Some Aspects on Korean Blends: An Optimality-theoretic Analysis*

Hongwon Seo
(Chonbuk National University)

Seo, Hongwon. (2013). Some Aspects on Korean Blends: An Optimality-theoretic Approach. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 21*(3), 135-150. This study aims to provide some aspects of Korean blends within the framework of Correspondence Theory. In spite of its productive and systematic characteristics, fewer interests have relatively been given to the analyses of blends in Korean. In the previous studies, blending is largely categorized into two groups: overlapping and non-overlapping blends. However, we found the distinction of two kinds of blends does not play a salient role in our analysis. In order to derive the optimal output, we divide constraints into the undominated and dominated ones. Of the undominated constraints, MinContrib entailing Blend= MinWord requires that at least one syllable of each base word should be involved in creating blends for the purpose of increasing the recoverability of bases. In addition, Align(BW, BW(σ)) forces a switch point to be located at the syllable boundary. Finally, since the overall length of the blend should be identical to that of the longer base, in our analysis Max-σ and Dep-σ are gradiently counted based on Bat-El's suggestion (1996).

Key Words: blending, switch point, recoverability, optimality, OO-Correspondence

1. Introduction

Blending refers to a word-formation process that two existing words are combined into one, accompanied by clipping or subtracting some parts of two base words with or without overlapping segments. In spite of its productive,

* I gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments by the anonymous reviewers. All the remaining errors are mine.

predictable, and systematic characteristics, as are other word formation processes like affixation and compounding, blending has long been dealt with as an arbitrary and marginal process by some scholars. In particular, Bauer (1983) argues that when blends are newly created from the parts of two other words, no obvious rules are applied and the coiner is also explicitly free to take as much from either base as is felt to be necessary or desirable.

Due to this previous view toward blending, not until only recently have many studies on blending been conducted. However, some researchers have argued that blending is not arbitrary nor less important, but a highly systematic and well rule-governed word-formation process, which can appropriately be explained based on a constraint-based approach (Kubozono, 1990; Bat-El, 1996; Piñeros, 1999; Hong, 2005; Jin, 2005, and others).

In spite of this trend, now that blending in Korean has not been considered very productive from the diachronic perspective, fewer studies to analyze Korean blends have been conducted from the phonological aspects so far (Seo, 2011; Ahn, 2012; Kang, 2013). However, the rapid development of science and technology and the influx of lots of foreign words or loanwords into Korean have had even more new words created by blending, compared with the past. Accordingly, in this study we will look at some morphological and phonological aspects on Korean blends within the framework of Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky, 1993; McCarthy & Prince, 1995).

This paper is organized as follows: In the next section, we present and describe some data produced by blending, dividing them into 3 groups based on what their source words are. Section 3 provides the analysis of Korean blends on some morphological and phonological aspects within Output-to-Output Correspondence Theory (Benua, 1995), which is extended from Correspondence Theory. Finally, we conclude this study and suggest some implications for future study in section 4.

2. Data and Description of Blends in Korean

In this section we will present the data produced by blending and describe how they have their own peculiar properties in common, depending on some

types into which we will divide them. In order to analyze Korean blends, it is necessary to clearly understand how words are newly coined by blending. Kubozono (1990) states that blending occurs by a word formation process as follows:

(1) Blending formation rule (Kubozono, 1990, p. 4)
AB + XY → AY (either B or X can be null)

As seen above, note that the left edge of the first base and the right edge of the second base must be preserved in the blends when defining blending. Under such a necessary condition, the previous studies attempted to analyze blends, largely categorizing them into two groups: overlapping blends and non-overlapping blends. Overlapping blends indicate the case that some segments of each source word are so shared that we cannot exactly demarcate where the boundary between splinter and residue is. On other hand, as blends which are produced without overlapping some segments have a crisp boundary, we can detect where the switch point is located between two source words. Since this classification of blending has played a crucial role in analyzing blends in the previous studies, the first step for the blending analysis was to divide blends into two groups.

However, in this study we will try to classify and examine Korean blends according to the origins of source words, rather than categorizing blends by whether overlapping segments within source words exist in blends. The following data show how Korean blends are divided according to the origins of source words. The data presented in this paper are largely chosen from Ahn (2012) and Seo (2011), most of which are collected from *Dictionary of Neologisms in Korean* and Internet materials, as Ahn states in her thesis.

As seen in (2), all blends consisting of two Korean words are created by combining each residue after clipping some parts of source words. Notice that all blends show that only the first syllable of a left word and all residue of a right word except its first syllable are combined in order to create a new word, irrespective of the overlapping of segments. It means that a syllable within each source word is used as a switch point which demarcates the boundary between the splinter and the residue.

(2) Type 1. Native Korean + native Korean[1)]
a. ɨ<sa + ha>nɨnim → ɨnɨnim (doctor + God)
b. cən<lato + kyəŋ>saŋto → cənsaŋto (Cənlato+Kyəŋsaŋto)
c. hak<kyo + ki>suksa → haksuksa (school + dormitory)
d. t'ək<kap + kəm>c^{h}al → t'əkc^{h}al (bribe + prosecutor)
e. c^{h}a + ka>kyepu → c^{h}akyepu (car + expense log)
f. tak + yək>sekwən → taksekwən (chicken + station area)

The following examples are blends, which are composed of a native Korean word and a loanword, regardless of the order of two words. Even in this case, Korean people are not sensitive to the use of their loanwords, which makes them create blends freely. All data in (3a-e) are formed by the same way as the examples presented in type 1. That is, the first syllable of a left word and the remaining syllables subtracting the first syllable of a right word are combined into one. On the other hand, the example (3h) shows when the length of the first base word is longer than that of the second one, the syllable size of the blend could be determined by the number of syllables of a left word. However, the general pattern is largely determined by the length of the right words[2)]. In addition, as shown in (3f-g), when some parts of a source word are clipped, its recoverability should be significantly considered. Recoverability means the deleted parts of two original words must be recovered for the intended

1) Ahn (2012) argues that all blends can be divided into two groups depending on types of combining patterns: overlapping and non-overlapping blends. For example, all blends in (2a-d) are produced without overlapping segments, but in blends (2e-f) overlapping happens. That is, a vowel /a/ and a consonant /k/ are overlapped in (2e) and (2f), respectively. She adds that the presence of overlapping segments can make each source word keep more segments in the resultant blend.

2) When it comes to the length of the blends, Ahn (2012) shows the general patterns are as follows:

Blend =left SW	Blend =right SW	Blend =left SW =right SW	Other	Total
14(3.3%)	313(74.5%)	65 (15.5%)	28(6.7%)	420

As shown above, about 90% of blends have the same length as the right source words. SW indicates a source word.

meaning from blends. Thus, more than one syllable of each word are combined to form blends, which makes it possible to restore original words.

(3) Type 2. native Korean+loanword (loanword+native Korean)
a. $p^{h}o<k^{h}ɨ$ + sut>kalak → p^{h}okalak (fork + spoon)
b. ak + li>p^{h}ɨl → akp^{h}ɨl (bad + reply)
c. pap + si>t^{h}ədi → papt^{h}ədi (rice + study)
d. minpak + ho>t^{h}el → mint^{h}el (home stay + hotel)
e. t^{h}ek<si + no>sukca → t^{h}eksukca (taxi + homeless)
f. kimc^{h}i + hali>wudɨ → kimc^{h}iwudɨ (kimchi + Hollywood)
g. piman + piyon>se → pimanse (obesity + Beyonce)
h. lecən<tɨ + cən>səl → lecənsəl (legend + folktale)

All of the data in type 3 are formed by the combination of two loanwords, most of which conform to phonological grammar or restrictions in Korean. The examples in (4a-g) have the same pattern in common regardless of the presence or absence of overlapping segments. That is, they are produced by combining the first syllable of left words and the remaining parts except the first syllable of right words. The examples (4j-k) show the data where the first base word is longer than that of the second one, The data in (4h-i) show two syllables of the first source words are included in the blends, respectively. We assume that this pattern might be caused to maximize the degree of recoverability of original words or to reflect the foot structure of English words. According to Itô and Mester (1995), lexical domains of Japanese can be stratified into 4 strata such as 'native vocabulary', 'assimilated loans', 'foreign vocabulary', or 'unassimilated vocabulary'. Considering the core-periphery structure of the phonological lexicon, we can assume the peculiar properties of loanwords might be partly reflected or kept into newly formed blends. In particular, all the data given in (4l-n) show the exceptional patterns, in that the switch point of each blend is not at the syllable boundary[3].

3) Ahn (2012) argues that a syllable is much more preferable as the switch point of blends than an onset or a rhyme. More than 95% out of blends without overlapping have a syllable boundary as the switch point.

(4) Type 3. loanword + loanword
a. ne<tʰicɨn + li>pʰotʰə → nepʰotʰə (netizen + reporter)
b. sel<lə + kʰən>syumə → selsyumə (seller + consumer)
c. myu<cik + o>pʰela → myupʰela (music+ opera)
d. hom + ə>syulənsɨ → homsyulənsɨ (home + assurance)
e. an<tʰi + ne>tʰicɨn → antʰicɨn (anti + netizen)
f. pʰæ<sɨtʰɨ + le>sɨtʰolaŋ → pʰæsɨtʰolaŋ (fast + restaurant)
g. pək<sɨ + ek>sɨpʰo → pəksɨpʰo (bugs + Expo)
h. pʰoli<tʰɨsyən + pʰɨlo>pʰesə → pʰolipʰesə
(politician+professor)
i. s'ælə<limæn + sɨtʰyu>dəntʰɨ → s'ælətəntʰɨ
(salaried man + student)
j. tici<tʰəl + kʰa>tʰun → ticitʰun (digital + cartoon)
k. kʰəncəpə<tʰipɨ + kʰitɨ →kʰəncəpəkʰitɨ (conservative + kid)
l. kæk<mæn + anna>unsə → kækunsə (gagman+announcer)
m. mæ<cik + e>nciniə → mænciniə (magic + engineer)
n. neks<ɨtʰɨ + n>opɨlliən → neksopɨlliən (next + noblian)

In addition to the patterns above, we frequently encounter blends somewhat similar to affixation in terms of productivity. Lots of blends are formed by only adding the specific residue of a right word to the partial or full part of a left word like creating new words by attaching a suffix. The examples such as -tʰing (meeting), -tʰeinə (entertainer), -pʰaracʰi (paparazzi), -tol (idol), -llela (Princess Cinderella), and -piannaitʰɨ (Arabian Night) are productively used like suffixes in the formation process of Korean blends. From a different view, this word-formation process can be regraded as folk etymology because unanlysable parts can mistakenly be treated as analysable ones based on wrong analogical inference.

(5) Type 4. suffixation
a. -pʰaracʰi (paparazzi)
kʰa + pʰa>pʰaracʰi → kʰapʰaracʰi (car + paparazzi)
sik<pʰum + pʰa>pʰaracʰi → sikpʰaracʰi (food + paparazzi)
sən<kə + pʰa>pʰaracʰi →sənpʰaracʰi (election + paparazzi)

b. -$t^hiŋ$ (meeting)
   cəŋ<ki + mi>$t^hiŋ$ → cəŋ>$t^hiŋ$ (periodical + meeting)
   p^hon + mi>$t^hiŋ$ → $p^hont^hiŋ$ (phone + meeting)
   t'aŋ + mi>$t^hiŋ$ → t'aŋ$t^hiŋ$ (land + meeting)

From all the data presented in (2), (3), and (4), the generalization regarding Korean blends can be summarized as follows:

(6) Generalizations about Korean blends
   a. The length of blends largely agrees with the number of syllables of a right word.
   b. The length of a right word is more than or equal to that of a left word in the universal pattern.
   c. The syllable boundary is preferred to the boundaries between an onset and a rhyme, or a peak and a coda as a switch point of each base word.
   d. The presence or absence of overlapping segments is not a decisive factor in the analysis of Korean blends.
   e. The first syllable of a left word and the residue except the first syllable of a right word are combined into one.
   f. In terms of semantic aspects, a right source word should be a semantic head.
   g. Before creating blends, recoverability of the base word has a significant role in clipping.
   h. Exceptional patterns, which do not follow generalizations of blends happen more in the combination of two loanwords than other cases.

So far we have presented some data formed by blending and have described the generalization concerning how two original words are combined into one. In the next section, we will provide an analysis for Korean blends based on the framework of Correspondence Theory.

3. Analysis of Korean Blends

In this section, we will provide an analysis for blends in Korean under Correspondence Theory. The constraints employed in our analyses are as follows:

(7) The constraints for Korean blends
  a. Anchor constraints
    I. LeftAnchor(BW1, Blend): The left edge of the BW1 must correspond to the left edge of the blend.
    ii. RightAnchor(BW2, Blend): The right edge of the BW2 must correspond to the right edge of the blend.
  b. RightAnchor(Head)
    The head base must correspond to the right edge of the blend.
  c. Align(BW, BW(σ))
    i. Align(BW1, R, σ, R): Align the right edge of some syllable with the right edge of BW1.
    ii. Align(BW2, L, σ, L): Align the left edge of some syllable with the left edge of BW2.
  d. Minimal Contribution (MinContrib)
    Each base must contribute at least one syllable to the blend. (Bat-El, 1996)
  e. Blend=MinWord
    The blend must have at least 2 syllables.
  f. HeadMax-σ
    Every syllable in the head must have a correspondent in the blend.
  g. HeadDep-σ
    Every syllable in the blend must have a correspondent in the head.

When analyzing Korean blends, above all, we need two anchoring constraints, LeftAnchor(BW1, Blend) and RightAnchor (BW2, Blend) requiring that the left edge of BW1 must correspond with the left edge of the blend and the right edge of BW2 must correspond with the right edge of the blend. These anchoring constraints should be undominated in all blend analyses since

blending entails the necessary condition that the left edge of the BW1 and the right edge of BW2 must agree with the left and right edge of a blend, respectively. When it comes to the order of two bases, RightAnchor(Head) restricts that the head base word stand at the right edge of the blend, blocking the change of their order. In short, this constraint is responsible for the order of the bases in blends, as the phonological head is universally fixed at the right edge (Kubozono, 1990). However, this constraint will be ignored in our analysis because it should be predetermined by semantic factors.

Second, the alignment constraint, Align(BW, BW(σ)) which is closely related to switch points, serves to agree the right edge of the first base with the left edge of the second base word at the syllable boundary. That is, this constraint shows that the syllable boundary can play a highly important role in carrying out the demarcative function between the splinter and the residue. We need to note that other prosodic categories such as foot or onset-rhyme in the analysis of Korean blends perform very limited roles in separating the splinter and residue, unlike English blends.

Third, since MinContrib is a constraint that at least one syllable of two bases should be in the blend. Thus, it contributes to preserve the semantic property of the blend, which increases the recoverability of the bases. On the other hand, Blend=MinWord regulates the minimum size of the blends that blends must be at least disyllabic. From this requirement, we can adopt the Bat-El's argument (1996) that MinContrib entails Blend=MinWord. Since blends consist of two bases, each base should occupy at least one syllable in the blends. This has an implication that Blend=MinWord does not have to be considered in our analysis from now on.

Finally, two head identity constraints, HeadMax-σ and Head Dep-σ, which are involved in one-to-one correspondence of syllables between the blend and the head base word, should be added to keep the processes of syncope and epenthesis within the head base from arising in the blend.

Summing up the results of the discussion so far, we now turn to the analysis of Korean blends. The ranking schema that we need to use is given in (8):

(8) The constraint hierarchy for Korean blends

a. Undominated constraints:
LeftAnchor(BW1,Blend), RightAnchor(BW2,Blend), MinContrib, Blend=MinWord, RightAnchor(Head)

b. Dominated constraints
Align(BW, BW(σ)) ≫ HeadMax-σ, HeadDep-σ

Let us begin with the constraints undominated in the analysis of Korean blends. As can be seen in tableau 1, the undominated anchoring constraints rule out candidates (1a, 1b) that the edges of a blend do not correspond to the right or left edge of bases, respectively. On the other hand, candidates (c, d) in tableau 1 are also eliminated from optimal candidates by violating MinContrib.

Tableau 1. sel⟨lə + k^hən⟩syumə → selsyumə

sel.lə + k^hən.syu.mə	LeftAnchor (BW1,Blend)	RightAnchor (BW2, Blend)	MinContrib
a. lə..syu.mə	*!		
b. sel.lə. k^hən		*!	
c. sel.lə		*!	*!
d. se.syu.mə			*!
e. sel.mə			
f. sel.lyu.mə			
g. sel.lə.syu.mə			
h. sel.syu.mə			

Of the remaining candidates, we should choose the optimal output with the help of some lower ranked constraints.

Tableau 2 briefly demonstrates how we can derive the optimal output with the additional dominated constraints and their ranking given in (8b). Candidate (b) in tableau 2 is non-optimal with respect to Align(BW, BW(σ)) since it does not have a switch point at the syllable boundary of each base. As a syllable is omitted in candidate (2a) and added in candidate (2c), and consequently these candidates incur the violation of HeadMax-σ and HeadDep-σ, respectively. Thus, candidate (2d) seems to tentatively be chosen as an optimal blend by satisfying all given constraints above.

Tableau 2. sel⟨lə + kʰən⟩syumə → selsyumə

sel.lə + kʰən.syu.mə	Align (BW, BW(σ))[4]	HeadMax-σ	HeadDep-σ
a. sel.mə		*!	
b. sel.lyu.mə	*!		
c. sel.lə.syu.mə			*!
☞ d. sel.syu.mə			

However, if we consider including *sel.lə.mə* as a possible candidate in our analysis, we cannot appropriately derive the optimal output under the given ranking. Thus, we need a more constraint, Max-seg (BW2) requiring that the segments of base word2 have correspondents in the blend as many as possible. As a result, it causes most syllables except the first syllable of the second base to be preserved in the blend to reduce its violations. As shown below, it is ranked below HeadMax-σ and HeadDep-σ and the optimal form is candidate (3d) due to fewer violations of Max-seg (BW2) than (3e).

Tableau 3. sel⟨lə + kʰən⟩syumə → selsyumə

sel.lə + kʰən.syu.mə	Align (BW, BW(σ))	Head Max-σ	Head Dep-σ	Max-seg (BW2)
a. sel.mə		*!		******
b. sel.lyu.mə	*!			****
c. sel.lə.syu.mə			*!	***
☞ d. sel.syu.mə				***
e. sel.lə.mə				****!**

Next, let us consider the pattern that the length of the first base is longer than that of the second base. In such an exceptional pattern, the blend tends to comply with the number of syllables of the left word rather than that of the

4) We can encounter some problem Align(BW, BW(σ)) cannot predict some exceptional data. For example, cʰikʰ<in + tæ>tʰoŋlyəŋ → cʰiktʰoŋlyəŋ (chicken + president) violates this constraint, which causes another constraint, Align(BW, BW(sub-σ)) to be added in our analysis. However, we will ignore considering the fact the number of examples with such pattern is very limited.

head. It means that the syllable number of head cannot play a salient role in determining the size of blend. For this reason, the restriction on the size of the blend should be extended into the longer base word. That is, the syllable correspondence between a blend and a longer base should be dealt with in the analysis. Consequently, we should change the previous constraints, HeadMax-σ and HeadDep-σ into Max-σ and Dep-σ, respectively. In addition, the property that is identical to the longer size of two base words in the blend forces Max-σ to be ranked over Dep-σ.

(9) Additional constraints
  a. Max-σ
     Every syllable in the base word has a correspondent in the blend.
  b. Dep-σ
     Every syllable in the blend has a correspondent in the base word.

For the application of the constraints, Max-σ and Dep-σ, we will adopt Bat-El's idea that when every syllable in the blend does not have a correspondent in each base, it is gradiently evaluated to determine the violation of these constraints.

Figure 1. How to count Max–σ and Dep–σ (Bat–El, 1996, p. 295)

/σσ, σσσσ/	Max-σ	Dep-σ
BW1 σ Blend σ σ_1 σ_2 BW2 σ σ σ σ_3	* σ_3 in BW2 lacks a correspondent in the blend	** σ_1 and σ2 lack a correspondent in BW1

Figure 1 shows how many asterisks they get according to the gradient evaluation when applying Max-σ and Dep-σ.

Tableau 4 shows how Max-σ, where each syllable in the bases should have a correspondent in the blend, has an influence on selecting the optimal output. Candidate (4b) violates Align(BW, BW(σ)), since the first syllable in BW2 is

misaligned with the right edge of BW1, whereas candidate (4a) is also ruled out by violating Max-σ three times. The optimal form is candidate (4d) as it incurs no violations of Max-seg(BW2), contrary to (4c).

Tableau 4. $k^həncəpə\langle t^hipi + k^hiti \rightarrow k^həncəpək^hiti$

$k^hən.cə.pə.t^hi.pi + k^hi.ti$	Align (BW, BW(σ))	Max-σ	Dep-σ	Max-seg (BW2)
a. $k^hən.ti$		*!**		**
b. $k^hən.cə.pə.i..ti$	*!		***	*
c. $k^hən.cə.pə.t^hi..ti$			***	*!*
☞d. $k^hən.cə.pə.k^hi.ti$			***	

In sum, the constraints which have been demonstrated for Korean blends can be hierarchically ranked as follows:

(10) The constraint ranking
  a. Undominated constraints:
    LeftAnchor(BW1, Blend), RightAnchor(BW2, Blend),
    MinContrib, Blend=MinWord
  b. Dominated constraints
    Align(BW, BW(σ)) ≫ Max-σ ≫ Dep-σ ≫ Max-seg (BW2)

In this section, we have provided constraint-based analyses for Korean blends. However, when it comes to recoverability, in this paper it has not sufficiently been dealt with since it is very difficult or maybe impossible to quantify how much information should be involved in recalling the bases. As other remaining problems, when some blends are formed by the combination of only loanwords, with respect to the size of blends and the switch point some exceptional patterns somewhat different from the universal tendency are attested. We assume that these patterns might be caused under the influence of the phonological grammar of the source word. Actually, English loanword blends might have to be considered with respect to the foot closely related to stress which does not exist in Korean. We hope further study would reveal the

remaining issues.

In the next section, we will summarize and explore implications of this study.

4. Conclusion

In this study, we have analyzed some aspects on Korean blends within the framework of Correspondence Theory. Although blending has been considered as an unpredictable and arbitrary morphological process by some scholars, lots of words created by blending are listed in the lexicon due to rapid development of science and technology and the exposure to foreign languages. Thus, it is significantly worth analyzing and investigating how blends are formed.

In most of the previous analyses, blends have been dealt with categorized into two groups: overlapping and non overlapping blends. However, we tried to analyze most blends in Korean with difficulty under the appropriate constraint ranking regardless of this distinction.

In the optimality theoretic analysis of blends in Korean, Anchoring constraints serve to preserve the left edge of the first base and the right edge of the second base in the blend, which meets the definition of blending. When it comes to the switch point, Align(BW, BW(σ)) plays a significant role in that a syllable largely functions in demarcating the splinter and the residue of each base word, which blocks the case that a switch point is located at a sub-syllable boundary such as onset-rhyme or peak-coda.

In addition to Anchoring and Alignment constraints, we need additional undominated constraints, MinContrib and Blend= MinWord. MinContrib is a constraint requiring that at least one syllable of each base should be in the blend, which means the blend consists of at least two syllables. Considering that the constraint, Blend=MinWord prescribes the minimum requirement about the size of the blend that the blend must have at least two syllables. However, Blend=MinWord does not have to be considered since MinContrib entails Blend=MinWord.

Finally, the overall syllable length of the blended form is largely identical to that of the longer source word of the two, and can be explained by constraints

Max-σ and Dep-σ. For the evaluation of Max-σ and Dep-σ, we adopt Bat-El's was how to count the number of each violation.

The constraint rankings for Korean blends can be summarized as follows:

(11) The constraint ranking
LeftAnchor(BW1, Blend), RightAnchor(BW2, Blend),
MinContrib, Blend=MinWord ≫ Align(BW, BW(σ)) ≫ Max-σ ≫
Dep-σ ≫ Max-seg (BW2)

We think that many blends in Korean can be explained under the constraints and their ranking that we suggested. In spite of the attempt to analyze Korean blends, there have still been some remaining problems such as recoverability in the functional grammar and exceptional cases to be solved in further study.

References

Ahn, Su-Ji. (2012). *A constraint-based analysis of Korean blends*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Seoul National University.

Bat-El, O. (1996). Selecting the best of the worst: the grammar of Hebrew blends, *Phonology 13,* 283-328.

Bauer, L. (1983). *English word-formation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Benua, L. (1995). Identity Effects in Morphological Truncation. In . Beckman, L. Dickey and S. Urbanczyk (Eds.), *UMOP 18,* 77-136. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

Hong, Sung-Hoon. (2005). An optimality theoretic analysis of English blends. *Korean Journal of Linguistics, 30*(3), 551-582.

Itô, J. and Mester, A. (1995). The core-periphery structure of the lexion and constraints on reranking. In J. Beckman, L. Dickey and S. Urbanczyk (Eds.), *UMOP 18* (pp. 181-209). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

Jin, Mi-Joo. (2005). English blends: A descriptive study of their distributional patterns and prosodic features. *The Modern Linguistic Society of Korea 20*(3), 195-231.

Kang, Eun-Gyeong. (2013). An Optimality-theoretic analysis of lexical blends in

Korean. *The Journal of Studies in Language 28*(4), 5653-672.

Kubozono, H. (1990). Phonological constraints on blending in English as a case for phonology-morphology interface. *Yearbook of Morphology 3*, 1-20.

McCarthy, J and A. Prince. (1995). Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. *UMOP 18,* 249-384.

Piñeros, C. (1999). Word-blending as a case of non-concatenative morphology in Spanish. Ms. University of Iowa. [ROA-343, Rutgers Optimality Archive].

Prince, A., and Smolensky, P. (1993). *Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Ms., Rutgers University and University of Colorado, Boulder.

Seo, Hong-Won. (2011). Blending in English and English Loanwords: An optimality theoretic approach. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 19*(2), 35-55.

Hongwon Seo
Department of English Education
College of Education
567, Baekje-daero, Deokjin-dong
Jeonju 561-756, Korea
Phone: 010-9782-2684
Email: hongwonseo@hotmail.com

Received on June 28, 2013
Revised version received on August 23, 2013
Accepted on September 5, 2013