Analyzing the Creativity of English Blends: a Corpus Study

Glavak, Jakob

University of Zagreb

Department of English

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Jakob Glavak

Analyzing the Creativity of English Blends: a Corpus Study

Master's thesis

Supervisors: dr. sc. Janja Čulig Suknaić, dr. sc. Marina Grubišić

Academic year : 2022. / 23.

Abstract

Despite their long history, blends are often seen as peripheral in the English language. Compared to other language phenomena, they get very little attention by researchers. Linguists cannot agree on what makes a true blend; some say that overlap between the source words is necessary and some say that clipping is enough. They also cannot agree on what makes a blend more or less conventional.

The enTenTen20 corpus had a rich collection of English blends. They had a variety of structures, sizes, ages and origins. There were even cases of blends inspiring or being used to create new blends. The semi-official rules were frequently bent or broken. There were even a few cases where a term's status as blend was uncertain. The way the common people use a language can have a strong impact on it.

Keywords: blending, source word, fracto-lexeme, overlap, conventional, corpus.

Index

1. Introduction

Blends are new words created by combining parts of pre-existing words. Some of the examples are „brunch" (breakfast + lunch), „smog" (smoke + fog) and „dramedy" (drama + comedy). Blends have a long history in the English language; according to the professor of the English language and linguistics Elisa Mattielo and her book "Extra-grammatical Morphology in English", blending can be traced back to 1512 with examples such as "blatterature" (blatter + literature). Another old example is "foolsopher" (fool + philosopher) from 1592 (Mattielo 2013: 111).

Blends gradually gained influence over the centuries. They were popularized by Lewis Carroll and his works. They are frequently used and created to this day. Because of that, there are several ways to blend words together. Blends do not follow a single forming principle; they tend to exhibit divergent structural patterns. Unfortunately, a lot of linguists, such as Randolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum, treat blends as peripheral when it comes to English word-formation. Even some of the sources for this essay talk very little about them (for example, "A University Grammar of English" and "The Cambridge Grammar of English Language"). They are treated as if they have no importance in the morphological theory. They are designated to the "extra-grammatical" branch of morphology, as if they belong to the margins of English grammar (Mattielo 2013: 111).

This study will take several kinds of blends, both conventional and unconventional, and analyze them in the enTenTen20 corpus on Sketch Engine. There are plenty of questions to ask regarding blends. What makes a blend conventional or unconventional?

To add on to that, what makes them acceptable or unacceptable? How does the average person use them? What kinds of words appear in tandem with them? If there are unconventional ways to form a blend, how far can they be pushed? What factors make us classify blends as outdated or innovative? Are there gray areas? This essay will try to answer some of these questions. It will focus especially hard on the first one.

2. An Overview of Blending

In her book “Blending, from English to Arabic”, Ekhlas Ali Mohsin gives us an overview of blending in English. It is recognized as a very productive source of words. Blends are formed by joining parts from two or more source words. Source words have several other terms, such as “parent words”, “constituent words” and “etymons”. The segments that make up a blend are usually called “splinters”, “sub-morphemic splinters” or “fracto-lexemes” (Mohsin 2021: 4-5).

The fracto-lexemes are often connected next to each other, but there are rare cases of blends where a part of one word is inserted into another, such as “chortle” (chuckle + snort). Blends like these have been referred to as “sandwich blends”, “discontinuous blends”, “infixed blends”, etc. Another important part of the study of blends is the split point; the boundary point between the fracto-lexemes of a blend. Like the other aspects of blends, it also has alternate terms: “breakpoint”, “switching point”, “crossover point”, etc. One last important term is the “cutoff point”, a point inside the source word that is cut or shortened to create the fracto-lexeme (Mohsin 2021: 5).

Traditional accounts of the creation of blends tend to focus on one of three points (or a combination of them). The first one is describing blending in terms of graphemes and sometimes phonemes. The second one is determining whether the fracto-lexemes come from the initial or final part of the source word. The third one is determining the number of source words involved. The number is usually two, but it can also be three,

such as in “turducken” (turkey + duck + chicken). Very rarely, the number can be more than three, such as in an innovative word “Cablinasian” (Causasian + Black + Indian + Asian) (Mohsin 2021: 5-6).

Different researchers have different ways of defining what a blend is. Mohsin shares the thoughts of her fellow researchers. Algeo defined it as a combination of two or more word forms where at least one of them is shortened. Gries is more specific; there needs to be some phonemic or graphemic overlap between the two words. For example, “motel” (motor + hotel) is acceptable, but not “brunch” (breakfast + lunch) (Mohsin 2021: 6).

The research on English blends has shown that there are several tendencies governing their formation. They can be identified by examining characteristics that distinguish blends from other kinds of words. For example, in “Dépasser les désaccords: pour une approche prototypiste du concept d'amalgame lexical.”, the professor of English linguistics Vincent Renner specified three major types of restrictions that can be used to identify blends (Mohsin 2021: 6).

The first restriction is that the creation of a blend involves omitting the final sound of the first word and/or the initial sound of the second word, for example, “morphosyntax” (morphology + syntax). Any word combination that does not follow that pattern is not a blend, but a clipped compound. The second restriction is that a blend should reflect the meanings of its source words. For example, smog is a combination of smoke and fog. The third restriction is that source words need at least one overlapping phoneme or grapheme, for example, “motel”. It is a similar restriction to Gries’, who also claimed that blends need some kind of phonemic and graphemic overlap (Mohsin 2021: 7-9).

In “A University Grammar of English”, Linguists Randolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum have much different standards for what counts as a blend. Not only are they fine with one element being reduced to a fragment while another is kept whole, they

expect it. However, they do believe that blends such as “motel” and “transistor” (transfer + resistor) are legitimate. They also point out that many blends are informal and quickly fall out of use, but some have become fully accepted in the language. There is a lot of outdated blends in the English language (Greenbaum, Quirk 1989: 448-449).

Finally, linguists Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum have made their own contributions in their book “The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language”. Blends can have overlapping elements, but they do not need them. Elements can overlap in writing, but not in speech (for example, “smoke” and “fog” in “smog”) and vice versa (“balloon” and “parachute” in “ballute”). Since the enTenTen20 corpus is a collection of writing and not speech, it is likely that a few details will be missed (Huddleston, Pullum 2002: 1636-1637).

Usually, blends are not longer than the biggest source word, but there are some exceptions, such as blends where both components are clipped, such as “musicassette” (music + cassette), or innovative blends, such as “glasnostalgia” (glasnost + nostalgia). Blends with three or more source words can be added to that list since it would be difficult to truncate them that much. The source words in a blend are usually free, but there are examples where one of the words cannot stand on its own, such as “electrocute” (electro + execute) (Huddleston, Pullum 2002: 1637).

3. The Study

3. 1. Methodology

The research started by determining the groups of blends that were going to be analyzed. The structures in question turned out to be “beginning + ending”, “beginning + beginning”, “ending + ending”, sandwich blends, three word blends and cases where a blend was used as a part of a blend. A few outdated and innovative blends were also

analyzed. Some of these blends were taken from English grammars, but many of them (especially the unconventional ones) were taken from a variety of websites on the internet.

The blends in question were typed into the enTenTen20 corpus and the Sketch Engine tool, which enabled simple and precise corpus research. The number of examples was recorded. Examples that were especially interesting were singled out, analyzed and compared to scientific texts. If there was next to nothing interesting to extract from corpus examples, N-grams were used as well.

3. 2. Conventional Blends

The best way to start the analysis of blends is with the most common and conventional kind; beginning of the first word plus the ending of the second word. In her overview, the first blend that Mohsin mentions is “brunch”. The Cambridge Dictionary defines it as ‘a meal eaten in the late morning that is a combination of breakfast and lunch’. The enTenTen20 corpus contains 113,718 examples of that word.

As expected, most of the texts that make use of „brunch” are reviews or promotions of restaurants and events. It is used in the same contexts as “breakfast” or “lunch”. One of the more interesting examples is:

> The Bloody Mary is one of the most universally-loved drinks. Perfect for breakfast, brunch, lunch, dinner, and beyond, there simply isn't a wrong time for a Bloody and this book is perfect for anyone on a quest to find the perfect Bloody Mary recipe or to simply show off to their friends with the best and most unusual alternative Bloody Mary recipe out there.

When listing meals that a person might have throughout the day, brunch is not redundant when it is placed between breakfast and lunch. Most people are not going to have all three in one day, but brunch is still considered its own separate event. According to another example, there is a set of expectations associated with brunch:

> I love jazz and love brunch, but one thing up with which I will not put is Jazz Brunch. I don't like jazz with good manners. I prefer jazz that takes its shoes off and puts its feet on the coffee table.

In this example, brunch is associated with sophistication and good manners, meaning that it is closer to the idea of lunch or dinner.

Despite the frequency of the term, there are linguists who have issues with the way it is constructed. According to the corpus linguist Stefan Th. Gries and his text: "Shouldn't it be breakfunch? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English", an ideal blend is the one that leaves both its source words recognizable. "Brunch" does not do that: "Similarly, consider the blend alluded to in the title of this paper, namely *brunch*. As we saw above, *brunch* consists of 22.2% of *breakfast* and 80% of *lunch* and has rather moderate SI values (SIG = 0.304; SIP = 0.275). Along the lines of this paper at least, however, *breakfunch* would be a ''better'' or a more ''typical'' blend (Gries 2004: 663)."

The "breakfast" part is much less recognizable than the "lunch" part. The blend looks improper at first glance, but Gries explains that English blends tend to have as many syllables as the second source word, so it makes sense to omit the first word as much as possible. The structure of "brunch" could also explain why the meal itself is seen as closer to lunch than to breakfast.

The second blend that Mohsin mentions is "motel", defined as 'a hotel for people traveling by car, usually with spaces for cars next to each room'. Motors are not mentioned in the definition, but "motor" does not just mean a vehicle, it can also mean a part of a vehicle. "Motel" has 222,175 examples in the corpus. They include promotions, reviews, news articles, people talking about their travels, etc.

There are 489 examples of the word "roach" appearing close to the word "motel". That is because of the phrase "roach motel", described in the following example:

> For instance, as he shows in the video, the hoops you need to jump through to delete your Amazon account are astounding; it's buried levels deep in a place no one would ever think to look. This dark pattern is called a roach motel— users check in but they don't check out. I wonder how much this single pattern has added to Jeff Bezos' personal net worth?

The phrase comes from the name of an American brand of bug traps. Cockroaches can walk inside, but the glue keeps them from getting out. The manufacturers chose the word "motel", even though "hotel" has a more general meaning and is used more commonly. The most likely explanation is that motels are stereotyped as lower class hotels.

Just like with “brunch”, there are linguists who have issues with the word. Elisa Mattielo shares the thoughts of Kilani-Schoch and Dressler in their work “Extragrammatical vs. marginal morphology”:

> Another necessary distinction, based on the difference between the syntagmatic and the paradigmatic axis, is between blends (or “paradigmatic contaminations”) and “syntagmatic shortenings” (Dressler 2000: 5). According to Kilani-Schoch and Dressler (forth.), only “paradigmatic amalgams” such as *smog* can be considered real blends, whereas those formations which can be analysed as “syntagmatic truncations of potential compounds” (e.g. *motel*) cannot. However, as the authors themselves admit, their approach is “more restrictive than usually found in the literature” (Mattielo 2013: 116-117)

To be more specific, Kilani-Schoch and Dressler do not have a problem with the word itself, but with how it is classified. Since a motel can be defined as a “motor hotel”, it does not count as a blend, but as a truncated compound. Most people, even the authors themselves, would agree that such a rule is very restrictive, perhaps even too restrictive. There is so much conflict around blends that even the most conventional ones have people who doubt their legitimacy.

3. 3. “Beginning + Beginning” Blends

If “beginning + ending” blends are the most common kind, “beginning + beginning” are in the second place. Despite the linguists (for example, Vincent Renner) who claim this kind of blending is unacceptable, blends with this structure can be found in a lot of lists on the internet, such as the one on ThoughtCo. One of the blends like this is “moped”, a combination of “motor” and “pedal”. It is defined as ‘a small motorcycle with pedals that can be used when starting it or traveling up the hill’.

The word has 21,213 examples in the corpus. Because a moped is a vehicle, a lot of examples are reports on crimes and accidents. The second most common N-gram (with lexical words) is “scooter and moped”. Furthermore, there are 2,106 examples of the word “scooter” appearing near the word “moped”. It makes sense that the two would often be mentioned together. They are both small and slow vehicles that are relatively easy to use.

The third most common N-gram that follows the aforementioned criteria is “ride a moped”. A moped is a type of motor; of course they would both use “ride” and not “drive”.

	N-gram	Frequency ?			N-gram	Frequency ?
1	a moped	100	11	moped is	11
2	the moped	50	12	or moped	11
3	moped and	25	13	moped around	10
4	moped or	19	14	moped scooter	9
5	on a moped	16	15	ride a moped	9
6	pak moped	13	16	the power pak moped	7
7	power pak moped	13	17	moped that	7
8	and moped	12	18	moped to	7
9	his moped	12	19	a moped or	7
10	my moped	11	20	moped in	7

Picture 1: Top 20 N-grams for “moped”

One of the corpus examples talks about “noped”, a new blend derived from the word “moped”:

> The term noped is sometimes used for mopeds that do not have pedals. By the 1980s, it was obvious that the pedals on mopeds were no longer performing any useful function, in fact the performance of the 49cc engines available was delivering speeds in excess of 80km/h, a common model in the UK being the Yamaha FS1E.

We can interpret the word “noped” in two ways; it is either a blend of “no” and “moped” or a blend of “no” and “pedal”. Considering the description from the example, the former is more likely. The example also shows how the word “moped”, along with its definition, is somewhat outdated. Pedals on the moped are no longer useful. When we look at most modern-day mopeds, we will not see any pedals. Words do not always change at the same speed as technology.

Another example from ThoughtCo. is the word “agitprop”, a combination of “agitation” and “propaganda”. The Cambridge Dictionary defines it as ‘(the spreading of) strongly political ideas or arguments expressed especially through plays, art, books, etc.’ The definition can make one believe that the word “agitprop” is interchangeable with

"propaganda", but the insertion of "agitation" implies that pieces of agitprop are deliberately designed to incite anger or hatred.

"Agitprop" has 4,880 examples in enTenTen20. Most examples are people of various political leanings accusing other people of brainwashing the masses. One of the most obvious examples of the word's negative connotations is this:

> What he (or she) writes is some diabolically clever good-guy agitprop (wait a minute...can the good guys produce agitprop?)

There is a strong implication that creating agitprop makes one a bad person. The negative connotations of the word "propaganda" transferred over to "agitprop".

On the other hand, there are some examples that try to paint agitprop in a positive light. One of them makes a distinction between it and propaganda:

> To me, the word propaganda contains a sinister connotation: the intent to deceive. Since I didn't set out to deceive anyone with my film, I don't consider it an example of propaganda. Agitprop might be a better description, referring here to the politicized artwork that flourished in the first half of the twentieth Century. We would do well to consider the idea that the most insidious forms of propaganda do not come in the form of a plainly stated thesis or obvious political viewpoint, but in the art of pseudo-objectivity.

Despite the definition and the structure of the word, this writer does not see agitprop as a type of propaganda. Propaganda is presented as deceptive, while agitprop is presented as honest. Along with deception, a common aspect of propaganda is trying to make people angry at a specific person, a group of people or an idea. The word "agitprop" takes that aspect and emphasizes it. Deception is secondary and arguably optional.

Gries explains why "beginning + beginning" blends are the second most common structure. Kaunisto analyzed the structure of blends and claimed that the ideal blend is the one where neither source word is clipped; they retain full recognizability. Gries criticizes Kaunisto's research:

> However, in the vast majority of blends, the two source words contribute different portions of themselves: typically, the first lexeme contributes its beginning whereas the second lexeme its end. However, previous studies have shown that x segments of the beginning of a word increase its chance of being recognized more than the same number of segments of its end (Gries 2004: 650).

In other words, the beginning of a word is more recognizable than the ending of the same length. We could argue that combining two beginnings makes just as much sense as combining a beginning and an ending. Gries' paper also explains why the following "ending + "ending" blends are so rare in comparison. The source words in those kinds of blends are relatively hard to recognize.

3. 4. "Ending + Ending" Blends

Unlike the previous two kinds of blends, the blends that combine the endings of two words were somewhat difficult to find. It is rare to find a list with just one. However, two of them were eventually found. According to Natalia Beliaeva's article "Blending in Morphology", "frohawk" is a combination of "afro" and "mohawk". It means 'a mohawk hairstyle worn by someone with afro-textured hair, with the crest generally standing up naturally'.

The lemma "frohawk" has 157 examples in the corpus, but the majority of them refer to people with the last name "Frohawk". If we make it so that enTenTen20 only gives us results with no uppercase letters, we get 25 examples. It is a more precise number, but it is not completely accurate, since it ignores examples where the word refers to the hairstyle, but it happens to be at the beginning of a sentence.

Out of the original 157 examples, three of them capitalize both the "F" and the "H". One of them is:

> Martin is known as her unique voice and her "Egyptian Warrior Princess" style, headband and her signature hairstyle she calls a "FroHawk", a portmanteau of "afro" and "mohawk".

The fact that both components of the blend are capitalized is a sign that the word has not fully integrated itself in the English language. On the other hand, we do not know how old those three texts are, so it is only a speculation.

Another "ending + ending" blend was found on a Grammarly blog post called "56 Words That Are Actually Portmanteaus". The word "podcast" comes from "iPod" and

“broadcast”. It is defined as ‘a radio programme that is stored in a digital form that you can download from the internet and play on a computer or on an MP3 player’. The term is a bit misleading since podcasts are not limited to iPods. There are 604,488 examples of “podcast” on enTenTen20. Most of them are promotions.

Just like with “frohawk”, there are examples where “podcast” is spelled with both of its components capitalized. There were 665 examples, meaning that it was easier to find one with a specified time:

> Smart Buildings Videocast and PodCast for week ending Feb 3, 2019, features interviews with Ken Sinclair, owner and editor of Automated Buildings, who helps to navigate our journey through the perilous “Path of Least Disruption,” and rising entrepreneur and SandStar founder, Alper Üzmezler, CEO of BASSG and Alta Labs.

The source is only four years old, which makes the claim that the word “podcast” is not fully integrated easier to make. On the other hand, “podcast” has many more examples in the corpus than “frohawk” and people use it a lot more often. A four year difference is not such a small one when a word is commonly used. Furthermore, podcasts have gotten a lot more popular in the last couple of years, partially because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

There is another explanation why “podcast” is so commonly used despite the structure. In “A Web of New Words”, Professor Daphné Kerremans talks about semantic transparency and recognizability of compound words, including blends. She shares the results of an experiment:

> In an experiment with high- and low-frequency words, Schreuder and Baayen (cf. 1997: 121-124) noticed that response times to words with the same base frequency were significantly faster when the word belonged to a large morphological family. Therefore, prefixations such as e-friend or e-novel will be understood and processed faster than blends like globesity or burquini, because the e- prefix has become highly productive in recent years and constitutes an expanding family (Kerremans 2012: 57).

The words “e-friend” and “e-novel” are not blends (“e” is a prefix and not a clipped word), but they are comparable to the blend “podcast”. E-mail is a medium that caught on and basically replaced physical mail. People used the word frequently, which lead to the creation of other words with a similar structure.

For comparison, the iPod is a successful product that sold well and got a lot of people talking about it. Any blend that used it as a component will get a leg up when it comes to frequency of use. Despite Gries' claims that the first half of a word tends to be easier to recognize, the latter half of the word "iPod" turned out to be very recognizable.

3. 5. Sandwich Blends

Like "ending + ending" blends, blends where one word is inserted in the middle of another are very rare. Fortunately, Mohsin mentions one in her book. "Chortle" is a mix of "chuckle" and "snort" and the Cambridge Dictionary defines it as 'to laugh, showing pleasure or satisfaction'. The definition is somewhat deficient; it does not differentiate chortling from standard laughing and it does not mention snorting at all. The word comes off as redundant.

"Chortle" has 12,335 examples in the corpus. Most of them are people talking about their personal experiences and literary texts with a goofier tone. It is hard to imagine a more serious text using that word. Like with "frohawk", there are texts which use the word as the name of a website or a person, but it is not nearly as common of an occurrence. One of the texts uses the word "chortle" in an interesting way:

> They play, fight, laugh, scream, giggle, chortle, make us proud, make us scream, make us laugh, and make us want to throttle them in equal measure. They are the consummate siblings; friends one second, rivals the next. And family always!

The sentence uses three different synonyms for the word "laugh". The word "giggle" has a slightly different definition ('to laugh repeatedly in a quiet but uncontrolled way, often at something silly or rude or when you are nervous'), but, as mentioned before, "laugh" and "chortle" appear interchangeable. It is likely that a more accurate definition of "chortle" would simply be "chuckling and snorting at the same time", but it is also likely that the author used different terms for the same action in order to emphasize the chaotic nature of children's behavior.

Another example of a sandwich blend comes from a Wikipedia article on blended words. “Adorkable” is a combination of “adorable” and “dork” and it means ‘socially awkward or not fashionable, but in a way that makes you love or like it or them’. Just like the words it is comprised of, it is a subjective term. There are 617 examples in the corpus. Most of them are of people complimenting other people or fictional characters. The examples are just as casual as the ones for “chortle”.

One of the examples is theorizing about the origin of the word:

> Sure, it doesn't have an "easy" buzzword (AKA you can't shove a 'k' in there and have it still make sense--looking at you, 'adorkable' and 'gleek'), but even FOX recognizes the potential of the sophomore series.

A buzzword is any commonly used word of phrase that is considered fashionable. The writer calls it easy because the two words can naturally blend together. “Adorable” and “dork” share the “dor” part. There is only a one letter difference between “glee” and “geek”. Those kinds of blends sound natural because they have a close resemblance to a pre-existing word.

The idea that a blend is more acceptable if it has a resemblance to a source word was tested by Gries in his text “Isn’t that Fantabulous? How Similarity Motivates Intentional Morphological Blends in English”. He performed a study where he took a list of intentional blends and compared how many letters they share with each of their source words. He also analyzed randomly combined words for comparison. He describes the results in layman’s terms:

> Less technically, the results show that source words of authentic blends are blended in such a way that the blends still exhibit a strong similarity to the original source words. By contrast, if words are merely arbitrarily blended in all phonologically possible ways, then the degree of similarity between source words and blends decreases strongly (Gries 2004: 424).

A comparison between the corpus example and Gries’ studies can be made, but there is a noticeable difference. “Adorkable” and “adorable” only have a one letter difference, but “adorkable” and “dork” are very different. They only share three letters, which is very few for a nine-letter word. On the other hand, “gleek” is very similar to both of its source

words. It is uncertain if Gries would see “adorkable” as a good example of similarity. An average person and an expert are not always going to classify words in the same way. Experts rely more on their own analysis, while the average person just uses their own speaker instinct. What is acceptable to one might not be acceptable to the other, and vice versa.

There are several examples where the word “adorkable” was written slightly differently than usual:

> aDORKable - When trying to understand Earth customs.

The “dork” part was written in all capital letters, likely because the writer wanted to emphasize that aspect of the character. Another example is:

> Hairy and Sherri (Sharon) are an “adorkable” interracial couple living in gentrified East Austin.

Unlike most other examples, the word is written in quotation marks. This essay uses quotation marks when talking about the word itself and not the entity, but that cannot be the reason why the article uses them. A possible explanation is that the writer does not see it as an official word in the English language, so they feel the need to use quotation marks.

3. 6. Three or More Words Combined

As mentioned before, blends are not limited to just two words. Mohsin gives us two examples; one of them is “turducken”, created by combining “turkey”, “duck” and “chicken”. It is defined as ‘a cooked dish consisting of a chicken placed inside a duck, which is then placed inside a turkey’. EnTenTen20 contains 1.605 examples, most of which are texts on how to make the meal or texts praising it for how delicious it is.

“Turducken” does not just have to refer to a meal, it can also be a point of comparison:

> And I packed them ridiculously well, especially the deck book combos and multi deck combos, some of you will laugh when you see how packed they are, like a turducken, haha.

The size difference between the three birds is not so big that inserting one carcass into another would be easy. The structure of a turducken makes it a good metaphor for any group of objects that is tightly bound together.

The word "turducken" invited the English speakers to create an even longer word "turbaconducken". It has 14 examples and they are not all from the same source. One of the examples is:

> Loosbrock founded his company, which does $5 million in business a year, in 2001, when the turbaconducken, a bacon-wrapped turkey stuffed with a duck stuffed with a chicken, was just a glimmer in one hungry man's eye.

The word "bacon" is somewhat clumsily inserted into "turducken". It is not clipped, nor does it overlap with any other word. Going by the logic of how the original word is constructed, the word "bacon" should go at the beginning, since the turkey is the one that's wrapped in bacon, not the duck. All of this can make one wonder if "turbaconducken" counts as a blend or just a compound word.

This confusion is not limited to obscure terms like "turbaconducken." Gries talks about his fellow researcher Algeo's article "Blends, a structural and systemic view". According to him, blending is a combination of words where at least one of them is shortened. If neither word is shortened, then it is not a blend, but a compound. This definition leads into Gries talking about ambiguous cases:

> Examples of non-blends mentioned include *squandermania, daisy* (historically a compound, namely *day's eye*) and *meritocracy* (''a derivative with the combining form -*ocracy*'' [1977: 54]). However, I believe the case of *meritocracy* is a difficult one since, strictly speaking, *meritocracy* can be argued to be covered by Algeo's definition of blends (*merit* X *aristocracy*), so it seems as if the definition is either not followed by consistently or is in need of refinement in terms of additional criteria (Gries 2004: 641).

"Meritocracy" has 15,325 examples in the corpus. It is not particularly common, but it is not obscure either. Whether it counts as a blend or not depends on which words were used in its formation. Similarly, the blend status of "turbaconducken" depends on whether we

look at it as a combination of two words or four. The English language has plenty of ambiguous cases such as these.

Another example of a three-word blend in Mohsin's book is "compushity", a combination of "compulsion", "push" and "necessity". This word is interesting because, even though it has zero examples in the corpus, it does appear in several literary sources. In "Blends - Their Relation To English Word Formation", Louise Pond gives us a definition: "**compushity, compush,** compulsion, necessity. "A case of compushity" (Pond 1914: 31)."

The word "compushity" has several synonyms. All of them have a simpler construction. It is also worth noting that Pond's book is almost 100 years old. From all of this, including the fact that it has zero examples in the corpus, we can conclude that the blend is outdated. Mohsin had to use an outdated word as an example because three-word blends are just that rare. The rarity can be explained with Gries' criteria for an ideal blend. In a three-word blend, it is hard to make all three source words recognizable. It is also hard to make the blend resemble just one of them, let alone all three.

Elisa Mattielo brings up some three-word compounds that lie on the border between blends and acronyms:

> However, some formations reported in López Rúa (2002: 44) lie in between non-prototypical blends and acronyms (see the extended type in 3.1.6.4). For example, *HoReCa* (← *Hotel, Restaurant, and Café keepers*), *Euratom* (← *European Atomic Energy Community*), and the international *Benelux* (← *Belgium-Netherlands-Luxembourg*) retain more than the initial letters, but the source words are clearly part of a phrase or list, which excludes them from blends (Mattielo 2013: 116).

Earlier in the book, Mattielo explains how acronyms do not count as blends; they shorten a pre-existing word sequence to its initial letters. Blending shortens two lexemes that have no composite meaning and blends retain larger portions of source words. There are some holes in that distinction, however. The aforementioned turducken is a literal combination of three different birds. The word "brunch" contains only two letters from the word

"breakfast"; the same as the components of "HoReCa". It appears that, no matter how we define blending, there will always be instances that cannot be easily classified.

3. 7. A Blend as a Part of a Blend

Some of the strangest kinds of blends discovered in this research are of blends being used as a part of the blend. The aforementioned "noped" can be a case of this, but there are more transparent examples. Wikipedia contains two related examples. A tigon is a hybrid of a male tiger and a female lion. A litigon is a hybrid of a female tigon and a male lion. The word "tigon" has 1,066 examples in the corpus. The word "litigon" has 22. Since the creation of a tigon requires only one generation of breeding, they are more numerous and people talk about them more. All but three examples of the word "litigon" come from Wikipedia, which means that the pool of references is even smaller than it appears. Predictably enough, all of the texts are about breeding big cats in confinement.

"Litigon" has some similarities to an aforementioned word. Unlike "turbaconducken", there is no doubt that "litigon" is a blended word. The first word that comprises it is clipped. On the other hand, the question of whether it counts as a three-word blend has no clear answer. Should we count the "tigon" part as one component or two? In math, "1+1+1" has the same answer as "1+2", but linguistics is not that simple.

A liger is a hybrid of a male lion and a female tiger. The word has 5,860 examples in enTenTen20. A tiliger is a hybrid of a male tiger and a female liger. The word has only three examples. Just like before, all of them are about breeding big cats. One of the examples introduces an option of creating even more hybrids:

> Joe would go on to create a tiliger and even a tililiger (or T3) – creatures that existed almost nowhere else on earth.

The definitions of "liliger" and "tililiger" are obvious at this point. If we give hybrids of hybrids their own names instead of just referring to all of them as ligers or tigons, the possibilities are endless. These kinds of blends are infinitely recursive. On the

other hand, hybrids like this can only be born in captivity and they are often infertile. Blends like “tililiger” make for an interesting experiment in language, but they are arguably unnecessary. They are so long that even the source text proposes a shorter term- T3.

3. 8. Outdated Blends

Just like with words in general, there are plenty of blends that used to be highly conventionalized, but in the present day, are either not used anymore or their usage has been reduced drastically. In fact, blends are especially susceptible to that phenomenon. There can be several reasons. For example, a word that was previously acceptable to use can be considered offensive in modern day, such as “Amerind” from Jakub Marian’s article “Blend words (portmanteaus) in English”. It is a combination of “American” and “Indian” and it was used to refer to Native Americans. The term comes from a centuries-old misconception (European settlers thinking that America was India), so it is not considered acceptable anymore. Language reflects society; as our standards change, so will our language.

The word “Amerind” has 1.295 examples in the corpus. Its longer variant, “Amerindian”, has 9,861 examples. Even though it is longer, “Amerindian” has a clearer meaning; both source words are fairly recognizable. It makes sense that people used it more often. Most of the examples of the usage of “Amerind” are people talking about Native American history or literature about them. They did not use the term out of malice, but out of ignorance.

One of the examples gives us a brief history of the term:

> It was the general belief of the day, shared by Columbus, that in his voyage across the Atlantic he had reached India. This term, in spite of its misleading connotation, has passed into the languages of the civilized world: Indio in Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian; Indien in French; Indianer in German, etc. The term American Indian, for which it has been proposed to substitute Amerind [nowadays: Amerindians], is, however, in common use; less so the objectionable term redskins, to which correspond the French Peaux- rouges, the German Rothhäute.

We can see how the term evolved through time. English speakers, along with other Europeans, started out by using the term “Indian”. It was eventually replaced by “Amerind”, “Amerindian” and “American Indian” in that order. The two blends were stages of transition between a single word and a collocation. The example also gives us another reason why “Amerindian” has more examples than “Amerind”; it is a more recent term. Blend structure is a good way to illustrate the advancement of society and language. Observing the usage of blends is also important.

Speaking of the terms changing through time, there is an example that used both the outdated and the modern term:

> Amerind Foundation Museum and Archaeological Research Facility – Dragoon. A private, nonprofit archaeological research facility and museum devoted to the study and interpretation of Native American cultures.

At first sight, it seems strange that the same text would use both terms and not be about the changes in the English language. The two terms are not even next to each other in the timeline. However, we can conclude that the museum got its name back when the term “Amerind” was more acceptable.

Another reason why a word may fall out of use is because it refers to a piece of outdated technology. In the article “50 Outdated Words That Instantly Age You”, Sarah Crow mentions “rolodex”, a combination of “rolling” and “index”. It is defined as ‘a brand name for a circular file of cards on which you keep people’s names and addresses’. Nowadays, we have more practical ways of keeping track of those things. The blend “rolodex” also stands out because of the added “o” in the middle. No other blends so far was formed by adding extra letters.

“Rolodex” has 5,194 examples in enTenTen20. Many of these are not talking about literal rolodexes. There are quite a few examples that use the term as a metaphor for the human mind and its storage of information, such as:

> For now, it still helps to have that mental Rolodex of obscure historical portraits flipping through your mind.

Any method of storing information (such as an archive or a phonebook) could be used in its place. It is likely that the writer did use an actual rolodex at some point in their life, so it was the first thing to come to mind.

Another way of using the term is to compare it to a more recent piece of technology:

> I had read about a program called AZZ CardFile in a computer magazine sidebar as a rolodex type program.

This comparison makes sense; many pieces of technology can be defined as a more practical or convenient variant of something that came before it. A personal computer is a more efficient typewriter, for example.

One of the examples talks about how the rolodex is outdated. It mentions a similar piece of technology in the process:

> The older recruiters still remember the Rolodex and the Filofax. Faxing the CVs to the clients, well it wasn't that long ago. Computers & internet replaced the paper based systems. We recruiters become more productive and effective.

"Filofax" is another blend in the English language. It means 'a brand name for a type of small book in which a record can be kept of phone numbers, future plans and visits, business meetings, etc.' The function is the same as that of a rolodex. That, along with the similarity of the structure, makes it very likely that one of these names inspired another.

This example leads us towards the investigation of the origin of the word. In the article "Arnold Neustadter and the History of the Rolodex." Mary Bellis gives us a short history of the device: "The Rolodex was based on a similar, earlier invention called the Wheeldex. Neilson engineered several improvements that made the Rolodex a better circular file card holder than the Wheeldex including: a second circular rail, plastic handles for easy turning, and a type of clutch (Bellis)."

The rolodex was such a successful invention that other inventions with a similar name soon followed:

- Autodex, a phone directory book that automatically opened to the right letter
- Swivodex, an inkwell that did not spill
- Punchodex, a paper hole puncher
- Clipodex, a stenographer's aid that attached to the knee (Bellis)

The word “wheeldex” started a whole family tree of blends following its structure. We can look at “wheeldex” as the grandfather and “rolodex” as the father of the words in the example. A few of these inventions are not indexes, but they were created by the same company, so they follow the same naming convention. Some blends have a roundabout origin.

A third way a word can become outdated is if it is based on outdated knowledge. Jakub Marian talks about the blend “camelopard” and its origin: “Camelopard”, sometimes spelled “cameleopard”, is the more traditional English expression for a giraffe. It comes from Greek *kamēlopárdalis*, derived from *kámēlos* “camel” and *párdalis* “leopard”, and was common until the late 19th century (Marian).” Unsurprisingly, the word gave people a wrong idea on what a giraffe is, especially those in the past who had no way of seeing what a giraffe actually looked like.

The word “camelopard” has 152 examples in the corpus and “cameleopard”, the alternate way of spelling it, has 79 examples. Most of the examples are older scientific texts. One of the newer ones talks about the giraffe’s scientific name:

> The giraffe's species name is camelopardalis and it originates from Latin. It derives from an archaic English name for the giraffe "camelopard", which was given to giraffes because they resembled both camels and leopards.

To this day, Latin is used to determine a species’ scientific term. It is strange how “camelopard” is outdated, but not “camelopardalis”. That can be explained by the fact that the conventional and scientific terms are held to different standards. The conventional term is more commonly used, so it will be more susceptible to changes. Furthermore, Latin is a dead language. Nobody uses it in everyday life, so there is no point in updating it.

3. 9. Innovative Blends

Innovative blends are portmanteaus that an individual came up with for a specific context. They are not conventionalized, so they cannot be easily used outside of that context. One of those blends is the aforementioned “Cablinasian”, coined by Tiger Woods to describe what his ethnicity is. Gary Younge’s article “Tiger Woods: Black, white, other” explains his heritage:

> Woods is indeed a rich mix of racial and ethnic heritage. His father, Earl, was of African-American, Chinese and Native American descent. His mother, Kultida, is of Thai, Chinese and Dutch descent. "Cablinasian" was a composite of Caucasian, black, Indian and Asian. When he was asked to fill out forms in school, he would tick African-American and Asian. "Those are the two I was raised under and the only two I know," he told Oprah. "I'm just who I am... whoever you see in front of you (Younge 2010)."

Tiger Woods is not the only one to have DNA of those four ethnicities, but the odds of a person like that being born are very small. Even people with two biracial parents are likely to choose something simpler. Woods himself admitted that, before “Cablinasian”, he only used two ethnicities to describe himself. A combination of those two would be called “blasian”, a much more commonly used term.

“Cablinasian” has 116 examples in enTenTen20. Almost all of them are about Tiger Woods and how he chooses to identify. Most people report on it neutrally, but some people have issues with it:

> Side Note: The Tiger Woods "Cablinasian" thing drove me crazy! Not because I do not support his right to identify however he chooses, but because one minute he is stating that he does not want to be referred to as merely black because that it ignores his rich cultural heritage. But in the next breathe he is doing an million dollar advertisement for Nike, talking about "there are some golf courses I'm not even allowed to play on." That ain't because you're "Cablinasian!"

According to The Guardian article, Tiger Woods played golf at a time where there were golf courses that banned black people from playing. The person in the example accuses Woods of contradicting himself; he cannot reject the label “black” while also complaining about being a target of anti-black racism. On the other hand, the blend “Cablinasian” does include the word “black”, so it could be argued that Woods is being consistent.

There is, however, another argument for why the term “Cablinasian” is illegitimate. This one comes from a group of people:

> There was a huge backlash in the black community when Tiger Woods identified himself as "Cablinasian" as opposed to black. I heard a lot of black people say, "Well, the world sees you as black, so that's what you are." And then there's our "first black president," Barack Obama. And our "first black female Oscar winner," Halle Berry.

Technically speaking, Barrack Obama and Halle Berry are both half white, half black, but most people just call them black. The controversy around Woods’ identity leads us to ask, how do we determine an individual’s race? Is it based on DNA? Is it based on how an individual is perceived by others? Is it up to the individual to choose for themselves? It is possible that Obama and Berry are called black because of a desire for a black president or a black Oscar winner. A whole essay could be written about the term “Cablinasian” and its implications, but this one is about more than just one blend.

Speaking of other blends, innovative blends are common in fictional works. According to a San Francisco Chronicle article from Carolyn Said, San Fransokyo is a fictional city from the Disney movie “Big Hero 6”. It is a blend of real-world cities San Francisco and Tokyo. “San Fransokyo” has 439 examples in the corpus. Most of them talk about the aforementioned movie, the TV show that is based on it and the videogames that feature the city.

One of the examples explains why exactly the city is called the way it is:

> The filmmakers' idea was that San Fransokyo is based on an alternative history in which San Francisco was largely rebuilt by Japanese immigrants in the aftermath of the 1906 earthquake, although this premise is never stated in the film.

It is not uncommon for ideas to come up during the production of a movie, only for them to not show in the movie itself. Had it not been for the “behind the scenes” statements about San Fransokyo, the blend would have had a more shallow origin.

There is another example from a person who likely does not know about the full origin of the word:

> He lives in San Fransokyo, which is kind of like a futuristic San Francisco if Japan had won World War II (no, nobody else is going to tell you that).

Considering the fact that, in WWII, Japan fought on the side of Nazi Germany, this is a very dark interpretation. In a way, even the writer acknowledges it by saying, “Nobody else is going to tell you that”. Most people do not want to think about a world where Nazi Germany and its allies won.

The next example is a borderline case. It is the oldest of the three. It comes from Lewis Carroll’s book “Through the Looking Glass”. Alice talks to Humpty Dumpty and listens to his poem. She asks him about the words she does not understand, one of them being “slithy”: ‘That’ll do very well,’ said Alice: and “slithy”?’ ‘Well, “slithy” means “lithe and slimy.” “Lithe” is the same as “active.” You see it’s like a portmanteau— there are two meanings packed up into one word (Carroll 2018: 83).’

There are 451 examples of „slithy” in the corpus. It is called a borderline case because, even though Carroll coined the term for the purposes of a fictional story, there are plenty of examples which do not even mention the novel it originated from. Considering the fact that the novel is over a 100 years old, that is not very surprising.

There are examples that appear to have forgotten the meaning of the word, such as:

> Barcelona duo Roc Jiménez de Cisneros and Anna Ramos deliver songs (?) similar in nature to their pet chinchilla, Perkele – hyperactive, slithy and hairy with promise.

According to Lewis Carroll himself, „slithy” means „active and slimy”. A chinchilla can be active, but how can it be slimy? Like with most words, the meaning of „slithy” has changed over time.

It is impossible to perfectly translate any story from one language to another, but some stories are harder than others. One of the enTenTen20 examples talks about translators struggling with translating Carroll's works:

> Of course, Carroll's portmanteau creations posed a challenge to the translators of his works. For example, in the famous Russian translation, parallel portmanteau words were created; for example, xlivkie (slithy) is a blend of xlipkie (slimy) and lovkie (lithe). While portmanteau words are difficult to achieve (importantly, they must obey all the

> constraints on a possible English word) and are often considered a sign of Carroll's verbal wit, blends of various types are very common in English.

Lewis Carroll was so influential that he indirectly created new blends in other languages. Despite the abundance of blends in the English language, English speakers are not the only ones who can show creativity and resourcefulness when creating them. The Russian translator translated "slithy" to "xlivkie"; they managed to translate Carroll's innovative blends while still making them sound natural in their own language.

According to the professors Rita Brdar-Szabó and Mario Brdar and their article "On the marginality of lexical blending", languages adopting blends from English is relatively common, such as the term "smog":

> It is irrelevant for our purposes that the English word smog is now found in a vast number of languages although it may have been identified as a blend by those who first introduced it into another language. What is important is that (i) it was not blended in the borrowing language, and (ii) that native speakers of the host language are usually unaware of its being a blend in English, just like many native speakers of English nowadays (Brdar-Szabó, Brdar 2008: 189).

"Smog" is used in a variety of languages, including Croatian. The fact that most people do not know it is a blend is just proof of how long it has been a part of multiple languages. Unlike "slithy", it has not been translated, just pronounced differently. If Croatian adopted the word the same way as the Russian translator adopted "slithy", we would probably get a term like "dimagla". However, "smog" follows Gries' idea of similarity better, so, from that angle, the word "smog" makes more sense.

Carrol's influence extends beyond creating new blends in other languages. Elisa Mattielo claims that the author had a major influence on the English language itself:

> Although blending is an old process – blatterature (← blatter + literature) is dated 1512 (Cacchiani 2007: 103) and foolosopher (← fool + philosopher) dates back to 1592 (Adams 2001: 141) – the phenomenon has gradually gained influence over the centuries (Lehrer 2003), becoming very popular when Lewis Carroll made an extensive use of blends like slithy and mimsy in his poem "Jabberwocky", from Through the Looking-Glass (1871), later attracting the attention of linguists such as Aronoff (1976), Bauer (1983), Carstairs-McCarthy (2002), and many others (Mattielo 2013: 111).

"Slithy" is not the only word that Carrol made up. In fact, he was well known for playing with the English language. Mattielo does not specify if that was Carrol's intention, but his

works started a domino effect. Linguists started analyzing his literature, which lead to blending becoming more conventionalized in the English language. Whenever an individual innovates a word, not just a blend, there is a chance that it will eventually fall into everyday use. Of course, many factors are at play: the influence of the innovator, the cleverness of the word, pure luck, etc. The needs of society and the changes within it are an especially strong factor.

In "The Dynamics of the Linguistic System", writer Hans-Jörg Schmid talks about conventionalization in the English language. One of the ways to find out if a word has been conventionalized is checking if it has been codified. It is a key component in the process of standardization:

> The most typical forms of codification are linguistic reference works such as dictionaries, grammars, and usage manuals (TiekenBoon van Ostade 2018), produced either by official authorities such as academies or ministries of education or by commercial publishers. No matter whether such publications are produced with more descriptive, more prescriptive, or more critical or deconstructive intentions, they have a very strong influence on the degree to which the members of a speech community accept norms and conform to them, at least in formal language use (Schmid 2020: 99).

If we apply this standard to the innovative blends in this essay, we can conclude that none of them are conventionalized. The words "Caucasian", "Black", "Indian" and "Asian" all have entries in the Cambridge Dictionary, but not "Cablinasian". The cities Tokyo and San Francisco have entries in the dictionary, but not San Fransokyo.

On the other hand, "slithy" does not have an entry. The word comes from a famous author and novel, it has existed for over a 100 years and people use it outside of the context of "Through the Looking Glass". Despite all of these factors, the Cambridge Dictionary ignored it. We can conclude that dictionaries are not 100% reliable when it comes to determining whether a word is conventionalized or not. To be fair, not even

Schmid makes such a claim; he just says dictionaries have a strong influence, not an absolute one.

4. Conclusion

The analysis of blends started with conventional “beginning + ending” blends. Judging by the academic texts, even their status as legitimate blends is not a unanimous decision. “Beginning + beginning” blends are not far behind when it comes to conventionality; the first half of a word tends to be the more recognizable one. “Ending + ending” blends and sandwich blends are much rarer and much less accepted; it is not difficult to find examples of people capitalizing individual components or altering them in other ways.

Three words blends and blends comprised of other blends show the potential for blends to be recursive; in the right context, new words can be inserted with no limit. However, those contexts are very rare and the end result might not even count as a blend. The idea of acronyms complicates things even further. If a pre-existing phrase is truncated into a series of connected syllables, does it count as a blend or an acronym?

Blends can become outdated for a variety of reasons; a blend can no longer be considered socially acceptable, it can refer to a piece of outdated technology, it can be based on outdated science, etc. However, it is possible for an outdated blend to change with time or to have been an inspiration for a more recent term. Innovative blends often arise from a need to refer to something very rare or something that only exists in fiction. They can also be created just for entertainment. In the right circumstances, an innovative blend can become conventionalized.

After going through a variety of academic texts, one can see many different standards on what counts as a good example of a blend. Some linguists do not approve of any combination that is not “beginning + ending” (such as Renner), some do not like it

when a source word is clipped so much it becomes unrecognizable (such as Gries), etc. It seems that the only consistent rule is, “Blending requires clipping and/or overlapping of source words.” For example, it would be hard to find a linguist who claims that “Greenland” is a blend.

This corpus analysis has revealed many odd and unconventional blends in the English language. Looking up one blend often resulted in the discovery of more obscure blends. “Moped” led to the discovery of “noped”, “tigon” led to the discovery of “litigon”, etc. The semi-official rules were frequently bent or broken. There were even a few cases where a term’s status as blend was uncertain. All of this shows us that a prescriptive view of language is not enough for us to get the full picture. We need to look at how people actually use the language.

5. References

Beliaeva, N. (2019). “Blending in Morphology.” Oxford Research Encyclopedias, (https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.511)

Brdar-Szabó, R. and Brdar, M. (2008). “On the marginality of lexical blending.” *Jezikoslovlje,* vol. 9, no. 1-2 (pp. 171-194)

Carroll, L. (2018). “Humpty Dumpty.” e-book ed. , *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There,* Global Gray (pp. 66-79) (https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/12/pg12-images.html#link2HCH0006)

Greenbaum, S. and Quirk, R. (1989). “Word formation.” *A University Grammar of English,* Longman Group UK Limited (pp. 430-449)

Gries, S. T. (2004). “Isn’t that Fantabulous? How Similarity Motivates Intentional Morphological Blends in English”, *Language, Culture and Mind,* edited by Michel Achard and Suzanne Kemmer, SSLI Publications (pp. 415-428)

Gries, S. T. (2004). “Shouldn’t it be breakfunch? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English.” *Linguistics,* vol. 42, no. 3 (pp. 639-667)

Huddleston, R. and Pullman, G. K. (2002). “Blending”, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language,* Cambridge University Press (pp. 1636-1637)

Kerremas, D. (2012). „The Importance of Transparency”, *A Web of New Words,* Peter Lang Edition (pp. 55-59)

Mattielo, E. (2013). “Blends”, *Extra-grammatical Morphology in English,* Walter de Gruyter GmbH (pp. 111-140)

Mohsin, E. A. (2021). “Overview of Blending in English.” *Blending, from English to Arabic,* Cambridge Scholars Publishing (pp. 4-8)

Pond, L. (1914). “Illustrative List of English Blend Forms.” *Blends- Their Relation To English Word Formation,* Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung (pp. 25-58)

Schmid, H. J. (2020). “Understanding the Process of Conventionalization.” *The Dynamics of the Linguistic System,* Oxford University Press (pp. 87-123)

6. Internet Sources

Bellis, M. “Arnold Neustadter and the History of the Rolodex.” About.com, (https://webarchive.loc.gov/all/20081107153618/http://inventors.about.com/od/rstartinventions/a/Rolodex.htm)

“Blend word.” Wikipedia, (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blend_word)

Calonia, J. “56 Words That Are Actually Portmanteaus.” Grammarly Blog, (https://www.grammarly.com/blog/portmanteaus/)

Cambridge Dictionary (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/)

Crow, S. (2020). “50 Outdated Words That Instantly Age You.” Best Life, (https://bestlifeonline.com/outdated-words/)

"Litigon." Wikipedia, (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Litigon)

Marian, J. "Blend words (portmanteaus) in English." Jakub Marian's language learning, science and art, (https://jakubmarian.com/blend-words-words-composed-of-two-other-words-in-english/)

Marian, J. "Origin of the words "camelopard" and "giraffe"." Jakub Marian's language learning, science and art, (https://jakubmarian.com/origin-of-the-words-camelopard-and-giraffe/)

Nordquist, R. "What Are Word Blends?" ThoughtCo., (https://www.thoughtco.com/blend-words-1689171)

"Panthera Hybrid." Wikipedia, (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panthera_hybrid)

Said, C. (2023). "Welcome to San Fransokyo! Disneyland creating mashup of S.F., Tokyo from 'Big Hero 6' film." San Francisco Chronicles, (https://www.sfchronicle.com/california/article/san-fransokyo-disney-theme-park-17795588.php)

enTenTen20, Sketch Engine, (https://app.sketchengine.eu/#dashboard)

Younge, G. (2010). "Tiger Woods: Black, white, other." The Guardian, (https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2010/may/29/tiger-woods-racial-politics)

7. Appendix- Table of Blends

The following tables contains all the blends that were analyzed in this study, along with a couple of extra ones. Since the whole point of innovative blends is that they were made up for a specific context, they have the added category "Origin".

Conventional blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
brunch	breakfast+lunch	A meal that you eat in the late morning as a combination of breakfast and lunch	113,718

smog	smoke+fog	A form of air pollution that is or looks like a mixture of smoke and fog, especially in cities	51,975
camcorder	camera+recorder	A video camera that records pictures and sound; it can be carried around	53,848
infomercial	information+commercial	An advertising film that tries to give a lot of information about a subject, so that it does not appear to be an advertisement	18,821
motel	motor+hotel	A hotel for people who are travelling by car, with space for parking cars near the rooms	222,175

"Beginning + beginning" blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
moped	motor+pedal	A motorcycle with a small engine and pedals	21,213
agitprop	agitation+propaganda	(The spreading of) strongly political ideas or arguments expressed especially through plays, art, books, etc.	4,880

"Ending + ending" blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
frohawk	afro+mohawk	A type of mohawk hairstyle with Afro-textured hair	157
podcast	iPod+broadcast	A program (as of music or talk) made available in digital format for automatic download over the Internet	604,488

Sandwich blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
chortle	chuckle+snort	An act of laughing loudly with pleasure	12,335
adorkable	adorable+dork	Socially awkward or not fashionable, but in a way that makes you love or like it or them	617

Three word blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
turducken	turkey+duck+ chicken	A boneless chicken stuffed into a boneless duck stuffed into a boneless turkey	1,605
compushity	compulsion+push + necessity	A compulsion and a necessity to push	0 (appears in several literary sources)

Blends comprised of other blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
litigon	lion+tigon	Offspring of a female tigon and a male lion	22
tiliger	tiger+liger	Offspring of a male tiger and a ligress	3

Outdated blends

Term	Components	Definition	Corpus frequency
slantindicular	slanting+ perpendicular	Somewhat oblique	9
telex	teleprinter+ exchange	An international system of communication in which messages are typed on a special machine and sent by the phone system	10,203
Amerind/ Amerindian	American+Indian	An American Indian (= a member of any of the peoples who were the original people living in America)	1,295 / 9.861
rolodex	rolling+index	Rotating card file device used to store business contact information	5,194
camelopard / cameleopard	camel+leopard	Outdated term for a giraffe	152 / 79

Innovative blends

Term	Components	Definition	Origin	Corpus frequency
Cablinasian	Causasian+Black+ Indian+Asian	A person who is Caucasian, Black, American Indian and Asian	Coined by Tiger Woods to describe his mixed ethnicity	116
jombies	jade+zombies	Minions of the “Kung Fu Panda 3” antagonist	Coined by the protagonists to describe what their opponents are	2
critician	critic+comedian	A critic comedian	Jokingly coined by Doug Walker to explain what his job is	9
slithy	lithe+slimy	Lithe and slimy	Coined by Humpty Dumpty in „Through the Looking Glass”	451
San Fransoyko	San Francisco+ Tokyo	City in the „Big Hero 6” movie	Fictional location made up for the purposes of a movie	439