Anti-naming through non-word-formation

Peter Hohenhaus

Abstract
Like many other word-formation theories, the onomasiological approach assumes that the sole function of word-formation is NAMING for the purpose of expanding the lexicon. There is, however, evidence of classes of formations that do (and can) NOT be lexically listed. Furthermore there are various functions of word-formation OTHER than naming. In an extreme form presented here it can even be the exact opposite! This phenomenon, dubbed 'anti-naming', is illustrated in this chapter on the basis of a specially compiled Anti-Naming Corpus. It confirms the need to capture word-formation beyond lexicalizable naming units, to include non-lexicalizabilty and non-naming functions.

1 Background

It can be assumed that most if not all readers of this volume will be well aware of the fact that Pavol Štekauer is one of the key proponents in current linguistics of the onomasiological approach (see e.g. Štekauer 2005). What is less widely known are the discussions he and I have had about some fundamental assumptions entailed by this approach. They took place partly in private exchanges (by email mostly) but are also reflected in a few publications, especially in Štekauer's 2002 reply to my presentation of the theory of non-lexicalizability in Hohenhaus 1998 (which goes back to Hohenhaus 1996). These exchanges also fed into Hohenhaus 2005, i.e. my chapter on lexicalization and institutionalization in the *Handbook of Word-Formation* (Štekauer & Lieber 2005). However, ten years on, the general view that word-formation (WF) is indeed all about naming (and lexical categorizing) still seems to be pretty much current across the board.

Therefore I would like to take this opportunity to embark on another round. This time with new ammunition at the ready.[81]

1.1 Onomasiological approaches versus the theory of non-lexicalizability

The theory of non-lexicalizability basically predicts for certain nonce word-formations (henceforth NFs) that they cannot enter the lexicon. They can appear in performance, i.e. they can be formed, but they cannot be listed in the permanent word stock. In other words: they may be POSSIBLE WORDS but not necessarily at the same time potential LISTEMES. This assertion is naturally at odds with a general theory of WF which, like the onomasiological approach and many others, sees the sole function of WF in naming, and naming always as intended to provide (potential) new lexicon entries. So who's right? And where does the idea of non-lexicalizable WF come from?

1.2 Deictic reference versus naming

An early suggestion paving the way for the theory on non-lexicalizability came from Downing 1977. Mainly concerned with classificatory compounds, i.e. those that do name generic categories and thus are lexicalizable, she also mentions in passing an apparent exception by adducing the well-known (if not to say: by now 'hackneyed') example *apple-juice seat*. This was attested in conversation, when one member of a group was instructed to sit in the chair in front of which a glass of apple juice had been placed. The compound thus served only to distinguish that chair from others in this one, specific situation, but did not also imply the existence of a 'name-worthy CATEGORY' of apple-juice seats – hence Downing (1977: 823) called such compounds based not on permanent but fortuitous semantic relationships 'deictic compounds', and indicates that because of the non-genericness of the semantics and its context-dependency such a compound would remain unsuitable for lexicalization. This has usually been accepted in the literature, but at the same time often brushed aside as just an exceptional or even

---

[81] Readers may please forgive me this mock-martial wording. It is only meant humorously. In reality all this is of course only an intellectual dispute which is neither aggressive nor personal in any way. Far from it. I have the fullest respect for Pavel Štekauer's work and I believe he does for mine too.

irregular phenomenon of little relevance (still so in ten Hacken 2013: 39, cf. Hohenhaus (forthcoming).

Štekauer (2002:110) went even further by claiming that *apple-juice seat* could actually be lexicalized after all. The fact that it is not lexicalized is supposedly only due to the fact that in extra-linguistic reality there normally are no such things as *apple-juice seats*, but that nothing linguistically excludes it. He goes on to suggest that if extra-linguistic reality changed and e.g. a concept like 'chairs the colour of apple juice' became conventionalized, then this compound could well be a name lexicalizable in the permanent word stock. What this argument disregards is a) that this particular apple-juice seat did actually exist in extra-linguistic reality, but only fleetingly, and b) that if you hypothetically pair the same form *apple-juice seat* with a meaning that is quite different from the one in the above attestation, then you are effectively no longer talking about the same sign (in the Saussurean sense of a singular form-meaning pair). Whether that different sign could then be lexicalized or not thus says nothing about the (non-)lexicalizability of the originally attested compound (cf. Hohenhaus 2005: 366).

It is also not the case that 'deictic compounds' are a marginal phenomenon. In fact when you leave the armchair-study approach of only looking at existing, context-free WFs and instead study real-life performance for WF 'in action', then you find them quite frequently, especially in the form of a particular type of NFs, 'dummy-compounds', a concept introduced in Hohenhaus (1996: 281-296) and elaborated on in Hohenhaus 2000. These compounds consist of a head noun that is practically empty in semantic terms and functions almost like a PRO-form (hence only a 'dummy' constituent). This empty head is usually realized as *thing* or *business*, while the element in the non-head position is some bit taken from the preceding co(n)-text. Together, as a compound, these forms serve pure text-deictic reference, without any implication about any permanent concepts or categories, i.e. there is no naming involved, only deictic anchoring inside specific, temporary and fortuitous contexts. For limitation of space, only one example with shortened context can be given here:

(1)   'What do you think of that chap Kroop then?' Philip enquired. 'As little as possible. I'm coming up for tenure myself this quarter' [...] 'This <u>tenure business</u> seems to create a lot of tension.' (Lodge 1975: 76)

Schmid (2008:20,29) also acknowledges that 'dummy compounds' a) do not trigger any hypostatization, i.e. do not imply the existence in extra-linguistic reality of any concepts or categories, and b) due to their deictic function never get 'entrenched' (i.e. remain non-listed).

1.3 A wide range of yet more functions other than naming

In contrast to Schmid 2008, I do not view dummy-compounding as the only type of NF that is not (at least in principle) capable of producing potential listemes. One can find similarly context-dependent NFs of other types too (see Hohenhaus 1996: 37ff and 44ff). Moreover, many subtypes of NFs are functionally bound to non-lexicalizability. Hohenhaus 2007 presents a range of such functions, such as ad-hoc-stereotypification, delocutive conversion, and in particular identical-constituent compounding (for the latter see also Hohenhaus 2004). There is not the space to discus all these cases in detail here. So let's for the moment just assume, for the sake of the argument, that non-lexicalizability is indeed a feature of many NFs. If that is so, what does this mean for WF theory?

1.4 Theoretical consequences

The fundamental question in this context is: what scope should a theory of WF have? WF studies have traditionally relied on well-attested classic sets of data. Only more recently has empirical attention also shifted to 'real-world data' e.g. from corpora. At the same time many WF theories aim to not only explain what actually exists but also to predict what is possible, and to what degree (cf. scales of productivity). But we have to ask: productive/possible as what? As possible lexicon entries or merely as one-off NFs? Theories that restrict the function of WF to naming and lexical expansion do so at a price. Put bluntly, such onomasiologically-oriented theories of WF are rather theories of LISTEME-formation but cannot serve as theoretical models capturing all of WF at large.

There is nothing wrong, in principle, with focusing only on listeme-formation. But then this limitation of scope should also be made explicit. A comprehensive theory of WF, however, should include non-lexicalizable NFs and all their functions beyond naming as well.[82]

2 Yet another case of WF not for naming – rather the opposite

An extreme manifestation of the use of WF for a function other than naming is what I would now like to dub 'anti-naming'. It is the maximal opposition to the naming function. Regular naming provides a well-formed label to refer to and categorize something in reality. In anti-naming, WF is used to form a NON-WORD to not-refer (and not-classify/not-categorize) something that does NOT exist in extra-linguistic reality. What could that possibly look like?

2.1 Anti-naming
Let us begin with a striking example:

(2)   [pre-context: British hotel owner Basil Fawlty is trying to rustle up a Waldorf salad for a choosy American guest but can't find the ingredients, and says:] "There's no celery, there's no grapes ... walnuts! That's a laugh, easier to find a packet of sliced hippopotamus in *suitcase sauce* than a walnut in this bloody kitchen" (Cleese & Booth 1989: 233).

The purpose of these utterances is to express frustration at not being able to find something. Amongst other things this is done by likening the situation to one where something definitely could not possibly be found, simply because it does not even exist.

---

[82] Recently, ten Hacken (2013: 42) in his integrative theory proposals claimed that a WF component separate from the lexicon was needed but at the same time follows the dictum that WF was a "concept-naming component used to extend the lexical component" – see Hohenhaus (forthcoming) for some fundamental criticism of this.

This applies both to the syntactic A+N phrase *sliced hippopotamus* and to the compound *suitcase sauce*. Functionally they both serve the same expressive purpose (and in combination reinforce each other). To this end semantic-pragmatic deviations are created: 'slicing' would require in its Lexical Conceptual Structure (cf. Jackendoff 2010) a certain constraint on size – something that can physically be sliced by means of a knife or equivalent implement. 'Hippopotamus' is chosen here precisely because it prototypically stands for 'very big, chunky animal', which is in stark contrast to what you can find sliced in packets in a kitchen.

The point is that following the non-referential, deviant phrase the compound *suitcase sauce* now extends this to the level of WF. It is not only non-referential and semantically deviant, it is also deliberately 'naming' something that is non-existent or even conceptually impossible (a *suitcase* is a concrete container of solid material and a large squarish shape; *sauce* however must contain in its conceptualization an element like [liquid] as well as a size-restriction on what could possibly be floating in it).

Not only does *suitcase sauce* not refer, on top of that it plays with the naming function of WF by turning it on its head. This is something you could not do by purely syntactic means. In Hohenhaus (2007: 37) I tentatively proposed describing this case as 'negative hypostatization', but here I will call it 'anti-naming' – because this captures the phenomenon under investigation here better (as we will see) and is a simpler term that is more to the point.

Moreover, in Hohenhaus (1996: 128ff and 2007: 36f) I still treated (2) under the heading of 'special cases'. If (2) was indeed a totally isolated case it could perhaps be dismissed as too marginal to be of much relevance. But it is not as isolated a case as it may at first have seemed. In the meantime I have discovered a special linguistic niche where such anti-naming is much closer to being the rule rather than the exception.

2.2 A special setting for anti-naming
In a certain very specific linguistic setting, anti-naming can be exactly what is required. Such a setting is observable in the quiz-show format "Who Wants to be a Millionaire?" – or the German equivalent "Wer wird Millionär?". This long-running classic of TV entertainment has a simple format: candidates are asked questions and have to select the

correct answer from a given multiple-choice set of four, i.e. where three versions will be incorrect answers.

For the most part this is linguistically unremarkable as such, since the correctness of the answer is mostly just about factual truth. But especially in early stages of each round, the wrong answers frequently display analogical[83] WF, where specially made-up NFs are proposed in the wrong answers that are in some way similar or parallel to the correct one. Usually, the task is simple, with very obvious answers, often based on word-play.

For an initial illustration, here are a couple of examples that may also be of particular amusement to linguists.[84] (Notation: the question in the original German is followed by an English translation of my own. The correct answer is marked by italics, the anti-naming non-words are marked by an asterisk; glosses in parentheses following the answers are, where necessary, given first in a literal morpheme-by-morpheme form and, where applicable, the proper equivalent in real English is given after that):

(3)   Was wird beim Sprechen im Inneren des Kehlkopfs in Schwingung versetzt?
         ('What inside the larynx vibrates during speech?')
         A: *Stimmgaumen (voice_palate, literally 'vocal palate')
         B: *Stimmlippen* (voice_lip_{plural}; 'vocal chords')
         C: *Stimmzunge (voice_tongue; literally 'vocal tongue')
         D: *Stimmzähne (voice_tooth_{plural}; literally 'vocal teeth')

---

[83] For more on the notion of analogy in WF, and especially in NFs, see e.g. Hohenhaus (1996: 323-328) or Szymanek (2005: 431) and the literature referred to there.

[84] The examples selected here were primarily chosen on the basis of how easy they were to render in English. Many of the funnier word-play elements in this setting would not translate into English very well, so simpler examples were given preference. I did however make sure that most of the cases that involve some linguistics-related theme are included here – after all this is a Festschrift, and the German *Fest* not only means 'celebration' in English but also 'festivity', so a bit of fun should be permissible here.

(4)   Was hat der „Wirtschaftsminister", was der „Finanzminister" nicht hat? (What does *Wirtschaftsminister*, 'economy_minister', have that *Finanzminister*, 'finance_minister' does not have?')
A: *Spalten-i (fissure_<i>)
B: *Lücken-m (gap_<m>)
C: *Fugen-s* (fuge/seam_<s>
D: *Ritzen-t (cleft_<t>)

Fuge in (4) C should of course have been understood as the technical term in German linguistics for a combining element such as <s>, but is here re-interpreted as the homonymous noun meaning 'seam' or 'groove', thus giving rise to the analogy string A, B and D involving near-synonyms of *Fuge* in that other sense.

2.3 The Anti-Naming Corpus

Once I had become aware of the phenomenon I started collecting such attestations and compiled a fairly sizeable Anti-Naming Corpus.[85]

Since at the time I had no access to the British (or other English-language) format of the show I had to rely on the German version. Hence all original attestations given are in German. The same principle, however, can be assumed to be at work in the English equivalent of the show too. Over several months a corpus of a total of nearly 10,000 words was compiled. WFs constitute approximately 20% of the total word count (the rest is the wording of the questions and other surrounding language). The format of the material follows a common model, as has already been seen in (3) and (4): the question and four choices of answers, A, B, C and D.

---

[85] I am using the term corpus in the old-fashioned sense here, for a collection of specific data compiled and ordered manually, as it were, and not in the modern sense of large electronically assembled databases for computer-assisted analysis. Nevertheless, such traditional collections are, strictly speaking, corpora all the same.

Let us call each of these question-and-four-answers sequences an Event. Events where no WF played any role were disregarded (i.e. the majority of all Events in the programmes that were evaluated did not make it into the corpus for that reason).

In total, 448 Events involving WF were recorded. In the vast majority of cases all four answers have the form of a WF, either on its own, or as part of a short phrase (usually an NP). A few cases are mixed in that one or two answers employ means of expression other than WF, as in (5), where B and C are simple NPs, A is the existing WF and only D introduces a single anti-naming NF:

(5)   Was ist eine beliebte Zutat amerikanischer Sitcoms? ('Which of these is a popular ingredient in American sitcoms?')
A: *Lachkonserven* (laugh_preserve_{plural}, 'sound track of pre-recorded laughter')
B: tiefgekühlte Pointen ('deep-frozen punchlines')
C: Gags im Glas ('gags in a jar')
D: *Tetra-Pak-Witze (carton_joke_{plural})

If all four answers in the Event are WFs, then usually the correct answer is the existing lexeme and the other three constitute non-existing anti-naming NFs. Very occasionally it is the other way round, i.e. if the question amounts to 'which of these four does NOT exist?' then it is a single NF that forms the correct answer, the other three will be existing words. But that reversed pattern is very much the exception. My corpus has only two, given here as (6) and (7):

(6)   Welche dieser Tiere sind frei erfunden? ('Which of these animals are completely fictitious?')
A: *Lanzenkäfer* (lance_beetle)
B: Schildkröten (shield_toad_{plural}; 'tortoises')
C: Schwertfische ('sword fish')
D: Panzerechsen ('armoured reptiles', i.e. crocodiles)

(7)   Was steht in keinem Tierlexikon? ('What is not listed in any animal encyclopaedia?')
A: Klapperschlange ('rattle snake')
B: Zitteraal (tremble_eel; 'electric eel')
C: *Fröstelfrosch (shiver_frog)
D: Schnatterente (quack_duck; 'gadwall')

Occasionally you also get another existing word which isn't the correct answer simply for semantic reasons (i.e. doesn't fit the question, but as a WF as such it is established), as in (8):

(8)   Konservenmahlzeiten sind in der Regel bereits …? ('Canned/preserved meals are usually already ...?)
A: *pultsauber (desk_clean)
B: *schwammfeucht (sponge_moist)
C: kreideweiß (chalk_white; 'ashen, white as chalk')
D: *tafelfertig* (blackboard/table_ready; 'ready to eat/serve')[86]

Discounting all those instances of items that either exist or do not constitute WF at all, the corpus yields a total of 1321 newly formed WFs, i.e. NFs. This should suffice to show that, specific as the pragmatic context giving rise to these forms may be, the sheer number of instances makes the phenomenon significant enough for consideration in the study of WF.

2.4 Some classifications
The items in the corpus can be classified according to the type of formation. Out of these the vast majority are compounds, mostly nominal compounds, with N+N forming by far the most productive pattern. This is perfectly in line with general tendencies in German, of course. Only 153 of the recorded WFs are not nominal compounds, but either non-nominal compounds, derivatives or the result of secondary WF processes.

---

[86] The polysemous first constituent is re-interpreted here to give rise to the analogy string.

2.4.1 *Nominal compounds*
The largest number of all instances of anti-naming through WF found in the corpus had the form of rather simple N+N analogy strings. Only a couple of examples, (9) and (10), have to suffice for illustration here:

(9)   Wie wird Tofu auch genannt? ('What's another name for tofu?')
        A: *Erbsenjoghurt (pea_yoghurt)
        B: *Linsenbutter (lentil_butter)
        C: *Möhrenkäse (carrot_cheese)
        D: *Bohnenquark* ('bean curd')

(10)   Was ist knackig? ('What is crisp?')
        A: *Gletschergemüse (glacier_vegetable)
        B: *Lawinenkohl (avalanche_cabbage)
        C: *Eisbergsalat* ('iceberg lettuce')
        D: *Polarobst (polar_fruit)

        In (10) the first triggering step of the analogy string is a literal re-interpretation of the first noun (which in the original can be taken to be metaphorical – whereas in (9) the relation is more literal). An example of a re-interpretation of the second noun triggering the analogy (namely as breeds of dogs) can be seen in (11), in which the compounds happen to consist almost entirely of English loan words, so hardly any glosses are necessary for these NFs:

(11)   Wer bestimmt in Modefragen die Richtung? ('Who is determining the direction in questions of fashion?')
        A: *Fashionterrier
        B: *Trendsetter*
        C: *Styleboxer
        D: *Lookmops (*mops* = 'pug')

Nominal compounds involving non-noun first constituents include V+N constructions such as (12) and A+N compounds as in (13):

(12)   Womit sind viele Wecker ausgestattet? ('What are many alarm clocks equipped with?')
        A: *Gähnschalter (yawn_switch)
        B: *Döstaste (doze_key)
        C: *Schlummerfunktion* (snooze_function)
        D: *Schnarchknopf (snore_button)

(13)   Wörtlich übersetzt bezeichnen sich englische Liebespaare gegenseitig gerne als …? ('Translated literally, English lovers like to call each other ...?')
        A: *Salziglunge (salty_lung)
        B: **Süßherz* (sweet_heart; 'sweetheart')
        C: *Bitterleber (bitter_liver)
        D: *Scharfniere (hot/spicy_kidney)

(13) is also unique in that all four compounds are non-existent in German, including the one in the correct answer, which is merely a literal nonce-translation.

A unique example is also (14), where the highly exceptional pattern of Pro+N, of which C is to my knowledge one of only two or three attested examples on record, is playfully extended through analogy, resulting not only in non-existent anti-naming compounds but also ones of highly questionable morphological well-formedness:

(14)   Welchen Begriff hört man oft im Zusammenhang mit literarischer Erzähltechnik? ('Which term can often be heard in the context of literary narrative techniques?')
        A: *Sieredner (you[formal]_talk_-er)
        B: *Duschwafler (you[informal]_waffle_-er)
        C: *Icherzähler* (I_tell_-er; 'first-person narrator')
        D: *Wirsprecher (we_speak_-er)

Note that none of these are synthetic compounds, since the first element does not realize a thematic role of the underlying verb in the second constituent, the -er-derived noun. Thus these have to be taken as N+N compounds too. Genuinely synthetic compounds, where N1 is in the object role of the underlying verb, occur in (15):

(15)   Hinter welchem Begriff verbirgt sich eine Familie der Spechtvögel? ('Which term denotes a member of the woodpecker family of birds?')
        A: *Buttersucher (butter_seek_-er)
        B: *Honiganzeiger* (honey_indicate_-er; 'honeyguide')
        C: *Milchverräter (milk_disclose_-er)
        D: *Marmeladenfahnder (jam_investigate_-er)

2.4.2 *Other compounds*
Of the non-nominal compounds in the corpus, seventeen are N+A, as in (9) above, and six are A+A adjectives, including an instance (within a string of nominalized A+As) that will probably make most linguists raise an eyebrow, namely under A in (16):

(16)   Zu den bekanntesten Rinderrassen gehört die …? ('One of the best-known breeds of cattle are ...?')
        A: *Farblosgrüne (colourless_green_{nom}) [sic!][87]
        B: *Dunkelweiße (dark_white_{nom})
        C: *Knalliggraue (bang_ly_grey_{nom}; 'brightly-coloured-grey')
        D: *Schwarzbunte* (black-colourful_{nom}; 'Holstein Friesian cattle')

Even fewer, namely a total of merely six, verb compound NFs were found in the corpus, all of the form N+V, including those in (17):

---

[87] Presumably most readers (unless this article has made them fall furiously asleep already) will get the idea instantly – i.e. the allusion to Chomsky's (1957:15) famous example of a grammatically well-formed but semantically nonsensical string: *colourless green ideas sleep furiously*.

(17) Was macht ein Polizist von Berufs wegen? (What does a policeman do as part of his profession?)
A: ?partygeben (party_give_{infinitive})[88]
B: *feierhalten (festivity_hold_{infinitive})
C: *feteholen (fete_fetch_{infinitive})
D: *festnehmen* (tight_take_{infinitive}; 'arrest', 'apprehend'.[89]

There are also a few isolated instances of word-playful pseudo-compounds involving prepositions, adverbs, pronouns and even determiners, but these are too marginal to be discussed here.

2.4.3 *Derivation*
Derivatives in the corpus are split between 23 instances of prefixation and 47 suffixations, with derived adjectives and verbs forming the majority. Since in this context we are concerned with questions of naming, however, we should concentrate on nominalizations, as it is prototypically nouns that 'name' in the traditional sense. One Event in the corpus that produces nominal derivatives seems to have been made especially for merry linguists, namely (18):

(18) Welche Sprache wurde früher im Südwesten Britanniens gesprochen? ('Which language used to be spoken in the south-west of Britain?')
A: *Wodkisch (vodka_-ish)
B: *Geneverisch (Dutch gin_-ish)
C: *Kornisch* (schnapps_-ish; 'Cornish')[90]
D: *Wiskisch (whisky_-ish)

---

[88] As a nominalization of the phrase meaning 'to throw a party', i.e. *Das Partygeben* 'party-throwing, this may actually be existing, though rare.
[89] But the first constituent is re-interpreted as *Fest*, as the noun meaning 'celebration' – i.e. as in *Festschrift*!
[90] German *Korn* is a simple but popular grain spirit.

2.4.4 *Secondary WF processes*

Falling under this heading are various processes that are not fully productive nor rule-governed – such as clipping, back-formation, blending and reduplication (cf. Welte 1996: 290-301). An example of the latter is invoked in (19) and pseudo-copied in the analogy string:

(19)   Was steht als umgangssprachlicher Ausdruck im Rechtschreibduden? ('Which can be found in the Duden spelling dictionary as an informal expression?')
A: *Mannomann* (man_o_man; 'my oh my!')
B: *Menschomensch (human_o_human)
C: *Frauofrau (woman_o_woman)
D: *Kindokind (child_o_child)

A case of blending is (20):

(20)   Was ist rund 54.000.000 km^2 groß? (What has an area of roughly 20,850,000 square miles?')
A: *Eurasien* ('Eurasia')
B: *Austrafika (Australia + Africa)
C: *Afralien (Africa + Australia)
D: *Ameropa (America + Europe)

A mixture of clipping and back-formation can be observed in (21):

(21)   Wie sieht man am Morgen danach schon mal aus? ('What can a person look like on the morning after?'
A: *savann (< Savanne, 'savannah')
B: *stepp (< Steppe)
C: *wüst* (< Wüste 'desert', actual meaning: 'rough')
D: *oas (< Oase, 'oasis')

Here, C is originally the adjective root from which the noun *Wüste* 'desert' was derived, so this instance can be seen as a back-formation. The resultant analogies, however, can only be interpreted as clippings (since the alleged short adjective forms do not exist).

2.4.5 *Special cases*

Not only is the trigger for the analogy string often a re-interpretation of one element in the WF, as in (4), (8), (11) or (17), occasionally the re-interpretation to trigger the analogy is more brutal, disregarding actual morpheme boundaries through deliberately deviant segmentations, as in (22).

(22) Was misst 80 mal 120 Zentimeter und ist häufig in Lagerhallen zu finden?
      ('What is 80 x 120cm big and often found in warehouses?')
      A: *Afrikafinnen (Africa_Finn_{plural})
      B: *Amerikaschweden (America_Swede_{plural})
      C: *Asienesten (Asia_Estonian_{plural})
      D: *Europaletten* (Europe_Latvian_{plural}, correct segmentation:
                        Euro-_pallett_{plural})

In even more extreme cases the mis-segmentation and re-interpretation requires a different pronunciation as well in order to trigger the analogy (these are usually the cases that elicit a pained groan from both the host of the show and the audience), as for instance in (23) and (24):

(23) Auf wen hat es die Genussmittelindustrie abgesehen? ('Who is the food industry after?')
A: *Exporthühner (export_chicken_{plural})
B: *Verbrauchsgänse (use-up_{Fuge-s}_goose_{plural})
C: *Umsatzputen (turnover_turkey_{plural})
D: *Konsumenten* (consume_duck_{plural}; 'consumers')[91]

(24) Wobei handelt es sich um textiles Gewebe? ('Which is a textile/fabric?')
A: *Drübenschiff (over there_ship)
B: *Hierruder (here_rudder)
C: *Dortsegel (yonder_sail)
D: *Damast* (there_mast; actually 'damask')

(24) takes the game yet another step further in that it not only extracts two constituents that the original, simplex word does not contain (again requiring a shift in the stress pattern from second-syllable main stress to level stress), the analogy also produces a string of pseudo-compounds of the highly dubious formal pattern locative adverb + noun.

2.5 Generalization
The instances of WF in the Events in the corpus cover almost the entire arsenal of WF patterns in German – and to a small (and extremely playful) degree they even go beyond actually well-formed patterns. The vast majority, however, are regular nominal compounds, especially N+N, and thus prime candidates for the naming function. Yet all the NFs in this corpus uniformly do the exact opposite: provide wrong answers through the artificial formation of non-existing WFs to at best 'pseudo-name' things which do not exist and thus contrast to the correct, existing forms and meanings in the real world. Such playful suspensions of the real world through 'un-real' non-naming by non-words

---

[91] I.e. the correct segmentation should have been: Konsum_-ent_{plural}, with the main stress on the third syllable rather than on the second in the re-interpreted mis-segmentation.

may be a very special case in a highly delimited setting, but nonetheless it demonstrates the potential of WF to be exploited for precisely this function as well.

3   Conclusion

As could be demonstrated, not only does WF serve various functions other than just naming, under very special circumstances it can even be used for the exact opposite of what onomasiological theories claim is the only purpose in life for WF. Of course, the instances of 'anti-naming' presented in this contribution are not serious WF – but they are WF nonetheless! They do for a large part adhere to formal, morphological rules (but sometimes break rules too) and often follow their models closely in multiple analogies – just not for genuinely naming real-life concepts, but rather for underscoring their absence from real life.

Do 'serious' theories of WF have to consider such phenomena? Those linguists that follow the tradition of excluding the 'ludic function' of language as a matter of principle may think so (see Crystal 1998 for a plea against such a restriction). My view, however, is that any theory that purports to be not only 'serious' but comprehensive cannot afford to restrict its subject matter, whether for the sake of convenience or the preservation of fundamental theoretical assumptions, to only a chosen subset of WF. Otherwise this should at least be reflected in its name, e.g. call it 'a theory of lexicalized and lexicalizable WF only'. A truly comprehensive theory of all of WF, however, should capture all those other phenomena in NF and their functions, including those that go beyond naming, as well. Anti-naming is admittedly only a rather exotic, special case amongst these. Nonetheless it is worthy of attention and of inclusion is the already wide range on non-naming functions that WF can fulfil.

May this article provide food for thought with regard to such grander pre-theoretical questions. But hopefully it also provided a degree of sheer entertainment through the word-play in the creative material presented here.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Cleese, John, Booth, Connie. 1989. *The complete Fawlty Towers*. London: Methuen.

Crystal, David. 1998. *Language Play*. London: Penguin, 1998.

Downing, Pamela. 1977. On the creation and use of English compound nouns. In *Language,* vol. 53. 810-842.

ten Hacken, Pius. 2013. Semiproductivity and the place of word formation in grammar. In ten Hacken, Pius & Thomas, Claire (eds.). *The semantics of word formation and lexicalization*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 28-44.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 1996. *Ad-hoc-Wortbildung. Terminologie, Typologie und Theorie kreativer Wortbildung im Englischen*. Bern: Lang.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 1998. Non-lexicalizability – as a characteristic feature of nonce-formations in English and German. In *Lexicology*, vol. 4, no. 2. 237-280.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2000. An overlooked type of word-formation: dummy-compounds in German and English. In Hall, Christopher & Rock, David (eds.). *German studies towards the millennium*. Bern: Lang. 241-260.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2004. Identical constituent compounding – a corpus-based study. In *Folia Linguistica*, vol. 38, nos. 3-4. 297-331.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2005. Lexicalization and Institutionalization. In Štekauer, Pavol, Lieber, Rochelle (eds.). *Handbook of Word-Formation*, Dordrecht: Springer. 353-373.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2006. Bouncebackability – A Web-as-corpus-based study of a new formation, its interpretation, generalization/spread and subsequent decline. In *SKASE online journal of theoretical linguistics*, vol. 3, no. 2. 17-27.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2007. How to do (even more) things with nonce words (other than naming). In Munat, Judith (ed.). *Lexical creativity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 15-38.

Hohenhaus, Peter. Forthcoming. Review of ten Hacken & Thomas 2013. In *Word Structure*.

Jackendoff, Ray. 2010. *Meaning and the lexicon: the parallel architecture 1975-2010*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lodge, David. 1975. *Changing places*. London: Penguin.

Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2008. New words in the mind: concept-formation and entrenchment of neologisms. In *Anglia*, vol. 126, no. 1. 1-36.

Štekauer, Pavel. 2002. On the theory of neologisms and nonce-formations. In *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 22, no. 1. 97-112.

Štekauer, Pavel. 2005. Onomasiological approach to word-formation. In Štekauer, Pavel & Lieber, Rochelle (eds.). *Handbook of word-formation*. Dordrecht: Springer. 207-232.

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

Welte, Werner. 1996. *Englische Wortbildung und Morphologie*, *2nd edition*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.

Dr. Peter Hohenhaus
Rauscherstraße 6/42
1200 Vienna
Austria
www.dark-tourism.com/about
phohenhaus@yahoo.co.uk