FROM EXTRA-GRAMMATICAL TO EXPRESSIVE MORPHOLOGY: PRAGMATIC EFFECT OF METAPHORICAL, METONYMIC, AND METAPHTONYMIC BLENDS

Ewa Konieczna

University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland

Abstract: This paper presents the analysis of blends based on metaphorical and metonymic conceptualisations. Metaphor and metonymy reduce the semantic transparency of blends and necessitate a greater processing effort for their interpretation. Since, according to the principle of Optimal Relevance, extra processing effort is offset by extra effects, it is proposed here that the interpretation of metaphorical, metonymic, and metaphtonymic blends entails a pragmatic effect.

Key words: expressive blends, metaphor, metonymy, pragmatic effect, transparency.

1. Introduction

Even though blending is by no means a new process because it dates back to the 16th century as attested by *blatterature < blatter + literature*, coming from 1512 (Cacchiani 2007: 103), and *foolosopher < fool + philosopher*, dating from 1592 (Adams 2001: 141), it became popular only much later with the publication of "Through the looking glass" (1871) by Lewis Caroll, well-known for its extensive use of blends, such as *slithy* and *mimsy*. In modern English, blending is a very productive word-formation process, taking place almost on a daily basis, as remarked by Lehrer (1996).

In spite of the considerable amount of literature on lexical blending in English, linguists still do not agree on a precise definition of this term. The existing approaches to the

definition vary from the adoption of a broader view on the nature of blending, according to which clipping of only one source word is sufficient to qualify as a member of the category (see, e.g., Brdar-Szabo & Brdar 2008 or Lehrer 2007) to the perspectives which put restrictions on various types of complex words (i.e. created from at least two word fragments) if they are to be included within the category of blends. Thus, for instance, according to Bat-El (2006) and Bauer (2012), a complex word can be referred to as a blend only when it is composed of inner edges, i.e. the beginning of source word 1 (which comes first in terms of the linear structure) and the end of source word 2 (which comes second). Ralli and Xydopoulos (2012) maintain that a complex word may be considered a blend as long as no source word remains intact; consequently, words such as *slanguage* must be excluded from the category. In the opinion of Arcodia and Montermini (2012), a word can qualify as a blend if there is overlapping of parts of source words, as in *froogle < frugal + google*. For Plag (2003) and Dressler (2000), only those lexemes that have coordinate semantics can be considered blends. Thus, in their view, *infotainment < information + entertainment* is a blend, while *motel < motor + hotel* is not.

Renner (2015) suggests that in the light of a large number of conflicting views on the nature of lexical blends, a prototype approach to their categorisation could be undertaken. Thus, a central member of the category displays clipping of source words at their inner edges, segment overlapping, and coordinate semantics. This perspective seems to echo the one taken by Lopez-Rua (2004), who additionally notes that a high degree of phonic integration of prototypical blends is iconically mirrored by the semantic fusion, as exemplified by *motel* or *smog*. In this paper an inclusive definition of blends is adopted, which means that a lexeme is considered to be a blend if at least one of its source words has been clipped irrespective of presence or absence of other features.

The present paper focuses on the occurrence of metaphor, metonymy, and metaphtonymy in lexical blends because, to the best of my knowledge, there has been

scarcely any discussion in the literature on the use of these three conceptual mechanisms in the process of lexical blending. One of the few accounts dealing with this issue is Kemmer's study (2003) into semantics of *glitter* used in the lexical blend *glitterati < glitter + literati.* Kemmer argues that *glitter* metonymically evokes the world of high society while metaphorically it suggests a polished appearance and elegance.

Given a high degree of irregularity, many researchers assign the process of lexical blending to the category of extra-grammatical morphology. Since the extra-grammatical character of blends and their reduced transparency are closely intertwined, these two phenomena constitute the subject matter of Section 2 and 3, respectively. The next section, i.e. Section 4 is concerned with the description of the data collection, the adopted methodology as well as the aims of the present study. Section 5 offers the analysis of the selected blends created from source words which activate a metaphor, a metonymy, or a metaphtonymy. Section 6 constitutes an attempt at explaining the reasons behind employing the aforementioned conceptual mechanisms in creating blends. Section 7 focuses on the relationship between semantic transparency and morphotactic transparency of blends. Finally, Section 8 offers concluding remarks.

2. Extra-grammatical character of blends

Despite the existence of several recurrent blending patterns, blends are typically denied the grammatical status on the grounds of their unpredictability and irregularity. Kemmer (2003: 71) admits that blending patterns are "[...] so varied that no neat taxonomy can do justice to the full range of the phenomenon". According to Ronneberger-Sibold (2006: 159), blends are excluded from morphological grammar on the grounds of their lack of transparency and "the impossibility of predicting the exact output of the blend, given its input".

The irregularities in blends can be presented in terms of the violation of major morphological rules, as outlined by Mattiello (2013: 129-131):

1. Morphological irregularity and output unpredictability. Blends are not only transparently unanalysable into morphemes since they are made up of "phonological strings that trigger meaning" (Kemmer 2003: 77), but also, they can be segmented in the way that violates morpheme boundaries, as in *info + tainment < inform-ation + entertain-ment*. Consequently, in contrast to compounds, composed of two or more concatenated and wholly identifiable morphemes, blend constituents are frequently very poorly recognisable due to their abbreviatory character. Moreover, the output of blends is difficult to predict as it allows several options, such as the combination of a full word with a splinter (i.e. a fragment of a source word), as in *chat-(sat)ire*, the occurrence of an overlapping segment (*-at-* in the previous example) and intercalation of a splinter, or a shorter word into a longer matrix word, e.g., *de(part)ure + start > destarture.*

2. Alternative outputs. The same source words are capable of producing more than one blended structure, depending on the order of elements, e.g., *moon + earth > moorth* vs. *earth + moon > earthoon*) or selection of the final segment (e.g., *zebra + donkey > zedonk* vs. *zonkey*, *Amerind* vs. *Amerindian*).

3. Non-morphematic analysis. In contrast to derivatives and compounds, which are morphosemantically transparent, *total*[1] and *intercalative* blends are made up of opaque fragments that frequently do not correspond to word syllables, as in *br(eakfast) + (l)unch > brunch.* Consequently, they cannot be divided into morphemes unless the source words of overlapping blends (e.g., *slanguage < slang + language*) and substitution blends (e.g., *bullionaire < bullion + billionaire*) are analysed as not being properly truncated.

4. Uncertain headedness. Unlike in prototypical derivatives and compounds, in which the head can be singled out almost automatically, much in accordance with Williams' (1981) Righthand Rule, in blends the head may be either the right-hand (as in *dancercise < dance + exercise*) or the left-hand constituent (as in *dishmobile < dishwasher + mobile*) due to the variable order of blend components. In some blends, where relationship between the elements is like that of exocentric compounds, the head

is outside the blend, as in *helilift* 'a group transported by helicopter', while coordinate blends have two heads (as in *dramedy < drama + comedy*).

5. Irregular subtraction. While regular morphological processes, such as backformation, delete small parts of their bases, blending makes use of words, substantial parts of which have been already removed. Besides, the subtraction of word parts is highly irregular because the following parts may be left out: the middle part, as in *fan + (maga)zine > fanzine*, two codas, (e.g., *mo(dulator) + dem(odulator) > modem*), the beginning of the word (e.g., *(we)b + log > blog*), or, very rarely, two beginnings (e.g., *(inter)net + (cit)izen > netizen*).

6. Discontinuity of bases. Intercalative blends allow discontinuous bases, which is not possible in regular word formation process, as exemplified by *chortle > chuckle + snort*.

7. Alternative input categories. While regular morphological processes operate on specific categories of bases, "blends allow any possible combination of lexical categories, including some that do not appear in compounds" (Bat-El 2006: 67). For example, the combinations of the following categories are allowed: adverbs (*so + ugly > sugly*), proper names (*Federico Fellini + fool > Federico Foolini*, *James Bond + industry > James Bondustry*, *Obama + economics > Obamanomics*), or titles (*Mrs + missile > Mrssile*).

3. Reduced transparency of blends

As stated above, one of the features of extra-grammatical formations is their non-morphematic composition, irregular subtraction and discontinuity of bases, all of which reduce their analysability. According to Langacker (1987: 448), "analysability pertains to the ability of speakers to recognise the contribution that each component structure makes to the composite whole". Thus, when confronted with blends, the language user finds it more difficult to recognise the contribution of their components, i.e. source words, from which they are made, than when faced with outputs of regular morphological processes, such as compounding or affixation.

Analysability of blends can be accounted for within the approach put forward by Dressler (2005), in which it is possible to measure the analysability of a linguistic expression by two sets of parameters. The first set, i.e. the signans parameters pertain to the phonological pole[2], which means that they involve the whole array of conditions imposed on the form, such as the degree of shortening, spelling, or phonotactic constraints. The second type is represented by signatum parameters that are applied at the semantic pole of an expression and they involve, inter alia, the relatedness of senses through metaphor and metonymy and the degree of compositionality (cf. Kardela 2016).

Because signans parameters specify the conditions on the form of a complex symbolic assembly[3], they include the parameter of morphotactic transparency. As observed by Galeas (2001: 397), "[...] the parameter of morphotactic transparency distinguishes the various degrees of recognisability of the morphological base within the related complex signans".

When seen in this light, the analysability of many blends measured by means of signans parameters can be quite low on account of the fact that blends are composed of non-morphemic splinters, which are frequently difficult to recognise due to their shortness. For example, in the blend *flog < fake + blog* the splinter *f* coming from *fake* consists of a single letter. A reduced transparency of blends "[...] ranges from slight obscuration to complete opacity, depending on the technique applied" (Ronneberger-Sibold 2006: 161). Naturally, the least transparent are total blends, according to the taxonomy proposed by Mattiello (2013), which are identified by the reduction of both source words to splinters, as exemplified by *dawk < dove + hawk* or *swacket < sweater + jacket.* Partial blends are more transparent due to the fact that only one word is reduced and the other is left intact, as demonstrated by *blogerrific < blog + terrific* or *Amerindian < American + Indian*. The most transparent are overlapping blends, whose constituents overlap orthographically or/and phonologically with neither of them being shortened, as exemplified by *anecdotage < anecdote +dotage*, or *palimony < pal + alimony*.

The above claims are compatible with the results of psycholinguistic experiments conducted by Lehrer and Veres (2010), the participants of which were asked to identify source words in various types of blends, including both the novel ones and those which were – at the time of the experiment – fairly well established in the language. It has turned out that overlapping blends got the highest scores: the mean percentage of correct recognition of source words in this category was 64%. In contrast, the lowest scores were obtained by blends consisting of two splinters because the mean percentage for the correct recognition of source words was 44%.

As regards the signatum parameters, it can be postulated that the semantic transparency of many blends is far greater, and it can be even compared to that of compounds. This stems from the fact that even though lexemes constituting the conceptual structure of the blend are represented by splinters, they must be evoked in the mind of the language user in the course of unravelling the meaning of a blend. Once the underlying blend components have been decoded, i.e. the symbolic poles of the symbolic assembly triggered by their phonological poles have been figured out, the phonological poles can be treated as shortened compound constituents in accordance with the Lehrer's approach, within which blends can be treated as dormant compounds (2007). As a result, the semantics of the blend can be processed analogically to that of compounds. Thus, since in the blend *flog* FAKE[4] has been activated by *f-* and BLOG by *-log,* the two source words, i.e. *fake* and *blog* are present at the signatum level, even though they are represented only in a shortened form at the signans level. Consequently, the meaning of *flog* is a 'fake blog', from which it follows that the blend *flog* has got a subordinative structure.

According to Kardela (2016), signatum parameters pertain to relatedness of senses through category extension, metaphorisation, metonymisation, and conceptual integration. Therefore, examining blends in terms of signatum parameters should

include looking at the processes of metaphorisation and metonymisation. They are discussed in Section 5.

4. Database, methodology, and aims of the study

As blending is a productive way of coining new words in modern English, I have chosen two websites aimed at collecting nonce-formations and neologisms as the sources of data, as I have expected that they will abound in blends. These are *Wordspy* and *The Rice University Neologisms Database*. While the former source registers words that have appeared in a wide variety of mass media, quoting the instances of their usage, and normally providing their earliest citation, the latter is clearly more restricted in its range. This is so because new words have been collected mainly by Suzanne Kemmer herself as well as by her students, and, as Kemmer notes, many of the neologisms are not used outside the Rice University campus. As for *Wordspy*, the time span ranges from 2006 to 2017, while Kemmer's dictionary of neologisms encompasses a far shorter period, of one year in 2004 with some sporadic additions from then on.

Having manually searched the two aforementioned bases I have collected a sample of 997 lexemes, which I classified as blends. In other words, I have analysed all the neologisms one by one with the aim of identifying blends and including them into the sample, meanwhile rejecting all other morphological formations. As pointed out in the Introduction, I consider the clipping of at least one source word to be a sufficient criterion to classify a lexeme as a blend. Next, I have narrowed down the sample to those blends, which are motivated by a metaphor, metonymy, or metaphtonymy. This involves that such blends contain (a) splinter(s) corresponding to the source word(s), which make(s) use of at least one of the aforementioned conceptual mechanisms. The search has amounted to 146 blends, which constitutes 14.6% of the original sample.

In Cognitive Linguistics, as the basic framework of the present study, metaphor and metonymy are regarded to be conceptual in nature and ubiquitous in human speech and

thought (Kövecses 2010; Langacker 1993). A conceptual metaphor is defined as cross-domain mapping, which should be understood as perceiving the target domain in terms of the source domain (Kövecses 2015). It is also systematic, which means that there are correspondences between the conceptual elements of the target domain and the source domain. Metonymy is defined as a cognitive process "[...] in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealised cognitive model" (Radden & Kövecses 1999: 21). The vehicle must be salient enough to be chosen for a metonymic conceptualisation. Goosens (1990: 323) makes the following observation: "although in principle metaphor and metonymy are distinct cognitive processes, it appears to be the case that the two are not mutually exclusive". In other words, both metaphor and metonymy can participate in the process of making conceptualisations, which is what the linguist refers to as *metaphtonymy*.

As regards the purpose of the present study, it is to analyse metaphorical and metonymic blends in order to answer the following research questions:

1. How does metaphor, metonymy, and metaphtonymy operate on source word 1 and source word 2?

2. Given that blends are far less transparent than the outputs of other morphological processes, such as affixation or compounding, what is the purpose of reducing their transparency even further by means of metaphor, metonymy, and metaphtonymy?

3. In view of the fact that the semantic transparency of metaphorical, metonymic, and metaphtonymic blends is so significantly reduced, how do they manage to preserve their intelligibility?

The next section (i.e. Section 5) aims to answer the first question, i.e. it offers the analysis of metaphorical, metonymic, and metaphtonymic patterns that have been attested in the corpus of blends under the study. Section 6 and 7 constitute an attempt at providing the answer to the second and third research questions, respectively.

5. Metaphorical, metonymic and metaphtonymic blends

5.1 Metaphorical blends

The analysis of the corpus of blends has demonstrated that the metaphor may operate on source word 1, source word 2, or – although far less frequently – on both source words. Since virtually all blends in the sample under analysis have got a subordinative structure, source word 2 functions as a syntactic and semantic head of the composite structure while source word 1 can be regarded as a modifier.

5.1.1 Metaphorical source word 2

Blends, containing a metaphorical source word 2, are not only the most numerous in the database (82 instances), but they also substantially outnumber all kinds of other blends, being at least four times as frequent as other metaphorical or metonymic blends.

One of representatives of this category is an institutionalised blend *gaydar < gay + radar*, denoting the ability to single out a gay individual on the basis of his actions, speech, or clothes. Thus, a skill attributed to homosexual people to identify a (fellow) homosexual person by interpreting subtle signals coming from their appearance or behaviour is conceptualised as a system for detecting the presence of distant objects. The metaphorical use of source word 2 is an example of the so-called ontological metaphor, which, according to Kövecses (2010: 38), "gives a new ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts and brings about new abstract entities. What this means is that we conceive of our experiences in terms of objects, substances and containers [...]". Thus, an intuition to identify a homosexual person is conceptualised as a concrete device that sends out radio waves and processes their reflections to determine the position and speed of a moving object.

A very imaginative blend with a metaphorical source word 2 is *flunami < flu + tsunami*, which stands for an overwhelming number of flu cases in the same area at the same time. In this blend, the epidemic of flu is conceptualised as a tsunami. Consequently, it is possible to identify systematic correspondences between the elements of the target

and source domain: a tsunami causing destruction is the flu undermining people's health, waves coming over the land correspond to viruses attacking people, while victims of the tsunami are ill people who went down with the flu. The effectiveness of this metaphor results from visualising an infectious disease as a giant wave washing over and destroying everything on its way.

Yet another blend, in which it is possible to identify numerous correspondences between the source domain and target domain, is *mathlete < math + athlete*, which is used to refer to a person who takes part in a mathematic competition. In this blend, a maths scholar, taking part in a maths tournament is conceptualised as a person competing in sports. The source domain of athletics is mapped on the target domain of mathematics, producing a series of correspondences. The following elements of the source domain map onto the elements of the target domain: training hard before the sports competition maps onto studying maths and solving complicated maths problems prior to mathematical competition, physical activity of running, jumping, etc. corresponds to intellectual activity of solving mathematical problems, physical effort put into achieving the best result corresponds to intellectual effort undertaken in the process of mathematical analysis.

Due to the high productivity of the pattern (in which source 2 is metaphorical) and probably a high frequency of specific models, some splinters have been employed in analogical formations, e.g., *-gasm* ('an extremely pleasurable experience') from *orgasm* occurs in the following series of blends: *eargasm*, *flavourgasm*, *laughgasm*, *joygasm.* Another splinter *-pocalypse* ('a disaster, catastrophe') from *apocalypse* occurs in *browpocalypse*, *deerpocalypse*; *-rexia* ('unhealthy obsession') from *anorexia* can be found in *bleachorexia*, *bigorexia*, or *drunkorexia*; *-(ma)geddon* ('a bitter or fierce battle') from *Armageddon* occurs in *Eurogeddon*, *sockmageddon*, or *farmageddon*; *-rati* ('social elite') from *literati* and popularised by *glitterati* turns up in *vulgarati*, *geekerati*, and *-holic* ('an addict') from *alcoholic* can be found in *chocoholic*, *shopaholic*, etc. As remarked by Mattiello (2019: 24), "[…] analogy can provide some

regularity to the blending process and increase predictability in the formation of novel blends".

5.1.2 Metaphorical source word 1

The database contains 19 blends in which source word 1 is metaphorical. Most of these blends are characterised by a metaphorical relation between source word 1 and source word 2. For example, a blend *sheeple < sheep + people* conceptualises meek, easily persuaded people who tend to follow the crowd as sheep do. The basis for this conceptualisation is a well-known fact that sheep tend to congregate close to other members of a flock and are easily led. Thus, the meaning of the blend is based on perceiving similarity between a specific kind of people and sheep, in terms of their behaviour. Conceptualising people as sheep is activated by the conceptual metaphor that is a part of the system of the Great Chain of Being (Lakoff & Turner 1989) which proposes a hierarchical structure of the world. In the system a specific level of the chain is used metaphorically to conceptualise entities belonging to another level. For example, people are frequently defined via inanimate objects, plants, and animals. Thus, *sheeple* is motivated by the PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS conceptual metaphor, where conceptualisation proceeds from animals, i.e. a lower level to people, i.e. a higher level in the Great Chain.

Another example of a blend based on the metaphorical relation between source word 1 and source word 2 is *zombee* 'a bee which abandons its hive and dies after being infected by a parasitic fly' *< zombie + bee*. This blend, in which the bee is conceptualised as a zombie, is homophonous with *zombie*, establishing in this way a humorous association between the meaning of the entire blend and the meaning of source word 1 on which it has been modelled. The humorous effect of this blend stems from what Brone and Feyartes (2003) refer to as the association of incompatible domains, which in the case under discussion is the domain of popular culture, represented by a zombie, and the domain of animal kingdom, represented by a bee. The metaphorical construal consists in the mapping of a zombie's brain that has been

attacked by some sort of virus or bacteria, and therefore damaged, onto the insect's brain attacked by the larva of a parasite, called *Apocephalus borealis*, developing in the bee's body from an egg laid by the female fly and causing destruction of the bee's brain. Thus, the element of the source domain, which is the damaged zombie's brain, is mapped onto the element of the target domain, i.e. the damaged bee's brain. Other elements from the source domain that map onto elements of the target domain are the following: zombies' unusual manner of movement, such as shuffling their feet and lack of coordination, maps onto the bees' disoriented flying, such as going in circles, or losing their ability to stand and zombies' short life span corresponds to the bees' quick death after being infected by the parasite.

Yet another case of a blend containing a metaphorical source word 1 is a lexeme *blogject < blog + object*, which conceptualises an electronic device attached to an animate being and continually sending information concerning its state, location, and environment. In this construal a regular transmission of data by an electronic object is conceptualised as habitual updating one's blog. The *blogject* has been used in "The pigeon that blogs" project, in which a flock of pigeons was equipped with telecommunication devices and environmental sensors to track where it has been flying and to monitor its environmental behaviour. The data collected from the pigeons could indicate the level of toxins and the kind and extent of pollution in various areas, all of which could be seen on Google maps. In this metaphor, there are many correspondences between the source domain and the target domain: the pigeon maps onto the person, the pigeon's flight corresponds to events in the person's life and sending data matches up with blogging. Thus, the metaphor used here is an instance of personification because the activity that the animal is involved in is conceptualised as that being performed by a person, and, consequently, although indirectly, a non-human being is conceptualised as a person. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claim, personification is one of the most obvious ontological metaphors, as it makes it possible for us to understand quite a significant number of experiences with non-human entities in terms of human activities, interests, and motivations.

5.1.3 Metaphorical source word 1 and source word 2

The corpus has yielded a single instance of a blend in which both source word 1 and source word 2 are metaphorical: *meanderthal* 'an unintelligent individual who is without direction and focus in his or her life' < *meander + Neanderthal*. Thus, in this blend there are two source domains (meandering and a Neanderthal) and two target domains (aimless life and unintelligent person) with two subsequent sets of mappings. First of all, a winding course of a river is mapped onto the aimless life of a person unable to make up their minds as to the course of their lives, which is, for this reason, filled with numerous twists and turns. Secondly, the generally supposed crudeness and low intellect of Neanderthals are mapped onto the foolishness of young people that prevents them from making decisions concerning their future lives. This blend is often used to refer to people unable to choose their major area of study at college.

5.2 Metonymic blends

The corpus of blends contains 32 metonymic blends altogether. Like in the case of metaphorical blends, metonymy may operate either on source word 1 (23 exemplars), or source word 2 (9 exemplars).

5.2.1 Metonymic source word 1

An example of a blend with a metonymic source word 1 is *botax* 'a tax proposed in the United States Senate in July 2009 to tax botox and other cosmetic procedures' < *botox + tax*. In this blend *botox* serves as a salient reference point, which provides access to the target, namely a beauty treatment. *Botox* was chosen as a reference point since at the end of the first decade of the 21st century it was an extremely widespread procedure. According to the American Society of Plastic Surgeons, it was the most common cosmetic operation in the USA in 2007. Thus, the selection of this particular reference point is conditioned by the social context: there were both many cosmetic operations with the use of botox at the time, on which the tax was imposed and, consequently,

such a type of cosmetic surgery was considered to be representative for the whole industry.

Another blend *poorism* 'travel that includes tours of or accommodations in slums or dangerous urban neighbourhoods' < *poor + tourism* contains a modifier, i.e. the adjective *poor*, which is an instance of QUALITY FOR PLACE metonymy, because the quality of being poor metonymically represents poverty-stricken town areas which recently became popular destinations among some tourists. Yet another blend belonging to this category, *fiberhood* 'a neighbourhood that has Internet access via fiber-optic cable' < *fiber + neighbourhood* conceptualises access to Internet via fiber-optic cables, i.e. an essential part of the Internet infrastructure, which ensures high capacity and speed of transmission. Thus, this construal is motivated by INSTRUMENT FOR ENTITY metonymy.

5.2.2 Metonymic source word 2

A very interesting metonymic blend, in which source word 2 is construed metonymically, is *slizzard* 'a person who is very much intoxicated, mainly from alcohol' < *slutty + lizard*. The blend has been retrieved from Kemmer's dictionary of neologisms, according to which the motivation of the word *lizard* is mystifying. Kemmer says that because the word comes from the south of the USA it could be treated as an indication of its geographical origin, since the south is a place where lizards are common. In that case *lizard* would be the salient reference point, constituting an example of an ANIMAL FOR PLACE metonymy, and providing access to the target, which is the southern part of the USA. However, this metonymy does not denote the place but a person conceptualised as an animal that comes from this place, therefore, the process taking place here is multiple metonymic mapping, referred to as a metonymic chain (Barcelona 2002). ANIMAL has been selected as a reference point, providing access to the PLACE it comes from, as well as standing for PERSON, while at the same time PLACE metonymically stands for ORIGIN.

The *Urban Dictionary* provides numerous interpretations of this blend (e.g., a humorous one is that it denotes a person who 'is only able to live off beer and occasionally Jack Daniels') but the one I would like to concentrate on at this point is that *slizzard* denotes a person so intoxicated that they perceive themselves as a slutty lizard. When seen in this light, the whole blend is metonymical, being an instance of an EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy where the distorted perception of oneself as a slutty lizard is a salient result of being highly intoxicated, providing in this way access to the intoxication ICM (Idealised Cognitive Model), comprising elements, such as excessive consumption of alcohol, irrational thinking, loss of control over one's behaviour, getting drunk, post-alcoholic hallucinations, etc. Thus, one element within this particular ICM, i.e. post-alcoholic hallucinations representing EFFECT provides access to another element, i.e. getting drunk, which stands for CAUSE. In the process of the metonymic chain, the action of getting drunk represents a drunk person as a result of an ACTION FOR PERSON metonymy. Thus, the blend as a whole stands metonymically for a drunk person thinking that he or she is a slutty lizard.

Another instance of the blend with a metonymic source word 2 is *locapour* 'a person who drinks only locally produced wine or beer' < *local + pour*[5], seemingly modelled on *locavore.* In this metonymic construal pouring domestic wines and craft beers into glasses stands for consuming them. As Radden and Kövecses (1999: 32) propose, "events may be […] viewed as things which may have parts". The event of drinking wine or beer involves (as one of its subevents) opening a bottle, pouring its contents into a glass, taking its contents to one's mouth, swallowing it, etc. Thus, the initial phase of local wine or beer consumption stands for the whole experience of drinking it through the SUBEVENT FOR WHOLE EVENT metonymy. Being part of a metonymic chain, a subevent of pouring a liquid metonymically represents the person drinking it, which is ACTIVITY FOR PERSON metonymy.

The metonymic blend *menoporsche* 'angst and anxiety exhibited by some men upon reaching middle age' < *menopause + Porsche* is a humorous play on source word 1,

i.e. *menopause*. The blend draws on one of the most common symptoms of a middle life crisis experienced by men, which is the purchase of a sports car. This conceptualisation involves a chain of metonymies. First of all, Porsche, a make of high-performance sports cars, has been chosen as a salient point of the access to the category of sports cars (CATEGORY MEMBER FOR CATEGORY). Secondly, the category of sports cars represented metonymically by Porsche stands for a middle life crisis experienced by men, which constitutes an instance of EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy.

5.3 Metaphtonymic blends

The corpus under study contains only nine metaphtonymic blends. One of them is *twitchfork* 'an angry or aggressive protest on Twitter, particularly one seeking justice or vengeance' < *twitter + pitchfork.* The construal of this particular blend is affected by the historical and social context. In the past, the pitchfork, one of the most important farm tools, was frequently used by peasants as their basic weapon in various uprisings and rebellions, such as, for example, the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 and the Pitchfork Uprising in 1920. Even in modern times we can still see traces of this old tradition: in Sicily there is an informal association of farmers and breeders, called the "Pitchforks Movement" (Italian: *Movimento dei Forconi*), which in 2012 organised a protest against the economic crisis and a rise in the price of fuel. Thus, as an important asset of farmers, and, if the need arises, a weapon, a pitchfork is an instance of the INSTRUMENT FOR ACTION metonymy, representing the farmers' protest. Then through the conceptual metaphor, the source domain of the farmers' protest is mapped onto the target domain of an Internet protest and, consequently, Internet users seeking justice are conceptualised as farmers seeking justice.

While in the blend *twitchfork* metaphtonymy operates on source word 2, in another blend *giraffiti* 'graffiti painted in a very high spot' < *giraffe + graffiti*, it is source word 1 that is metaphtonymic. *Giraffe*, the tallest animal in the world, whose most salient attribute is its towering height, metonymically represents the high altitude, at which a spray painting has been done, constituting an instance of the ENTITY FOR CHARACTERISTIC

metonymy. Besides, the activity of painting and subsequent displaying of graffiti in an extraordinarily high location is conceptualised as if it had been done by or meant for giraffes. Therefore, it can be argued that the source domain of animal behaviour is mapped onto the target domain of human behaviour. At the same time, human activity of painting graffiti at a very high spot is conceptualised in terms of its output, which is an instance of PRODUCT FOR ACTIVITY metonymy.

6. Rationale behind the use of metaphor and metonymy

Opting for metaphorical and metonymic blends in the conceptualisation process may be explained by means of the Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986). As Sperber and Wilson maintain, each aspect of human cognition and communication is governed by the search for relevance, defined in terms of contextual effects and processing effort. Contextual effects are achieved when new information interacts with the context of the already existing assumptions by strengthening them, contradicting them, or combining with them. The processing effort indispensable for the comprehension of an utterance depends basically on the effort of memory and imagination, necessary for constructing an appropriate context, and also on the psychological complexity of an utterance, understood as the linguistic complexity, and also, the frequency of occurrence of a linguistic unit – less complex and more frequent items are easier to be processed than more complex and rarely encountered ones.

Since every act of overt communication builds up an expectation of relevance, looking at it from the perspective of effort and effect, the reader or hearer quests for what Sperber and Wilson (1998: 286) label Optimal Relevance, defined in the following way: "An utterance, on a given interpretation, is optimally relevant if and only if:

(a) it achieves enough contextual effects to be worth the hearer's attention;

(b) it puts the hearer to no gratuitous processing effort in achieving those effects".

A logical consequence of point b) is that an extra effort demanded from the hearer on processing the linguistic unit entails additional effects that could not be achieved otherwise.

When seen in this light, the processing of metaphorical and metonymic blends involves additional processing effort in terms of:

1. Memory and imagination. The interpretation of blends motivated by metaphorical or metonymic construals requires relying on memory if one wants to make use of encyclopaedic knowledge that a given linguistic unit provides access to. For instance, in interpreting the meaning of the blend *piem* 'a poem in which the length of each word corresponds to a digit in the decimal expansion of the mathematical constant pi' < *pi* + *poem*, it is necessary to look into one's encyclopaedic entry for *pi,* which would not be possible without the extra processing effort of memory. The conceptualiser needs to remember that *pi* is an irrational number that cannot be represented by a fraction. As regards the additional processing effort of imagination, metonymic and metaphorical construals require imagination on the part of the recipient of the message, needed to draw parallels and establish conceptual links between various concepts both within one domain and across different domains.

2. Psychological complexity (understood as the ease of cognitive processing). Taking into account the fact that blending belongs to the domain of extra-grammatical morphology and blends are characterised by many irregularities (unpredictability of their outputs, non-morphematic analysis, irregular subtraction, discontinuity of bases, etc.), their complexity in terms of signans parameters is greater than that of other morphological processes, such as compounding or affixation, which are far more regular and transparent. Consequently, blends are relatively difficult to be processed.

Besides, as observed by Wilson (1994: 49),

"*The linguistic structure of an utterance is not the only source of psychological complexity. In fact, a linguistically simpler utterance may nonetheless be psychologically more complex. For instance, it is well known from psycholinguistic experiments that frequently-encountered words are easier to process than rarely-encountered ones*".

As regards the frequency of occurrence, many blends do not go beyond the status of nonce-formations, as they are highly dependent both on the linguistic and extra-linguistic context. Consequently, the frequency of such blends is quite low.

Given this, forming conceptualisations "packaged" in the form of metaphorical and metonymic blends requires extra processing effort in terms of memory, imagination, and psychological complexity. If the principle of Optimal Relevance is to be obeyed, the effort that the recipient of the message needs to make in order to work out the meaning of the blend cannot be gratuitous: their extra processing effort must be offset by extra effects (Sperber & Wilson 1986). I argue that extra effects can be perceived in terms of what Zwicky and Pullum (1987) call a *pragmatic effect*, which is a distinctive feature of expressive morphology.

Even though expressive morphology is mainly considered to rank on a par with extra-grammatical morphology, these two terms are not mutually interchangeable despite the fact that they share a majority of features, such as promiscuity with regard to input category, promiscuity with regard to input basehood (i.e. lack of constraints on the grammatical category of bases), forming alternative outputs, imperfect speaker's control, and interspeaker variation. Regardless of numerous similarities between extra-grammatical and expressive morphology, Mattiello (2013) takes the view, which is also shared here, that these two branches of morphology do not come under one and the same heading, as only expressive morphology encompasses composite structures characterised by what Zwicky and Pullum (1987: 335) refer to as pragmatic effect, defined by them as "an expressive, playful, poetic, or simply ostentatious effect of some kind". Zwicky and Pullum (ibid.) exemplify their claim with whimsical coinages of commercial names, created by means of the suffix (-*e/t/eria*), such as *basketeria*, *groceteria*, *candyteria*, *honeyteria*, *caketeria*, *cleaneteria*, which in their view evoke the pragmatic effect that is absent from the plain derivational morphology. They argue that the outputs of this analogical affixation process are humorous (by being a play on

a well-established lexeme *cafeteria*), which is not the feature of non-expressive derivations.

The pragmatic effect can also be defined as "[...] mental/internal activity taking place in a person, traceable to his or her encountering figurative as well as other language, usually when receiving it (e.g., as an addressee, hearer, overhearer, reader, etc.) but also when he or she produces or even thinks about it" (Colston 2015: 6). As result of additional mental activity undertaken by a conceptualiser, "[...] additional complex meaning is produced" (ibid., 5). Since the interpretation of metaphorical and metonymic blends requires that the conceptualiser gets involved in extra mental activity, which gives rise to additional complex meaning, I argue that metaphorical and metonymic blends trigger the pragmatic effect. Since such blends belong to expressive morphology, I refer to them as *expressive blends*.

Thus, in order to decode the meaning of an expressive blend, such as *haycation* 'holiday spent on the farm, during which guests often help with daily farm tasks' < *hay + vacation*, it is not sufficient to identify successfully the blend components, i.e. the two source words it has been based on, which is only the first step towards decoding the blend's semantics. Once this has been done, it is necessary to engage in additional mental activity aimed at working out the meaning of the blend, which is only partly compositional. According to Kardela (2012: 308),

> "[…] *a linguistic unit with a low degree of compositionality requires a greater involvement on the part of the speaker/hearer to recognise the contribution of each unit to the expression's overall meaning. The recognition of this contribution [...] relies heavily on the context-dependent discourse and involves everything what Langacker calls the Current Discourse Space (CDS), i.e. '[...] everything presumed to be shared by the speaker and the hearer as the basis for communication at a given moment* (2008: 466)' ".

The CDS relied on in the interpretation of the blend *haycation* is the knowledge of the cultural and social context, which prompts the use of both conventional and novel metaphors (Kövecses 2018: 133). In this particular case, it is the knowledge that

agrotourism has recently become a fashionable form of tourism, that it involves staying on the farm to experience country life, that feeding cattle is an indispensable part of country life and that staple food of cattle is hay.

Thus, this shared knowledge enables arriving at the metonymic conceptualisation of agrotourism, in which *hay* constitutes a salient reference point (in the sense of Langacker 1993) to the ICM of country life.

7. Semantic transparency versus morphotactic transparency

The analysis of expressive blends has demonstrated that a decrease in their semantic transparency is counterbalanced by an increase in morphotactic transparency with the aim of preserving their intelligibility. The morphotactic transparency of blends amounts to the recognisability of their constituents, which basically depends on two factors: preserving as much from the source word(s) as possible[6] and preserving the prosodic structure of the so-called matrix word (Ronneberger-Sibold 2006). An example of such a blend is *decknician* 'a disc jockey who is admired for skilful manipulation and mixing of music on turntables' < *deck + technician* (Borys 2018: 3).

As regards the first factor, preserving the maximum of source words can be achieved either by means of overlapping, or by a minimal deletion of phonological material from source words in the absence of overlapping. The analysis of the sample has shown that a majority of metaphorical and metonymic blends, i.e. 110 out of 148, are characterised by overlapping, which amounts to 74.3% of the blends under study. The following degrees of overlapping have been distinguished:

1. complete overlapping in which both words remain intact, as exemplified by *bromance < bro + romance*;

2. partial overlapping in which a few segments (marked in bold) of both source words are shared in the blend, as in *fiberhood < fiber + neighbourhood*;

3. contrastive overlapping by which I mean that the blend, characterised by the occurrence of this phenomenon, differs from one of its source words merely in one or

two phonemes, bearing a very close resemblance to it, as exemplified by *floordrobe <
floor + wardrobe* or *shuicide < shoe + suicide.* I have decided to refer to this type of
blends as contrastive on account of the fact that they minimally contrast with either
source word 1, or source word 2.

While complete and partial overlapping seem to be aimed exclusively at maximising
recoverability of source words, and consequently facilitating blend comprehension,
contrastive overlapping enhances the pragmatic effect by adding a touch of humour to
the metaphorical or metonymic construal. In fact, blends, which are the products of
contrastive overlapping, can be perceived in terms of surface analogy (see Motsch's
(1981: 101) *Oberflächenanalogie*), defined as the process "[...] whereby a new word
(called *target*) is coined that is clearly modelled on a precise actual model word (hence
model, base, analogue, source, or trigger)". The humorous character of these blends
consists in the perceived incongruity[7] between the spelling and pronunciation of the
target word (the blend) and the model (the source word). The target is intended as a
phonologically and graphically distorted "variant" of the model, alluding to it very
clearly, which creates a humorous and playful effect.

Almost all overlapping blends (103 out of 110) are also contour blends in the sense of
Ronneberger-Sibold (2006). In contour blending one lexeme functions as the so-called
matrix word, providing the rhyme and the overall rhythmic contour of the blend,
understood as its main stress, the number of syllables, and the stressed vowel. The other
lexeme is usually inserted in the pretonic part of the matrix (e.g., *sexcursion < sex +
excursion*), but it may also be positioned in its posttonic part, rarely changing its
stressed vowel (*facejack < facebook + hijack*). Contour blends also ensure a high
degree of transparency because even though the matrix word is not entirely present in
the blend, it can be easily tracked down by several phonological features highly
conducive to its recoverability, such as overall rhythmical contour determined by the
place of the main stress and the overall number of syllables, the stressed vowel, and
the rest of the syllable's rhyme.

A minimal deletion of phonological material from source words without the occurrence of overlapping has been found in 31 expressive blends, which constitutes 21% of the sample. In these blends one of the source words is usually retained in full and the other is only insignificantly reduced, as can be exemplified by *hooterlicious < hooter + delicious*, *floorcest < floor + incest*, *bridezilla < bride + Godzilla*, etc. Besides, the splinter, which represents source word 2 of the blend is iteratively used in other blends, which enhances its recognisability, e.g., *-zilla* ('selfish arrogant and obnoxios woman') reappears in *promzilla < prom + Godzilla*, while *-cest* ('sexual relationship between people who study together, or inhabit the same living quarters') occurs also in *sidcest < Sid (Sid Richardson College) + incest, suitecest < suite + incest, dormcest < dorm + incest*, and *trincest < Trinity (Trinity College) + incest.*

Consequently, as the analysis of the data has demonstrated, there exists a very strong correlation between signatum parameters of semantic transparency and signans parameters of morphotactic transparency. This should be taken to mean that the reduced semantic transparency corresponds to the increase in the morphotactic transparency. The tendency to make source words maximally recognisable may be explained in the light of the Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975). The Cooperative Principle is governed by, among other things, a conversational maxim of manner, according to which obscurity of expression should be avoided. Given indirect semantics of expressive blends, hidden behind conceptual processes, such as metaphor, metonymy, or metaphtonymy, morphotactic transparency of blends counteracts their obscurity to the point at which their meaning can still be decoded. If the source words can be easily retrieved, because they are recognisable, they can be used as access points to metaphorical or metonymic conceptualisations. Otherwise, the reader, or listener would not succeed in inferring the intended meaning of the blend.

Expressive blends need to be morphotactically transparent for one more reason. Source word 1 and source word 2 do not co-occur in the discourse (Beliaeva 2014) because

they are conceptually distant from each other. For example, two source words of a metaphorical blend *apostrofly* 'an errant or misplaced apostrophe', i.e. *apostrophe* and *fly*, represent two incompatible concepts, i.e. WRITING and INSECTS, respectively. Given this, there is hardly any possibility that there exists any conceptual or semantic relationship between both source words prior to the blend formation (Cacchiani 2011).

Lack of semantic correspondence between source words in metaphorical and metonymic blends can be contrasted with the occurrence of a variety of semantic relationships demonstrated by non-expressive blends, whose components are related semantically being co-hyponyms of a hyperonym, as in *breakfast + lunch > brunch*, synonyms, as in *giant + enormous > ginormous*, or antonyms, e.g., *friend + enemy > frienemy*. As Beliaeva (2014) insightfully remarks, if there is no semantic link between the source words, the formation of the blend based on them, automatically entails the creation of such a link, and this calls for a high degree of recognisability of both source words. "Recognisability is not so vital in the first case [i.e. when the source words are related semantically - explanation mine] because the semantic link is already there and the main aim of the formation of a new lexeme is merging the source words together in a compact form" (ibid., 49).

Thus, it is apparent that the reduction of blends transparency at the signatum level is compensated by maximising their transparency at the signans level. Because the pragmatic effect of expressive blends depends on the intelligibility of their source words, they cannot be opaque which is the feature of many blends aimed at condensing information and serving a purely referential function, such as *pluot < plum + apricot* or *freppy < frat + preppy*.

8. Concluding remarks

In the corpus of blends collected for the purpose of this analysis, metaphorical blends are the most frequent amounting to 101 examples, with 82 instances of blends in which the metaphor operates on source word 2, e.g., *floordrobe < floor + wardrobe*

(*floordrobe* conceptualises one's collection of clothes not hung, or folded, but dumped into a pile), and 19 containing a metaphorical modifier, e.g., *flashpacker < flash + backpacker* (*flash* metaphorically represents smartness and high class). The number of metonymic blends is by far smaller as it amounts to 32 instances: 23 blends contain a metonymic modifier, as exemplified by *fiberhood < fiber + neighbourhood*, (*fiber* stands for the Internet) and in 9 it is source word 2 that is metonymic, as e.g., *menopaws < menopause + paws* (*paws* represent the female cat). Besides, there are 9 metaphtonymic blends: in 5 metaphtonymy operates on the modifier, as in *giraffiti < giraffe + graffiti*, and in 4 source word 2 is metaphtonymic, as in *twitchfork < twitter + pitchfork*. Finally, the corpus contains merely 2 blends, in which metonymy operates on one source word, while metaphor on the other, as in *pajamahideen* 'reactionary activist blogging from home' *< pajama + Mujahideen* and one blend, in which both a blend and source word 1 are metaphorical: *meanderthal < meander + Neanderthal*.

Despite the fact that expressive blends are not prevalent in the database, used for the purpose of the present analysis, as they constitute just 14.6% of the sample, high token frequencies of some blends (in terms of Google hits obtained on August 20, 2020), such as *bromance* (11 200 000), *gaydar*, (31 400 000), or *bankster* (2 130 000) are a clear indication that they have caught on in the speaking community. This can be taken to mean that they have turned out to be successful in producing the pragmatic effect for which they were primarily coined. Describing expressive blends in terms of the pragmatic effect evoked, they are playful because the whole blend can be a play on one of its source words. They are also poetic in the sense of Zwicky and Pullum (1987) since the occurrence of a metaphor and metonymy entails rich imagery. Besides, they turn out to be ostentatious due to the fact that they have the attention-catching potential. It has been argued that the use of metaphorical and metonymic blend constituents produces a pragmatic effect, which can be achieved only if the blend is morphotactically transparent, i.e. if its source words can be easily identified. Thus, a decrease in semantic transparency is counterbalanced by an increase in morphotactic transparency, which is in line with the conversational maxim of manner, stating that

the obscurity of expression should be avoided. Maximising morphotactic transparency is achieved by preserving as much from the source words as possible either by modelling the whole blend on the matrix word so that there is an overlap between source word 1 and source word 2, as in *trampede < trample + stampede*, or by reducing source words only minimally, as can exemplified by *loligator < lol + alligator*.

Since blends analysed in this paper come from two different sources: *Wordspy*, a source of journalistic coinages and *The Rice University Neologisms Database*, which is a database of neologisms used mainly by the students of Rice University, the reasons behind evoking the pragmatic effect seem to be different depending on the database. As regards the journalistic blends, they are motivated, like many mass media coinages, by the desire to catch the reader's attention and create an interpersonal closeness between the author of blends and the reading public, built in the course of processing these blends. Expressive blends created by students are meant to produce a humorous effect, to show off, or to create a sense of belonging to the group of the initiated (and at the same time to exclude outsiders).

Because of the moderate size of the sample, on which this study has been based, the results concerning the frequency of attested morphological and metonymic patterns should be treated with caution. In order to obtain a more conclusive evidence it would be necessary to collect a larger sample of expressive blends also from sources other than those used for the purpose of the present analysis. Further, the suggested approach could be applied to the analysis of correlation between morphotactic transparency and semantic transparency of expressive blends in languages other than English.

Notes

1. Mattiello (2013) proposes that total blends are those in which all source words are reduced to splinters, the best-known of which are *brunch, Oxbridge*, and *smog*.

2. In Langacker's (1987) model of Cognitive Grammar a linguistic expression has a bipolar structure, consisting of the phonological pole and the semantic pole, which correspond to the form and meaning, respectively.

3. In Langacker's (1987) theory of grammar symbolic assembly is a fundamental unit of grammar made up of a semantic pole and a phonological pole.

4. In accordance with the well-established convention, the semantic pole of a linguistic expression is represented by capital letters.

5. This blend is an example of the combination not occurring in compounding, i.e. an adjective followed by a verb.

6. It has already been demonstrated by Lehrer (1996) that there exists a direct correlation between preserving a substantial amount of material from the target word(s) and the ease of identifying the blend.

7. According to Attardo (1994), one of the principles underlying humour can be incongruity.

List of abbreviations

CDS – Current discourse space

ICM – Idealised cognitive model

References

Adams, V. (2001). *Complex words in English*. Harlow: Pearson.

Arcodia, G.F. & Montermini F. (2012). Are reduced compounds compounds? Morphological and prosodic properties of reduced compounds in Russian and Mandarin Chinese. In *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending.* Renner, V., Maniez, F. & Arnaud, P.J.L. (eds.). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, p. 93-115.

Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humour.* Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barcelona, A. (2002). On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor. In *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: Cognitive perspective.* Barcelona, A. (ed.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 31-58.

Bat-El, Q. (2006). Blend. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics.* Brown, K. (ed.). Oxford: Elsevier, p. 66-70.

Bauer, L. (2012). Blends: Core and periphery. In *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending.* Renner, V., Maniez, F. & Arnaud, P.J.L. (eds.). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, p. 11-23.

Beliaeva, N. (2014). A study of English blends: From structure to meaning and back again. In *Word structure*, 7 (1), p. 29-54.

Borys, D. (2018). Clipping in English slang neologisms. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, III (1), June 2018, p. 1-45. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0001

Brdar-Szabo, R. & Brdar M. (2008). On the marginality of lexical blending. In *Jezikoslovvlje*, 9 (1/2), p. 171-194.

Brone, G. & Feyartes, K. (2003). *The cognitive linguistics of incongruity resolution: Marked reference point structures in humour* [Preprints van het Departement Linguistiek nr. 205]. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Cacchiani, S. (2007). Discourse-pragmatic features of novel evaluative blends. In *Cityscapes: Islands of the self. Language studies*, *Proceedings of the 22nd AIA conference*, Cagliari, 15-17 September 2005, vol. 2. Jottini, L., del Lungo, G. & Douthwaite, J. (eds.). Cagliari: CUEC, p. 103-114.

Cacchiani, S. (2011). On unfamiliar Italian lexical blends from names and nouns. In *Linguistica*, 51 (1), p. 105-120.

Caroll, L. (2006 [1871]). *Through the looking glass.* New York: Bantam Classic.

Colston, H.L. (2015). *Using figurative language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dressler, W.U. (2000). Extragrammatical versus marginal morphology. In *Extragrammatical and marginal morphology*. Doleschal, U. & Thornton, A.M. (eds.). Munich: Lincom Europa, p. 1-10.

Dressler, W.U. (2005). Word formation in natural morphology. In *Handbook of word formation*. Štekauer, P. & Lieber, R. (eds.). Dordrecht: Springer, p. 267-284.

Galeas, C.G. (2001). Uniformity, transparency of encoding, and bi-uniqueness within the model of natural morphology. In *SILTA*, XXX/2, p. 397-405.

Goosens, L. (1990). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 1 (3), p. 323-342.

Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts. Syntax and semantics*, 3. Cole, P. & Morgan, J.L. (eds.). New York: Seminar Press, p. 225-42.

Kardela, H. (2016). Analyzability and institutionalization: Setting parameters in cognitive morphology. In *SKASE Journal of theoretical linguistics*, 16 (2), p. 69-90. Available at: http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL32/pdf_doc/04.pdf/

Kardela, H. (2012). Non-concatenative morphological formations: A cognitive grammar analysis of blends and acronyms. In *Sound, structure and sense. Studies in memory of Edmund Gussmann*. Cyran, E., Kardela, H. & Szymanek, B. (eds.). Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, p. 303-319.

Kemmer, S. (2003). Schemas and lexical blends. In *Motivation in language: From case grammar to cognitive linguistics.* Cuyckens, H., Berg, T., Dirven, R. & Panther, K.-U. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadephia: John Benjamins, p. 69-97.

Konieczna, E. (2014). Compounds and blends as wordplay. In *The Subcarpathian studies in English language, literature and culture. Linguistics*. Kleparski, G.A., Konieczna, E. & Kopecka, B. (eds.). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, p. 257-269.

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (1999). Metaphor: Does it constitute or reflect cultural models? In *Selected papers from the 5th International cognitive linguistics conference, Amsterdam 1997*. Gibbs, R.W. Jr. & Steen, G.J. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 167-188.

Kövecses, Z. (2018). Metaphor in media language and cognition: A perspective from conceptual metaphor theory. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, III (1), June 2018, p. 124-141. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0004

Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from. Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R.W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R.W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*, vol.1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R.W. (1993). Reference-point constructions. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 4, p. 1-38.

Lehrer, A. (2007). Blendalicious. In *Lexical creativity, texts and contexts.* Munat, J. (ed.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 115-133.

Lehrer, A. (1996). Identifying and interpreting blends: An experimental approach. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 7 (4), p. 359-390.

Lehrer, A. & Veres, C. (2010). *Two experiments on processing lexical blends.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Lexical Blending, Lyon, June 10-11, 2010. Available at: https://alehrer.faculty.arizona.edu/research_interests/ Lopez-Rua, P. (2004). The categorical continuum of English blends. In *English studies*, 85 (1), p. 63-76.

Mattiello, E. (2019). A corpus-based analysis of new English blends. In *Lexis*, 14, p. 1-28. DOI: 10.4000/lexis.3660.

Mattiello, E. (2013). *Extra-grammatical morphology in English. Abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives, and related phenomena*. Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.

Motsch, W. (1981). Der kreative Aspekt in der Wortbildung. In *Wortbildung*. Lipka, L. (ed.). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, p. 94-118.

Oxford English dictionary. Available at: http://www.oed.com/

Plag, I. (2003). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radden, G. & Kovecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In *Metonymy in language and thought* [Human cognitive processing 4]. Panther, K.-U. & Radden, G. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 17-59.

Ralli, A. & Xydopoulos, G.J. (2012). Blend formation in modern Greek. In *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending*. Renner, V., Maniez, F. & Arnaud, P.J.L. (eds.). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, p. 35-51.

Renner, V. (2015). Lexical blending as wordplay. In *Wordplay and metalinguistic/ metadiscursive reflection: Authors, contexts, techniques, and meta-reflection*. Zirker, A. & Winter-Froemel, E. (eds.). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, p. 119-133.

Ronneberger-Sibold, E. (2006). Lexical blends: Functionally tuning the transparency of complex words. In *Folia linguistica*, XL (1/2), p. 155-181.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1998). Pragmatics and time. In *Relevance theory*. Carston, R. & Uchida, S. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 276-298.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

The Rice University Neologisms Database. Available at: http://neologisms.rice.edu/

Urban dictionary. Available at: https://www.urbandictionary.com/

Williams, E. (1981). On the notions 'lexically related' and 'head of a word'. In *Linguistic inquiry*, 2, p. 245-274.

Wilson, D. (1994). Relevance and understanding. In *Language and understanding*. Brown, G., Malmkjaer, K., Pollitt, A. & Williams, J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 35-58.

Wordspy. Available at: https://www.wordspy.com/

Zwicky, A.M. & Pullum, G.K. (1987). Plain morphology and expressive morphology. In *Proceedings of the 13th annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistics society, general session and parasession on grammar and cognition*. Aske, J., Beery, N., Michaelis, L. & Filip, H. (eds.). Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, p. 330-340.

Contact data

	name:	**Ewa Konieczna**
	academic title / rank:	PhD in Linguistics Assistant Professor
	department:	Department of English Studies
	institution:	University of Rzeszów ul. W. Kopisto 2B, 35-315 Rzeszów, Poland
	e-mail:	ekon66@wp.pl
	fields of interest:	Cognitive linguistics, morphology, semantics, sociolinguistics.

Résumé

The paper presents a study of innovative metaphorical and metonymic blends in English. The analysis is based on the corpus of blends derived from two Internet webpages aimed at collecting nonce-formations and neologisms: *Wordspy* and *The Rice University Neologisms Database*. In the study, the most inclusive definition of blends is adopted, which means that a lexeme is regarded as a blend even if only one of its source words has been clipped. In general, blends belong to extra-grammatical morphology and are characterised by a lot of irregularities, including non-morphematic analysis, discontinuity of bases, alternative input categories, etc., all of which reduce their morphotactic transparency. However, as the present study has shown, metaphorical and metonymic blends are different in this respect. The reduction in the semantic transparency of such blends – entailed by the occurrence of metaphor and metonymy – is counteracted by the increase in their morphotactic transparency, which is aimed at preserving their intelligibility. Reduced semantic transparency of blends demands a greater processing effort required for their interpretation. Since, according to the principle of Optimal Relevance, extra processing effort is offset by extra effects, it is proposed that the interpretation of metaphorical and metonymic blends entails a pragmatic effect. Because pragmatic effect is a feature of expressive morphology, blends involving metaphorical and metonymic construals are referred to as expressive blends. The analysis has shown that metaphor and metonymy can operate both on source word 1 and source word 2, represented by the splinter, which comes first and

second, respectively, in the linear structure of the blend. However, in the sample under analysis the most predominant pattern is the metaphorical use of source word 2 (probably because of the fact that source word 2 represents the semantic head of the blend).

Key words: expressive blends, metaphor, metonymy, pragmatic effect, transparency.

Appendix

Table 1. Metaphorical, metonymic, and metaphtonymic blends
(arranged in the order in which they appear in the paper)

Blend	source word 1	source word 2
glitterati	*glitter*	*literati*
gaydar	*gay*	*radar*
flunami	*flu*	*tsunami*
mathlete	*math*	*athlete*
eargasm	*ear*	*orgasm*
flavourgasm	*flavour*	*orgasm*
laughgasm	*laugh*	*orgasm*
joygasm	*joy*	*orgasm*
browpocalypse	*brow*	*apocalypse*
deerpocalypse	*deer*	*apocalypse*
bleachorexia	*bleach*	*anorexia*
bigorexia	*big*	*anorexia*
drunkorexia	*drunk*	*anorexia*
Eurogeddon	*Europe*	*Armageddon*
sockmageddon	*socks*	*Armageddon*
farmageddon	*farm*	*Armageddon*
vulgarati	*vulgar*	*literati*
geekerati	*geek*	*literati*
chocoholic	*chocolate*	*alcoholic*
shopaholic	*shop*	*alcoholic*
sheeple	*sheep*	*people*
zombee	*zombie*	*bee*
blogject	*blog*	*object*
meanderthal	*meander*	*Neanderthal*
botax	*botox*	*tax*
poorism	*poor*	*tourism*
fiberhood	*fiber*	*neighbourhood*
slizzard	*slutty*	*lizard*
locapour	*local*	*pour*
menoporsche	*menopause*	*Porsche*
twitchfork	*twitter*	*pitchfork*
giraffiti	*giraffe*	*graffiti*

piem	Pi	poem
haycation	hay	vacation
bromance	bro	romance
fiberhood	fiber	neighbourhood
floordrobe	floor	wardrobe
shuicide	shoe	suicide
facejack	facebook	hijack
hooterlicious	hooter	delicious
floorcest	floor	incest
bridezilla	bride	Godzilla
promzilla	prom	Godzilla
sidcest	Sid	incest
suitecest	suite	incest
dormcest	dorm	incest
trincest	Trinity	incest
apostrofly	apostrophe	fly
flashpacker	flash	backpacker
menopaws	menopause	paws
pajamahideen	pajama	Mujahideen
bankster	banker	gangster
trampede	trample	stampede
loligator	lol	alligator