Clipped Loanword Blends in Japanese

Zhaohan Wang and Julia Gribinski

Department of Linguistics, McGill University
LING 440: Morphology
Professor Martina Martinović

Abstract

Word-blending is a common and productive process that forms new words by combining components of multiple source words. Different from compounding, blending is defined by the shortening of one or more of the constituent words. This paper conducts a typological analysis of Japanese Clipped Loanword Blend (CLB), a process of word blending involving loanwords. By drawing on existing blendword literature and by investigating the semantics of lexical data, this paper establishes three descriptive categories of Japanese CLBs based on semantic meaning and pragmatic usage: true compounds, true blends, and complex clipped loanwords. Empirical investigation suggests that many blend-word data fall between these categories, possibly due to shifts in meaning and/or usage.

1 Introduction

Do you feel like watching an episode of a *dramedy* after a long day at work? Ever need to rely on your phone to *scanlate* while travelling in Tokyo? You might find such terms a mix of foreign and old-fashioned. However, the word-formation method of *blending* is a highly productive and common process, creating frequently used and nearly lexicalized words such as *brunch* and *motel*. Word blending is analogous to compounding; however, blendwords' structures might not be as overt as those of compounds. In Japanese, word-blending is an extremely productive and common word-formation strategy that applies to both native words and loanwords. Although conjunctions alongside the shortening of native morphemes are usually morphological processes, this is not always the case for loanword-blending.

In this paper, we will examine the phenomenon of **Clipped Loanword Blends** (CLB henceforth) in Japanese and attempt to formalize a theoretical account of their formation. CLBs are blends of one or two shortened loanwords, whose shortening is intuitively motivated by the circumvention of the epenthetic repair of loanwords, which would create sequences that are long and cumbersome to pronounce. The phonological aspect of CLBs has been well documented in the current literature, yet few linguists have examined their morphological structure. Section 2 will review existing literature on general blending theories, Japanese loan words and compounds; Section 3 examines the lexical data of Japanese

CLBs and provides three categories of blend words according to their semantic meaning in relation to the source morphemes; Section 4 concludes this paper by discussing the three categories and proposes directions for future studies.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Blend Words & Compounds

The categorization of blending as a type of word formation has been much disputed. Blending has been hypothesized to be a type of compounding, a type of shortening, or unrelated to either. We will work with the following definition: **blends are lexical items formed by merging two or more words in a way in which only part of their material is preserved, where the merging does not exclusively involve the simple concatenation of existing morphemes.**

Beliaeva (2014) hypothesizes a set of rules that indicate which words can be blended. We notice that an essential feature that distinguishes blend words from, for example, compounds, is that part of the word material, which is orthographic and/or phonological, is lost. We will designate the original words from which we form the blend 'source words'. In blend words, we most commonly find some similarity between the source words. Furthermore, the locus of the similarity is most often the locus of the switch point, on which either side is a segment from different sources. The overlap between words can be fully phonological, such as in *fauxbia (**faux** + pho**bia**)*, in which the overlap of *faux* and *pho* in the source words is not graphical. The overlap can also be graphical and have little phonological overlap. Furthermore, the overlap is not limited to solely one switch point; in *parentnoia (**parent** + **para**noia)*, the blend takes the fully overlapping (orthographically and phonologically) segment *par* of either source word, and takes the ultimate syllable of the latter source word, while replacing the second /a/ of *paranoia* with /ent/ of the first source word.

The words that can be blended are not just determined by their formal properties; as we can note relevant semantic properties as well. J. Algeo (1977:56) distinguishes two semantic categories of blend. The first category is **syntagmatic blends,** which are "the combination(s) of two forms that occur sequentially in the speech chain". The classic blend example, *motel* (motor + hotel), is presumably an instance of this; a motel was originally called a motor hotel, which eventually became a blend. The second category that Algeo distinguishes is **associative blends**. These are "linked in the word-maker's mind and thence in his language" (Algeo 1977:57). This is, for example, *pleurire (pleurer + rire)* in French, meaning *to cry and laugh (cry + laugh)*. The source words have clear semantic relations, as both are displays of emotion, and the blend describes a real phenomenon – laughing to the point of tears. Although this semantic distinction is disputed, we will attempt to account for it.

We can now examine the factors that influence how the source words are blended. A first element of prevalence is the order of the words in the blend, conditioned by the semantic properties of the resulting blend and by the source words themselves. The importance of word order in determining the resulting blend is especially apparent in syntagmatic blends, as syntagmatic blends are the result of sequential, and therefore often ordered, words in speech. The order of the source words is likely to be determined by the position of the semantic head, often on the right in English, according to the Right-Hand Head Rule; *floordrobe (floor + wardrobe)* is a type of wardrobe, not a type of floor. We also commonly find that the shorter word, should the sources be of different lengths, and that the more frequently used source word appears first. The more prototypical often appears first when the blend is formed from two words of the same lexical category, for example, in *spork (spoon + fork)*, where spoons have been longer and more widely used than forks. There can also be pragmatic influences, such as the temporal order of meals in *brunch (breakfast + lunch)*.

The parts of words that become part of the blend vary; source words can be found in their entirety, or can become clipped in a blend, which are the word parts we call splinters.
Furthermore, splinters can eventually acquire morphemic status should they become productive. In English, we can observe this phenomenon with the morpheme *-aholic*, which originated from the morphologically complex word alcoholic, with the root alcohol and the suffix *-ic*. The bound morpheme *-aholic*, which we now use productively, was, at its origin, a splinter of *alcoholic*. Considering this, we now call words such as *workaholic* or *shopaholic* affixations rather than blends. As we will see in Japanese, the clipping of loanwords into new morphemes is a very productive process.

We can observe around a dozen very common structures in blends. First, blends in which the source words do not overlap at the switch point: *tigon (**tig**er + li**on**)*. We find blends where the source words do not overlap, and where the first word is entirely present: *blogebrity (**blog** + cel**ebrity**)*. Blends such as these would require that the first source have fewer segments than the second. Another is where the source words do not overlap, and the second word is entirely present: *incredidrunk (**incredi**bly + **drunk**)*. For blends with overlap, as seen before, we have formations in which the source words overlap and are both clipped, such as *motel (**m(ot)**or + h**(ot)el**)*. We have blends with overlap where the first word is entirely present: *mockbuster (**mock** + bl**(ock)buster**)*, and where overlap with the second word is entirely present: *jumbrella (**j(umb)**o + **umbrella**)*. Finally, we find blends in which the source words overlap, and in which they are both entirely present: *alcoholiday (**alcohol** + **holiday**)*. I would assume that this formation is rarer, as it requires that the final segment of the first word be the same as the first segment of the second.

While these seven blend formations account for most blends, others are attested as well. Among them, cryptoblends (Renner 2015) are blends in which "the first splinter retains no other phonological and graphical material than the segment overlapping with the second source word" (Belieava 2019:9). She gives the example *ostalgie ((**ost**)en + n(**ost**)algie)* in German. However, this blend could be analyzed as source-word boundary: #ostalgie (#(ost)en + n(ost)algie), which would fit within the framework of the blends we know how to account for, as an overlap between two splinters. Another attested form is infixed blends, in which a fragment from the middle of one source word is replaced by the other source word or its splinter. This gives us *prowebstinate (**pro**cra**stinate** + **web**)*. As manifested in this last example, infixed blends do not obligatorily include any phonological or orthographic overlap, although attested. We also find infixed blends with source words intercalated in the blend, resulting in words such as *skarfolóno (**s(ka)l(óno)** + **(ka)rf(óno)**)* in Greek, in which it seems that *karf* is inserted at the point of overlap, and that a second point of overlap *óno* is present. Blend words must observe formal regularity. They must obey phonotactics; among these, the stress pattern must be conserved from source to blend. The switch points should also be placed at major phonological joints, such as syllable boundaries or boundaries of syllable elements (commonly between the onset and rhyme).

A relevant formation, especially in Japanese, is clipping compounds. These are items formed by the concatenation of the initial segments of sources, commonly splinters, for example, digicam (*digital* + *camera*) instead of **digimera*. Beliaeva does not consider such formations to be blends, as they do not meet a defining blend constraint: not "have [...] been formed by concatenation of morphs"; she considers them to be neighbouring morphological categories (Beliaeva 2014:2). The formation of blend words, as said, has been disputed, especially regarding it as a subtype of compounding and/or word shortening. In her 2014 paper, Beliaeva concludes that blending is neither an instance of nor a process of blend formation, and that blend formation is far more complex.

Clipping compounds, or complex clipping, have an AC formation (AB + CD = AC); the **beginnings of the source words are conserved**, and they differ from the blends we have seen henceforth. The source words are often **difficult to deconstruct** without prior knowledge. Their formation seems to be the opposite of that of blends: in **clipping, a frequent co-occurrence establishes a semantic link between source words that gives rise to their merging**, whereas blending is a "formation of new notions in the process of conceptual integration" in which the merging gives rise to a semantic link (Beliaeva 2014). The origins of blending and complex clipping are therefore different, as AC formation implies a semantic link between sources before their merging, like syntagmatic blends.

Here, a question arises about the difference between complex clipping and syntagmatic blends – which have been analyzed as blends – for example, why did *digital camera* become a clipped compound

and *motor hotel* become a blend? Considering that they are both phrases that commonly arise in speech, what factors result in their different creative formations? We will propose the following: as Beliaeva describes blending as a type of "creative word formation," and a motor hotel is not a hotel for motors, but rather a hotel for motorists, the meanings of blend words are not strictly compositional. Alternatively, a digital camera has no idiosyncrasies. This is a possible reason for the difference in formation.

Complex clippings seem to be contractions of **existing compounds**. Their formation relies on source word merging followed by shortening of some kind, and the merging and shortening of words coincide in blends such that enough material from the source words appears in the blend. Beliaeva does state that there are marginal cases in which these principles do not seem to stand: "the ultimate boundary between them is impossible to draw."

2.2 Japanese Loanwords and *Wasei-Eigo*

Loaning is a widespread phenomenon, and loanwords in Japanese have been researched extensively from multiple perspectives (see Hoffer 1990, Schmidt 2009, Hatanaka & Pannell 2016, among others). Mark Irwin offers arguably the most comprehensive account in his 2011 book, *Loanwords in Japanese.* Irwin pointed out that Japanese borrows words from other languages extensively due to language contact, and its lexicon can thus be divided into three major strata: Native (*yamato*), borrowing from ancient Chinese (Sino-Japanese), and foreign words from other languages (Irwin 2011). Irwin also classified a separate stratum for mimetic words. However, they will not be included in our discussion.

The foreign stratum is termed as *gairaigo* or *yogo,* meaning 'western words', which refers to loanwords from specifically European languages. While strictly speaking, loanwords from Chinese and Korean are also foreign, the stratum of words borrowed from outside the Sinosphere receives special treatment. Below, Irwin provides his definition:

> A *gairaigo* is a foreign word which has undergone adaptation to Japanese phonology, has been borrowed into Japanese after the mid-16th century and whose meaning is, or has been, intelligible to the general speech community. (Irwin 2011:10)

Due to the strict phonotactics in Japanese, *gairaigo* almost always undergoes phonological reparations such as epenthesis. This could greatly lengthen the input word, so it is consequently shortened for more convenient use. For example, 'convenience store' becomes *konbiniensu-sutoa,* which is subsequently clipped as *konbini*. Although this slightly differs from the CLBs, since it is purely elliptical

and does not contain roots from two source words, it is an example of Japanese speakers using clipping to shorten loanwords rather than using the full form.

In addition to nouns, verbs and adjectives are also frequently borrowed into Japanese. Source verbs can be preserved or truncated, and a verbal inflectional suffix is attached; the verb is then subjected to regular Japanese inflectional rules. For example, 'to sign' is borrowed as *saiɴ* and verbalized by inflection *-suru* as *saiɴ-suru*; 'panic' is borrowed as *panikku* and verbalized with another inflection *-ru* and becomes *panikkuru.* 'Sabotage' is borrowed as *sabotaaju,* clipped into verbal root *sabo-* and *-ru* verbal inflection attaches to make *saboru.* On the other hand, if the original word already ends with *-ru*, it can be adapted directly, such as 'Google' > *guuguru* > *guugu-ru* (Irwin 2011:137-138).

Adjectives, on the other hand, are categorized into two different classes. Some of them are directly adopted as an adjectival noun and used in conjunction with a copular particle *na,* for instance 'best' > *besuto* > *besuto na* (noun), whereas some other words become native-like adjectives after truncation and attachment of adjectival suffix. Such is the case with 'grotesque' > *gurotesku* > *guro-i* and 'erotic' > *eročikku* > *ero-i.* Lastly, adjectival nouns and true adjectives are inflected differently in adverbial forms (e.g. *besuto ni* vs. *guro-ku*). Such variation shows that truncated loaned adjectives have a special status, supporting the view that clipping is a morphological process rather than a purely phonological one.

Notably, whereas *gairaigo* loanwords are the direct adaptations of foreign words, some of them do not make sense or even seem bizarre when they are re-adapted into English: they seem to have no source. These words are "expressions that are coined in Japan from English words" (Hatanaka & Pannell, 2016:15), termed *wasei eigo*, literally meaning 'Japanese-made English'. Unlike direct loanwords, they often undergo semantic shifts and/or narrowing. For example, the loan of 'mansion' - *manshon,* does not refer to a mansion; instead, it means 'apartment complex'. *Wasei eigo* derivation can also occur during compound formation, creating novel compounds with no English counterparts. For example, *romansu gure* 'romance grey' refers to a 'middle-aged lover', *wan patan* 'one pattern' refers to something redundant or boring, etc. They could be subjected to clipping as well: *eko guzzu* 'ecological goods' refer to recyclable items. The creative formation of new words that semantically differ from their English origins is parallel to Believa's claim that blend word formation is creative: the meaning of *wasei eigo* compounds is very often non-compositional.

2.3 Japanese Compounds and Clipping

Compounding is a remarkably productive word-formation process. Japanese compound word formation can be categorized into NN, NV, VN and VV compounds (Lensun et al. 2023). Japanese compounds mostly obey the syntactic property of right-headedness, but Sino-Japanese ones could reflect Chinese syntax when the original word is left-headed (Kageyama 2011). However, there is debate over how to analyze compounds in Japanese, an isolate language. Li (2019) analyzed nominal compounding from a Distributed Morphology perspective, while Kageyama (2011) argued that it is incompatible with DM and instead supports the Modular Morphology model. Kageyama suggested that Japanese compounding was pervasive "in both lexical and syntactic domains"; a lexical compound and a syntactic phrase are easily distinguished by whether or not they have inflections. For example, *huru-hon* 'used book' is a compound, while *huru-i hon* 'old-INFL book' is an NP containing an AdjP adjunct (Kageyama 2011:512). Nevertheless, despite their different approaches, both Kageyama and Li agree that compounds are often lexicalized and become single words in the lexicon.

Li (2019) further categorizes NN compounds based on the semantic relation between the two noun elements: N_1 could either be "a modifier…, an object… or an instrument of N_2" (Li 2019:2). His analysis of N_{OBJ} - $N_{TRANS.conj}$ compounds demonstrates similarities between them and English deverbal compounds. For example, *gohan-dukuri* 'rice-making' is formed by adding 'rice' and the conjunctive form of 'to make', and the elements are not semantically related because other transitive verbs could easily replace the deverbal head productively (e.g. 'rice-eating', 'rice-selling', etc.). Such evidence supports his claim that Japanese compound formation is syntactic and that semantic interpretation occurs after merger. This is consistent with the observation that the semantic meanings of non-lexicalized loanword compounds are compositional as well.

Ito & Mester (1996) examined Sino-Japanese compounds in depth. They pointed out that Sino-Japanese stems are maximally bimoraic, are typically CVCV, and that neutralization is commonly applied to the second consonant's consonantal feature. These are all carryover effects from rigid Chinese phonotactics. Such a phonological constraint also seems to apply to CLBs, as almost all of them have maximally bimoraic roots, and if there are rare exceptions, their roots do not surpass two syllables. Importantly, they suggest that "Sino-Japanese stems are subject to syllabic closure" (Ito & Mester 1996:22), as codas of stem 1 do not re-syllabify as the onset of stem 2 if stem 2 starts with a vowel. On the other hand, this non-cyclicity is less visible in CLBs, perhaps because most of the loanword elements begin with a consonant.

In his 2018 paper, Daniel argued that clipping is a morphology-motivated process rather than a purely phonological or arbitrary one. He defines clipping as "a process which creates new lexemes by shortening expressions" (Daniel 2018:16). This is supported by the fact that the clipping of long, complex compounds cannot be predicted by phonology, but by syntax and semantics, because the preserved element is usually more crucial for the deduction of the original meaning. The status of being semantically significant is determined by the morphological component of the grammar. Daniel's conclusion provides further evidence supporting the suspicion that CLBs are motivated not only by phonology but also by morphology and semantic preservation, which govern the clipping and blending of loanwords.

3 Clipped Loanword Blends (CLBs) in Japanese

After examining the literature on Japanese compounds and loanwords, we realize that there is no structural account for loanword compounds, which are frequently shortened by clipping. Daniel (2018:20) declared that clipped loanwords "do not show the complex morphological structure as seen in native expressions", yet such a claim is ungrounded. The authors of this paper speculate that CLBs may be complex compounds, just as native expressions, and, by comparing them with native/Sino-Japanese compound theory, we find that the same phonological operation can yield structurally diverse forms. A CLB can be descriptively defined as a compound word that consists of one or two elements, which are shortened loanwords. A closer examination of the examples of blend words shows that the CLB could consist of either compound clipping or blended words.

Given the prevalence of semantics in determining blend words, we investigate the morphological properties of CLBs by analyzing their meanings and how standard theories of blend words and compounds apply to them. After closely examining the morphological-semantic interface of CLB data, we propose **three** major categories of CLBs: (1) true compounds formed with morphemes produced by clipping, (2) true blend words, and (3) complex clipping. Additionally, data show that the boundary between these categories can be blurred, especially under the influence of lexicalization.

3.1 True Compound Formed with Clipped Morphemes

As Daniel (2018) argued, clipping can produce productive lexemes and morphemes, but contrary to his claim, this process is not limited to native Japanese words. The clipping process can produce productive, native-like morphemes that can stand alone when suffixed, and the compound words that they constitute are structurally identical to regular compounds. For example, as Irwin (2011) has demonstrated, loanword adjectives can be clipped and combined with adjectival suffixes to become native-like

adjectives, such as 'grotesque' → *guro-i* and 'erotic' → *ero-i.* In this instance, the two adjectival roots combine to form the blendword *eroguro*, which is an adjectival noun (jisho, n.d.). It can be used as an adjective in conjunction with a copular particle *na* or a noun suffix *-kei* 'genre' as in *eroguro kei* 'erotic-grotesque genre'. Another example is *-kon,* the clipped form of *konpulekkusu* 'complex'. It is extremely productive in forming words such as *rori-kon* 'lolita complex', *šhisu-kon* 'sister complex' and *faza-kon* 'father complex'. Such productivity is contrasted with the homophony produced by clipping other compounds, as demonstrated by Irwin's (2011) data below, which show that homophonic lexemes can have different morphological statuses as their meanings vary: some are productive morphemes, some are not productive, and their significance is contingent on the surrounding morphological context.

Radio + control	***raji****(o)* + ***kon****(torooru)*	*rajikon*	'Radio controlled'
Family + computer	***fami****(rii)* + ***kon****(pyuutaa)*	*famikon*	'family computer'
System + component	***šisu****(temu)* + ***kon****(poonento)*	*šisukon*	'system component'
Summer + concert	***sama****(a)* + ***kon****(saato)*	*samakon*	'summer concert'

Table 1: Examples of CLBs with the morphemes of the same phonological form *-kon*

Interestingly, according to internet search results, the word *šisukon* seems more commonly perceived as 'sister complex' than 'system component' (or the brand 'Syscom'), showing that the productive morpheme is semantically more competitive.

Most importantly, the true compounds' meanings are strictly compositional: the compound's meaning does not deviate from the sum of its parts, which individually have their meanings. This contrasts with blends, where semantic narrowing and shifts can occur, and with complex clipping, where meaning is processed in the source-language compound, and individual parts cannot retain their respective meanings once divided.

WORD	SOURCE WORDS	SEMANTIC	LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN
Eroguro (nansensu)	ero(tic) + gro(tesque)	An artistic movement featuring "erotic grotesque nonsense" that emerged in Japan in the early 20th century	English
nōto-pasokon	*note* + *pasokon*	laptop	English
rorikon	*Loli(ta)* + *com(plex)*	sexual attraction to fictional and real underage girls	English

Table 2: Examples of true compounds

3.2 (True) Blends

Alongside true compounds, another form of creative formation involving loanwords is **true blends**. These are multi-morphemic words that are entirely or partially made up of loanwords. Many *wasei eigo* examples fall under this category. However, unlike true compounds like *eroguro*, they are distinguished by non-compositionality: their meanings usually shift or narrow, but their formation is not entirely arbitrary, as the elements are semantically associated to a limited extent. For example, *karaoke* is a blend of *kara-* 'empty' and *Ōkesutora* 'orchestra'. It does not literally mean 'an empty orchestra'; instead, its meaning has shifted and is idiosyncratic. This property aligns with Beliaeva's definition of blend word formation as being creative, and the fact that the frequency of *karaoke* occurring far surpasses that of *oke* as in 'orchestra' (jisho, n.d.) alone signifies that the clipping most likely happened after the blend has formed, and *Ōkesutora* > *oke* clipping was not a morpheme production process, unlike examples like *-kon.*

Another example that falls under this category is *depachika,* literally composed of *depato* 'department store' and the native noun *chika* 'underground'. It is classified as a blend word for two reasons. First, *chika*'s head status is different from its native usage, when it usually occupies the non-head position, such as *chika-tetsu* 'subway', *chika-sui* 'underground water' and *chika-šitsu* 'basement'. It could be considered an example of syntagmatic formation (Alegeo 1977), where consecutive elements in a phrase get combined, as in the derivation hypothesized in (1):

(1) **Depā~~to no~~** **chika~~-kai~~**
department.store-MOD underground-level

Secondly, *depachika* refers specifically to the food court that is usually situated on the underground level of a mall (Wiktionary contributors, n.d.). This is a classic example of semantic

narrowing without compromising endocentricity, as the right-hand head determines that this blend refers to a type of underground space rather than a department store. Below are the data we analyzed as blend words.

WORD	SOURCE WORDS	SEMANTIC	LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN
bīdama	*vi(dro)* + dama	marbles	Portuguese + Japanese
depachika	depa(rtment store) + *chika*	Food courts located in the basement of Japanese department stores	English + Japanese
hote-toru	hote(l) + Tur(kish bath)	sexual services provided in a hotel room	English
pansuto	pan(ty) + sto(cking)	pantyhose	English
anison	ani(me) + son(g)	An anime song, most often the theme	English
erogu	ero(tic) + (blo)g	erotic blog, adult-oriented blog	English
karaoke	kara + *orche(stra)*	karaoke	Japanese + English
pokemon	*pocke(t)* + *mon(ster)*	Pokémon	English
taoru ketto	*Towel* + *(blan)ket*	a type of blanket made of a material similar to a beach or bath towel	English
tonkatsu	*Ton* + *cut(let)*	pork cutlet	Japanese + English
woshuretto	*wash+(toi)let*	a toilet with a built-in bidet	English
rabuho	*Love ho(tel)*	Love hotel	English
eneo	*ene(my)* + *otto(husband)*	Enemy husband: a husband who torments his wife	English + Japanese
enetopia	*Ener(gy)* + *(u)topia*	Green housing development	English

Table 3: Examples of blend words

3.3 Complex Clipping

While Beliaeva seems to rely on the formal structure of clippings – deletion of end segments and concatenation of initial segments – to identify them, we will not be employing this formal structure to classify clipping compounds. Although the AC clipping pattern is accurate for complex clippings, it cannot be a reliable identifying factor, because many true blends, which differ in other ways from complex-clipped words, share the AB + CD = AC clipping pattern.

However, since the surface form is motivated by morphology, we do not need to posit that Japanese morphology motivates an AC form in the same way that English morphology does. We can still identify some formal properties that allow us to account for the data we have. We can characterize the category of Complex Clipping by the shortening of constituent words in the source. Furthermore, across all our data, the words that meet all the requirements of this category are derived from two foreign words. We will take a first example: we find *eakon*, which was derived from the English phrase 'air conditioner' (***ai****r* + ***con****ditioner).* In contrast with blend words and true compounds, these words strictly correspond to the source English compound, and the intended meaning cannot be deduced if they are separated: even though *ea* is the loanword of 'air', *ea* + *kon* cannot derive the compound 'air conditioner'; the multimorphemic counterpart is instead a Sino-Japanese word *kūchō sōchi* 'air-conditioning appliance'.

To identify clipped compounds, we will rely mostly on their semantic features. This includes the origin of the word formation: a syntagmatic combination of both source words that previously occurred in the source language. This implies, and runs in parallel with, the same-language origin of the source words, with the additional need for them to form a common phrase in this language. The structure of these words is monomorphemic; the structure of the compound is opaque. This suggests that, due to a semantic association in the source language, the words are concatenated before being borrowed into Japanese. The phrase, therefore, acts as a unit in Japanese; the source words are unable to be semantically separated. This is further supported by the fact that these words keep the semantic meaning of the phrase from which they originate.

WORD	SOURCE WORDS	SEMANTIC	LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN
mobo	mo(dern) bo(y)	(1920s slang) young men adopting western styles and behaviours	English
moga	mo(dern) gi(rl)	(1920s slang) young women adopting western styles and behaviours, flapper	English
eakon	air con(ditioning)	air conditioning or air conditioner	English
pasokon	*perso(nal) com(puter)*	PC	English
puroresu	*pro(fessional) wrest(ling)*	professional wrestling	English
rimokon	*remo(te) con(trol)*	remote control	English
sefure	*se(x) + frie(nd)*	casual sexual partner	English
tereka	*tele(phone) ca(rd)*	A prepaid card for using public telephones	English
wāpuro	*wor(d) + pro(cessor)*	word processor	English
yan egu	*youn(g) ex(ecutive)*	young executive	English
dejikame	*digi(tal) came(ra)*	Digital camera	English
sekuhara	*sex(ual) hara(ssment)*	Sexual harassment	English
hansuto	*Hun(ger) + st(rike)*	*Hunger strike*	English
sekohan	*Seco(nd) + hand*	*secondhand*	English

Table 4: Examples of loanwords undergone complex clipping

3.4 Further Analysis

Nevertheless, the three categories we have identified above still struggle to account for all the data. There are some words, such as *famikon (**fami**ly + **com**puter)* and *ensuto (**en**gine + **stop**)*, that seem to fall somewhere between blends and clipping compounds. The composing morphemes of these examples share surface properties with complex clippings; they present two points regarding the deletion of word-final segments, both sourced from non-native words in the same language. However, they behave semantically like blends: they are not derived from common English phrases and have idiosyncratic meanings. For example, *famikon* could mean 'family computer', but, according to a native speaker, it is more commonly associated with a model or series of Nintendo gaming consoles.

In the data we collected from native speakers, some words appear formally as blends but are monomorphemic. This poses a problem if we want to integrate these into the blend category, where we

specifically state morphological complexity as a requirement for words to be defined as blends. *Karupisu (**cal**cium + sar**pis**)*, a popular yogurt-flavoured soft drink, is derived from the English word *calcium* and the Sanskrit word *sarpis* for 'good taste'. Like blends, the derived meaning is idiosyncratic and creative. In the same fashion as clipping compounds, there is deletion of a segment from both source words; however, as seen here, not just the final segments of the sources. This word is also monomorphemic to native speakers, possibly a result of its lexicalized usage.

WORD	SOURCE WORDS	SEMANTIC	LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN
afu-reko	af(ter) + recor(ding)	postrecording, dubbing	English
ensuto	en(gine) sto(p)	stall (as in an automobile engine)	English
famikon	fami(ly) com(puter)	The Nintendo Entertainment System. Also, a catch-all term by the older generation for any gaming console.	English
jīpan	jea(ns) + pan(ts)	jeans	English
karupisu	*cal(cium) + (sar)pis*	Calpis (a brand of soft drink that uses milk as a key ingredient)	English + Sanskrit
sumaho	*sma(rt) + (p)ho(ne)*	smartphone	English
mopaato	*mo(tor) + (a)part(ment)*	Apartment with a garage	English
resuteru	*Rest + (ho)tel*	Short-stay hotel	English

Table 5: Blend words that cannot be categorized

4 Conclusion

In tandem with Beliaeva's proposition, the line between compound clipping and blend words is extremely hard to draw. Under the influence of compound rules, phonotactics and the extensiveness of borrowing, the term CLB is no more than a descriptive umbrella term. Blending could be considered a subtype of word merging, whereas compounding is instead concatenative. Many theories offer potential explanations, but they are difficult to test due to differently ordered sequences of concatenation, merging, loaning, and shortening. Furthermore, lexicalization seems to occur in real time, and greatly affects how blends, compounds, and complex clipped loanwords are interpreted. In conclusion, Japanese CLBs could be either true compounds, complex-clipped loanwords, or true blends, depending on the interface between their semantic and morphological structures. To rigorously test their morphological status and structure, future research could collect additional native-speaker judgements and analyze actual usage in spontaneous speech corpora.

References

Algeo, John. 1977. Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech* 52. 47-64.

Beliaeva, Natalia. 2014. A study of English blends: From structure to meaning and back again. *Word Structure* 7. 29-54.

Beliaeva, Natalia. 2019. Blending in morphology. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.511

Daniel, Audrey D. 2018. Grammaticality in Japanese clipping. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics* 30. 15-32. Online: http://hdl.handle.net/1880/108951.

Hatanaka, Mariko, and James Pannell. 2016. English loanwords and made-in-Japan English in Japanese. *Hawai'i Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series* 14. 14-29.

Hoffer, Bates L. 1980. English loanwords in Japanese: Some cultural implications. *Language Sciences* 12. 1-21.

Irwin, Mark. 2011. *Loanwords in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Itō, Junko, and Armin Mester. 1996. Stem and word in Sino-Japanese. In Takashi, Otake and Anne Cutler (eds.), *Phonological structure and language processing: Cross-linguistic studies*, 13-44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jisho(a). n.d. エログロ. *Japanese Dictionary*. Online: https://jisho.org/word/%E3%82%A8%E3%83%AD%E3%82%B0%E3%83%AD.

Jisho(b). n.d. オケ #sentences. *Japanese Dictionary*. Online: https://jisho.org/search/%E3%82%AA%E3%82%B1%20%23sentences.

Kageyama, Taro. 2012. Isolate: Japanese. In Lieber, Rochelle and Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of compounding*, 512-526. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lensun, Sientje F., Sanny Aror, and Alfrida Sompotan. 2023. The process of Japanese compound word formation. In *Proceedings of the Unima International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities (UNICSSH 2022)*, 1574–1582. Paris: Atlantis Press SARL. doi: 10.2991/978-2-494069-35-0_188.

Li, Wei. 2019. A phonological, morpho-syntactical study of nominal compounding in Japanese. *International Journal of Linguistics* 11. 1-15. doi: 10.5296/ijl.v11i5.15185.

Renner, Vincent. 2015. Lexical blending as wordplay. In Zirker, Angelika and Esme Winter-Froemel (eds.), *Wordplay and metalinguistic / metadiscursive reflection: Authors, contexts, techniques, and meta-reflection*, 119-134. Berlin: De Gruyter. doi: 10.1515/9783110406719-006.

Schmidt, Christopher K. 2009. Loanwords in Japanese. In *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*, 545-574. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9783110218442.545.

Wiktionary contributors. n.d. デパ地下. *Wiktionary*. Online:
https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/%E3%83%87%E3%83%91%E5%9C%B0%E4%B8%8B.