Between *Abi* and *Propjes*:
Some remarks about clipping in English, German, Dutch and Swedish

Camiel Hamans, University of Amsterdam / Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

This paper discusses clipping in a few Germanic languages, English, Dutch, Swedish and German. It deals with older monosyllabic clipped forms as well as with recently borrowed disyllabic clipping patterns with final -o. Attention is also given to a more traditional pattern in which clipping goes hand in hand with diminutive or hypocoristic suffixation. The data discussed in this paper show on the one hand how output resemblances influence possible innovations and on the other hand how prosodic preferences may reinforce such innovations. It is also shown how crucial the role of the naive language user is when it comes to innovation. This language user borrows a coherent set of lexemes from a foreign language, subsequently finds out what possible system governs this set and introduces this pattern into his own language, where it becomes productive.

Keywords: *clipping, truncation, trochaic pattern, diminutives, hypocoristics*

1. Introduction

1.1 *Aim of the study*

In his introduction to morphology Bauer (2003: 40) deals with clipping briefly, which he defines as "the process of shortening a word without changing its meaning or part of speech". However, "clipping frequently does change the stylistic value of the word" (ibid.). Bauer puts forward a few examples as proof of the unpredictable and irregular way in which clipping operates:

(1) *binoc(ular)s*
    deli(catessen)
    (de)tec(tive)
    (head-)shrink(er)
    op(tical) art
    sci(ence) fi(ction)

Bauer's conclusion is that "since the parts that are deleted in clipping are not clearly morphs in any sense, it is not necessarily the case that clipping is a part of morphology, although it is a way of forming new lexemes" (ibid.). Although Bauer's opinion that clipping is unpredictable and unsystematic was shared for a long time, the rise of prosodic morphology has changed it. "Clippings have often been claimed to be irregular and highly idiosyncratic (for example Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994; Dressler 2000) but more recent work, for example Lappe (2007), has shown that such claims are ill-founded." (Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013: 190). Jamet (2009) presents an overview of both positions.

This contribution demonstrates that clipping is less unpredictable and irregular, when one does not concentrate on the parts which are deleted, but looks at the resulting parts. In addition, it will be shown that clipping, being "a way of forming new lexemes", should be

considered as part of morphology, something which one may expect of a process that together with other "non-rule governed" processes is responsible for an extremely large part of the vocabulary innovation in English (Bauer 2001: 95; cf. Mattiello 2013: 217). Clipping is not restricted to English, as shown below. However, certain types of clipping became popular and frequent only recently (Hamans 2008: 152–153).[1] Borrowing played an important role in this development. However, how this process of borrowing took place and how youth and popular culture played an essential role in it is already discussed in Hamans (2004b) and therefore will not be repeated here.

This paper compares the pattern of older monosyllabic clipped forms in some Germanic languages with recently borrowed disyllabic clipping patterns, especially recent clippings with final *-o.* Since it has been claimed that there is a parallelism between clipping on the one hand and hypocorisms and diminutives on the other hand (Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994; Lappe 2007), attention is also paid to corresponding hypocoristic and diminutive formations. Subsequently it is hypothesized that the language user may have borrowed a coherent set of disyllabic lexemes from a prestigious foreign language, American English, introduced this pattern into his own language, where it became a productive source of innovation. To show that clipping is not a process that is exclusive to Germanic languages, attention is also paid to clipping in French in the first part of this contribution.

Since the focus of this research is on prosodic aspects of clipping, no attention is paid to the semantic and pragmatic aspects (for these aspects, especially in comparison to diminutive formation, see Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994; Merlini Barbaresi 2001). The data discussed in this paper come from the literature about clipped forms discussed in this contribution and from focused internet searches. All the examples presented have been attested more than once. Since the focus of the analysis is on formal aspects of clipping, the acceptability of the forms found has not been checked, nor has it been investigated whether the new words are accepted in a wider circle or whether they reach a certain degree of frequency. What is at issue here is the productive capacity to generate new forms only (cf. Štekauer 2002: 101).

Although the data are analyzed from a diachronic perspective, no investigation has been done into the exact first attestations of these forms, since clipped forms are usually seen as colloquial or highly informal,[2] which makes it nearly impossible to date them with any precision.

1.2 *Structure of the study and of the argument*

This contribution is structured as follows:

A. Section 2 offers an overview of types of clippings as found in English, followed by an overview of the corresponding types in some other languages (3.1). Most of the examples presented in 2 and 3.1 appear to be monosyllabic. However, in some languages, for instance

---

[1] According to Fandrych (2008), clipping and other non-morphematic word formation processes, such as blending and the formation of acronyms, have been particularly productive in English since the second half of the 20th century. Steinhauer (2015: 353) adds: "Clipping as a word-formation process is seen as a phenomenon of the late 19th and the 20th and 21st century." Nübling (2001: 168) also noticed that clipping is a recent phenomenon.
[2] See Szymanek's (2005) remark: "The method of clipping (or shortening) stands behind another large portion of new colloquial vocabulary."

French and German, disyllabic clipped forms are much more common than monosyllabic clippings. A short presentation of the types found in these languages is presented in 3.2.

B. Section 4 is devoted to the analysis of hypocoristics and diminutives in German, English and Dutch, since it is often claimed that hypocoristics/diminutives and clippings can be analyzed in similar terms. In 4.1 German hypocoristics with final -*i* are discussed. The reason to start with German is that the hypocoristic forms resemble significantly the disyllabic German clippings in -*i* discussed in 3.2. It turns out that there are two types of hypocoristic forms: a. names or nouns that are first truncated to a monosyllable and to which subsequent suffixation is applied; b. monosyllabic names or nouns to which a suffix is added.Corresponding English hypocoristics/diminutives are then analyzed in 4.2. The outcome is similar to that of German. Finally, in 4.3 the question is raised whether Dutch and Swedish hypocoristics and diminutives show the same pattern. The answer is predominantly negative.

C. In section 5 a recently emerged new type of English clipping, i.e. disyllabic forms with final -*o*, is discussed (5.2). It is demonstrated that three stages or types can be distinguished:

    – pure truncation, ending in final -*o*;
    – truncation, followed by suffixation with -*o*;
    – no truncation; only suffixation of a monosyllabic word with -*o*.

This last type cannot be formally called clipping. However, since the formal and semantic features of this type resemble the formal and semantic features of the first two this last category will be taken together under the same label here. Moreover, since this last type seems to be the end point of a diachronic development in which the other two types can be described as earlier stages. In addition, these three stages or types appear to have one extra thing in common: they are trochaic.

    The final part of this section, 5.3, tries to answer the question of where this new suffix came from. In section 6 final -*o* in some other languages is discussed. Since the development of final -*o* to a full-fledged suffix is clearly visible in French, this section starts with an analysis of French clipped forms ending in -*o* (6.1). In 6.2 clippings ending in -*o* in Swedish, Dutch and German are discussed. The description of Swedish clipped forms with final -*o* in 6.2.1 starts with a brief exposé of clipping in Swedish. Subsequently, the -*o* clippings are described and analyzed. The analysis leads to a result similar to that for English. In 6.2.2 Dutch clipped forms with final -*o* are examined. A development which is the same as that found in English can be established. Subsequently, Dutch disyllabic clipped forms are compared with monosyllabic clippings. It appears that two stages can be distinguished:

    – an old CVC pattern;
    – a more recent trochaic pattern with final -*o*.

In 6.2.3 German disyllabic clipped forms with final -*o* are discussed. Although there seemed no need for a new pattern in German, because of the already existing and well-functioning pattern of disyllabic clipped forms ending in -*i*, a few examples with final -*o* are attested. Since the first final -*o* examples are borrowings, this development points to a social factor: the power of a prestigious language.

D. Section 7 returns to the prosodic factor – the emergence of the preferred disyllabic, trochaic word form – and describes how this change may have taken place, especially in Dutch.

E. In section 8 the study concludes by stressing the importance of three different factors. First comes reanalysis. The development in, for instance, French clearly shows how the emergence of a productive final segment *-o* started with the recognition of a common segment *-o* in clipped forms. The following stage is reanalysis of this segment, which resulted in the emergence of a new suffix *-o*. Secondly, it is demonstrated how important the social factor is. It is because of borrowing that the new suffix popped up in languages such as Swedish, German and Dutch. However, this borrowing could only become successful since the receiving languages had a (new) prosodic structure which facilitated the process of borrowing. Finally, the borrowed coherent set became a productive source for innovation in the receiving languages in a way in which reinterpretation played a comparable role as in French or the language from which the forms have been borrowed, American English. This process of innovation results in a predictable and regular word formation process and thus must be a part of regular morphology.

2. Systematicity of clippings

2.1 *Types of clipping*

Although Bauer (2003) suggests that clipping is highly unsystematic, Marchand (1969: 441–448) distinguishes three main types: back, fore and middle clipping. Mattiello's classification roughly follows Marchand's format.
　　Examples of these three types are:

(2) Back clipping
　　sax　　< *saxophone*
　　nip(s) < *nipples*
　　tute　　< *tutor*

(3) Fore clipping
　　coon　< *raccoon*
　　droid < *android*
　　vator < *elevator*

(4) Middle clipping,[3] or edge clipping
　　jams　< *pyjamas*
　　quiz　< *inquisitive*

---

[3] Actually, middle clipping is a confusing term, since it is not the middle part which is truncated, but just the two edges. However, middle clipping is used commonly for this kind of examples where the "middle of the word is retained" (Marchand 1969: 444; Steinhauer 2015: 357). When the middle part is really deleted, one may speak of median clipping (Jamet 2009: 10; Mattiello 2013: 75). However, examples such as *breathalyzer*, from *breath* and *analyzer*, make clear that one should rather describe this type of formations in terms of blending.

script < prescription

Instances of back clipping are numerous whereas examples of middle clipping are very rare (Mattiello 2013: 75). In addition, fore clipping is far less frequent than back clipping (Marchand 1969: 443; for a similar conclusion for German, see Balnat 2011: 44).[4] Usually the beginning of a word is retained, or in other words an ANCHOR-LEFT constraint operates. This constraint operates in all languages under discussion. Consequently, back clipping is also much more frequent than any other type in these languages (Mattiello 2013: 72).

The examples produced here are all nouns, which is not accidental. There exist a few examples of clipped adjectives, e.g. *fab* for *fabulous* and *preg* for *pregnant*, and for verbs *to dis* for *to disrespect*, but the vast majority of clippings are nouns.[5] What the examples also show is that there usually is a difference in register between the source word and the clipped form. Most of the resulting nouns belong to an informal or even slangy register or are part of a youth or student language or a specialized jargon. However, this is not an automatic result of clipping. See for instance:

(5) *sex   < sexual activity*
    movie < moving pictures
    pub   < public house

(6) *plane < aeroplane/airplane* (AE)
    bus   < omnibus
    varsity < university

(7) *flu   < influenza*
    fridge < refrigerator
    tec   < detective

These examples show that clipped forms which have been around for a longer period[6] may become accepted at a certain point in time and so rise in standing from an informal register to a more accepted one.

2.2 Quasi-unsystematic examples

Since clipping is often considered to be unpredictable and irregular, the examples presented in the literature usually look unsystematic. However, the distinctions proposed by Marchand are quite useful to distinguish between the unsystematic examples presented by for instance Bauer (2003: 40): *binocs* and *deli* are instances of back clipping. However, both nouns are disyllabic, whereas most of the examples given so far are monosyllabic. *Deli* is trochaic. Disyllabic trochaic clipped nouns will be discussed extensively later. In *binocs* stress is on

---

[4] Diachronically the picture is different. Minkova (2018) showed that clipping in early English is restricted to fore clipping, which peaked between 1300 and 1600 and then decreased quite sharply. Back clipping was practically unattested until the end of Middle English, whereupon it rapidly became the dominant model.

[5] In Swedish clipped adjectives and even verbs are much more common (Leuschner 2006; Nübling 2001; Nübling & Duke 2007).

[6] Unlike many of the clipped words that will be discussed below, most of the examples presented in (5)–(7) are already cited in the 19th and early 20th centuries. A word such as *varsity* even goes back to the 17th century.

the second syllable and the noun is therefore not trochaic. When we compare the form *binocs* with similar clipped nouns such as *celeb*, *exec*, *exam* and *rehab* then the stress pattern of these data enforces the conclusion that back clipping should retain the leftmost stressed syllable of the source word, even if this syllable bears secondary stress only.[7] The *s* in *binocs* is a quasi-plural suffix, just as in *jams* and *specs*, and does not play any role in clipping.

The examples *tec* and *shrink* can be classified as instances of middle clipping, although the process that operated in *shrink* can also be described as normal back clipping of the part *shrinker*. In *op art*, only the word *optical* has been truncated. Here again standard back clipping applied. In Bauer's last example, *sci fiction* or *sci fi*, the first or both source words are truncated and as in most of the other examples of clipping from right to left, so once again do we have a form of back clipping.[8]

The examples presented so far show that: (i) the taxonomy of clippings leads to three subtypes, of which one, back clipping is most frequent in contemporary English; (ii) this taxonomy does not offer a clear and consistent pattern, which can describe all subtypes.

3. Clipping in some other languages than English

3.1 *Monosyllabic clipped forms*

As said, clipping is not exclusive to English. It also appears in other languages. Here, data from a few Western European languages[9] are presented. Since middle clipping is again very rare, only examples of back and fore clipping will be presented. As said before back clipping is much more frequent than fore clipping; this is also true in the languages discussed here:

German back clipping
(8) *Bib < Bibliothek* 'library'
    Lok < Lokomotive 'locomotive'
    Rep < Republikaner 'republican'

        fore clipping[10]
(9) *Karte   < Postkarte* 'postcard'
    Platte   < Schallplatte 'record'
    Schirm < Regenschirm 'umbrella'

Swedish[11] back clipping

---

[7] Assuming that the preferred foot type for English is predominantly trochaic, the first syllable in these examples must be unparsed. The structure of *binocs* is *bi(nocs)*.

[8] In *sci-fi* truncation is accompanied by a change in pronunciation of the second part from [fɪ] in *fiction* to [faɪ]. The same happened in *hi-fi*. The reason is analogy or rhyme with the diphthong of the first syllable.

[9] Although clipping in Spanish is well-documented (see for instance Rainer 1993: 679–701 and Piñeros 1998), no examples from Spanish will be presented and discussed here. The Spanish system is more or less similar to the French one.

[10] Steinhauer (2015: 358) does not consider the examples of German fore clipping presented here as clipped words, since truncation takes place at a word boundary. According to her fore clipping is very rare in German. The only example she gives is *Schland* from *Deutschland* 'Germany'.

[11] Two explanatory notes should be added to the Swedish data: The normal pronunciation of the first syllable of the Swedish word *pensionat* is with a final [ŋ] and with a nasalized vowel resembling [ɑ]; the spelling of the

(10) *livs* < *livsmedelbutik* 'grocery'
     mens < *menstruation* 'period'
     pang < *pensionat* 'boarding house'

       fore clipping
(11) *bil*   < *automobil* 'car'
     nalle < *yuppienalle* 'cell phone'
     noja < *paranoia* 'paranoia'

Dutch back clipping
(12) *buur* < *buurman* 'neighbor'
     Jap < *Japanner* 'Japanese'
     lab   < *laboratorium* 'laboratory'

      fore clipping
(13) *bam*   < *boterham* 'sandwich'[12]
     bus   < *omnibus* 'bus'
     tuurlijk[13] < *natuurlijk* 'naturally'

French back clipping
(14) *bac* < *baccalauréat* 'baccalaureate'
     fac < *faculté* 'faculty'
     frig < *frigidaire* 'morgue'

      fore clipping
(15) *blème* < *problème* 'problem'
     cart   < *rencart/d* 'date'
     dwich < *sandwich* 'sandwich'

Most of the examples presented here are monosyllabic clippings. Since back clipping is much more frequent than fore clipping, it appeared impossible to find enough monosyllabic examples of fore clipping. Although the output forms are monosyllabic, this does not mean that the syllable which constitutes the resultant clipped noun matches with a syllabic constituency in the source word. For instance, phonologically, *Japanner* in (12) should be

clipped form is a phonetic transcription thereof. The example *nalle* is a shortening of *yuppienalle* 'teddy bear'. Metaphorically this form developed a new meaning, 'cell phone.'

[12] The form *bam* looks as if the middle segment *oterh* has been deleted. Such a process, which is extremely rare, is known as mid-clipping, median clipping or contraction. Median clipping, of course, is a way to describe the resulting form *bam*, just as *proctor* from *procurator* in English (Mattiello 2013: 75). However, it is much more attractive to describe *bam* as a process of fore clipping, which should have resulted in *ham*. This form should have coincided with an existing noun *ham* 'ham'. Since clipped forms should be as transparent as possible semantically, because of their required semantic retrievability (Hamans 2008: 156–157), the clipped form *ham* is excluded, as it is a clear instance of blocking. Thus, for the onset of the output, another consonant of the source word must be selected. *Tam* and *ram* are existing Dutch words, so they are also blocked. Consequently, the only remaining option is *bam*.

[13] *Tuurlijk* is an adverb. There are a few more examples of nominal fore clipping, such as *net* < *internet*, *cello* < *violoncello*, *bas* < *contrabas* 'double bass' and *fax* < *telefax*. However, these forms may have been taken over directly from other languages as clipped nouns.

divided into *ja·pan·er* and *Republikaner* in (8) into *re·pu·bli·ka·ner*, which shows again that clipping does not take into account the syllabic or morphological structure of the source word. It is the well-formedness of the output which counts. That is why one of the effects of clipping may be the resyllabification of the segments of the source word.[14]

3.2 Disyllabic clipped forms in German and French

Whereas English and Dutch prefer monosyllabic clipped forms (Antoine 2000a: xxx; Fisiak & Hamans 1997: 161), disyllabic forms are much more frequent in French and German[15] (Antoine 2000b; Hamans 2004b: 164; Balnat 2011: 41; Nübling 2001: 177–178). Most of the French and German examples presented in (14–15) and (8–9) are commonly and frequently used words; however, they form a minority within the total of clippings of these two languages. Therefore, a few examples of the more common German and French pattern will be presented here.

German final *-i*
(16) *Abi*   *< Abitur* 'finals'
       Krimi *< Kriminalroman* 'detective story'
       Uni   *< Universität* 'university'

         final *-o*
(17) *Demo* *< Demonstration* 'demonstration'
       Kino *< Kinematograph* 'cinema'
       Tacho *< Tachograph* 'tachograph'

In French disyllabic clipped forms ending in tensed vowels are quite common, although clipped forms with final *-o* are the most frequent. Fore clipping is much less frequent than back clipping. Therefore, the examples of fore clipping are supplemented with some non-disyllabic clipped forms.

French   final *-a*
(18) *rata* *< ratatouille* 'ratatouille
       fana *< fanatique* 'zealot'
       prépa *< préparation* 'preparation'

         final *-é*
(19) *ciné* *< cinéma* 'cinema'
       pédé *< pédéraste* 'gay'
       récré *< récréation* 'playtime'

---

[14] It goes without saying that the output forms should be well-formed possible words of the language. In addition, the output forms should be large enough so that their source words are retrievable (see Footnote 12). Moreover, since the clipped forms should be as transparent as possible, ambiguous output forms are disfavored (for an example, see Footnote 17).
[15] However, Ronneberger-Sibold (1995: 423) and Nübling (2001: 185–186) show that, despite an overwhelming majority of disyllabic clippings, the number of monosyllabic clippings still accounts for almost one-third of the total number.

final -*u*

(20) *alu   < aluminium* 'aluminium'
    Sécu < Sécurité Sociale 'social security'

    final -*y*

(21) *psy   < psychologue* 'psychologist'
    poly < polycopié 'handout'

    final -*o*

(22) *ado   < adolescent* 'adolescent'
    braco < braconnier 'poacher'
    catho < catholique 'Catholic'

(23) *aristo*[16] *< artistocrate* 'aristocrat'
    collabo < collaborateur 'collaborator'
    météo   < météorologie 'meteorology'

Final closed syllables are also possible:[17]

(24) *alloc   < allocation* 'benefit'
    appart   < appartement 'apartment'
    compil(e) < compilation 'compilation'

(25) *imper < imperméable* 'raincoat'
    manif < manifestation 'demonstration'
    super < supermarché 'supermarket'

Unlike in the previously discussed languages, feet are right-dominant in French – they are not trochaic, but iambic. That is why forms as those presented in (23) are acceptable in French. Back clipping remains, of course, left-anchored, but may stop when a well-formed stressed foot has been reached. The first syllables simply remain unparsed, which obviously violates the standard MAX constraint.[18] However, in (24) and (25), there is no violation of MAX, and back clipping leads once again to well-formed iambic stress feet.[19]

---

[16] As far as our research shows, *aristo* is one of the first clipped forms that is attested in French. It goes back to the turbulent times just before the French Revolution of 1789.

[17] Ronneberger-Sibold (1995: 425) notes that, in French, shortenings resulting in open syllables are less preferred than in German, "whereas the diachronic development of French has been determined by a tendency towards open syllables (and a tendency towards shortening the word forms)". An explanation may be that "if the final consonant of the clipped form would have been truncated, a homonym clash would arise." For instance, a clipped form such as **mani* could have resulted from the nouns *manifestation* and *manipulation*, which correctly produce *manif* and *manip* as clipped forms without truncation of the final consonant. Such a homonymic clash would have happened in 2/3 of the cases of Ronneberger-Sibold's corpus. German just has a preference for disyllabic clippings ending in an open syllable with a final long vowel (Nübling 2001: 177–178).

[18] MAX is a constraint which prevents deletions since it claims that all input segments have to appear in the output. MAX is the successor of the earlier constraint PARSE.

In *collaborateur* clipping could have resulted in a well-formed clipped noun *colla*. However, this form is semantically non-easily traceable to *collaborateur*, since a similar form *colla* may be truncated from *collation* 'snack', *collage* 'collage', *collant* 'tights', etc. As this and other examples show, semantic transparency of the output form also plays a significant role in clipping. However, avoidance of ambiguity is not an absolute result

Because of this difference in foot preference, French will not be discussed exhaustively here. Furthermore, French does not have much direct influence on neighboring languages anymore. French data will only be adduced to show that the processes which operate in the Germanic languages under discussion also appear in other languages.

While the difference in foot preference may explain the difference in preferred template for clippings – monosyllabic for English and Dutch against disyllabic for French – this cannot explain why disyllabic forms[20] are much more frequent than monosyllabic forms in German. This problem will be discussed hereafter.

Although traditional Dutch and English clipped nouns are mainly monosyllabic, most recent clipped forms in English and Dutch exhibit a disyllabic trochaic pattern. How this change from accepted minimal word template for clipped forms into a binary syllabic trochaic pattern occurred will be discussed in the remainder of this contribution.

As the examples (16)–(23) show, a number of clipped forms share a same final vowel, respectively *-o*, *-a*, *-i*, *-u*. Such a common segment plays an important role in the theory of distinctive morphology of Zabrocki (1962) and is called a distinctive morpheme or *confusivum*. Since the common parts in word lists such as those presented here are often much longer than one phoneme, Zabrocki introduced the term *distinctive morpheme*. When a certain confusivum, for instance *-o*, becomes frequent in similar environments and also shares semantic or other formal aspects, it can become psychologically real and subsequently claim a role in the production of new word forms, as will be demonstrated in this study (cf. Awedyk & Hamans 1992).

In this section the most common patterns of clippings in French, German and Dutch have been discussed. It appears that: (i) German and French share a disyllabic pattern with an final open syllable, whereas Dutch traditionally prefers CVC-clipped forms; (ii) such a disyllabic word form with a final open syllable filled with a same long vowel may lead to the recognition of a confusivum by the language user, when that identical final part turns up frequently.

4. Hypocoristics and diminutives

4.1 *German hypocoristics*

The German examples presented so far are all rather recent, which does not mean that clipping is a young phenomenon in German. On the contrary, Balnat & Kaltz (2006: 199) produce a couple of old examples such as *Lanz* from *Lanzknecht* 'footman, soldier' and *Ländi*

---

of the transparency constraint – see for instance the English clipped form *vet*, which corresponds to the two nouns *veteran* and *veterinary*. As with other homonyms the context normally makes clear which meaning is meant. Since this contribution mainly concentrates on formal aspects, the semantic transparency constraint is not discussed here in detail.

[19] Why French accepts monosyllabic forms such as *crim(e)* 'criminal police' and *fric* 'moolah' from *fricassee* 'ragout' and the examples presented in (14), which violate a couple of constraints, will not be discussed here, since this contribution does not aim at a full description of French clipped words.

[20] In the literature about clipped forms in Swedish one can also find a few instances of recent disyllabic clippings: *mara* (< *maraton* 'marathon'), *mille* (< *miljon* 'million'), *moppe* (< *moped* 'motorbike') and *rehab* (< *rehabilitering* 'rehab').

from *Landjäcker* 'policeman', which have been attested as early as the 16th century.[21] The fact that there are hardly any data available for older periods of German is most likely due to the informal register to which clippings usually belong. Consequently, the standard written sources of older stages of German on which the handbooks are based hardly contain any clipped forms. In Modern German, however, the shortening of words is a normal and frequent process (Angst 2000: 210). Balnat (2011: 287) even claims that the productivity of clipping started to increase around 1900. From this moment on, "it is impossible to imagine life without clipped forms". As we will see later, this is in conformity with findings in other languages. However, this does not imply that clipping was an exotic and infrequent process before 1900. It is not well-attested and just as many of the recent clippings never exceed the threshold level to get more accepted,[22] and thus may disappear again, older clippings may have got lost and never made their way to the recorded lexicon.

Another interesting aspect of the examples Balnat & Kaltz quote is the final *-i* in *Ländi*. As has been shown in (16), final *-i* is quite common[23] in German clippings, much more than in Swedish or Dutch (cf. Leuschner 2006, 2008). In (16) the vowel *i* is part of the source words, whereas in *Landjäcker* there is no vowel but a glide [*j*].

Balnat (2011: 75–76) quotes a few other early examples with final *-i*, which originate in Southern German, especially in Bavarian German: *Spezi* from *Spezialfreund* 'special friend', with *i* from its source word, and *Gspusi* from *Gespons* 'sweetheart', with added *-i*. This final *i,* which is frequently used in the formation of names in Bavarian, "became popular again in the 1950s and later, especially in the formation of first names" (Balnat 2011: 76). Hamans (2015: 28–29) discusses examples such as:

(26) *Heini*   hypocoristic form, from *Heinrich*
     Ul(l)i   *Ulrich*
     Peti   *Peter*
     Willi   *Wilhelm*

(27) *Schumi*, nickname of racing driver Michael Schumacher
     Lewi, nickname of film director Hans-Jürgen Lewandowski
     Gorbi, nickname of the Russian leader Michael Gorbachev
     Honni, nickname of the DDR leader Erich Honnecker

(28) *Schmitti*, nickname of artist Jürgen Schmitt
     Krammi, nickname of poker player Markus Kramm.

---

[21] Greule (2007) produces instances of clipped names, which have been attested much earlier than the 16th century.

[22] As the two corpus descriptions of Mattiello (2013, 2017) show, a great number of occasionally formed clipped words (and blends) disappear quickly. In order to become accepted, a word seems to have to reach a certain frequency and to exceed an unspecified threshold level (Seuren 2013).

[23] So far, there are no extensive corpora of clipped forms in different languages. However, a quick search through an internet corpus of German *Kurzwörter* 'clipped words' results in a great number of clipped words with final *-i* (http://www.mediensprache.net/de/basix/oekonomie/kurzwort/liste_kw.aspx). Köpcke (2002: 303), which is an overview of final *-i* clippings and *-i* derivatives in Modern German, describes a corpus of 205 *-i* formations, of which 42 can be described as clipped forms. For Dutch Hamans (1997a) and Hinskens (2001) only produced a very small number of corresponding Dutch examples. There are hardly any comparable Swedish clipped words.

What the examples in (26) show is that the adding of the hypocoristic suffix *-i* results in a preferred form, since names such as *Hein*, *Ul*, *Pe(e)t* or *Will* are virtually excluded in German. That is why clipping here must preferably be followed by suffixing. This is the same in (27).[24] In Modern German, just as in Dutch, Swedish and English, the trochee is the unmarked metrical pattern and this explains why in the examples of (26) and (27) a monosyllabic clipped form is dispreferred. The examples of (28), which are not instances of truncation followed by *-i* suffixation, but of *-i* suffixation only, show how dominant the trochaic character of Modern German is – it can even affect the form of names. Because of their trochaic pattern *Schmitti* and *Krammi* appear to be preferred and thus better forms of colloquial Modern German than *Schmitt* and *Kramm*.

Balnat (2011: 76) explains the productivity of *-i* formations by pointing to the immense popularity of English and especially of English names ending in *-y/-ie* in the 1950s in Germany, which was partly occupied by British and American troops. Even a movie star such as Rosemarie Albach chose a first name with an American flavor as her stage name – Romy Schneider,[25] with the then fashionable Anglo-American suffix *-y*. Köpcke (2002: 294) disagrees with this explanation since most of the new borrowed clipped forms do not have a parallel full form in English. He points, just as Greule (2006: 424–430) does, to the *-i* hypocoristic pattern, discussed before, as a starting point. However, what was even more important for the success of this new pattern is that Modern German is a predominantly trochaic language. This fact, already mentioned by Féry (1997), who even speaks about *Trochäuszwang* 'trochee coercion', greatly facilitated this process of suffixation. In addition, Köpcke (2002:300) demonstrates how important the trochaic character of Modern German is by pointing to the stress shift in clipped forms such as *Ábi* from *Abitúr* 'graduation from high school' and *Stúdi* from *Studént* 'student'.

This process is not restricted to names only, as the examples in (29) show:

(29) *Bubi*   < *Bube* 'boy'
    Mutti   < *Mutter* 'mother'
    Omi   < *Oma* 'grandmother'
    Vati   < *Vater* 'father'

In these examples clipping operated first, and then was followed by suffixation, which appears to be obligatory in the examples *Mutti*, *Omi* and *Vati* as the unacceptability of *Mut*, *Om* and *Vat* demonstrates. Here, just as in the examples (26)–(28), the ending *-i* expresses endearment, which is not surprising, knowing that the *-i* suffix originally is a diminutive suffix (Würstle 1992: 54).[26] However, final *-i* became so frequent in informal language that the speakers of German gradually came to the implicit conclusion that *-i* was no longer only a

---

[24] Monosyllabic clipped names are not excluded in German – see for instance *Hans* or *Gert/Gerd* (cf. Kürschner 2014). However trochaic disyllabic names are dominant. For standard Dutch it is different: monosyllabic clipped names are quite common and fully acceptable. However, in the informal slang of traditional Amsterdam, disyllabic names are preferred: *Hansie* instead of *Hans* and *Pietje* instead of *Piet*.

[25] Her mother's name was (Magda) Schneider.

[26] Diminutives belong to what is usually called evaluative morphology. Quite often they not only express smallness but also familiarity and a positive or negative attitude towards the referent (see for instance Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994 and Schneider 2013). Diminutive suffixes are widely used to express endearment. See for instance Polish, in which a plurality of diminutive suffixes is used to form common first names, for instance the suffix *-ek*: *Dariusz > Darek*, *Sławomir > Sławek* and *Tadeusz > Tadek*. Note that suffixation follows clipping here, just as in (26) and (27) and in the English and Dutch examples which follow.

marker of endearment, but it was at the same time a marker of possible clipped forms. Consequently, the suffix *-i* could be used in examples such as:

(30) *Fundi* < *Fundamentalist* 'fundamentalist'
 Ossi < *Ostdeutsche* 'East-German'
 Profi < *professioneller Sportler* 'professional sportsman'
 Studi < *Student* 'student'

Again, clipping and subsequent suffixation operated here. However, it is no longer the feature *endearment* which is prominent here. Other semantic aspects of the diminutive suffix prevail, which is even more visible in:

(31) *Blödi* 'stupid person' *blöd* adj. 'stupid'
 Gifti 'junk' *Gift* noun 'drugs'
 Hirni 'intellectual' *Hirn* noun 'brain'
 Schwuli 'gay' (noun) *schwul* adj. 'gay'

The examples of (31) can best be compared to those of (28). In neither case does clipping operate. It is only a matter of suffixation. However, the source words to which this suffixation process applies are monosyllabic. In this respect, they correspond with the clipped bases in (26), (27), (29) and (30). The result is again the preferred German phonological word, a disyllabic trochee.

 In addition, these examples show that the semantic value of *-i* differs from the meaning of the source word. When the source word has a pejorative meaning, the suffix *-i* cannot change the overall meaning. Finally, examples (26)–(31) show that the suffix *-i* tends to imply the feature [+human],[27] whereas the final *-i* which originates from the source word, as in (16), does not include such a feature.

 What the examples discussed here show is that two factors determine clipping in German:

– The Modern German preference for the unmarked metrical word pattern, the trochee, explains why most clippings are disyllabic. Unfortunately, there are not enough data available from earlier stages of German. Therefore, it is impossible to analyze older German clippings in detail. Whether in earlier stages of German the most frequent form of clipping also resulted in disyllabic forms or possibly in monosyllabic clipped forms is impossible to say. However, the instances of early name clippings discussed by Greule (2007) are often monosyllabic, which suggests that older patterns of clippings may have had a preference for monosyllabic forms, just as in English and Dutch, as will be shown in 4.2, 4.3 and 6.2.2.

– The frequency of final *-i* in clipped contexts brings the language user to the idea that forms ending in this final segment are associated and subsequently that this final *-i* has a special function and meaning. After all, many clipped nouns have one and only one formal aspect in common, that is this final *-i*. Such a common segment is called a confusivum by Zabrocki (1962). This confusivum subsequently becomes the most prominent marker of German

---

[27] This implication is not absolute, as a counterexample such as *compi* for *computer* shows. However, Köpcke's (2002: 303) figures confirm this tendency.

clipped forms. Since part of the meaning of this marker *-i* is that it signals informality and a certain degree of endearment (or other semantic aspects of the meaning of diminutive suffixes), these aspects may get more prominence and so the marker *-i* can also be used without clipping the base.

Final *-i* is not the only suffix which can be added to clipped forms in German, although it is the normal pattern (Féry 1997; Wiese 2001). Very recently final *-o* came up and displayed a similar behavior. However, before we can discuss this most recent development, we must first take a look at an English and a Dutch suffix more or less corresponding to German *-i.*

4.2 *English hypocoristics with final* -ie/-y[28]

In English one can easily find similar examples. The difference in spelling between *-ie* and *-y* has no systematic function or special meaning.

(32)	*telly*	*< television set*	(33)	*Aussie*	*< Australian*
	movie	*< moving pictures*		*commy*	*< communist*
	footy	*< football*		*nunky*	*< (n)uncle*

(34)	*hottie*	*< hot*	(35)	*slappy*	*< slap dick*
	dearie	*< dear*		*junkie*	*< junk*
	cutie	*< cute*		*hippie*	*< hip*

The difference between (34) and (35) lies in their connotation. The nouns in (34) are usually evaluated positively, whereas those in (35) are clearly negative. As said before this is normal for diminutives.[29]

Most of these forms are highly informal and date from the 20th century. However, a now obsolete form such as *nunky* was already attested in the 18th century, which shows that the process of truncation followed by suffixation in *-y* has a much longer history than only our informal days. Examples such as *junky* and *hippie* go back to the 1920s and 1960s[30] respectively.

---

[28] Lappe (2007) discusses English clipped forms and hypocoristics in detail. Her point of departure is opposite to the analysis presented here. Hamans (2012) offers a discussion of her analysis. Merlini Barbaresi (1999) offers an analysis of the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the *-ie/-y* suffix. For a comparable, but considerably less frequent ending *-er(s)*, see Footnote 39 and the literature mentioned there.

[29] Antoine (2000b: xxxi–xxxii) discusses the formal and semantic aspects of final *-ie/-y* at length: "*-ie/-y* is a true suffix, with a hypocoristic meaning, which was first used in Scots; […] it was used very early in combination with clipping (*hussy*, *chappy*). This suffix is commonly used with clippings of Christian names (*Andy*, *Cathy*, *Eddie*, *Ronnie,* etc.) or of family names (*Fergie, Gorby, Schwarzy*, etc.). It is also used in the coining of nicknames (*Fatty*, *Froggie*, etc.) or of endearing terms (*dearie*, *sweetie*, etc.) […]. It can serve, as in the case of proper nouns, to obtain a hypocoristic diminutive (e.g. *pressie*, *shortie*, *woodie*, *biccy*, *chewie*, *hottie*, *preemie*) though such words can also be used humorously, or ironically, or even pejoratively. It is to be noted further that the suffix *-ie/-y* is added to clippings of words that already have negative overtones – the change of ending often results in an even more pejorative word; *-ie/-y* thus serves to enhance the negative trait in words that designate individuals whose social or political behaviour is frowned upon by the speaker, character traits or behaviours that are deemed to be and presented as pathological ones. The political lexicon offers instances of this, with words like *commie*, *lefty*, *rightie*, but other fields also do."

[30] *Hippie* was already attested in the 1940s, but the word only became common from the 1960s onwards.

What the data presented here demonstrate is a process similar to the one sketched above for German clipped nouns. First, clipping to a monosyllabic base form and subsequent suffixation go hand in hand, whereas later suffixation without prior clipping has become possible with monosyllabic adjectives and nouns.

However, there is one big difference between the German and the English process. There are hardly any clipped forms in English ending in a *-ie/-y* that originate in a clipped source word. One of the few examples is South-African English *combi/kombi* 'minibus', from *combination*.[31] The word *combi* itself, as in *combi oven*, also from *combination*, is of course one of the few examples with an original *-i* as well. So, influence from or reinforcement through a standard clipping process ending in *-i* is hard to imagine for English.

In examples (32) and (33) suffixation is obligatory after truncation, just as in most of the following examples of (36) and (37). Monosyllabic clipped forms such as **tel*, **Aus*, **nunk*, etc. are excluded. However, monosyllabic clipped forms as such were not excluded, as we will see. One may call the examples in (32–33) and the examples that follow in (36–36a) lexicalized, which they now are, but that does not explain how these forms have been "derived". Both clipping and suffixation must have occurred to produce the examples presented here.

As in German, English hypocoristics may be formed by truncation followed by suffixation:

(36) *Andy*   *< Andrew*   (36a) *Aggie*   *< Agnes*
      Gerry   *< Gerald*   *Izzy*   *< Isabella*
      Frankie *< Franklin*   *Vicky*   *< Victoria*

It is clear that the predominantly trochaic character of English must have influenced the process – see for instance the stress shift in *Austrálian > Aússie* or *Victória > Vícky*. However, the unmarked trochaic pattern does not play a role with respect to stress shift only. The prosody also determined the overall outcome of the process: the preference for disyllabic trochaic forms prevented a monosyllabic output, such as **tel*, **Aus*, **nunk*, **And*, **Ag*, etc. The preference for disyllabic trochaic forms does not go so far as to trigger the removal of all existing monosyllabic words or names from the language. [32]

Semantically the suffix does not add much to the forms. The clipped form itself has already an endearment, familiar or similar reading, which may be the reason why the suffix *-ie/-y* can be added so easily to fulfill the prosodic preference:

(37) *Chevrolet > Chev > Chevy*
      cigarette > cig   > ciggie
      Stephen   > Steve > Stevie

Semantically, there is not much difference between *Chev* and *Chevy* or between *cig* and *ciggie* or *Steve* and *Stevie*. However, it is not accidental that the difference between *Jack* and *Jacky* is that between male and female (see for instance the correspondence with the Dutch

---

[31] The first *combis/kombis* were produced by Volkswagen and were already called *Kombi* in German. These vehicles in which passengers and cargo could be transported – which is why they were called combination vehicles – became quite popular among hippies.

[32] As we will see in Section 7, the preferred minimal word form was not always trochaic. Existing monosyllabic clipped forms or names, such as *pub*, *gin*, *Will* and *Jack*, simply stayed in the lexicon.

words for 'boy' and 'girl', respectively *jongen*, from the adjective *jong* 'young' used as a noun, and originating from this noun plus a case ending, and *meisje*, from a diminutive of the noun *meid* 'maiden'; on the sexist use of diminutives see Schneider & Schneider 1991). This aspect will not be discussed further here since this study focuses on the formal aspects of clipping and diminution.

Unfortunately, there are not enough data available to sketch the historic changes in detail and with certainty. What is known is that a form such as *cig* turned up in the late 19th century, whereas *ciggie* made its entrance only more than half a century later, around 1960. A well-known form such as *hanky* (from *handkerchief*), however, also dates back to the late 19th century. This brings us to the assumption that the change from clipping only to clipping followed by suffixation is not an abrupt change but a gradual process of diffusion of innovation.

What is clear is that the few instances of early historic clipping that have been recorded are mainly monosyllabic.[33] The few disyllabic forms are rather new and mostly trochaic. Marchand (1969: 449) presents the following data:

(38) *coz*   < *cousin* (1559)   *gent*   < *gentleman* (1564)
     mas   < *master* (1575)   *chap*   < *chapman* (1577)
     winkle < *periwinkle* (1585)   *cock*   < *cockboat* (Shakespeare)
     van   < *vanguard* (17th c.) *quack* < *quacksalver* (17th c.)
     hock   < *hockamore* (17th c.) *mob*   < *mobile* (17th c.)
     cit   < *citizen* (17th c.)   *phiz*   < *physiognomy* (17th c.)
     wig   < *periwig* (17th c.)   *sub*   < *sub-word* (17th c.)

The only three-syllable clipped form Marchand quotes from the 17th century is *plenipo* from *plenipotentiary*. Here the part *potentiary* is clipped and the result thereof is a word consisting of a monosyllabic open syllable *po*. Another example Marchand gives is trochaic *brandy*, from *brandywine* (17th c.). Here possible confusion with the existing word *brand* 'fire, flame' may have played a role. However, it shows that disyllabic trochaic clipped forms were not excluded.

For the 18th century Marchand produces about ten examples of which two are disyllabic: the trochaic *confab*, from *confabulation*, and *consols*, from *consolidated securities*. Of course, one does not have a clue how *consols* was pronounced. Nowadays two pronunciations are accepted.[34] The first with stress on the initial syllable, which results in a trochaic pattern, the other one with tress on the second syllable. Consequently this leads to a first syllable that may have been heavily reduced but anyhow is theoretically not parsed.

Subsequently Marchand (1969: 449) quotes extensively from Swift's remarks in his *Introduction to Polite Conversation* (1738). Swift's remarks show how fashionable clipping was in his days:

> *The only Invention of late Years, which hath any way contributed towards Politeness*
> *in Discourse, is that of abbreviating or reducing Words of many Syllables into one, by*
> *lopping of the rest… Poz for Positive, Mobb for Mobile, Phizz for Physiognomy, Rep*

---

[33] Kreidler (1979) shows that traditional English clipped forms are monosyllabic.
[34] http://www.dictionary.com/browse/consols. The digital Oxford Dictionary gives only a pronunciation with stress on the first syllable: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/consols.

for Reputation, Plenipo for Plenipotentiary, Incog for Incognito, Hyppo or Hippo for Hypocondriacks, Bam for Bamboozle, and Bamboozle for God knows what.

One can hardly imagine a better testimony to the historicity of clipping. Marchand also refers to examples from the 19th century and it is here where one comes across the first disyllabic forms ending in *-ie/-y* next to a plurality of monosyllabic forms and a first example ending in *-o*, *photo*. Marchand's 19th century *-ie/-y* data include:[35]

(39) *movie*, *talkie*,[36] *speakie*, *Jerry*, *commie*, *bolshie*

In addition, Marchand (1969) refers to Mencken's long list (1945) of "super-coinages" where one finds among countless other examples clipped nouns such as *pix* for *pictures*, *nabe* for *neighborhood*, *intro* for *introduction*, *preem* for *premier* and *ork* for *orchestra*. Most of these neologisms are found in popular American magazines of the first half of the 20th century. Marchand cannot help saying that the language of these magazines was "far ahead of normal usage", so as to emphasize the informal character of clipping on the one hand, and the growing popularity of the phenomenon, at least in printed form, on the other hand.

What the English data presented here show is that:

– clipping is an old phenomenon. Unfortunately, it is scarcely documented because it belongs to informal, spoken registers. However, scrutiny of dramatic texts and informal sources such as letters may possibly reveal more data.

– there seems to be an ongoing change in clipping preference. It looks like it starts with monosyllabic clipping first, followed by monosyllabic clipping plus *-ie/-y* suffixation and finally also simple *-ie/-y* suffixation without prior clipping. The upcoming preference for a trochaic pattern plays an important role in this change, as we will see later.

– the frequency of *-ie/-y* suffixation, after clipping to monosyllabic base forms, brings the language user to the conclusion that this suffix is not only a diminutive marker with all possible connotations, but also signals the informality, which is a characteristic feature of short, clipped forms. Subsequently the suffix can be used, as in the case of *deary*, to mark these new word forms as informal and affective, or in the case of *junkie* as informal and disapproving.

4.3 *Dutch diminutives with final* -je

The other two Germanic languages discussed here, Swedish and Dutch, do not have a suffix like German *-i* or English *-ie/-y*. Swedish hardly uses diminutive suffixes; diminutive forms in Swedish are instead expressed mainly by compounding or prefixation (Olofsson 2015). For Dutch, the situation is a bit more complicated (Hamans 2015: 30–31).

Hypocoristics ending in *-ie* are quite common in Dutch:

---

[35] Of the two "very early" examples presented by Antoine (2000b: xxxi), *hussy*, from Middle English *husewif*, indeed is very old (early 15th century). The other one is *chappy*. However, *chap* is a late 15th-century clipped form. *Chappy* only became popular in the 19th century.

[36] It may be that *talkie* and *speakie* are not really clippings, but instances of suffixation of a verb accompanied by conversion. Most likely they are formed analogous to *movie*.

(40) *Alie*   *< Adelheid*
     Pleuni(e)   *< Apollonia*
     Nellie/Nelly *< Cornelia* or *Petronella*

(40a) *Bennie/Benny*   *< Benjamin* or *Bernhard*
      Freddie/Freddy *< Alfred* or *Frederik*
      Harrie/Harry   *< Hendrik*

The names under (40) refer to women, whereas the names in (40a) are exclusively male. The first two names in (40) have a regional flavor, whereas those under (40a) are more widely acceptable. It is not by accident that these male names also appear in an orthographic form that suggests an English influence. The same can be said about the form *Nelly*. A spelling *-y* is very un-Dutch, since the grapheme <y> is not part of the Dutch orthographic system. The corresponding Dutch grapheme is <ij>, which stands for the diphthong /ɛi/.
 The regional character of hypocoristics ending in *-ie* corresponds with the highly regional and informal connotation of the diminutive suffix *-ie* in examples such as:[37]

(41) *bakkie*   Standard Dutch *bakje*   'little bin'
     tassie   Standard Dutch *tasje*   'little bag'
     stekkie Standard Dutch *stekje* 'little cutting of a plant'

Since the *-ie* suffix is considered highly regional and highly substandard, it never found its way into Standard Dutch. Therefore Dutch *-ie* cannot be compared to corresponding German or English endings.
 However, the standard Dutch diminutive *-(t)je* may show a few examples which can be compared to the German and English data presented above:

(42) *bammetje*[38] *boterham*   'sandwich'
     pootje   *podagra*   'gout'
     propjes[39] *propaedeuse* 'propaedeutics'

In all three examples the suffix does not have a diminutive meaning, but it signals informality. In these examples clipping operated first, and was immediately followed by

---

[37] The examples in (42), which are found in popular substandard songs and in an ironic cabaret text, are extensively discussed in Hamans (1997b).

[38] For a discussion of the clipping of *boterham* to *bam*, see Footnote 12.

[39] A paragogic *-s* is quite normal in informal clipped forms. See for instance English *champers* for *champagne* instead of the normal suffix *-er*, as in *sanger* for *sandwich*. An added *-s* ending is also common for proper names in Australian English, e.g. *Jules* for *Julie* (Collins 2012: 79). Also, in British English, a paragogic *-s* may show up incidentally; see for instance the nickname for the test match presenter Brian Johnson *Johnners*, whereas the normal suffix would have been *-er*, as in *Jagger* from *Jaguar* or *rugger* from *rugby* (p.c. John Charles Smith, Oxford). All these outputs include clipping. An *-er* "diminutive" suffix, mostly representing schwa, "has been noted to be in-group marking, particularly in academic institutions (…)" (Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013: 393). This ending, which is also found in examples such as *footer* from *football*, *prepper* from *prep(aratory) school* and *fresher* from *freshman*, appears to follow a similar pattern as the ending *-ie/-y*: truncation that is followed by suffixation. However, "there seem to be too few forms to establish more detailed generalizations." (Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013: 394). Marchand (1969) does not even mention this ending neither the parallel form with a paragogic *-s.*

suffixation. *Pootje*, which is now as obsolete as the disease itself, is already attested in the 17th century. *Propjes*[40] and *bammetje* are found in Dutch newspapers of the early 20th century and the second half of that century, respectively.[41] As expected, forms such as *prop and *poot are excluded in this meaning. After all, the predominantly trochaic character of Dutch prefers and enforces the disyllabic alternatives. A clipped noun *bam* has been attested incidentally. However, the normal form is *bammetje*, a trisyllabic form, which is the result of the complex Dutch diminutive formation system. Discussion of the Dutch diminutive system is beyond the scope of this article.[42]

The fact that *prop and *poot are excluded does not mean that monosyllabic clipped nouns did not appear in Dutch. On the contrary.[43] There are quite a few well-attested examples which all go back to the late 19th century or the early 20th century. Among these examples one finds frequently attested words such as[44]:

(43) *juf*   < *juffrouw*   'female teacher'   (attested 1866)
     lab   < *laboratorium* 'laboratory'   (attested 1914)
     Jap   < *Japanner*   'Japanese person'   (attested 1926)
     bieb < *bibliotheek*   'library'   (attested 1938)

The diminutive suffix can also be attached to full words to signal informality (cf. the examples given in (44)). The corresponding full forms without a suffix do not exist anymore in present-day Dutch or they belong to different parts of speech and have a non-related meaning.

(44) *dutje* 'nap'   < [?]*dut* or *dutten* (verb)
     toetje 'dessert' < *toe* (variant form of preposition *tot* 'to')
     tientje 'tenner' < *tien* (numeral)[45]

Dutch hypocoristics display a pattern similar to that of the German and English examples. First comes clipping, and then it is followed by suffixation. Next to the standard Dutch *-(t)je* one may find an alternative form *-(s)ke* originating from Frisian or eastern dialects as demonstrated in the names presented in (45–46):

(45) *Geeske/Geesje*   < *Gezina*
     Geerke/Geertje < *Geertruida*

---

[40] *Propjes*, just like *kantjes*, for *kandidaatsexamen* 'bachelor's exam', is outdated nowadays. These words belonged to an (old-fashioned) student's jargon.

[41] The earliest attestations can be found via http://www.delpher.nl/, a database in which more than 60 million pages of historic Dutch newspapers, journals and books are made available.

[42] See for a discussion of the Dutch diminutive system: Trommelen (1983), Booij (1995: 69–73) and Kooij & Van Oostendorp (2003: 165–175).

[43] See also Van der Sijs (2002), who shows that CVC-clippings, and thus monosyllabic clippings, were and still are rather frequent.

[44] The first attestations of the following data are found in http://www.etymologiebank.nl/. The 'etymologiebank' is a database in which all Dutch etymological dictionaries are included.

[45] Remarkably, Dutch also accepts longer forms with a diminutive suffix that signals informality and for which the forms without a suffix also have a different non-related meaning: *enkeltje* 'one-way ticket' (from *enkele reis* 'one way'), *onderonsje* 'informal chat' (from *onder ons* 'among us') and *twaalfuurtje* 'midday snack' (from *twaalf uur* 'noon').

Guurke/Guurtje < Guurtruida

(46) *Gerke < Gerhardus*
     Pieke < Pieter
     Bouke < Boudewijn

For some of these names a clipped form without a diminutive ending may exist in Dutch, but they are much rarer than the forms with a suffix. It is also striking that there are much more female names with a diminutive ending than male ones. This intriguing phenomenon is not further discussed here, as already announced in 4.2.

What may be concluded from the ample Dutch data presented here is that:

– clipping followed by suffixation with a diminutive suffix is a process of Modern Dutch that may be compared to the corresponding German and English processes. However, the Dutch process does not result in a disyllabic word with a long vowel as nucleus of the final syllable. The Dutch diminutive suffix ends in a schwa.

– since Swedish hardly works with diminutive suffixes and since standard Dutch diminutive suffixes do not lead to trochaic patterns with a long vowel in the second syllable, it is not very likely that there is a direct relation between diminutive formation and clipping suffixed with final *-o*.

– a process of clipping followed by suffixation already existed in Dutch in the 17th century. However, it is nearly impossible to give an accurate sketch of the subsequent or coexisting strata of the clipping process in Dutch because of a lack of data. So far it is clear that a pure process of clipping operated quite early, resulting in monosyllabic CVC forms such as *juf*. It is also evident that clipping could be followed by suffixation, as in the case of hypocoristics and *pootje*. Most of the clipped base forms of the lexemes that resulted from clipping plus suffixation do not exist independently, which suggests that suffixation became obligatory or at least preferred at a certain moment. Finally, the originally diminutive suffix can also be put after monosyllabic forms and then result in a new disyllabic word with a different meaning.
– the connotation of all the output forms of the process of clipping and/or suffixation is informal and familiar.[46]

5. A new pattern for clipped forms in English

5.1 *Neoclassical clippings*

Recently a new process of clipping emerged – disyllabic clipping ending in *-o.* All modern languages seem to contain neoclassical forms such as:

(47) *disco < discotheque*
     stereo < stereophonic record

---

[46] An endearment interpretation for diminutives is quite common in Dutch: *kindje* from *kind* 'child' is often used as a sympathetic form of address. *Weertje* from *weer* 'weather' refers to nice weather only. However, the forms discussed in this section should not be described as terms of endearment only, they are also informal.

memo < *memorandum*

Most of these words have been borrowed from the culture in which the concept of the object was introduced first. So, for instance, the word *kilogram* was introduced in France at the end of the 18th century during the French Revolution,[47] when the metric system was officially adopted. Half-way through the 19th century the word was shortened to *kilo*. Less than ten years later it was borrowed by speakers of English. However, this type of example is not very interesting, since the pattern never became productive in other environments.

5.2 *English clippings ending in* -o

Another -*o*, however, became very productive in a different semantic context, as the English examples in (48–50) show.

(48) pure clipping
psycho   < *psychopath*
homo   < *homosexual*
dipso   < *dipsomaniac*

(49) clipping + suffixation in -*o*
afro   < *African (hairstyle)*
lesbo < *lesbian*
relo   < *relative*

(50) suffixation in -*o* only
sicko   < *sick*
kiddo   < *kid*
creepo < *creep*

The examples presented here come mainly from American English or Australian English. Clipping started in Australian English earlier than in American English. In American English the process became productive after the Second World War, whereas in Australian English this had already happened at least a few decades earlier.[48] What we see nicely resembles the pattern discussed before. The forms in (48) have something in common – they share a same ending -*o*, and they all are [+human], [+negative] and [+informal]. In other terms these words share a confusivum -*o*, with which the semantic and stylistic features [+human], [+negative] and [+informal] are associated. That is why the language user considers this type of form as a coherent category intuitively. Note that the examples in (47) also formally share a

---

[47] For an extensive history of the introduction of the metric system, see Ronald Edward Zupko (1990), *Revolution in Measurement: Western European Weights and Measures Since the Age of Science.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, Diane Publishing.

[48] Kidd, Kemp & Quinn (2011: 360) quote the diachronic overview of Australian English by Moore (2008), who indicates that the first instances of Australian English hypocoristics with both final -*ie and* -*o* were attested in the 19th century. The examples Jespersen (1942: 223) produces are all examples of Australian English. A number of his examples are still not yet attested in American English. However, as early as 1858 an example such as *dipso* was already attested in American English, just as *kiddo* in 1893, *wino* in 1915, *psycho* in 1927 and *pinko* in 1936. Some years later a wave of new formations in -*o* occurred, resulting in, among others, forms such as *fatso* (1944), *weirdo* (1955) and *sicko* (1977).

confusivum *-o*, but since there is no common semantic feature between these forms, this confusivum is less powerful than that in (48) and therefore never became productive. Since the language user interprets *-o* as a marker for a [+clipped], [+human], [+negative] and [+informal] noun, it is seen as a sort of suffix that can be added to short (clipped) forms. This is why it can subsequently be used in (49) as a suffix, after a process of clipping to a monosyllabic base form has applied. Just as we have seen with the diminutive suffix, finally this new suffix *-o* may also be added to monosyllabic words, resulting in perfect prosodic trochaic forms, as in (50). What should also be noticed is that all these three types consist of trochaic disyllables.

5.3 *Reinforcement by bilingual speakers*

As sketched so far, the origin of the new suffix *-o* and the extension of its applicability to non-clipped base forms is a matter of distinctive morphology, the theory of Zabrokci, of which the notion *confusivum* is a crucial part. However, the success of this new suffix is most likely strengthened by other factors as well. Which factors may have reinforced the innovation depends on the variety of English one studies.

5.3.1 *Australian English*
Australian English is extremely rich in clipped forms (Peters 2007, Bardsley & Simpson 2009). Both suffixes *-ie/-y* and *-o* were and are highly productive in this variety of English. In addition, Australian English also produces smaller categories of clipped nouns and names with a suffix *-a/-er* and the two suffixes mentioned in Footnote 39 (Collins 2012). However, only *-o* is of interest here. According to Taylor (2001) this *-o* has its origin in Irish. In Irish names, *Ó* means 'male descendant of' and is the normal "infix" between first name and surname. Given the large proportion of people of Irish origin in Australia and the fact that most of them came quite early – "by 1891, one quarter of the Australian population was of Irish origin" (Peters 2007:117) – it is not unlikely that this *Ó* has reinforced the innovation or has cooperated with it.

However, the earliest examples of Australian *-o* hypocoristics are signal words, i.e. cries with which hawkers announced their arrival: *milk-oh, rabbit-oh* and *bottle-oh*. These words marked the arrival of a milkman, rabbit hawker or bottle collector in a street. The *-oh* is simply the end of their loud cry for attention. All three words date from the second half of the 19th century (Peters 2007: 117).

These three factors – the confusivum *-o*, together with the Irish *Ó* and the final *-oh* of the shouting of hawkers – may have influenced and reinforced each other in such a way that Australian English now is a paradise for collectors of clipped words ending in *-o*.

For American English, however, a language variety in which *-o* suffixation is also quite productive, other explanations have usually been proposed. In a linguistic internet discussion, initiated and summarized by Mikael Parkvall (1998), suggestions have been made that the origin must be found in the influence of speakers of Italo-American or Latino-American English. Since the number of Italian immigrants in Australia is considerable, a possible explanation for Australian English *-o* via an Italo-Australian dialect cannot be ruled out either. A great number of Italian immigrants arrived just after the First World War in

Australia.[49] However, the bulk came only after the Second World War, which makes this explanation less probable. After all, one should not forget that Jespersen (1942) already quoted a couple of examples with final *-o* from Australian English. Whatever the case, the impact of bilingual speakers, and especially of speakers of the second and subsequent generations, in the emergence and popularity cannot be underestimated. First-generation immigrant speakers are usually not accepted as innovators of their new language. The features they introduce are seen as mistakes and errors and therefore they will not be accepted as innováters by speakers with a native fluency (Hamans 2004b: 184).

5.3.2 *Spanish or Italian influence in American English*
As said, the origin of the new suffix *-o* in American English has been explained by an Italian or Spanish influence, although Irish is not impossible if we consider the number of Irish immigrants in the US. However, it is not necessary to explain the emergence of the new suffix in the same way for both varieties of English.[50] Since in both cases the confusivum *-o* is the starting point, the other factors are only secondary causes.

For Spanish one points to the well-known case of Mock Spanish, as described by Hill (1998). Hill presents examples of affixation of Spanish grammatical elements to English words, e.g. *no problemo*, *el cheapo* and writes: "the definite article *el* and the masculine-gender suffix *-o* are used to give them a new semantic flavor, ranging from jocularity to insult, or to enhance an already somewhat negative connotation of the English word" (Parkvall 1998). Murray (1996) lists 422 Spanish loanwords in American English slang, of which quite a number end in *-o*. Among these words one finds:

(51) *bato*   'user of drugs'
     bravo   'Mexican-American'
     burro (lit. *donkey*)   'smuggler of drugs'
     chico (lit. *boy*)   'Filipino' (derogative)
     cholo (lit. *half-breed*) 'Mexican'
     macho (lit. *male*)   'aggressive man'

This type of example with final *-o* may have promoted the growth and wealth of American English hypocoristic *-o* formations.

Also, in the language of Italo-Americans, one comes across arguments for the emergence, or better the support, of the new suffix *-o*. Correa-Zoli (1981: 247) describes the language of Italian-Americans, the largest linguistic and ethnic minority group in the US. In Italo-American, forms such as the following are frequent:

(52) *il toblo*   from *trouble*
     il sciáuro   from *shower*
     il gioncáccio from *junk*

Haller (1993) describes the Italian of the Italo-Americans and points to neologisms such as:

---

[49] For some general information about the migration of Italians to Australia, see http://www.italianlegacy.com /italian-migration-to-australia.html. More detailed information can be found in Castles, Alcorso, Rando & Varta (1992).

[50] An influence of Australian English on American English can be discarded as highly unlikely, just as an influence of Australian English on the other languages discussed here.

(53) *carro*   from *car*
    storo   from *store*

However, neither Correa-Zoli nor Haller present forms with [+human] *-o*. On the other hand, the minimal prosodic word in Italian is disyllabic, has trochaic stress, and ends in a vowel, as Thornton (1996) demonstrated. From this preferred structure to a similar American English word pattern seems no more than a step, especially for speakers who have reached a certain level of bilingualism.

What should be understood from these quotations and examples is that nobody has been able to determine where the suffix originated precisely, but it is quite clear that, because of the multitude of bilingual speakers in whose languages there already existed a grammatical element which resembled final *-o*, there were enough secondary forces around to support the rise of the new suffix *-o*. That the new suffix, however, can also emerge without any circumstantial support will be shown in the next section.

6. The *-o* pattern in some other languages

6.1 *French*

In French one finds an innovation similar to that described for English. As always, it is difficult to date the first appearance of clipped forms, but most of them seem to be less recent than the English ones.[51] In addition, one finds clipped forms regularly in French newspapers,[52] something which is exceptional in English newspapers. The shortening of the name of the former president Sarkozy to *Sarko* or of the famous football player Cantona to *Canto* is quite normal, even in printed form, which shows that clipping is more socially accepted in French than in English. However, a negative connotation is as common in French as in English.

(54) pure clipping
clepto   < *cleptomane*   'kleptomaniac'
nympho < *nymphomane*   'nymphomaniac'
phallo   < *phallocrate*   'male chauvinist'

(55) clipping plus suffixation in *-o*
broco < *brocanteur*   'bric-a-brac dealer'
prolo < *prolétaire*   'prol'
stalo < *stalinien*   'stalinist'

(56) suffixation in *-o* only

---

[51] Frei (1929, reprinted 1982: 119) already describes the order of the innovation discussed here: first came clipping only, later followed by clipping plus suffixation. This proves that the French innovation dates to a period around or before the First World War. Maybe clipping was already productive in Australian English then, but in American English the innovation started decades later (see Footnote 48).
[52] This is not restricted to forms ending in *-o*. The former French prime minister *Balladur* quite often appeared as *Balla* in headlines. The name of prime minister *Raffarin* was often clipped as *Raff'*.

follo   'idiot'   *< fou/folle* (adj.) 'mad'
gaucho 'leftie'   *< gauche* (adj.) 'left'
lourdaud[53] 'oaf, blockhead' *< lourd* (adj.) 'heavy'

For French, one cannot suggest an influence from Irish bilinguals, and also the chance that the language has been influenced by Italian and Spanish is very small, even when one realizes that the registers where the innovation is the most apparent are slangy registers. This shows that a distinctive morpheme or confusivum *-o*, referring to a person and carrying all the features of informality, truncation and negative meaning discussed before, is enough to let the language user start an innovation. Since French is not the main concern of this study, the French data will not be analyzed further. However, the French data (54)–(56) are presented here for two reasons: to show that clipping, clipping followed by suffixation and finally suffixation of monosyllabic source words, without prior clipping, are not restricted to Germanic languages, and that when the basic data are available language users tend to follow similar patterns that may become new and productive patterns for word formation. This pattern, which can be better dated for French than in other languages due to the availability of sources (see Footnote 51), can be summarized as follows:

– firstly, pure truncation, ending in final *-o*, which due to its frequency and shared formal, semantic and pragmatic connotations, invited the language user to recognize it as a common segment. Consequently, this common segment or confusivum has been reinterpreted as suffix-like.

– secondly, truncation, followed by suffixation with *-o*. This second stage is a first innovation.

– thirdly, no truncation at all but suffixation of a monosyllabic word with *-o*, which is a next innovative step.

6.2 *Innovation in Swedish, Dutch and German*

The pattern which is found in English and French can also be encountered in Swedish, Dutch and, to a lesser extent, German. These last three languages share a prosodic system with English. Lahiri, Riad & Jacobs (1999: 340) summarize the literature about the German prosodic system with the observation that "(…) the modern Germanic languages including English, Danish, Dutch, German and Swedish are considered to have left dominant, quantity-sensitive trochaic feet." However, this does not mean that clipping operates in exactly the same way in all these languages. First, some Swedish examples will be presented.

6.2.1 *Swedish clippings ending in* -o

---

[53] In French there is a suffix *-aud,* which can be used to form proper names, later also common words, and which later acquired a pejorative connotation. For example: the proper names *Arnaud* and *Renaud*, common words such as *noiraud* 'swarthy person' and *sourdaud* 'hard-hearing person' and finally words with a pejorative meaning such as *salaud* 'bastard' and *maraud* 'rascal'. This suffix *-aud* is pronounced [o]. Because of the homophony between this suffix and the suffix *-o* discussed here, and because of the equal negative association, the spelling *aud* may be used here.

Clipping in Swedish shows another picture than in the languages discussed so far. This is not the place to discuss the Swedish processes of clipping extensively.[54] However, it may be useful to give a few examples of the two common Swedish patterns. As the examples presented before as (10) and (11) show monosyllabic CVC-clipped forms are common in Swedish:

(10) *livs*   < *livsmedelbutik* 'grocery'
     mens < *menstruation* 'period'
     pang < *pensionat* 'boarding house'

(11) *bil*   < *automobil* 'car'
     nalle < *yuppienalle* 'cell phone'
     noja   < *paranoia* 'paranoia'

However, next to this pattern there is also a disyllabic pattern in Swedish, which is even preferred (Nübling & Duke 2007: 234). However, this pattern does not end in an open syllable, as for instance in German, but is characterized by a suffix *-is*.

(57) *alkis*   < *alkoholisk* 'alcoholic'
     kompis < *kompagnon* 'mate'
     skådis < *skådespelare* 'actor'

(58) *doldis*   'anonymous public figure, hider'   < *dold* (adj.) 'hidden'
     kändis   'public figure'   < *kand* (adj.) 'well-known'
     snackis   'snacker'   < *snack* 'snack'

As the examples in (58) show the suffix is no longer restricted to previously truncated forms. Both types, those of (57) and (58), share a negative or at least emotional connotation and both belong to a colloquial style (Nübling & Duke 2007: 234–235). However, the productivity of the patterns differs considerably. Whereas truncation followed by suffixation, as in (57), is highly productive, examples with suffixation only, as in (58), are scarce.

Recently a new disyllabic pattern came up in Swedish (Parkvall 1998): disyllabic clippings with final *-o*. Examples are given in (59)–(61):

(59) pure clipping
alko   < *alkoholist* 'alcoholic'
lycko < *lycklig* (adj.) 'lucky' (person)
psyko < *psykopat* 'psychopath'

(60) clipping plus suffixation in *-o*
aggro 'aggressive person'   < *aggressiv* (adj.) 'aggressive'
hygglo 'nice person'   < *hygglig* (adj.) 'reasonable'
pucko 'stupid person'   < *puckad* (n.) 'puck'

---

[54] For more detailed descriptions of Swedish clippings and comparisons with other languages, see Nübling (2001), Leuschner (2006), Nübling & Duke (2007) and Lux (2016).

(61) suffixation in -*o* only
fetto 'fat person'   < *fet* (adj.) 'fat'
fyllo 'drunkard'   < *full* (adj.) 'full'
slappo 'lazy bump'   < *slapp* (adj.) 'soft'

The process in Swedish looks precisely the same as that in English or French. So, one may explain this innovation in a similar way. It is the power of the distinctive morpheme, the confusivum -*o*, that triggers the innovation. But, as we will see in the discussion about the examples from Dutch which comes next, the influence of a foreign language may trigger the innovation or, better, may seduce or invite the speaker of the receiving language to start the innovation consciously or unconsciously.

Since the changes in clipping patterns in Swedish are less well-described than in Dutch or German there are not yet enough data to demonstrate how the language change really progressed. However, and this is something which should also be noted, all the Swedish data presented here are from the last 25 to 30 years. They cover the same period as in Dutch, as we will demonstrate now.

6.2.2 *Dutch clippings ending in* -o
(62) pure clipping
aso   < *asociaal* 'antisocial'
impo   < *impotent* 'impotent person'
pedo   < *pedofiel* 'pedophile'

(63) clipping plus suffixation *in* -*o*
alto 'alternative person'   < *alternatief*
depro 'depressed person'   < *depressief*
saggo 'cantankerous person' < *chagrijnig*

(64) suffixation *in* -*o* only
lullo 'dumb person'   < *lul* 'prick'
duffo 'dull person'   < *duf* 'dull'
jazzo 'fan of old-style jazz music' < *jazz*

Again, we see the same pattern as in English, French and Swedish. However, here we have more data available to sketch a possible course of the history. The three examples presented in (62) are from the last three decades of the 20th century. Only two earlier forms ending in -*o* and referring to persons have been attested. The first one is the word *indo*, from *Indonesian*, which was in use for mixed Dutch-Indonesian people in the then-Dutch colony of the Dutch Indies, now Indonesia, before the Second World War. The other example is *provo*, from *provocateur*, for 'member of the *provo* movement in Amsterdam in the 1960s'. This word was consciously coined by the Dutch criminologist Buikhuisen in 1965.

Also, the forms in (63) and (64) appeared for the first time in the late 1970s and 1980s, together with some clear loanwords from American English youth language and slang such as *lesbo*, *macho* and *creepo*. In 1987, Kuitenbrouwer published a collection of clipped forms called *afko's*, which is a clipped form of *afkortingen* 'abbreviations' (or shortenings,

50

since the forms he collected are mostly clipped forms).[55] Many of his examples are clipped forms ending in *-o*, with or without subsequent suffixation, and some with *-o* suffixation only. This collection shows how influential American English examples were and how rapidly the innovation progressed.

A few years later Van der Sijs (2002) collected some older clippings. She found that traditional clipping followed a monosyllabic CVC pattern, as her examples in (65) show. Van der Sijs' examples, however, belong to a completely different register than the examples (62)–(64).

(65) *loods* < *loodsman* 'pilot' (already attested in the 17th century)
mum < *minimum* 'wink' (attested since 1940)
pas < *paspoort* 'passport' (already attested in the 17th century)
pon < *japon* 'nightie' (attested in the early 20th century)
prol < *proleet* 'plebeian' (already attested in the 1930s)
soos < *sociëteit* 'club' (already attested in the 19th century)
spijs < *amandelspijs* 'almond paste' (attested since 1875)
toffel < *pantoffel* 'slipper' (already attested in the 15th century).

From the data presented by Kuitenbrouwer (1987), Van der Sijs (2002) and Hamans (2004a, 2004b) one can only conclude that the borrowing of a couple of American English slang words by Dutch youngsters triggered a process of innovation in Dutch. These youngsters must have had a certain knowledge of English, although they cannot be considered bilingual. They immersed themselves in the universally attractive American English youth culture, pop music, films, shows, etc., picked up a couple of English slang words ending in *-o* and introduced them in their own youngsters' and street language. They must have recognized consciously or unconsciously how the clipping and subsequent suffixation operated and so they applied these linguistic techniques to new Dutch forms and introduced a new Dutch *confusivum -o* thereby. It is clear that these forms are perfectly well-formed, since they are trochaic and, from that moment on, the innovative power of the new process launched a language change.

Although there are not enough data available for Swedish one may assume that the process worked in a similar way in this language. In any case, it did so in German, as will be shown in the next section.

6.2.3 *German clipped forms with final -o*
In German, examples of pure clipping resulting in [+human] clipped forms ending in *-o* are scarce, due to the frequency of the competing suffix *-i*. Steinhauer (2000: 10) describes *-o* as a younger suffix". However, neoclassical [–human] clipped forms with final *-o* are common, as the examples in (17), *Kino*, *Demo* and *Tacho*, show.[56] A few [+human] examples of pure clipping with final *-o* are presented in (66):

(66) pure clipping
Homo < *Homoskesueller* 'gay'

---

[55] The form *afko* wonderfully shows how clippings follow the normal rules of Dutch syllable structure. Whereas *o* in *afkorting* is short or lax, the corresponding vowel in *afko* is long or tensed due to open syllable lengthening.
[56] According to Ronneberger-Sibold (2014: 280) the Limo-type shortening is the most transparent type of German clippings.

Pedo   < *Pädophiler* 'pedophile'
Psycho   < *Psychopath* 'psychopath'

(67) clipping plus suffixation in -*o*
Nudo   < *Nudist* 'nudist'
Prolo   < *Proletarier* 'proletarian'
Stino   < *stinknormale Person* 'absolutely normal person'

(68) suffixation with -*o* only
Heino   < *Hein*(*z*), name of a popular singer[57]
Kloppo   < *Jürgen Klopp*, beloved German football coach
Normalo[58]< 'normal Person'   < *normal* (adj.) 'normal'

The process in German is hampered by the productivity of the -*i* suffix. However, forms such as *Realo* ('realist') versus *Fundi* ('fundamentalist') are quite common in Modern German and show that -*o* clipping and suffixation have given foot to the ground in German. As Balnat (2011: 78) claims, this is due to a recent English influence.[59] Fleischer (1969: 210) and Angst (2000: 223) both describe the order in which the innovation took place: first came clipping, resulting in -*o* (or -*i*), later followed by clipping plus suffixation. This corresponds to the way the process is described here and it follows from the initial recognition of a common segment, confusivum, as described in Zabrocki's theory.

What is demonstrated in section 6 is that two distinct factors play a role in the emergence of the suffix -*o*:

– borrowing: all the Germanic languages discussed here, borrowed the new final -*o* from another language. The source for the introduction of final -*o* in American English cannot be determined with certainty, but most likely it is Italian. The source for Swedish, German and Dutch is colloquial American English or maybe an American English slang. The first introduction of final -*o* in American English is most likely due to a certain level of bilingualism, whereas the youngsters who introduced final -*o* in Western European languages do not necessarily have to master English more or less fluently. Here the introduction seems to be a matter of contact.

– innovation: when a language contains enough identical formal elements with a similar function, the language user not only recognizes and identifies this segment as a confusivum, he or she also will assign a formal status to it; that of a suffix in this case. This leads to a new productive pattern of word formation. In addition, the acceptability of the new pattern is reinforced by a prosodic factor.

---

[57] The standard form *Heini* acquired a negative meaning (Balnat 2011: 74; Elsen 2011: 70) since the name became part of compounds such as *Trödelheini* 'sorehead'. That is why the popular singer Heinz Georg Kramm (and others) called himself *Heino*, which has a positive connotation that is also due to the association with the old Germanic name *Haimo* or *Heimo*, which contains the element *Heim* 'house' and which means 'calm, well-balanced ruler (of the house)'. The form *Heino* may also be influenced by Frisian boys' names such as *Dodo*, *Eggo*, *Eicko*, *Enno*, *Friko*, *Habbo*, *Hano*, *Hemmo*, etc.
[58] The first syllable is not parsed.
[59] It cannot be excluded that the existing pattern of historical short names in German ending in –*o* such as *Ado*, *Emmo* and *Friddo*, reinforced the new pattern (cf. Greule 2007). However, since the frequency of these names is rather low in contemporary German such an explanation is not very plausible.

7. A possible explanation

7.1 *Change of prosodic pattern*

In the previous discussions, it was noted that older English and Dutch clippings show a monosyllabic CVC pattern whereas more recent disyllabic clippings follow a trochaic pattern, which is now the unmarked metrical pattern for languages such as English, Dutch, German and Swedish. This difference suggests that there has been a change in pattern preference, which indeed is the case.

The preferred Dutch minimal word has not always been trochaic. See for instance the late Middle Dutch process of apocope:

(69) *stemme > stem* 'voice'
  vrouwe > vrouw 'woman'
  kribbe > krib 'crib'

Stress used to fall on the first syllable of the older variants in (69), while the vowel in the second syllable was [ə]. At a later stage the whole second syllable got so reduced that it was deleted. At a certain moment in the history of Dutch, however, this process stopped and from then on trochaic patterns remained unaffected (Kooij & Van Oostendorp 2003: 80):

(70) *boete > *boet* 'fine'
  vrede > *vreed 'peace'
  knudde > *knud 'mess'

From this very simplified sketch of the data one may feel inclined to suggest a change from a non-trochaic metrical pattern to a trochaic one for Dutch.

7.2 *Order of constraints*

A change of metrical preference from a monosyllabic minimal word to a disyllabic trochaic minimal word may explain why Dutch and English accepted the innovation of clipping. At the beginning of this study the constraint ANCHOR-LEFT is discussed briefly. This constraint explains why back clipping is the most frequent type of clipping and prescribes that the beginning, and only the beginning of the source word, must be retained. This is not the only constraint which plays a role. Another is TROCH, which describes the preference in English and Dutch for disyllabic trochaic minimal words. As described in Hamans (2012: 38) "the development from an initial stage with a preference for monosyllabic clippings to a later stage with an influx of *-o* (and *-i*) clippings" can be expressed in terms of reranking of constraints, as in (71) and (72):

(71) Classical system: ANCHOR LEFT >> TROCH

(72) New system: TROCH >> ANCHOR LEFT

However, the Dutch preference for disyllabic trochaic minimal words, which predates the

change from mono- to disyllabic clippings, has not yet become absolute, and most likely never will. This means that the language system displays some variability (which is not problematic in Prosodic Morphology). Unfortunately, there are not yet sufficient diachronic data to refine this very sketchy picture.

It goes without saying that the constraint ranking here has no relation with the last stage of the development sketched before, suffixation only as in for instance (64), *lullo*, *duffo* and *jazzo*. However, these examples became possible because of the preference for trochaic word forms. Left anchoring is vacuous here and thus does not play a role.

8. Conclusion

In this contribution it is shown that the language user notices resemblances between formally unrelated lexemes in his or her language use, identifies the common segments – the so-called confusiva – and subsequently reinterprets the structure of these lexemes because of these resemblances. This reanalysis can be the starting point for an innovation.

In addition, it is made plausible that a group of speakers with a restricted knowledge of a prestigious foreign language can borrow a set of lexemes of this language, subsequently analyzes the borrowed lexemes, detects a hidden structure in these lexemes, and then introduces this structure into its own grammar and lexicon. In this way finally the innovation that is made possible by the reanalysis sketched above starts. The data also showed that prosodic preferences may play a crucial role in facilitating this language change. In addition the data demonstrate that this language change is not an abrupt, absolute change. The actual synchronic system of the languages display some variability, showing that Schuchard (Spitzer 1922) is right when he claims that the language system is constantly in a state of transition, often caused by continuous processes of reinterpretation by language users.

Finally, it is demonstrated that the innovation led to a predictable and productive process of word formation, which implies that the process, clipping, must be considered an intrinsic part of morphology.

Acknowledgements

References

Angst, Gerhard. 2000. Gefahr durch lange und kurze Wörter. In Stickel, Gerhard (ed.), *Neues und Fremdes im Deutschen Wortschatz: Aktueller Lexikalischer Wandel*, 210–238. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Antoine, Fabrice. 2000a. *An English-French Dictionary of Clipped Words*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.

Antoine, Fabrice. 2000b. *Dictionnaire français-anglais des mots tronqués.* Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.

Awedyk, Wiesław & Hamans, Camiel. 1992. The 'Poznan' School of Structural Linguistics. In Ahlqvist, Anders (eds.), *Diversions of Galway, Papers on the History of Linguistics*, 213–225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Balnat, Vincent. 2011. *Kurzwortbildung im Gegenwartsdeutschen.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Balnat, Vincent & Kaltz, Barbara. 2006. Zu einigen theoretischen Problemen der Kurzwortbildung. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 16. 195–218.

Bardsley, Dianne & Simpson, Jane. 2009. Hypocoristics in New Zealand and Australian English. In Peters, Pam, Collins, Peter & Smith, Adam (eds.), *Comparative studies in Australian and New Zealand English*, 49–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Bauer, Laurie. 2003. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*, second edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Booij, Geert. 1995. *The Phonology of Dutch.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Castles, Stephen, Alcorso, Caroline, Rando, Gaetano & Varta, Ellie (eds.). 1992. *Australia's Intalians: Culture and Community in a Changing Society.* North Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Collins, Peter. 2012. Australian English: Its Evolution and Current State. *International Journal of Language, Translation and Intercultural Communication* 1. 75–86.

Correa-Zoli, Yole. 1981. The language of Italian Americans. In Ferguson, Charles A. & Heath, Shirley Brice (eds.), *Language in the USA*, 239–256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 1994. *Morphopragmatics. Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German, and Other Languages.* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Dressler, Wolfgang U & Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2001. Morphopragmatics of diminutives and augmentatives: On the priority of pragmatics over semantics. Kenesei, Istvàn & Harnish, Robert M. (eds.), *Perspectives on semantics, pragmatics and discourse*: *A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*, 43–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Elsen, Hilke. 2011. *Grundzüge der Morphologie des Deutschen.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Féry, Caroline. 1997. *Uni* und *Studis*: Die besten Wörter des Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 72. 461–489.

Fisiak, Jacek & Hamans, Camiel. 1997. Memento for a Lefto. In Ahlqvist, Anders & Čapková, Věra (eds.), *Dán do oide. Essays in memory of Conn R.Ó Cléirigh*, 157–163. Dublin: Institiúd Teangeolaíochta Éireann.

Fleischer, Wolfgang. 1969. *Wortbildung der Deutschen Gegenwartsprache*. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut.

Frandrych, Ingrid. 2008. Submorphemic elements in the formation of acronyms, blends and clippings. *Lexis* 2.

Frei, Henri. 1929 (1982). *La grammaire des fautes : Introduction à la linguistique fonctionnelle. Assimilation et différenciation, brièveté et invariabilité, expressivité*. Genève: Slatkine Reprints. Reprint of the edition 1929 Paris-Genève: P. Geuthner.

Greule, Albrecht. 2006. Kurzwörter in historischer Sicht. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 107(4). 423–434.

Haller, Hermann W. 1993. *Una lingua perduta e ritrovata: L'italiano degli italo-americani*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Hamans, Camiel. 1997a. Clippings in modern French, English, German and Dutch. In Hickey, Raymond & Puppel, Stanisław (eds.), *Language history and linguistic modelling: A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th birthday*, 1733–1741. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hamans, Camiel. 1997b. Im Westen nichts Neues: over de opkomst van een beschaafd morfeem. In Van Santen, Ariane & Van der Wal, Marijke (eds.), *Taal in tijd en ruimte*, 237–245. Leiden: SNL.

Hamans, Camiel. 2004a. From *rapo* to *lullo*. In Duszak, Anna & Okolska Urszula, (eds.), *Speaking from the margin: Global English from a European Perspective*, 69–75. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Hamans, Camiel. 2004b. The relation between formal and informal style with respect to language change. In Dabelsteen, C.B. & Jorgensen, J.N. (eds.), *Languaging and Language Practicing* (Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism vol. 36), 168–195. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Humanities.

Hamans, Camiel. 2012. From prof to provo: Some observations on Dutch clippings. In Botma Bert, & Noske, Roland (eds.), *Phonological Explorations: Empirical, Theoretical and Diachronic Issues*, 25–40. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hamans, Camiel. 2015. De relatie tussen verkleinwoorden en verkortingen: Een vergelijking tussen drie West-Germaanse talen. *Brünner Beiträge zur Germanistik und Nordistik* 29(2). 21–33.

Hill, Jane H. 1998. Language, race, and White Public Space. *American Anthroplogist* 100(3). 680–689.

Hinskens, Frans. 2001. Hypocoristiche vormen en reductievormen in het hedendaagse Nederlands. *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 39. 37–49.

Jamet, Denis. 2009. A morphophonological approach to clipping in English. *Lexis* HS 1.

Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A Modern English grammar. Part 4: Morphology.* Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.

Kidd, Evan, Kemp, Nenagh & Quinn, Sara. 2011. Did you have a *choccie bickie* this *arvo*? A quantitative look at Australian hypocoristics. *Language Sciences* 33. 359–368.

Kooij, Jan & van Oostendorp, Mark. 2003. *Fonologie: Uitnodiging tot de Klankleer van het Nederlands*. Amsterdam: AUP.

Köpcke, Klaus-Michael. 2002. Die sogenannte *i*-Derivation in der deutschen Gegenwartsprache: Ein Fall outputorientierte Wortbildung. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 30. 293–309.

Kreidler, Charles W. 1979. Creating new words by shortening. *Journal of English Linguistics* 13: 24–36.

Kuitenbrouwer, Jan. 1987. *Turbotaal: Van Socio-babbel tot Yuppiespeak*. Amsterdam: Aramith.

Kürschner, Sebastian. 2014. Familiennamen als Basis der Spitznamenbildung: Ein deutsch-schwedischer Vergleich. In Debus, Friedhelm, Heuser, Rita & Nübling, Damaris (eds.), *Linguistik der Familiennamen*, 441–473. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Lahiri, Aditi, Riad, Tomas & Jacobs, Haike. 1999. Diachronic prosody. In Harry van der Hulst (ed.), *Prosodic systems in the Languages of Europe*, 335–422. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lappe, Sabine. 2007. *English Prosodic Morphology*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Leuschner, Torsten. 2006. Nederlands tussen Duits en …Zweeds. Grafonemische afkortingen (*Kurzwörter*) in taalvergelijkend perpsectief. In Hüning, Matthias, Vogl, Ulrike, Van der Wouden, Ton & Verhagen, Arie (eds.), *Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels: Handelingen van de workshop op 30 september en 1 oktober 2005 aan de Freie Universität Berlin*, 141–162. Leiden: SNL.

Leuschner, Torsten. 2008. Kurzwortbildung im Deutschen und Niederländischen. Grundlagen und Ergebnisse eines prototypischen Vergleichs. *Germanistische Mitteilungen* 67. 247–261.

Lux, Barbara. 2016. *Kurzwortbildung im Deutschen und Schwedischen: Eine kontrastive Untersuchung phonologischer und grammatischer Aspekte*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*, second edition. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Mattiello, Elisa. 2013. *Extra-grammatical Morphology in English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mattiello, Elisa. 2017. *Analogy in Word-Formation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 1999. The Pragmatics of the "Diminutive" –y/ie Suffix in English. In Schaner-Wolles, Chris, Rennison, John & Neubarth, Friedrich (eds.), *Naturally! Linguistic studies in honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 315–326. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Minkova, Donka. 2018. English word clipping in a diachronic perspective. In Petré, Peter, Cuykens, Hubert & D'hoedt, Frank (eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Lexis and Text in the History of English*, 227–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Murray, Thomas E. 1996. Spanish loanwords in American English slang. In Rodríguez González, Félix (ed.), *Spanish loanwords in the English Language: A tendency towards hegemony reversal*, 105–137. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nübling, Damaris. 2001. *Auto – bil, Reha – rehab, Mikro – mick, Alki – alkis*: Kurzwörter im Deutschen und Schwedischen. *Skandinavistik* 31(2). 167–199.

Nübling, Damaris & Duke, Janet. 2007. Kürze im Wortschatz skandinavischer Sprachen: Kurzwörter im Schwedischen, Dänischen, Norwegischen und Isländischen. In Bär, Jochen A., Roelcke, Thorsten & Stenhauer, Anja (eds.), *Sprachliche Kürze. Konzeptuelle, strukturell und pragmatische Aspekte*, 227–263. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Olofsson, Arne. 2015. Swedish. In Grandi, Nicola & Kortvelyessy, Livia (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 306–309. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.

Parkvall, Mikael. 1998. O-words: Colloquial/slangy words ending in <-o>. *Linguist List* 9.360. (https://linguistlist.org/issues/9/9-360.html) (Accessed 2018-07-12).

Peters, Pam. 2007. Australian English as a regional epicenter. In Hoffmann, Thomas & Siebers, Lucia (eds.), *World Englishes: Problems, Properties and Prospects*, 107–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Piñeros, Carlos Eduardo. 1998. *Prosodic Morphology in Spanish: Constraints Interaction in Word Formation*. Ohio State University. (Doctoral dissertation).

Rainer, Franz. 1993. *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ronneberger-Sibold, Elke. 1995. On different ways of optimizing the sound shape of words. In Andersen, Henning (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1993*, 421–432. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ronneberger-Sibold, Elke. 2014. Tuning morphosemantic transparency by shortening: A cross-linguistic perspective. Rainer, Franz, Gardani, Francesco, Luschützky, Hans Christian & Dressler, Wolfgang U. (eds.), *Morphology and Meaning*: *Selected papers from the 15th International Morphology Meeting. Vienna, February 2012*, 275–288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schneider, Iris & Schneider, Klaus P. 1991. 'Ach Kindchen, davon verstehen Sie nichts!' Über den sexistischen Gebrauch deutscher Diminutivformen. In Feldbusch, Elisabeth, Pogarell, Reiner & Weiss, Cornelia (eds.). *Neue Fragen der Linguistik. Akten des 25. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Paderborn 1990.* Vol. 2: *Innovation und Anwendung*, 169–174. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schneider, Klaus P. 2013. The truth about diminutives, and how we can find it: Some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Skase, Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(1). 137–151.

Seuren, Pieter. 2013. Frequency linguistics – 2. (https://pieterseuren.wordpress.com/2013/04/) (Accessed 2018-07-12).

Sijs, Nicoline van der. 2002. Verkortingen. *Onze Taal* 71: 210–211.

Spitzer, Leo (ed.). 1922. *Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier.* Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Štekauer, Pavol. 2002. On the theory of neologisms and nonce-formations. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1). 97–112.

Steinhauer, Anja. 2000. *Sprachökonomie durch Kurzwörter: Bildung und Verwendung in der Fachkommunikation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Steinhauer, Anja. 2015. Clipping. In Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan & Rainer, Franz (eds.), *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Vol.1, 352–363. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Szymanek, Bogdan. 2005. The latest trends in Englsih word-formation. In Štekauer, Pavol & Lieber, Rochelle (eds.), *Handbook of Word-Formation*. 429–448. Dordrecht: Springer.

Taylor, Brian. 2001. Australian English in interaction with other Englishes. In Blair, David & Collins, Peter (eds.), *English in Australia*, 317–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thornton, Anna. 1996. On some phenomena of prosodic morphology in Italian: Accorciamenti, hypocoristics and prosodic delimitation. *Probus* 8. 81–112.

Trommelen, Mieke. 1983. *The syllable in Dutch. With special reference to diminutive formation.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Wiese, Richard. 2001. Regular Morphology vs. Prosodic Morphology? The Case of Truncation in German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 13. 131–177.

Würstle, Regine. 1992. *Überangebot und Defizit in der Wortbildung: Eine kontrastive Studie zur Diminutivbildung im Deutschen, Französischen und Englischen*. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang.

Zabrocki, Ludwik. 1962. Phon, Phonem und distinktives Morphem. *Biuletyn Fonograficzny* 5. 59–87.

Camiel Hamans
Baronielaan 185
4818PG Breda
Netherlands
hamans@telfort.nl