Published in: The Interaction of Borrowing and Word Formation, ed. by Pius ten Hacken and Renata Panicová, 17-31. Edinburgh University Press, 2020

Part I Compounding

2

Compounding and Contact

Brian D. Joseph

This chapter examines the behaviour of compounds in language contact situations. Preliminaries about compounds and language contact are presented in section 1, focusing largely on questions of simplification versus complexification in language contact and of nativisation of borrowed elements as opposed to adoption without adaptation. This is followed by case studies involving Greek influence on English (section 2), Western European languages, especially English, on Russian (section 3), Western European languages, especially French, on Greek (section 4) and French influence on English (section 5). Key lessons to take away from these case studies are first that in the borrowing of compounds and compounding structures, languages seem not to engage in adaptation to native language patterns, and second that once a new structure enters a language via borrowing it takes on a life of its own, so to speak, and can take on forms that are quite different from their form in the source language.

1. Preliminaries on compounds and on contact

Vital to any serious discussion of word formation is a consideration of compounding, the process (or processes)[1] by which complex words are created out of elements that are already words or word-like along various parameters. Compounding presents an interesting analytic conundrum for linguistic theory in general, in that it is a conceptually simple operation that is nonetheless quite complex at various levels of analysis. That is, while compounding often seems to involve nothing more than simply the juxtaposition of two (or more) elements, together with the possibility of some concomitant phonological or morphophonological adjustments, it also interacts with aspects of both argument structure and lexical semantics. Moreover, given the fact that it essentially stands at the nexus of syntax, in that it involves phrasal representations, and morphology, in that it involves word-level representations, compounding raises questions as to the analytic status of the composite form as a whole as well as the status of the parts that make up the composite.

These various issues fall within the realm of theoretical problems raised by language-internal considerations. But there are important questions as well that can be asked about compounding within any framework of language contact and contact-induced change.

A good reason for considering compounding in situations of language contact is that compounding presents some elements of particular interest to language contact studies. Contact-induced change is often thought to involve simplification,[2] and thus a search on the part of speakers with some command of more than one language system,[3] i.e. bilinguals,[4] for congruent elements between the languages they control to some extent. However, there is also a view that takes contact to be a source of complexity in a language system (Nichols 1992: 193). Moreover, an influential approach to contact-induced change, specifically the position advocated in Thomason and Kaufman (1988), holds that, essentially, 'anything goes' in language contact situations and that there are no linguistic constraints on change motivated through forces external to a given language system, rather only constraints based on the social circumstances of the contact situation. Under this view, which is endorsed here, one would be led to think that compounding in situations of contact between languages could be a good testing ground for the question of simplification versus complexification in language contact outcomes. Given the multiplicity of what compounding involves and what it can do system-internally, one might expect it to be rather exempt in cases of language contact, under an assumption that speakers confronting a second language might 'take the easy way out' and look to simplify by ignoring compounding rather than to complexify. But given that the surface operation in compounding is rather simple, typically involving what appears to be just juxtaposition, enforced adjacency as it were, it might actually be seen as a handy tool for speakers to avail themselves of when using material from another language or who are faced with dealing with expressing themselves in a second language.

It is well known that in cases of borrowing, speakers of the recipient language often assimilate or adapt a foreign element of the donor language to their native language patterns and structure. Thus, words borrowed from Spanish into English with an initial voiceless stop, e.g. *taco*, are pronounced by English speakers with an English-style aspirated stop rather than the Spanish-style unaspirated stop (thus [t^{h}ako] as opposed to [tako]). Also, to offer an example from morphosyntax, Turkish postpositions, such as *karşı* 'opposite', have generally been borrowed into other languages in the Balkans as prepositions. Such is the case in the Greek of Ottoman-era Adrianoupolis, for instance, with this particular lexeme.[5] But at the same time, when for whatever reason there is no assimilation or adaptation of the external element to the structure of the borrowing language, a degree of complexity enters the grammar. For instance, English speakers, such as myself, who pronounce the name of the famous German composer Johann Sebastian Bach with a German-style [x],[6] have introduced complexity into the phonemic system of English, first by adding an altogether new element to the phonemic inventory, and second by marking the element with severe lexical restrictions as to its occurrence. And, to turn once more to Ottoman-era Adrianoupolis Greek, the Turkish postposition *gibi* 'like' was borrowed into that language as a postposition, thus introducing a new structure into the language and thereby a degree of complexity as well to the syntax of adpositions.

How compounds fare in situations of borrowing can therefore be quite revealing with regard to matters of judging how languages complexify, or not, as the case may be. The basic conundrum here is that we might expect compounds to show assimilation/adaptation to the borrowing language's structure, but in fact in many instances we find just the opposite. That is, often, compounding involving both foreign elements and foreign patterns provides a ready device that speakers incorporate into their usage even if at the expense of having to deal with certain anomalies these elements might cause within their native language.

Accordingly, in this chapter, in keeping with the general theme of studying borrowing and word formation, what can happen with regard to compounding under conditions of contact between speakers of different languages is examined via the presentation of various case studies. The case studies to be discussed here involve different pairs of languages, and for two of the languages involved, Greek and English, it is possible to see them both in the role of the recipient, i.e. borrowing, language and in the role of the donor language. Admittedly all of the language pairs are Indo-European in terms of their genealogical affiliation, but they are illustrative of compounding under conditions of language contact nonetheless.

Besides what these case studies show about the particular languages involved, an important lesson to be learned from them is that once elements are borrowed into a recipient language, they take on a life of their own, creating new patterns and new forms that can be quite different from what can be seen in the donor language.

2. Greek and Latin borrowings in English technical vocabulary

The first case study involves the absorption into English learnèd vocabulary of elements ultimately of Greek origin, or in some instances Latin origin, and their effect on the word formation system. The elements in question form the basis for a wide array of technical terminology having to do with medicine, science and technology more generally, but they are of interest here because they show that the borrowings bring to English a structural possibility that is not fully available with native Germanic or Anglo-Saxon elements. In a certain sense, then, the borrowings create a degree of complexity by adding to the range of structures that are available to users of English, though an attractive alternative view would say that they add to the expressive capabilities of speakers.

To illustrate this, I start with the observation that English, at least insofar as native elements are concerned, does not generally allow for so-called 'copulative' compounds (*dvandvas* in the influential terminology of the native Sanskrit grammarians of ancient times), i.e. compounds in which one item is tied to another in a composite meaning 'X and Y' but without an overt linking word like *and*. This is especially so with regard to the possibility of adding a derivational suffix to the potential compound. That is, in English it is not possible to construct words like **ear-nose-r* for 'one involved with the ear and the nose' with the agentive *-(e)r* suffix,[7] nor **red-white-ish* for 'somewhat red and white', with the approximative suffix *-ish*, in which a suffix is added onto a *dvandva* compound representing a pair of words with no overt conjunction linking the members of that compound. The *dvandva* compounding option admittedly is available

in a limited way, i.e. just as the first member of a compound, as in *soda-wine mixture*, meaning 'a mixture of soda *and* wine',[8] but it is not generally possible to have such a copulative compound as input to suffixation. However, when elements that have been borrowed into English from Greek are involved, a *dvandva* compound with a suffix is possible.

For instance, in *otorhinolaryngologist*, the first three elements form a *dvandva* compound. When *oto-* for 'ear', *rhino-* for 'nose' and *laryng-* for 'throat', all representing borrowings from Ancient Greek (GRC) elements, ὠτο- (*ōto-*, oblique stem of οὖς *ous* 'ear'), ῥινο- (*rhino-*, oblique stem of ῥις *rhis* 'nose'), and λάρυγγο- (*laryngo-*, oblique stem of λάρυγξ *larynks* 'upper part of windpipe'), are simply strung together, they give a copulative sense of 'ear, nose *and* throat' even though there is no overt word for 'and'. They occur here with the complex suffix *-ologist*, also Greek in origin, referring to one who studies something. Thus, the compound means 'one who studies (i.e. is a specialist in) the ear, the nose and the throat'.[9]

The same is true with chemical names, where *dvandva*s and Greek-derived elements abound.[10] A chemical that is named entirely with Greek elements just added together is *bromochloroiodomethane*, the name for a methane molecule to which atoms of the elements bromine, chlorine and iodine are attached. The overall form is thus a determinative (*tatpuruṣa*) compound, headed by *methane*, with a composite first member *bromochloroiodo-*, where each part of the first member refers to a particular element, the free form for which in each case has the suffix *-ine*. This first member is additive in its meaning, thus a *dvandva*, but occurs without an overt word for 'and'. Here the Greek elements in the compound are the stems for βρῶμο- *brōmo-* 'stench', χλωρός *khlōro-* 'light green' and ἰώδης *iōd-* 'bluish-green', respectively, and represent the elements derived from these stems with the Latin-derived suffix *-ine*.[11]

It must be admitted that compound words like *otorhinolaryngologist* or *bromochloroiodomethane* occur just in highly restricted sectors of the English lexicon and are hardly common garden-variety everyday household words. But they are forms that are known to and used by at least some speakers of English, and they thus qualify as a real part of the English language in a macro sense, even if jargonistic in their nature.

These words and the combining elements that they consist of exhibit a degree of productivity. One relevant fact in that regard is that they are expandable: *otorhinolaryngologist* is itself an expansion of *otolaryngologist*, literally 'a specialist in ear and throat' but conventionally, given the interconnection of the relevant body parts, a doctor who specialises in disorders of the ear, throat and nose, so that *otorhinolaryngologist* offers a more explicit enumeration of specialties. Also, *bromochloroiodomethane* can be expanded with another chemical element to *Bromochlorofluoroiodomethane*, the further addition being *fluoro-* for the element *fluorine*, a Latin-derived name (*fluor* 'a flowing', cf. *fluere* 'to flow').

Moreover, new words can be formed with these elements. For instance, starting with the English medical term *encephalon* 'brain' (in anatomical usage), which is a loanword taken from GRC ἐγκέφαλος *enkephalos* '(that which is) within the head', it is possible to form the composite *encephalograph* 'brain image' with the morpheme *graph* from GRC γράφειν *graphein* 'to write'.[12] From *encephalograph*, or possibly directly from *encephalon*, the derived noun *encephalography* 'brain imaging' is created with

the noun formative *-y*, from GRC -ια *-ia*, giving *-graphy* (cf. GRC γραφία *graphia* 'drawing), and from that, *electroencephalography* 'electronic encephalography' can be formed, with *electro-* from GRC ἤλεκτρον *ēlektron* 'amber', and from that, *electro-encephalographology* 'study of electronic encephalographs' can be created (with *-logy* from GRC -λογία *-logia* (ultimately from λόγος *logos* 'word')), and so also *electro-encephalographologist* 'specialist who studies electroencephalographs' (with *-ist* from GRC -ιστης *-istēs*). Of these, by way of suggesting the productivity to these recursive processes, the last two do not occur in OED (2000–2019), the most comprehensive listing of English words.

English of course can string together elements as a compound in *brain imaging*, but to go further with non-Greek elements what is needed is either an adjective, as in *electronic brain imaging*, or more expansive non-compound syntax, as in the phrasal form *study of electronic encephalographs*, or a complex noun phrase with a relative clause, as in *specialist who studies electroencephalographs*.

It is noteworthy too that in these forms English has absorbed not only the Greek ability to string elements together copulatively, but also the Greek pattern in compounds of using a 'linking vowel' *-o-* to connect the stems in question. Thus in Greek, even though the stem for 'ear' is *ōt-* (ὠτ-) and the stem for 'nose' is *rhin-* (ῥιν), in compounds, they are joined to other stems with an *-o-*, as in GRC ὠτολαβίς *ōtolabis* 'instrument for laying hold of the ears' (lit. 'ear-taker') or ῥινολαβίς *rhinolabis* 'instrument for laying hold of the nose' (lit. 'nose-taker'). And that linking vowel -o- recurs in the Greek-derived compounds in English as well.

The various elements presented here, therefore, represent borrowings from Greek that have brought a new structural possibility into a restricted domain of English vocabulary. Thus, by one measure, these combining forms present a complexity in providing a structure not otherwise generally available in English. On the other hand, however, one could assess the contribution of these borrowed elements in a somewhat more positive light; that is, in a certain way, they expand the expressive range of English by providing a novel possibility, that of productive *dvandva* expansions, not previously available to Modern English. And within their particular jargonistic domains, these compounding patterns provide a productive means of technical nomenclature, and thus nicely fill a functional niche.

3. Analytic compounds in Russian

In the case of the Greek elements in English, the new patterns that entered the borrowing language were not particularly disruptive to the existing structure in the recipient language; they were additive in what might be viewed as a positive way. I move now to an instance of a foreign compound pattern entering a language in which the new patterns are not nativised, not adapted to existing structural possibilities, and in this way would seem to introduce a certain disruption into the recipient language system. Interestingly, though, it can be argued that the disruption is only apparent, and that the non-nativisation is rather an indication of a structural change in the language.

In particular, in a study of innovative instances of non-agreement within noun phrases in contemporary Russian, Patton (1999) discusses instances in which various

compound types involving non-native elements are at odds with traditional well-entrenched structures in the language. The most revealing instances for the present purposes are cases in which the left-hand member modifies the right-hand head (thus a *tatpuruṣa* compound type) and serves an adjectival function, but, tellingly, does not inflect for case or gender in the way that a modifier in the Russian noun phrase usually does. While some of these non-agreeing elements can be categorised as indeclinable adjectives, e.g. экзотик *ekzotik* 'exotic' or беж *bež* 'beige', others involve nominal elements. An early one noted by Voroncova (1964) that shows a non-agreeing first element 'condensed' from a fuller declinable adjective is проф-билет *prof-bilet* 'union card', interestingly without the typical *-o-* joining vowel (etymologically connected with the linking vowel *-o-* in Greek discussed in section 2) as seen in compounds like рыб-о-продукты *ryb-o-produkty* 'fish products'. The Noun-Noun type mostly entered the language from foreign sources throughout the twentieth century but with a marked increase in the post-Soviet era due to greater contact with the West and with Western business and cultural practices, and thus Western languages.[13] The primary Western influences in recent years have come from America and thus, in terms of outside linguistic influence on Russian, from American English, though several of the innovative compounds Patton cites are from German.

Patton (1999: 21) notes that there generally are 'synthetic and analytic variations of a single phrase, e.g. клип-антракт *klip-antrakt* "music video intermission" v. антракт клипов *antrakt klipov* [with genitive plural *klipov*] or сервис-центр *servis-centr* "service center" v. сервисный центр *servisnyj centr* [with declinable adjective *servisnyj*]'. Nonetheless, his surveys showed that 'collocations containing indeclinable or nominal adjectives are often preferred by native speakers of Russian'.

Interestingly, Patton's findings indeed point towards a general preference by Russian speakers surveyed for the analytic, non-agreeing structures, even though, as he argues, the compounds go against existing morphosyntactic and syntactic patterning in Russian in three ways (1999: 22–23): lack of case agreement, an 'overwhelming tendency for recently acquired indeclinable adjectives to be preposed (versus the tendency of earlier borrowings to assume postposition', and 'the use of a single word form in both adjectival [= modifying] and nominal functions . . . a striking departure from typical Russian morphosyntax'. Thus, these borrowings, including forms such as футбол-клуб *futbol-klub* 'football club', with the Noun-Noun compound replacing an NP with agreeing Adjective-Noun structure, футбольный клуб *futbolnyj klub*, or офис-директор *ofis-direktor* 'office director' replacing an NP with Noun-Genitive structure, директор офиса *direktor ofisa*, and so on, represent innovations in Russian due to language contact. Among the compounding elements 'commonly found in the popular press and in speech' (Patton 1999: 21) are, from English, бизнес *biznes* (from *business*), дизайн *dizajn* (from *design*), офис *ofis* (from *office*), джаз *džaz* (from *jazz*), менеджмент *menedžment* (from *management*), секс *seks* (from *sex*) and рок *rok* (from *rock* (music)), though he ultimately lists several hundred items. Moreover, in many instances, the compounds do not reflect a foreign source directly, but show novelty, and thus some degree of productivity, within Russian; клип-антракт *klip-antrakt* 'music video intermission' and тренд-журнал *trend-žurnal* 'high fashion magazine' are examples of such novel compounds.

Importantly, however, although there are reasons for seeing the move towards Noun-Noun compounds as counter to the general structure of Russian, as noted above, Patton ultimately argues that these developments overall 'are indicative of a marked shift toward analytism' (1999: 23). Moreover, he suggests that there has been movement towards analyticism in Russian prior to the proliferation of such compounds, as argued by Comrie et al. (1996), so that the compounds with their analytic structure are not so much disrupting the general structure of Russian as perhaps just feeding an undercurrent of analyticism present in the language, thus exacerbating an already-existing tendency, though one that is admittedly innovative as compared with the Russian of, say, two centuries ago. In this view, Russian would be borrowing Noun-Noun compounds readily because it was ready to accept and develop further the structures they represent. The fact, then, that these compounds have entered Russian without nativisation would thus not be so much a matter of adding complexity to the language as enhancing what was already there, adding to the frequency of analytic structures.[14]

4. Noun-Noun compounds in Greek

As a follow-up to the Noun-Noun compounds of the previous case study, I turn now to a case where Greek, more specifically Modern Greek, plays the role not of donor, as in the first case study (where Ancient Greek is at issue), but rather as recipient, with Western European languages, especially French and English, serving as the donors. The compound type in question here is Noun-Noun compounds with the meaning 'an X which is also Y' or 'an X which is like Y'. In this case, the structure in question involves the juxtaposition of complete words, as opposed to the prevailing Greek pattern of compounding with stems. That is, as described by Mackridge (1985: 328–330) and Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 227–228), instead of compounds with stems joined by a linking vowel, *-o-*, such as τσικλόφουσκα *tsiklófuska* 'bubble-gum' (τσίκλα *tsíkla* 'gum' + φούσκα *fúska* 'bubble', joined with *-o-*), Modern Greek, inspired by Western European, especially French, models in the twentieth century, shows Word-Word compounds, with the juxtaposition of whole words, without the joining *-o-*.

The earliest examples include παιδί-θαύμα *peðí-θávma* 'child-prodigy', literally 'child-wonder', thus presumably based on German *Wunderkind*, but with the order of elements as in the English, according to Charalambakis (2014: s.v.); λέξη-κλειδί *léksi-kliði* 'key-word', literally 'word-key', showing the order in the French model *mot clé*; and απάτη-μαμούθ *apáti-mamúθ* 'mammoth fraud', literally 'fraud-mammoth', with the order of the French *imposture mammouth*. Each member noun in these forms has its own accent, unlike the more widespread τσικλόφουσκα *tsiklófuska* type of compound where the accent of each member is effaced and the composite form has a single accent, which (as in τσικλόφουσκα *tsiklófuska*) can be different from that in each of the component parts. Moreover, although there is some variability in this regard, each member of this innovative compound type generally shows its own inflection for the appropriate case; thus, the genitive singular of 'child prodigy' is παιδιού-θάυματος *peðjú-θávmatos*, the nominative-accusative plural is παιδιά-θάυματα

peðjá-θávmata, and the genitive plural is παιδιών-θαυμάτων *peðjón-θavmáton*. Such double inflection is quite unlike what is found in general with composite forms in Greek; τσικλόφουσκα *tsiklófuska* 'bubble-gum', for instance, has a genitive singular τσικλόφουσκας *tsiklófuskas* 'of bubble-gum', not *τσικλάσφουσκας *tsiklásfuskas*, with inflected τσικλα- *tsikla-*, or *τσικλούφουσκα *tsiklúfuska*, with a putative stem with the linking vowel -o- inflected. There are also examples in which only one member, the leftmost one, is inflected, as in (1).

(1) a. της δεσποινίδος-θαύμα
tis δespiníðos-θávma
the.GEN.F miss.GEN wonder.NOM
'of the girl-wonder'

b. του παιδιού-θαύμα
tu peðjú-θávma
the.GEN.N child.GEN wonder.NOM
'of the child prodigy'

Mackridge (1985: 329), for instance, cites (1a), and Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 228) mark (1b) as acceptable, with only the first member of each in the genitive case.[15] In fact, instances of this compound occur where the two elements show a case mismatch, as in (2), from Mackridge (1985: 329).

(2) των χωρών μέλη
ton xorón méli
the.GEN.PL nation.GEN.PL member.NOM.PL
'of the member nations'

Mackridge notes that a doubly inflected compound, των χωρών μελών *ton xorón melón*, with two genitive plural forms, occurs alongside (2). As noted, the double inflection in a compound is unusual within Greek, but so too is the singly inflected type of (1a) and (2), in that the occurrence of the inflection on the left-hand member is at odds with where inflection occurs in other compounds, as τσικλόφουσκας *tsiklófuskas* 'of bubble gum' indicates.

The entry into Greek of these Noun-Noun compounds, therefore, has led to anomalous morphosyntactic patterns in the language along various dimensions: a novel compound type with a novel accentuation pattern and novel inflectional properties. In this regard, the reaction of some native grammarians is interesting: as Mackridge (1985: 329) reports, 'such formations are condemned by Triandaphyllidis (1941: 177–178) as being alien to the spirit of the Greek language'. Alien or not, they were adopted into the language and have thrived. In fact, Mackridge (1985: 328) sees in the decades of the 1960s and 1970s 'a huge increase in the use of loose compounds' and in his estimation (1985: 329), this type has had a period of being in vogue and has come to constitute a productive pattern: 'More recent formations . . . are found frequently, particularly in journalism but also in everyday speech . . . [these] compounds may however be coined *ad hoc*, using practically any pair of nouns.'

Even with the phonological independence of each member, these inflected forms can be considered compounds for several reasons.[16] Nothing can intervene between the two pieces, there is no independent syntactic means of generating such Noun-Noun sequences in Greek, and there is no usual mechanism by which the inflectional mismatching could be generated. In instances in which a noun is in apposition with another noun, for instance, or where titles are involved, the two nouns must agree in case, as in the different case forms for 'President Stasinopulos' in (3).

(3)	a.	ο	πρόεδρος	Στασινόπουλος	/ *ο πρέδρος	Στασινόπουλο
		ο	proeðros	Stasinopulos	/ *ο proeðros	Stasinopulo
		the.NOM	president.NOM	Stasinopulos.NOM	NOM	ACC
	b.	τον	πρόεδρο	Στασινόπουλο	/ *τον πρόεδρο	Στασινόπουλος
		ton	proeðro	Stasinopulo	/ *ton proeðro	Stasinopulos
		the.ACC	president.ACC	Stasinopulos.ACC	ACC	NOM
	c.	του	προέδρου	Στασινοπούλου	/ *του πρόεδρο	Στασινόπουλος
		tu	proeðru	Stasinopulu	/ *tu proeðro	Stasinopulu
		the.GEN	president.GEN	Stasinopulos.GEN	ACC	GEN

It is worth noting further that unlike in Russian, in Greek there is no evidence of a trend towards analyticity. There are some uninflected and uninflectable nouns and modifiers, e.g. γιωτ *jot* 'yacht' and μπλε *ble* 'blue', but they are mostly loanwords, and very few if any are native.[17] Also, there are periphrases for genitive cases, mostly with the preposition από *apó* 'from', especially instead of the genitive plural, a form which is missing from the paradigms of many nouns (cf. Sims 2015). However, it is hard to see a trend towards uninflectability as something going on within Greek. Thus, Greek differs from Russian in this regard in that it does not appear to be ready to give up inflection, so that the presence of these Noun-Noun compounds does not seem to be an indication of any incipient (further) structural revamping of the language.[18]

These Noun-Noun compounds therefore have introduced some innovations into the grammar of Greek and yet they have found a ready home. It can be speculated that the fact that the formation of these Noun-Noun constructs is just a matter of simple juxtaposition in the source language(s) is what helped to make them an attractive addition to the language from the outside.

5. English Verb-Noun Compounds from French[19]

The preceding case studies have, quite fortuitously, involved mostly nouns used in the formation of compounds. As a final case study, I examine the development of a compound type in English with a verbal base, even though the ultimate meaning of the compound is generally nominal in nature. The source language in this case is French, and the compound itself can be exemplified by the present-day word *pick-pocket*, meaning 'someone who picks the pocket of, i.e. steals from, someone else; a thief'. This type consists of an uninflected verbal base as the first (left-hand) member and a noun serving as the object of that verb as the second (right-hand) member. The meaning is exocentric (a *bahuvrīhi* in the Sanskrit system), so that the compound

as a whole generally refers to the agent of the verbal action indicated by the first member.

There are several reasons for ascribing the occurrence of this Verb–Noun compound type in English to French influence. Drawing on the discussion in Marchand (1960: 37–39),[20] it can be noted first of all that there are no such compounds to be found in Old English; compounds with verbal elements are all *tatpuruṣa*s (determinative) with the verbal element as the second (right-hand) member, e.g. *reord-berend* 'speech-bearer' (which is used figuratively to denote 'human').[21] Moreover, this Verb–Noun type begins to appear in Middle English, with the first attestations coming in the early fourteenth century, around the time that the most intense contact influence from French began to manifest itself and affect English. The earliest cited form, to judge from Marchand's presentation and the OED, appears to be *traylebastoun* (attested 1305) 'one of a class of violent evil-doers in the reign of Edward I; a particular kind of brigand or hired ruffian', from French *traille*, imperative of *trailer* 'drag', and the Old French *baston* 'stick, cudgel, club', thus literally 'a carrycudgel', i.e. 'one who trails or carries a club or cudgel'.[22] More generally, as the analysis of *traylebastoun* shows, the basis in French is a pattern with an imperative verb as the left-hand member and a noun object as the right-hand member.

Since its entrance into English, this compound type, while never overly numerous, nonetheless has remained a clear pattern that has been readily available to speakers. Marchand (1960: 37) lists a dozen early examples from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and then observes that 'there has been an uninterrupted flow of coinings ever since'. Moreover, there seem to be some small clusters of these compounds with the same first element, suggesting sub-patterns that emerged in periods of a limited productivity for this type. Marchand, for instance, offers several items with first member *lick-* from the late fourteenth to the early seventeenth centuries (*lickpot* (1387), *lickdish* (1440), *lickladle* (1571), *lickplatter* (1571), *lickbox* (1611), *lickspit* (1629) and *lickspittle* (1629)), none of which has any currency today.

In fact, of the seventy-four Verb–Noun compounds that Marchand (1960: 37–38) mentions, leaving aside the seemingly stable special groups of bird names such as *wagtail* or plant names such as *catchfly*, just a little over a quarter of them (twenty-one in all) are recognisable today.[23] There are other such compounds in use today that are not mentioned by Marchand, such as *grabass* 'disruptive behaviour, horseplay', or *lackluster* 'lacking in brightness', but there are also some earlier now obsolete ones that he does not list, such as *breakvow* 'a breaker of vows'. The unparsability and obsolete character of many that Marchand lists, e.g. *pickthank* 'toady', *turnbroach* 'boy whose office was to turn the spit' or *scaldrag* 'dyer', suggest that although Verb–Noun compounds are a legitimate type still, any general productivity for them is mostly a thing of the past.

Nonetheless, it is possible for any existing pattern in a language to serve as a model for the launching of new forms. In this regard, Baldwin (1970) is an interesting study. She discusses compounds in the works of the American humorist James Thurber, and notes that Thurber himself created numerous compounds. Among Thurber's neologistic compounds are some twenty or so instances of Verb–Noun compounds, all of which are fairly transparent as to their meanings (explained here otherwise):

blessgravy, *crumplehope*, *crunchberry*, *dampenglee*, *douselight*, *grabcheck*, *grablass*, *hidebottle*, *hugmoppet*, *kissgranny* (perhaps not so transparent, 'a man who seeks the company of older women'), *praisegravy*, *scornmuffin*, *shattermyth*, *shuncabbage*, *shush-laugh* ('one who quiets someone who is laughing'), *snatchkiss*, *sneakslug* ('a person who sneaks a slug of alcohol'), *starefrock*, *tossgravel* and *twisttongue*.

The Verb-Noun compound, while a completely novel type when it entered English from French, nonetheless seems to have found a welcome in its new language. The fact that it was at odds with existing patterns in English did not prevent it from being borrowed in the first place, suggesting that the simplicity of its mechanics, involving nothing more than juxtaposition, overrode the novelty, and thus the complication, that this pattern represented. Moreover, it seems to have successfully resisted nativisation for some seven centuries and has even shown pockets of productivity throughout its history within English.

6. Conclusion

From these several case studies, some generalisations can be developed. First, the issue of simplification versus complexification in language contact is anything but a simple one and in fact is rather complex in its own right. In particular, it is certainly not the case that languages reject in contact situations elements that are alien to their system and thus can take in foreign elements that add to the structural possibilities available to speakers. Second, it may well be, in fact, that the surface simplicity of compounds involving nothing more than juxtaposition of two (or more) elements is what makes such compound patterns easily borrowed and easily absorbed into the recipient language system, even if they would seemingly be at odds with the structure of the borrowing language. All of the case studies examined here suggest that to be a valid generalisation. Finally, based on the characteristics that these compound patterns show in the borrowing languages, it would seem to be the case, not surprisingly but tellingly nonetheless, that once a borrowed element enters a language, it takes on a life of its own and goes its own way, exhibiting properties that outstrip what was possible in the donor language. Thus, they can develop inflectional behaviour that is different from that in the donor language, they can develop degrees of productivity that go above and beyond that found in the donor language, and they can be the locus of innovation in their own right within their new environment. In this way, although compounds are synchronically special in certain ways, lying at the interface of morphology and syntax, they really are no different from other borrowed material, especially unambiguously morphological elements such as affixes; the adjective-forming suffix *-able*, for instance, while of Latinate origin, and originally restricted in Latin to occurring just with verbs, once it was borrowed into English, began to be able to combine with non-Latinate verbal bases, forming such items as *readable* or *drinkable*, based on Germanic roots, and with non-verbal bases, forming such items as *objectionable*. In contact situations, synchronically significant donor-language differences between elements can thus have less importance for the borrowing language than they do in the source language.

Notes

1. I take no position on whether the creation of, say, endocentric compounds (*tatpuruṣa*s in the influential system of the ancient Indian grammarians) differs, in terms of grammatical mechanism employed, from, say, exocentric compounds (*bahuvrīhi*s for the Indian grammarians). For the purposes of the discussion here, this matter is irrelevant.
2. Some sources for this view include Vogt (1948), Coteanu (1957), Givón (1979), Jeffers and Lehiste (1979), Mühlhäusler (1980), Whinnom (1980), Trudgill (2004) and McWhorter (2005). Thomason (2008) is an invaluable summary of the issues pertaining to simplification and complexification in language contact.
3. The discussion here focuses on contact between speakers of distinct languages, though in principle different dialects of the same language could be involved. Thus, my use of the phrasing 'language contact' should be taken to include dialect contact, even though my case studies all involve separate languages.
4. I take a broad view of what constitutes bilingualism and consider speakers with even a minimal ability in another language to be counted among the class of 'bilinguals'; see Friedman and Joseph (forthcoming: chapter 3) for discussion. Clearly, though, different degrees of ability with another language could yield different results vis-à-vis compounding.
5. See Ronzevalle (1911) on this variety of Greek and, more recently, Joseph (2019). Adrianoupolis is modern-day Edirne, now in Turkey and predominantly Turkish-speaking, but in Ottoman times it had a large Greek-speaking population.
6. See Hock and Joseph (2009: 243, 267) for some thoughts on this pronunciation.
7. Nor, alternatively, with the Greek-derived agentive suffix *-ist*: *ear-nose-ist.
8. I am deliberately overlooking *dvandva* compounds such as *farmer poet*, meaning 'a person who is a farmer and a poet' as they are not copulative in nature, and do not conjoin two distinct entities; rather, they designate two qualities of the same individual.
9. It is interesting, but beyond the scope of this study, that the acronym (or initialism, in this case) *ENT* formed from this phrase *ear, nose and throat (specialist)* has the copulative sense without any inclusion or overt representation of *and*.
10. I thank Adam Clark-Joseph of the University of Illinois for help with the matter of chemical nomenclature; see also Joseph (2017).
11. This suffix entered English from French. Note that even the head noun here, *methane*, is based on Greek, being a shortening of *methylene*, from Greek μέθυ *methu* 'wine' and ὕλη *hulē* 'wood, matter', with an adjustment of the vowel of the suffix to give *-ane* (invented to be part of a series of chemical suffixes).
12. I leave as an open question here whether the word *graph* is involved in this derivation or rather a separate but possibly related morpheme *-graph* is.
13. There is certainly more to morpholexical expansion than just outside influence. Voroncova (1964) draws attention to the effects of the 1917 revolution, for instance. As Patton (1999: 29) describes her position, she 'notes that the 1917 revolution gave rise to a process whereby compounds were introduced into the

language at a striking rate', a trend which she ascribes to 'intense social, economic and technical development at that time'.

14. For more recent views on Noun-Noun compounds in Russian, see Kapatsinski and Vakareliyska (2013). Vakareliyska (forthcoming) examines the entry of Noun-Noun compounds into other Slavic languages, especially Bulgarian, on which see also Vakareliyska and Kapatsinski (2014).
15. In fact, in that work, the doubly inflected παιδιού-θαύματος *peðjú-θávmatos* is marked as being of only marginal acceptability.
16. Mackridge (1985: 328) and Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 227) refer to these as 'loose compounds'.
17. Some dialects have a feminine noun η γης *i jis* 'the earth' as indeclinable (genitive της γης *tis jis*, accusative τη γης *ti jis*), continuing an Ancient Greek feminine declinable noun ἡ γῆ *hē gē* (with, e.g. accusative τὴν γῆν *tēn gēn*); see Thumb (1912: §85).
18. I say 'further' because Greek did take part in a general shift towards analyticism in the medieval period due to contact with neighbouring languages (its 'involvement' in the so-called *Balkan Sprachbund*, and that shift has left its mark on the structure of Greek, with new periphrastic verbal tenses, analytic marking of adjectival degree, and so on; see Friedman and Joseph (forthcoming) for discussion).
19. I would like to thank Laurie Bauer, Bethany Christiansen, Jonathan Davis-Secord, Drew Jones and Leslie Lockett for useful leads and information regarding the history of this compound type in English.
20. See also Uhrström (1918), a work that unfortunately was not available to me.
21. I thank Jonathan Davis-Secord for supplying me with this example; I have introduced the hyphens to make the parsing clear.
22. These definitions and the etymological information are adapted from OED (2019: *trailbaston*, last accessed 3 April 2019).
23. I am basing this judgement on my own sensibilities as a well-educated native speaker as to present-day usage. The compounds I judge as still in use are *pickpocket*, *pinchpenny*, *turnkey*, *scarecrow*, *cutthroat*, *telltale*, *donothing* (as a modifier, as in *donothing Congress*), *killjoy*, *spoilsport*, *knownothing*, *spendthrift*, *daredevil*, *turnpike*, *breakfast*, *turnstile*, *stopgap*, *turnbuckle*, *breakwater*, *dreadnought*, *turntable* and *breakneck* (as a modifier, as in *breakneck speed*). It seems to me that some of these are not readily parsable to contemporary speakers (especially *turnpike*, *turnstile*, *turnbuckle* and *dreadnought*).

References

Baldwin, Alice (1970), 'James Thurber's Compounds', *Language and Style. An International Journal*, III: 3, 185–197.

Charalambakis, Christoforos (2014), *Xristiko leksiko tis neoelinikis γlosas*, Athens: Academy of Athens.

Comrie, Bernard, G. Stone and M. Polinsky (1996), *The Russian Language in the 20th Century*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coteanu, Jon (1957), *A propos des langues mixtes (sur l'istro-roumain)*, Bucharest: Mélanges linguistiques.

Friedman, Victor A. and B. D. Joseph (forthcoming), *The Balkan Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, Talmy (1979), 'Prolegomena to any Sane Creology', in I. F. Hancock (ed.), *Readings in Creole Studies*, Ghent: Story-Scientia, pp. 3–35.

Hock, Hans Henrich and B. D. Joseph (2009), *Language Change, Language History, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 3rd edn.

Jeffers, Robert J. and I. Lehiste (1979), *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Joseph, Brian D. (2017), 'The "Indirect" Influence of the Greek Language' (Part II of a multi-part series on the influence of Greek on the English language), *Greek Ethos*, 22: 9.

Joseph, Brian D. (2019), 'The Greek of Ottoman-era Adrianoupolis', in A. Ralli (ed.), *The Morphology of Asia Minor Greek. Selected Topics*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 315–333.

Joseph, Brian D. and I. Philippaki-Warburton (1987), *Modern Greek*, London: Croom Helm.

Kapatsinski, Vsevolod and C. M. Vakareliyska (2013), '[N[N]] Compounds in Russian: A Growing Family of Constructions', *Constructions and Frames*, 5: 1, 73–91.

Mackridge, Peter (1985), *The Modern Greek Language. A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McWhorter, John H. (2005), *Defining Creole*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marchand, Hans (1960), *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Mühlhäusler, Peter (1980), 'Structural Expansion and the Process of Creolization', in A. Valdman and A. Highfield (eds), *Theoretical Orientations in Creole Studies*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 19–55.

Nichols, Johanna (1992), *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

OED (2000–2019), *Oxford English Dictionary*, edited by J. Simpson, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, www.oed.com (29 June 2019).

Patton, David (1999), *Analytism in Modern Russian: A Study of the Spread of Non-Agreement in Noun Phrases*, PhD dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Ronzevalle, P. Louis (1911), 'Les emprunts turcs dans le grec vulgaire de Roumélie et spécialement d'Andrinople', *Journal Asiatique. Receuil de mémoires et de notices relatifs aux études orientales publié par la Société Asiatique*, 18: 1, 69–106, 257–336, 405–462.

Sims, Andrea D. (2015), *Inflectional Defectiveness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. (2008), 'Does Language Contact Simplify Grammars?', invited lecture at *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft*, Bamberg, http://www-personal.umich.edu/~thomason/temp/simple2.pdf (29 June 2019).

Thomason, Sarah G. and T. Kaufman (1988), *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thumb, Albert [1895] (1912), *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*, translated from the 2nd edn (1910) by S. Angus, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Triandaphyllidis, Manolis (1941), *Neoeliniki γramatiki (tis Ðimotikis)*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseos Sxolikon Vivlion.

Trudgill, Peter (2004), 'Linguistic and Social Typology: The Austronesian Migrations and Phoneme Inventories', *Linguistic Typology*, 8: 305–320.

Uhrström, Wilhelm P. (1918), *Pickpocket, Turnkey, Wraprascal and Similar Formations in English*, Stockholm: M. Bergvall.

Vakareliyska, Cynthia M. (forthcoming), *Action Heroes: A Survey of Recent English Loanblend Open Compounds Across the South Slavic Languages* (Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series, 10), Oxford, MS: Balkanistica.

Vakareliyska, Cynthia M. and V. Kapatsinski (2014), 'An Anglo-Americanism in Slavic Morphosyntax: Productive [N[N]] Constructions (with Focus on Bulgarian)', *Folia Linguistica*, 48: 1, 277–312.

Vogt, Hans (1948), 'Reply to the Question, "Dans quelles conditions et dans quelles limites s'exercer sur le système morphologique d'une langue l'action du système morphologique d'une autre langue?"', in M. Lejeune (ed.), *Actes du VIe Congrès Internationale de Linguistes*, Paris: Klincksieck, pp. 31–40.

Voroncova, V. L. (1964), 'Processy razvitija morfologičeskix elementov, stojaščix na grani morfemy i slova' [Processes of the Development of Morphological Elements Standing on the Edge of Morpheme and Word], in *Razvitie Gramatiki i Leksiki sovremennogo russkogo jazyka* [Development of Grammar and Lexicon of the Contemporary Russian Language], Moscow: Nauka.

Whinnom, Keith (1980), 'Creolization in Linguistic Change', in A. Valdman and A. Highfield (eds), *Theoretical Orientations in Creole Studies*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 203–210.