi-suffix *-tainment* have appeared recently: **transportainment** is leisure transport in a theme park; **disinfotainment** is the presentation of misleading information in the guise of entertainment; **eatertainment** relates to the fashionable type of restaurant-with-entertainment exemplified by Planet Hollywood; **utilitainment** was coined not long ago by a maker of computer screen-savers as a term for their product. Also from the entertainment field we have **animatronics** (a blend of *animated* and *electronics*), **camcorder** (*camera + recorder*), **rockumentary** (a *rock documentary*) and, for a while in Britain, **squarial** (a *square aerial*, used to receive satellite television signals) (ibid).

Politics and the economy have a fair representation in the list. There are now such blends as **Clintonomics**, **Reaganomics**, and **Rogernomics** which all combine the name of a political figure with the word *economics*. In similar vein are **stagflation**, a near-disastrous combination of *stagnation* and *inflation*, and **slumpflation** (*slump + inflation*) (SOED, 2003).

Science and technology has been responsible for large numbers of new blends. Some well-established ones are **transistor** (*transfer + resistor*), **Chunnel** (*Channel + tunnel*), **smog** (*smoke + fog*); **nucleonics** (*nucleon + electronics*), and **transputer** (*transistor + computer*). However, there is a set of new scientific words which fall somewhere in the same territory as blends but which also could also be said to look like extended abbreviations or acronyms. An excellent example is **amphetamine**, which comes from its full chemical name of *alpha methyl phenyl ethyl amine*. Such creative mangling of names is now common when making up the vast number of trade and generic names needed for new drugs: **zidovudine**, the generic name of the AIDS

drug AZT, is formed from *azidodeoxythymidine* with the letters *vu* inserted for no obvious reason; **ranitidine**, used to treat stomach ulcers and better known by its trade name Zantac, is *furan* + *nitro* + *-itidine* (Quinion, 1996: 20-1).

2.4 Types of Blends

The next sections describe different types of blends and their structure. It will also discuss the different systematic categories of blends. Structurally, blends can be divided into three different types: blends with overlapping, blends with clipping, and blends with clipping and overlapping. Systematically, blends are either syntagmatic or associative (Gries, 2004: 646).

2.4.1 Blends with Overlapping

Overlapping in these blends might take place with overlapping as the only type of shortening of the words. The most common pattern is the one where the final part of the first word overlaps the first part of the second word. The overlap can be one phoneme or several. One example of this is **slanguage** from *slang* and *language*. Blends with overlapping may also include all of one form and the first or last part of the other word. In those cases it is the spelling of the word that tells us it is a blend:

(11)

Sinema "adult film" = *sin* + *cinema*

Celebrity "famous criminal" = *cell* + *celebrity*

Cartune "musical cartoon" = *cartoon* + *tune*

There is one type of overlapping blend that is not very common. In such blends one form is inserted into another; the overlapping might be complete or partial. **In-sin-uation** for example, meaning *insinuation* of *sin*, is created by a fusion of the two words *insinuation* and *sin* (Algeo 1977: 49). In such words, it is the inserted element that is stressed.

2.4.2 Blends with Clipping

Blends with clipping have no overlapping. Instead one part or more is omitted. There are different patterns that are used when creating these kinds of blends. One is to keep the whole part of the first word and the last part of the second word (Wikipedia, 2008).

(12)

Foodoholic = *food* + *alcoholic*

Fanzine = *fan* + *magazine*

Another alternative is to keep the whole second word and only use the first part of the first word.

(13)

Eurasia = *Europe* + *Asia*

When both words are clipped it is common to use the first part of the first word and the last part of the second part. Two widely used blends are examples of this combination:

(14)

Brunch = *breakfast* + *lunch*

Smog = *smoke* + *fog*

A fourth alternative is to combine the first parts of both or all elements.

(15)

Agitprop = *agitation* + *propaganda*

Aldehyde = *alcohol* + *dehydrogenatum*

Algeo believes that acronyms belong to this class of blends rather than being a separate type of word-formation (Algeo, 1977: 50).

2.4.3 Clipping at Morpheme Boundaries

Blends that have been created by simple clipping are often shortened at morpheme boundaries. **Oxbridge** is an example of this. In cases like **Oxbridge**, it can be difficult to decide if the word results from blending or from compounding if one does not know its background. Blends that are clipped at morpheme boundaries are therefore a less obvious example of the blending process than blends that are shortened in a less straightforward manner.

Blending can turn into compounding as in the example of **landscape**; a word that has been borrowed from Dutch, and it is used to create new blends: *cityscape*, *inscape*, *offscape* and more. Even the single word *scape* has been created from the word *landscape*. Because of this, any new word that is formed using the morpheme *scape* can no longer be seen as a blend but a compound.

Blending can also give new meaning to morphemes. The blends *radiocast*, *telecast*, *sportscast* and *newscast* have given the word *cast* the meaning of *broadcast* (Algeo, 1977: 51-52).

2.4.4 Blends with Clipping and Overlapping

Some blends are created by using both clipping and overlapping. There are many variations of patterns to this word-formation. The words that follow are some examples.

(16)

Californication = *California* + *fornicate*

Suspose = *suspect* + *suppose*

Hungarican = *Hungarian* + *American*

Motel = *Motor* + *hotel* (Algeo, 1977: 52)

2.5 Systematic Categories

Blends can be described in terms of distinguishing features as seen above, but there is also another way to distinguish them: they can be classified according to whether they are syntagmatic or associative.

Syntagmatic blends are blends that represent combinations of words that occur next to one another in the speech chain. Although normally regarded as blends, they could equally be seen as contractions. In most of these cases the first word ends with the same sound or sequence of sounds as the second word begins with (Gries, 2004: 647-8).

(17)

Chicagorilla = *Chicago* + *gorilla*

Radarange = *radar* + *range*

However, syntagmatic blends do not need to be haplologistic, i.e. the dropping of two consecutive morphs of identical or similar form (Trask, 1993: 125). Some reflect both clipping of one or both forms, some overlapping, and some both processes. The following two blends are examples of syntagmatic blends:

(18)

Amerindian = *American* + *Indian*

Hashbury = *Haight* + *Ashbury*

Associative blends, by contrast, are created from words that are linked in the word-maker's mind. The words can share a common base morpheme or affix, or they might be similar in sound. They can also have a semantic link, which is most common. The clearest examples of associative blends are those which are made by combining synonyms:

(19)

Bonk = *bump* + *conk*

Swellegant = *swell* + *elegant*

Needcessity = *need* + *necessity*

Shill = *shiver* + *chill*

When words that belong to the same paradigmatic class, but are not synonyms, are combined into a blend, the result is sometimes called a *dvandva* blend (a term from Sanskrit grammar). *Smog* from the words *smoke* and *fog* is an example of a *dvandva* blend. Synonymic and *dvandva* blends are similar because the words can replace each other. It is possible to use *bumped*, *conked* and *bonked* in the same place in a sentence and with the same meaning.

These blends are called paradigmatic blends. A blend whose source words are associated with each other but are not interchangeable is called a **jumble**. *Foodoholic* from *food* and *alcoholic* is one example of a jumble (Algeo, 1977: 55-58).

The forms of all the examples above show that the phonological properties, rather than morphological ones, are highly relevant to the blending process since the phonological similarity of the blend with part or whole source words increases the likelihood or felicity of the blend (Kemmer, 2003: 75).

3. *Contrastive Analysis*

The brief description of the manifestations of blending in Arabic and English allows listing the following points:

I. Similarities

1. Blending is found in both of the two languages under study, probably as a manifestation of the universal trend by language speakers to opt for economy in speech.
2. In all cases, this process involves a certain phonemic contraction in the new coinages.
3. In many cases, new blends may also involve some type of phonemic overlap between the two source words.
4. In some cases, the phonemic change in the root words is so great to the effect that the blend becomes unanalyzable as such.
5. There are examples of borrowed blends in both languages.
6. In both languages, blends can function as nouns, verbs, or adjectives.

II. Differences

1. Blending is a more frequent and productive word-formation process in English than in Arabic. This is one manifestation of the fact that English accepts a faster and a greater change than Arabic.
2. Blends in Arabic can involve the fusion of two, three, four, or more words. It can also involve whole sentences. In English, only the word process of acronymy can involve so many words.
3. Most blends in Arabic are relational, phatic, or reported speech of religious or traditional utterances. Such specialization does not obtain in English, whose inventory of blends covers a wider semantic distribution.
4. Certain function words (i.e. grammatical words) are blends in Arabic. Such blends are not described in the literature of English function words.

4. *Summary and Conclusions*

A blend involves the telescoping of two or more separate word-forms into one, or, rarely, a superposition of one form upon another. It usually contains overlapping phonemes and preserves some of the meaning of at least one of the source words, though sometimes so much of the roots are lost that a blend is unanalyzable.

As a process of new word-formation, blending is found in both Arabic and English. It has a wider use in English than Arabic. The English language is constantly changing at a much quicker pace than Arabic.

Arabic References

- الألويسي ، محمود شكري (١٤٠٩ هـ) كتاب النحت وبيان حقيقته ونبذة من قواعده . تحقيق وشرح محمد بهجة الأثري ، بغداد: مطبعة المجمع العلمي العراقي.
- ابن فارس ، (1366 هـ) معجم مقاييس اللغة . تحقيق عبد السلام هارون . القاهرة : دار إحياء الكتب العربية .
- ابن منظور ، أبو الفضل محمد بن مكرم (١٩٥٥-١٩٥٧ م) لسان العرب . بيروت : دار صادر .
- أبو سكين ، إبراهيم محمد (1404 هـ) فقه اللغة . دمشق : مطبعة الأمانة .
- أمين ، عبد الله (١٩٤٩ م) الاشتقاق . القاهرة : مطبعة البابي الحلبي .
- بلاسي ، محمد السيد علي (١٩٩٩ م) النحت في اللغة العربية . «اللسان العربي» ، العدد: ٤٧ ، يونيو .
- البطاينة ، فارس فندي (١٩٩٩ م) النحت بين مؤيديه ومعارضيه . مجلة اللسان العربي ، العدد: 34 .
- الجاحظ ، أبو عثمان عمرو بن بحر (1958 م) البخلاء . تحقيق طه الحاجري ، القاهرة : دار المعارف بمصر .
- جرجس ، رمسيس (1961 م) النحت في العربية . القاهرة : مجلة مجمع اللغة العربية بالقاهرة : العدد- 61 (13 (76).
- الخليل بن أحمد الفراهيدي (١٩٨٠ م) العين . تحقيق الدكتور مهدي المخزومي والدكتور إبراهيم السامرائي ، بغداد : دار الرشيد .
- الداوولي ، فتحي أنور (1406 هـ) الاشتقاق عند اللغويين . ، القاهرة : مجلة كلية اللغة العربية بالقاهرة ، العدد الخامس .
- السامرائي ، فاضل صالح (٢٠٠٣ م) معاني النحو . عمان : الدار الفكر للطباعة و النشر والتوزيع . ط ٢ .
- السيوطي ، جلال الدين (١٩٥٨ م) المزهر في علوم اللغة . شرحه وضبطه: محمد أحمد جاد المولى وآخرون ، القاهرة : دار إحياء الكتب العربية.
- الصالح ، صبحي (١٩٧٦ م) دراسات في فقه اللغة . بيروت : دار العلم للملايين ، ط ٦ .
- الغلابيني ، مصطفى (١٩٢٠ م) جامع الدروس العربية . بيروت : دار الفكر العربي .
- مجاهد ، عبد الكريم (1412 هـ) النحت في العربية . الرياض: مجلة الفيصل : العدد 56 .
- الموسى ، نهاد (1405 هـ) كتاب النحت في اللغة العربية . الرياض : دار العلوم للطباعة ، ط ١ .
- مينايجيان ، كيفورك (١٩٩٥ م) النحت قديما وحديثا . مجلة اللسان العربي : العدد التاسع ، الجزء الأول .
- يعقوب ، إميل بديع (١٩٨٢ م) فقه اللغة العربية وخصائصها . دار العلم للملايين ، بيروت .

English References

- Adams, Valerie (1973) *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.
- Akmajian, Adrian; Demers, Richard A.; Farmer, Ann K.; and Harnish, Robert M. (1995 [1984]). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication, 4th ed.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Algeo, John (1977) Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech*. 52, 47–64.
- Bauer, Laurie (1983) *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berg, Thomas (1989) On the internal structure of polysyllabic monomorphemic words: the case for superrimes. *Studia Linguistica*. 43, 5–32.

- Bergstrom, Gustav Adolf (1906) *On Blendings of Synonymous or Cognate Expressions in English*. Lund: Hakan Ohlsson.
- Bryant, Margaret M. (1974) Blends are increasing. *American Speech*. 49, 163–184.
- Cannon, Garland (1986) Blends in English word formation. *Linguistics*. 24, 725–753.
- Clark, V. P., Eschholz, A.F. and Rosa, A.F. (eds.) (1994) *Language: Introductory Readings*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Crystal, David (1997) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (4th ed.) London: Blackwell.
- Cutler, Anne; Hawkins, John A.; and Gilligan, Gary (1985) The suffixing preference: A processing explanation. *Linguistics*. 23, 723–758.
- Dictionary.com. [Online] Available at <http://dictionary.reference.com/> (accessed November 15, 2008).
- Enarsson, Anna (2006) *New Blends in the English Language*. Engelska C-uppsats Termin: Höstterminen.
- Eye, Alexander von (1990) *Introduction to Configural Frequency Analysis: The Search for Types and Antitypes in Cross-Classifications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Francis, N.W. (1994) Word-making: Some sources of new-words. In Clark, Eschholz and Rosa (eds.), 368 – 382.
- Google. [Online] Available at <http://www.google.se> (accessed November 15, 2008).
- Gries, S. T. (2004) Shouldn't it be breakfunch? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English. *Linguistics*. (42) 3: 639-667.
- (2008) Some characteristics of English morphological blends. In *Papers from the 38th meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society: The Panels, Mary Andronis* (eds.) Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Irwin, Betty J. (1939) Trends in blends. *American Speech*. 54, 284.
- Kaunisto, Mark (2000) Relations and proportions in the formation of blend words. *Conference handbook, Fourth Conference of the International Quantitative Linguistics Association* (Qualico) Prague, August 24–26.
- Kelly, Michael H. (1998) To 'brunch' or to 'brench': some aspects of blend structure. *Linguistics*. 36, 579–590.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (2003) Schemas and lexical blends. In *Motivation in Language: From Case Grammar to Cognitive Linguistics. A Festschrift for Gunter Radden*. Thomas Berg (ed.), 69–97. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Kubozono, Haruo (1990) Phonological constraints on blending in English as a case for phonology–morphology interface. *Yearbook of Morphology*. 3, 1–20.
- Laubstein, Ann Stuart (1999) Lemmas and lexemes: the evidence from blends. *Brain and Language*. 68, 135–143.
- Ljung, M. (2003) *Making words in English*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- MacKay, Donald G. (1973) Complexity in output systems: evidence from behavioral hybrids. *American Journal of Psychology*. 86, 785–806.
- (1987) *The Organization of Perception and Action: A Theory for Language and Other Cognitive Skills*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Murray, Thomas (1995) *The Structure of English: Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Noteboom, Sieb G. (1981) Lexical retrieval from fragments of spoken words: Beginnings vs. endings. *Journal of Phonetics*. 9, 407–424.
- Pound, Louise (1914) *Blends: Their Relation to English Word Formation*. Heidelberg: Winter.

- Quinion, Michael (1996) *World Wide Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. (SOED) (2003) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stekauer, Pavol (1991) On some issues of blending in English word-formation. *Linguistica Pragensia*. 1, 26–35.
- Trask, R. L. (1993) *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Tversky, Amos (1977) Features of similarity. *Psychological Review*. 84, 327–352.
- Yule, George (1985) *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wikipedia. *List of Portmanteaux*. [Online] Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_portmanteaux (accessed November 6, 2008).
- Wright, W. (2005) *A Grammar of Arabic*. (3rd ed.) New York: Dover Publications, INC.