BORROWING WORD-FORMATION

The article examines the influence of English on Bulgarian in the area of word-formation. The first part deals with the possible borrowing of the English suffix -*ing*, the reinterpretation of the pattern, and the degree to which the process has advanced. A brief comparison with Russian is also made. The second part focuses on some aspects of blending, which in its prototypical forms is a novelty for the Bulgarian language. Special attention is paid to haplological blends and a wider interpretation of the concept of overlap is offered, which allows for discontinuous overlap. The role of lexical borrowing and of translation is also touched upon. While -*ing* borrowing is a case concerning only one specific suffix and derivational pattern, the case of blending represents the adoption of an entire means of word-formation. The processes discussed are part of the tendency of internationalization and globalization and are not limited to Bulgarian.

1. THE CASE OF -*ING*[[1]](#footnote-1)

1.1 BORROWING AFFIXES

It is well-known that language contact, or simply borrowing, is one possible source for the appearance of a new affix in a given language. This is a commonplace in every textbook in lexicology. O. Jespersen (1905/1972: 98-101; 1922: 214-215) discussed this mainly in the context of hybridity, i.e. the combination within one lexical item of elements originating from different languages - stems and affixes, described as native and foreign. See also Marchand (1969: 210 - 211) on the origin of suffixes in general and in the treatment of individual suffixes. This is how a contemporary linguist summarizes the gist of the matter in a recent publication:

Another cause for the emergence of affixes in a language is language contact. Prefixes and suffixes may be transferred from their source language to a recipient language ready made, as parts of simplexes. As soon as a sufficient number of analysable words with the same suffix has been introduced into the recipient language the structure of these words is decomposed, the affixes are analysed as word-formation elements, and become part of the inventory of the recipient language. (Trips 2014: 385)

Bulgarian makes no exception to this. T. Boyadjiev (Бояджиев 2002: 176-177) has this to say on this point (my translation): “The word-formative structure of many borrowed lexemes has conditioned the spread and establishment in Bulgarian of some formants, which are not only recognized as means of derivation but show some productivity and serve as a model in adopting the word-formation type.” Due to its dominant position of a global language English can be expected to influence other languages and to be the donor language from which other languages will borrow. My interest here will focus on the suffix -*ing*, which Vȃtov (Вътов 1998: 195) singles out, from a Bulgarian perspective, as one of the most characteristically English affixes in borrowings into Bulgarian.

1.2 ENGLISH -ING AND SOME BULGARIAN CORRESPONDENCES

The suffix -*ing* functions in Present-Day English in a whole range of forms which will be positioned differently along a scale between verbal and nominal character. Closest to the verbal end of the spectrum is the present participle in -*ing*, which participates in the analytical forms for the progressive and in independent participial clauses. There the suffix -*ing* is treated as inflectional. A step in the direction of nominalness are the verbal nouns, naming the activity denoted by the respective verbs as an abstract object. Thus the verbal noun *painting* names the activity designated by the verb *paint*. These English verbal nouns correspond functionally to the Bulgarian verbal nouns in -*ne* (*risuvane* – “painting”) whose pattern is highly productive, approaching inflection in this respect. They might even be included in the periphery of the Bulgarian verbal paradigm. (This is one of the cases speaking against the sharp division between inflexion and derivation.) Returning to our English example, through metonymy we get from the verbal noun the full-fledged noun *painting*, referring to the artistic product of the activity. This very sketchy and incomplete picture is given here to serve as some background for our further discussion. For more details on the gradience from deverbal nouns via verbal nouns to participles see Quirk et al. (1985: 1290-1292).

1.3 THE CORPUS OF BULGARIAN BORROWINGS IN -*ING*

My observations on the English borrowings in -*ing* into Bulgarian will be based mainly on the corpus of the two existing reverse dictionaries of Bulgarian: *Reverse Dictionary of Present-Day Bulgarian* (Андрейчин 1975), henceforthRD1, and *Reverse Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language* (Мурдаров и др. 2011), RD2. There is a time gap of some 35 years between them, which, for the state of dynamic flux which Present-Day Bulgarian is going through now, is not insignificant. Although the second of these dictionaries is advertised as a second revised and enlarged edition of the first one, it is compiled by a different team of authors and we cannot be sure that their methodology is the same. This undermines somewhat the possibility for a valid comparison between the two, but I nevertheless believe that the existence of the two reference books makes it possible to notice at least some trends of development. The size of the two dictionaries is approximately the same but the respective lists of words differ considerably.

A comparison of the lists of -*ing* Anglicisms in the two dictionaries yields results which are not surprising as far as their number is concerned. While the -*ing* Anglicisms in RD1 are only 14, RD2 lists 78. The 14 items in RD1 are all borrowed from the earlier three-volume *Dictionary of Standard Bulgarian* published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, which means that they were lexicographically recorded in the 1950s, and have entered the language at least some time before that. We learn from the Preface of RD2 that its corpus includes not only the latest normative dictionaries but also neological dictionaries, materials from the mass media, the internet, etc. The time gap between RD1 and RD2 is actually greater than the 35 years between their respective publication and amounts to at least half a century. The higher number of -*ing* Anglicisms in RD2 may be partly due to a more open and tolerant attitude towards borrowing on the part of its compilers as against a more strongly purist attitude of earlier times. Even allowing for this, however, there is no doubt that this quantitative difference is due to the increasing influence of English and the continuing mass-scale borrowing during recent decades. It is also obvious that the actual number of -*ing* Anglicisms today is much larger than the 78 items of RD2. (Пернишка и др. 2010, a neological dictionary covering the period 1990-2010, lists 141 lexemes in -*ing*, all of them borrowings from English.) The list, which is actually open, will be much longer if we include various specialized sub-languages of various technological and mass culture domains, where the terminology is almost entirely English.

Here is the full list of the 78 -*ing* Anglicisms found in RD2. They are given in their original reverse (from left to right) Cyrillic alphabetical order. One advantage of this is that this keeps together word-formative nests ending in the same way (-*bording*, for instance). The list is first given in the original Cyrillic and then in Latin transliteration.

джогинг, бодибилдинг, тиймбилдинг, холдинг, бодибординг, уейкбординг, скейтбординг, сноубординг, **пудинг**, лизинг, мърчандайзинг, франчайзинг, крекинг, трекинг, викинг, **смокинг**, паркинг, [ризлинг], пилинг, **шилинг**, стайлинг, карлинг, **стерлинг**, кърлинг, **боулинг**, роуминг, аквапланинг, тренинг, автотренинг, психотренинг, спининг, скрининг, клонинг, каньонинг, броунинг, хепънинг, **дъмпинг**, къмпинг, допинг, антидопинг, телешопинг, **лупинг**, [**ринг**], спаринг, инженеринг, [**херинг**], **клиринг**, мониторинг, биомониторинг, [стринг], кетъринг, авиокетъринг, [**месинг**], дресинг, фиксинг, **дансинг**, аутсорсинг, пиърсинг, маркетинг, **митинг**, рейтинг, бодипейнтинг, картинг, кастинг, листинг, постинг, хостинг, рафтинг, лифтинг, миолифтинг, фотолифтинг, [**суинг**], брифинг, сърфинг, скай-сърфинг, уиндсърфинг, кайтсърфинг, стречинг.

džoging, bodibilding, tijmbilding, holding, bodibording, uejkbording, skejtbording, snoubording, **puding**, lizing, mȃrčandajzing, frančajzing, kreking, treking, viking, **smoking**, parking, [rizling], piling, **šiling**, stajling, karling, **sterling**, kȃrling, **bouling**, rouming, akvaplaning, trening, avtotrening, psihotrening, spining, skrining, kloning, kanjoning, brouning, hepȃning, **dȃmping**, kȃmping, doping, antidoping, telešoping, **luping**, [**ring**], sparing, inženering, [**hering**], **kliring**, monitoring, biomonitoring, [string], ketȃring, avioketȃring, [**mesing**], dresing, fiksing, **dansing**, autsorsing, piȃrsing, marketing, **miting**, rejting, bodipejnting, karting, kasting, listing, posting, hosting, rafting, lifting, miolifting, fotolifting, [**suing**], brifing, sȃrfing, skaj-sȃrfing, uindsȃrfing, kajtsȃrfing, strečing.

The 14 items given in bold type are the ones listed in the earlier RD1. It turns out that none of them has been removed from RD2. In this list we have to cross out the monosyllabic *ring*, *string* and *suing* because the final -*ing* cannot claim morphemic status in them. They, so to say, end in -*ing* by chance. We can add to them the German borrowings *rizling* and *mesing*, the latter with etymology which is not clear. All these are put in square brackets. In the somewhat longer nouns *rizling* and *mesing* -*ing* may to some extent support the impression that -*ing* is a suffix. Some of the items in the above list will be False Anglicisms. (*Smoking* certainly is, and there are probably quite a few more.) For a definition of False Anglicisms with a focus on French and Bulgarian and a discussion of the processes that give rise to them see Bagasheva and Renner 2015. This is however, irrelevant to our discussion. The emphasis in this context is on Anglicism and not on False. The important point is that they are perceived as Anglicisms (remember the above-quoted observation that -*ing* is emblematic of their Englishness).

Some more examples of Anglicisms in -*ing* may be found a neological dictionary covering the period 1998-2003 (Бонджолова 2003). On the list are 14 items included in RD2, given here in bold type. The alphabetic order is normal Bulgarian Cyrillic:

**аквапланинг**, антиейджинг, армрестлинг, **аутсорсинг**, бекинг[-вокал((-ист)-ка)], билинг, **бодибординг**, бодидрагинг, бодисърфинг, бордсейлинг, боулдъринг, брендинг, вендинг[-автомат], гейминг, **дресинг**, имиджинг, кайтбординг, **кайтсърфинг**, **клонинг**, м-банкинг, м-маркетинг, моделинг, мошинг, **мърчъндайзинг**, пауърлифтинг, пиъринг, **постинг**, **рафтинг**, реинженеринг, рейсинг, рендъринг, **роуминг**, сексбилдинг, сетинг, скайдайвинг, **скайсърфинг**, скаутинг, скейлинг, спийдбайкинг, **стайлинг**, стейдждайвинг, стрийкинг, стрийминг, тайминг, трейнинг, **трекинг**, тунинг, уайтънинг, флеъринг, **франчайзинг**, хоумшопинг, шопинг, яхтинг.

**akvaplaning,** antiejdžing, armrestling, **autsorsing**, beking[-vokal((-ist)-ka)], biling, **bodibording**, bodidraging, bodisȃrfing, bordsejling, bouldȃring, brending, vending[-avtomat], gejming, **dresing**, imidžing, kajtbording, **kaitsȃrfing**, **kloning**, m-banking, m-marketing, modeling, mošing, **mȃrčandajzing**, pauȃrlifting, piȃring, **posting**, **rafting**, reinženering, rejsing, rendȃring, **rouming**, seksbilding, seting, skajdajving, **skajsȃrfing**, skauting, skejling, spijdbajking, **stajling**, stejdždajving, strijking, strijming, tajming, trejning, **treking**, tuning, uajtȃning, fleȃring, **frančajzing**, houmšoping, šoping, jahting.

1.4 SOME COMMENTS ON THE CORPUS

A closer look at our list of Anglicisms in -*ing* shows that they are all nouns. What is more, the majority of them are semantically “devebral”: their meaning is connected with some kind of activity. They represent activities and processes as abstract entities. One group denotes various sports and similar preoccupations: *džoging*, *bodibilding*, the word nests in -*sȃrfing* and -*bording*, *treking*, *rafting*, *kȃrling*, etc. There are also financial activities (*lizing*, *frančajzing*, *dȃmping*,*kliring*), everyday activities ([*tele*]*šoping*), technological processes (*kreking*). The more recent borrowings are connected with novel (at least for the recipient culture) activities and modern lifestyle, spreading worldwide in the time of globalization (*ketȃring*, *monitoring*, *rouming*, *autsorsing*, *tijmbilding*, *piȃrsing*). These examples give some idea of the conceptual domains in which speakers of Bulgarian felt it necessary to borrow ideas together with the respective words. Occasionally the borrowings do not fill up an actual gap but are predominantly used to suggest a more modern attitude, thus adding prestige. This is the case of *šoping* vs. the older and more familiar *pazaruvane* (verbal noun from *pazaruvam*), so trendy people go *šoping* while ordinary folk do *pazaruvane*. Notice the etymology of the two words – English vs. Turkish/Persian.

Not all of the nouns in the above list are *nomina actionis*. There are some *nomina loci* (*parking*, *kȃmping*, *dansing*) naming locations connected with some activity. Others name the product/ result of an activity (*kloning*), or agentive substances (*doping*, *antidoping*). Some of the words on our list are unmotivated even from the point of Present-Day English (*viking*, *šiling*). Although such semantic sub-classifications of nouns are basically valid, we should not forget the possibility of polysemy and the flexibility of language allowing for whole spectra of shades of meaning (Cruse 1986: 7-74) based on metonymic and other relations: activity, location of the activity, result of the activity, etc.

A necessary (but insufficient) condition for recognizing a formal component as a word-formative formant, in this case a suffix, is its recurrence in a specific position in a number of lexical items. The appreciation of compositionality also depends on the nature of the residue, in our case the putative base, to which the suffix is added. If this residue is a free form (thus having a recognizable meaning of its own), this guarantees the recognition of the morphemic boundary between base and suffix. This is the case with some of the items on our list: *akvaplan*-*ing*, (*bio*)*monitor-ing*, *inžener-ing*, *kanjon-ing*, *kart-ing*, (*skaj*/ *uind*/ *kajt*)*sȃrf-ing*, (*skejt*/ *snou*)*bord-ing*. Also *imidž-ing*, *model-ing*, *skaut-ing* from Бонджолова 2003. An interesting usage of *kanjoning* was attested in a television program: … *Tova ne e kanjoning.* *Tova e GRANDkanjoning!* [This isn’t just canyoning. This is GRANDcanyoning!] This demonstration of wit relies on familiarity with the name *Grand Canyon*, which also shows awareness of the boundary between *kanjon* and *ing*,and requires familiarity with the meaning of *grand*. Another factor contributing to the analysability of these items is their participation in word-formative paradigms, comprising at least two cognate words, where the formant -*ing* will be substituted by other formants or zero.[[2]](#footnote-2) Examples of affix-replacement and paradigms from the corpus:

*sȃrf-ing* (noun) – *sȃrf-ira* [[3]](#footnote-3)(verb) - *sȃrf-irane* (verbal noun) - *sȃrf-ist* (agent noun) – *sȃrf-ist-ka* (fem. agent noun)

*tren-ing* (noun) - *tren-ira* (verb) - *tren-irovka* (verbal noun) - *tren-irovȃčen* (adjective) – *tren-jor* (agent noun) – *tren-er* (agent noun)

It is precisely those lexical items, where the component -*ing* is added to a free base, and which participate in word-formative paradigms and affix-replacement, that are sufficiently transparent/analysable for the Bulgarian native speaker and may serve as a model for the productive adoption of the affix. We see that there are at least some justifications to regard -*ing* as a suffix participating in the word-formative structure of nouns borrowed into Bulgarian.

1.5 PRODUCTIVE USES OF –*ING* IN BULGARIAN (?)

In order to be able to speak of a word-formative pattern with a suffix -*ing* in Bulgarian, however, we need not only a sufficient number of lexical items where it can be isolated, but also the appearance of new words containing it, which would prove at least some productivity.

In the summer of 2011 we learned from television broadcasts and from other media about a reckless form of outdoor recreation where tipsy youngsters jump off the balconies of seaside resort hotels right into the swimming pool below. This was called *balkoning*. This word looks like a Bulgarian coinage as *balkon* [balcony] is a very common Bulgarian word, totally assimilated into the Bulgarian lexicon and not perceived as a borrowing from another language. The word *balconing* exists also in Spanish and Wikipedia has a short article on balconing, associating the phenomenon with Spanish and Bulgarian resorts and quoting references dated in 2010. So Bulgarian *balkoning* may be yet another borrowing in -*ing*, although “synchronically” speaking from the point of view of Bulgarian, it looks like a Bulgarian coinage.

Similar is the situation with *klubing* (English *clubbing*) “visiting and gathering socially at nightclubs”. This must be a borrowing of the English word but the form is not *klȃbing* (*клъбинг*) or *klabing* (*клабинг*),as it ought to be according to the present-day practice of phonetic adaptation of English to Bulgarian, but *klub-ing* (*клубинг*) with the older and well-assimilated form *klub*, meaning “club”. Cf. also the two Bulgarian equivalents of *clubber* both listed in Бонджолова 2003: 1) *klub-ar*, which is a product of Bulgarian word-formation – the noun *klub* + Bulg. suffix -*ar* (-*ар*), and 2) *klȃb-ȃr*, which shows phonetic rendering of the English prototype in both the base and the suffix. The form *klubing* belongs to the derivational paradigm: *klub* (noun) *- klub-en* (adj.) *- klub-ar* (agent noun) - *klub-ing* (action noun). Very similar is the case of *jahting* (“yachting”) from the second list above. Instead of *joting* (\*йотинг), which would have been phonetically adequate from the point of view of the English sound form, we have *jaht-ing*, where the base is that of the earlier established borrowed form *jahta* (яхта) – “yacht”(a case of transliteration rather than phonetic transcription), thus establishing the pair (minimal derivational paradigm): *jaht-a* (noun, feminine) – *jaht-ing* (action noun). To these can be added a number of compounds with *jaht-* as an intial component (*jahtmjasto*, *jahtport*, *jahtpristanište*, *jahtrevju jahtsmen[ka]*, *jahtturizȃm*, *jahthotel –* all in Пернишка и др. 2010).

To V. Murdarov (personal communication) I owe the Bulgarian word *pejking*, a doubtless Bulgarian coinage from *pejk-a* [bench] meaning “sitting on benches in public parks, (usually drinking beer)”, yet another form of recreation. Here the Bulgarian feminine inflection -*a* is removed and the noun stem is combined with -*ing*, which clearly shows awareness of the meaning of the suffix. In a large-scale study of occasionalisms in the language of the media Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007: 51) gives several examples of neologisms in -*ing*: *karavaning* “caravanning” (< *caravan-a* “caravan, trailer, camper van”); *manastiring* - “monastery-visiting” (< *manastir* “monastery”); *dȃrling* “squabble *n*., arguing” (< *dȃrlja se* “squabble *vb*.”); *advokating* “act as legal adviser” (< *advokat* “legal adviser, attorney”). Yet another Bulgarian formation *moling* is quoted and discussed by Vatеva (Ватева 2012). She treats this as a case of substitution (in that case substitution of the base, as distinct from affix-replacement/substitution) and her analysis is supported by the quote adduced there: “Shopping is dead, long live malling (headline). *Moling* is a verb denoting the activity of ‘going shopping in a mall and hanging around there for hours’ *Sega* [newspaper] 06.08.2008” (my translation). This explanation suggests analogical formation of *moling* based on *šoping* (substitution of *mol*- for *šop*-). However, it is perfectly legitimate to analyse *moling* as a Bulgarian formation from the Bulgarian noun *mol* (recently borrowed from English *mall* but a wide-known and popular word in Present-Day Bulgarian) plus -*ing*. Whether this word-formation/analogical process actually happened within Bulgarian or else the word was borrowed ready-made from English, is difficult to say. Both are possible and both may have actually happened. English *malling* does exist and is listed in neological dictionaries. *YourDictionary* (<http://www.yourdictionary.com/malling>) defines it as “1) the construction of indoor shopping malls; 2) the act of spending time in a shopping mall”, while *Urban Dictionary* gives “going to the mall with a large group of people with no intention of buying anything” (www.urbandictionary.com).

1.6 REINTERPRETATION OF THE PATTERN

It is time to look at the word-formative pattern of our Anglicisms in -*ing*, or their word-formative type in the sense of Radeva (Радева 2007: 32-34). It was suggested already that the resultant form is an action noun. In order to understand the pattern we need to know the type of base to which the suffix is added. We have only a handful of items where -*ing* is productively used in Bulgarian (*advokating*, *balkoning*, *karavaning*, *pejking*, *manastiring*, *moling*, *klubing*, *jahting*, the last two because of the adaptation of the base to coincide with the earlier borrowings *klub* and *jaht-a*). In all of them the motivating base is certainly nominal. Here we see the pattern:

noun base + -ing = action noun (an activity related to the object named by the noun base)

This can be demonstrated by paraphrase: “the activity of sitting on a bench…”, “the activity of visiting monasteries” etc. The object named by the base can be related to the activity in a variety of ways – location, instrument, etc, as the examples show. The same pattern applies to the interpretation of the Anglicisms where -*ing* combines with a free base. This base is a noun in Bulgarian (the -*bord-ing* and the -*sȃrf-ing* groups, *monitor-ing*, *inžener-ing*, *kanjon-ing*, and from the Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2003) list above: *imidž-ing*, *model-ing*, *skaut-ing*).

Radeva (Радева 2007: 129-135) regards the Bulgarian action nouns as transpositional formations and defines them as “deverbal nouns naming an activity in abstraction from its agent, unrelated to time and having the semantic feature Processuality”. Our -*ing* nouns, however are not transpositional but mutational (class-preserving), they are not deverbal but denominal, and the change is only from a concrete noun base to the resultant abstract noun. English verbal nouns in -*ing* conform to Radeva’s definition quoted above. *The New Shorter Oxford Dictionary* (NSOD 1993), for instance, starts its definition of -*ing* as follows: “Forming nouns, usually from verbs, occasionally by analogy from nouns or adverbs, denoting (a) verbal action …” So the basic English pattern here is:

verb base + -ing = action noun

This model applies to the English prototypes of the Bulgarian -*ing* Anglicisms even when the base seems to be originally nominal. As a result of the validity of this model such bases are interpreted/interpretable as verbal, derived through conversion: *yacht* is a noun but *yacht-ing* is derived from the verb *to yacht*, itself the result of conversion. (In some cases a back-formation process may be at work, especially in object-incrporating compounds like *troubleshooting*/ *troubleshooter* > *to trouble shoot*.) The existence of conversion guarantees the verbal reading of the stem. This, of course is due to the enormous productivity of conversion in Present-Day English, and ultimately to the highly analytical isolating typology of this language. The situation in the fusional-inflectional Bulgarian language is very different. There verbal and nominal stems are formally different, and this precludes the possibility of conversion of the type observed in English. We see then that *yachting* and *jahting* conform to two different word-formative patterns, the crucial difference being in the difference of the base – verbal vs. nominal. This shows that rather than mechanically borrowing the pattern from English, Bulgarian re-interprets the -*ing* Anglicisms in a different way and imposes a different pattern of them, which could be potentially productive in the recipient language.

We are dealing here with the process of suffixation. V. Murdarov (Мурдаров 1983: 73-75) points out a tendency of a decreasing importance of derivation, and especially of suffixation, in Present-Day Bulgarian, at the expense of what he call *sinapsij* (synapse, formation of complex names consisting of more than one word) and of composition. At the same time he also sees some potential “in the use of new word-formative types, usually attracted from active lexis borrowed into Present-Day Bulgarian and having transparent word-formative structure”.

1.7 HYBRIDITY AND ASSIMILATION

It is true that neologisms and occasionalisms like *pejking*, *manastiring*, *balkoning*, will cause a few raised eyebrows among those who come across them for the first time. This will be due not so much to their novelty, but to their hybridity, the combination of a native base with a recognizably foreign suffix. Purists find hybrid combinations particularly obnoxious.[[4]](#footnote-4) Etymology has been pointed out as a possible cause of blocking in word-formation. Thus the agentive suffix -*ant* is seen in many words borrowed into Russian but it can produce new words only from non-native, non-Slavic bases (Bower 2003: 84) This holds good for Bulgarian[[5]](#footnote-5) as well as, and a search in RD2 proves it. It should be noted here that the division of the wordstock into native and foreign for the sake of constraints like the one mentioned here, does not exactly coincide with deep etymological analysis. Thus *balkon* and *manastir* are etymologically foreign but sufficiently well-integrated in the Bulgarian vocabulary to count as “native”. Bulgarian, like the other Balkan languages, has a large number of Turkish borrowings, but some of them are unrecognizable for the average speaker as foreign (*boja* “paint,”, *čanta* “bag”, *čorap* “sock”), while others are marked as obviously Turkish, which is often accompanied by specific stylistic connotations.

The existence in Bulgarian of nouns in -*ing* with activity or activity-related meaning and their participation in derivational paradigms raises the question: what is the form of the cognate verb. We have well-established institutionalized verbs in *parking* – *park-ira* (verb), *tren-ing* (noun) - *tren-ira* (verb), *fiksing* – *fiks-ira* (verb) and many others.[[6]](#footnote-6) It is not surprising that English *banking*, when borrowed into Bulgarian relatively recently, was morphologically adapted to *bank-ira-ne*, a verbal noun which soon produced through back-formation the verb *bank-ira* (Благоева, Колковска 2013: 318). The existence of -*ira* verbs and the productively derived verbal nouns in -*ira-ne* offers the opportunity of differentiating between the the -*ing* and the -*ira*-*ne* nouns. Thus *parking* is the place for doing this, while *parkirane* is the activity itself; *kloning* - the product/result of the process, while *klonirane* refers to the process/activity; *sȃrfing* is the name of the sports discipline, while *sȃrfirane* is the activity as such. Against the noun *kȃmping* we have the verb *kȃmpinguva* with the suffix -*uva*.[[7]](#footnote-7) Not long ago the unusual verb *vakancuva* “to vaccation” was used in public parliamentary debates causing a strong negative reaction among the general public. Derivational paradigms are generally believed to be less regular and complete than inflectional ones. In the case of *piȃrsing* and *šoping* the verbal meaning is expressed analytically with the help of a delexical verb like *do* plus the noun in -*ing* as its object (*pravi si piȃrsing*, *pravi šoping*).

Among the sociolinguistic factors relevant to word-formation Kȍrtvélyessy & Štekauer (2014: 417-419) include education and language. Related to these is the degree of linguistic competence of the individual speaker in one’s native language and in foreign languages (bilingualism and multilingualism). The large-scale borrowing from English is of course the result of contacts with this language and this presupposes various degrees of bilingualism. A typical situation provoking borrowing is translation, especially when there is no obvious equivalent of a certain item. We know from translation studies that one strategy of coping with realia is transliteration, i.e. borrowing (Florin 1993: 125). The principle of the least effort leads to borrowing even when an equivalent in the recepient language is available but requires some searching. With the wider spread of competence in English, especially among the younger generations, it is quite likely that many users of words like *balkoning* and *pejking* are aware of the mixed Bulgarian-English nature of such formations and this may even be regarded as a kind of code-mixing on sub-lexemic level. There may be an element of playfulness[[8]](#footnote-8) here too, a demonstration of wit and originality. Danchev (Данчев 2001: 204) speaks of adaptations in teenager slang where joking Anglicization of the form contributes expresiveness, irony, etc. I have witnessed in a conversation between Bulgarian-English bilinguals the obviously joking nonce formation *puking* (from Bulg. *puk* onomatopoeic interjection “crack, pop”, *puka* vb.).

1.8 FINAL REMARKS

Finally let’s repeat the question which serves as the title of Стаменов 2010: is there a suffix -*ing* in Bulgarian? Before trying to give it an answer I will refer to attempts at establishing distinct stages in the process of adopting foreign affixes. The following quotation from Trips (2014: 391) will be relevant here:

Burnley distinguishes three successive stages in the process of adopting and assimilating non-native affixes. In the first stage, an affix is part of a lexeme which is borrowed as such (a simplex) and assimilated into the lexicon (and grammar) of the recipient language. In the second stage, speakers of the recipient language analyse the word structure of these loans which results in the formation of new lexemes with these affixes with a restricted set of bases. In the third stage, the affixes are no longer felt to be foreign and are widely and productively used with bases of native and non-native origin. It is at this point that affixes have become part of the recipient languages’s derivational system.

How far has the process of the adoption of the suffix -*ing* in Bulgarian gone? According to the above criteria it has reached the beginning of stage two. If the three stages could be further subdivided, Bulgarian -*ing* is in the first sub-stage of stage two. The resultant formations are very few in number and they are strongly felt as neologisms and even occasionalisms. Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007: 51, 95) is of the opinion that despite the large-scale borrowing of words in -*ing*, there is no active word-formation in Bulgarian with this suffix, which she describes as non-productive. She goes on to say that the suffix is used for the creation of occasionalisms from both nominal and verbal bases, in spite of its foreignness (why not because of it, the hybridity producing attention-catching and expressiveness effect?). Her only example of a Bulgarian -*ing* formation from a verbal base *dȃrling* (see above) is a not very successful occasionalism limited to its unique context, where the word rhymes with *kȃrling* and relies on the punning effect. Blagoeva and Kolkovska (Благоева, Колковска 2013: 307) are also very cautious and believe that speaking of a suffix -*ing* in Bulgarian is still “in the sphere of hypothesizing”. So the tentative conclusion is that the numerous Anglicisms in -*ing* borrowed into Bulgarian are analysable and a suffux-like element can be recognized in them. There are attempts to use -*ing* productively but they are still very limited and the resulting forms have the nature of occasionalisms. The recognizable pattern is “noun base + -*ing*” as distinct from the “verb base + -*ing*” of the respective pattern of the English words which are borrowed.

A brief comparison with another Slavic language, Russian, shows, on the one hand, the international, global character of the linguistic phenomena discussed and the influence of English, and, on the other hand, the specific peculiarities in the speed and nature of the processes in the different recipient languages. A number of Russian publications discuss the borrowings in -*ing* and the adoption of the respective pattern: Сэшан 1996, Сологуб 2002, Баасанжав 2003, Григорьев 2004, Щитова 2004, Абраева 2014. Dyakov and Skvoretskaya (Дьяков, Скворецкая 2013) have the significant title “The suffix -*ing* gaining positions in Russian word-formation”. The authors show that the suffix combines productively, i.e. with Russian materal, with personal name bases (*puting путинг* “electioneering in favour of V. Putin”, *Lening*, *Staling*, *Rogozing*, all of them with haplology -*ing* < [-*in*]-*ing*), with concrete nouns (*sobačing* *собачинг* “shooting stray dogs” < *sobaka* *собака* “dog”) and even with phrases (*kryšelazing* *крышелазинг* “roof-crawling”< *lazit’ po kryšam* лазить по крышам “crawl on roofs”, a case of phrasal compounding). The same shift of the (original English) pattern from deverbal to denominal suffixation is noticed here as in Bulgarian. The occasional and sometimes jocular, punning and stylisticly marked character of the -*ing* formations is also shared by the two languages, which is not surprising in view of the nature of the process (novelty, hybridization). In Russian, however, the range of bases is wider and includes proper names and phrases, which is not observed in Bulgarian. On the whole the productive use of -*ing* in Bulgarian is far more limited than in Russian, where the process of the adoptiong of the suffix is more advanced.

2. THE BULGARIAN BLENDER

2.1 BULGARIAN TERMINOLOGY FOR BLENDING

A couple of decades ago blending as a means of word-formation was almost non-existent in Bulgarian in its prototypical form. Probably because of the novelty of the phenomenon in the language there isn’t a well-established term for it in Bulgarian linguistic terminology. Discussing English word-formation Pencheva (Пенчева 2004: 203-214) uses the term *teleskopija* [telescopy] and so does Stamenov (Стаменов 2007), where attention is drawn to the appearance of blends in Present-Day Bulgarian. In an extensive and thorough study of occasionalisms in the language of the Bulgarian media Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007: 98-111) pays special attention to *blending* (one more borrowing in -*ing*!) as one of a number of means explicitly associated with nonce-formation. For her blending is a wider category subsuming three subcategories; *kontaminacija* [contamination], *mežduslovno nalagane* [inter-word overlap] and *vstavăcno slovoobrazuvane* [insertive word-formation]. In addition to this some of the other nonce-formational means discussed by this author (*substitution*, *epenthetic word-formation*, *metathetic word-formation*) are also interpretable as specific cases of blending. Without going into the subclassification offered by Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007), we can point out that it is yet another indication that blending is not a homogeneous phenomenon and that it is open to various interpretations.

The term *contamination* is borrowed from West European languages/linguistics. Marouzeau’s multilingual dictionary of linguistic terminology (1951, 1960: 139) lists it for all languages included there (French, German, English, Italian, plus Russian in the 1960 Russian edition), with the due variation in form and with alternative terms in some of the languages. Hartmann & Stork’s (1972: 51) definition of *contamination* is: “the process or result of confusing or joining two forms which are habitually or accidentally associated”. The disadvantage of this term is that it tends to suggest a chance (un-purposeful, accidental) phenomenon like a lapse or a Freudian slip, and that it is applicable to syntactic constructions as well.

Yet another term for blends is *portmanteau words*, dubbed so by Lewis Carroll in Humpty Dumpty’s words (*Through the Looking Glass*, 1872, ch. VI): “You see it’s like a portmanteau – there are two meanings packed up into one word” (to repeat a famous quote, appearing in Bauer 1983: 234 and elsewhere). In the Bulgarian literature the term *portmanto/portmanteau* has been used by Hranova (Хранова 2000: 192-193) discussing Bulgarian material, but she uses it in a rather loose sense. Most of her “portmanteau” words are actually straightforward compounds. English-speaking linguists, especially American descriptivists, use *portmanteau* mostlyin the combination *portmanteau morph*, a morph realizing two or more morphemes (Matthews 1997: 286).

2.2 SOME REMARKS ON BLENDING AS A MEANS OF WORD-FORMATION

Because of its (alleged) irregularity and unpredictability blending is often contrasted to the catenative means of word-formation – derivation and compounding – and is even excluded from regular word-formation processes, earning for itself the label “extra-grammatical”[[9]](#footnote-9), together with the other non-linear word-formative processes. Cf. Spencer (1991: 461-462): “In English new words are formed by *clipping* (e.g. *mike* from *microphone*) and *blending* (e.g. *smog* from *smoke* and *fog*) as well as from acronyms such as *radar* and ‘stub’ compounds such as *Caltech*. None of these is of any great importance to morphological theory.” Spencer, further on, insists on “[t]he distinction between these ways of *creating* new words (as opposed to genuine morphological devices used in productive word *formation*)”.

More recent approaches, however, emphasize that blending is subject to restrictions – not only prosodic, but also semantic and syntactic and that “these seemingly irregular processes are highly systematic in nature and should therefore not be excluded from what has been called ‘grammatical morphology.’” (Plag 2003: 125-126). See also Arndt-Lappe and Plag (2013: 538) who point out that “[m]ore recent approaches no longer consider blends unpredictable, and pertinent studies have found interesting restrictions at work that allow the formulation of a number of interesting generalizations…”, mainly in the prosodic-morphological interface (“prosodic morphology”).

Blending does depend on the creativity and ingenuity of the individual coiner and more often than not it has the nature of a language game[[10]](#footnote-10). It is usually an intentional, purposeful act on the part of the speaker. From the perceiver’s perspective, the new blend he/she comes across, is often a puzzle which has to be solved (a mixture of which two words is this formation?). For the ludic aspect of language and the role of riddle-solving see Bagasheva & Stamenov (2013). The majority of blends are occasionalisms and few of them are institutionalized and become lasting additions to the lexicon of a language. Because of their character most of them are stylistically marked. Krumova-Tsvetkova et al. (Крумова-Цветкова и др. 2013: 331) include blending in “expressive word-formation”. Blending is limited predominantly to the language of the media, and other specific areas like advertising and the creation of brand names. As Szymanek (2005:434) points out:

*Blending* constitutes another area of contemporary English word-formation where neologisms are fairly common (particularly in media language). As pointed out by Stockwell and Minkova [sic! Minkova & Stockwell is the right order] (2001: 6), “it is not uncommon for new technical terms to be created by blending.” This remark is echoed in Ayto (2003: 183): blending “is now a perfectly respectable method of creating new scientific or technical terminology”; “instances of blending multiplied exponentially in the twentieth century”, with the 1930s probably offering the largest number of new instances, but the trend continues to the present.

The above quote emphasizes the significance of blending as a means of word-formation, especially in some registers and areas of language, despite the traditional opinion that it is marginal, extra-grammatical, “rule-breaking” (a qualification made in Pencheva 1981).

A clear and compact definition of blending is: “the formation of a word from a sequence of two bases with reduction of one or both at the boundary between them…” (Bauer & Huddleston 2002: 1636). Thus blending is distinguished from compounding, which also involves joining two bases, by two additional requirements: 1) at least one of the two bases is reduced (clipped); and 2) the clipping should occur at the boundary between the two bases, i.e. it should be either back-clipping of the first base, or foreclipping of the second base, or both. Blends should not be confused with clipping compounds (Bauer & Huddleston 2002: 1635), where both elements are back-clipped, so the second elements is not clipped at the boundary between the two bases (e.g. *sitcom*). Clipping compounds were quite popular in Bulgarian in the first one or two decades after the Second World War, (*narmag* < *naroden magazin* “people’s shop”; *selkor* < *selo/selski korespondent* “village correspondent”; and even the three-element *horemag* < *hotel restorant magazin* “hotel, restaurant, shop”). The clipping involved in blending, like all clipping in word-formation, ignores morphemic boundaries and produces the so called splinters (Bauer 2004: 93-94, Renner et al. 2012a: 2), which under certain conditions can develop into new morphemes. Clipping however has to observe the phonotactic, syllable structure rules of the respective language. Various terms have been used for the bases/ words joined together in the blend: source word, base word, constituent (word), etymon (Renner et al. 2012a: 2). Source word will be preferred henceforth, abbreviated to SW1 and SW2 for the first/lefthand and the second/righthand constituent respectively.

2.3 CLASSIFICATION OF BLENDS

Blends can be classified on the basis of various principles, taking into account: formal characteristics (mainly with respect to the clipping involved and the presence/absence of medial overlap); number of constituents (double vs. triple/multiple [rare]); the word-class of SW1 and SW2 and of the resultant item; degree of transparency/recognizability of the SWs; occasional (context-restricted, doomed to nonce-hood) vs. lexicaliz-ed/-able blends; etymology (borrowed vs. natively formed); semantic relations between SWs (coordinative vs. modifying).[[11]](#footnote-11)

Bauer & Huddleston (2002: 1636-1637) offer the following formal sub-categorization of blends into four types. “In [type] [i] the blend consists of the first part of the first base + the whole of the second base. In [ii] it consists of the whole first base + the final part of the second. In [iii] it consists of the first part of the first base and the final part of the second. And in [iv] the central part is common to the two bases: there is overlap between them.” These four types can be grouped into two binary divisions as follows: first, (a) blends with only one of the bases clipped (type (i) and (ii)) vs. blends with both bases clipped (type (iii)); and second, blends with overlap between the two bases (haplological blends) vs. blends without overlap between the two bases (non-haplological). Bauer and Huddleston claim that types (i) and (ii) have a more definite morphological status and “can be regarded as compounds, whereas the morphological status of the bases in (iii) and (iv) is somewhat indeterminate.” The question arises as to which of these types is/are closer to the ideal, prototypical blend, characterized by the highest degree of blend-hood. Despite (or rather, because of) the more definite morphological status of type (i) and type (ii), and from a position that the very nature of blending is the merging of the two lexical items into one, and the interpenetration of the two bases (cf. the term “telescopy”), it is type (iii) and type (iv) that should be viewed as central and prototypical blends. These two types clip both SWs (for type (iv) this may be controvercial, but more on this later on) and this happens in the centre/middle of the formation (a criterion, which according to many, disqualifies clipping compounds from belonging to the category of blending). The presence of a medial overlap also contributes to the mergeing of the two SWs.[[12]](#footnote-12)

The prototypical approach to blending has often been suggested. It has been pointed out that “the category of blends is not well-defined and blending tends to shade off into compounding, neo-classical compounding, affixation, clipping and […] acronyming” (Bauer 1983: 236). Thornton (1993: 143) claims “that ‘blend’ is a fuzzy concept, to be handled by means of a mulitifactorial definition, which will include indications on which words are prototypical, more central members of the category, and which are more peripheral ones.” A special (marginal) case are blends whose first or second component approaches an affix and because of this is sometimes referred to as affixoid. Here belong words of the -*aholic*, -*burger*, -*gate*, -*nomics* families, or with the initial *agro*-, *cyber*-, *disco*-, *eco*- , *euro*- (splinter, combinig form, radixoid, prefix/suffix/affix(-oid), quasi-prefix/suffix/affix, all of these terms have been applied). It should be pointed out that these elements function (with the necessary adaptation) in many languages, Bulgarian included, and are part of an international lexical stock and of the so called internationalisms.

2.4 HAPLOLOGICAL BLENDS

Haplological blends, or Bauer & Huddleston’s type (iv), represent a special case of blending. They are characterized by the coincidence of the final part of the first component and the initial part of the second component and the deletion of one of the two appearances of the common element in the sequence of the two SWs (hence the term haplological). The result is a medial overlap. This is how this situation is described in Thornton (1993: 147) on the basis of Italian material:

Compounds where haplology has applied come close to blends. Technically in these compounds the second constituent is intact, as it appears clearly in cases like *esentasse* [It. *esente tasse* “taxfree”], where the syllables involved have different rhymes. A speaker, however, might perceive a real blending of the two words, as s/he might process the preserved syllable onset as part of the first word, and see the second word as lacking its initial phoneme.

Other examples are: Eng. *sEXploitation* < *sEX* + *EXploitation* and Bg. *čARomat* < *čAR* “charm”+ *ARomat* “aroma”, where the overlapping parts of the two SWs are given in capital letters.

Thornton’s position tends towards an interpretation of haplological blends as compounds with only the first component clipped, i.e. as a peripheral, non-central type of blending. In addition to this it is claimed that their share among all the various types is relatively small. We can see that the place of haplological blends among other blends is somewhat controversial. Two extreme positions are observed here. According to the first one, they are marginal, non-typical, not even to be accepted as blends: “[o]ther cases that should be excluded from the category of blends are those which are built in accordance with the compounding processes, but are reduced via haplology…” (Ralli and Xydopoulos 2012: 46). Presumably, the explanation for this position is the belief that in haplological blends none of the SWs is clipped and they are fully retained in the resultant form. This is true, but not quite. For the perceiver they offer two alternative readings, under which one of the SWs is clipped and the other one is not (the figure/ ground effect). Accorfing to the second position haplological blends are the only formations that truly deserve to be named blends:

We consider blending as a particular phenomenon that creates a new word by combining two or more words that have one or more segments in common, and for which the common string serves as the conjunction point (Eng. *motel* < *motor hotel*). Reduced compounds, on the other hand, are complex words that are made up of two or more words, at least one of which is shortened, usually according to prosodic principles (Russian *himčistka* < *himičeskaja čistka* ‘dry-cleaner’s’). While blends are also reduced compounds, the reverse is not necessarily true. (Arcodia & Montermini 2012: 93-94)

Both positions are trying to differentiate blends from (reduced/clipped) compounds, which is not an easy task. The fact remains that the prototypical approach better reflects the actual situation. What is more we believe, as already hinted above, that haplological blends, together with type (iii), are central, rather than marginal representatives of the category. In addition to their high degree of interpentration/ merging of the two SWs, they at the same time fully retain the SWs in the two alternative readings, at least in the written form of the language, which makes them more transparent. The relatively rare chance of identity of the final part of SW1 and the initial part of SW2, securing the overlap, enhances their expressiveness and makes haplological blends more conspicuous. Such blends are effective and testify to the ingenuity of the coiner. Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007: 106) emphasizes the “complex semantics”, the unconventional word-formative meaning and the ambiguous morphological divisibility of haplological blends (inter-word overlapping, in her terminology). She associates them even more strongly with nonce-formation, quoting another opinion that they are incapable of becoming units of language, i.e. of being lexcalized/ institutionalized. Nevertheless, haplological blends figure prominently in our corpus. At least one of them has even produced derivatives through suffixation: *čaromat* n. > *čaromat-en* adj.; we can also add here the (potential) abstract noun *čaromat-n-ost*, based on the adj. In Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007) we also find interesting examples of blends showing various kinds of hybridity: English-Bulgarian, acronym-unabbreviated word, written-spoken, Cyrillic-Latin: *PRовал* - *PRoval*: *PR* + *proval* [“PR” + “failure, fiasco”].

In the remaining part of this subsection I will focus on the overlap, giving it a somewhat wider interpretation than just the final part of SW1 and the initial part of SW2 emphasizing the overall formal coincidence of the two SWs, which contributes to a higher degree of blending/ merging. The idea is summarized in the following categorization of

**Various types of overlap** (the overlap in the examples is in capitals and the retained part of SWs is underlined)

1. Medial overlap at the end of the full form of SW1 and the beginning of the full form of SW2. This guarantees the full presence of both SWs in the blend, depending on the reading, and ensures the strongest overlapping effect and the highest recognizability of the two SWs: Bg. *чаромат* - *čaromat*: čAR + ARomat [“charm”+”aroma”]; Eng./Bulg. sEXploitation: sEX + EXploitation; *сексплоатация* - *seksploatacija* : sEKS + EKSploatacija [“sex”+”exploitation”] .

2. Medial overlap at the end of the clipped form of SW1 and the beginning of the clipped form of SW2. Bg/Eng. mOTel: mOT(oring) + (h)OTel.

3. Discontinuous overlap: the coincidence of the phonological/orthographic material shared by SW1 and SW2 is greater than the medial overlap and the shared material is discontinuous.E.g.*глокален* - *glokalen*: gLObALEN + LOkALEN [“global” + “local”], with discontinuous overlap: *lo*…*alen*, where the final –*en* is Bulgarian adjectival suffix. In extreme cases this boils down to substitution of a single phoneme/letter from the viewpoint of one of the SWs: ­ *махмурлек* - *mahmurlek*: mahmurLuK+LeK [“hangover”+”cure”] u > e in SW1 (the longer constituents, which “incorporates” SW2).

4. Cases of metathesis (variation of discontinuous overlap): *мазегинче* - *mazeginče*: maze + magazinče [“basement” + “shop-*dimin*.”] – metathesis g-z > z-g from the viewpoint of SW2.

5. Prothetic and epenthetic blending. Prothetic:*кметъл* - *kmetăl*: kMET + METăl (“mayor” + “heavy metal”) addition of prothetic *k*- to SW2, both SW1 and SW2 fully retained in the blend. (Refers to Tsonko Tsonev, mayor of Kavarna, where a rock festival is held annually.) Epenthetic: *драХматично* - *draHmatično*: DRAhMA + DRA MAtično [“drachma”+”dramatic”], insertion of -*h*- from the perspective of SW2 (capital H in the written form, SW2 being interrupted by the inserted H).

6. According to size of overlap: minimal overlap (one phoneme/letter) - *демократура* - *demokratura*: demokrAcija + diktAtura [“democracy” + “dictatorship”]; longer overlap: *пациентела* - *pacientela*: pacIENT + klIENTela [“patient”+”clients”]; *реститутка* - *restitutka*: reSTITUcija + proSTITUtka [“restitution”+”prostitute”], both example with disyllabic overlap.

Since the above categorizations are not based on a single criterion, they are not mutually exclusive and the same blend can appear in more than one category. The various situations may be described differently, depending on the perspective (from the point of of view of SW1 or of SW2. etc.) Many of these have been categorized as word-formative means other than blending, e.g. in Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007).

2.5 THE BULGARIAN CORPUS AND SOME COMMENTS ON IT

The observations on Bulgarian blending are based on a corpus (Appendix 1) of 79[[13]](#footnote-13) existing blends culled from various sources: the media (printed and electronic), advertisements, fiction (original and translated) and other sources. Neither the size, nor the method of collecting these items is sufficient for statistical purposes but the corpus can at least indicate certain trends. Older, well established examples of Type (i) blends and clipping compounds, which are traditional for Bulgarian, have been excluded. The blends are given in Cyrillic, in Latin transliteration, followed by the two SWs, where the retained part of each SW is underlined and in haplological blends the overlap is given in capital letters. A translation of the two SWs is given in square brackets. In many cases additional explanations and comments are given in small print. This presentatipon of the blends in Appendix 1 includes at least partial formal nalaysis of each lexical item.

Even a cursory look at the corpus of blends listed in Appendix 1 shows that Present-Day Bulgarian boasts a variety of formations representing all structural types. Especially important is the appearance of Type iii and Type iv which are a novelty for the language and which are central to the blending phenomenon. Haplological blends, considered to be less numerous because of the additional requirement they impose on the potential SWs, are also fully present. This is obvious from the capital letters in the analysis, which indicate the overalps. The various types of overlap we allow for (including discontinuous overlap) are also there, as discussed in 2.4. The prominence of haplological blends in the corpus may be due to a subconscious bias in the collection process but their existence and effectiveness are undeniable. Although nouns predominate, there are a few adjectives (from which adverbs may be almost automatically produced) and also verbs. Some show morphological adaptation and potential to participate in word-formative paradigms (*čaromat* n. – *čaromaten* adj. – *čaromatno* adv.; *stȃkmist* n. agentive App2 - *stȃkmistika* n. abstract ; feminization and diminutivization of nouns is also attested). The blends in the corpus differ in the degree of their transparency: from the totally transparent *čaromat* to the occasionalism *mutrenica* , which is only understandable in its context.

Appendix 2 includes all the blends and clipping compounds listed in Pernishka *et al*. (Пернишка и др. 2010), a neological dictionary covering the period 1990-2010. It shows that at least some blends are (on the way to be) lexicalized. Of the 33 blends four (реститутка, стъкмист, цветопунктура, целерационален) may be accepted as Bulgarian formations, and another four are partial calques of English forms ending in -*aholic* and -*otheque*; *jahtpristantište* ends in the Bulgarian word for “port”. The remaining 25 blends have close formal analogues in English (one of them, *phototeque*, is more common in the French-speaking world) and may be viewed as borrowings. However, all the blends are analyzable in Bulgarian and many of them consist of well established (clipped) lexical elements, e.g. *bebefon* “babyphone”, *kiberseks* “cybersex”, *seksoholik* “sexoholic”. From a synchronic Bulgarian perspective they are hardly distinguishable from native formations. Very common in Appendix 2 are the formations whose second element is a suffixoid/ combining form. Among them -*aholic* and -*otheque* (in their Bulgarian form) are very productive in the period registered in this corpus, less so -*burger*, and there is only one formation in -*athon*. One item contains the prefixoid/ initial combinig form *kiber-* “cyber”. These are classified here as type (ii) blends because the affixoid is clipped from a longer form, but they also verge on neoclassical compounds.

Appendix 3 gives all the affixoids (combinig forms, radixoids ?) represented in Pernishka *et al*. (Пернишка и др. 2010), often by more than one lexical item. Very productive during this period are the prefixoids *авио*- “avio”, *авто*- “auto”, *агро*- “agro”, *аудио*- “audio”, and *био*- “bio”. One item *бизнес* „business” finctions as both SW1 and SW2 (suffixoid and prefixoid, initial/final combining form) and here the Bulgarian orthographic practice hesitates between between solid and open spelling. Much longer lists and discussion of these can be found in various studies on the dynamics of Present-Day Bulgarian vocabulary, e.g. Krumova-Tsvetkova (Крумова-Цветкова 2013: 86-87); Blagoeva & Kolkovska (Благоева, Колковска 2013: 297-307).

2.6 BULGARIAN BLENDING: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Calling this a historical perspective is a bit of an exaggeration as we are dealing here with a short period of time, the second half of 20th c. and the first decade of 21st c. In addition to this, the appearance of new words and meanings in Bulgarian is not well-documented, at least not in sources available to the public. Only recently neological dictionaries have been published, some of them compiled with modern corpus-based methodology and indicating the time period they cover. So what follows in this sub-section has the character of impressionistic remarks. I started with the claim that blending is a new phenomenon for the Bulgarian language, characteristic of the last couple of decades. This requires certain qualifications.

A possible counterexample to the above claim is *Evksinjak*, westernized (Latin alphabet) version: *Euxignac*. This is a variety of high quality Bulgarian brandy distilled in the Evksinograd wine cellars since 1934. The name is a blending of *Evksinograd* (Euxinograd), a royal palace on the Black Sea near Varna, and *Cognac*. Another famous variety of French brandy is *Armagnac*. Both *Cognac* and *Armagnac* are place names (town and district, respectively) later given to varieties of brandy, and the latter meaning may be secreted from them. The case of *Evksinjak* can be regarded as a limited analogy based on the two French brand names. This example can be dismissed as the single swallow that does not make a summer. Another relatively early (pre-1989) Bulgarian blend is *stȃkmistika* - *stȃkmja*(*va*) “adjust, manipulate” + *statistika* “statistics”, which captures the jocular meaning expressed in the title of a popular book by Darrell Duff, *How to lie with statistics* (1954). This blend has produced the agent noun in -*ist*; *stȃkmist*, through back-formation, elimination of the suffix -*ika* (for names of scientific disciplines or intelectual activity, corresponding to English -*ics*). To the same pre-1989 period belongs *vlastitutka* (*vlast* “power, government” + *prostitutka* “prostitute”) ascribed to poet and dissident Radoy Ralin (1922-2004) and soon after 1989, on the analogy of this, *restitutka* (*restitutuira* vb. “restitute, restore property” + *prostitutka* “prostitute”) was coined. This raises the question of individual creativity and the authorship of blends, which are not always anonymous. An interesting case is the following example which we owe to Valery Petrov (1920-2014), poet, translator and a linguistic virtuoso. He entitled one of his books *Ot iglu do kjunec* (2010). This is a slight distortion of the idiom *ot igla do konec* “from beginning to end”, literally “from needle to thread”, which contains two blends (?): *iglu* (*iglu* “igloo” + *igla* “needle”) and *kjunec* (*kjunec* “stove-pipe”+ *konec* “thread”), where the second component is only virtually present as a result of the almost complete coincidence with the said idiom. Here the “blending” process works across different ranks (size-levels) – lexeme and phrase. In addition to this, there is blending of the meaning “from beginning to end; everything” and Eskimo dwellings and the local traditional home-heating practices. V. Petrov is also the author of the punning blends *hodatajnstvo* and *vermuft* (see Appendix 1 for their interpretation), quoted in Blagoeva & Kolkovska (Благоева, Колковска 2013: 229).

A more important fact partly refuting the claim that blends are novel to the Bulgarian language is the earlier existence of a large number of the non-prototypical type (i) blends (SW1 back-clipped and SW2 intact): *proforganizacija* < *profesionalna* “professional”+ *orgnizacija* “organization”; *himkombinat* < *himičeski* “chemical” + *kombinat* “works”; *socrealizăm* < *socialističeski* “socialist”+ *realizăm* “realism”). With the appearance of more words with the same SW1 in such combinations, SW1 tends to behave as a prefixoid.[[14]](#footnote-14) The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Grammar (Стоянов 1983: 77-78, 98) refers to these as “compounds with a shortened first component” and *složnosȃkrateni dumi* [shortened compounds], pointing out their popularity in scientific and technical terminology and the international character of many of them. Bondjolova (Бонджолова 2007: 100) notes that in the Bulgarian linguistic tradition this type of blend is treated as group abbreviation or (a special case of) composition.

Clipped compounds (both SWs back-clipped), examples in 2.2, enjoyed the same popularity as type (i) blends in Bulgarian in the period between the Second World War and 1989, due to the influence of Russian and a process of internationalization. In addition to the term *shortened compounds*, other terms, *grupovi sȃkrašteniya* [group abbreviations], displacing the earlier *syllabic abbreviation*, *polusȃkrateni dumi* [semi-abbreviated words], have also been used (Йорданова 1980: 63-64). All these terms can refer equally to both type (i) blends and to clipped compounds, emphasizing various aspects of the process, but there is no indication in them of a blending/ telescoping/contaminating nature of the process. So when blends of type (iii) (SW1 back-clipped, SW2 fore-clipped) and type (iv) (haplological blends) began to appear more recently, they produced the effect of something entirely novel, and not of a mere variation of an already familiar phenomenon. The very fact that type (i) blends and clipped compounds were not recognized (terminologically) as blends confirms the difference/ division between the central, prototypical and the marginal types. So it remains true that it was not until the last one or two decades that we witness the appearance of prototypical blending in Bulgarian on a more or less mass scale.

2.7 THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH

There is no doubt that the present-day proliferation of blends in Bulgarian is due to the influence of English. In this case this influence does not work only through the borrowing of lexical items that instantiate the phenomenon, although this has also happened. Rather, the phenomenon itself, the very idea of blending, has been borrowed as such through familiarity with it from English texts of various types. This ties up with the usually intentional and conscious nature of the act of producing a blend. This also fits the social and sociolinguistic context in Bulgaria after the political changes after 1989, which resulted in a more relaxed, less strongly prescritivist and even playful attitude towards language use and normativity. This is especially obvious in the language of the press (sometimes going to extremes, as it often happens with the next swing of the pendulum in the opposite direction[[15]](#footnote-15)). More intensive language contacts and globalization, the importance of English, linguistic fashion, all contribute to this.[[16]](#footnote-16)

2.7.1 LEXICAL BORROWING AND BLENDING

Like all lexical items blends are subject to borrowing, especially the institutionalized ones, which have become established words. (For obvious reason occasionalism on the other hand have little or no chance of being borrowed). Some of the older and well established English blends like *brunch* and *smog* have been borrowed indeed. *Smog* is a fairly common “Bulgarian” word and *brȃnč* (“brunch”) has been listed in at least some Bulgarian dictionaries (Пернишка и др. 2010) and can be seen in the Internet and some of the media. Neither of these is however recognizable as a blend in Bulgaria because the items that compose them are not Bulgarian words. This comes to show that some of the English blends are not borrowable into Bulgarian *qua* blends. Quite a few, however, are. Their components are common to English and Bulgarian, (mostly internationalisms).Take *seksperiment*, for instance, which works equally well in both languages. A well eastablished blend borrowed into Bulgarian (and, of course, into many other languages) is *motel*. Naturally, some of the borrowable blends require easily predictable adaptation to conform to the morphology and typology of the recipient language. Thus *sexploitation* in Bulgarian becomes *seksploatacija* (-*ation* > -*acija*, and the deverbal nominalizing suffix conditions the formation of the cognate verb through affix replacement > *seksploat-ira-*, also a blend), *glocal* becomes *glokalen* (shaped as a Bulgarian adjective with the suffix -*en*). These, and many more, may have been borrowed from English, with adaptation where necessary. It is worthy of mention that Bulgarian students participating in a a morphology seminar, once they had grasped the principle of (haplological) blending, were creating a number of interesting “Bulgarian” blends out of SW1 *seks* (sex) and SW2s internationalisms beginning with *eks-* (ex-), commonly used in Bulgarian. Most of these have been coined in English as well and can be found in the Net. The difference between borrowed and native formations can be blurred especially when the material is not strongly marked as either foreign or native.

There are also partial calques (hybrids) like *rabotoholik*, *trudoholic*, (“workaholic”), where the first component is Bulgarian and the second one is the internationalized -*a/oholic*, and a few more marginal blends with affixoids.

The transparency of blends is a matter of degree. For Bulgarian-English bilingual speakers even *brănč* may be recognizable as a blend but that depends on the activation of the speaker’s bilingual (translator’s) competence.[[17]](#footnote-17) Among the latest blends borrowed from English are *Grekzit* (“Grexit”) and *Brekzit* (“Brexit”) perhaps partly transparent even for non-bilingual speakers due to familiarity with the common inscription EXIT.

2.7.2 TRANSLATION AND BLENDING

Generally speaking translation is a situation which naturally encourages and provokes borrowing from the source to the target language, even though this is, more often than not, undesirable. Translation, however, does not normally work at morphemic level and that includes word-formation. There is no reason to expect that if a word is the result of suffixation, for example, it should be translated with a suffixed word. The same should hold good for blending as well. But does it? As is often the case with translation the solution depends on a lot of factors: the type of text, the specific use, etc. If a blend is used with only informative purpose, to convey a certain denotative meaning, there is no need to keep its blend-hood. If, however the poetic function of language (in R. Jakobson’s sense) comes to the fore, things will be different. The translator should try to render the expressiveness of the blend, the stylistic markedness, the display of linguistic ingenuity. Again, this does not mean that a blend should necessarily be translated with a blend. The stylistic and emotive effect can be recreated elsewhere in the text (the useful translation device of compensation!). There are context, however, which contain a metalinguistic comment indicating that a blend is required there. As for instance when Humpty Dumpty explains a word: “You see, it's like a portmanteau - there are two meanings packed up into one word.” Here what is important is not so much the meaning of the word but its blend-hood. Some translation situations, especially in fiction, do not require keeping together meaning and the formal-stylistic effect of blending itself. The Bulgarian versions of *Through the Looking Glass*, (ch. VI) have produced the blends: *fižni, glepkavo*, *gmȃrcaš, sgladno,* and a few more even less orthodox formations. Another similar case, though less explicit is the following excerpt, quoted from Pipeva (Пипева 2014: 196) to whom I owe this English-Bulgarian exaple:

“All I did was I coughed,” said Tigger.   
 “He bounced,” said Eeyore.   
 “Well, I sort of boffed,” said Tigger.

(Milne, A. A. *The World of Pooh*. London: Methuen, 1966, р. 253)

Here the Bulgarian translation (Winnie the Pooh 2001: 138) offers the blend *blȃhnah*. The translation of J. Joyce’s *Ulysses* by I. Vasileva (2004) has also produced a couple of Bulgarian blends: *Blumusalim*, *kikosmjah*, *nagohalstvo* (Cf. Appendix 1 for these examples from translations and their interpretation).

3. CONCLUSION

The effect of English on Bulgarian is not limited to lexical borrowing. In the sphere of word-formation we are witnessing attempts to borrow suffixes, -*ing* in particular, with reinterpretation of the pattern in the process of its adaptation and a few cases of productive use with Bulgarian bases. A brief comparison with Russian shows that some Slavic languages are further ahead with respect to this process. Part two of this article discusses the adoption of a whole means of word-formation, namely blending (in its prototypical forms). To these two I would have liked to add the Noun + Noun pattern of compounding, which is almost totally alien to the typology of Bulgarian and introduces a drastic change in its structure, but lack of space does not allow it. The latter process has been noticed by both Anglicists (Ковачева 2006, 2007) and Bulgarianists (Крумова-Цветкова 2013: 88-89 and the references there). The appearance of N+N compounds, which are often on the borderline between word-formation and syntax, raises before Bulgarian linguists both theoretical issues of interpretation and practical problems (open or solid spelling?). All this comes to show that English has a far-reaching influence on Present-Day Bulgarian affecting its word-formation system and even its syntax. The phenomena observed are not limited to Bulgarian alone. They are part of the process of internationalization and globalization, which is materialized in a specific way depending on the peculiarities of the recipient language and culture.
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APPENDIX 1 (Blends)

**барашон** - barašon: barAka + kАšon [“shack” + ‘carton’] **блъхнах** - blȃhnah: blȃsna me + kihnah [“pushed me” + “sneezed-I”] (Winnie the Pooh 2001: 138) **Блумусалим** - Blumusalim: Blum + Jerusalim [“Bloom”+”Jerusalem”] (Ulysses 2004:489)

**бодилник:** bodilnik: BODIL + BuDILNIK [“thorn” + “alarm clock”] name of radio program, alternation O/U, phonemes neutralized in this position

**Бостан** - Bostan: Bojko Borisov + L. Mestan (Iron. putative political coalition named after two political party leaders. The blend coincides with a Bulg. word of Turkish origin meaning “melon field”, a possible allusion to the ethnic character of one of the parties: in this respect the blend is similar to reverse (imitative) acronyms, Minkova & Stockwell 2001: 17-18.)

**Брекзит**: Brekzit borrowed from English *Brexit*

**Бритзит**: Brikzit [BRITaniya + ekZIT] instead of/ variation of *Brexit*, tv 2016

**Бранджелина** - Brandželina: brAd pit + Andželina džoli (<English) **вермуфт** – vermuft: verMUT + MUfT-a [“vermouth” + “gratis, for free”](Epenthetic: insertion of -f- in SW1/ discontinuous overlap in SW2 *mu t*, author V. Petrov.Quoted inBlagoeva & Kolkovska 2013**:** 229.) **вкусмихни се** - vkusmihni se: vkUSno + USmihni se [“tasty” +“smile”] (tv advertisement; verb, imperative) **властитутка** - vlastitutka: vlaST + proSTitutka [“power, government” + “prostitute”] (Avramova 2003: 136) **гавър** - gavȃr : gAVra + kAVȃr [“mockery, insult”+ “cover version”]( blend almost identical withSW2, metathesis: ar- ra; Bonjolova, 2003)

**Гаф Игнатиев**: Gaf Ignatiev: Gaf + Graf Ignatiev [“gaffe” + “Graf Ignatiev Street”] a scandal over the renovation of Graf Ignatiev Street in Sofia, deletion of the phoneme R, tv 2018.

**герберащина:** gerberaština: gerberŠTINA + prostaŠTINA [“style of political party Gerber, pejorative ” + “vulgarity”] insertion of A (Internet)

**глепкаво** - glepkavo: gȃvkavo + lepkavo [“flexibly” + “stickily”] (? discontinuous overlap, common morphology for the SWs: -*av* (adj suffix) -*o* (adv suffix), Alice 2006:176.) **глокален** - glokalen: gLObALEN + LOkALEN [“global” + “local”] (< English, discontinuous overlap, prothetic from the viewpoint of SW2: addition of g-; final -en marks the Bulg. masc. adj.) **гмърцаш** - gmȃrcaš: gmurkaš + skȃrcaš [“dive”+ “skeak”] (Alice 1996:88) **графикатура** - grafikatura: grafiKA + KArikatura [“a piece of graphic art” + “cartoon, caricature”] style created by Bulgarian artist Ivan Gazdov in the 1990s

**демократура** - demokratura: demokrAcija + diktAtura [“democracy” + “dictatorship”]

**демокретени**: demoKRati + KReteni [“democrats” + “cretins”] (journalist Yosif Herbst (1875-1925))

**джинтуиция** - džintucija: džIN + INtuicija [“gin” + “intuition”] (tv advertisement; Bondjolova 2007: 107)

**докушоу** - dokušou: dokumantalno + šou [“documentary” + “show”] (< English) **драХматично** - draHmatično: DRAhMA + DRA MAtično [“drachma”+”dramatic”] (newspaper headline, capital H attention-catching device in the written form, SW2 interrupted by the inserted H)

**Дупетати**: dupetati: DuPe + DePutati [“bottom, arse” + “MPs, deputies”] metathesis E/U

**евксиняк** - evksinjak: evksiNograd + koNjak [“Euxinograd” + “cognac” ] (Bonjolova, 2003) **еврократ** - evrokrat: evRO(pejski) + bjuROkrat [“European” + “beaurocrat”] (? blend or neoclassical compound; Bonjolova, 2003) **жълтини** - žȃltini: žȃltI + novIni [“yellow” + “news”] (Cf. *kljukini* below with similar meaning.)

**кафешествай** - kafešestvaj: kafE + pȃtEšestvaj [“coffee” +”travel- *imp*.”] (tv advertisement; vb, imperative)

**кикосмях** - kikosmjah: kikot + smjah (Ulysses 2004: 272, minimal clipping: only one letter/sound in SW1.)

**клюкини** – kljukini: kljukI + novIni [“gossip” + “news”] (Bondjolova 2007: 102) **кметъл** - kmetȃl: kMET + METȃl (“mayor” + “heavy metal”) (Vateva 2012: 26; prothetic word-formation: addition of k-; SWs both fully retained. Refers to Tsonko Tsonev, mayor of Kavarna, where a rock festival is held annually.)

**кутикутура**: kutikutura: KuTi + kariKaTura [“Kuti, nickname of artist Ivan Kutuzov” + “caricature”] name of exhibition of cartoonist Ivan Kutuzov-Kuti, 2016

**Кучетавър**: kučetavȃr: kuče + kentavȃr [“dog” + “centaur”] title of surrealist painting by I. Petkov 1979

**кютекшън** - kjutekšȃn: kjutEK + EKšȃn [“beating, thrashing” + “action”] (Alexieva 2004: 39) **кючекшън** - kjučekšȃn: kjučEK + EKšȃn [“belly dancing” + “action”] (Alexieva 2004, 39) **Литературс**: literaturs: literaTURa + TUR + s ?English plural [“literature” + “tours”] literary invents in Sofia, tv 2018

**магазинохоличка** - magazinoholička: magazin + alkoholička [“shop” + “alcoholic- *fem*.”] (the -*oholic* suffixoid, Avramova 2003: 193) **мазегинче** - mazeginče: maze + magazinče [“basement” + “shop-*dimin*.”] (Bondjolova 2007: 119; Igov 2011:42. Blend almost identical with SW2, incorporating the whole of SW1, metathesis g/z: z/g. Jocular, ironic, for what is colloquially called *klekshop* [squat-shop] - a small shop in basement selling through window at ground level so that the clients have to squat down.) **махмурлек** - mahmurlek: mahmurLuK+LeK [“hangover”+”cure”] (substition of a single phoneme/grapheme in SW1: e>u)

**Механче**: mehanče: meHANa + HANče [“inn, pub” + “small inn”] name of a pub

**модераст** - moderast: moDERAtor + peDERAst [“anchorman”+”homosexual, pederast”] (Blagoeva 2006: 9; more examples of blends in -*derast* < *pederast*, a term of abuse, in Bondjolova 2007: 103) **мокачино** - mokačino: moKA + KApučino [“mocha”+ “cappuccino”](deletion of second syllable of SW2) **мотел** - motel: mOTor(-ist) + hOTel **музинки** - muzinki: muzIkalni + novInki [“musical” + “news-diminutive-plural”]

**мутреница** - mutrenica: mutra + martenitsa [“thug”+”red and white tassels warn to celebrate spring”] (Vateva 2012: 26, occasionalism which can be understood only in its context, which explains it.)

**мутреса** - mutresa: mutra + metresa [“thug”+”mistress”] (Avramova 2003: 193-194, slight modification of SW2: e>u. Analysable as suffixation: *mutr-a* + -*esa* [femin. suffix] but that loses the connection between the two items)

**Мъжоретки**: mȃžoretki: MȃŽ + MaŽoretki [“man” + “majorettes”] name of a tv series, substitution a/ă

**нагохалство** - nagohalstvo: naglost + nahalstvo [“impudence”+ “impertinence”] (Insertion of -go- in SW2. Ulysses 2004: 268) **насекомикс** - nasekomiks: naseKOMI + KOMIks [“insects” + “comic strip”] Name of fusion, avant-garde and experimental electro-jazz-rock-punk music gang from Bulgarian. One of their albums’ title *Insectcomix* is an English translation of their name, also a blend.

**Нашингтон:** Našington: nAŠ/nAŠensko + VAŠington [“our own” + “Washington”, capital of USA] substitution V>N (title of a book by M. Veshim, 2010)

**омбудсМая** – ombudsMaja: ombudsMAn + MAja Manolova [name of politician], 2015, the media, capital M in the middle. Refers to the person or to the alleged political coalition supporting her election ombudsman. **омбудсрам** – ombudsram: ombudSman + Sram [“ombudsman” + “shame”] 2015, author G. Gospodinov in Facebook, substitution in SW1: m>r. **пациентела** - pacientela: pacIENT + klIENTela [“patient”+”clients”] (Vateva 2012: 26, allusion to the (illegal) mixing of free and paid medical services.)

**работохолик** - rabotoholik: rabota + alkoholik [“work”+”alcoholic”] (hybrid, the -*oholic* suffixoid) **реститутка** - restitutka: reSTITUcija + proSTITUtka [“restitution”+”prostitute”] (Avramova 2003: 193. The analogy of *vlastitutka*, also on this list) **сгладне** - sgladne: plADne + glAD [“noon”+”hunger”] (Alice 1965/1996: 161; Alice 1996:87. Not an orthodox blend. The initial s- comes from nowhere) **секскурзия** - sekskurzija: sEKS + EKSkurzija [“sex”+”excursion”] (Internet, < English) **сексплоатация** - seksploatacija : sEKS + EKSploatacija [“sex”+”exploitation”] (Internet, < English)

**сексперимент** - seksperiment: sEKS + EKSperiment [“sex”+”experiment”] (Internet, < English; Bondjolova 2007: 106 gives the cognate verb.) **Софарма** - Sofarma: SoFia + PHarmacevtična kompanija [“Sofia”+”pharmaceutical company”] (f/ph)

**Sopharmacy**: SoFia + PHarmacy (f/ph, chemist’s shop, not in Cyrillic)

**социаглисти**: sotsiaglisti: SOTSIALISTI + GLISTI [“socialists” + “parasitic worms”] insertion of G

**страгедия** - stragedija: sTRAtegija + TRAgedija [“strategy”+”tragedy”] (discontinuous overlap for SW1, metathesis eg-ge) **стъкмистика** - stȃkmistika: stȃkmja(va) + statistika [“adjust, manipulate” + “statistics”] (partial substitution in SW2: t>km, Bondjolova 2007: 123) **съботаж:** sȃbotaž: SȃBOTA + SaBOTAž [“Saturday” + “sabotage”] name of radio program, alternation a/ă, phonemes neutralized in this position

**таблоидиот** - tabloidiot: tabloID + IDiot (Alexieva 2004: 39) **тарамбура** - tarambura: tarAMBUka + tAMBUra [“goblet drum, tarabuka”+”tambura, mandoline”]

**толерастия** - tolerastija: tolERAntnost + pedERAstija [“tolerance”+”pederasty”] an absuve term for liberal tolerance, also **tolerast** – “someone practicing this” (politically incorrect “phobic” language rejecting tolerance, cf. also *moderast* above.)

**трощастно** - troštastno: tromavo + neštastno [“clumsily”+”unhapily”] (Alice 2006:176) **трудохолик** - trudoholik: trud + alkoholik [“work, labour”+”alcoholic”] (suffixoid -*oholic*) **фижни** - fižni: fini + tăžni [“delicate”+”sad”] (Alice 1996:89) **фрапучино** - frapučino: frAPe + kAPučino [“frappé coffee”+”cappuccino”] **ходатайнство** – hodatajnstvo: hodaTAJSTVO + TAJnSTVO [“(act of) nepotism, intercession” + “rite; sth secret/ mysterious”] (epenthetic: insertion of -n- in SW1/ discontinuous overlap in SW2 *taj stvo*, author V. Petrov.Quoted inBlagoeva & Kolkovska 2013**:** 229.)

**Хумориситет**: humorisitet: humor + universitet [“humour” + “university”] name of the humour section of the Sofia University newspaper in the 1980s, insertion of a linkin -i- , M. Veshim, 2018

**Чалгария** - Čalgarija: čALGA + BȂLGArija [“(low-quality) pop-folk”+ “Bulgaria”] (journalist M. Karbovski) **Чалгатрополис** - Čalgatropolis: čalga + metropolis [“(low-quality) pop-folk”+ “metropolis” **чаромат** - čaromat: čAR + ARomat [“charm”+”aroma”] (tv advertisement) **шикалкавърверсия** - šikalkavȃrversija: šikalKAVja + KAVȃrversija [“shilly-shally”+”cover version”] (Alexieva 2004: 39) **шоколед** - šokOLaD +sladOLeD [“chocolate” + ”icecream”; a > e] (tv advertisement) **щуротека** - šturoteka: štur(-a) + diskoteka [“crazy”+ “discoteque”] (suffixoid -oteka < -oteque)

APPENDIX 2 (Blends and clipping compunds listed in Pernishka et al. 2010)

aртотека [artotheque; -отека -otheque, type ii], бебефон [babyphone; type ii], блогатон [blogathon; -атон -athon, type ii], киберсекс [cybersex; кибер- cyber-, type i], прогейминг [progaming; про- pro[fessional], type i], работохолик [hybrid, -охолик -aholic, type ii], реститутка [type iv, discont. overlap, see App1], робомобил [robomobile; clipping compound: robo[t] + mobile [telephone, etc.]], сатфон [satphone; type iii], сексохолик [sexoholic; -охолик -aholic, type ii], синдет [syndet, clipping compound: syn[thetic] det[ergent]], синдибос [syndiboss; type i], синдилидер [syndileader; type i], сисадмин [sysadmin; clipping compound], ситком [sitcom, clipping compound], стагфлация [stagflation, type iii or iv (discont. overlap)], стрийпбар [*sic*! correct form: стрип-, strip bar; type i], стъкмист [through affix replacement < стъкмистика – type iv (discont. overlap), see App1], трудохолик [hybrid; -охолик -aholic, type ii], уебинар [webinar; type ii], уебономика [webonomics; -(о)номика -nomics, type ii], уебопедия [webopedia; type ii], уикипедия [wikipedia; type ii], фемидом [fem[ale] + [con]dom, type iii], фототека [phototheque; -отека -otheque, type ii], фрапучино [frappuccino; type iv], хайпоника [ high [technology] + [hydro]ponics, type iii], хамбургер [hamburber; the original member of the -бургер -burger family, reanalyzed form not a blend], цветопунктура [kind of chromotherapy, cvet “colour” + [acu]puncture, cveto- initial combining form, or cvet + interfix -o-, typical of Bulgariana compounds, type ii], целерационален [cele[nasočen]”goal-oriented” + racionalen “rational”, type i], чалготека [hybrid; -отека -otheque, type ii], чийзбургер [cheeseburger; -бургер -burger, type ii], чиклит [chicklit; clipping compound], шопохолик [shopaholic; -охолик -aholic, type ii], яхт- [-смен(-ка) yachtsman/woman; -пристанище “port”, hybrid; -хотел “hotel”; type (i) in Bulgarian: jaht[a]].

APPENDIX 3 (Affixoids/radixoids in Pernishka et al. 2010)

**Suffixoids:** -атон, -бизнес, -бургер, -(о)тека, -(о)холик, -(о)холичка, -(o)холизъм

**Prefixoids:** авио-, авто-, агро-, алтер-, антропо-, арома-, астро-, аудио-, бизнес-, био-, Брит-, вело-, вибро-, видео-, фото- , промо-, соц-, спец-, теле-, хомо-, юго-, яхт-.

ЗАЕТО СЛОВООБРАЗУВАНЕ: НАСТАВКА -*ING* И БЛЕНДИНГ (ТЕЛЕСКОПИЯ) В БЪЛГАРСКИЯ ЕЗИК

(Резюме)

Статията разглежда някои страни от влиянието на английския език върху български в областта на словообразуването. Първата част поставя въпроса за възможното заемане на суфикса -*инг*, вследствие на заемането на значителен брой английски думи с този суфикс. Установява се реинтерпретирането на съответния деривационния модел, който в английски работи с глаголни основи, а в български – с номинални. Изследва се степента, до която процесът на заемане на суфикса е достигнал, като се коментира ограничената продуктивна употреба на суфикса в български. Предлага се и кратка съпоставка с руски, където процесът е по-напреднал. Втората част се занимава с явлението блендинг, което в своя прототипичен вид е новост за българския език. Анализиран е корпус от 79 думи, събрани от различни български източници. Специално внимание се отделя на т.н. хаплологични блендинги, като се възприема по-широко разбиране за понятието „припокриване” (overlap), позволяващо прекъснато припокриване. Отделя се внимание на ролята на лексикалното заемане и на превода. Докато при заемането на -*инг* става дума за конкретен суфикс и деривационен модел, при блендинг се наблюдава цялостно заемане на словообразувателно средство. Разглежданите явления се наблюдават и в други езици като проява на тенденцията към интернационализация и глобализация и силното влияние на английския език.

1. This section is essentially a re-writing of a paper published in Bulgarian (Стаменов 2012) but I have taken this opportunity to introduce considerable changes and additions. I am grateful to A. Bagasheva, L. Grozdanova, B. Parashkevov and A. Stoevsky, who read earlier drafts of (parts of) this article for their useful comments and suggestions. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. On the concept of affix-replacement see Bauer & Huddleston (2002: 1673-1674) See also Marchand (1969: 219) for the similar concept of “derivative alternation” and on paradigms in word-formation, see Štekauer (2014); Bagasheva, Stamenov, Kolarova (2013: 207-209); Stamenov and Kolarova (2014), among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Since Bulgarian verbs have no infinitive they are given in their 3rd person present tense form, which coincides with the present base of the verb (and not in the less revealing 1st person form, which traditionally serves as the basic citation form). In this I follow the practice of Radeva (Радева 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For a discussion of this problem see, for instance, Fowler (1965: 253-254). The title of the article there is significant: “hybridity and malformations”. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. On -*ant* in Bulgarian see Radeva (Радева 2007: 97). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See more on the productive verbal suffix -*ira*, characteristic of borrowed or international lexis, in Vankov (Ванков 1957) and Blagoeva and Kolkovska (Благоева, Колковска 2013: 300-301). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. On the role of -*ira* and -*uva* in the adaptation of borrowed material see also Благоева, Колковска (2013: 317). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See also Bagasheva and Stamenov (2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Mattiello (2013) is a whole book devoted the extra-grammatical morphology in English, which shows the recent interest in this type of phenomena. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. On blending as wordplay see Renner (2015). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. For various possible classifications of blends and different definitions resulting from them see e.g. Plag (2003: 121-126), Renner (2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The three formal criteria of double clipping, internal clipping and overlapping plus the semantic criterion of coordination are discussed in Renner (2006) in the context of adopting a prototypicality-based approach to blending. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The list has been expanded for this edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See a list of such prefixoids, which were still active in the period 1990-2010 in Pernishka *et al*. (Пернишка и др. 2010), and also in Appendix 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The general climate has been commented on in the context of Present-Day Bulgarian word-formation by Avramova (Аврамова 2003: 124-125,136-137). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For a detailed characterization of this latest period in the development of the Bulgarian language and the role of English in this process see also Krumova-Tsvetkova *et al*. (Крумова-Цветкова и др. 2013: 74-81, 282-283). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. On the role of the individual speaker’s competence and background see Kȍrtvélyessy & Štekauer (2014: 417-419). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)