UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

From prof to provo: some observations on Dutch clippings

Hamans, C.

Publication date

2012

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Phonological explorations: empirical, theoretical and diachronic issues

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hamans, C. (2012). From prof to provo: some observations on Dutch clippings. In B. Botma, & R. Noske (Eds.), *Phonological explorations: empirical, theoretical and diachronic issues* (pp. 25-40). (Linguistische Arbeiten; No. 548). Walter de Gruyter.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Camiel Hamans

From *prof* to *provo*: some observations on Dutch clippings*

1 Introduction

Traditionally, clipping (also called shortening, abbreviation or truncation) of lexical material has been viewed as an irregular and rather eccentric process of word formation. For example, Stockwell & Minkova (2001: 10) observe that

shortening may take any part of a word, usually a single syllable, and throw away the rest, like quiz from inquisitive, phone from telephone, plane from airplane, flu from influenza ... The process often applies not just to an existing word, but to a whole phrase. Thus mob is shortened from mobile vulgus “fickle rabble”. Zoo is from zoological gardens. Ad and British advert are transparently based on advertisement ... Many shortenings have entered the language and speakers have lost track of where they came from. How many people would recognize gin and tonic as coming from Genève?

According to Marchand (1969: 441), clipping is not a regular grammatical process but a stylistic and sociolinguistic phenomenon belonging to informal registers and special jargons. This leads him to claim that clipping forms part of the *parole* (speech) instead of the *langue* (system). The same claim, in a different theoretical framework, is made by Aronoff (1976: 20–21). However, the examples provided by Marchand (e.g. *fridge* for *refrigerator*, *plane* for *airplane*, *maths* for *mathematics*) show how common clipped forms are in Standard English.

Marchand distinguishes between four types of clipping:

(i) <i>Back clipping</i>	temp ad	<	temperature advertisement
(ii) <i>Fore clipping</i>	van plane		caravan airplane
(iii) <i>Fore and back clipping</i>	fridge flu		refrigerator influenza

* Frans Hinskens, Richard Wiese and the editors of this volume were kind enough to comment on an earlier draft of this article, which has resulted in quite a few additions and improvements. I want to thank them for their suggestions.

(iv) <i>Compound clipping</i>	Amerind modem	American Indian modulator-demodulator
-------------------------------	------------------	--

Given this scheme, it will be clear that there is no immediately clear rule or set of rules which governs the process of clipping. The overall picture seems to be irregular: sometimes the right part of a word is truncated, as in (i), sometimes the left part, as in (ii), and sometimes truncation applies at both sides, as in (iii). For this reason, clipping has long been neglected in the theoretical literature, in spite of its surprisingly high productivity, in English as well as in a host of other languages (see e.g. Augst 2000; Bauer 1994, 2001; Hamans 1997, 2004a, 2008; Kuitenbrouwer 1987; Rey-Debove & Rey 1993).

2 Productivity

Clipping has recently begun to attract more attention, in particular because of the recent emergence of a new form of clipping which consists of a trochaic foot with a final full vowel. Some English examples are given in (1).

(1) <i>English</i>	psycho	<	psychopath
	homo		homosexual
	nympho		nymphomaniac

Jespersen (1942: 223) was one of the first to provide examples of this type of clipping, which is characterized by an added *-o* in the second syllable, as in (2):

(2)	journ	<	journalist
	commo		commissary
	aft		afternoon

Another quite frequent pattern involves truncated forms with final *-y*, *-ie* or *-i* (examples from Lappe 2007).

(3)	assy	<	asphalt
	skelly		skeleton
	veggies		vegetables

The question of whether the forms in (2) and (3) involve the same type of clipping as those in (1), or whether they present a special case of truncation followed by derivation, is discussed below.

As Moore (2010: 144) notes, the patterns illustrated in (2) and (3) are especially frequent in Australian English:

This use of the *-ie* or *(-y)* and *-o* suffix with abbreviated forms of words is not exclusive to Australia, although it is more common in Australia than elsewhere, and it is used in distinctive ways in Australia.

The same point is made by Gunn (1972: 60):

Aren't we reaching the inane, when we Australians start accepting *beddie*, *cardie*, (cardigan), *Chrissie*, *pressie*, *ciggie*, *habbie* (haberdashery), *leckie* (lecture), *prossie* (prostitute), *sandie* (sandwich), *tabbie* (tablet), *weepie*, and *yewie* (U-turn)? Of course, these and other habits are not restricted to Australia, but the increase in their popularity here is phenomenal.

A similar development has been observed for Dutch (e.g. Kuitenbrouwer 1987; Fisiak & Hamans 1997; Hamans 2004b). First, Dutch, like English, has an older class of monosyllabic clippings. As in English, this class consists mainly of back clippings, as in (4).

(4)	Jap	<	Japanner	'Japanese person'
	prof		professor	'professor'
	mees		meester	'teacher'

In addition, Dutch, again like English, has a more recent, productive class of disyllabic clippings ending in *-o*, as in (5).

(5)	alto	<	alternatief	'alternative'
	lesbo		lesbisch	'lesbian'
	provo		provocateur	'member of the anarchistic Provo movement of the 1960s in Amsterdam'

Dutch also has a small number of clippings ending in *-i*, as in (6) (examples from Hinskens 2001).

(6)	obi	<	ober	'waiter'
	studi		student	'student'
	omi		oma	'grandmother'

Unlike in German, where clippings regularly end in *-i* (Féry 1997; Wiese 2001), the Dutch *-i* class is small and only marginally productive. As Van de Vijver (1997: 229) has argued, in Dutch *-o* can be seen as the default vowel in this context. In the remainder of this paper, I will ignore clipped forms ending in *-i*.

Clipping is not restricted to the Germanic languages. Hamans (2004b) and Fisiak & Hamans (1997) cite a number of examples from French, noting that the French truncation patterns are in fact much richer than those of English, Dutch and German. Some examples are given in (7).

(7)	bac(calaureat)	appart(ement)	ado(lescent)
	fac(ulté)	manif(estation)	promo(tion)
	pub(licité)	coop(érative)	diapo(sitive)
	mégalo(mane)	sympa(thique)	ciné(rama)
	écolo(giste)	fana(tique)	télé(vision)
	biblio(thèque)	giga(ntesque)	pédé(raste)

The description of Spanish clipping in Rainer (1997: 679–701) shows that it is similar to French clipping. In both French and Spanish, clipped forms are not restricted to a final *-o* but may end in a range of vowels. In addition, clippings may consist of either one or two syllables, and the final syllables may be closed or open.

(8)	dex(erina)	fac(ultad)	ape(tito)
	box(eo)	diver(tido)	bibe(rón)
	fut(bol)	sacris(tán)	dire(ctor)
	bici(cleta)	coca(ína)	choco(late)
	combi(nacion)	compa(ñero)	crono(metro)
	pisci(na)	contra(revolucion)	saxo(fono)

3 Clipping or derivation?

Let us now address the question posed earlier, viz. whether the data in (2), (3), (5) and (6) should be considered as instances of clipping similar to those in (1), or whether they present a special case of truncation followed by derivation. Of course, it is immediately clear that the processes operating in (2), (3), (5) and (6) cannot be described in terms of truncation alone. Clipping of e.g. *commissary* would lead to a form like **com* or **commis*, and cannot produce the correct form ending in *-o*. In cases such as this one, clipping is only the first step in the process; the truncation ‘rule’ must be followed by suffixation of *-o*.

On the other hand, there are good arguments for why the ‘suffix’ *-o* (cf. Lappe 2007) should not be distinguished from the ending *-o* in the examples in (1). The first, and most important, argument for this is that forms like *psycho*, *homo* and *nympho* share certain semantic and stylistic features (see Hamans 2004b for extensive discussion of the semantic, stylistic and sociolinguistic aspects of clippings):

- they belong to an informal register
- they have a certain negative connotation

The second, semantic aspect may be due to “the not always and everywhere appreciated denotation” of these clippings (Hamans 2004b: 162), which has become an integral part of the connotative meaning of the *-o* ending. In (2) and (5), the ‘suffix’ *-o* has an explicitly informal and negative meaning, even in those cases where the base form has no negative associations itself. Jespersen (1942: 223) notes the “slangy, often also hypocoristic, character of the suffix *-o*, which does not really change the sense of the root-word itself.” It is doubtful whether this is correct, however; a form like *journo* conveys far less respect and appreciation than its non-truncated counterpart *journalist*.

In French, where the same process operates, the situation appears to be quite similar:

(9)	catho	<	catholique	‘Roman Catholic’
	clepto		cleptomane	‘kleptomaniac’
	neuro		neurologue	‘neurologist’
(10)	stalo	<	stalinien	‘Stalinist’
	prolo		prolétaire	‘prole/proletarian’
	intello		intellectuel	‘intellectual’

According to Antoine (2000a: xlv), the *-o* ending strengthens the negative association, not just in words from the ‘political domain’ but also in e.g. *intello*. While *intellectual* has a positive meaning, *intello* is not only clearly informal but also has an (exclusively) pejorative meaning. The same holds for the Dutch example *alto*, in (5) above. Whereas non-truncated *alternatief* has a neutral association, *alto* has a pejorative meaning only.

This brings us to the preliminary conclusion that distinguishing between the ending *-o* and the ‘suffix’ *-o* leads to a methodological problem: if we make this distinction, we miss the generalisation that the two forms share certain stylistic and semantic aspects. Below, we will also see that the two forms display the same phonological behaviour: combining them with the truncated base almost always results in a trochee. This, too, is a strong argument for not distinguishing between the two *-o* endings. With Ockham’s razor in mind, forms like (English) *journo* and (Dutch) *alto* are therefore best analyzed on a par with ‘real’ clippings like *dipso* (< *dipsomaniac*) and *psycho* (< *psychopath*).

In section 6, I will discuss a number of examples with *-o* which do not involve any truncation, e.g. *sicko* (< *sick*) in (17) and Dutch *suffo* ‘fathead’ (< *suf* ‘silly’) in (19). (Another example is Swedish *fyllo* ‘drunkard’ (< *full* ‘full’).) In these forms, the ‘suffix’ *-o* plays exactly the same role as in (1) and (2). This provides us with a third argument against a distinction between the ending *-o* and the suffix *-o*, and suggests instead that the three instances of *-o* should receive a unified treatment. However, it will be clear that for the derivation of the second and third ‘type’ of *-o*, an extra suffixation rule is

required, whereas the first type of *-o* is a direct result of the clipping process itself.

One question that remains is whether a form like *veggies* (see (3)) should be analyzed along the same lines. Antoine (2000b: xxxi–xxxii) discusses 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.

Although there is a clear difference between *-ie/-y* and *-o* (*-ie/-y* does not result from clipping¹ and functions as a diminutive/affective suffix with a hypocoristic meaning), the two forms have something in common: both can be combined with a truncated form, and both may have a pejorative meaning.

I will not discuss clipping followed by *-ie/-y* suffixation any further here. I will therefore not attempt to answer the question to what extent forms like *veggies* must be treated on a par with forms like *psycho* and *journos*. For discussion of this, see Lappe (2007). For a unified approach to German *i*-formation (which includes clipping, as in *Sani* (< *Sanitäter* ‘medical assistant’) and hypocoristic formation, as in *Rudi* (< *Rudolf*) and *Ossi* (< *Ostdeutscher* ‘person from East Germany’), see Féry (1997).

4 Prosodic Morphology

The advent of Prosodic Morphology (McCarthy & Prince 1986, 1994) provided an impetus to the analysis of clipping, since this framework makes

¹ *Callie* (from *California*) and *combie* (from *combination*), taken from Lappe (2007), may be counterexamples to this.

it possible to account for phenomena which cannot be straightforwardly handled in ‘regular morphology’. As Wiese (2001: 131–132) notes, traditional concatenative morphology cannot account for clipping because the phenomenon “does not rely on the chaining of morphemes”. A further problem for traditional approaches is that it is often unclear how truncation operates. The cut-off point in clipping may be a morphological boundary (e.g. *tram* < *tramway*), a syllable boundary (e.g. Dutch *auto* < *automobiel* ‘car’), or it may not coincide with any boundary, as in *info* (< *information*) and *temp* (< *temporary*). This problem is obviated in Prosodic Morphology, where the focus is shifted to the output of the truncation process, which is assumed to be prosodically conditioned.

Approaches to clipping in Prosodic Morphology include Weeda (1992) for English, Piñeros (1998) for Spanish, Féry (1997) and Wiese (2001) for German, Simpson (2001, 2010) for Australian English, and Van de Vijver (1997) and Hinskens (2001) for Dutch. This paper is not the place for an extensive discussion of these works; below, I restrict my attention to the analyses of Van de Vijver and Hinskens, and I consider briefly a recent approach to English clippings by Lappe (2007).

Van de Vijver considers a number of different types of Dutch clippings and hypocoristics. These include monosyllabic forms, which invariably end in a consonant (see (4) above), and disyllabic forms. The latter include clippings that consist of two open syllables, as in (11), and clippings that consist of a closed syllable followed by an open syllable, as in (12). (Van de Vijver also discusses disyllabic clippings consisting of a closed syllable preceded by either an open or a closed syllable; since these occur with names only, they will not be discussed here.)

(11)	aso	<	asociaal	‘antisocial’
	brabo		Brabant	‘person from Brabant’
	depro		depressief	‘depressed person’
(12)	alto	<	alternatief	‘alternative’
	lesbo		lesbisch	‘lesbian’
	limbo		Limburg	‘person from Limburg’

Van de Vijver develops an Optimality-theoretic analysis in which two constraints are undominated. The first of these is ANCHOR-LEFT, which requires the left edge of the clipping to match the left edge of the base, i.e. “the first segment of the base is also the first segment of the clipping” (Van de Vijver 1997: 223). In earlier work (cf. Hamans 1996: 72) I have shown that there are very few counterexamples to this left-anchoring, one being *bus* ‘bus’ (< *autobus*). However, such cases of ‘non-back clipping’ are clearly exceptional.

The second undominated constraint is CONTIGUITY, which requires the relative order of segments in the clipped form to be identical to that in the base. Van de Vijver (1997: 223) further assumes a constraint ALIGN (σ , PrWd) (“Some edge of every syllable must be aligned to some edge of the prosodic word”). This constraint bans clippings that are larger than two syllables, since such forms will necessarily have at least one syllable that is not aligned with the edge of a prosodic word. ALIGN (σ , PrWd) outranks MAX-IO, the correspondence constraint which requires input segments to be retained in the output.

Van de Vijver’s analysis is based on names only, and so we may wonder whether it can be straightforwardly extended to the kinds of clippings under discussion here. It would seem that this is not the case. One general problem is Van de Vijver’s (1997: 221) assertion that “all monosyllabic clippings have disyllabic bases”. This claim is incorrect, as is shown by the existence of forms like *provo* (< *provocateur*), *prof* (< *professor*), and many more. Van de Vijver (1997: 228) himself notes the counterexample *bieb* (< *bibliotheek* ‘library’). He suggests that clipping here involves an intermediate form *biblio* (*-theek* is treated as a bound morpheme) in which the final syllable falls outside the disyllabic template (i.e. *bibliotheek* > *bibli(o)* > *bieb*). Aside from the fact that this seems an ad hoc solution, it is unclear what the intermediate forms of *provo* and *prof* would be, and why. The problem with Van de Vijver’s account, it seems, is simply that clipping from longer bases is much more frequent than he claims.²

Another problem with Van de Vijver’s account is that it incorrectly predicts **provoc* ([*ˈprovɔk*]) as the optimal clipping of *provocateur*, rather than *provo* [*ˈprovo*]. The constraints introduced so far predict two pairs of possible clippings for *provocateur* and *professor*: *provo* and *provoc*, and *profes* [*proˈfɛs*] and *profe* ([*proˈfɛ*]). Of these, *provoc*, *profes* and *profe* are unattested. One way to rule out *provoc* and *profes* would be to invoke the well-known markedness constraint NOCODA and rank it above MAX-IO. However, Van de Vijver (1997: 224) instead prefers a constraint which compares the syllabic role of a segment in the base with that in the clipping, viz. STROLE (“Segments in the clipping and their correspondents in the base should have identical syllabic roles”), originally proposed in McCarthy & Prince (1994). *Provok* and *profes* violate this constraint, since the final consonants in these forms occupy the coda position of the second syllable, while in the base they occupy the onset position of the third syllable.

This leaves the non-optimal candidate *profe*, with a final [ɛ]. Observing

² The same holds for English, where we find even larger inputs with monosyllabic clippings, e.g. *vet* (< *veterinarian*, *veteran*), *lab* (< *laboratory*) and *ad* (< *advertisement*).

that Dutch word-final syllables are not usually stressed, Van de Vijver proposes the dominant constraint FINALSTRESSCLOSED (FSC), which requires the final stressed syllable of a clipping (which corresponds to a stressed syllable in the base) to be closed. FSC rules out *profe*, but sanctions outputs like *profes* and *prof*.³ However, the problem is that FSC predicts the wrong outcome for *provocateur*, since it prefers **'provoc* to *'provo*. This is illustrated in the tableau in (13).

(13) Incorrect selection of *provoc* (instead of *provo*) due to high-ranking FSC

<i>provocateur</i>	FSC	ALIGN (σ, PrWd)	StROLE	MAX-IO
a. <i>provoca</i>		*!		<i>teur</i>
b. <i>provoc</i>			*	<i>ateur</i>
c. <i>provo</i>	*!			<i>cateur</i>

Thus, while the ranking in (13) accounts for the presence of final consonants in hypocoristics like *A'leid* (< *A'leida*) and *Pa'tries* (< *Pa'tricia*), it makes an incorrect prediction for clippings. We may conclude, therefore, that Van de Vijver's analysis cannot be easily extended to this type of truncation.

Like Van de Vijver, Hinskens (2001) takes disyllabic clippings as his starting-point. Rather than present a theoretical analysis, his concern is to provide an inventory of possible Dutch clippings, along with their sociolinguistic and stylistic properties. His corpus consists of a collection of Dutch neologisms from Kuitenbrouwer (1987). Hinskens observes that most of the clipped forms in the corpus are trochaic. This supports Kooij & Van Oostendorp's (2003) observation that the 'ideal' Dutch word consists of exactly one trochaic foot (a preference that can be seen even more clearly in abbreviated forms; cf. Kooij & Van Oostendorp 2003: 80). In Optimality Theory, trochaic feet can be derived by the constraints FOOT-BINARITY ("Feet are binary") and FOOT-FORM (trochee) ("Align the left edge of a foot with the left edge of its head"), TROCHEE in short. See Piñero (1998) for an application of these constraints to clipping in Spanish.⁴

Hinskens is not explicit about the constraints that are necessary to derive the appropriate clipped outputs, except to note that ANCHOR-LEFT must outrank TROCHEE. The output **profes* violates TROCHEE, while **fessor* violates ANCHOR-LEFT; the fact that the correct form is monosyllabic *prof*

³ Note that **[pro'fe]* is ruled out in any case because it ends in a lax vowel, which is impossible in Dutch; all of Van de Vijver's examples contain final tense vowels and diphthongs.

⁴ Van de Vijver achieves the same result with ALIGN (σ, PrWd) and WSP ('Weight-to-Stress', i.e. 'stressed syllables are heavy').

suggests that the ranking is ANCHOR-LEFT >> TROCHEE (cf. Hinskens 2001: 46). To ensure that e.g. *provo* is favoured over **provoc*, Hinskens assumes NOCODA (rather than Van de Vijver's constraint STROLE).

While Hinskens' analysis accounts for a range of data, his constraint ranking incorrectly derives **prof* ([prɔf], with final devoicing) from *provocateur*. We have seen that this problem cannot be circumvented by reversing the ranking of TROCHEE and ANCHOR-LEFT, since this would incorrectly derive **fessor* from *professor*. The only way to avoid this, it seems, is to relinquish Van de Vijver's claim that ANCHOR-LEFT is inviolable in clipped forms. Hinskens' use of NOCODA is also in need of refinement, since it favours the clipped form **pro* ([pro], a possible but not preferred Dutch word form; cf. Kooij & Van Oostendorp 2003: 92) over *prof*.⁵ To ensure that the optimal clipping is disyllabic, one possibility is to assume that NOCODA operates on polysyllabic words only (which would be a very unattractive stipulation), or to assume Van de Vijver's FSC constraint.

5 Lappe's alternative

Lappe (2007) does not consider Dutch clippings; her focus is on English clippings, name truncation (e.g. *Rube* < *Ruben*, *Di* < *Diana*), and what she terms 'suffixed' hypocoristics and clippings. Examples of suffixed hypocoristics include *Izzy* (< *Isidore*), *Callie* (< *California*) and *Mandy* (< *Amanda*). Suffixed clippings include such forms as *hammy* (< *hamster*), *limo* (< *limousine*), and also *avo* (< *avocado*) and *condo* (< *condominium*).⁶ Lappe's examples of clippings include *mes* (< *mescaline*) and *pro* (< *professional*), in addition to unsuffixed disyllabic clippings such as *detox* (< *detoxification*) and *accad* (< *academy*).

Given that English truncation is similar to Dutch truncation, it may be useful to consider some aspects of Lappe's account here. Lappe's starting-point is quite different from what we have seen so far. She argues that since clippings usually consist of a single heavy syllable, and since truncation does not display 'emergence-of-the-unmarked' effects (for this notion, see

⁵ The form **pro* would end in a tense vowel, since Dutch bans final lax vowels (i.e. **[prɔ]*). If a lax vowel in a base ends up in word-final position due to clipping, it is realized as tense, e.g. *info* (< *informatie* 'information'), *demo* (< *demonstratie* 'demonstration') and *afko* (< *afkorting* 'abbreviation'). Here the full forms have lax [ɔ] and the clippings tense [o].

⁶ *Avo* and *condo* could also be treated as simple disyllabic clippings.

McCarthy & Prince 1994), the basic structure of clippings is monosyllabic (see Lappe 2007: 7–13).⁷ In Lappe's (2007: 163) view, "monosyllabic clipping, *y*-suffixed clipping and *o*-suffixed clipping, and unsuffixed clipping are truncatory processes in their own right". Disyllabic clipped forms like *barbie* (< *barbecue*) and *alkie* (< *alcohol*) are viewed as consisting of a monosyllabic root plus an affix (*-y* or *-o*). The same holds for forms like *combie* (< *combination*) and for the forms *avo* and *condo* mentioned above.

Lappe's (2007: 46; see also 2003) main argument for this view comes from a consideration of the constraint MAX:

The main problem for a MinWd approach to English truncation ... comes from the fact that the proposed ranking of the prosodic markedness constraints with respect to MAX predicts that only one of the two possible minimal word structures will surface in truncation: the disyllabic minimal word. Monosyllabic minimal words, by contrast, can never be optimal. The reason is that MAX, even though lowly ranked, will always prefer a disyllabic candidate over a monosyllabic candidate. The basic prediction of this ranking is that the amount of segmental material preserved from the base will be maximal; disyllables will always preserve more material from their bases than monosyllables.

This is also the reason why Van de Vijver (1997: 225) claims that "clipped forms do not have an underlying form of their own", and that faithfulness constraints therefore do not play a role. The same view is implicit in Hinskens (2001), where monosyllabic outputs are favoured by ANCHOR-LEFT, with MAX playing no role in this aspect of the analysis.

This paper is not the place to review Lappe's analysis in any detail. In what follows, my focus will be on the diachrony of clipping phenomena (see section 6), and not so much on the synchronic grammatical system that produces them. Here I will note only that Lappe proposes an important markedness constraint that restricts the size of outputs, viz. COINCIDE- σ (stress), which requires "every element of the output [to be] in the main stressed syllable" (Lappe 2007: 179). This constraint favours the creation of monosyllabic outputs, and at the same time penalizes each segment which is not part of the output of the clipping. COINCIDE- σ (stress) is dominated by the constraint MAX (affix), which requires every affix in the input to have a correspondent in the truncated form" (Lappe 2007: 187). One effect of MAX (affix) is therefore that it forces the presence of *-o* and *-y* in the output, if these vowels are also part of the input.

⁷ One of Lappe's arguments for this is that in unsuffixed disyllabic clippings like *celeb*, *exec* and *ident* (with final stress), the "word structure cannot be explained in terms of unmarked prosodic word structure" (Lappe 2007:13). An unmarked prosodic word structure would have resulted in a trochaic pattern instead. In Dutch, this kind of clipping is restricted to names, and is not considered here.

6 Diachronic aspects

Lappe is certainly correct when she notes that the majority of clippings consists of a single heavy syllable. However, the preponderance of monosyllabic clippings in Lappe's corpus obscures the observation that truncation to a disyllabic template is a recent phenomenon in (American) English. In earlier work, I have also observed that older clippings tend to be monosyllabic (see Hamans 1996, 2004a, 2004b). However, both English and Dutch also display a more recent pattern of disyllabic clipping, which is likely due to the fact that the two languages are predominantly trochaic.

The emergence of disyllabic clippings is one argument for taking the trochee to be the unmarked metrical pattern in modern Dutch (see Kooij & Van Oostendorp 2003 for other arguments). However, the preferred Dutch minimal word has not always been trochaic, as is evidenced for instance by the historical apocope process illustrated in (14).

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

Stress used to fall on the first syllable of the older variants in (14), which contain a schwa in the second syllable. At some point in the history of Dutch, apocope no longer applied; from this point onwards, trochaic forms remained unaffected (cf. Kooij & Van Oostendorp 2003: 80). The forms in (15), for example, did not undergo apocope.

(15)	boete	>	*boet	'fine'
	vrede	>	*vreed	'peace'
	rede	>	*reed	'speech'

These data could suggest a change from a non-trochaic to a trochaic metrical pattern. Further support for this comes from the accommodation of loans, e.g. *pijler* 'pillar' from Latin *pila*, with stress shift and subsequent diphthongization.

Not all the evidence points in the same direction, however. Another loanword from the same base, *pilaar*, retained stress on the final syllable. In addition, the preference for a trochaic pattern is not manifested in allegro speech, where instead of an expected stress shift we find complete vowel reduction and concomitant monosyllabification (Awedyk & Hamans 1998), as in (16).

(16)	ba.'naan	>	bnaan	'banana'
	par.'tij	>	p(r)tij	'party'
	ka.'non	>	knnon	'cannon'

These data suggest that there is more variability in preferred minimal word structure than is sometimes assumed (though whether it is justified to compare the effects of fast speech with 'normal' grammatical patterns is an open question).

These considerations aside, we can observe two competing clipping patterns in modern Dutch: an older pattern, illustrated in (4), of mainly monosyllabic forms, and a relatively recent pattern, illustrated in (5), (11) and (12), of mainly disyllabic trochees with a final, possibly suffixed, *-o*. The recent pattern emerged in the mid 1980s, due to influence of American English (Kuitenbrouwer 1987; Hamans 1996, 2004a, 2004b). Dutch has only two disyllabic clipped nouns with final *-o* that are older, viz. *indo* 'Indonesian-Dutch half-breed' (first attested in 1898) and *provo* (introduced by the criminologist Wouter Buikhuisen in 1965). (The clipped form *prof*, from *professor*, was first attested in 1875.)

As noted, the preponderance of monosyllabic clippings in Lappe's corpus masks the recent emergence of disyllabic truncation in (American) English. Lappe's corpus consists of three dictionaries (one of standard English and two slang dictionaries) from the early 1980s, a few years before *-o* clipping became fashionable. The pattern was already productive in Australian English earlier, but the influence of Australian English on American and British English is small, and its influence on Dutch negligible.

To date, no satisfactory explanation has been advanced for the emergence of *-o* clippings in American English, owing to the lack of reliable data. Since clipped forms, and in particular *-o* clippings, belong to informal registers, a reasonable scenario is that this pattern originated in the street jargons of youngsters in the big American cities, with a possible influence from Hispanic and perhaps Italian (see Hamans 2004b). It is interesting to observe in this respect that the *-o* ending has subsequently spread to full words which form part of and originated in youngsters' slang:

(17)	sicko	<	sick
	weirdo	<	weird
	creepo	<	creep

Hamans (1996, 2004a, 2004b) proposes an American English influence for languages such as Dutch, Swedish and Polish, which have all acquired *-o* clippings fairly recently and, for Dutch and Swedish at least, on a massive scale.

7 Conclusion

If the diachronic and contact-based scenario sketched in section 6 is correct, then the approach of Van de Vijver (1997) or Hinskens (2001) would offer a reasonable explanation for the change from a mono- to a disyllabic clipping template. The development from an initial stage with a preference for monosyllabic clippings to a later stage with an influx of *-o* clippings, and a subsequent extension of *-o* suffixation to ‘full words’ (as in *sicko*), can be expressed in terms of a re-ranking of constraints, as in (18).

- (18) Old system: ANCHOR-LEFT >> TROCHEE
 New system: TROCHEE >> 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, we do not yet have sufficient diachronic data to refine this very sketchy picture.

The account offered by Lappe also contributes to our understanding of the change, in particular because the change did not just involve truncation, but was also extended to full forms, with suffixation of *-o*. English examples of this were given in (17). Some Dutch examples are provided in (19) and (20):

- (19) lullo < lul ‘penis’
 duffo duf ‘dull’
 suffo suf ‘silly’
- (20) lokalo < lokaal ‘local’
 gewono gewoon ‘normal’
 positivo positief ‘positive’

A detailed description of this process is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it will be clear that in Lappe’s approach, these data can conceivably be treated by extending the constraints COINCIDE- σ (stress) and MAX(affix).

In sum, the three theoretical approaches considered in this paper take different perspectives on clipping. Lappe’s point of departure is the older pattern of monosyllabic clipping, while Van de Vijver and Hinskens focus primarily on the more recent, disyllabic pattern. More diachronic data are required to evaluate which of these perspectives is ultimately the more appropriate. This is an issue for further research.

References

- Augst, 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): *Dictionnaire français-anglais des mots tronqués*. – Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.
- (2000b): *An English-French Dictionary of Clipped Words*. – Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.
- Aronoff, Mark (1976): *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. – Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Awedyk, Wiesław & Camiel Hamans (1998): "How allegro speech ruins the principles of universal grammar or are universal constraints universal?" – In: Caron, Bernard (ed.): *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguists*. Oxford: Pergamon (CD-ROM Paper No. 0155).
- Bauer, Laurie (1994): *Watching English Change. An Introduction to the Study of Linguistic Change in Standard Englishes in the Twentieth Century*. – London & New York: Longman.
- (2001): *Morphological Productivity*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunn, Jeannie (1972): "Change in Australian idiom." – In: Turner, George (ed.): *Good Australian English and Good New Zealand English*, 47–63. Sydney: Reed Education.
- Féry, Caroline (1997): "Uni und Studis: Die besten Wörter des Deutschen." – In: *Linguistische Berichte* 172, 461–489.
- Fisiak, Jacek & Camiel Hamans (1997): "Memento for a Lefto." – In: Ahlqvist, Anders & Věra Čapková (eds.): *Dán do oide. Essays in Memory of Conn R. Ó Cléirigh*, 157–163. Dublin: Institiúid Teangeolaíochta Éireann.
- Hamans, Camiel (1996): "A Lingo of Abbrevs." – In: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 38, 69–78.
- (1997): "Clippings in modern French, English, German and Dutch." – In: Hickey, Raymond & Stanisław Puppel (eds.): *Language History and Linguistic Modelling. A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th Birthday, 1732–1741*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2004a): "From *rapo* to *lullo*." – In: Duszak, Anna & Urszula Okulska (eds.): *Speaking from the Margin. Global English from a European Perspective*, 69–75. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- (2004b): "The relation between formal and informal style with respect to language change." – In: Dabelsteen, Christine & J. Normann Jørgensen (eds.): *Language and Language Practices*, 162–187. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.
- (2008). "Why clipped forms should be accepted as nouns." – In: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 50, 95–109.
- Hinskens, Frans (2001): "Hypocoristische vormen en reductievormen in het hedendaagse Nederlands." – In: *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 39, 37–49.
- Jespersen, Otto (1942): *A Modern English Grammar. Part 4: Morphology*. – Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.