Personal-Name Blends as Instances of Morphological Creativity in English and Their Equivalents in Serbian: A Constructionist View

Jelena Vujić, University of Belgrade, Serbia
Tijana Šuković, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

There are numerous restrictions on the word-formation processes that are applied to proper nouns, and yet proper nouns may act as components of complex words. In recent years there has been a growing number of personal names that have been used in nonce and neological formations as *ad hoc* humorous, playful and stylistically marked and therefore highly context-dependent portmanteau words. The aim of this paper is to show that despite being instances of morphological creativity, English personal-name blends represent form-meaning correspondences, which proves them to be generated by constructional schemas rather than arbitrary coinages. Following Booij's framework of Construction Morphology, we analyse personal-name blends in English on a corpus compiled from popular American sitcoms, TV dramas and films and their possible translational equivalents in Serbian, which offers an insight into available morphological mechanisms of creating (morpho)semantically equivalent personal-name portmanteaus in Serbian. The results suggest that most examined blends follow a regular pattern and are extracted from constructional schemas which can be helpful when translating portmanteaus.

Keywords: nonce formations, blends, proper nouns, morphological creativity, constructional schemas, translation equivalents, English-Serbian analysis

1 Introduction[1]

When speakers use marginal and less productive morphological processes and mechanisms to consciously produce new coinages which are "clearly deliberate and independent of the system" (Bauer 2005, 329), we can speak of morphological creativity. Morphological creativity is the domain of unproductive or marginal lexeme formation processes such as blending or backformation (Lieber 2016, 78). Though not all morphologists make a distinction between creativity and productivity, all agree that it is quite often impossible to draw a clear boundary between the two (Bauer 2001). Typically, creativity is not rule-governed, but rather a rule-changing innovation; therefore, quite often, new coinages are used by individuals in isolation and on a single occasion only (Bauer 2001, 64). Such new lexical items, which are intended to catch the reader's/interlocutor's attention are the outputs of morphological creativity and are referred to as nonce formations. Much as there may be a consensus over their use, whether these formations are indeed not rule-governed has been quite a debated issue. For Katamba (1993), nonce formations are formed using standard rules since creativity is mostly rule-governed. Similarly, Štekauer (2002, 97) sees nonce formations as "regular coinages generated by productive word-formation rules". Taking into consideration the arguments for previous stances, we argue that nonce formations are only partially regular. If they were entirely rule-governed, regular and canonical, the addressees/readers would accept them as they accept other productively formed new words, not noting them as new words (Lieber 2016, 78). Thus, they would not be classified as nonce formations. On the other hand, if they were completely irregular, the speakers would not be able to decompose them.

Thus, we propose that the matter of regularity of word-formation patterns be seen as a continuum on which the nonce formations (blends in particular) would stand somewhere in the middle as partially regular since they typically bend productive word-formation rule(s) to a certain extent, thus initializing the establishment of new patterns which, by processes of lexicalization and conventionalization, become productive themselves (e.g. blending patterns, acronyms, etc.). Despite their partial grammaticality, they are completely acceptable as they are supported by the speakers' ability to interpret and decompose them. Therefore, when decomposing nonce formations, the unification

1 The authors express their gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions which greatly contributed to the improvement of the draft version of the paper.

mechanism gets activated and operates despite the conflict that typically exists in relevant information output (Vujić 2016). Their extra-grammaticality is what makes Construction Grammar (CxG) a particularly suitable theoretical frame to treat nonce formations (Vujić 2016).[2] All this said, we can refer to nonce formations as non-canonical word-forms.

This paper presents a study of a selected corpus of personal name blends in spoken English (SL) and their possible equivalents in Serbian (TL).[3] The statistical analysis of a wider corpus of English novel coinages (Vujić and Rabrenović 2019) shows that for proper-noun nonce formations in English, the processes that are usually perceived as more productive, such as suffixation, prefixation and compounding, have generated fewer examples (10≤) as opposed to conversion and blending.[4]

We aim to investigate the mechanisms that govern the creation of personal-name blends and, if possible, identify their structural, semantic (and possibly pragmatic/functional) properties for the purpose of establishing their constructional schema(s). We believe that nonce formation blends can be treated as constructs presenting individual concrete instantiations of abstract form-meaning-usage correspondences and patterns, i.e. constructions (Booij 2010, 2013). Their complex structure together with the seemingly marginal status is what makes them ideal for the constructionist approach (Fried & Östman 2004, 15; Vujić 2016, 21). As noted above, the analysis will be based on a small-scale corpus containing 24 personal-name blends in English compiled from popular American sitcoms, TV dramas and films.

We aim to demonstrate that for (de)composing and translating blends it is not only the pragmato-semantic component (their usage) of each construction that is crucial, but also some more or less identifiable prosodic and morpho-syntactic constraints (their form). All such factors supported by the fact that they are both highly context-dependent and culture-dependent make them quite challenging for translation, which leads us to explore their translational potential as well as the structure of possible Serbian equivalents.

2 More on constructionist approach to devious and rule-bending structures see Vujić (2016, 42).

3 SL (source language); TL (target language).

4 The paper will be dealing with the selection of 24 blends that are a part of the larger corpus containing over 70 English proper-noun nonce formations. For a constructionist view on proper-name nonce formations that are created by grammatical processes (prefixation, suffixation, compounding and conversion) see Vujić and Rabrenović (2019).

2 Blends as nonce formations – form and meaning

In English, lexical blending is one of the most powerful and most frequent sources of nonce formations (and neologisms). According to Hohenhaus (2005, 364), nonce formations are "somewhat 'in between' actual and possible words" since they are "'new' in a psychological sense" and not retrieved from the speaker's storage of already existing listemes in the lexicon. Therefore, the basic feature of nonce formations is that they never get listed or become part of speakers' long-term vocabulary, because they are too dependent on the context (Hohenhaus 2007). This is somewhat contradictory to Štekauer (2002, 97), because if his notion is to be accepted then from the point of view of Construction Morphology (CxM) their schemas exist in the speaker's mental lexicon and can be analogically and productively used for new formations in adequate communicative situations. In addition, if a constructionist approach to (blend) nonce formations is applied, we can see that they can be often formalized by constructions (abstract formation patterns), which facilitates and explains their decomposability. Blending indeed started as a nonce-formation process only to grow into a frequent and productive (though not quite consistent) word-formation process with often transparently predictable outcomes. The context-dependence of blends (and nonce formations in general) is a characteristic of speech (parole), and not that of the system (langue) while their interpretation may vary within different speech-communities (Štekauer 2002). For that reason, (blend) nonce formations can be traced in "the interplay between the language, on the one hand, and the extra-linguistic reality and the speech community, on the other" (Štekauer 2002, 97). Given their particular function to amuse, shock, draw the interlocutor(s)' attention, they are frequently described as being "queerious" (Kelly 1998), "clever, trendy, eye-and-ear-catching […] cute and amusing words" (Lehrer 2003, 2007), "cool" and "creative" (Beliaeva 2019a, 2019b; Fandrych 2008).

The form of nonce formations may range from being "regular", when they are formed by productive, rule-based grammatical morphological processes such as in (1a) (Katamba 1993, 296), to completely "deviant" such as (1b) (Hohenhaus 2005, 363) or (1c) (Štekauer 2002, 106).

(1)

a. Prime ministerable
b. oidy
c. isms

As for their meaning, they are easily interpreted once the speakers are familiar with the (extra)linguistic context. However, in some cases their meaning is not fully decipherable for "outsiders", because they can be related to a situation known only to one speech community (Hohenhaus 2007, 21) as is often the case with personal-name nonce formations. In other words, nonce formations may have a number of discourse or communicative functions (also see Hohenhaus 2007). Some of them arise as deliberate ways of expanding the vocabulary while others are results of unconscious linguistic computing. The examples studied in this paper mainly fall into the former category.

Much as there may be numerous restrictions on the word-formation processes that are applied to proper nouns, proper nouns act as components of complex words. However, they do not usually act as derivational bases, as it is the case with common nouns. While *mountainless* is a possible derivative, **Alpless* is not (Lehmann and Moravcsik 2000, 748). Nevertheless, Marchand (1969) and Bauer, Lieber and Plag (2013) list affixes and other elements that create complex words in English together with proper nouns as word-formation elements. As we will see from our corpus, due to the specific, context dependent nature of nonce words, personal names appear quite commonly as formation bases in nonce formation processes.

By applying a construction-based approach to analysing personal-name blends, we will show that the formation of such neologisms is not governed by rules, but rather formulated on the basis of constructional schemas. Moreover, it will be illustrated how these coinages can be interpreted even without knowing the context of the situation, although their meaning is context-dependent because their meaning is already embedded in the constructional schemas on which such novel formations rely.

3 Theoretical background

Construction Morphology, the 21st century approach to morphological analysis proposed by Geert Booij (2010; 2013), was developed from cognitive-approach-based Construction Grammar (CxG). This theoretical framework seems to be particularly suitable for the study of complex words which linger on the borderline between morphology and syntax. Just like syntactic structures in CxG, the form (1a) is formed according to the productive derivational pattern that is presented in schema I except that the compound noun *Prime Minister* was used as a derivational base instead of a verbal base. The meaning

of the entire novel form is 'having the qualities good enough to / able to become a Prime Minister'.

Complex words are constructs which instantiate morphological constructions (Booij 2010). Constructions of all complexity are abstract representations of words, whereas constructs are their realizations in speech (Fried and Östman 2004; Fried 2015). Each construction represents a systematic form-meaning-function correspondence which serves as the basis on which speakers can form an abstract (constructional) schema that expresses a generalization about the form, meaning and function of the construction (Booij 2010). For all complex words, schemas necessarily give information about the formal representation of the complex word including the base word [X] together with the semantic representation of the complex word.

For example, deverbal adjectives ending in the suffix –able such as *acceptable* and *approachable* are generated by schema I (Booij 2013, 255):

$$\text{I}\quad [[x]_{Vtr}\ \text{able}]_{Aj} \leftrightarrow [[\text{CAN BE X-ed}]\text{PROPERTY}]_{Aj}$$

Apart from giving the information about the complex word(s), schemas also represent the first step in formulating new coinages since "schemas express the generative power of the grammar" (Booij 2013, 258). Rules are always source or input-oriented, which means that there is a base word (with all its morpho-semantic and phonological properties) used as a base for morphological operations. Unlike rules, schemas can be product- or output-oriented (Booij 2010, 4). This has proved to be crucial in analysing complex words without input, and Booij (2010, 29–32) shows that this is the case of baseless complex words with a recognizable affix whose meaning is not fully predictable because of their lack of the base-word (e.g. nouns ending in suffixes –ism or –ist of the type c*ommunist* or *communism*). In such cases, despite the lack of a base-word, it is possible, for example, to concur that all "-isms" are nouns expressing one of the semantic categories based on schema II.

$$\text{II}\quad [x\text{-ism}]_{Ni} \leftrightarrow [\text{PHENOMENON, IDEOLOGY, DISPOSITION...}]_{Ni}$$

The fact that in such cases there is no base-word to serve as an input element proves that they cannot be formulated as rules (which are always source/input-oriented) but are indeed output-oriented schemas. The property of schemas to be output-oriented is crucial for both composition and decomposition of nonce formations, where often one recognizable part is vital for the interpretation of such novel formations.

3.1 Schemas vs. analogy

One of the most debated issues in word-formation is whether new coinages are a result of analogy or abstract schemas (Becker 1990, 1993; Pinker 1999; Booij 2010; Matiello 2016, 2017). An analogical formation (also known as target T) is clearly modelled on an already existing word (model M) due to the existence of partial resemblance between a target and a model, be it a phonological, morphotactic or semantic feature that they share – what is necessary is that there is a clear association between a model and a target (Mattiello 2016). On the other hand, a schema represents an abstract pattern according to which the word is formed, which means that there is no precise model to be selected for the target word. CxM bridges the gap between these two seemingly opposite phenomena seeing that analogy may prompt the development of a new schema; a well-known example is a set of words ending in *-holic* (*chocoholic*, *workaholic*) which have been modelled on the word *alcoholic*. Mattiello (2016, 108) discusses such formations with combining forms as the outputs of analogy via schema, and separates them from those formations which are the outputs of surface analogy. Surface analogy is based on "concrete models of precise similar forms". For example, *white market* is modelled on *black market* (Mattiello 2016, 105). Analogy via schema is said to operate in "transitional phenomena between derivation and compounding" (e.g. combining forms -gate, -holic), whereas surface analogy is applied when forming new words by means of regular processes (derivation, conversion and compounding) and extra-grammatical morphological processes (blending, clipping, acronym formation and related phenomena) (Mattiello 2016, 131). However, the schema-based and usage-based analysis of lexical blends shows that particular blend(s) can form the nucleus of a new, analogical word formation process that can generate a whole family of words, and ultimately, a newly entrenched bound morpheme (Kemmer 2003).

4 Blends as instances of language creativity

Even though mainstream morphologists (Plag 2003; Lieber 2016; Bauer 2005; Lieber and Štekauer 2014; Fabregas and Scalise 2012; Mattiello 2013) classify blending as a minor and extra-grammatical morphological process due to a highly unpredictable outcome, it represents a rather potent, frequent and vital mechanism to form new lexemes in English, and there have been

studies which suggest that in contemporary language blending is becoming one of the most productive lexeme formation processes (Bauer 2013; Renner, Maniez and Arnaud 2013; Mattiello 2019). It is especially active in product-naming, advertising, playful and humorous language (Lieber 2016, 59). In modern English word-formation blending is a signature mark of language creativity, which is supported by the significant number of blends that are listed on the Word Spy website.[5]

The term blending refers to a word-formation process which does not include listed affixes, but instead parts of the existing words, which are not morphemes themselves, are combined to coin a new word. In some cases, one of blend components may be an entire base or an affix (e.g. *bridezilla*). Marchand (1969, 451) defines blending as "compounding by means of curtailed words", a process which has no grammatical status but rather a stylistic one, due to the use of non-existent 'morphemes'. It is superficially similar to the existing canonical WF processes (and indeed often combines them) such as compounding, clipping abbreviating, etc. Traditionally, a blending pattern is formulated bases on the following rule: AB+CD→AD (Plag 2003, 123). This pattern and its reading can be represented as schema III:

III $[\text{segment 1 of } [X]_{Ni} \text{ segment 2 of } [Y]_{Nj}]_{Nk.} \leftrightarrow [\text{AN ENTITY Z WHICH SHARES PROPERTIES OF X AND Y}]_{Nk.}$

Despite their unpredictability and "irregularity", the fact that blends resemble compounds in the arrangement of their constituents and the relation(s) they stand in, makes some syntactic features in blends recognizable, stipulating their classification into coordinate and determinative blends (Bauer 2012, 12), exocentric and endocentric blends (Bat-El 2006) or paradigmatic and syntagmatic blends (Dressler 2000). As for their semantics, according to Renner (2006) nonce formation blends can project the following semantic interpretations: A) hybrid meaning (e.g. *staycation*, *guesstimate*, *skort*) B) addition, which is found in coordinative blends (e.g. *Brangelina*, *Oxbridge*) C) tautologous (e.g. *posilutely*, *fantabulous*).

The given classifications clearly add to the compound-like structure of blends, implying a schematic aspect of their nature.

Blends usually have the status of nonce words and/or neologisms because they are formed in order to refer to (unique) novel concepts (Mattiello 2016).

5 See *Word Spy*, *The Word Lover's Guide to New Words* (www.wordspy.com).

Moreover, blends always include the interplay and integration of diverse information that is not always central to their linguistic study, such as the interplay of orthography and pronunciation (Gries 2012, 145). In order to fulfil the speakers' communicative intention, which in spoken language involves objectives such as reaching a humorous effect or expressing endearment, they must be recognizable by the interlocutors. Therefore, one of the prerequisites for blend-formation is that both the material taken from lexeme A and the material taken from lexeme B remain (formally and structurally) recognizable in blends (Bauer 2011, 13) so that their meaning can be adequately (de)composed and interpreted. This implies that however spurious, unsystematic and context-specific blends may seem, there is a lot of systematicity in both their form and meaning.

Findings from a psychological and cognitive perspective, which were based on case studies and research conducted by Gries (2004, 2006, 2012), show that composition and decomposition of blends is far from being chaotic and random. They suggest that from the speaker's position this intentional and to a large degree regular-WF-pattern-governed process involves the following three stages (Gries 2012, 164), which all speak in favour of blends having a schematic nature:

1) Choosing two source words which can communicate what the new formation is supposed to express and are similar to each other in terms of phonemic and/or graphemic length, stress pattern as well as semantics;
2) Ordering of the elements in a new coinage, which is governed either by their syntax so that they remain in the modifier-head[6] or head-head[7] order, or the frequency and length of the constituents with the shorter and more frequent one being fronted;
3) The blending of the constituents which is done by first cutting them up at a syllable boundary close to the uniqueness/selection point and, fusing them with more of source-word 2 (SW2) being used.

With all this in mind, blending cannot be seen as a single-instance nonce formation process but as intentionally creative and productive computation in which different WF potentials are deployed and fused creating new WF schemas, which may be analogical or productive in their nature.

6 In determinative blends.

7 In coordinate blends.

5 Corpus analysis

The analysis presented in this paper is based on the personal-name portmanteau words in the 21st century popular American sitcoms and drama series: *2 Broke Girls*, *Grey's Anatomy*, *Hart of Dixie*, *How I Met Your Mother*, *New Girl*, *Riverdale*, *This Is Us*, *Young & Hungry* and *Younger.* Our corpus, which intends to be illustrative of the morphological potential of personal names, includes 24 personal name blends in English and their potential equivalents in Serbian.

Table 1. Personal names serving as the splinters in blend formation: first and second splinters in both full and clipped forms

Nonce formations in context	*Blend formation*
1) Yo, Swiss miss, you wanna have a conversation about cold climes with *Snowleg* over there?	Snowleg ← Snow + (O)leg
2) Hey, *Magpie* why don't you go to bed?	Magpie ← Mag(nolia) + pie
3) You can put a little sign right at the edge of the town that says "now entering *Ruby-Jeffries-Bell*. Population: You", uh!	Ruby-Jeffries-Bell ← Ruby Jeffries + Bell
4) What's up, Mount *Keverest*?	Keverest ← K(evin) + Everest
5) Oh man you know I love me a good *Kevent*.	Kevent ← Kev(in) + (ev)ent
6) Well, first of all, it's a *Sophievent.*	Sophievent ← Sophie + (e)vent
7) My last name rhymes with gay and the best thing you can think of is *Jerksica*?	Jerksica ← jerk + (Jes)sica
8) After he saw the movie Titanic, he started the Billy Zane fan club… They are called the *Zaniacs*.	Zaniacs ← Za(ne) + (ma)niacs
9) Oh, well if it isn't Schmidt. Or should I call you *Scmidttata* because you have so much egg on your face?	Smidttata ← Scmidt + (frit)tata

10) It's called *Marshgammon*. It combines all best features of all the best games… Candy Land, I never, Pictionary. – Backgammon, obviously. – No. Backgammon sucks. I took the only good part of backgammon, the "gammon", and I left the rest of it in the trash where it belongs.	Marshgammon ← Marsh(all) + (back) gammon
11) Max, Caroline, I'd like you to meet my gamer crew. Basically, *Hantourage*.	Hantourage ← Han + (en)tourage
12) Halle Berry? More like Frankenberry.	Frankenberry← Franken(stein) + Berry
13) We're just looking out for your best interests. *Quinnterest*.	Quinnterest ← Quinn + (in)terest
14) My friends think you're wrong for me, so they're having an intervention. -A *Quinntervention*.	Quinntervention ← Quinn + (in)tervention
15) I'm telling all y'all… it's *Zabkatage*.	Zabkatage ← Zabka + (sabo)tage

The examples listed in Table 1 show that personal names serving as the splinters in blend formation can be used as both first and second splinters. Moreover, they can be used in both full and clipped forms giving rise to the following schemas:

1) A whole personal name in the initial position of the blend is followed by a part of a common or abstract noun as the second splinter (A6), (A9), (A11), (A13), (A14) and (A15):

   1 $[[X]_{Niprop}$ [segment of Y$]_{Njcomm/abstr}] \leftrightarrow$ Z [AN ENTITY/OBJECT Y HAVING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF/LINK WITH THE PERSON X $]_{Nk}$

Following the scheme given in 1, the blend *Sophievent* (A6) can be segmented into *Sophie* and *event*, while its meaning can be interpreted as 'the event organized/run BY Sophie'. Other nonce formations that fit the scheme, *Quinntervention* (A14) and *Zabkatage* (A15) can be segmented accordingly leading the speaker(s) towards the agentive interpretations '*intervention performed by Quinn*' and '*sabotage performed/undertaken by Zabka*', respectively. Therefore, the syntactico-semantic link between the proper noun and the common/abstract noun as the second splinter is of agentive nature. Thus, the general structural construction schema 1 for this type of blends could be specified into the following subschema 1_a with the specific meaning

1_a [[X]$_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum.}}$ [segment of Y[8]]$_{\text{Njabstr .naming action}}$]$_{\text{Nk}}$ ↔ Z [AN ACTION Y PERFORMED BY X]$_{\text{Nkabstr.}}$

Other examples belonging to this structural type *Hantourage* (A11) and *Quinnterest* (A14) can be segmented into *Han* + *entourage* and *Quinn* + *interest*, respectively triggering the following possessive, defining, classifying interpretations '*Han's entourage/ the entourage of Han*' and '*Quinn's interest / the interest of Quinn*' with the specific constructional subschema (1_b)

1_b [[X]$_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum.}}$ [segment of Y]$_{\text{Njabstr/comm}}$]$_{\text{Nk}}$ ↔ Z [AN ENTITY Y POSSESSED/CLASSIFIED BY X]$_{\text{Nkabstr/comm.}}$

Finally, schema 1 allows segmenting of the example *Smidttata* (A9) into '*Smidt* and *frittata*'. However, the meaning of this example is much more dependent on the situational context and could trigger qualitative, descriptive (or even locative) meaning '*frittata on Smidt*' or '*frittata with Scmidt*'.

1_c [[X]$_{\text{prop.}}$] $_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum}}$ [segment of Y]$_{\text{Njcomm/abstr}}$] ↔ Z [AN ENTITY Y ON/WITH X]$_{\text{Nkabstr/comm..}}$

2) A segment of a proper noun is the first splinter and the segment of a common or abstract noun is the second splinter (A10), (A8), (A5):

2 [[segment of X]$_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum.}}$ [segment of Y]$_{\text{Njcomm/abstr}}$]$_{\text{Nk}}$ ↔ Z [AN ENTITY/OBJECT Y HAVING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF/LINK WITH Y]$_{\text{Nk}}$

As for schema 2, the examples (A5) and (A10) trigger the agentive interpretations of '*an event organized by Kevin*' and '*a special kind of backgammon-like game created by Marshall*'. Therefore, the appropriate subschema would be

2_a [[segment of X]$_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum.}}$ [segment of Y]$_{\text{Njcomm/abstr}}$]$_{\text{Nk}}$ ↔ Z [AN ACTIVITY Y DONE BY X]$_{\text{Nk.}}$

The example (A8) presents a combination of the personal family name and the plural of the common [+ animate, + human] noun and is segmented into '*Zane* + *maniacs*'. The given context provides enough information for its appropriate possessive classifying interpretation as '*a group of (Billy) Zane's hardcore fans*' thus the subschema is

8 For more on the restrictions governing the phonological make-up of blends and guiding the position of cuts within base words, see Plag (2003).

2_b [[segment of X]$_{Nprop.anim.hum.}$]$_{Ni}$ [segment of Y]$_{Njcomm.}$]$_{Nkcomm}$ ↔ Z [AN ENTITY/PERSON Y POSSESSED/CLASSIFIED BY THE PERSON X NAMED BY N_i]$_{Nkcomm..}$

3) A segment of a proper noun is the first splinter and the whole of a common or abstract noun is the second splinter (A2), and (A5):

3 [[segment of X]$_{Niprop.anim.hum.}$ [Y]$_{Njcomm/abstr}$]$_{Nk}$ ↔ Z [AN ENTITY Y HAVING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF/LINK WITH THE PERSON X]$_{Nk}$

Relying on the (extra)linguistic context provided in the TV show, the example (A2) is easily segmented into the clipped personal name of one of the main characters and a common noun. Given the conditions in which the utterance occurs, such a combination renders the hypocoristic reading based on the analogy with the term of endearment '*cutie pie*'. Therefore, the adequate subschema projecting such reading will be

3_a [[segment of X]$_{Niprop.anim.hum.}$[Y]$_{Njcomm/abstr}$]$_{Nkcomm./abstr.}$ ↔ Z [A PARTICULARLY DEAR PERSON X]$_{Nkanim.hum.}$

The example (A5) is morphosemantically segmented into '*Kevin+event*' with the agentive semantic interpretation '*an event organized by Kevin*'.

3_b [[segment of X]$_{Niprop.anim.hum.}$] [Y]$_{Njcomm/abstr}$]$_{Nkabstr.}$ ↔ Z [AN ACTION Y PERFORMED BY X]$_{Nk}$

4) A whole common or abstract noun in the initial position is followed by a segment of the personal name as the second splinter (A1), (A7):

4 [[X]$_{Nicom/absstr.}$ [segment of Y]$_{Njprop}$] $_{Nkprop.anim.hum}$ ↔ Z [A PERSON Y HAVING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENTITY X NAMED BY N_i]$_{Nk}$

Obviously, both examples allow for transparent segmentations. As for their semantic interpretation, it is largely taken from the (extra)linguistic context and both would fall under the same constructional schema 4 with the descriptive reading. *Snowleg* can be understood as '*Oleg*, *who is fond of snow*' while *Jerkssica* is '*Jessica*, *who is a jerk*'.

5) A segment of a proper noun (personal name) as the first splinter is combined with the segment of another proper noun as the second splinter (A12):

5 [[segment of $[X]_{Niprop.}$ $[Y]_{Njprop}]_{Nkprop.anim.hum.}$ ↔ Z [A PERSON Z HAVING BOTH THE CHARACTERISTICS OF X AND Y]$_{Nk}$

Frankenberry (A12) is structurally quite transparent and easily broken into '*Franken(stein) + (Halle) Berry*' triggering coordinative meaning as given in schema 5.

6) A segment of a proper noun (personal name) as the first splinter is followed by a segment of a proper noun in the position of the second splinter (A4).

6 [[segment of $[X]_{Niprop.anim.hum.}$ $[Y]_{Njprop}]_{Nkprop.anim.hum.}$ ↔ Z [A PERSON X HAVING THE CHARACTERSITICS OF THE ENTITY/ PERSON Y]$_{Nk}$

Just like the previous type, the example (A4) *Keverest* is highly transparent and easily broken into source words, which, with the help from the extralinguistic context, guides us into the modifying, metaphorical semantic interpretation '*Kevin*, *who is very tall / who is as tall as (Mount) Everest*'.

The examples listed above, and the schemas provided indicate that personal names as blend splinters (either as a whole or in part) tend to combine with both other proper nouns or common/abstract nouns (or their parts). No adjectives or verbs have been found to interact with proper nouns in blend-formation in this small-scale corpus, which is in accordance with their lesser general tendency to serve as blend splinters.

A special kind of personal-name blends are those indicating a love relationship between two people, who, by being romantically involved, form a bipolar entity generally perceived as a single abstract item/phenomenon. Such blends are productively formed following the blend *Be$_{(n)(Je)}$nnifer* (referring to the romantic relationship between Ben Affleck and Jennifer Lopez). The form *Bra$_{(d)(A)}$ngelina* (referring to the affair between Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie) was first created by analogy with *Bennifer* and even though neither of the two are officially listed in OED, they are not perceived as nonce formations because of their now recognized status in spoken English and journalism (Mattiello 2013, 120). Other blends of this kind are usually formed by merging the given names of two people who are romantically involved with each other, and the pattern allows for either the parts of their first names or the whole names to be merged with one another. Irrespective of the type of splinters (personal names used as wholes or in part) involved, all examples have a coordinative structure triggering a hybrid meaning.

The most general schema fitting this pattern would be

$$7\ [[X]_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum.}}\ [Y]_{\text{Njprop.anim.hum.}}]_{\text{Nkcoll.}} \leftrightarrow Z\ [\text{ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN X AND Y}]_{\text{Nk.}}$$

The examples of this type of blend given in Table 2 were found in our English corpus, proving the pattern to be quite established and institutionalized.

Table 2. Splinters (personal names used as wholes or in part) with a coordinative structure triggering hybrid meaning.

Nonce formations in context	*Blend formation*
16) Cause that's how *Katoby* roll.	Katoby ←Kat(e) + (T)oby
17) Attention Blawkerites, *Zudson* is over.	Zudson ← Z(oe) + (J)udson
18) Well, will y'all be going by *Lavonabeth* or the shorter *Annabon*?	a) Lavonabeth ←Lavon + (Ann)abeth b) Annabon ← Annab(eth) + (Lav)on
19) *Zeorge*. ("Geo" with a "G" was just too confusing.)	Zeorge ← Z(oe) + (G)eorge
20) Well, does this mean that there's still hope for *Zade* fans out there?	Zade ← Z(oe) + (W)ade
21) Well, Blawkers, it's official *Lemonade* lives!	Lemonade ← Lemon + (W)ade
22) Dash is covering *Joelabeth* 24/7. + Hashtag *Bughead* is no more?	a) Joelabeth ← Joel + (Ann)abeth b) Bughead ← B(etty) + (J)ughead

Given the structure of the examples (B16–22), schema 7 could be further formally specified into the following:

$$7_{a}\ [\text{segment of } [X]_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum}}\ \text{segment of } [Y]_{\text{Njprop.anim.hum}}]_{\text{Nkcoll.}} \leftrightarrow Z\ [\text{ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN X AND Y}]_{\text{Nk.}}$$

$$7_{b}\ [[X]_{\text{Niprop.anim.hum}}\ \text{segment of } [Y]_{\text{Njprop.anim.hum}}]_{\text{Nkcoll}} \leftrightarrow Z\ [\text{ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN X}_{\text{(THE PERSON Ni)}}\ \text{AND Y}_{\text{(THE PERSON Nj)}}]_{\text{Nk.}}$$

Examples (B16, B17, B18a, B19, B20 and B22) fit both formally and semantically the schema provided in $7_{a,}$ while (A18a) and (21) correspond to $7_{b.}$ This indicates that personal-name blends with coordinative structure and reading show a higher tendency to be partial with both splinters being parts of personal names (schema 7a) rather than using constituent proper nouns in their entirety (as in B18a and B21).

Semantically speaking, these blends project a hybrid meaning, a sort of personalized semantic amalgam(s) fusing the meanings associated with two specific people, both individually and as a romantic couple. Such a meaning is composed based on certain extra-linguistic, encyclopaedic knowledge regarding the unique, individual, context-dependent relation between the two constituting persons.

This results in the fact that such nouns can be perceived as inherently marked for dual (plural) number since they refer to an entity composed of precisely two persons despite their lack of formal number markedness. In that respect they resemble collective nouns since they can be treated as either singular (as in B22, B21, B17) or plural (B16, B18).

Obviously, all personal-name blends studied here follow either

a) the "prototypical" blending pattern $X_{(AB)}+ Y_{(CD)} \rightarrow Z_{(AD)}$ (e.g. *Bughead*, *Zade*, *Zeorge*, *Annabon*, *Zudson*, *Kevent*, *Sophievent*), or

b) the pattern $X+ Y_{(CD)} \rightarrow Z_{(XD)}$ (e.g. *Lavonabeth*, *Lemonade*, *Quinnterest*, *Jerkssica*, *Snowleg*, *Smidttata*, *Hantourage*, *Zabkatage*)

The former have splinters with no morphological status, which proves them to be true blends (blends proper) and not truncated-form compounds of the type *Interpol*, *agitprop* or *satnav*. The latter, with a noun as a whole as the first splinter followed by a second segment of the second noun, prove to belong to a more dominant structural pattern in personal-name English blends, which is in accordance with the psycholinguistic findings that the beginning of a word is more recognizable than its end (Gries, 2004, 2012). Such a tendency to preserve as much as possible of the first constituent's orthographic and phonological content is found in examples (A6), (A9), (A11), (A13), (A14), (A15), (B18a), (B21), and (B22a). For that reason, the monosyllabic and disyllabic names as first constituents tend to appear in their uncurtailed forms, such as *Sophie*, *Han*, *Quinn*, *Zabka*, *Zane*, *Smidt*, *Joel*, *Lemon*, *Kate* versus *Kev(in)*, *Marsh(all)*, *Mag(nolia)*, *Franken(stein)*, and *(Anna)beth*. The former mostly form *telescope blends* where the final segment of the personal name as the first source word overlaps with the beginning of the second base word which is the semantic core of the entire blend. The structure of the preserved segment may vary from a single grapheme/phoneme (e.g. *Ka**t**oby* /keɪˈ**t**əʊbi/, *Sophi**e**vent* /ˈsɒfi**e**vent/, *Ha**n**tourage* /h**ʌ***n***t**uˈraːʒ/) to a string of graphemes/phonemes (e.g. *Quinntrest* /ˈkwɪ**n**trest/, *Quinnterevention* /kwɪ**n**ˈtərvenʃən/[9]*).*

9 In the IPA transcriptions of the given blends, the stress-marking is based on their pronunciation in TV shows.

In addition, the given examples reflect the tendency of at least one of the stressed syllables from the two elements to be preserved at the same time showing preference for the (primary) stress of the right-hand word to be retained.[10] Given that the transparency and recognizability of blends are among key conditions for their interpretation (Bauer 2012, 13), this preservation of phono-graphemic material adds to the transparency and recognizability of the coined blends contributing to their easier processing and interpretation.

Finally, the presented English personal-name blends follow the tendency of English blends that the base words are of (nearly) the same size regarding the number of syllables (Plag 2003, 125).

6 Translatability and adaptability of English personal-name blends in Serbian

Since in the globally Americanized world such English nonce formations and novel coinages are widely available to English and non-English speaking audiences alike, we were intrigued to look into how such highly context-motivated English (SL) portmanteau words can be translated and/or adapted into Serbian (TL).

Blends are known to be structurally restricted by a host of semantic, syntactic and prosodic restrictions, which makes them particularly tricky and demanding for translation and/or adaptation (into Serbian as TL).

According to Newmark ([1988] 2003, 144), before deciding whether to recreate them in the TL or to translate the complete components of the blends, the translator has to be aware of their function, neatness and phonaesthetic quality in both SL and TL.

Blending is generally perceived among Serbian linguists to be a relatively new formation phenomenon which is believed to have entered Serbian via language contact with English, with the early Serbian blends dating back to the 1990s (Halupka-Rešetar and Lalić-Krstin 2009; Bugarski 2019; Tomić 2019). However, the mechanism has been around in Serbian literature (Milanović 2022) much longer, and well before any Serbian-English language contacts could be traced (Milanović and Vujić 2019). Examples such as (2) (Milanović 2022) show that blending as a mechanism of coining highly descriptive and

10 For more on stress position in blends, see Bauer (2012).

stylistically charged coinages in Serbian literary language, though rare, can be detected decades (and even centuries) before the various contemporary corpora (Bugarski 2019, Tomić 2019, Halupka-Rešetar and Lalić-Krstin 2009, Jovanović 2019), compiled in the past two decades, might suggest.

(2)

a. romor(i) + Anka→ romoranka (1862)
E *sough-PRES.3.PER.SG* + *Anka*

b. štal(a) + (br)log→ štalog (1939)
E *barn* + *den*

c. opan(ak) + (ota)džbina → opandžbina (1972)
E *opanak*[11] + *fatherland*

Typically hapaxes, such portmanteau creations tend to be the results of lexical/morphological creativity.

Few would disagree that blending is an elastic and quite dynamic process in Serbian nonce-formation creation, and some scholars even consider blends to be the most original and humorous lexical formations in present-day Serbian (Prćić 2018). But blending is still far less productive than typologically canonical, grammatical formation processes (derivation and composite derivation), which only adds to the challenge of translating English blends into Serbian. The problem so far has been tackled in three serious and more in-depth studies (Subašić 2014; Prćić 2018; Jovanović 2019). While Subašić's study focuses only on translation, covering the techniques of direct and structural translation and functional approximation, Jovanović's contrastive approach explores the mechanisms of incorporation and adaptation of English blends as loanwords into the lexicon of Serbian. He deals mainly with instances of lexical borrowing through language-contacts and provides only a few examples of (mainly) direct translation (e.g. lobs$_{(ter)(mons)}$trosity > jastog$_{(čud)}$ovište) and formal adaptation (e.g. skull$_{(mull)}$et > nularica sa repovima).

What all of the previous studies have in common is that corpora mainly consist of blend nouns that are predominantly common or abstract and rarely (if ever) contain proper-noun and personal-name blends[12] or blends with proper-noun splinter(s).

11 A type of traditional Serbian footwear typically worn in rural environments.

12 Jovanović (2021, 121) mentions the example Patricia-gator > Patriša-gator, but the example may be seen as a compound given that the truncated form *gator* is highly lexicalized and institutionalized in AE.

Given that proper nouns tend to be semantically highly specific and definite with monodimensional semantics aimed solely at naming persons, it is rare that they get translated into TL, and instead usually undergo phonological and/or orthographic adaptation (e.g. E Quinn> S Kvin; E Wade> S Vejd; E George> S Džordž). This may falsely suggest that personal-name portmanteau words are easy to translate and incorporate into Serbian.

The meaning of blends tends to be interpreted according to the "typical or context-dependent relation between the two constituents" (Plag 2003). However, when personal names are used as English blend source-words, their semantics is somewhat changed. It becomes highly personalized and individualized since it refers to the particular person(s) with all the associative meaning they may carry, triggering a distinct conceptualization and processing of a proper noun which, in nonce formations, implies and signifies much more than just a name. It gets a rather definite, narrow metaphorical reference and the speakers absolutely need to be familiar with what the particular personal name symbolizes in order to semantically decompose personal-name nonce formations in both languages.

The main challenge during translation is to preserve as much as possible the novelty of the orthographic/phonological appearance of the English source word in Serbian translation equivalent, while at the same time maintaining its transparency and decomposability. On top of this, the humorous and playful effect is also expected to be preserved in the TL. All this can be quite a task bearing in mind the different nonce formation tendencies of both languages.

Incorporation of coordinate blends containing personal names as both source words projecting hybrid 'having the features of both X and Y' meaning into Serbian would entail orthographic and phonological adaptation of blends (3) since their semantics is super-specific. For their interpretation, the speakers have to rely on extralinguistic knowledge and familiarity with the certain persons as participants of the certain fictional events depicted in the TV shows. This means that only the audience of the given sitcoms would possess enough linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge to properly decompose and understand the meaning of such blends.

(3)

a. Katoby > Kejtobi
b. Zudson > Zadson
c. Zeorge > Zordž

d. Lavonabet > Lavonabet
e. Joelabeth > Džoelabet
f. Keverest > Keverest
g. Frankenberry > Frankenberi

When one of the source words belongs to any other class of nouns with more elaborate and open semantics, the translation or any other sort of domestication/naturalization of English blends into a Serbian (con)text becomes definitely more complicated. This is the case with all examples (A1–15) except for 3), 4), 12). Such forms cannot be simply adapted and naturalized, but require finding adequate structural and semantic equivalents in Serbian. Looking at the corpora and examples offered in the previous studies as well as investigating translatability of English blends which classify as common, abstract or mass nouns, we have noticed that the blends containing loanwords or internationalisms as a second source word tend to show a higher translational potential allowing for preservation of prosodic, structural, semantic and pragmatic features (4).

(4)

a. E tree+(sy)nergy → treenergy
S jel(ka) + (sin)ergija → jelergija

b. E bro(ther) + (ro)mance → bromance
S br(at/aća) + (r)omansa → bromansa

c. E lob(ster) + (mon)strosity → lobstrosity
S jastog + (čud)ovište → jastogovište

d. E bride + (God)zilla→ bridezilla
S mlad(a) + (God)zila → mladzila

e. E glam(or)+(cam)ping→glamping
S glam(ur) + (kam)povanje → glampovanje

f. E info(rmation)+(epi)demia→infodemia
S info(rmacije) + (epi)demija →infodemija

All examples (4a–f) adhere to the prototypical blend scheme III conforming to prosodic constraints typical of blends with the constituents of syllables left intact (Plag 2003, 123). This may explain why (4b), (4e–f) are not treated as proper loanwords from English (borrowed as whole lexemes) but rather as blends formed from Serbian lexemes (domestic or fully domesticated loanwords) based on the productive schema which is almost identical in SL and TL.

With all this in mind, we believe that the following translations (5) of English personal-name blends from popular sitcoms would be adequate Serbian equivalents that stay true to the complex linguistic features of the original nonce formations:[13]

(5)

a. Snowleg > Snoleg ← sn(eg) + Oleg
   OR Snowleg > Snegleg ← sneg + (O)leg

b. Magpie > magmed ← Mag(nolija) + med

c. Kevent > kivent/kevent

d. Sophievent > sofivent

e. Jerksica > Drksika ← drk(oš) + (Dže)sika

f. Hantourage > hanmarila ← Han + (ka)marila

g. Zaniacs > zejnijaci ← Zej(n) + (ma)nijaci

h. Smidttata > šmitata ← Šmi(t) + (frit)tata

i. Marshgammon > Maršgemon ← Marš(al) + (bek)gemon

j. Quinnterest > kvinteres ← Kvin + (in)teres

k. Quinntervention > kvintervencija ← Kvin + (in)tervencija

l. Zabkatage > zabkataža ← Zabka + (sabo)taža

The proposed translations (5 g–l) confirm the previous finding that the blends containing an established and fully domesticated loanword (or loanwords), display a high translational potential. In our examples, Serbian semantic equivalents for English lexemes *maniacs*, *frittata*, *backgammon*, *interest*, *intervention* and *sabotage* are fully domesticated lexemes *manijaci*, *fritata*, *bekgemon*, *interes*, *intervencija*, *sabotaža* with just sightly modified prosody in the TL. This means that in the proposed translations there occurs very little shifting of prosodic, syntactic and semantic balance of the English blends in the TL. Therefore,

13 Since translation is a creative activity which produces different outputs depending on the creativity, knowledge and inspiration of individual translators, the Serbian examples offered in (5) are to be seen just as illustrative instances of possible solutions proposed by the authors whose efforts to find the suitable formal and semantic equivalents were aided by theoretical work.

their original phonoaesthetic and morpho-semantic stability remains rather intact, preserving their (pragmatic) function in the TL, too. As such, they are equally effective in both languages.

In examples (5a) (5e–f), Serbian semantic equivalents for base words *snow*, *jerk*, and *entourage* are domestic Serbian words *sneg*, *drkoš* and the domesticated loanword *kamarila*, respectively. A similar prosodic structure of two semantic equivalents *snow* and *sneg* in (5a) offers possibilities for two elegant translation solutions offered under (5a).[14] The first one, *Snoleg* preserves the structure and prosody of splinters in the original portmanteau word with the first splinter being a part of the mass noun while the second is the whole personal name *Oleg*. The second proposed translation *Snegleg* would also qualify as an acceptable translation with a shifted structure in which the first source word is used as a whole *sneg* while the initial syllable is dropped from the second base word *(O)leg*.

Quite similar is the situation with (5e) *Jerkssica/ Drksika*,[15] where we encounter likeness in prosody between English *jerk /*ˈdʒɜ:(r)k*/* and Serbian *drkoš*. The high prosodic overlapping is present between the phonological realization of the English monosyllabic word and the initial syllable of the Serbian semantic equivalent. Therefore, it is quite easy to preserve the prosody of the English blend. The Serbian translation has a somewhat changed structure since the first splinter is just a segment of the source word *drk(oš)* while in English it is the whole of the word *jerk*, which does not interfere with the effectiveness of the original. In addition, the English original preserves most of the phonetic (and orthographic) material from the personal name *Jessica* (/ˈ**dʒesika/** → / ˈ**dʒə**(r) **ksika***/*, making it quite recognizable, while in the proposed Serbian equivalent the meaning of the personal name is anchored in the second, stressed part *-sika*.

As for (5f), the fact that the chosen Serbian semantic equivalent for English *entourage* is *kamarila* which shares phonological material with neither the first splinter, the personal name Han, nor the second splinter *entourage*, made translating of *Hantourage* somewhat more challenging than the previously

14 The form *snegoleg* was proposed as an adequate translation here. While we agree that semantically, stylistically as well as prosodically this is the best solution, such a form is likely to be morphologically (structurally) treated as a compound with no linking vowel (the type of *bubašvaba*) in Serbian rather than a blend (Piper and Klajn 2014, 249). Therefore, we have not included it in our analysis. Similar is the case with the proposed solution for (5f) *hansvita* (Han + svita).

15 Other blend solutions that were offered here include *jebsika* or *masturbika*. However, as funny as they may sound, their meaning would not comply with the situational context in which the original was used. In addition, their structure would not comply with the proposed schema 4 as their first source words are verbs.

discussed cases. However, in finding the adequate translation we could rely on the structural side of the original as well as on the prosodic constraints that regulate cutting in blends. The prosodic features of the lexeme *kamarila* allowed it to be truncated into the splinter *-marila* which combines quite well with the personal name *Han*. The output is suggestive enough and in compliance with the phonological system of Serbian.

The appearance of examples (5c–d) may suggest that they have undergone the process of borrowing and orthographic adaptation in Serbian, like the lexemes *branč (brunch)*, *motel* and *smog*. However, this is not the case as contemporary Serbian slang has adopted the English word *event* denoting 'a special kind of organized celebration or social occasion'. It is realized in Serbian as *event / event/* or *ivent /ivent/*[16] which is why the translation (5c) has a twofold orthographic and phonological realization.

Finally, we based the translation of the example (5b) *Magpie* on the structural, semantic and functional (pragmatic) information contained in the constructional schema 3_a, in which its affective hypocoristic semantics is specified. The Serbian equivalent for the noun *pie* is *pita*, which is completely devoid of any affective or hypocoristic meaning. For that reason, by following the semantics of the English blend as well as its prosody and structure, we chose the lexeme *med* (E *honey*) which is not only prosodically close to the English *pie* (both being monosyllabic words) but also semantically since the lexeme *med* is in Serbian associated with hypocoristic pet names such as *medu moj* (E *my honey*) or *medena*$_N$ (E lit. *honey-like*$_N$).

The proposed translations suggest that the translational potential of English (personal-name) blends largely depends on the phonological make-up of the semantically equivalent Serbian lexeme(s) and their size. The closer the prosody of the Serbian equivalent(s) is to the components of the English original, the more likely the English blend will be successfully translated into Serbian, largely preserving the form, structure, semantics and pragmatics of the original. As for size, the examples show that lexemes with up to three syllables are most commonly used in English blend-formation. Thus, if the semantically equivalent Serbian lexemes comply with this tendency they are more likely to be structurally adequate for blend translation. In addition, both English examples and their Serbian equivalents show the tendency to front the shorter and more salient (or frequent) constituent.

16 Some recent combinations include *Event Industrija Srbije/Ивент индустрија Србије*, *event centar/ивент центар*, *event planer/ивент планер*, *event sala/ивент сала*.

The size of English blends tends to be determined by the second element (Plag 2003, 125). Moreover, in accordance with the prevailing right-hand rule, the second element defines their morpho-syntactic behaviour and grammatical class as well. Such grammatical information is contained in the schemas provided earlier. It is also a semantic core of the given portmanteau words. Since the Serbian translations offered in (5) have a high equivalence on several aspects with the English originals, the same schemas can be operable for Serbian translations, too.

As Serbian equivalent blends are common/abstract countable nouns (e.g. *magmed*, *kevent*, *sofivent*, *hanmarila*, *kvinteres*, *kvinternvencija*, *šmitata*, *zejnijaci*, *zabkataža)*, proper nouns used as source words are not capitalized in writing. According to the same "right-hand rule" the blends *Snoleg* and *Drksika* are defined by the grammatical class of the second splinter and remain proper nouns, which explains their capitalization in writing. As for (5i) which is the name of a boardgame, we suggest it remain capitalized in the Serbian translation given the specific personalized meaning and by analogy with the Serbian orthographic system which requires the proper nouns remain capitalized when used as names (or name-components) of different concepts, such as institutions, manifestations and so on (Pešikan et. al. 2020).

We acknowledge that the translation solutions proposed in (5) vary in their effectiveness and may well lag behind the English originals. This is understandable given the differences and restrictions that exist in the morpho-phonological systems of English and Serbian, which limit the blending capacity and possibilities for Serbian (proper) nouns. In addition, Serbian has a higher index of fusion than English (Lieber 2016; Vujić 2020), which restricts blending possibilities in the language. All this can result in more or less clumsy blending solutions in Serbian, mainly with regard to their phonaesthetic quality. With all that in mind, blends remain one of the greatest challenges for Serbian translators to tackle.

7 Concluding remarks

Our analysis shows that all the studied English portmanteaus are extracted from constructional schemas that could produce quite a few new expressions. We have demonstrated that a specific schema and/or sub-schema can be attributed to a number of blend formations rather than to single instances, which indicates that they are more rule-governed than may initially appear. This seems to be due to the fact that both productive processes and schemas are usually related to frequency and salience (Vujić 2016).

In the introduction, we identified some uncertainty as to whether morphological creativity is rule-governed or rule-changing. Based on the analysis presented in this paper, it could be said that most personal-name blends are instances of rule-governed creativity.

The second question raised is whether nonce formations are based on (constructional) schema or analogy. Our findings indicate that the outputs of blending may be regarded as extracted from schemas because of the lack of a specific model. This is in line with Tuggy's belief (2006, 102) that analogy-based and schema-based models are not "strict alternatives" because they may be "simultaneously active" since "the difference between them is one of degree".

As we have seen from the examples in B, they may be said to be instances of analogy via schema if we take *Bennifer* and *Brangleina* to be the model. Our examples show that the number of formations based on this model exceeds occasional random instances, suggesting that the analogy may have indeed slid along the scale and prompted a new schema. This again proves that there is a possibility of an analogy prompting a new schema (Booij 2010).

Furthermore, we have demonstrated how the identification and formulation of English blend construction schemas, which specify all vital information regarding prosodic, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of the novel formations, can be highly valuable to translators, helping them find and create suitable equivalents in the TL maximizing the preservation of the form-meaning-use correspondence of the original. Moreover, our study suggests that somewhat modified English schemas might actively operate in Serbian speakers' mental lexicon for nonce word creation. However, presently it is just an initial hypothesis based on the small-scale specific corpus studied in this research, and remains to be thoroughly investigated in our future work.

As playful and humorous expressions that are the results of morphological creativity, the personal-name blends are highly context-dependent and understood only by a close speech community. By applying a constructionist approach, we have shown that their meaning does not have to be completely unpredictable and indecipherable. Even though their form may seem 'deviant' at first, our study indicates that there is a regular pattern that they follow, i.e. there are constructional schemas which allow for the extraction of these nonce formations. Due to multiple examples of blends, these form-meaning correspondences are quite straightforward, confirming that constructional schemas are related to frequency and salience.

References

Beliaeva, Natalia. 2019a. "Blending creativity and productivity: On the issue of delimiting the boundaries of blends as a type of word formation." *Lexis: Journal in English Lexicology* 14: 1–22. https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.4004.

—. 2019b. "Blending in Morphology." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.511.

Bat-El, Ouiti. 2000." The "grammaticality" of extragrammatical morphology." In *Extragrammatical and Marginal Morphology*, edited by Ursula Dolechal and Anna M. Thornton, 60–81. Munich: Lincom Europa.

—. 2006. "Blend." In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd ed., Vol. 2, edited by Keith Brown, 66–70. Oxford: Elsevier.

Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2005. "Productivity: Theories." In *Handbook of Word-Formation*, edited by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 315–34. Dordrecht: Springer.

—. 2013. "Blends: Core and periphery." In *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*, edited by Vincent Renner, François Maniez and Pierre J.L. Arnaud, 11–22. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110289572.11.

Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber, and Ingo Plag. 2013. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Becker, Thomas. 1990. *Analogie und morphologische Theorie*. Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

—. 1993. "Back-formation, cross-formation and 'bracketing paradoxes'." In *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, edited by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 1–25. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Booij, Geert. 2010. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. 2013. "Morphology in construction grammar." In *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, edited by Thomas Hoffmann and Graham Trousdale, 255–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bugarski, Ranko. 2019. *Srpske slivenice: monografija sa rečnikom*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga.

Dressler, Wolfgang. 2000. "Extragrammatical vs marginal morphology." In *Extragrammatical and Marginal Morphology*, edited by Ursula Doleschal and Anna M. Thornton, 1–10. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Fabregas, Antonio, and Sergio Scalise. 2012. *Morphology.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Fandrych, Ingrid. 2008. "Submorphemic elements in the formation of acronyms, blends and clippings." *Lexis: Journal in English Lexicology* 2: 103–21. https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.713.

Fried, Mirjam. 2015. "Construction Grammar." In *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook.* Vol. 2, edited by Tibor Kiss and Artemis Alexiadou, 974–1003. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110363708-005.

Fried, Mirjam, and Jan-Ola Östman, 2004. "Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch." In *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective*, edited by Mirjam Fried and Jan Ola Östman, 11–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.2.02fri.

Gries, Stefan Th. 2004. "Shouldn't it be *breakfunch*? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in English." *Linguistics* 42 (3): 639–67. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2004.021.

—. 2006. "Cognitive determinants of subtractive word formation: A corpus-based perspective." *Cognitive Linguistics* 17 (4): 535–58. https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2006.017.

—. 2012. "Quantitative corpus data on blend formation: Psycho- and cognitive-linguistic perspectives." In *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*, edited by Vincent Renner, François Maniez and Pierre J.L. Arnaud, 145–67. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110289572.145.

Halupka-Rešetar, Sabina, and Gordana Lalić-Krstin. 2009. "New blends in Serbian: Typological and headedness-related issues." *Годишњак Филозофског факултета у Новом Саду* XXXIV (1): 115–24.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2005. "Lexicalization and institutionalization." In *Handbook of Word-Formation*, edited by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 353–73. Dordrecht: Springer.

—. 2007. "How to do (even more) things with nonce words (other than naming)." In *Lexical Creativity*, *Texts and Contexts*, edited by Judith Munat, 15–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.08hoh.

Jovanović, Vladimir. 2021. "Engleske slivenice i odgovarajući oblici u srpskom jeziku." In *O engleskom i srpskom kroz vreme i prostor*, 111–28. Novi Sad: Društvo za primenjenu lingvistiku Srbije.

Katamba, Francis. 1999. *Morphology*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Kelly, Michael H. 1999. "To 'brunch' or to 'brench': Some aspects of blend structure." *Linguistics* 36 (3): 579–90.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 2003. "Schemas and lexical blends." In *Motivation in Language*, *Studies in honor of Günter Radden*, edited by Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven, and Uwe Panther, 69–97. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.243.08kem.

Lehmann, Christian, and Edith Moravcsik. 2000. "Noun." In *1. Halbband: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan, 732–57. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110111286.1.10.732.

Lehrer, Adrienne. 2003. "Understanding trendy neologisms." *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 15 (2): 369–82.

—. 2007. "Blendalicious." In *Lexical Creativity*, *Texts and Contexts*, edited by Judith Munat, 115–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2016. *Introducing Morphology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-Formation.* 2nd revised ed. Munchen: C.H. Beck.

Mattiello, Elisa. 2013. *Extra-grammatical Morphology in English. Abbreviations*, *Blends*, *Reduplicatives*, *and Related Phenomena*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110295399.

—. 2016. "Analogical neologisms in English." *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 28 (2): 103–42.

—. 2019. "A corpus-based analysis of new English blends." *Lexis. Journal of English Lexicology* 14. https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.3660.

Milanović, Aleksandar. 2022. "Iz istorijata srpskih slivenica." *Novorečje* III (6): 13–17.

Milanović, Aleksandar, and Jelena Vujić. 2019. "The earliest Anglo-Serbian language contacts: Historical sociolinguistic perspective." Unpublished research paper presented at the *First Annual Meeting of the North American Research Network in Historical Sociolinguistics* as a part of *93rd Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America* (New York, January 3–6, 2019).

Newmark, Peter. (1988) 2003. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Longman.

Östman, Jan-Ola, and Mirjam Fried. 2004. "The cognitive grounding of Construction Grammar." In *Construction Grammars, Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*, edited by Jan-Ola Östman and Mirjam Fried, 1–13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.3.01ost.

Pešikan, Mitar et. al. 2020. *Pravopis srpskog jezika.* Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Pinker, Steven. 1999. *Words and Rules*. New York: Basic Books.

Piper, Predrag, and Ivan Klajn. 2014. *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika*. Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.

Plag, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological Productivity. Structural Constraints in English Derivation*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—. 2003. *Word-Formation in English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renner, Vincent. 2006. *"Les composés coordinatifs en anglais contemporain."* PhD diss., Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Lyon.

Renner, Vincent, François Maniez, and Pierre J. L. Arnaud. 2013. *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending.* Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110289572.

Subašić, Slobodanka. 2014. "Tvorbeni obrasci slivenica u engleskom jeziku zabeleženih na sajtu WORDSPY i njihov prevod na srpski jezik." *Reči* VI (7): 26–42.

Štekauer, Pavol. 2002. "On the Theory of Neologisms and Nonce-formations." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1): 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268600120122571.

Tomić, Gorica. 2019. "Tvorbeno-semantička analiza novih slivenica u srpskom jeziku." *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini* 49 (2): 61–84.

Tuggy, David. 2007. "Schematicity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 82–116. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vujić, Jelena. 2016. *Konstrukcione teme*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet.

—. 2020. *Osnovi morfologije i leksikologije engleskog jezika.* Beograd: Filološki fakultet/ Philologia.

Vujić, Jelena, and Tijana Rabrenović. 2019. "A constructionist approach to morphological creativity: a study of first and/or last name nonce formations in English." *Jezici i kulture u vremenu i prostoru* VIII (1): 573–85.