Minor word-formation processes in jargon bird names in English

Petr Kos (České Budějovice)

ABSTRACT
The present paper analyzes minor word-formation processes, namely clipping, blending, initialism, and motivation by linguistic form, on one specific sample of the English lexicon — jargon bird names. It aims to search for tendencies which prove to be systematic as well as for those which prove to be idiosyncratic. The two major motivations behind coining jargon bird names is the brevity of form and humour. The brevity of form is achieved predominantly by clipping, the processes of blending and initialism not being very frequent. Humour displays itself mainly through motivation by linguistic form, a process in which original names are modified to resemble other existing words. Jargon bird names prove to be generally systematic with a few idiosyncratic features.

KEY WORDS
minor word-formation processes, prosodic morphology, clipping, blending, motivation by linguistic form

1. INTRODUCTION

Next to a range of word-formation processes which are highly productive in English, namely compounding, derivation, and conversion, there are 'various word-formation processes that are marginal in some way. They do not yield words of a distinct morphological structure or result in new combinations of independently meaningful components.' (Bauer, Huddleston, 2002, 1632) The processes in question are clipping, blending, initialism, and motivation by linguistic form. As their major characteristic is the reduction of the original form, these minor word-formation processes are predominantly productive in the sphere of jargon.

The present work attempts to give a detailed and comprehensive description of these word-formation processes based on one specific sample of jargon terms, namely jargon bird names. The aim is to assess to what extent formation of these jargon names reflects generalised processes and to what extent, and in what respects, the formation is idiosyncratic.

Jargon words are generally defined as words whose use is confined to a specific professional or social group. In the past the professions that had special terms for birds were seamen and fowlers. In the case of seamen these names were often inspired by a superstition connected with the bird, and the interest of fowlers in birds was connected with economic profit. As these names are now mostly obsolete, the only jargon names that are in current use are those of bird watchers, or birders. For bird watchers, these names 'become a cant for those in the know, a badge of recognition and an acknowledgement of shared expertise. Simply being able to communicate through neologisms coined on the spot separates the birdwise from the unwashed

masses who have never even heard of a Pectoral Sandpiper and won't have a clue what a "Pec" might be.' (Faulkner 2005)

The compilation of jargon names proved to be rather difficult. To my knowledge, there is no printed source listing birders' jargon bird names, so I had to rely on the internet. The first source is an amateur list by N. Faulkner named *The Glossary of Birders' Names for British Birds*. This list is amended with names that I found on various birders' discussion forums (for the list, see Sources). The final list is by no means comprehensive, but it is a substantial representative sample of the most commonly used names. 'Whilst some of these have passed into fairly widespread usage among birders in the UK, many of them have not. Some derive from local birding groups or individual birders, used privately as well as publically, and indeed some may have been used on only one occasion. Nevertheless, I feel their inclusion is warranted, since the names that birders use can say something about the bird, birding as a hobby, and birders themselves.' (Faulkner 2005)

The total number of jargon bird names found in the various sources is 85. Those coined by minor word-formation processes represent a major part, 93 per cent, namely 79 names. The remaining 6 names were compounds or products of semantic shift, namely metaphor or metonymy.

The overall classification of minor word-formation processes in the present paper is based on Bauer and Huddleston (2002) and is amended by other authors when appropriate.

2. CLIPPING

Let us start with the definition of clipping provided by Bauer and Huddleston (2002, 1634): 'The operation of clipping involves cutting off part of an existing word or phrase to leave a phonologically shorter sequence: *ad* from *advertisement*, *chute* from *parachute*, etc. We call the word that is the source of the clipping the original; the phonological material that is cut away will be called the surplus, and the remaining material that forms the new base the residue.' Other authors, namely Plag (2003) and Lappe (2007), go beyond considering clippings (and blends) as 'mere' instances of shortening of form, claiming that it is prosody that 'plays a prominent role' (Plag, 2003, 116) in these processes. In view of this approach I will also consider the phonological make-up of these truncations.

Clippings may be further subdivided into categories such as back-clippings, fore-clippings, clipping compounds, and clippings with an additional suffix. Let us look into the categories individually.

2.1 BACK-CLIPPINGS

Consider the following examples:

[1] *Merg* (← *Merganser*)
[2] *Purp* (← *Purple Sandpiper or Purple Heron*)
[3] *Wood* (← *Woodpecker*)
[4] *Whitefront* (← *White-fronted Goose*)

Back-clippings are formed by removing the final part of the original. They can be further subdivided according to the form of residue. In examples [1] and [2], the residue forms a new lexeme. In [2], however, the substantial shortening of form leads to ambiguity of meaning, yielding homonymy. These are clippings formed from modifiers in which the distinguishing head remained in the surplus; another example of this phenomenon is *Casp* (←*Caspian Tern* or *Caspian Gull*). However, since the birds in question are of completely different species, this homonymy seems to pose little problem, as the meaning is unambiguous in the given context.

In [3] the residue is the initial base of a compounded original, other examples being *Fly* (← *Flycatcher*), *Sand* (← *Sandpiper*), and *Wag* (← *Wagtail*). These new coinages become homonymous with the sense of the original form. It must be noted, however, that these clippings are usually used with the original attributes, such as *Green Wood* or *Pied Fly*.

In [4] the residue is in the form of a bahuvrihi compound, as also in *Blackback* (← *Black-backed Gull*), *Pinkfoot* (← *Pink-footed Goose*), and *Roughleg* (← *Rough-legged Buzzard*). They may be considered to be a special instance of back-formation, as morphologically more complex 'extended bahuvrihi compounds' (*black-backed*), historically a secondary form, are clipped to form an identical pattern as 'original' bahuvrihi combinations. As modifiers of the pattern *black-backed* in vernacular names are extremely frequent (cf. Kos 2011), they represent a great potential for new formations of this type.

There are two instances of back-clipping that differ from the remaining bahuvrihi compounds despite being formally similar, *Lesser Spot* (←*Lesser Spotted Woodpecker*) and *Greatspot* (← *Greater Spotted Woodpecker*). These are not abbreviated forms of extended bahuvrihi compounds, but they are clipped forms of two independent modifiers; in these names, unlike in bahuvrihis, there is no semantic connection between the bases, e.g. in *Greatspot*, the first base *great* does not modify the final base *spot*.

The frequency of occurrence of individual forms of residue in back-clippings is shown in Table 1.

New lexeme	18
First base	5
Bahuvrihi	7

TABLE 1: Form of residue in back-clippings

Back-clippings forming new words are the most common (60%) with the remaining types having a very similar frequency of occurrence. The highest occurrence of the former type is due to the fact that such clippings can be coined from any original, whereas the latter two are restricted to compounds and extended modifiers, respectively.

As it is only types [1] and [2] in which the residue is a completely new lexeme, the analysis of the syllable structure will concern only those. Within that subset, there are 12 monosyllabic and 6 bisyllabic residues. The tendency for the majority of monosyllabic residues is in compliance with what Bauer and Huddleston (2002,

1636) say on the topic, '[p]lain clippings are almost always monosyllabic, but there are a few clear exceptions to this'; however, one third of bisyllabic residues can hardly be called 'a few exceptions'. Moreover, if we include all instances of back-clipping in the analysis, i.e. also the residues in the form of bahuvrihi compounds, the occurrence of bisyllabic back-clippings rises to 13, i.e. 43%.

When we carry out the analysis of the prosodic structure of all monosyllabic residues, we see a strong tendency for systematicity — all monosyllabic residues carry the pattern of CVC, where C stands for a consonant cluster and V for a vowel. This is fully in compliance with what Plag (2003, 117) says on the topic, namely that '[t]runcations in English are highly systematic, and their systematicity shows that the knowledge about the structural properties of these categories must be part of the morphological competence of the speakers.'

Sporadically, there may be a modification of spelling in the residue; thus, *Capper* (← *Capercaillie*) doubles the *p* in order to retain the original pronunciation of the first syllable (/kæpə/), *Peri* (← *Peregrine Falcon*) also changes the spelling to preserve the original pronunciation, *Lapp* (← *Lapland Bunting*) doubles the *p* in order to keep the relevant semantic connection (Lapland, the land of Lapp people), and *Kez*[1] (← *Kestrel*) represents visually the most likely pronunciation /kez/[2].

There is only one occurrence of a modification of phonemes, namely *Flicka* (← *Flycatcher*) — /ɪ/ ← /ɑɪ/ and /ə/ ← /æ/.

2.2 FORE-CLIPPINGS

This sub-class should more properly be called 'a fore-clipping', as there is only one member of this category, namely *Pecker* (← *Woodpecker*). Note that *Woodpecker* has been both back-clipped (*Wood*) and fore-clipped (*Pecker*).

2.3 CLIPPING COMPOUNDS

Names that are abbreviated forms of orthographically two-word vernacular names, such as *Rouzel* (← *Ring Ouzel*) and *Snob* (← *Snow Bunting*), pose some classificatory problems. Such abbreviated forms are in a transitional area between clippings, on the one hand, and blends, on the other, as classifications of various authors prove. According to Marchand's (1969, 445) classification, these names are all clippings: 'The type *cablegram* f. *cable telegram* illustrates the process of the clipping of an overlong cb. One part of the original cb most often remains intact'. An approach at the other extreme, namely that such names are all blends, is presented by Lehrer (2007, 115): 'Blends are compounds consisting of a whole word and a splinter (part of a morpheme) or two splinters'.

1 Cf. the spelling and pronunciation of the clipping of *Kestrel* in the title of the film *Kes* (1969, directed by Ken Loach), pronounced as /kes/.

2 Due to the jargon character of the name, the pronunciation of the name is not listed in any standard pronunciation dictionaries.

The approach taken in this work, however, follows the position taken in Bauer and Huddleston (2002, 1635): 'There are also cases where both words of a phrase are back-clipped to form a clipping compound'. Thus, *Snob* (← *Snow Bunting*) will be considered as a clipping compound, and *Rouzel* (← *Ring Ouzel*) as a blend.

To sum up, '[t]here is some evident resemblance between clippings and blends, but what distinguishes a blend from a clipping is that it always begins with the final part of the first source base and ends with the final part of the second' (Bauer, Huddleston 2002, 1637).

There are six instances of clipping compounds within jargon bird names

[5] *Oyc* (← *Oystercatcher*)
[6] *Snob* (← *Snow Bunting*)
[7] *Treep* (← *Tree Creeper*).
[8] *Flyspot* (← *Spotted Flycatcher*)
[9] *Flava Wag* (← *Motacilla flava* + *Yellow Wagtail*)
[10] *Alba Wag* (either ← *Motacilla alba yarrellii* + *Pied Wagtail* or
← *Motacilla alba alba* + *White Wagtail*)

Example [5] differs from the other clipping compounds in that the original is orthographically a one-word compound. This variation in orthography causes some classificatory problems that I will deal with in more detail below (see Chapter 3).

[6] is an instance of a clipping compound in which the final make-up is also motivated by its form. Such motivation by form is rather common in jargon bird names, so I devote a separate chapter to this phenomenon (see Chapter 5).

In [7] the central part is common to the two bases — there is an overlap between them.

[8] is a special case in which the order of the two elements differs from the original. The motivation for the change in the order may lie in the analogy with *Lesser Spot* and *Greatspot*.

[9] and [10] are clipping compounds in which one sequence comes from the Latin name of the bird and the other from the English name. This only underlines the jargon character of these formations, as the knowledge of scientific names is restricted to specialists in the field. In [10], moreover, we witness another instance of intentional polysemy, as the name is common for two similar species.

2.4 EMBELLISHED CLIPPINGS

'Embellished clippings' is a term used in Bauer and Huddleston (2002) for words consisting of a clipping followed by a suffix. The range of suffixes used in embellished clippings is limited, the main suffixes being '*-ie* (or *-y*) /i/ and *-o* /oʊ/. [...] The *-ie/y* can be identified with the diminutive suffix [...], but overall the suffixes have mainly a rhythmic or decorative function, hence the term "embellished"' (Bauer, Huddleston, 2002, 1636).

The suffixes used in embellished clippings in bird names are those mentioned above — there are three instances of embellished clippings with the suffix *-ie/-y*, and one instance of an embellished clipping with the suffix *-o*.

[11] *Guillie* (← *Guillemot*)
[12] *Gozzie* (← *Goshawk*)
[13] *Icky* (← *Icterine Warbler*)
[14] *Ringo* (← *Ringed Plover*)

In [12] there is a change in the consonant, /z/ ← /s/, due to the medial position between two vowels, and doubled spelling in order to retain the preceding short vowel. In [13] the spelling is modified in order to retain the original pronunciation. In [14] the suffix *-o* may be motivated by /oʊ/ in *Plover* as well as by the identity of form with Ringo Starr's first name. For such cases, see the chapter on motivation by linguistic form.

3. BLENDING

Bauer and Huddleston (2002, 1636) give the following definition of blending: 'Blending is the formation of a word from a sequence of two bases with reduction of one or both at the boundary between them'.

[15] *Barwit* (←*Bar-tailed Godwit*)
[16] *Rouzel* (← *Ring Ouzel*)
[17] *Chillow* (← *Chiffchaff + Willow Warbler*)
[18] *Commic* (← *Common Tern + Arctic Tern*)

Blends in bird names, and in general, may be divided into two major groups, those formed from the bases of one complex name, [15] and [16], and those formed from two different names, [17] and [18]. The primary motivation for coining names of the former group is the reduction of form. A complex phrase is shortened to a one-word form in order to be more suitable for a frequent reference to the bird. A typical characteristic of these blends is that the order of sequences in the blended form corresponds to the order of bases in the originals. As the only motivation for these coinages is the reduction of form, and not the blending of two different concepts, some authors (cf. Plag 2003) do not regard them as proper blends.

In contrast, proper blends 'denote entities that share properties of the referents of both elements.' (Plag, 2003, 122). This does not hold true, however, for proper blends in jargon bird names. These names are primarily coined out of inability or disinterest in distinguishing between two different bird species, so the speaker uses a common name for the two. If proper blends are compared to copulative compounds (cf. Plag 2003, 123), in which the logical relation is that of conjunction (cf. smog is a condition which combines features of smoke and fog together), in our case the logical relation is that of disjunction — *Chillow* refers to a chiffchaff or a willow warbler. The referent in question can never be both species together. So, as one name refers to two denotata, such coinages are instances of ambiguity of sense that is intentional. Since the senses are closely related, at least for the bird-watchers, we can classify them as instances of polysemy.

There is one instance of blend that does not fit any of the above categories, namely *P-wing* (← *Peewit + Lapwing*). Unlike the first group it is coined from two distinct names, and unlike the second group it refers to one specific species (*Peewit* is a local name for the lapwing). The motivation for coining such a name must be searched for in the sphere of humour, as the blend does not yield a shorter form, nor does it combine two distinct concepts.

The classification of names such as *Sprawk* (← *Sparrowhawk*) and *Gropper* (← *Grasshopper Warbler*) among blends may require some justification. They are abbreviated forms of orthographically one-word compounds, and it is the central part of the name which is left out. So, they could as well be classified as some kind of syncopes, or medial clippings. The difference between blends and medial clippings lies in the number of words from which the new lexemes are coined — medial clippings are formed from one word (eg. *fantasy* → *fancy*) and blends from two. Although *Sparrowhawk* and *Grasshopper* are orthographically one-word compounds, they are synchronically transparent, so speakers are still able to distinguish the two separate bases. And it is these two bases that are blended to create an abbreviated form. The same reasoning applies to *Oyc* (← *Oystercatcher*) mentioned above (see Chapter 2.3). It is the initial parts of both bases of a compound that are clipped, yielding a clipping compound.

Another name that causes classificatory problems is *Willow Chiff* (← *Willow Warbler* + *Chiffchaff*). It is a combination of two elements put together, but the name defies the basic definitions for both clipping compounds and blends. Unlike clipping compounds it is coined from two different names (not one complex name), and unlike blends it begins with the first part of the first source base and ends with the first part of the second.

In his analysis of blends, Plag (2003, 125) comes to the conclusion that 'their phonological make-up is characterized by three restrictions. The first is that the initial part of the first word is combined with the final part of the second word. Secondly, blends only combine syllable constituents (onsets, nuclei, codas, rimes, or complete syllables), and thirdly, the size of blends (measured in terms of syllables) is determined by the second element.'

When we carry out a formal analysis of both types of blends (see Tables 2 and 3), we see that the combination of first part + final part is predominant but not exclusive, as it is also whole words, either in the first or in the second position, that enter the process of blending.

first part + whole			*Rouzel*
whole + final part			*Rocket*
first part + final part	full name	phrase	*Barwit, Blackwit, Mippit, Tripit, Trog*
		compound	*Sprawk*
	modifier		*Gropper*

TABLE 2: Analysis of form — blends reducing form only

first part + final part	full name + full name	*Razormot*
	full name + modifier	*Chillow*
	modifier + modifier	*Commic, Millow*

TABLE 3: Analysis of form — blends combining concepts

The second restriction deals with the question of whether it is only syllabic constituents (onsets, nuclei, codas, rimes, or complete syllables) that are combined in blends, following the blending rule A B + C D → A D. Tables 4 and 5 confirm that the constituents of syllables are left intact, and they can only be deleted as a whole.

onset + rime	*Trog, Sprawk*
onset + penultimate rime and ultimate syllable	*Gropper, Mippit, Tripit, Rouzel*
syllable + rime	*Rocket*
syllable + syllable	*Barwit, Blackwit*

TABLE 4: Prosodic analysis — blends reducing form only

onset + penultimate rime and ultimate syllable	*Chillow, Millow*
syllable + rime	*Commic*
two syllables + syllable	*Razormost*

TABLE 5: Prosodic analysis — blends combining concepts

Blends in jargon bird names are also fully in compliance with the third restriction worded by Plag (2003, 125), namely that the number of syllables in the resulting name is determined by the second element. Tables 6 and 7 show that the numbers of syllables in the second elements in all cases correspond to the numbers of syllables in the resulting forms.

Bar-tailed Godwit	2 + 2	>>>	*Barwit*	2
Black-tailed Godwit	2 + 2	>>>	*Blackwit*	2
Grasshopper	1 + 2	>>>	*Gropper*	2
Meadow Pipit	2 + 2	>>>	*Mippit*	2
Ring Ouzel	1 + 2	>>>	*Rouzel*	2
Rock Pipit	1 + 2	>>>	*Rocket*	2
Tree Pipit	1 + 2	>>>	*Tripit*	2
Tree Sprog	1 + 1	>>>	*Trog*	1
Sparrowhawk	2 + 2	>>>	*Sprawk*	1

TABLE 6: Number of syllables — blends reducing form only

Chiffchaff + Willow	2 + 2	>>>	*Chillow*	2
Common + Arctic	2 + 2	>>>	*Commic*	2
Marsh + Willow	1 + 2	>>>	*Millow*	2
Razorbill + Guillemot	3 + 3	>>>	*Razormot*	3

TABLE 7: Number of syllables — blends combining concepts

4. INITIALISM

Bauer and Huddleston (2002, 1632) state about this type of word-formation that it 'has its basis in the written language: in the central cases a base is formed by combining the initial letters of a sequence of words (or of the parts of a complex word)'.

Generally, there are two types of initialism, namely abbreviations and acronyms. However, within the set of jargon bird names, we can only find three instances of abbreviations and no acronym.

[19] *GBB Gull* /ʤi: bi: bi: gʌl/	*Great Black-Backed Gull*
[20] *HB* /eɪʧ bi:/	*Honey Buzzard*
[21] *LEO* /el i: əʊ/	*Long-eared Owl*

In [19] and [20] it is clear that the initial letters are pronounced individually, as they are all consonants. In [21], however, the expected pronunciation for an outsider would be /li:əʊ/ as the one for the sign of zodiac, thus being an acronym, but still the letters are spelled individually. Faulkner (2005) suggests that it is '[p]erhaps because a roosting Long-eared looks more like an overfed tabby than anything truly leonine'.

5. MOTIVATION BY LINGUISTIC FORM

[22] *Pullover* (← *Plover*)
[23] *P G Tips* (← *Pallas' Grasshopper Warbler*)
[24] *Goat Screwer* (← *Great Skua*)
[25] *Glodfinch* (←*Goldfinch*)

This chapter comprises jargon bird names that were formed solely on the basis of formal similarity with existing words in order to create a humorous effect. We are not dealing with instances of semantic shift, as there is no semantic connection between the original form and the new form; nor are these names instances of folk etymology, as they do not attempt to reinterpret obscure forms.

The formal similarity is based mostly on pronunciation, *Pullover* (← *Plover*), *Fudge Duck* (← *Ferruginous Duck*). Nevertheless, occasionally the similarity is based rather on the written form, *P G Tips* (← *Pallas' Grasshopper Warbler* — product name ← abbreviation), *Ravenous* (← *Raven* — cf. difference in pronunciation /æ/ vs /eɪ/).

There are two other names displaying a different type of motivation by form, namely *Pakareet* (← *Parakeet*) and *Glodfinch* (←*Goldfinch*). They are not motivated by the formal similarity with another word, but the humorous effect is reached by the metathesis of phonemes.

To my knowledge, no author deals with this type of word-formation. I borrowed the term for this process from Marchand (1969), as it seems best to describe motivation for the change of form; it must be stressed, however, that Marchand deals with different word-formation processes, namely ablaut and rime combinations.

As already mentioned, this tendency to coin names which are identical or closely resemble existing words is also apparent in clipping and blending. Names such as *Oyc* (identical pronunciation as *oik*), *Snob*, *Commic*, *Ringo* and *Rocket* are evidently coined with this intention. In other names, such as *Flicka* (identical pronunciation as *flicker*) and *Purp* (identical pronunciation as *perp(etrator)*), this similarity may be accidental, but motivation by linguistic form cannot be ruled out.

6. SUMMARY OF MINOR WORD-FORMATION PROCESSES

Table 8 shows how frequent individual minor word-formation processes are in jargon bird names.

Clipping			41
	back-clippings	30	
	fore-clippings	1	
	clipping compounds	6	
	embellished clippings	4	
Blending			15
	blends reducing form only	9	
	blends combining concepts	4	
	problematic cases	2	
Initialism / Abbreviation			3
Motivation by linguistic form			20

TABLE 8: Frequency of occurrence of minor word-formation processes in jargon bird names

The most frequent, with 52%, are clippings. Within clippings, the most common type is back-clippings — this subtype itself accounts for almost 38% of all minor word-formation processes in jargon bird names.

In blending the reduction of form is more than twice as frequent as 'proper' blends, those combining two concepts.

The reduction of form in general, with 53 instances, is the predominant driving force for coining jargon bird names — it accounts for 67% within minor word-formation processes and 62% within all jargon bird names (including the 6 instances of compounding or semantic shift).

One fourth of the names are motivated by linguistic form only — these are names in which humour is the main triggering factor. When we add the cases in which motivation by linguistic form correlates with other processes of shortening of form, we come to the conclusion that at least one third of all jargon bird names are motivated by humour.

7. CONCLUSION

The analysis has shown that minor word-formation processes in jargon bird names display tendencies which seem to have general validity, as described by various authors, and at the same time they display certain idiosyncratic features.

Like clippings in general, clippings in jargon bird names display the highest number of back-clippings in respect to other types of clipping. Another shared characteristic is the tendency for a rather rigid prosodic structure of residues, namely CVC. Also, a substantial loss of phonological material in clippings sometimes leads to crea-

tion of homonymous names, as in *Purp*; an example of this phenomenon from outside bird names is *vet* (either *veteran* or *veterinarian*).

A feature which proves to be idiosyncratic in our set of names is a type of residue in the form of bahuvrihi compounds. This is closely connected to another unusual phenomenon, namely a relatively high proportion of bisyllabic residues.

Blends in jargon bird names are systematic in that they can be sub-divided into those shortening the form only and those combining two concepts. The idiosyncratic feature of the latter type, however, is that they do not resemble copulative compounds — the logical relation is not that of conjunction but disjunction, leading to intentional polysemy.

The fact that one fourth of all the minor word-formation processes in jargon bird names are coined purely through motivation by linguistic form seems to be the major idiosyncratic feature of this set of names.

APPENDIX

BACK-CLIPPINGS
Acro (Acrocephalus), Blackback (Black-backed Gull), Capper (Capercaillie), Casp (Caspian Tern, Caspian Gull), Flicka (Flycatcher), Fly (Flycatcher), Glauc (Glaucous Gull), Gos (Goshawk), Greatspot (Greater Spotted Woodpecker), Hippo (Hippolais), Kez (Kestrel), Kitt (Kittiwake), Lapp (Lapland Bunting), Lesser Spot (Lesser Spotted Woodpecker), Med (Mediterranean Gull), Merg (Merganser), Pec (Pectoral Sandpiper), Peri (Peregrin Falcon), Pinkfoot (Pink-footed Goose), Pom (Pomarine Skua), Purp (Purple Sandpiper or Purple Heron), Phyllosc (Phylloscopus), Redthroat (Red-throated Diver), Roughleg (Rough-legged Buzzard), Sab (Sabine's Gull), Sand (Sandpiper), Turt (Turtle Dove), Wag (Wagtail), Whitefront (White-fronted Goose), Wood (Woodpecker)

FORE-CLIPPINGS
Pecker (Woodpecker)

CLIPPING COMPOUNDS
Alba Wag (either Motacilla alba yarrellii + Pied Wagtail or Motacilla alba alba + White Wagtail), Flava Wag (Motacilla flava + Yellow Wagtail), Flyspot (Spotted Flycatcher), Oyc (Oystercatcher), Snob (Snow Bunting), Treep (Tree Creeper)

EMBELLISHED CLIPPINGS
Gozzie (Goshawk), Guillie (Guillemot), Icky (Icterine Warbler), Ringo (Ringed Plover)

BLENDS
Barwit (Bar-tailed Godwit), Blackwit (Black-tailed Godwit), Chillow (Chiffchaff + Willow Warbler), Commic (Common Tern + Arctic Tern), Gropper (Grasshopper Warbler), Millow (Marsh Tit + Willow Tit), Mippit (Meadow Pipit), Razormot (Razorbill + Guillemot), Rocket (Rock Pipit), Rouzel (Ring Ouzel), Sprawk (Sparrowhawk), Tripit (Tree Pipit), Trog (Tree Sprog); P-wing (Peewit + Lapwing),Willow Chiff (Willow Warbler + Chiffchaff)

INITIALISMS
GBB Gull (Great Black-Backed Gull), HB (Honey Buzzard), LEO (Long-eared Owl)

MOTIVATION BY LINGUISTIC FORM
Block Head (Black-headed Gull), Bongo (Bonxie), Burger (Black-headed Gull), Cuntish (Kentish Plover), Fig Pig (Feral Pigeon), Fudge Duck (Ferruginous Duck), Glodfinch (Goldfinch), Goat Screwer (Great Skua), Grape Lover (Grey Plover), Great Crusted (Great Crested Grebe), Pakareet (Parakeet), P G Tips (Pallas' Grasshopper Warbler), Phallus (Phalarope), Pullover (Plover), Ravenous (Raven), Screwer (Skua), Scron (Scoter), Skeeter (Scoter), Snard (Sandwich Tern), Sylvia boring (Sylvia borin)

REFERENCES

Bauer, L. and R. Huddleston (2002) Lexical word-formation, in Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum (eds), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, 1621–1721, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faulkner, N. (2005) *Glossary of Birders' Names for British Birds*. Accessible from: http://homepages.tesco.net/~N.Faulkner/birding/birdname.htm [18. 3. 2011].

Kos, P. (2011) *English Bird Names: A Linguistic Analysis,* dissertation thesis, Praha: FF UK.

Lappe, S. (2007) *English Prosodic Morphology*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Lehrer, A. (2007) Blendalicious, in Munat, J. (ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*, 115–133, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marchand, H. (1969) *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-formation*, München: C. H. Beck.

Plag, I. (2003) *Word-Formation in English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SOURCES

http://homepages.tesco.net/~N.Faulkner/birding/birdname.htm

http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/londonbirders/message/249

http://website.lineone.net/~andrewself/Londonsbirding.htm

http://forum.biggonline.co.uk/viewtopic.php?p=46063

http://kitesnatureandbirdinglife.blogspot.com/

http://eagles-eye-on-life.blogspot.com