Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 56s1 (2021): 659–691
doi: 10.2478/stap-2021-0009

A LESSON FOR COVIDIOTS[1,2] ABOUT SOME CONTACT INDUCED BORROWING OF AMERICAN ENGLISH MORPHOLOGICAL PROCESSES INTO DUTCH

CAMIEL HAMANS[3]

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses morphological borrowing from American-English to Dutch. Three processes of non-morphemic word formation are studied: embellished clipping (*Afro* from *African*), libfixing (extracting segments from opaque wordforms such *-topia* from *utopia* and *-(po)calypse* from *apocalypse*) and blending (*stagflation* < *stagnation* + *inflation*). It will be shown that the borrowing of these processes started with borrowing of English lexical material followed by a process of reinterpretation, which subsequently led to the (re-)introduction of the processes in Dutch. Therefore, the traditional distinction between MAT and PAT borrowing turns out to be inadequate. Instead of a clear-cut difference between lexical and morphological borrowing a borrowing cline will be proposed. The respective ends of this cline are MAT and PAT.

Keywords: Morphological borrowing; non-morphemic word formation; embellished clipping; libfixing; blending.

1. Aim and structure

The aim of this article is to study borrowability of certain morphological elements. In this article instances of non-morphemic borrowing[4] will be

---

1 Stephen J. Nagle (Coastal Carolina University) was kind enough to read and comment on an earlier version of the paper and to polish up my English.

2 *Covidiot* is a blend of *Covid19* and *idiot*. Blending is one of the processes discussed in this paper.

3 Comité International des Linguistes, CIPL; University of Amsterdam; camiel.hamans@ciplnet.com

4 In contact linguistics the term 'borrowing' has been seriously criticized. For instance, Myers-Scotton (1993) prefers 'transfer', Johanson (1999, 2002) 'copying', and Matras (2009, 2011) 'replication'. However, since 'borrowing' is the traditionally accepted and most widely used term, it will be used here.

discussed. Three processes will be studied: embellished clipping, libfixing and blending. These three processes are instances of non-morphemic word formation. Traditionally word formation is divided into composition and derivation. In both the notion of morpheme plays an essential role. However, there are also processes of word formation in which the morpheme appears to be irrelevant. These processes are taken together under the label non-morphemic word-formation processes.

The receiving language under discussion is Dutch and the language which is supposed to influence these Dutch processes is English, especially American-English.

After an introduction, examples of the three processes will be presented as well as a brief analysis of each of the processes. In the following section the first occurrences of these processes in Dutch will be compared with the first attestations in (American-)English. In the final part the consequences for the theories of borrowing will be discussed.

The data discussed in this paper mainly come from the literature about the three processes and from a few specialized data bases identified in footnotes where relevant.

2. Introduction

Ten Hacken & Panocová (2020: 3) start their recent collection of articles about morphological borrowing by sighing that "[t]he interaction between word formation and borrowing is not a topic that has been studied widely". One finds a similar remark in the introduction of Gardani, Arkadiev & Amiridze (2015: 1): "While lexical borrowing has attracted particular interest, the borrowing of morphology has generally attracted less attention in the literature". Backus (2012: 4) distinguishes two research traditions when it comes to borrowing: historical linguistics and contact linguistics. However, historical linguistics concentrates on studying simplex words, whereas contact linguistics focuses on insertional code switching, the insertion of elements from one language into the morphosyntactic frame of the other. Backus advocates a combination of the two approaches: the study of contact induced changes. However, he does not mention morphological borrowing in his plea at all. Renner (2018: 2) also complains that so little research has been done on morphological borrowability: "Structural borrowing in word-formation seems to have been a relatively understudied research area within contact linguistics". This study will present the first results of a comparison of three non-morphemic processes of word-formation in English and Dutch and of the way the American-English processes influenced Dutch.

3. Processes

The three processes which will be presented here are quite different; however, they have one feature in common and that is that the notion of morpheme does not play an important role in any of them.

3.1. Embellished clipping

Clipping is a relatively old phenomenon in Dutch. The earliest examples Van der Sijs (2002: 210–211) presents are from the 15th and the 17th century. Traditional examples are monosyllabic CVC forms:

(1) *buur* from *buurman* 'neighbor'
juf from *juffrouw* 'miss'; however '*juf*' has a specialized meaning 'female teacher'
luit from *luitenant* 'lieutenant'

However, a recent innovation introduced forms such as:

(2) *aso* from *asociaal* 'antisocial person'
impo from *impotent* 'impotent man'
pedo from *pedofiel* 'pedophile'

(3) *lesbo* from *lesbisch* 'lesbian'
Limbo from *Limburg(er)* 'inhabitant of the province of Limburg'
alto from *alternatief* 'alternative person'

(4) *lullo* from *lul* 'dumb person' *lul* (N) 'prick'
suffo from *suf* 'dull person' *suf* (Adj) 'dull'
jazzo from *jazz* 'jazz fan' *jazz* (N) 'jazz'

The examples in (2) are real clippings: longer words shortened to a trochee in this case. The examples in (3) are first shortened and subsequently 'expanded' with a suffix-like element *-o*. This phenomenon is called embellished clipping by Bauer & Huddleston 2002: 1636). In (4) only suffixation has taken place. For the sake of convenience, this pattern will be called pseudo-embellished clipping. The pattern has also extended to forms longer than disyllabic in contemporary Dutch:

(5)	*lokalo*	from *lokaal*	‘member/representative of a local political group’
	gewono	from *gewoon*	‘dull, normal person’
	positivo	from *positief*	‘person with a positive attitude’

It is not difficult to see how the development progressed from (2) till (5). After the introduction of the new clipping process, as in (2), the language users recognized a common ending *-o*, a confusivum in Zabrocki’s (1962) terminology. In addition, most of the new clipped forms ending in a final *-o* shared an informal, negative and [+ human] meaning. Subsequently, a process of reinterpretation followed which led to the naïve conclusion that this original and inseparable final vowel should be seen as an distinct part, and according to Humboldt’s principle[5] as a bound morpheme with a meaning of its own. Therefore, it could be used as a suffix after a preceding process of clipping to a CVC syllable, as in (3). A next step in the development was extending the range of *-o*. The suffix could no longer be attached to a clipped CVC only but also to monosyllabic CVC nouns and adjectives as in (4). A following and so far final step is that the suffix can also be combined with longer adjectival bases, see the data in (5).[6]

As is clear from the examples presented in (1)–(3), clipping is a word-formation process in which morphemes do not play any role. It is the syllabic structure that determines the clipped form. However, when the suffix-like segment *-o* arose, the notion of morpheme became of course important. This suffix does not differ significantly from other affixes.

The process from clipping via embellished clipping to suffixation is not specific for Dutch, as the (American-)English data in (6) demonstrate. In (6a) an example of a traditional CV clipping is presented, in (6b) an example of a disyllabic clipping with final *-o*. (6c) is an example of embellished clipping, whereas *kiddo* in (6d) is an instance of pseudo-embellished clipping.

(6a)	*pic*	from	*picture*
(6b)	*dipso*[7]	from	*dipsomaniac*
(6c)	*Afro*	from	*African* (hairstyle)
(6d)	*kiddo*	from	*kid*

[5] According to Humboldt’s principle, there must be a one-to-one relationship between form and meaning. Therefore, each distinct part, even though it is morphologically bound, must carry its own meaning.

[6] For a full description of the process see Hamans (2004a, 2004b, 2012, 2018, 2020b).

[7] There is also a group of [-animate] clipped forms with final *-o*, see, e.g., *disco*, *info*, *meteo*. These data are not studied here, since there exists only a parallel between [+human] clipped forms, such as *dipso* and *homo*, and embellished clippings ending in *-o*.

3.2. Libfixing

The term 'libfix' has been coined by Zwicky (2010) and refers to affixes that have been extracted or 'liberated' from existing, usually opaque words after reinterpretation of these word forms.[8] Examples from English are:

(7a) *(po)calypso*	from *apocalypse*	as in *snow(po)calypse* and *heatpocalypse*
(7b) *mageddon*	from *Armageddon*	as in *carmageddon* and *snowmageddon*
(7c) *iversary*	from *anniversary*	as in *blogiversary* and *monthiversary*
(7d) *kini*	from *bikini*	as in *monokini* and *burkini*
(7e) *eteria*	from *cafeteria*	as in *washeteria* and *shopeteria*

One can find the same phenomenon in contemporary Dutch, especially in commercial names and in jocular neologisms:

(8a)

talië	from *Italië*		'Italy'
Vertalië	from *vertalen* 'interpret'	+ *talië*	'country of interpreters'
hospitalië	from *hospitaal* 'hospital'	+ *talië*	'hospital as long-term residence'
Kapitalië	from *kapitaal* 'capital'	+ *talië*	'country where capital rules'
Betalië	from *betalen* 'pay'	+ *talië*	'country where one has to pay for everything'

(8b)

naise	from *mayonaise*		'mayonnaise'
halvanaise	from *half* 'half'	+ *naise*	'light mayonnaise'
yogonaise	from *yoghurt* 'yoghurt'	+ *naise*	'mayonnaise on yoghurt basis
bionaise	from *bio-* 'bio-'	+ *naise*	'biological mayonnaise'
veggienaise	from *veggie* 'vegan'	+ *naise*	'vegenaise'

(8c)

topia	from *utopia*		'utopia'
Frietopia	from *frites/friet* 'French fries'	+ *topia*	'name of a snack bar/cafeteria'
Snoeptopia	from *snoep* 'sweets'	+ *topia*	'name of a candy shop'

[8] Recently, libfixes have received more attention in morphological research, see, e.g., Norde & Sippach (2019).

Biertopia	from *bier* 'beer'	+ *topia*	'name of a beer shop'
Diertopia	from *dier* 'animal'	+ *topia*	'name of a pet shop'

As is clear, one may explain these data as a result of blending. For instance the name *Scheldorado*, a swimming pool annex leisure park, can be the outcome of the blending of the name *Schelde* 'river in Flanders and the South-West of the Netherlands' plus *Eldorado*. However, *-dorado* has become rather productive as the data[9] in (9) show:

(9)

Dierdorado	*dier* 'animal'
Speldorado	*spel* 'game'
Fietsdorado	*fiets* 'bicycle'
Schoendorado	*schoen* 'shoe'
Tuindorado	*tuin* 'garden'

The examples presented in (9) are all names of large shops that want to advertise themselves as an Eldorado for pet owners, gamers, clients interested in bathroom décor, shoes, or gardening. In these examples *-dorado* could be described as a result of a repeated blending process; however, it functions as a suffix. Therefore, it is better described as a libfix. Zwicky (2010) already notices that the origin of a libfix can be an ordinary word, as in *spectacular* that after reinterpretation and liberation produces a libfix *-tacular*, see (10), or a blend as, for instance, *gaydar* from *gay* + *radar*, that leads to the libfix *-dar*, see (11).

(10) *cattacular*[10]
craptacular
spooktacular
creeptacular
awesometacular

(11) *jewdar*[11]
blackdar
sarcasmdar

---

9 Data from Van der Land (2019).

10 Examples from Stan Carey, "It's a libfix *-aganza*" http://www.macmillandictionaryblog.com/its-a-libfix-aganza (retrieved 11.04.2020) and from Neal Whitman, "A linguistic tour of the best libfixes, from *-ana* to *-zilla*" *The Week* 17.09.2013. https://theweek.com/articles/460279/linguistic-tour-best-libfixes-from-ana-zilla (retrieved 11/04/2020).

11 Examples from *Language Log* 25.11.2006 http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/003821.html (retrieved 11/04/2020).

humordar
grammardar

One could object that the process described in 3.1 and libfixing cannot simply be compared. It looks as if there is a striking difference between these two processes: the separation and subsequent 'promotion' of the final vowel *-o* to a suffix-like segment as in (2) most likely is an unconscious process, whereas the liberation of a libfix usually seems to be a process of deliberate and conscious extraction. However, this distinction does not appear to make any difference when it comes to the productivity of the new 'fixes'.

For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that the notion of morpheme does not play any role in libfxing.

3.3. Lexical blending

Lexical blending[12] is the third non-morphemic process of word formation to be discussed here. 'Lexical blending' may be defined as "a word-formation process that combines two or more source words into a single form, called 'blend', losing some phonological material in the process" (Moreton et al. 2017: 349).[13] Well-known English examples are presented in (12) and (13).

(12)	*smog*	from *smoke* +	*fog*
	brunch	from *breakfast* +	*lunch*
	glamping	from *glamourous* +	*camping*
(13)	*Norglish*	*Norwegian* +	*English*
	Oxbridge	from *Oxford* +	*Cambridge*
	stagflation	from *stagnation* +	*inflation*

The difference between the data in (12) and (13) is that in (12) truncation and subsequent insertion deals with onsets only, whereas in (13) blending affects syllables. In Dutch, one finds the same two subtypes[14], see (14) and (15).

---

12 In cognitive linguistics there is also a process called (conceptual) blending but this process has no direct relation with morphology, see for the similarities and differences Hamans (2010).

13 As is well-known, there is some discussion among linguists about the most adequate definition of lexical blending and about 'the exact delimitation of the concept' (Renner, Maniez & Arnaud 2012: 2). However, this discussion is irrelevant for the process of borrowing discussed in this study. The Dutch examples presented here are structurally similar to the American English ones.

14 Examples from Hamans (2019), unless another source is mentioned.

(14) *brusjes* ‘brothers and sisters’ from *broers* ‘brothers’ + *zusjes* ‘sisters’
vechtscheiding ‘divorce battle’ from *vechten* ‘fight’ + *echtscheiding* ‘divorce’
vaderlating[15] ‘crushing a father’s image’ from *vader* ‘father’ + *aderlating* ‘blood-letting’

(15) *alcomobilist*[16] ‘drunken driver’ from *alcohol* ‘alcohol’ + *automobilist* ‘driver’
conculega ‘colleague who is also a competitor’ from *concurrent* ‘competitor’ + *college*
moetivatie[17] ‘forced motivation’ from *moeten* ‘must’ + *motivatie* ‘motivation’

Although blending has long been viewed as irregular and unpredictable, analyses within a prosodic morphological framework show that the outcome of blending processes is highly predictable. According to Hamans (2020a) blends combine the final part of the right-hand source word with the initial part of the left-hand source word. In addition, in Germanic languages blends exhibit a formal head, which is the right-hand part.[18] It is also the right-hand part that determines the stress pattern of the blend, which means that blends copy the stress pattern of the source word of the right-hand part. Normally, the stressed segment of the right-hand source word must be included in the resulted blend. The cut-off point of the source words must be at a syllabic constituent, either between an onset and a nucleus (see (12) and (14)) or at a syllable boundary (see (13) and (15)). The syllabic structure of the blend is also a copy of the syllabic structure of the right-hand source word, which implies, Hamans (2020a) claims, that in general so much of the left-hand source word can be inserted into the ‘skeleton’ of the right-hand source word as has been truncated form the right-hand source word. Therefore, only the open onset slot of the initial syllable in *vechtscheiding* and *vaderlating* can be filled with the onset of the left-hand source words, coincidentally twice a /v/. In *brusjes* the single onset of the initial syllable of *zusjes* is filled with the onset cluster of broers.

As is clear, morphemes do not play any role in this word-formation process.

---

15 *Propria Cures* 11.04.2020.

16 1993, *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek, ANW*, http://anw.inl.nl/article/alcomobilist (retrieved 13/04/2020).

17 A targeted Google search yielded 3,550 hits for this word (retrieved 13/04/2020).

18 Semantically, blends can also have a coordinate structure in which both parts can be seen as the head when it comes to meaning, for example stagflation, which is a combination of inflation and stagnation.

4. First attestations

Unfortunately, language borders are less strictly guarded than national borders. There is neither border control nor customs and neither lexemes nor language patterns need visa to cross a language border. Therefore, it is really difficult to determine when a word or pattern has settled in a new language. A word or pattern can only be caught when it has been recorded in a written form. For that reason, a first attestation in a dictionary or in a corpus is regarded as the moment of the existence of borrowing of a lexical item, even though we realize that it may take a while for a word to find precipitation in written form. However, that makes no difference when it comes to a new word in a language or borrowing in another language. A new word form may have been in use for a while before it meets the criteria for inclusion in a dictionary such as the OED, just as a loan word can circulate for some time before it is included in a Dutch dictionary or even used in a newspaper, magazine, or book. For English data the online OED is used, next to targeted google searches. For the Dutch data the Delpher corpus[19] is consulted which contains more than 100 million pages from Dutch newspapers, journals, magazines and books from the period 1618–1995, next to the ANW-corpus[20] and the Etymologiebank[21], an internet portal in which all Dutch etymological and major general dictionaries are included and combined. Where necessary, the history of Dutch trade names is checked in the databases of the Dutch Chamber of Commerce.

Two of the processes under discussion deal with final parts of words. Therefore, a reverse search in a corpus would have been commendable. Where dictionaries could be consulted, this has been done. Unfortunately, the processes and the phenomena studied are so recent that dictionaries can hardly be used as sources for data collection. They are useful as possible evidence for borrowing dates. Delpher is much more useful as a source; however, a reverse search in it appeared not to be feasible.

4.1. Embellished and pseudo-embellished clippings

Marchand (1969: 441–450) discusses clipping and provides examples from the 6th till the 20th century. However, he hardly gives any clipped forms with final *-o*. Almost all his examples are monosyllabic and of the CVC-type. Only *memo* from *memorandum*, *polio* from *poliomyelitis*, *Sacto* from *Sacramento*, and *Frisco*

19 www.delpher.nl.

20 The ANW corpus, *Algemeen Nederland Woordenboek*, is a corpus of more than 102.5 million tokens from 1970 till now and is compiled by the Institute for the Dutch Language, INT: http://anw.ivdnt.org/anwcorpus.

21 http://www.etymologiebank.nl/.

from *San Francisco* resemble the examples presented above. He also mentions *hydro-*, *mono-*, *micro-* and *photo-*. However, these truncated forms are part of what he calls 'clipped composites' (Marchand 1969: 445), and are not free forms. Moreover, none of Marchand's data satisfies the semantic criteria the examples in (2) and (6b) meet. Marchand's examples are all [-animate].[22]

Jespersen (1942: 223), however, produces [+human] examples such as:

(16)	*journo*	from	*journalist*
	commo	from	*commissioner*
	garbo	from	*garbage collector*

Jespersen's examples are all taken from Australian English, and as Hamans (2018) shows there is no borrowing relation between Australian English and Dutch. Lappe (2007) is an extensive discussion and analysis of English clippings. Lappe concludes that of the corpus of 702 clipped forms, both monosyllabic and disyllabic forms, more than 50% is of American-English origin. Nearly 50% of the clippings, which are collected from dictionaries, has been attested for the first time in the period 1900–1949, almost 20% in the second half of the 19th century, and over a quarter in the time span from 1950 till 1986. Of the corpus 60% is monosyllabic, and over a quarter disyllabic. The subtype of disyllabic clippings roughly falls into two groups, with final *-o* (*dero* from *derelict*) or with final *-y/-ie* (*assy* from *asphalt*) (Lappe 2007: 64–69). Lappe does not distinguish between [+/- human] clipped forms.

The observations of Marchand and Lappe suggest that disyllabic *-o* clippings have recently surfaced in American- and British-English. Hamans (2018) makes it probable that the o-formations under discussion here originated under Italian influence in American-English.

4.1.1 Data from English

The first attestations of real clipped English -o forms are indeed relatively late.

(17)	*dipso* (<*dipsomaniac*)	1880
	psycho (<*psychopath*)	1919

[22] Marchand (1969: 442), however, notices the existence of "back clippings with an additional pet suffix": "*looney* (<lunatic), *Aussie*, *bolshie*, *commie*, *Jerry*, *bookie* (<bookmaker), *cabby* (<cabman), *middy* (<midshipman), *movie* (<moving picture), *speakie*, *talkie*, *telly* 'television BE, *toadie* (<toadeater), possibly by *bargee*, *goalee*, *townee*". Most of these embellished clippings presented by Marchand are [+human], although he does not pay attention to this fact. Marchand also quotes examples from 'nursery language', the majority of these examples are ['-human]: "*grannie*, *hanky*, *nightie*, *pinny* and *undies*".

homo (<*homosexual*)	1923
nympho (<*nymphomaniac*)	1934
paedo/pedo (*pedophile*)	1993

Of course, socio-cultural circumstances influence the appearance of these nouns. Only from the time pedophilia became a topic in the media an informal word for pedophiles came into vogue.

The first attestations of embellished clippings came not much later. However, a second group of embellished clippings (18a) followed around 1970.

(18)	*combo* (<*combination*)	1929
	lesbo (<*lesbian*)	1937
	Afro (<*African*)	1938[23]
(18a)	*aggro* (<*aggravation*)	1969[24]
	sleazo(<*sleazy*)	1972
	w(h)acko (*wacky*)	1975

Pseudo-embellished clippings show a different pattern

(19a)	*bucko* (<*buck*)	1883[25]
	kiddo (<*kid*)	1905
(19b)	*stinko* (<*stink*)	1924
	wino (<*wine*)	1926[26]
	pinko (<*pink*)	1930
	beardo (<*beard*)	1935
	fatso (<*fat*)	1944
(19c)	*weirdo* (<*weird*)	1955
	dumbo (<*dumb*)	1960
	cheapo (<*cheap*)	1975
	creepo (<*creep*)	early 70's
	sicko (<*sick*)1977	

---

23 *Afro* appeared first as an adjective. As a noun it has been attested for the first time in 1966.

24 *Aggro boy* has been attested in 1969, *aggro man* in 1982. *Aggro* is the only clipped form of the examples presented here that started in British English.

25 *Bucko* originally is a word from a nautical slang.

26 The first attestation in the OED is from 1915; however, written as *wineoe*. The first 'real' *wino* the OED presents is from 1926.

These data show that the first two pseudo-embellished forms (19a) were isolated. Perhaps these forms can be explained in the same way as the Australian *milko* (<*milkman*, 1865) is interpreted: as a sort of exclamation.

The development of this new word-formation process started with real clipped forms in (17) and was followed by a clipping plus embellishment (18). This step was reactivated later (18a) when pseudo-embellishment became popular again (19c). However, there had been already a pseudo-embellishment (19b) in the same period as the first clipping plus embellishment took place (18). One can reach the cautious conclusion that the process of clipping that resulted in final *-o*, see (17) – and which took place in the time span 1920–1930 – almost immediately, or within a few years only, led to two other processes:

(a) clipping plus embellishment (18)
(b) pseudo-embellishment (19b).

Both processes roughly operated in the 1930s. The two processes were reactivated in the 1960s and '70s. Why this happened is a matter for further research.

4.1.2 Data from Dutch

There are two relatively old Dutch disyllabic clippings with final *-o*.

(20)	*Indo* (<*Indonesian*)	1898	'person of mixed Dutch-Indonesian offspring'
	provo (<*provocateur*)	1965	'member of the anarchistic provo-movement'

These two forms were and remained isolated. New forms arrived later. However, in 1933 the word *homo* was already borrowed from English.

(21)	*kiddo*	1977[27]
	weirdo	1985
	dumbo	1987
	sicko	1988
	fatso	from the 1980s

[27] The word has already been found in a paid personal announcement in a Dutch colonial newspaper in Surabaya in 1942 (just at the beginning of the Japanese occupation). A father informed the rest of the family that he was interned by the Japanese, however, *Moeder & kiddo gezond* 'mother and kiddo healthy'.

(22) *lesbo* 1976
Afro 1979

(23) *Limbo* (<*Limburger*) 1984 'inhabitant of the province of Limburg'
Aso (<*asociaal*) 1986 'antisocial person'
arro (<*arrogant*) 1986 'arrogant person'
alto (<*alternatief*) 1987 'alternative person'
Brabo (<*Brabander*) 1993 'inhabitant of the province of Noord-Brabant'

(24) *dombo*[28] (<*dom*) 1984 'dumbo'
jazzo (<*jazz*) 1985 'jazz fan'
lullo (<*lul*) 1995 'dull person' (*lul* 'prick')
ballo (<*bal*) +/- 1995 'dull person' (*bal* 'testicle')
duffo (<*duf*) ?, attested 2013, probably around 2000 'dummy'

(25) *pedo*[29] (<*pedofiel*) 1988 'pedofile'
Impo (<*impotent*) 1991 ' impotent man'

These data demonstrate that:

a. A few foreign English words have been borrowed in Dutch, embellished clippings (22) as well as pseudo-embellished clippings (21).
b. Within a decade after the processes became productive again in English Dutch acquired an embellishment pattern as well as a pseudo-embellishment pattern. Most likely this happened after reinterpretation of borrowed English forms. The fact that the trochee is the preferred word form in Dutch facilitated the introduction of the embellishment and pseudo-embellishment pattern (cf. Hamans 2012, 2018).
c. However, Dutch also kept the rather unproductive clipping rule that could result in disyllabic trochees with final *-o*, see (25) and which had produced *indo* and *provo* in the past.

4.2 Libfixes

Although the term 'libfix' was only introduced ten years ago, this does not mean that the phenomenon must be just as young. Extracting or liberating elements

[28] The form *dombo* with /b/ must have been formed analogous to English *dumbo*, since the Dutch word *dom* 'stupid' does not contain a /b/.
[29] Due to the difference in pronunciation of the first vowel, it is highly unlikely that the Dutch word *pedo* is borrowed from English. The first vowel is a tensed /e/ in Dutch.

from complex forms is a well-known old procedure; however, it usually was the result of reinterpretation. Zabrocki (1969: 107–108) shows how in OHG. the suffix *-ing* has been reinterpreted as *-ling* and finally as *-eling*, This, however, happened since the preceding segment was often *Xl*-(*ing*) or *Xel*-(*ing*) and so the naïve language user reinterpreted the final segments *-ling* and *-eling* as suffixes and in this way liberated the last phonemes of the stem. The case of *landscape*, presented by Marchand (1969: 211), is more or less similar. Naïve users of English recognized the word *land* in this Dutch loanword which was introduced in English around 1600. Consequently, *landscape* was seen as a complex word, maybe a compound. Therefore, *-scape* could be used to coin new forms. The first attestations are presented in brackets.

(26) *seascape* (1799)
townscape (1867)
cloudscape (1868)
outscape (1868)
inscape (1868)
moonscape (1907)
soundscape (1977)

Similar, however, more recent cases are *–(e)teria* from *cafeteria*, *-gate* from *Watergate*, (-)*burger* from *hamburger*, *-tainment* from *entertainment* and *-preneur* from *entrepreneur*. Theoretically *Watergate* and *hamburger* could be compounds and so a naïve analysis could split the forms into *water* and *gate* or *ham* and *burger* respectively. Such an explanation is unlikely with *cafeteria*, *entertainment*, and *entrepreneur* . The language user still recognizes a part which they find elsewhere in the lexicon – the confusiva *café*, *enter*, and *entre* – but the morphological status of (*e*)*teria*, *tainment* and *preneur* differs from that of the possibly free morphemes *gate* and *burger*. Nevertheless the language user starts using these final segments productively, see *snackteria*, *shopeteria*, *washeteria* *infotainment*, *relitainment*, *musitainment*, *mumpreneur*, *webpreneur*, and *pastorpreneur*.

4.2.1 Recent American English libfixes

Recently libfixing goes in fact one step further: extracting a part of a complex word without recognizing it as confusivum with another word. For instance, in *apocalypse* the part *–(po)calypse* is liberated without being identified as similar or identical to a segment occurring elsewhere in the language. Since one does not find this kind of examples in the traditional as well as the recent morphological handbooks, one may conjecture that it is a very recent phenomenon. The dates of

first attestation, that follow here, confirm this hypothesis. It is impossible to produce all libfixes here; in the last decades dozens and dozens of libfixes have been identified,[30] however, only a few will be presented here. Most of these libfixes are not yet recorded in the OED or other dictionaries. Many of the sources are internet sites, found via targeted Google searches.[31]

(27) *apocalypse* (1384)
-pocalypse (2004)
snow(po)calypse (2009)
heathpocalypse (2015)

(28) *Armageddon* (1638)
Mageddon (2000)
carmageddon (1977)
snowmageddon (2010)

(29) *anniversary* (c. 1230)
monthiversary (1922/1999)[33]
blogiversary (2005)

(30) *bikini* (1948)[32]
monokini (1964)
burkini (2002)

(31) *spectacular* (1682)
-tacular (2015)
craptacular (1990s)
spooktacular (1992)
creeptacular (2009)
awesometacular (2009)
cattacular (2011)

(32) *Utopia* (1516)
eutopia/cacotopia (1818)
cyrtopia (1837)
photopia/scotopia (1915)
dystopia (1952)
motopia (1959)
privatopia (1994)
jewtopia (2003)

The examples presented in (32) are the most interesting. The first examples come from learned jargons and are clearly neo-classical word formations. The last examples *privatopia* and *jewtopia*, the title of a study about gated communities and the title of movie respectively, are the first instances of the libfix *-topia* combining with native English words, [34] which is a sign for acceptance as a

---

30 See, e.g., the inventory of postings of Arnold Zwicky on this issue: https://arnoldzwicky.org/linguistics-notes/libfix-postings/ or Leo Williams' postings on libfixes http://www.grumpyoldscribe.com/tag/libfixes/ or the references given in fn.4 and fn.5 and many others.

31 For space reasons, it is decided not to include the exact website and URL of any examples presented below that are not attested in the OED. A significant part of this has been found in the Urban Dictionary, https://www.urbandictionary.com/, where the first location and date are also mentioned. Of the other examples, the oldest information found on an internet site was always chosen as the year of the first attestation.

32 The English word *bikini* 'scanty two-piece beach garment worn by women' (OED) is a loanword from French, where it appeared in this meaning a year earlier (1947).

33 *Monthiversary* only became in real use as from 1999.

34 Maybe *motopia* should be put on par with *privatopia* and *jewtopia.* However, its OED meaning 'an urban environment designed to meet the needs of a pedestrian society by strict limitation of

productive English affix, and is in line with the libfixing fashion that emerged around 2000 according to the data presented here. Also the libfix *-dar*, which is extracted from the blend *gaydar*, shows a similar pattern.

(33) *radar* (1941)[35]
gaydar (1988)
jewdar (2000)
humordar (2006)
grammardar (2006)
homodar (2007)
humpdar (2007)
blackdar (2009)
mordar (2010) (<Mormons)
sarcasmdar (2012)

These examples confirm the correctness of the assumption that libfixing became a popular and productive process just before Arnold Zwicky noticed it in 2010 and called it libfixing.

4.2.2 Libfixing in Dutch

In Dutch libfixing did not wait till it became fashionable in American English; however, one can observe an increase recently. One hardly encounters libfixes that have been identified in American English in Dutch, *-topia* being an exception. Vice versa, popular Dutch libfixes are rare in English. One can find the trade name *Vegenaise* (1995), which is more or less similar to Anglo-Dutch *veggienaise*[36]; in addition, occasionally one finds a *Dorado* here and there in American English.

(34) *-talië* (see 8a)
Italië
Kapitalië (1940)[37]
Vertalië (2007)
betalië (2011)
hospitalië (2015)

---

the use of the motor car' points in the direction of a neoclassical, learned jargon.

35 *Radar* is an acronym: *radio detecting and ranging*.

36 *Veggie* for Dutch *veganist* 'vegan' is a embellished clipped form which is borrowed from English.

37 The word was used in a propagandistic article against the capitalist system in the USA, which was allegedly run by freemasons, in the fascist magazine *De Misthoorn* 'The Fog Horn' (12/10/1940) which can be best compared with its German Nazi pendant *Der Stürmer*.

(35) *-naise* (see 8b)
mayonnaise (1806)
halvanaise [38] (1974)
yogonaise (1982)
slank-o-naise (1982) from *slank* 'slim'
veggienaise (2014?)
bionaise (2018?)

(36)	*-mel*	from *melk* 'milk'	
	chocomel	'chocolate milk' (1932)	from *chocolade* 'chocolate' and *melk* 'milk'
	halvamel	'low fat milk' (1971)	from *half* 'half' and *melk* 'milk'

(37) *-topia* (see 8c)
utopia/utopië (1824)
pornotopia (1973, translated from the *Wallstreet Journal*)
ecotopia (1975, translated title of a novel by Ernest Callenbach; more frequently 1989)
frietopia (2003) from *friet/frites* 'French fries'
diertopia (2008) from *dier* 'animal'
biertopia (2013), maybe borrowed from German where it is a much more popular name
snoeptopia (2013) from *snoep* 'sweets'
oudtopia (2014) name of a sitcom, situated in an old people's home; from *oud* 'old'

(38)	*-dorado* (see 9)	
	Eldorado/dorado (1824)	
	fietsdorado (1895)	from *fiets* 'bicycle'
	sportdorado (1922)	from *sport* 'sports'
	zwemdorado (1924)	from *zwemmen* 'swim'
	bierdorado (1937)	maybe borrowed from German; from *bier* 'beer'
	foreldorado (1975)	from *forel* 'trout'
	tuindorado (1975)	from *tuin* 'garden'

[38] *Halv*(*a-*), as in *halvanaise* and *halvamel* (see (36)), became popular in commercial Dutch product names: *halvarine* (1968) 'low fat margarine', *halvaret* (1971) 'low tar content cigarette' from *half* and *sigaret*, *halviture* (1976) 'light jam' from *half* and *confiture*, and finally *halva-product* (1984) 'low fat product'. See for *halva-* Meesters (2004: 156).

speldorado (1980)	from *spel* ‘game’
geldorado (1980)	from *geld* ‘money’
schoendorado (2003)	from *schoen* ‘shoe’
haardorado (2004)	from *haar* ‘hair’

These data show that Dutch already had a process of libfixing before this process started to boom in American-English around 2000. However, when libfixes became a plague in American-English this influenced the productivity of the Dutch process too.

How a renewed American-English popularity of libfixes influenced commercial naming in Dutch becomes even more clear when we take a look at the libfix *-teria* or better its Dutch counterpart *-taria*.

(39) *cafetaria* (1937)
buffet(t)aria, *ijstaria*, *sneltaria*, *Henk’taria* (‘taria owned by Henk’)
etc. quoted in van Haeringen (1944: 149) but all disappeared)
snacktaria, *burgertaria*, *smultaria* (between 1980–1993)

A first wave of American-English *-teria*’s is found around 1920 (*booketeria*, *fruiteria*, *groceteria*, and *healtheria*); a new *-teria* stream emerged in the late 1950s and 1960s, e.g., *washeteria*. The OED quotes: “1965 *Listener* 2 Sept. 339/1 An Italian café-owner..has..switched his sign from Pizzeria to Pie-teria”. As these examples show, the *-teria* influence did not wait till libfixing became fashionable in American-English around the year 2000 but as soon as a specific and useful commercial libfix got frequent in the United States, it also became able to cross the Atlantic.

The data presented so far allow for a conclusion, which resembles the conclusion of 4.1.2.:

a. Dutch has a libfixing process of its own.
b. The frequency of libfixing in Dutch seems to increase with the growing popularity of libfixes in American-English. It is, of course, not possible to prove that there is a direct and causal relation between the increased frequency of libfixing in American-English and the growth of the similar phenomenon in Dutch. However, both rises and the sequence in both languages strongly suggest that this is more than a sheer coincidence. In other words, the frequency of American-English libfixes increases the incidence of the process in Dutch.
c. With the increase of ‘borrowed’ libfixing, the own Dutch pattern also increases (see, e.g., (34), which is, for the sake of completeness, the only instance of non-commercial libfixing among the examples presented here).

4.3 Blending

Even though Balteiro & Bauer (2019: 2) claim that "blends seem to be everywhere, from the most technical language to the most informal, even in slang", this does not mean that blending receives much attention in the morphological handbooks. Marchand (1969: 451–452) gives a few examples of blends but calls it a stylistic phenomenon. Dixon (2014: 69) mentions blends but only needs eight lines to describe it. For Booij (2012: 20) two lines and exactly two examples suffice to explain what blends are. Plag (2003: 121–125) constitutes an exception. He presents a detailed overview of the more specialized recent literature about blends. The Dutch handbooks do not pay much attention to blending either. One searches in vain in de Haas & Trommelen (1993), whereas Booij & van Santen (2017: 26), Booij (2019: 140–141), and van Bree (2020: 474) mention blending but do not analyze it. The academic digital grammars of Dutch, *e-Ans* and *Taalportaal*[39], pay no attention to blends. The fact that so little attention is paid to blends must mean that blending was a rare phenomenon in English as well as in Dutch.

There is, of course, some specialized literature about blends (Bryant 1974; Cannon 1986; Algeo 1998; Kelly 1998; Ayto 2003)[40] but one had to wait till the publication of Renner, Maniez & Arnauld (2012) before focused research became available. A year later Bauer, Lieber & Plag (2013: 458–463, 483–484) was the first handbook on English morphology which dealt with blending seriously and described it as a more or less regular process. Recently Balteiro & Bauer edited a special issue of *Lexis* (2019)[41] which is completely devoted to blending in English.

Apparently, the growing scholarly interest in blends goes hand in hand with the frequency in use. Ayto (2003: 185) presents a diagram with the number of blends decade by decade between 1900 and 1990. On the basis of these figures one can only support the conclusion Bryant (1974) drew thirty years before that 'blends are increasing', as the title of her paper reads. The figures also support the claim by Cannon (1986: 736–737, 2000: 956) that blending seems to have developed into an important word-formation pattern. Bauer (1994: 38) even goes a step further in his discussion of different types of word-formation processes in English over the period from 1880 till 1982. He concludes that there is an increase

---

39 https://ivdnt.org/onderzoek-a-onderwijs/spelling-grammatica/e-ans
https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/. *Taalportaal* is a "comprehensive and authoritative scientific grammar of Dutch, Frisian and Afrikaans, written [in English] and compiled by linguists, for linguists".

40 For a comprehensive and more detailed overview of the literature on blends cf. Hamans (2010, 2014) and Renner, Maniez & Arnauld (2012).

41 https://journals.openedition.org/lexis/.

of blends and "abbreviations"[42] as opposed to a decrease in the number of words derived by suffixation in the same period.

4.3.1 English blends

Smith (2014) clearly shows that blending operated in all periods of the history of English. However, in the last decades blending has become more and more popular not only in experimental literature, as it mainly was in the days of Lewis Carroll and James Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake*, in jocular language or specialized jargon but also in more colloquial language as the examples (40)–(45) show. The data mainly come from Cannon (1986), Fischer (1998), and Smith (2014).[43]

(40) *stumble* (1325) < *stop* + *tumble*
blatherature (1512) < *blather* +*literature*
foolosopher (1549) < *fool* + *philosopher*
knavigation (1613) < *knave* + *navigation*
glaze (1616) < *glare* + *gaze*
cantankerous[44] (1736) < *contentious* + *cankerous*

(41) *gerrymander* (1812) < *Gerry* +*salamander*
bit (1848) < *binary* + *digit*
Oxbridge (1849) < *Oxford* + *Cambridge*
slanguage (1879) < *slang* + *language*
brunch (1895) < *breakfast* + *lunch*
smog (1905) < *smoke* + *fog*[45]

(42) *advertorial* (1914)
motel (1925)[46]
Spanglish (1933)[47]
simulcast (1948)
cremains (1950)
ballute (1958)

(43) *stagflation* (1965)
fertigation (1967)
gasohol (1971)
affluenza (1973)
anacronym (1975)
palimony (1977)

---

42 Bauer counts acronyms and acronyms among abbreviations.

43 There are multiple collections of blends. Dabulskis (2012) has brought together all the hitherto known collections: https://github.com/mindausai/honors-project/blob/master/all_blends_complete.txt.

44 Originally also recorded as *contankerous*, according to the OED.

45 In this period (1907) one also finds the first rare attestations of the name *Chunnel*, which finally became popular in the last quarter of the 20th century.

46 *Motel* is a blend from *motorist* + *hotel* or from *motor* + *hotel*. Later on the part *-(o)tel* became a libfix, just as *-dar* from the blend *gaydar* in (33). The libfix *–(o)tel* led to a great paradigmatic productivity starting with *boatel* (1950).

47 Also, *–(n)glish* became a productive libfix, see *Dunglish*, *Norglish*, *Polglish*.

(44) *flexitarian* (1998)
globesity (2000–2005)
nectivity (2002)
glamping (2005)
kindulthood (2006)
beautility (2007)

(45) *handkerchoo* (2008)
Pinterest (2009)
Nobama (+/- 2010)
globalution (2015)
deskfast (2016)
carfast (2019)

The examples presented in (40)–(45) show that blending has always occurred in English, often as a marginal process leading to jocular forms but slowly becoming more and more accepted, as, e.g., the data in (41)–(43) demonstrate.

4.3.2 Blending in Dutch

Blending in Dutch is less well documented than for English. One does not find any entries in the historical grammars of Dutch. The first massive evidence of blending in Dutch is found in a nonsense poem by Leonard Huizinga (1963)[48], who evidently follows Lewis Carroll's example. Among his blends one finds:

(46) *petrofilanten* < *petroleum* 'petrol' and *olifanten* 'elephants'
urinoceros < *urine* 'urine' and *rinoceros* 'rhinoceros'
mammagaai < *mamma* 'mum' and *papagaai* 'parrot'
zebrazijn < *zebra* 'zebra' and *azijn* 'vinegar'
hermelijster < *hermelijn* 'ermine' and *lijster'* thrush
vakantieloper< *vakantie* 'holiday', *antilope* 'antelope' and *loper* 'runner'

Before Huizinga blending must have been known – there is an isolated example *plurk* (1928) 'jerk' from *ploert* 'cad' and *schurk* 'villain' – however, it hardly left any traces.

Several common English blends have been adopted in Dutch a while after they were introduced in English, cf. (47); in the first column the date of attestation in English is presented, in the second the dates of the first Dutch attestations.

	First found in English	First found in Dutch
(47) *smog*	1905	1945
motel[49]	1925	1954
brunch	1895	1957

[48] De 'Oerbosbrand' in *Olivier en Adriaan* (1940), see for the full text of this nonsense poem also: https://johfrael.nl/index.php/nl/articles-nl/31-gedichten/103-de-oerbosbrand.

[49] The first *botel* was introduced in the Netherlands in 1965. The libfix *–(o)tel* almost immediately became popular in Dutch hereafter. At the end of the 1960s the first *stutel* 'studenthotel' was opened in Amsterdam.

stagflation	1965	1974
advertorial	1914	1999
glamping	2005	2011

These examples show how practically nonexistent the English influence was before World War II and how this changed after 1945. However, Philips Eindhoven introduced an electric shaver under the name *Philishave* as early as in 1939.

When the blends of (47) were used in Dutch newspapers and magazines for the first time, they always were put between inverted commas or were italicized and were explained in meaning and structure. This explanation must have been an external stimulus for a Dutch process of blending, independent from English examples, cf. (48). The data presented here come mainly from Meesters (2004) and Pajerová (2018)

(48) *brozem* (1961) 'biker' from *bromfiets* 'moped', 'bike' and *nozem* 'sleazer'
provotariaat (1965-1970) ' members of the Provo movement' from *Provo* and *proletariat* 'proletariat'
klufter (1970) 'bastard' from *kluns* 'clumsy person' and *hufter* 'shithead'
zonderdag (1973) car-free Sunday from *zonder* 'without' and *zondag* 'Sunday'
Stopera (1975) nickname of the combined building of the Opera and the City Hall in Amsterdam from *stadhuis* 'city hall' and *opera* 'opera'
abortoir (1979) name used for an abortion clinic by pro-Life activists from *abortus* 'abortion' and *abattoir* 'slaughterhouse'

In the 1970s, a popular pair of TV comedians, van Kooten and de Bie, made blending one of their trademarks. Some of their most popular inventions are given in (49). The words are still in use.

(49) *bescheurkalender* (1973) 'block calendar with a daily joke' from *bescheuren* 'laugh loudly' and *scheurkalender* 'block calendar'
schrijpend (1974) 'harrowing' from *schrijnend* 'poignant' and *nijpend* 'pinging'
krommunicatie (1975) 'crooked communication' from *krom* 'bent' and *communicatie* 'communication'
demonstructie (1975) 'a combination of a *demonstratie* 'demonstration' and an *instructie* 'instruction'

natuurleuk (1970's) 'a combination of *natuurlijk* 'natural' and *leuk* 'funny''.
kneukfilm (1980) 'a movie with serious *knokken* 'scuffling' and *neuken* 'screwing''

Blending also became part of less humorous language, as the data in (50) and (51) show, though the humorous effect of some of these neologisms cannot be denied. Some of these forms evidently are occasionalisms; however, this does not alter their example value. The fact that the language user produces such forms shows that they dispose of the pattern.

(50) *cardulance* (1975) 'ambulance for cardiac victims' from *cardio-* and *ambulance*
voluntariaat (1975) 'people who work on a voluntary basis' from *voluntair* 'voluntary' and *proletariaat* 'proletariat'
salariaat (1979) 'people who earn a salary' from *salaris* 'salary' and *proletariaat* 'proletariat'
rumoes (1984) 'mixture of *rumoer* 'tumult' and *smoes* 'cop-out'
preektijger (1985) 'minister who loves preaching' from *preek* 'sermon' and *kroegtijger* 'barfly'
publivoor (1980's) 'somebody who reads everything which is published' from *publicatie* 'publication' and *omnivoor* 'omnivore'

(51) *alcomobilist* (1993) 'drunken driver' from *alcohol* 'achohol' and *automobilist* 'motorist'
echtscheidsrechter (1996) 'divorce mediator' from *echtscheiding* 'divorce' and *scheidsrechter* 'referee'
grachtengordelroos (1995) 'negative image of the people who live within the Amsterdam canals ring' from *grachtengordel* 'ring of canals' and *gordelroos* 'shingles'
dikcriminatie (1997) 'discrimination of fat people' from *dik* 'thick' and *discriminatie* 'discrimination'
duingalow (1997) 'cottage near the dunes' from *duin* 'dune' and *bungalow* 'bungalow'
omacipatie (2000) 'emancipation of grannies' from *oma* 'granny' and *emancipatie* 'emancipation'

The data presented above, allow for the following conclusion on blending:

a. Blending is now a regular occurrence in Dutch, even though it was not seventy years ago, when it was still a very marginal process.

b. In the same span of time, blending has grown from an epiphenomenon into an important word-formation process in English.
c. It is impossible to prove that the increase in blends in English had a direct impact on the development of the same pattern in Dutch, but is certainly probable given the increased influence of English on Dutch.
d. It is not unlikely that early English blend loanwords, of which the pattern was explained at the moment of first (written) use, stimulated the increase of Dutch blends

5. Borrowability

So far three processes of non-morphemic word formation have been identified that first became more frequent in American-English and later in Dutch. In the case of (pseudo-)embellished clippings and of blends it could be established that prior to or almost simultaneously with the first occurrences of the phenomena in Dutch, English loanwords – both (pseudo-)embellished clippings and blends – appeared in Dutch. In the case of libfixing, it could only be established that an increase in the phenomenon in American-English led to an increase in the phenomenon in Dutch.

However, the growth of these non-morphemic word-formation processes is not restricted to American English and subsequently to Dutch. Renner (2018: 5) points to an increase of hypocoristic clipped forms in Polish and Catalan, Hamans (2004a, 2004b, 2018, 2020b) demonstrates how American-English influence also led to the appearance and rise of (pseudo-)embellished clippings in German and Swedish. Lalić-Krstin (2008), Konieczna (2012), Ralli & Xydopoulos (2012), and Stamenov (2015), all claim that blending was virtually unknown in their languages – Serbian, Polish, Greek, and Bulgarian respectively – till recently, whereas it now is a productive process of word formation. According to Renner (2018: 6), it is the end of the Cold War, made visible in the Fall of the Berlin Wall, that accommodated American-English cultural and linguistic influence and stimulated the increase of this imported process, especially in the languages spoken in the countries of the former Eastern bloc. Whether this also holds for Swedish, German, and Dutch seems questionable. The Dutch data seem to indicate rather that the American-English influence arose after the Second World War and that the influence was reinforced when mass media, pop music and the internet started to boom.

Whether these processes are completely new for the languages that borrowed them is also debatable. Konieczna (2012: 56–57) notices that lexical blending has been attested occasionally in Polish before, which supports Backus' claim that change is often a matter of increasing or decreasing frequency in use "rather than

the adoption or complete loss of particular forms" (Backus 2014: 24, quoted from Renner 2018: 2). Konieczna's observation, and Backus' claim are consistent with the findings and conclusions presented here.

Renner (2018: 8–9) notices, while discussing the success of *-ing* borrowing in French and Spanish, that it usually is not the abstract element, here *-ing*, that is borrowed but that the affix is "abstracted only after a number of lexical borrowings containing this formal ending (e.g. *camping*, *karting*, *rafting*) had entered each language, and after the form was assigned a stable core meaning ('leisure activity') and thus a morpheme status". Needless to say, this is parallel to what has been described above for the suffix *-o*. Ten Hacken & Panocová (2020: 7) endorse this view: "Borrowing is always a matter of individual words. (…) Word-formation rules are not borrowed. The only way they can arise in the receiving language is by re-analysis". We will get back to this aspect later.

With regard to blending, and compounding, Renner (2018: 8–9) points to a possible similar path. Before the process may become productive in the recipient language some lexical precursors, being morphologically opaque blends, are taken over, just as what we have seen in section 4.3.2 above.

Renner also remarks that there hardly is a direct contact between the donor and the recipient language. It is a casual contact, a remote connection via broadcast and digital media. However, as ten Hacken & Panocová (2020: 7) rightly stress, there must be a contact. Borrowing requires a degree of access to another language and it is "linked to a cultural contact and to intercultural communication", in which a form of prestige[50] is involved.

5.1. Borrowing scales

The three processes under the discussion differ in several respects. One of the most striking ones is the possibly resulting affix. Clipping with [+human], resulting in final *-o*, almost automatically leads to the emergence of a new suffix, *-o*, that can be used in embellished clippings and with pseudo-embellishment and that also turns up in similar contexts in the receiving language. When libfixing results in a productive paradigm as in the examples (27)–(32) the 'liberated'

[50] Matras (2011: 211) summarizes the role of prestige clearly: "A traditional (…) explanation for the motivation behind borrowing is prestige: it is assumed that the use of word-forms from a language that is associated with cultural and technological progress (…) serves to signal the speaker's competence in this language, which in turn is associated with upwards social mobility. Speakers will, according to this assumption, integrate word-forms from the dominant language into their speech in the language of the socially weaker group as a token of higher social standing, power or competence". Borrowing of embellishment shows that it is not always higher social standing which counts, (extended) peer group solidarity may be as important, just as an attempt to prove awareness of last fashions and trends.

element could be described as on its way to becoming an affix (cf. Hamans 2017); however, the libfixes themselves are hardly borrowed in the receiving language, *-tainment* being one of the few cases.[51] The third process, blending, does not necessarily lead to the emergence of a new affix or affix-like segment, although it is, of course, possible that the right part of a blend becomes so productive that it becomes a libfix, see for example *-otel* or *-dar*. *-otel* is one of the few libfixes originating in a blend that has been borrowed frequently in other languages.

Although *-o* now is an affix and although it has been borrowed in several languages it is not included in Seifart's survey of affixes borrowed in a hundred languages (2020) and his studies of affix borrowing (e.g., Seifart 2017). The reason may be that the focus of his work is on inflectional affixes. Seifart's remarks on borrowability and his commentary and refinements of borrowing scales are therefore not relevant to the three processes discussed here. Actually the same can be said about the well-known borrowing scales[52] of Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 74–76) and Thomason (2001: 70–71). This latter borrowing scale starts with "casual contact" and runs via level two, "slightly more intense contact" and level three, "more intense contact", to level four "intense contact". Each level of contact is characterized by different categories of borrowing. Level one, "casual contact", for instance may lead to the borrowing of content words only. At level two, "slightly more intense contact", function words can be borrowed. Some slight structural borrowing is also possible at this level. Level 3, "rather intense contact", is characterized by borrowing of basic as well as non-basic vocabulary and of moderate structural borrowing. Thomason enumerates a long list of lexical material that can be borrowed at this level, which runs from more functions words, and pronouns to adjectives and derivational affixes. Heavy structural borrowing belongs to level four, "intense contact".

The embellishment suffix *-o* seems to belong to level three: "Derivational affixes [as part of lexical borrowing CH] may be borrowed too (e.g., *-able/ible*, which originally entered English on French loanwords and then spread from there to native English vocabulary)' (Thomason 2001:70). However, it seems that for this type of borrowing a rather intense contact is needed, whereas in reality there is only a causal contact, as correctly established by Renner (2018: 8–9). Maybe Thomason's caveat applies here: "The predictions of the borrowing scale can be violated, however, especially when the languages in contact are typologically

---

51 In Dutch, *-tainment* has become a productive libfix: *Twentetainment*, *Gaaspertainment*, *Limburgertainment* 'tainment in the region of Twente, near the Gaasperplas, a lake, or in the province Limburg' respectively.

52 A borrowing scale is "a scale showing the types of interference features to be expected under conditions of increasing intensity, from casual contact (only non-basic vocabulary borrowed) to the most intense contact situations (borrowing of non-basic vocabulary, some basic vocabulary, and structural features of all kinds)" (Thomason 2001: 259).

very similar (less typological distance)" (Thomason 2001: 259). "It is easier to introduce borrowings into typologically congruent structure than into divergent typologically structures (…) [T]he typological distance between two languages in contact is an important factor in any prediction of types of borrowing; languages that are typologically very different are likely to follow the borrowing scale closely, while languages that are typologically very similar are likely not to do so in all respects" (Thomason 2001: 71). However, embellished clipping is also advancing in a Slavic language like Polish (Renner 2018: 5). Moreover, when it comes to blending one does not see any essential difference in the speed and way of borrowing between Dutch on the one hand and Bulgarian, Polish, Serbian or Greek on the other.

The borrowing of libfixing can be considered as an instance of borrowing of derivational affixes, and therefore belongs to level three, even though there is hardly any lexical material that has been taken over. Blending seems to be a more structural phenomenon and therefore probably should be considered rather as a form of structural borrowing, which, according to Thomason, belongs to level three or to level four, depending on whether borrowing of blending should be seen as a form of moderate (level three) or heavy (level four) borrowing, Consequently, it must be the result of rather intense (level three) or even intense (level four) contact.[53] However, the contact between the donor language English and the recipient language Dutch did not change and remained casual.

It is clear that this type of borrowing scale, which points to extra-linguistic factors, does not work for the three processes discussed here. Maybe it is due to the fact that this, and other scales of borrowability, are conceived for the borrowing of matter only (Gardani 2018: 6). Although the models of Myers-Scotton (1993) and Myers-Scotton & Jake (2009) start from a psycholinguistic point of view and deal more with language processing than with extra-linguistic factors, they suffer from the same fallacy when applied to the three non-morphemic processes of word formation under discussion here. Their models may be very useful for bilingual speech but are not suitable for the contact-induced changes studied in this contribution. The same can be said about the replication model of Matras (2009, 2011).

---

[53] Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 74–76) distinguish five levels, where the contact also ranges from casual to intense. At the level of casual contact category 1 items can be borrowed, which are contents words. Category 2 items are function words, minor phonological features and lexical semantic features, whereas category 3 items consist of adpositions, derivational suffixes and phonemes. At level 4 category 4 items or processes can be borrowed, which consist of distinctive phonological features, word order and (inflectional) morphology. Intense contact, level 5, is needed for the borrowing of phonetic changes and significant typological disruption. It is not clear to which category blending belongs in the classification of Thomason and Kaufman. Since blending is a morphological process it is not unlikely that they assign blending to category 4, which implies rather intense contact.

5.2 Types of borrowing

The Code-Copying Framework of Johanson (1999, 2002) seems to be more suitable. Johanson makes a difference between two kinds of copying: global and selective. Global copying refers to the copying of 'units', whereas the copying of properties is called selective copying (Johanson 1999: 41). Selective copying includes loan phonology, loan syntax, and loan semantics (Johanson 1999: 44); strangely enough, loan morphology is missing. Morphological borrowing turns out to be part of global copying and is on par with the borrowing of lexical units. Most likely, it is since elements can be extracted from lexical material and used productively. This, of course, is what ten Hacken & Panocová (2020: 7) mean when they emphasize the role of re-analysis.

> Lexical units may initially be part of globally copied complexes, e.g. idiomatic, stereotyped phrases, and later on copied as isolates. This order is practically always found in the case of bound derivational or relational units; they are first copied as parts of complex originals and may later be copied in isolation and used productively. Global copies are inserted into the slots of their 'equivalents' in the basic code [the recipient language CH] (Johanson 1999: 42).

Johanson's model may work well for derivational affixes like *-o* and maybe even for libfixes, even though they are not or are hardly inserted in the recipient language, but it is difficult to imagine how this model should be applied to a borrowed blending process.

The distinction made by Matras & Sakel (2007) and Sakel (2007) between MAT and PAT borrowing seems more promising. MAT borrowing means that "morphological material and its phonological shape is replicated from one language in another, PAT describes the case where only the patterns of the other language are replicated, i.e. the organization, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed" (Sakel 2007: 15). However, the distinction is not absolute: "In many cases of MAT-borrowing, also the function of the borrowed element is taken over, that is MAT and PAT are combined" (Sakel 2007: 15)[54]. This is the case with the new *-o* suffix of (pseudo-)embellished clippings.

However, the question remains to what type of borrowing the two other processes discussed here belong. In both cases the result is a much more frequent and visible pattern in the receiving language than in the past but it remains

[54] In their discussion of universal constraints on borrowing Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 21) emphasize that affixes are transferred only as adjuncts on lexical morphemes, which does not necessarily have to be the case when there is substratum influence. Subsequent reinterpretation of the borrowed lexemes makes it possible to extract the 'adjuncts' from the borrowed forms.

questionable whether libfixing and blending are canonical cases of PAT borrowing. In both cases Dutch already had access to existing processes, albeit marginally especially in the case of blending. Moreover, in the case of libfixing a single libfix or a few have been borrowed, e.g., *-tainment*, *-topia*, *-taria*, which suggests that some instances of libfixing are more MAT than PAT borrowing, whereas some other cases tend more to PAT borrowing. Finally, blending has started to become a frequently used word-formation process by taking over a couple of English blends first. However, the next step was not a combination of MAT and PAT borrowing since blending was applied to completely new Dutch forms. Therefore, one better speaks of PAT reinforcement in the case of blending. PAT reinforcement reminds of the observation of Grant (2012): "Transfer of patterns from one language to another using morphemes which are already part of the basic language inventory is a fairly common practice". However, in the case of blending, there is no question of existing morphemes, but of a marginally present process.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of the borrowing of three non-morphemic word-formation processes in Dutch leads to the conclusion that

a. change is often a matter of increasing (or decreasing) frequency in use, rather than the adoption (or complete loss) of particular forms
b. the distinction between MAT and PAT borrowing is murky. It is better to replace the suggestion of Matras & Sakel (2007) that MAT and PAT are sometimes combined, with a proposal for a BORROWING CLINE.
c. MAT and PAT are the different ends of the BORROWING CLINE
d. PAT borrowing must be distinguished from PAT reinforcement, especially in the case of libfixing and blending.

REFERENCES

Algeo, John. 1977. Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech* 52(1–2). 47–64. DOI: 10.2307/454719

Algeo, John. 1998. Vocabulary. In Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language. Vol 4: 1776–1997*. Cambridge University Press: 57–91.

Ayto, John. 2003. Newspapers and neologisms. In Jean Aitchinson & Diana M. Lewis (eds.), *New media language*, Routledge. 182–186.

Backus, Albert (= Ad). 2012. *A usage-based approach to borrowability*. Tilburg University.

Backus, Ad. 2014. A usage-based approach to borrowability. In Eline Zenner & Gitte Kristiansen (eds.), *New perspectives on lexical borrowing: Onomasiological, methodological and phraseological innovations*, De Grutyer Mouton. 19–39. DOI: 10.1515/9781614514305.19

Balteiro, Isabel & Laurie Bauer. 2019. Introduction. *Lexis* 14. DOI: 10.4000/lexis.4085

Bauer, Laurie. 1994. *Watching English change. An introduction to the study of linguistic change in standard Englishes in the twentieth century.* Longman.

Bauer, Laurie & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Lexical word-formation. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, Cambridge University Press: 1621–1722. DOI: 10.1017/9781316423530.020

Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber & Ingo Plag. 2013. *The Oxford reference guide to English morphology*. Oxford University Press.

Booij, Geert. 2012. The grammar of words. An introduction to linguistic morphology (3rd edn.). Oxford University Press.

Booij, Geert. 2019. The morphology of Dutch (2nd end.). Oxford University Press.

Booij, Geert & Ariane van Santen. 2017. *Morfologie. De woordstructuur van het Nederlands* (3rd edn.). Amsterdam University Press.

van Bree, Cor. 2020. *Leerboek voor de historische grammatica van het Nederlands. Deel 2: Flexie woordvorming.* Leiden Universiteit.

Bryant, Margaret M. 1974. Blends are increasing. *American Speech* 49(3–4). 163–184. DOI: 10.2307/3087796

Cannon, Garland. 1986. Blends in English word formation. Linguistics 24(4). 725–753. DOI: 10.1515/ling.1986.24.4.725

Cannon, Garland. 2000. Blending. In Geert E. Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphologie/Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung/An international handbook on inflection and word-formation. 1. Halbband*, De Gruyter Mouton. 952–956. DOI: 10.1515/9783110111286.1.12.952

Dabulskis, Mindaugas. 2012. https://github.com/mindausai/honors-project/blob/master/all_blends_complete.txt

Dixon, Robert M. W. 2014. *Making new words. Morphological derivation in English.* Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198712367.001.0001

Fischer, Roswitha. 1998. *Lexical change in present-day English. A corpus-based study of the motivation, institutionalization, and productivity of creative neologisms.* Gunter Narr.

Gardani, Francesco. 2018. On morphological borrowing. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 12(10). e12302. DOI: 10.1111/lnc3.12302

Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze. 2015. Borrowed morphology: An overview. In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, De Gruyter Mouton. 1–23. DOI: 10.1515/9781614513209.1

Grant, Anthony. 2012. Bound morphology in English (and beyond): Copy or cognate? In Lars Johanson & Martine Robbeets (eds.), Copies versus cognates in bound morphology, Brill. 99–122. DOI: 10.1163/9789004230477_006

Haas, Wim de & Mieke Trommelen. 1993. *Morfologisch handboek van het Nederlands. Een overzicht van de woordvorming.* SDU Uitgeverij.

Hacken, Pius ten & Renáta Panocová. 2020. Word formation, borrowing and their interaction. In Pius ten Hacken & Renáta Panocová (eds.), *The interaction of borrowing and word formation*, Edinburgh University Press. 3–14.

van Haeringen, Coenraad B. 1945. *Cafetaria, taria*. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 38. 148–149.
Hamans, Camiel. 2004a. From *rapo* to *lullo*: About an informal internationalese. In Anna Duszak & Urszula Okulska (eds.), *Speaking from the margin. Global English from a European perspective*, Peter Lang. 69–75.
Hamans, Camiel. 2004b. The relation between formal and informal style with respect to language change. In Christine Dabelsteen & J. Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Languaging and language practicing*, University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Humanities. 168–195.
Hamans, Camiel. 2010. The productivity of blending: Linguistic or cognitive? Or how to deal with *administrivia* and *ostalgia*. In Danuta Stanulewicz, Tadeusz Z. Wolański & Joanna Redzimska (eds.), *Lingua terra cognita II. A festschrift for professor Roman Kalisz*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego. 467–490.
Hamans, Camiel. 2012. From *prof* to *provo*: Some observations on Dutch clippings. In Bert Botma & Roland Noske (eds.), *Phonological explorations: Empirical, theoretical and diachronic issues*, De Gruyter. 25–40. DOI: 10.1515/9783110295177.25
Hamans, Camiel. 2014. What makes a blend – a reading report and some observations. In Grzegorz A. Kleparski, Ewa Konieczna & Beata Kopecka (eds.), *Linguistics and methodology*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. 240–256.
Hamans, Camiel. 2017. Language change and morphological processes. *Yearbook of the Poznan Linguistic Meeting* 3(1). 1–23. DOI: 10.1515/yplm-2017-0001
Hamans, Camiel. 2018. Between *Abi* and *Propjes*: Some remarks about clipping in English, German, Dutch and Swedish. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 15(2). 24–59.
Hamans, Camiel. 2019. Een woordsoort als brug. *Brünner Beitrage zur Germanistik und Nordistik* 33(2). 79–91. DOI: 10.5817//BBGN2019-2-1
Hamans, Camiel. 2020a. The difference between blends and clipped compounds. In Gabi Danon (ed.), *Proceedings of IATL 34. Papers from the 34th Annual Conference of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics*, Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics. 31–43.
Hamans, Camiel. 2020b. How an 'Italian' suffix became productive in Germanic languages. In Pius ten Hacken & Renáta Panocová (eds.), *The interaction of borrowing and word formation*, Edinburgh University Press. 140–161.
Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A modern English grammar. Part 4: Morphology*. Ejnar Munksgaard.
Johanson, Lars. 1999. The dynamics of code-copying in language encounters. In Bernt Brendemoen, Elizabeth Lanza & Else Ryen (eds.), *Language encounters across time and space*, Novus Forlag. 37–62.
Johanson, Lars, 2002. Do languages die of 'structuritis'? On the role of code-copying in language endangerment. *Rivista di Linguistica* 14(2). 249–270.
Kelly, Michael H. 1998. To "brunch" or to "brench". Some aspects of blend structure. *Linguistics* 36(3). 579–590. DOI: 10.1515/ling.1998.36.3.579
Konieczna, Ewa. 2012. Lexical blending in Polish: A result of the internationalisation of Slavic languages. In Vincent Renner, François Maniez & Pierre Arnaud (eds.), *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending*, De Gruyter Mouton. 51–73. DOI: 10.1515/9783110289572.51
Lalić-Krstin, Gordana 2008. Portmanteau animals and their portmanteau names in English and Serbian. In Katarina Rasulić & Ivana Trbojević-Milošević (eds.), *International Conference English Language and Literature Studies: Structures across Culture proceedings*. University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy. 231–239.

Land, Wouter van der. 2019. Schel en andere dorado's. *Neerlandistiek.nl* 02/11/2019 https://www.neerlandistiek.nl/2019/11/schel-en-andere-dorados/ (date of access 09/04/2020).

Lappe, Sabine. 2007. *English prosodic morphology*. Springer.

Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The categories and types of Present-Day English word-formation* (2nd edition, revised and enlarged.). Beck.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511809873

Matras, Yaron. 2011. Universals of structural borrowing. In Peter Siemund (ed.), *Linguistic universals and language variation*, De Gruyter Mouton. 200–229. DOI: 10.1515/9783110238068.204

Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31(4). 829–865. DOI: 10.1075/sl.31.4.05mat

Meesters, Gert. 2004. *Marginale morfologie in het Nederlands. Paradigmatische samenstellingen, neoklassieke composita en splintercompositia.* KANTL.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching.* Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol & Janice Jake. 2009. A universal model of code-switching and bilingual language processing and production. In Barbara E. Bullock & Almeida Jacqueline Toribio (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*, Cambridge University Press. 336–357. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511576331.020

Moreton, Elliott, Jennifer L. Smith, Katya Pertsova, Rachel Broad & Brandon Prickett. 2017. Emergent positional privilege in novel English blends. *Language* 93(2). 347–380.

Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge University Press.

Norde, Muriel & Sarah Sippach. 2019. *Nerdalicious scientainment*. A network analysis of English libfixes. *Word Structure* 12(3). 353–384. DOI: 10.3366/word.2019.0153

Pajerová, Kristina. 2018. *Blends in het Nederlands. Blends in Dutch language.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, Palacký University.

Ralli, Angela & George J. Xydopoulos. 2012. Blend formation in Modern Greek. In Vincent Renner, François Maniez & Pierre Arnaud (eds.), *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending*, De Gruyter Mouton. 35–50. DOI: 10.1515/9783110289572.35

Renner, Vincent. 2018. Structural borrowing in word-formation: An exploratory overview. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 15(2). 2–12.

Renner, Vincent, François Maniez & Pierre Arnaud (eds.). 2012. *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending*. De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110289572

Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, De Gruyter Mouton. 15–29. DOI: 10.1515/9783110199192.15

Seifart, Frank. 2017. Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7(3). 389–431. DOI: 10.1075/jhl.16002.sei

Seifart, Frank. 2020. *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing.* Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. https://afbo.info. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3610155

Sijs, Nicoline van der. 2002. Verkortingen. *Onze Taal* 71. 210–211.

Smith, Chris. 2014. The phonesthetics of blends: A lexicographic study of cognitive blends in the OED. *ExELL: Explorations in English Language and Linguistics* 2(1). 12–45. DOI: 10.1515/exell-2016-0002

Stamenov, Christo. 2015. Borrowing word-formation: *-ing* suffixation and blending in Bulgarian. *Sŭpostavitelno Ezikoznanie/Contrastive Linguistics* 2015(3): 163–179.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact. An introduction.* Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. University of California Press.

Zabrocki, Ludwik. 1962. Phon, Phonem und distinktives Morphem. *Biuletyn Fonograficzny* 5: 59–87. [reprinted in Zabrocki (1980): 101–104.]

Zabrocki, Ludwik. 1969. Phonologie und distinctive Morphologie. In Alexandru Graur (ed.), *Actes du Xe Congrès International des Linguistes Bucarest 1967*, Editions de l'Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie. 367–375. [reprinted in Zabrocki (1980): 105–112.]

Zabrocki, Ludwik. 1980. *U podstaw struktury i rozwoju języka. At the foundation of language structure and development.* Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Zwicky, Arnold. 2010. Libfixes. *Arnold Zwicky's Blog* 23/01/2010. https://arnoldzwicky.org/2010/01/23/libfixes/