
When *sarkozysation* leads to the *hollandade*, or the rejection of phonological well-formedness constraints by anthroponym-based derived words

Stéphanie Lignon¹, Fiammetta Namer¹, Nabil Hathout², Mathilde Huguin¹

¹UMR ATILF, ²UMR CLLE-ERSS

The main issue addressed in this talk is the weakness of the classical well-formedness constraints such as OCP in wordforms coined on names of political personalities (hence PPNs) such as *Nicolas Sarkozy* → *sarkoz(y/i)ser* /sarkozize/ ‘sarkozy-ize’ where the /ziz/ sequence clearly violate OCP (*Obligatory Contour Principle*, Goldsmith (1976), McCarthy (1986), Yip (1988)). Similarly, size constraints seem to be weak in these derivatives such as *Najat Vallaud-Belkacem* → *vallaud-belkacemisation* ‘vallaud-belkacemization’ where the stem is 5 syllables long and far exceeds the 2 syllables ideal size of the stem in French derivatives (Plénat, 2009b). These examples show that well-formedness constraints are overweighted for PPN-based derivatives by other constraints that are weaker in the general lexicon, one of them being the informativeness constraint (IC) that is satisfied by forms that allow the identification of the base. In this talk we argue that PPN-based derivatives are an ideal data-set for the observation of these constraints and many others. They also highlight the diversity of the constraints that compete and gang up. They not only concern the phonological form and the referential capacity of the derivatives, but also their morphological, lexical and discursive properties.

1 Data, methods

Our corpus is made up of derivatives coined on anthroponyms that belong to the contemporary French political field. 90 PPNs have been selected. They name people that have occupied a leading function in the 1981-2018 period in France: 25 women and 75 men. PPNs consist of a first name and a last name that identifies the referent of the anthroponym (*Nicolas Sarkozy*). In discourse, a PPN can be referred to by different expressions, some of them having an anaphoric vocation. In the following, we call these expressions *subnames*, because they are often subparts of the PPN. The subnames of a PPN include at least the first name (*Nicolas*), the last name (*Sarkozy*) and the first name + last name (*Nicolas Sarkozy*). When the PPN contains a compound last name, it can have up to 6 subnames, including the two components of the last name and sometimes an acronym (eg. DSK for Dominique Strauss-Kahn) or a nickname. As shown in the table below, all subnames can be used for derivation.

PPN	First name	Last name	First name + last name	Last name's 1st comp.	Last name's 2d comp.	Acronym
Nadine Morano	<i>Nadinette</i>	<i>Moranette</i>	<i>Nadinemoranien</i>			
Najat Vallaud Belkacem	<i>Najatou</i>	<i>vallaud-belkacemisation</i>	<i>Najat Vallaud-Belkacemien</i>	<i>Vallaudista</i>	<i>Belkacemien</i>	<i>NVBiste</i>
Ségolène Royal	<i>Ségolènerie</i>	<i>Royalie</i>	<i>ségolèneroyalitude</i>			
Dominique Strauss Kahn	<i>Dominiqueur</i>	<i>StraussKahnne</i>		<i>straussophile</i>	<i>Kahnerie</i>	<i>DSKphilie</i>
Christine Lagarde	<i>Christinerie</i>	<i>lagardesque</i>	<i>Christinade Lagardinière</i>			
Nicolas Sarkozy		<i>sarkoziste</i>	<i>Nicolas Sarkozius</i>			

From these 90 PPNs we generated automatically about 130,000 candidate derivatives using a number of French suffixation exponents and only kept the ones that are attested online. The resulting corpus contains 5,000 derivatives and their 55,000 occurrences.

2 Well-formedness constraints

Numerous studies have demonstrated the existence of phonological and lexical well-formedness constraints on word formation. The main phonological constraints in French are OCP and the size constraint that give preference to derivatives with an ideal disyllabic stem (Plénat, 2009b). To reach this optimal shape, several strategies are implemented: stem adjustment (Plénat, 2009a); stem swapping (Dal & Namer, 2010); affix substitution (Koehl & Lignon, 2014; Lignon, 2013; Lignon & Plénat, 2009; Lindsay & Aronoff, 2013; Aronoff, 2016). Lexical (paradigmatic) constraints also apply: they are induced by the existing lexicon and can explain part of the variation observed in the output of various word formations (for French, see Roché 2011, Hathout 2011). Other constraints are more semantic. For instance, the informativeness constraint favors derivatives with a form that allow an optimal identification of the referent of the base. In the lexicon, the different constraints gang up and compete with each other (McCarthy & Prince, 1993; Prince & Smolensky, 1993). Individual trade-offs between them explain the observed lexical variations (Roché & Plénat 2014).

For instance, the interplay between the phonological and informativeness constraints can be observed in the verb in *-iser* derived from *Nicolas Sarkozy*. The verb could have been coined as *nicolasifier* 'nicolas-ify', which is phonologically better than *sarkoz(y/i)ser*. But because it is not informative enough this form is not attested online. When a speaker coins a PPN-based neologism, IC makes a form more likely to denote its referent unambiguously, even at the expense of the well-formedness constraints.

3 Derivation from PPNs: main cases

When it comes to anthroponyms, phonological constraints are weaker in the construction of their derivatives, with the exceptions exposed in §4. Examples (1) show that PPN-based wordforms are insensitive to dissimilative constraints.

(1) /sarkozize/

Si elle pouvait se "sarkoziser" jusqu'à être élue, ça m'irait très bien. [Nicolas Sarkozy]
 'If she could "sarkoz-ize" herself until being elected, that would suit me very well.'

/valsɛsk/

La formule Vallsesque a fini par percer [Manuel Valls]
 'The Valls-esque formula finally broke through'

The table below confirms the tendency. In our corpus, the most frequent subname that surfaces in the derivatives is the last name (in more than 80% of them) and subnames containing the last name make up almost 90% of the stems. This is a direct consequence of IC since last names are the most informative subnames.

First name	Last name	First name + last name	Component 1	Component 2	Acronym
5,68%	82,45%	5,50%	2,49%	2,49%	1,37%

4 Derivation from PPNs: minority cases

Almost 18% of derivatives on PPNs are not coined on the last name. They result from a combination of conditions that include:

- (a) **prosodic context:** when the last name is monosyllabic, the preferred stem is first name + last name. For example, nearly 58% of the words derived from the PPN *Rama Yade* use the stem /ramajad/ and only 16% use /jad/ alone. Here the IC is gang up with the size constraint.
- (b) **discursive context:** when the PPN is mentioned in the text just before the derivative, the use of a subname different from the last name has an anaphorical function:

(2) *Faites pas votre **Sarkozy** (j'ai souvenir d'un coup de colère **nicolien** face à la question d'un jeune sur un plateau de tv, pendant une campagne*

'Don't be such a **Sarkozy** (I remember a burst of **Nicolas-ian** anger at a question asked by a young one on a TV set, during a campaign)'

*Le monde, en ce soir bien sombre, a grand besoin des paroles lumineuses d'**Harlem Désir**. Où es-tu, trou du heuh, **Harlemou** ?*

'The world, in this very dark evening, is in a great need of **Harlem Désir's** illuminating words. Where are you, assho... hem... **little Harlem**?

- (c) **sociolinguistic context:** when the PPN denotes a woman, the first name is favoured especially when it is uncommon (eg. *Ségolène, Najat, Arlette, Roselyne, Rama, Rachida*): more than 80% of the words formed on a first name have a woman PPN base. This does not contradict IC, but weakens it when the last name is more informative than the first name such as in the case of *Bachelot* compared to *Roselyne*. On the other hand, *Royal*, which can be confused with the homonymous relational adjective, is less informative than *Ségolène*. In this case, the last name is used less frequently as a stem than both the first name and the first name + last name even if the latter violate the size constraint. This choice is sociologically marked, because for masculine PPNs the first name is used much less frequently even when it is rare and more informative than the last name. It actually echoes the way women politicians are referred to in texts.
- (d) **evaluative context:** when the derivative is a hypocoristic (eg. in *-ette* or *-ou*), the preferred subname ends in /ɛ̃/ or /in/. The attraction between these stems and suffixes results from the paradigmatic pressure of the existing lexicon (Plénat, 2005; Plénat & Roché, 2004), where /in/ is the most frequent sequence that appears before these suffixes. The selection of the /ɛ̃/ ending favors last names, as expected (*Boutin*, /butɛ̃/, *Jospin*, /ʒospɛ̃/, *Autain* /otɛ̃/), but also some frequent masculine first names (*Alain* /alɛ̃/) as in (3a) (note that in contact with *-ette* or *-ou*, /ɛ̃/ is denasalized in /in/). More interestingly, the selection of /in/ endings favors the female first names, whether rare (3b, c) or frequent (3d):
- (3) a. *Car. **Alinou** chéri. regardons les choses en face : tu as cent mille fois raison* [Alain Juppé]
'Because. **Alain-ou** darling. let us face things: you are absolutely right.
- b. *Où se trouvait classe pour aller en conseil des ministres? C'est vrai qu'elle est tellement distinguée **Nadinette** avec ses perlouses...* [Nadine Morano]
'Who does find herself classy to go to the Council of Ministers? It's true that she is so distinguished, **Nadine-ette** with her fake pearls'
- c. *Pour une fois au'une **marinnette** se présente ici . ça me fait rigoler* [Marine Le Pen]
'For once that a **marine-ette** presents herself here. that makes me laugh'
- d. *Retrouvez Ségo et **Martinette**. les deux sœurs haineuses* [Martine Aubry]
'Find out Ségo and **Martine-ette**, the two hateful sisters'

5 Conclusion

The data presented here show how constraints gang up and compete when the base of the derivative is a PPN: willingness to inform; gender of the PPN's referent; size of the subname; influence of the context; lexical pressure. Many of the derivatives in our corpus are nonce formations, and are only attested in online writing texts and are characterized by their spontaneity, volatility, willingness to play, etc. (Munat, 2007, Dal & Namer 2018). Our observations, analyses and results raise several questions: Are well-formedness constraints really operational in all contexts? If not, what are their limitations? Do PPNs form a subclass of anthroponyms? If not, what makes them special? Is it the size and frequency of their derivational families? Do they function as derivational bases in the same way as common nouns?

References

- Aronoff, M. (2016). Competition and the lexicon. In: A. Elia, C. Iacobini & M. Voghera (eds.): *Atti del XLVII Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana*. 39-52. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Dal G. & F. Namer (2010) French Property Nouns based on Toponyms or Ethnic Adjectives: a case of base variation, F. Rainer, W. U. Dressler, D. Kastovsky & H. C. Luschützky (eds). *Variation and change in Morphology*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 53-74.
- Dal G. & F. Namer (2018) Playful nonce-formations, creativity and productivity. In S. Arndt-Lappe, A. Braun, C. Moulin & E. Winter-Froemel (eds). *Expanding the Lexicon. Linguistic Innovation, Morphological Productivity, and Ludicity*. 203-228. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goldsmith, J. (1976). *Autosegmental Phonology*. PhD Thesis. Cambridge, Mass., MIT.
- Hathout, N. (2011). Une analyse unifiée de la préfixation en anti-. In M. Roché (ed) *Des Unités Morphologiques au Lexique*. 251-318. Paris: Hermès.
- Koehl A. & S. Lignon. (2014) Property nouns with *-ité* and *-itude*: formal alternation and morphopragmatics or the *sad-itude* of the Aité_N. *Morphology* 24(4). 351-376.
- Lignon, S. & M. Plénat. (2009) Echangisme suffixal et contraintes phonologiques. In B. Fradin, F. Kerleroux & M. Plénat (eds). *Aperçus de morphologie du français*: 65-81. Paris: PUV.
- Lignon S. (2013) *-iser* and *-ifier* suffixations in French: Verify data to verize hypotheses? In N. Hathout, F. Montermini, J. Tseng (eds). *Morphology in Toulouse. Selected proceedings of Décembrettes 7*. 109-132. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Lindsay, M. & M. Aronoff (2013). Natural selection in self-organizing morphological systems, In N. Hathout, F. Montermini & J. Tseng (eds). *Morphology in Toulouse: Selected Proceedings of Décembrettes 7*. 133-153. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- McCarthy, J. J. (1986). OCP effets: Gemination and antigemination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(2): 207-263.
- McCarthy, J. J. & A. Prince (1993) *Prosodic Morphology: Constraint Interaction and Satisfaction*. Amherst, MA: Linguistics Department Faculty Publication Series.
- Munat, J. (2007). *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Plénat, M. (2005). Rosinette, cousinette, putinette, starlinette. Décalage, infixation et épenthèse devant *-ette*. In I. Choi-Jonin, M. Bras, A. Dagnac & M. Rouquier (eds). *Questions de classification en linguistique : méthodes et descriptions. Mélanges offerts au Professeur Christian Molinier*. 275-298. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Plénat, M. (2009a). Le conditionnement de l'allomorphie radicale en français. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, Nouvelle série XVII*. 119-140.
- Plénat, M. (2009). Les contraintes de taille. In B. Fradin, F. Kerleroux & M. Plénat (eds). *Aperçus de Morphologie du français*. 47-64. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

- Plénat, M. & M. Roché (2004). Entre morphologie et phonologie : la suffixation décalée. *Lexique* 16. 159-198.
- Roché, M. (2011). Pression lexicale et contraintes phonologiques dans la dérivation en -aie du français. *Linguistica* 51. 5-22.
- Roché, M. & M. Plénat (2014). Le jeu des contraintes dans la sélection du thème présuffixal. *4e Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française*. Berlin. SHS Web of Conferences. 8: 1863-1879.
- Prince A. & Smolensky P. (1993) *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science Technical Report 2.
- Yip, M. (1988). The Obligatory Contour Principle and phonological rules: A loss of identity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(1): 65-100.