On Structural Blending

Oe, Saburo

https://doi.org/10.15017/2332658

出版情報：文學研究. 80, pp.1-13, 1983-02-25. Faculty of Literature, Kyushu University
バージョン：
権利関係：

On Structural Blending

Saburo Ohye

1. There are some constructions that result from blending two similar but separate constructions. The verb *distinguish*, for instance, takes after it either a *between*-phrase or an object followed by a *from*-phrase, and *distinguish between A and B* and *distinguish A from B* are said to be often blended to produce a not perfectly grammatical form *distinguish between A from B*, both *A* and *B* being noun phrases (NP's). Such phenomena as this I wish to call structural blending.[1)]

As is well known, Chomsky (1965, Chap. 1, § 2) maintains the necessity for distinguishing between competence and performance and points out some difficulties the native language speaker meets in actual performance due to such factors as memory limitation. He gives the examples in (1) to illustrate those difficulties.

(1) a. I called the man who wrote the book that you told me about up.
b. The man who the boy who the students recognized pointed out is a friend of mine.

But in psychological experiments these and other similar examples have usually been used in connection with difficulties in speech perception rather than speech production. Papers in Bever, Katz, and Langendoen (1976) all amount to assuming interactions between grammar and the extragrammatical systems, particularly the systems of speech perception and speech production, instead of including some powerful

1) Some established phrases such as *different than* ~ and *can't help but* ~, which are blended constructions historically, are ignored in this paper.

devices in grammar, to adequately explain language universals and the acquisition of language by children. And most of the papers also concentrate on speech-perception phenomena such as the difficulty of processing center embedded sentences. According to those proponents of the "interactionist view," examples like those in (1) are "grammatical but unacceptable." The reason why most linguists and psychologists have attended almost exclusively to speech perception rather than speech production is because the latter is much more difficult to handle, particularly in experimental settings, than the former.

With the advance of psycholinguistic research, however, adequate models of speech production like the model of Clark and Clark (1977, Chap. 3) have been proposed. Structural blending, which is the topic of this paper, is obviously a phenomenon in speech production and I shall rely on Clark and Clark's model for its clarification though they pay no attention whatever to slips of the tongue or pen of this particular type. They divide speech production into two steps which they call "plans for what to say" and "execution of speech plans" and assume two types of speech errors correlating to the two steps. The tongue-slips which they consider are limited to those having to do with the second step, particularly with a plan to command what muscles to move when, called "the articulatory program," such as spoonerisms and malapropisms (Clark and Clark, pp. 273-92).

One word of caution must be said here about the distinction between speech perception and speech production. We must of course be careful not to think that speaking is simply listening in reverse on the grounds that, in speaking, meaning is turned into sounds and, in listening, sounds are turned into meaning (Clark and Clark, p. 225). It is, however, as important to note that perception and production are at least partially interdependent phases of speech behavior. This is easily inferrable from the fact that the speaker, while speaking,

monitors his own speech by listening to it.[2] Sentences like those in (1) are not only practically impossible to process due to limitations on memory faculty but for this very reason are almost never produced. They are, as it were, examples artificially made for psycholinguistic arguments.

2. The examples of structural blending considered in §§ 2-4 will be taken from written materials some of which are conversation records found in literary works. Let us first examine the examples in (2).

(2) a. What made you get married so young for?—Carson McCullers, *The Member of the Wedding*
b. What makes you shake like that for, Frankie?—ibid.

(2a) could be considered as the result of the blending between (2′a) and (2′b).

(2′) a. What made you get married so young?
b. What did you get married so young for?

These two sentences are similar in form and mean the same thing, and are most likely to be blended. A more psychologically-oriented explanation of the blending in (2a) might be that the part of the sentence after *made* is rather long, and long enough to blur the speaker's memory of the construction of the sentence and make her switch to another construction designed for the same meaning. Exactly the same can be said of the blending in (2b).

(3) seems to be an example of the same kind and the two sentences in (3′) might be proposed as "sources" of the blended construction of the sentence.

(3) In a case like yours we always have to choose between suffering

2) See Bever, Carroll, and Hurtig (1976), p. 161.

our own pain or suffering other people's. —Graham Greene, *The Living Room*

(3′) a. We have to choose between suffering our own pain and suffering other people's.

b. We have to choose suffering our own pain or suffering other people's.

Clark and Clark (p. 257) suggest quite rightly that speakers, in saying what they want to say, work from a skeleton plan of a sentence and select the words roughly constituent by constituent. According to this view, the sequence *choose between A and B* of (3′a) roughly has a constituent structure as indicated in (3″).

(3″) (choose (between (A and B)))

The *A* constituent, that is, the first of the two conjoined NP's is rather long and complex in (3), whence arises the structural blending. In each of the (2) examples, the constituent which causes blending is the whole sentence.

3. The explanation of the blending in (3), given at the end of the preceding section, was not fully correct. The length and complexity of the first conjoined NP are not the only factors to motivate the blending. The speaker roughly intends to say something when he starts a sentence. This intention or meaning of the speaker's, in the case of (3), includes "a contrastive choice" of two things. When the production of the sentence reaches the stage of the conjoined NP constituent, the speaker, helped by the blurring of his memory due to the nature of the first NP, feels inclined to use a disjunction (NP *or* NP) and thereby emphasize a choice of two contrastive things. The sentences in (2), which entirely lack this factor, should be regarded as the mere result of memory failure. It is important to note, in this connection, that they were said by young children, while (3) was the

utterance of an adult.

The fact that the conjoined construction is "neutral" in that it expresses mere co-ordination and, to convey something else in addition, needs something else such as the preceding preposition *between* accounts for the structural blending seen in the following examples.

(4) It is quite crucial that we dintinguish between reconstructions the reader must make to perceive a text from those he need not. —Dillon, *Language Processing and the Reading of Literature*
(5) I have tried to distinguish between questions the reader must ask from those he may, and we can also distinguish assumptions he is likely to make from those that he may. —ibid.
(6) ... a correlation between the child's ability to deal correctly with numerical transformations with the ability to deal correctly with sentential transformations... —Bever, "The Cognitive Basis for Linguistic Structures"

The blended constructions found in (4) and (5), and (6) are *distinguish between A* ***from*** *B* and *a correlation between A* ***with*** *B*, respectively. Interestingly enough, these examples are all taken from books and articles, and those—ironically enough—written on (psycho)linguistic topics. These two blended forms serve to enhance the meanings of the contrast and close connection between the NP's *A* and *B*, respectively, compared to the neutral forms with *between A and B*. In these examples, the first conjoined NP is long and complex and the gradual shift in constituent-by-constituent production of (4) and (5) could be indicated as in (7).

(7) ((distinguish) (between (A and B)))
((distinguish) + (A) (from B))
((distinguish) ↓ (between (A) (from B))

It is interesting to note that in (5) the correct form *distinguish A from B* occurs after the blended form *distinguish between A from B* though in both parts the first NP's are almost equally long and com-

plex. The occurrence of the correct form in the latter part is easily explainable from the influence of the nearer occurrence of *A from B* in the preceding position.

The word *both* is of course followed by *A and B* and the bracketing of the whole thing in the constituent-by-constituent selection of words might be indicated as ((both) ((A) (and B))). But here again, blending can occur and the neutral *and* may be replaced by some other word, as is indicated by the following examples.

(8) The information to which the program[3] would need to have access must specify both that in the desired sense of "pen", pens are larger than boxes and can therefore contain them, whereas in the writing implement sense, pens cannot contain boxes. —Fillmore, *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*

(9) ...the child must have both a characterization of the set of possible perceptual strategies as well as a routine for the extraction of such strategies from his particular linguistic experience. —Bever, "Cognitive Basis"

Here we find *both A*, ***whereas*** *B* and *both A* ***as well as*** *B*, which emphasize a contrast and a close connection, respectively. In (8), the first conjoined NP is a particularly long embedded sentence introduced by *that*.

The use of the neutral *and* is not involved in (10), but it is still to be considered as similar to (8) and (9).

(10) If (2.3)[4] and (2.4) were synonymous, as Ross's theory holds, then not only would (2.46) and (2.47) be contradictory, so would both (2.48) and (2.49). — Katz, *Propositional Structure and Illocutionary Force*

---

3) The "program" here is a machine translation program which makes feasible the correct choice of the translation of the sentence "The box is in the pen."

4) Parenthesized numbers indicate example sentences as in most papers on linguistics.

Not only is usually followed by *but* (*also*), but here the "*so* plus inverted order" construction is employed because by placing (2.48) and (2.49) in clause-final position it is possible to give prominence to these two elements and thereby to indicate them as "new or non-presupposed items" that are contradictory. It would have been impossible to do this by using the non-inverted order after *but* (*also*). But there is another reason why this apparently anomalous clause is used after *not only*. *So* introducing an inverted-order clause conveys similarity in nature, as in "He was hungry and so was I." Similarity or parallelism is only meant in implication by a *but also* clause only by looking back to the correlating element *not only* that comes before it. Thus the clause introduced by *so* is more convenient to mean similarity from the point of view of constituent-by-constituent selection of words in production. Similarly we have *but* instead of the grammatical *as* in (11).

(11) But the question is not so much whether other auxiliaries than *will* may be used under these circumstances, but whether the use of *will* itself is significant.—Bolinger, *Meaning and Form*

As implies a contrast only in reference to the correlating element *not so much* that occurs in the preceding part, while *but* explicitly conveys a contrast of the part it starts with the part preceding it. In this example, the very long and complex *whether*-clause which coms after *not so much* is prone to cause memory failure and make it difficult to use *as* after it. In any case, in uttering (11), the speaker is treating the first half of the sentence as if only *not*, instead of *not so much*, had occurred there.

The contrast of *A* with *B* is implied by the sequence *not so much A as B*, which literally means a comparison. *No sooner A than B* implies the close sequence between the two events expressed by the two clauses *A* and *B*. This established implication also comes from the literal meaning of this construction of comparison. In this construc-

tion, *than* is occasionally replaced by *then* as in the following examples. (12a) and (12b) are from a conversational and a non-conversational part of a novel, respectively.

(12) a. No sooner do I take one away then he gets another. —Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited*
b. No sooner had he left my side then I smelled spearmint and looked up to see the old man with veiny nose and jowls. —Philip Roth, *Goodbye, Columbus*

This construction could be regarded as another example of structural blending. (12a), for instance, might be said to be the result of the blending of (12'a) and (12'b).

(12') a. No sooner do I take one (bottle of cognac) away than he gets another.
b. When I take one (bottle of cognac) away, then (immediately) he gets another.

The use of *then* in this blended construction is also motivated by the desire to convey explicitly the close sequence of an event in the constituent-by-constituent production of the sentence, though of course the phonetic similarity between *than* and *then* cannot be disregarded as a factor promoting confusion.

The examples of structural blending given in this section, most of which are written sentences of highly theoretical nature, are not mere results of the limitation of the language users' memory faculty. They might be said to have the intentional meanings that are absent in their grammatical counterparts and thus differ from examples like those in (2) in that they are not merely utterable and comprehensible but almost acceptable. [5]

5) Bever, Carroll, and Hurtig (1976, p. 151) propose the following principle of the acceptability status of speech errors : Communicatively usable speech errors remain unacceptable so long as there are grammatical alternatives. If there are no equally usable alternatives, then the errors may become acceptable even though they remain ungrammatical.

4. The structural blending found in (13) has to do with the use of the preposition *between*, but it is obviously different from examples (4), (5), and (6), where the source of structural blending is in the *between*-phrase, too.

(13) Even Quine himself fluctuates between embracing this position of extreme scepticism in which no statement, even those of logic, is necessarily true and immune from revision, and the rather weaker position in which at least the logical truths are said to be necessary. —Kempson, *Semantic Theory*

Here we see blended the two constructions *fluctuate between A and B* and *embrace A and B*, *A* and *B* being "the position of extreme scepticism" and "the rather weaker position," respectively. The intention to emphasize an element is clearly detectible in the blended construction of (13), too. Its writer starts the sentence with "Even Quine fluctuates between," but when she reaches this constituent boundary of the prepositional object NP, she feels like adding a somewhat related but new element represented by "embrace the two positions." Here there is no room for memory failing. Far from that, she remembers writing "(fluctuates) between"; so she cannot help but continue it with the gerundial form "embracing," though "embrace the two positions" cannot be semantically interpreted as object to "fluctuate between."

(13) is from a book on theoretical linguistics. The next example is also from a book on language and exhitbits a blending of the same kind.

(14) The assumption of proximity is noticed in a less determinate way in utterances like *Have you seen my slippers*? or *The electrician has been.* If the adverbs *recently* and *just* are respectively added to these sentences, there is scarcely no change of meaning, as this simply makes the 'nearness' of the event explicit. —Leech, *Meaning and the English Verb*

The crucial part is of course *scarcely no.* It might safely be said that this is the blending of *scarcely any* and *practically* (*almost*) *no.* But from the point of view of sentence production we might say that the writer, just after using *scarcely*, wanted to strengthen negativity and switched to *no.* The degree of negativity conveyed, which could better be expressed by the grammatical *little or no* (e. g. *little or no change in meaning*), comes in between *scarcely* and *no.*

It can easily be seen that the order of elements is important in the type of blending that has been treated in this section. The order of elements must be considered not only within sentential context but occasionally in discourse context or even situational context. The negative form of *let's* is usually expressed by *let's not* as in *Let's not play tennis*, but the form *don't let's* may occur depending on a preceding context. Let us consider (15), a very long quotation from a novel.

(15) 'He shouldn't be living with anyone. I realized that right away.'

'No.'

'Oh, hell!' she said, 'let's not talk about it. Let's never talk about it.'

'I'm thirty-four, you know I'm not going to be one of these bitches that ruins children.'

'No.'

'I'm not going to be that way. I feel rather good, you know. I feel rather set up.'

'Good.'

She looked away. I thought she was looking for another cigarette. Then I saw she was crying. I could feel her crying. Shaking and crying. She wouldn't look up. I put my arms around her.

'Don't let's ever talk about it. Please don't let's ever talk about it.'

'Dear Brett.'

'I'm going back to Mike.' I could feel her crying as I held

her close. 'He's so damned nice and he's so awful. He's my sort of thing.'

She could not look up. I stroked her hair. I could feel her shaking.

'I won't be one of those bitches,' she said. 'But oh, Jake, please let's never talk about it.'—Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*

The underscored parts of this example show that one and the same woman first says *let's not* (*never*), then shifts to *don't let's* and then reverts to *let's never*. In the first instance, her utterance comes after her interlocutor's, i.e. the first-person narrator's "No" and she is naturally aware that this is her turn, which makes her use the neutral *let's not*. In the second instance, however, there is some interval of silence after his remark "Good," and she is afraid that he may resume speaking. Thus in order to stop him she begins with "Don't," the prohibition formula, and then switches to (negative) exhortation, saying "let's." *Don't let's ever talk* here could also be taken to be the blending between the prohibition *don't* (*ever*) *talk* and the exhortation *let's never talk*. In the last instance, the negative exhortation occurs in the second half of her utterance and there is no need for intercepting her interlocutor. Hence the neutral *let's never talk* again. It is now easy to suppose that the psychological process in producing the form *don't let's* is reversed in producing another blended form *let's don't*. This is illustrated by the following example.

(16) ...then she lay down beside me. "Do you mind? I only want to rest a moment. So let's don't say another word. Go to sleep."—Truman Capote, *Breakfast at Tiffany's*

The form in question occurs after an expression of desire, and an exhortation, which is a subtype of desire, naturally comes first and then shifts to a prohibition or a negative command, which is in its turn followed by a command. Thus the utterance in the above exam-

ple, owing to the use of *let's don't*, forms a very natural stream of speech.

The same type of structural blending may take place within a single word, or at the level of morphology. To see this, let us consider (17).

(17) Rabbi Binder unpeeled his hands from his eyes, slowly, painfully, as if they were tape. —Philip Roth, *The Conversion of the Jews*

The prefix *un-*, as in *unlock* and *unpack*, means reversing the action, or more strictly the state resulting from the action, indicated by the simple verb. The narrator when saying (17) first wanted to use a word like *unfixed* but became aware that this verb by itself was not enough to indicate the slowness and reluctance with which the Rabbi removed his hands from his eyes—the sight was so terrible to him. Thus when his sentence production reached the stage of the stem verb, a morphological constituent, he switched to *peel* to emphasize the Rabbi's reluctance to see the sight. The verb *unpeel*, though a nonce word, is so appropriate for the situation to be described that very few readers are struck by the peculiarity of its formation. It differs from a mere portmanteau word like *chortle* (from *chuckle* and *snort*) or *gallumph* (from *gallop* and *triumph*) in that it does not blend elements mechanically for brevity's or novelty's sake but involves a clear intention for emphasis through complementation on the part of the speaker.

The examples treated in this section, just like those in the preceding section, are ungrammatical but almost acceptable.

5. The instances which have been observed in this paper all reflect a characteristic of speech production; that is, they are all explainable by the fact that the speaker, in saying what he intends to say,

selects appropriate words, phrases, or morphemes constituent by constituent. We can on the basis of the above data classify structural dlending into the following three types which are not to be strictly distinguished from each other.

(A) Blending due almost exclusively to the memory failure of the speaker, which is promoted by the semantic identity and formal similarity between the two constructions involved.

(B) Blending which is due not only to the memory failure of the speaker but his intention to emphasize or make explicit some element made vague by that memory failure.

(C) Blending which lacks the factor of memory failure but is due to the speaker's intention to emphasize at a certain stage of his production some element which he notes has been absent down to that stage.

REFERENCES

Bever, T. G., J. M. Carroll, and R. Hurtig. 1976. "Analogy or Ungrammatical Sequences That Are Utterable and Comprehensible Are the Origins of New Grammars in Language Acquisition and Linguistic Evolution." In *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Ability.*

Bever, T. G., J. J. Katz, and D. T. Langendoen, eds. 1976. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Ability.* Crowell.

Chomsky, 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* The M.I.T. Press.

Clark, Herbert H. and Eve V. Clark. 1977. *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.