

UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE

FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Tijana M. Šuković

**PROPER NOUNS AS WORD-FORMATION
COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH**

Doctoral Dissertation

Belgrade, 2025

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БЕОГРАДУ

ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

Тијана М. Шуковић

**ВЛАСТИТЕ ИМЕНИЦЕ КАО ТВОРБЕНЕ
КОМПОНЕНТЕ У СЛОЖЕНИМ РЕЧИМА У
ЕНГЛЕСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ**

докторска дисертација

Београд, 2025.

УНИВЕРСИТЕТ В БЕЛГРАДЕ
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ФАКУЛЬТЕТ

Тияна М. Шукович

**ИМЕНА СОБСТВЕННЫЕ КАК
ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ КОМПОНЕНТЫ
СЛОЖНЫХ СЛОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ**

Докторская диссертация

Белград, 2025.

INFORMATION ON THE SUPERVISOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Supervisor:

Prof. Jelena Vujić (PhD), Full Professor
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

Members of the Committee

1. _____
2. _____

Date of the defense: _____

ПОДАЦИ О МЕНТОРУ И ЧЛАНОВИМА КОМИСИЈЕ

Ментор:

проф. др Јелена Вујић, редовни професор
Филолошки факултет, Универзитет у Београду

Чланови комисије:

1. _____
2. _____

Датум одбране: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Knowing that every road has its ups and downs, turns and bumps, sunrises and sunsets, I decided to take the road of obtaining a PhD degree at the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade. In the course of almost nine years, I did course work, research papers, projects, teaching, conference presentations and co-chairing, all of which prepared the ground for the final copy of this thesis. And thank God, I was never alone on this road, and now I have so many people to express my thanks to and to be grateful for having them with me.

I am deeply grateful for the expertise, guidance and support of my PhD supervisor Professor Jelena Vujić. She successfully navigated me through constructionist theory and literature, kept her patience with my tardiness, and coped with my cumbersome sentences and unfinished thoughts. I profited enormously from our collaborations in which she introduced me to the world of academia and research publishing. I am also profoundly indebted to her for her moral support and understanding in the times of my personal struggles with unfortunate life circumstances. I was lucky to have a professional and caring person by my side at all times, and I thank her for everything sincerely.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all anonymous reviewers who have commented on my academic work, without which I would not have been able to present my research findings and shape my thesis. I would especially like to thank Professor Francesca Masini for her valuable insights at the 13th International Conference on Construction Grammar in Gothenburg (2024). Her constructive feedback and collegiality assured me to incorporate multi-layered indexicality in this thesis, which gave the final (and much needed) touch to my study of proper nouns in English word-formation.

This thesis was the topic of so many lengthy conversations in which my friends and colleagues shared my enthusiasm in the good days and lifted my spirit in the bad days. Each one of them helped me stay focused and committed to the work I was so passionate about. My heartfelt thanks go to the dear ones whose support was short-term, but nevertheless tremendous and well-remembered.

Lastly, I would like to thank my father Milan, sisters Tamara and Jelena and their families for being there for me every step of the way. All of this would have been impossible without their constant love and support.

I dedicate this thesis to my beloved mother Biljana whose words inspired and guided me all along:

„У животу је све могуће, али само ако знаш шта желиш, ако си реалан у процени својих могућности и потреба и ако уложиш довољно труда да оствариш оно до чега ти је стало.“

Proper Nouns as Word-Formation Components in English

Abstract

This doctoral thesis studies the relationship between the form and meaning of complex words with proper nouns as word-formation components in contemporary English. It examines their language use by taking a qualitative approach to corpus analysis. The sample collected from various text genres recorded in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) offers a valuable insight into proper nouns as linguistic units: they may freely and productively form complex words by prefixation, suffixation, affix combination, conversion and compounding given that they may act as constituents of abstract morphological schemas. As opposed to traditional grammar approaches focusing on regular units and predictable rules in word-formation, Construction Morphology has introduced the idea of a hierarchical lexicon which includes all possible kinds of linguistic units and patterns based on different levels of abstraction and knowledge. Within this theoretical framework, the analysis of 1872 constructs with proper nouns has led to the following findings. Proper nouns may fill in the open slots of schemas and be constituents of morphological and syntactic constructions because they conceptually represent bounded entities as well as unique referents and salient grounding elements in an act of reference. Successful schema entrenchment with proper nouns is supported by the semantic mechanisms of inheritance and motivation at the word level and by the interaction between the syntactic and morphological constructions at the sentence level. Once these prerequisites are fulfilled, constructions with proper nouns are activated in discourse in which their form-meaning correspondence remains stable even though their instantiation becomes context-specific.

Keywords: proper noun, word-formation, schema, construction, construct, Construction Morphology, COCA

Scientific field: Linguistics

Scientific subfield: Morphology

UDC number:

Властите именице као творбене компоненте у сложеним речима у енглеском језику

Сажетак

Ова докторска дисертација изучава однос форме и значења у сложеним речима чије су творбене компоненте властите именице у савременом енглеском језику. Применом квалитативне корпусне анализе разматра се употреба овог типа сложених речи. На основу узорка из Корпуса савременог америчког енглеског језика, који се састоји од различитих врста текстова, долазимо до важних сазнања о властитим именицама као потенцијалним језичким јединицама. Властите именице могу бити творбене компоненте у процесима префиксације, суфиксације, комбиноване деривације, конверзије и композиције имајући у виду да могу бити конституенти апстрактних морфолошких схема. Насупрот традиционалним приступима у изучавању творбе речи који су подразумевали стандардне јединице и устаљена правила, конструкциона морфологија као новији правац је увела појам хијерахијског лексикона који обухвата све врсте могућих језичких јединица и различите нивое апстракције и схематичности у творби речи. Овакав теоријски приступ је омогућио анализу 1872 конструкта са властитим именицама при чему су изведени следећи закључци. Властите именице могу бити конституенти делимично попуњених морфолошких и синтаксичких конструкција, јер се концептуално перципирају као ограничени ентитети и истовремено су референти и референтна средства у процесу референцијације. Семантички механизми инхеренције и мотивације поспешују улогу властитих именица као творбених компоненти на нивоу речи, а на нивоу реченице исто се остварује разним синтаксичко-морфолошким спрегама. Под овим условима конструкције са властитим именицама се реализују у дискурсној употреби приликом чега однос форме и значења остаје непромењен иако је сама њихова инстанцијација остварена у посебним контекстима.

Кључне речи: властите именице, творба речи, конструкција, конструкт, конструкциона морфологија, корпус

Научна област: наука о језику

Ужа научна област: морфологија и творба речи

УДК број:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 The organization of the thesis	2
2 LITERATURE OVERVIEW: PROPER NOUNS AS SIMPLEX WORDS IN ENGLISH.....	4
2.1 Proper nouns as a subclass of nouns	4
2.2 Proper nouns in comparison with common nouns	5
2.3 Special features of proper nouns in the grammar of the English language.....	6
2.3.1 Proper nouns as heads of noun phrases (NP)	6
2.3.1.1 Proper nouns with the definite article (<i>the</i>).....	7
2.3.1.2 Exceptions to the definite article and no article usage.....	8
2.3.2 Proper nouns and modification.....	8
2.3.3 Proper nouns and number	9
2.4 Orthography	9
2.5 Proper nouns and proper names	10
2.6 Proper nouns in word-formation literature.....	11
2.6.1 Hans Marchand’s semantic approach to proper nouns (1969)	11
2.6.2 Bauer and Huddleston’s list of the words based on proper names (2002)	12
2.6.3 Bauer, Lieber and Plag’s corpus findings on proper nouns (2013).....	13
3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: CONSTRUCTION MORPHOLOGY	15
3.1 A construction-based approach to language study.....	15
3.1.1 Complex words in a construction-based approach.....	16
3.2 Construction Morphology and its representation of complex words	17
3.2.1 Constructional schemas and their role in creating complex words	17
3.2.2 Analogical word-formation	19
3.2.3 Second-order schemas in Construction Morphology	21
3.3 Different dimensions of grammar in Construction Morphology	22
3.3.1 The tripartite grammar of the Parallel Architecture	22
3.3.2 Morphology as an individual component in the Parallel Architecture.....	22
3.4 A usage-based model in the domain of morphology	23
3.4.1 Morphological productivity as an indicator of actual language use.....	24
3.4.1.1 A scope of morphological productivity	25
4 RESEARCH METHODS: ANALYSIS, CORPUS AND DATA	27

4.1 Corpus linguistics: Qualitative corpus analysis	27
4.2 Corpus data and usage-based approaches	28
4.3 The research tool: the Corpus of Contemporary American English	29
4.4 Methods of collecting and managing the data from the corpus	29
PART 1: DERIVATION WITH PROPER NOUNS	31
5 PREFIXATION WITH PROPER NOUNS	32
5.1 Preliminaries	32
5.2 Prefixed proper nouns with attitudinal meaning	33
5.2.1 Constructions with <i>-anti/-pro</i> and proper nouns	33
5.2.1.1 Stylistic features of constructs with <i>anti-/pro-</i> and proper nouns.....	36
5.3 Prefixed proper nouns with locative meaning.....	37
5.3.1 Constructions with <i>pre-/post-</i> and proper nouns	38
5.3.1.1 Discourse features of constructs with <i>pre-/post-</i> and proper nouns.....	40
5.3.2 Construction with <i>ex-</i> and proper nouns.....	41
5.3.3 Construction with <i>proto-</i> and proper nouns.....	42
5.3.4 Constructions with <i>mid-</i> and proper nouns.....	44
5.3.5 Construction with <i>out-</i> and proper nouns	46
5.3.5.1 Distributional features of constructs with <i>out-</i> and proper nouns.....	47
5.4 Prefixed proper nouns with negative meaning.....	49
5.4.1 Construction with <i>non-</i> and proper nouns	49
5.4.1.1 Semantic and pragmatic readings of constructs with <i>non-</i> and proper nouns.....	50
5.4.2 Construction with <i>un-</i> and proper nouns	52
5.4.2.1 Pragmatic readings of the constructs with <i>un-</i> and proper nouns	55
5.4.3 Construction with <i>anti-</i> and proper nouns	56
5.5 Prefixed proper nouns with quantificational meaning	57
5.5.1 Construction with <i>mini-</i> and proper nouns	58
5.5.1.1 Distributional features of constructs with <i>mini-</i> and proper nouns.....	60
5.6 Summary	61
6 SUFFIXATION WITH PROPER NOUNS	62
6.1 Preliminaries	62
6.2 Suffixed proper nouns as verbs	63
6.2.1 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ify</i>	64
6.2.2 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ize</i>	67
6.2.3 Arguments of constructs with proper nouns and <i>-ify/-ize</i>	70

6.3 Suffixed proper nouns as nouns	71
6.3.1 Nominal suffixed proper nouns with abstract meaning.....	72
6.3.1.1 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ness</i>	72
6.3.1.2 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-dom</i>	76
6.3.1.3 Other constructs with proper nouns and abstract noun-forming suffixes.....	79
6.3.2 Paradigmatic constructions with proper nouns and <i>-ism/-ist</i>	80
6.3.2.1 Connecting meanings in constructions with proper nouns and <i>-ism/-ist</i>	83
6.3.3 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ite</i>	85
6.3.4 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ese</i>	86
6.3.5 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-(i)ana</i>	88
6.4 Suffixed proper nouns as adjectives.....	91
6.4.1 Adjectival suffixed proper nouns with similitive meaning.....	92
6.4.1.1 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-esque</i>	92
6.4.1.2 Constructions with proper nouns and <i>-ish</i>	95
6.4.1.3 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-like</i>	97
6.4.1.4 Distributional features of constructs with proper nouns and <i>-esque</i> , <i>-ish</i> , and <i>-like</i>	100
6.4.1.5 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-oid</i>	103
6.4.2 Adjectival suffixed proper nouns with negative meaning.....	104
6.4.2.1 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-less</i>	105
6.4.2.2 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-free</i>	107
6.4.2.2.1 Pragmatic use of the constructs with proper nouns and <i>-free</i>	109
6.5 Summary	110
7 AFFIX COMBINATION WITH PROPER NOUNS	112
7.1 Preliminaries	112
7.2 Prefix combinations with proper nouns: Attested constructs.....	114
7.3 Suffix combinations with proper nouns: Constructions and constructs.....	116
7.3.1 Constructions with proper nouns and <i>-ify/-ize</i> and <i>-(c)ation</i>	116
7.3.2 Construction with proper nouns and <i>-ist</i> and <i>-ic</i>	121
7.3.3 Constructs with proper nouns and ‘similitive’ suffixes and <i>-ness</i>	122
7.4 Prefix and suffix combinations with proper nouns: Constructions and constructs.....	123
7.4.1 Constructions with prefixes <i>de-</i> and <i>re-</i> and proper nouns and verb-forming suffixes <i>-ify/-ize</i>	123
7.4.2 Constructions with prefixes and proper nouns and noun-forming suffixes <i>-ism/-ist</i>	126
7.4.2.1 Constructions and constructs with <i>anti-/pro-</i> and proper noun- <i>ism/-ist</i>	127
7.4.2.2 Constructions with <i>pseudo-</i> and proper noun- <i>ism/-ist</i>	129
7.4.2.3 Constructions with <i>pre-/post-</i> and proper noun- <i>ist</i>	129
7.4.2.4 Constructions with <i>neo-</i> and proper noun- <i>ism/-ist</i>	131
7.4.2.5 Construction with ‘negative’ <i>anti-</i> and proper noun- <i>ism/-ist</i>	133
7.4.2.6 Construction with <i>non-</i> and proper noun- <i>ism/-ist</i>	134

7.4.3 Constructions and constructs with proper nouns and adjective-forming suffixes <i>-esque/-ish/-like</i> and negative prefixes	134
7.5 Summary	136
PART 2: CONVERSION AND COMPOUNDING WITH PROPER NOUNS.....	138
8 CONVERSION WITH PROPER NOUNS.....	139
8.1 Preliminaries	139
8.2 A semantic-pragmatic approach to denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns	141
8.2.1 Schematic representations of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns.....	142
8.2.2 The comparison between the denominal conversion verbs and denominal <i>-ify/-ize</i> verbs with proper nouns	145
8.2.3 Ending the semantic-pragmatic battle of conversion in a construction-based model	146
8.3 A morphosyntactic approach to denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns	147
8.3.1 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and their immediate syntactic surroundings	148
8.3.2 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and particles.....	149
8.3.3 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns in idiomatic constructions.....	151
8.4 Summary	152
9 COMPOUNDING WITH PROPER NOUNS	153
9.1 Preliminaries	153
9.2 Compounds with proper nouns and nominal heads	155
9.3 Compounds with proper nouns and deverbal heads.....	157
9.3.1 Compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms	158
9.3.1.1 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle of action-process verbs.....	158
9.3.1.2 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle forms of factive verbs.....	161
9.3.1.3 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle forms of position verbs.....	162
9.3.2 Schematic representations of compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms.....	162
9.4 Summary	164
10 DISCUSSION	165
10.1 Proper nouns as construction constituents – cognitive grounding	165
10.1.1 Boundedness as a cognitive and semantic feature.....	166
10.1.1.1 Proper nouns as bounded entities.....	167
10.1.2 Reference as a cognitive and linguistic phenomenon.....	169
10.1.2.1 Proper nouns as unique referents and salient grounding elements	170

10.2 Proper nouns as construction constituents – asabstracting away from morphological and syntactic constructions	171
10.2.1 Schematization at the morphological level: Inheritance and motivation	172
10.2.2 Entrenchment at the sentence level: interaction with syntax.....	174
10.3 Proper nouns in non-lexicalized occurrences – in and out of context.....	176
10.3.1 Property and context.....	176
10.3.2 Proper nouns as word-formation components and multi-layered indexicality.....	177
10.3.2.1 A new proposal	180
11 CONCLUSION	181
REFERENCES.....	183
APPENDIX – LIST OF ATTESTED INSTANCES	192
AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY	226

List of abbreviations

A – adjective

ACAD – academic journal

BLOG – blog

BNC – British National Corpus

FIC – fiction

COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English

MAG – magazine

N – noun

NEWS – newspaper

NP – noun phrase

OED – Oxford English Dictionary

PHON – phonetic property

ProperN – proper noun/name

SEM – semantic property

SPOK – spoken (genre)

SYN – syntactic property

TV/MOV – TV or movie transcript

V – verb

WEB – web page

WFR – word-formation rule

1 Introduction

Most linguistic studies center on the study of the form and meaning of diverse language units. It could be that only one of these facets is examined individually; however, a strong connection between the two is intuitively felt by linguists who strive to give a detailed account of grammar:

- 1) The relationship between the form and meaning – between what formal approaches differentiate as syntactic and semantic ‘components’ – is taken as *basic* and *inherent* in any grammatical description. (Östman and Fried 2005: 2, my emphases)

This doctoral thesis examines the relationship between the form and meaning of particular language units which have been underrepresented in English word-formation: proper nouns. With regard to grammar studies, the study of proper nouns has been “a linguistic underdog” in comparison with common nouns. Common nouns as word-level units prototypically represent the class of nouns, and they are the most frequent word-formation bases in English i.e. they are regularly used in the production of new members of its own class (nouns) or other classes (such as verbs and adjectives). Nevertheless, in contemporary language use, proper nouns may display similar grammatical features like common nouns and undergo morphological changes in word-formation processes: derivation (affixation), conversion and compounding¹.

The author’s interest in this topic sprang after her collecting random examples of proper nouns in non-lexicalized occurrences in TV shows and movies, and following a hunch that there was something fascinating to be studied and explained. The contextualized examples of derived, compounded and blended proper name formations, which were part of an initial personal small-scale corpus (Vujić and Rabrenović 2019; Vujić and Šuković 2024), are analyzed as creative coinages which are the outputs of either regular productive patterns or analogy. In another research study, proper name nonce-formations referring to elements of popular culture such as movies, music, books, and fairy tales, are discussed in terms of their discourse role in the media with the aim of determining their degree of lexicalizability (Rabrenović 2020)².

At first, these instances were felt as creative nonce-formations given the fact that creative formations are generally consciously formed, playful and humorous (Bauer 2001; Lieber 2016), and most importantly, highly pragmatically motivated (Vujić 2020). In all three papers, the emphasis is placed on their context-dependency and their rule-governed structure with reference to creativity and productivity. These ideas were put forward in the thesis proposal as well. The main argument was made following the author’s somewhat naive expectations that proper nouns were less likely to act as formal bases or compound elements, and that the examples of proper noun word-formation were scarce in academic literature and infrequent in language use.

However, as the examples from the chosen methodological tool COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English) started to multiply rapidly, “proper noun nonce-formations” felt less context-dependent and intuitively easier to interpret. With this fresh insight, the proposed research on their degree of creativity and productivity did not seem suitable anymore. In addition, some instances were found as parts of more complex syntactic structures, which signaled a need to look beyond word-formation, and apply an approach that would allow for the analysis of both their morphological and syntactic nature. This led the author to choose Construction Morphology as a theoretical framework once again (Vujić and Rabrenović 2019; Vujić and Šuković 2024), but this

¹ Word-formation is regarded as a hyponym of morphology (which also includes inflection and marginal morphological processes such as ablaut change, backformation and so on). The terms derivation and affixation are usually used synonymously in literature, and therefore, in this thesis they are also used interchangeably.

² The author of the thesis published her preliminary research under the name of Rabrenović.

time the research on proper nouns delves deeper into the nature of constructional schemas and the contribution of proper nouns as the constituents of both morphological and syntactic structures.

1.2 The organization of the thesis

The aim of the present doctoral thesis is to give a comprehensive grammar account on proper nouns and explain their role in contemporary English word-formation. This entails a thorough examination of their full potential: a) as simplex words and elements of complex words; b) as constituents in morphological and syntactic constructions; c) as context-dependent occurrences in discourse. Therefore, the analysis will be conducted on three different language levels: the word level, the phrase/sentence level and the text/discourse level. Given this wide scope, the thesis is organized in eleven chapters and two different parts of analysis.

Following this introduction, the second chapter describes main distributional features of proper nouns as simplex words. The features are illustrated by a large number of examples listed in isolation or used in context. The basic idea of this literature review is to provide an account of proper nouns which confirms their linguistic versatility: they may be marked for certain grammatical categories such as determination, modification, and number, and they may be used as formal bases in word-formation. In this respect, the nominal status of proper nouns is parallel to that of common nouns whose prototypicality in the class of nouns used to be unrivaled in structural-based accounts of grammar. This chapter also touches upon the difference between proper nouns and proper names in order to show a significant overlap.

The third chapter sets the theoretical foundation of the thesis. It describes a cognitive approach to language study and the role of morphology in both generative and constructionist frameworks. Within both theoretical frameworks, linguists share the same point of view that a complex morphological structure is the immediate consequence of a speaker's ability to abstract away information from general patterns (rules or schemas) and further apply this knowledge to forming new complex structures (words or constructs). The cognitive mechanisms of abstraction and generalization are at the core of linguistic competence as an essential part of the human mind. However, the two frameworks diverge in their point of view towards linguistic performance i.e. language use. Construction Morphology as a usage-based model has built its tenets on competence and performance equally because it shows that a new construct may be the direct result of both existing patterns and their subsequent elaboration in language use. This means that, apart from constructional schemas as fundamental abstract patterns, there are also subschemas (or second-order schemas) and analogical formations, which are all represented in this chapter. Finally, this chapter touches upon the role of morphology in grammar and its relatedness to other components, specifically syntax.

The fourth chapter illustrates how this study was carried out. It explains the reasons for performing qualitative corpus analysis, the methods of collecting data, and the benefits of its methodological tool i.e. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). As one of the largest corpora of English comprising eight different genres, COCA is expected to contain illustrative instances and be representative enough of proper nouns in English word-formation. Despite the fact that the interpretation of selected examples mostly relies on the extra-linguistic information and references associated with the culture and lifestyle in the United States of America, the thesis aims at presenting the theoretical linguistic findings and not sociolinguistic ones.

The analysis is based on the examination of the form, meaning and use of 1872 instances with proper nouns and proper names as listed in the Appendix of this thesis. In the course of the analysis, proper nouns are referred to by several different terms either in the most general linguistic sense such as *units* and *elements* or a more specific one depending on their grammatical aspect such as *bases*, *non-heads*, *variables*, *constituents* etc. Apart from their linguistic and grammatical character, their extra-linguistic/encyclopedic character is recognized, and therefore, they are also

called *unique referents*. Regardless of the position we take, the thesis aims at describing how proper nouns compose new words and complex structures, and therefore, we also use *word-formation components* as the umbrella term.

The analysis of proper nouns as word-formation components is divided into two parts. In the thesis proposal, the analysis was supposed to include all productive processes i.e. derivation, compounding and conversion, and less productive and marginal processes such as blending and creative processes. However, as the instances of derived proper nouns were generated across all eight genres of COCA, it was decided on derivation (prefixation, suffixation and affix combination) as the first part of analysis (Chapters 5, 6 and 7 respectively). The second part examines two highly productive morphological processes conversion and compounding (Chapters 8 and 9). These instances have a lower degree of corpus discernibility, and their scope is fairly narrow in comparison with derivation. In the end, marginal processes were not included in the analysis due to a smaller sample and difficulty in tracking incomplete bases in COCA (contrary to derivation, conversion and compounding whose outputs preserve full forms of proper nouns as formal bases).

In Part 1, the total number of affixes which are attested with proper nouns as formal bases is 37 and they are studied in three affixal morphological processes: prefixation is first investigated in Chapter 5, then suffixation in Chapter 6, followed by the study of affix combination in Chapter 7. The derived instances had the most discernible form in the corpus and the process of collecting the contextualized examples was straightforward. From a purely theoretical point of view, derivation is chosen for two reasons: firstly, derived proper nouns are representative of two factors which are related to productive processes and schemas – salience and frequency (Vujić 2016); secondly, they are part of other grammatical structures such as comparatives and phrasal structures, which indicates the interface of morphology and syntax. Since the selected examples of derived proper nouns are analyzed as constructs which are licensed by abstract grammatical patterns or constructional schemas, this part of analysis also serves as an attempt to explain why derived proper nouns may be marked for some grammatical features as opposed to merely listing them as exceptions as represented in the literature overview.

In Part 2, proper nouns are studied as formal bases in denominal conversion verbs and as compound elements in nominal and deverbal compounds. Conversion and compounding as word-formation processes are separated from derivation because the outputs of the two productive processes normally show greater dependence on the rules of syntax (Vujić 2020). In this thesis, it is investigated whether the schematic representation of the constructions with proper nouns is influenced by their syntactic surroundings or by their own internal syntax (i.e. argument structure). In other words, the two chapters of this part explore to what extent syntactic function may influence the form-meaning correspondence in morphological constructions with proper nouns as variables.

The findings and results of the analysis which is in line with constructionist and cognitive theoretical postulates are given in the discussion of the thesis (Chapter 10), and they are summarized in the conclusion (Chapter 11). The three-level usage-based analysis aims at providing a unified account on proper nouns, but it also touches upon other areas of word-formation and linguistics in general. In that way, we open up a possibility of further research challenges and applications of proper nouns in contemporary English. Hopefully, concluding remarks will be instrumental in further linguistic research on proper nouns in English.

2 Literature overview: Proper nouns as simplex words in English

The most frequent words in word-formation processes are nouns. For instance, nouns comprise the substantial majority of compounds in English (Bauer 1983), and in root compounds they are by far more common as modifiers and/or heads than other open classes i.e. verbs and adjectives (Lieber 2005). In morphology, it is equally important to differentiate between classes (e.g. nouns vs. verbs) and between their subclasses (e.g. common vs. proper nouns). A completely coherent description of nouns based on their semantic and syntactic features should show the differences between nouns and other classes as well as the prototypical features of its subclasses.

In formal semantics, nouns can be distinguished from other classes of words based on the criteria of identity that determine which things fall under a certain concept or have the same reference e.g. *a dog is an animal*; *a cat is an animal* etc. Owing to the criteria of identity, nouns belong to the only lexical category that bears a referential index (Baker 2003). Having a referential index, nouns are syntactically ruled out as predicates and take the argument positions of a subject, an object or a complement of prepositional phrases or clauses. With a view to grammatical classes, it is virtually impossible for a word to be a verb (to be a predicate) and a noun (to refer to a concept) simultaneously e.g. *It is a dog*. Once the reference is determined and the given word is classified as a noun, other issues may rise in defining the word more closely i.e. if the noun is common or proper.

All nouns bear referential indexes, but their criteria of identity are not met by the same principles – proper nouns are closely related to common nouns as their criterion of identity depends on another identity (Baker 2003); for example, *Mark is a boy* or *Boston is a city*. The given semantic condition shows merely one way of defining proper nouns as a subclass of nouns, others being further elaborated in this chapter.

As proper nouns are dependent on specific concepts, an accurate description of proper nouns should provide a detailed account of all grammatical features and clear demarcation from both common nouns and more complex linguistic units i.e. proper names. For that reason, it is necessary to present the special properties of proper nouns which are exhibited in different grammatical contexts. In this chapter, a general literature overview of proper nouns as grammatical units is provided.

2.1 Proper nouns as a subclass of nouns

In order to discuss proper nouns, it is essential to define the class to which proper nouns belong: nouns. Cross-linguistically, nouns “designate entities i.e. concepts that reified,” and they are used as referents of specific entities (Lehmann and Moravcsik 2000: 733). Moreover, nouns denote time-stable concepts that are static and that do not tend to change e.g. *book* (Givon 2001). Nouns as the most static concepts are by default located on one end of the time-stability scale, whereas verbs as the most dynamic concepts are located on the other end. The given semantic criterion, however, is not watertight as it may not be met with the nouns denoting states, processes and events (Lehmann and Moravcsik 2000); this is a case of derived abstract nouns such as *sadness*, *interpretation* and *refusal*.

In principle, nouns can serve as heads of noun phrases and may exhibit case marking, number marking, gender marking etc. (Payne 1997). Generative grammarians place greater emphasis on syntactic than morphological criteria when defining nouns as a unique class. The reason behind this lies in the fact that not all nouns in English have a plural or possessive form e.g. *tolerance*, or take a pluralizing suffix e.g. *sheep*, *feet*, *people*; without overt marking, the morphological make-up of a word appears less reliable in determining the class type than its syntactic function (see Lyons 1977: 423-30).

Nouns are usually illustrated by the largest subclass of nouns which are taken as the default class – common nouns which denote concrete individual physical objects such as *car* or *banana*. For example, in the sentence *I bought a new car*, semantically the noun *car* is a time-stable concept, distributionally it is the head of the noun phrase functioning as an object, and structurally it exhibits singular marking.

The second largest subclass of nouns constitute nouns whose designation is usually an individual and not a concept (Lehmann and Moravcsik 2000) – proper nouns which are largely associated with personal names e.g. *Julie* or *Smith*. Proper nouns are also time-stable, but they display greater restrictions regarding their distribution and morphological structure. These restrictions are also the reason for dismissing proper nouns as formal bases in traditional accounts on word-formation processes.

2.2 Proper nouns in comparison with common nouns

Proper nouns are primarily names of people e.g. *David Peterson*, names of places e.g. *London, Japan, Africa*, and periods of time e.g. *Thursday, April, Christmas*. Other names, such as names of magazines, publications, events, occasions, and festivals, are also considered to be proper nouns³. Van Langendock and Van de Velde (2016: 33) draw our attention to “a grammatically relevant cline from more to less typical types of names.” For instance, personal names, place names, and names of months are towards the top of the cline whereas non-prototypical names with unusual properties such as names of diseases are placed at the bottom.

According to Crystal (2003), in most cases people make a distinction between common and proper nouns intuitively e.g. *bed* and *breakfast* vs. *Washington* and *Jackson*. The former is recorded in any dictionary, whereas the latter is felt not to be “true vocabulary” and therefore placed “on the boundary of the lexicon” (Crystal 2003: 122). The most likely explanation for this lies in the lexicographers’ established practice since not all proper nouns are automatically listed in dictionaries and other reference works. They are more likely to be felt as a part of a speaker’s encyclopedic knowledge and not vocabulary. Another assumption is that common nouns classify and proper names (proper nouns) identify (Cacchiani 2022). In other words, we identify a specific member of a class by its name e.g. *Barbie is a doll*.

On the other hand, some speakers may have considerable doubts whether the words and phrases they encounter consist of proper or common nouns. This could be due to different uses of one and the same word that results in different capitalization e.g. the literal use *They can all go to Hell*, in which *Hell* refers to a biblical place connected with afterlife, or the metaphorical use *It’s living hell in the ghetto*, in which *hell* means an extremely unpleasant place or experience. Some noun phrases with a common noun as their head may show inconsistency in capitalization e.g. *First Lady* or *First lady* or *first lady* even when their use remains the same. Another issue is the use of a proper noun which is a brand name of an object to denote the object itself e.g. *a Purell*.

The subclass of proper nouns is no exception to the rule that all grammatical classes have fuzzy boundaries (Quirk et al. 1985). Generally speaking, both common and proper nouns represent time-stable entities, serve as heads of noun phrases and exhibit unique structural properties. However, proper nouns have their own distinctive features which are often identified only after having been contrasted to common nouns on more specific structural and semantic grounds.

³ See 2.5 on the difference between proper nouns and proper names.

2.3 Special features of proper nouns in the grammar of the English language

In his glossary on linguistics terms, Crystal (2003: 43) defines a proper noun/name as “[A] noun that labels a unique place, person, animal etc. and *lacks the grammatical form of a common noun*” (my emphasis). Quirk et al. (1985) apply a simple test to differentiate between COMMON NOUNS (both countable and uncountable nouns, categorially marked as COUNT and NONCOUNT NOUNS) and PROPER NOUNS. Four different nouns *Sid*, *book*, *furniture*, and *brick* are used as an object in a sentence starting with *I saw ...*; these nouns are used as heads of a noun phrase without any determiners, with determiners (*a*, *the* and *some*) and in the plural form (see Quirk et al. 1985: 245-246). The test shows that proper nouns cannot be used with determiners or in the plural form, which is conditioned by semantic factors since proper nouns have unique denotation (Quirk et al. 1985: 288).

Proper nouns are said to be “semantically definite” (Lehmann and Moravcsik 2000: 747) as they do not require certain grammatical devices that would enable us to differentiate one entity from another of the same kind which is necessary with common nouns e.g. *This is my car* vs. *She bought a red car*. It is our encyclopedic knowledge that governs the use of a proper noun as semantically definite e.g. we know that there is only one continent called *Europe*. And yet, our perception and interpretation of the world may change even the strictly definite units such as proper nouns. This is accomplished with the use of determiners, modifiers and plural forms as illustrated in the following sections.

2.3.1 Proper nouns as heads of noun phrases (NP)

Proper nouns act as heads of noun phrases (NP) which normally function as subjects, objects and complements of prepositional phrases or clauses. In this sense, proper nouns are identical to common nouns which can also be heads of NPs as in the above-mentioned test. However, the constituency of the “basic” noun phrases (as defined by Quirk et al. 1985: 245), in which closed class determinative elements precede head of NP, largely differs if a proper or common noun is used as a head of an NP. The differences arise from both grammatical and semantic reasons.

As Crystal (2003) notices, proper nouns can stand alone in noun phrases consisting only of heads and without any determinative elements. This is only possible with uncountable common nouns:

(1)

- a. They visited *Berlin*. [PROPER NOUN]
- b. *Paul* is waiting for you. [PROPER NOUN]
- c. It is *Thursday* tomorrow. [PROPER NOUN]
- d. *Embroidery* was a popular activity. [COMMON NOUN] [NONCOUNT NOUN]

In terms of article usage, proper nouns are analyzed as words with NO ARTICLE, whereas common uncountable nouns are said to have ZERO ARTICLE (Quirk et al., 1985: 246). In other words, proper nouns, which do not typically take an article, are marked with NO ARTICLE as in the above given examples (1a-1c), whereas common nouns, which typically take an article, are marked with ZERO ARTICLE only when they are not countable e.g. *a glass* vs. *glass*. Contrary to proper nouns which are already semantically definite, common countable nouns are not identifiable per se and cannot stand alone e.g. **He is reading book*, **Cat is asleep*, **It is interesting story*.

Payne (1997: 39) states that proper nouns in English are typically not used with those devices that generally “render nouns more identifiable” such as articles, modifiers, possessors; it is

in the nature of proper nouns to automatically address or identify people or places e.g. *Kelly is his younger sister* or *They were born and raised in Rome*. If they are used with any of these devices, they are not identifiable per se, but determined by the context and as such they resemble common nouns e.g. *The museum has acquired two Rembrandts* or *This doesn't look like the Chicago I grew up in*. In other words, proper nouns may behave like common nouns having the characteristics of common countable nouns: determination, modification and number contrast.

2.3.1.1 Proper nouns with the definite article (*the*)

A proper noun which is preceded by the definite article (*the*) and used as the head of an NP is by default a proper name. In this case, proper nouns are called *weak proper names* as their definiteness is “redundantly marked” (Payne and Huddleston 2002: 517). Plural proper names are always weak as in (2a-2c), whereas weak singular names with proper nouns denote certain entities as in (2d-2t) and some may even have doublets i.e. strong names without the definite article as in (2d). The given list is made following Payne and Huddleston (2002: 517-18) and Quirk et al. (1985: 296-7) with the authors' examples (2a-2n) and (2o-2t) respectively:

(2)

- a. Mountain ranges: *the Alps, the Himalays, the Urals*;
- b. Island groups: *the Bahamas, the Hebrides, the Maldives*;
- c. Geographical entities: *the Netherlands, the Balkans, the Dardanelles*;
- d. Countries: *(the) Argentine, the Ukraine, (the) Sudan, (the) Yemen*;
- e. Geographically defined regions: *the Crimea, the Caucasus, the Ruhr*;
- f. Famous buildings: *the Colosseum, the Panteheon, the Parthenon*;
- g. Rivers and straits: *the (River) Thames, the Potomac, the Bosphorous*;
- h. Seas and oceans: *the Adriatic, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean*;
- i. Deserts: *the Ghobi, the Sahara, the Negev*;
- j. Swiss Alpine peaks: *the Eiger, the Jungfrau, the Matterhorn*;
- k. Political/military authorities: *the Knesset, the Kremlin, the Pentagon*;
- l. Libraries and galleries: *the Bodlein, the Guggenheim, the Tate*;
- m. Religious tracts: *the Bible, the Koran, the Talmud*;
- n. Newspapers and periodicals: *the Economist, the Guardian, the Times*;
- o. Hotel and restaurants: *the Grand (Hotel)⁴, the Waldorf Astoria*;
- p. Theatres, opera houses, cinemas and clubs: *the Criterion (Theatre), the Globe (Theatre), the Athenaeum*;
- q. Ships and planes: *the Victory, the Spirit of St Louis*;
- r. Canals: *the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Erie Canal*;
- s. Other geographical regions (with a compass point in their names): *the Near/Middle/Far East, the (Deep) South, the Midwest*;
- t. Other features of coastline: *the Gulf of Mexico, the Cape of Good Hope, the Bay of Biscay, the Strait of Magellan, the Sound of Bute, the Isle of Man*.

⁴ The elliptic form, which retains the definite article *the*, but omits the referent entity, has also been institutionalized as in *the Tate (Gallery), the Atlantic (Ocean), the Mediterranean (Sea), the (River) Thames* etc (Quirk et al. 1985: 296).

2.3.1.2 Exceptions to the definite article and no article usage

The exceptions to the definite article usage are primarily related to premodification (Quirk et al. 1985). The names of geographical entities with an *of*-phrase postmodification have a compulsory *the*, which is typically not present in the names of geographical entities with premodification e.g. *the bay of Acapulco* vs. *Acapulco Bay*. The names of universities may have an *of*-phrase postmodification or its premodified counterpart without the definite article e.g. *the University of Belgrade* and *Belgrade University*; the premodified form is only possible with universities named after a person e.g. *Stanford University*. The definite article is also omitted in the names of public institutions that begin with a genitive form of the personal name e.g. *Stone's Public House*. The names *Kensington Gardens* and *Burnham Beeches* represent a few rare cases of strong proper names in plural form that do not take the definite article (Quirk et al. 1985: 296).

As for singular proper names that exceptionally take the definite article, they typically consist of the structure "proper noun + common noun descriptor" denoting man-made features such as roads, streets, squares, buildings, airports, parks and gardens e.g. *the Albert Hall* or *the Mansion House* (Quirk et al. 1985: 294). Among isolated weak names, there are names of city districts e.g. *the City* and *the West/East End* in London and *the Bronx* in New York. The name of a Dutch city, written with the initial capital letter and the definite article e.g. *The Hague*, has the definite article as an inherent part of that name (contrary to weak proper names). This is due to its literal translation from the Dutch language as the city name consists of an article in its original form *Den Haag*.

2.3.2 Proper nouns and modification

Premodified proper nouns are exclusively used with nonrestrictive adjectives that denote personal attitude with emotive colouring (Quirk et al. 1985). In premodification such as *sweet little Caroline*, *romantic Paris* or *the impressive Colosseum*⁵, proper nouns retain their unique denotation.

When a proper noun is postmodified by nonrestrictive modifiers, its unique denotation is even more strongly emphasized. On the other hand, when the definite article is used as a determiner with a proper noun which is postmodified, the proper noun loses its unique denotation and takes on the features of common nouns (Quirk et al. 1985). The following examples show the nonrestrictive and restrictive postmodification of a proper noun:

(3)

- a. *Gary Hill*, who is a firefighter, lives in Sacramento. [NON-RESTRICTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSE]
- b. *The Gary Hill* you met lives in Sacramento. [RESTRICTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSE]

The above examples show the difference in meaning when two different kinds of relative clauses are used as postmodifiers with proper names; with the non-restrictive clause the primary use of a proper name (i.e. the bearer of the name) is given, whereas with the restrictive clause it is the secondary use of a proper name (i.e. a person called X). Moreover, the former has a proper name as its NP and the latter has a proper name as a part of a nominal and not an NP (see Huddleston et al. 2002: 1060).

With restrictive modification, the definite article may be cataphoric and lead to decomposing the unique referent into different parts or aspects (Quirk et al. 1985: 290). In this case, it has a partitive meaning as in *the Hanukkah of my childhood*, *the England of Queen Victoria*, *the Vienna I remember*.

⁵ If a weak proper name is premodified, the definite article remains (Quirk et al. 1985: 290).

2.3.3 Proper nouns and number

Proper nouns generally do not take plural form as they belong to SINGULAR INVARIABLE NOUNS together with uncountable common and abstract nouns (Quirk et al. 1985: 297). Both singular and plural proper names are included in this number class since proper nouns either take the singular form without the possibility of creating its plural counterpart or vice versa e.g. *Australia* but not **Australias*; *the Bahamas* but not **a Bahama*.

Despite being typically unmarked for number, proper nouns may sometimes take the plural form. With the presence of plural marking, proper nouns lose their unique denotation and become reclassified as common nouns (Quirk et al. 1985: 288). For instance, *the Swifts*, *the Dickenses* and the *Hawthornes* stand for the authors whose style resembles that of Jonathan Swift, Charles Dickens and Nathaniel Hawthorne, *the Simpsons* for all family members and *Romes* for cities resembling the city of Rome in Italy, or the city of Rome itself, but from two different historical periods. There is a lack of clear demarcation between proper and common nouns and a minimal chance of determining the meaning if the word is taken out of the context (Chalker 1992); for example *Morrison*s may refer to the people coming from the same family, those who share that surname despite their family background, or people figuratively compared to Jim Morrison, the late singer of the band *The Doors*.

When marked with plural, proper nouns always take the plural regular suffix *-s* and keep their bases in their authentic form both in speech and writing (Palmer et al. 2002). For instance, common nouns ending in *-y* which is preceded by a consonant undergo changes when pluralising suffix *-s* is added e.g. *a berry – berries*, whereas the proper nouns of the same shape would not undergo any changes e.g. *Jerrys* as in the example recorded in COCA:

(4)

It might be a ploy similar to his gambit after last season that forced the much-reviled *Jerrys* (Bulls chairman Jerry Reinsdorf and general manager Jerry Krause) to preserve the team. (NEWS: USA Today, 1998)

2.4 Orthography

Apart from their grammatical and semantic differences from common nouns, proper nouns are also orthographically distinctive as they are written with an initial capital letter. This criterion is not to be taken as the foremost given the fact that common nouns can behave as proper nouns and be capitalized e.g. *I do not fear you, Death* (Chalker 1992: 813). Moreover, McArthur (1992) also notices that some common nouns which have an embedded proper name are capitalized. This is typical of brand names e.g. *Gouda cheese, Dr Martens boots*, or animal breed *a Persian cat*.

Eponyms that directly come from proper nouns drop initial capitalization after gaining a single established meaning as in *ampere*, a base unit of electric current named after French mathematician and physicist André-Marie Ampère, or *bloomers/the bloomer*, women's garments in the 19th century named after the women's rights activist Amelia Bloomer. All eponyms are unanimously classified as common nouns in literature, but what differs is the linguists' opinion on the mechanisms that trigger their change of class⁶.

Word groups that make up proper names e.g. *the Royal Garden Hotel* are usually capitalized. The orthography of proper names makes them falsely equated with proper nouns as a grammatical class. Although proper names are often discussed alongside proper nouns in reference

⁶ For further explanation see Chalker (1992), Crystal (2003), and Bauer and Huddleston (2002).

to their distinctive features and orthography, proper names constitute their own special category as they are more similar to common nouns than proper nouns in terms of their grammatical representation.

2.5 Proper nouns and proper names

Both proper nouns and proper names denote people, places, periods of time etc. Contrary to proper nouns that are solely word-level units, proper names are composite units of at least two words e.g. *China* is a proper noun and *The Republic of China* is a proper name. As composite units, proper names may be made up of different kinds of words, both open and closed class words, and they are always capitalized as they are used in formal situations. For instance, appellations that indicate the social status of an individual consist of at least one pre-modifier and a proper noun which functions as the head of a noun phrase: *King George*, *Pope John*, *Professor Sir Ernest Rutherford* and *Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth* (Payne and Huddleston 2002: 519).

The difference between proper nouns and proper names does not only lie in the number of words, but also in the grammatical function of all the words in proper names. A proper noun is prototypically a head of a noun phrase, whereas a proper name does not necessarily have a proper noun as its head (Payne and Huddleston 2002). In the NP *Oxford Street*, the common noun *street* is the head of the NP. This grammatical criterion is crucial in separating proper nouns from proper names.

Despite being composite units that can even have their own internal structure e.g. *St. James's Park* (pre-modifier + genitive noun + head noun), proper names are not syntagmatic structures consisting of several units. A proper name functions as a single unit and its form cannot be changed due to the fact that no insertions are permissive i.e. *vibrant St. James's Park* is a possible structure, whereas **St. James's vibrant Park* is not (Quirk et al. 1985: 288).

Payne and Huddleston (2002: 517) point out the fact that proper names may also be clauses. Clauses are quite frequent with the titles of various works of literature or motion picture industry e.g. declarative *Gentlemen Prefer Blondes* (a musical starring Marilyn Monroe), interrogative *Dude, Where's My Car?* (a comedy movie starring Ashton Kutcher), imperative *Come September* (a rom-com movie starring Rock Hudson), subordinate *As I Lay Dying* (a novel by William Faulkner), and subordinate interrogative e.g. *How I Met Your Mother* (a sitcom).

Apart from grammatical distinctions, proper nouns and proper names show subtle nuances regarding denotation. Van Langendonck (2007: 88) agrees that both proper nouns and proper names have unique denotation but adds that in the case of proper names denotation depends on "the level of established linguistic convention." In practice, proper names may have certain salient features and various connotations attached to them. Moreover, they may have either public or private associations; the former may refer to a specific event from a global perspective such as (the) *Fukushima* (disaster), a nuclear accident that took place in Japan in 2011, and the latter to an event from a person's private life such as *The Plastics*, a group of the most popular girls at school in the movie *Mean Girls*. Public associations may remain even when their referent is changed e.g. *Fleet Street* which is no longer the location of the British newspaper offices refers to the British national press by the extension of metonymy (McArthur 1992: 678).

Generally speaking, there is a strong pragmatic dependence in interpreting the meaning of proper names. Héois (2020) emphasizes their wider scope in language use when compared to proper nouns because proper names are at the same time linguistic and cultural items and unique referents with idiosyncratic characteristics. This may be due to a specific and/or narrow reference of a proper name e.g. *the Eternal City* vs. *Rome*; however, it could also be that a proper noun as a word-level unit and a proper name as a composite unit share the same unique referent, but the shorter form is more salient e.g. *Eminem* vs. *Maschall Bruce Mathers III*. Overall, the reference of a proper name in discourse is undoubtedly interpreted owing to the shared knowledge of the participants (Gary-Prieur

2016, as cited in Héois 2022) and as it will be demonstrated in this thesis, the same holds true for proper nouns as single units.

Proper names are studied not only by linguists, but also by anthropologists, historians, geographers, encyclopedists, sociologists, psychologists, genealogists and literary critics. Traditionally, proper names belong to the field of onomastics which gives their descriptive and historical account (McArthur 1992). Proper nouns, however, are the subject of the study of grammar. Nevertheless, the combination of word-formation and onomastics may be applied in dynamic lexicology for analyzing proper names as meaningful linguistic signs which are morphologically and semantically motivated (see Lipka 2000).

2.6 Proper nouns in word-formation literature

Proper nouns have been rarely considered as word-formation units as opposed to common nouns; Lehmann and Moravick (2000: 747) state that *mountainless* is a possible derivative of the common noun *mountain* whereas **alpless* is perceived as an impossible word-formation unit. However, Marchand (1969), Bauer and Huddleston (2002), and Bauer et al. (2013), whose approach to word-formation is more semantically oriented, list affixes and other elements that create complex words together with proper nouns. The three referential works present the starting point for analysing proper nouns as word-formation components – a phenomenon which has not been discussed in great detail as the literature has mainly focused on common nouns. Given that the three referential works have offered a considerable insight into proper nouns as components of complex words and structures, a brief description of each one (with the authors' examples) is provided in the last section of this chapter.

2.6.1 Hans Marchand's semantic approach to proper nouns (1969)

Being an unsurpassed landmark in English word-formation, Hans Marchand's handbook *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation* (1969, 2nd edition) made a great impact in the study of complex words (Kastovsky 2005). Despite the handbook's subtitle *A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*, Marchand's description is fundamentally synchronic with historical aspects i.e. Marchand shows the history of the patterns, but more closely examines complex words within a synchronic system consisting of *syntagmas* – sign combinations based on a determinant (modifier) and determinatum (head) structure. As Kastovsky notices (2005), the central notions in his theoretical framework are motivation (originally taken from Saussure's compositionality principle which allows for the semantic interpretation of the syntagma constituents), morphosemantic patterns and productivity (both directly related to creating new forms), and morphophonemic alternations (referring to native and non-native word-formation in a structural-functional sense).

What makes Hans Marchand's handbook noteworthy is the fact that it provides a description of the word-formation trends, and it focuses on the structural types which are representative of established patterns. The isolated forms and neologisms are not well presented in Marchand's analysis given that mass production of new words is not necessarily a sign of the language development and change. To be more precise, Marchand (1969: 9) disregards the words that are formed "for the sheer pleasure of coining" or creative coinages. Instead, he is concerned with prototypical cases or types that are explained in terms of grammar e.g. the subject/object/complement/transpositional/prepositional types.

Marchand accounts for both productive and unproductive word-formation processes and discusses proper nouns (names) as the outputs and elements. What is fascinating about his work is

the historical background of the surnames. Some surnames are analyzable as complex words, but morphological processes by which they were coined are no longer productive e.g. patronymic names *Fitzgerald*, *MacDonald* and *Kirkpatrick* are compounds; surnames based on place names *Whitby* and *Newton* are derived by *-by* and *-ton* suffixation; surnames *Hawkin*, *Atkins* and *Wilkinson* are of the Dutch origin with the borrowed suffix *-kin*; surnames *Dolittle*, *Lovegold*, *Makejoy* and *Shakespeare* are zero-derived compounds with a verb as its first element.

Proper nouns as parts of complex words (or composites) are mentioned in more productive morphological processes. In compounding, proper nouns are more likely to be first elements of compounds as in *Ford car* or *Smith Act*. From a diachronic point of view, some proper names such as Jack, Jenny, Tom, Billy, Nanny were turned into a common noun to form the compound phrases denoting male and female animals e.g. *jackass*, *jenny-ass*, *tom cat*, *billy-goat* and *nanny goat*. In prefixation, Marchand's examples of proper nouns as bases are of the prepositional type, and they are mostly based on proper nouns that were first derived by noun-forming suffixes *-ism* and *-ist* or adjective-forming suffixes *-an/-ian* and *-ic* e.g. *neo-Calvinist* and *mid-Victorian*. In suffixation, Marchand lists all the suffixes which are productively added to proper nouns in the following order: *-an/-ian*, *-dom*, *-er*, *-ese*, *-esque*, *-iana*, *-ic*, *-ie/y*, *-ish*, *-ist*, *-ism*, *-ite*, *-ize*, and *-i*. Marchand highlights the standard and non-standard use of each suffix e.g. hypocoristic *Anny* vs. colloquial or journalistic *Queen Annish*. A special kind of word-manufacturing is explained in terms of fabricated blends which are either place names e.g. *Dakoming* (*Dakota* + *Wyoming*), or personal names e.g. *Leilabeth* (*Leila* + *Elizabeth*).

Marchand's contribution to English word-formation remains significant, not just because of the detailed diachronic and synchronic description, but also because of his focus on semantics and language use. Despite mostly using dictionary entries as examples, references on colloquial use signal a more usage-based approach, as opposed to a purely structuralist approach of the time.

2.6.2 Bauer and Huddleston's list of the words based on proper names (2002)

In one of the most widely used grammar textbooks *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* edited by Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1691-6) give an account of suffixed proper nouns and proper names, which is primarily based on their morphological shape with a few comments on the semantics of suffixes. Their list of words is based on proper names as word-level units (proper nouns) with the exception of a few composite proper names such as *New Jerseyite*, *New Yorker*, *New Zealander*, *North Carolinian* and *San Franciscan*.

From a morphological point of view, the authors examine the words that include adjectives and nouns as the outputs of suffixation with *-an/-ian*, *-er*, *-ese*, *-esque*, *-i*, *-iana*, *-ic*, *-ish*, *-ite*, and compounds with *-man/-woman*. The suffixation is discussed in terms of the base and suffix separability and compatibility i.e. whether there is an indeterminate boundary between a base and a suffix e.g. *Kenyan* (*Kenya* + *-an*), a neutralization of the distinction between suffixes e.g. *Australian* (*Australia* + *-ian* or *Australia* + *-an*), an omission of the final letter in the base e.g. *Maltese* (*Malta* + *-ese*), and a suffix preference for specific endings e.g. the suffix *-er* attaches to endings with *land* as in *Icelander*.

Semantically, all suffixes have the same meaning due to their association with the place names and they denote specific cultures, languages or inhabitants e.g. *Celtic*, *Japanese*, *Jewish*, *Korean*, *Yemeni*. Their connotations, however, may vary e.g. the suffix *-ese* may refer to the idiosyncratic language styles (*Brooklynese*), the suffix *-ic* is used for language families (*Turkic* includes *Turkish*, *Azerbaijani* and other languages from the Altaic family), and the suffix *-ite* is used with the names of the politicians in a derogatory tone (*McCarthyite*).

This overview also provides a general classification consisting of two major classes and two subclasses whose derivatives are grouped within four-term sets: place name, ordinary adjectives, inhabitants' names and their generic use:

(5)

- a. Class 1A *China – Chinese – Chinese – the Chinese*
- b. Class 1B *Australia – Australian – Australian(s) – the Australians*
- c. Class 2A *England – English – Englishman/Englishmen – the English*
- d. Class 2B *Sweden – Swedish – Swede(s) – the Swedes*

The main focus is again on the morphological make-up (whether words have inflectional endings or irregular forms) and special uses of similar forms e.g. *the British* vs. *the Britons*; *Saudi(s)* vs. *Arabian* vs. *Arab*. At the end of this section, neo-classical compound adjectives (*Anglo-American*) and nouns (*Anglophobia*) with established initial combining forms are briefly mentioned and compared to their corresponding ordinary adjectives e.g. *Americo-* vs. *American*, *Franco-* vs. *French* etc.

Overall, the list serves as a practical reference guide to morphological processes with proper names, and although the authors emphasize the standard use of derived proper names, a few examples of idiosyncrasy indicate other possible uses.

2.6.3 Bauer, Lieber and Plag's corpus findings on proper nouns (2013)

Regardless of their volume and scope, dictionaries offer limited data for analyzing word-formation processes. A more useful source of information on the current state of English morphology is found in digital corpora and lexical databases, which are the chief methodological tools used in Bauer, Lieber and Plag's monograph *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology* (Bauer et al. 2013)⁷. This reference guide surpasses Marchand's handbook as it covers both major and minor processes more closely, and it delves into more complex theoretical issues other than the ones concerned in traditional structuralist approaches as outlined in Huddleston and Pullum's grammar. The data and theory are skillfully handled so as to provide an account that would "reflect the usage of words by contemporary speakers of English" (Bauer et al. 2013: 3). For that reason, different varieties of English are included, and more importantly complex words derived from proper nouns are discussed at greater length.

The monograph gives an in-depth overview of major word-formation processes (derivation, conversion and compounding) including minor processes such as back-formation, clipping and the formation of acronyms. In their analysis, the authors focus equally on structure and use, and their description of complex words is proportionally based on formal and semantic considerations⁸. What sets the guide apart from other linguistic works is its great contribution in presenting the interaction of morphological processes (inflection and derivation), affix-ordering, affixation on compounds and phrases, and paradigmatic processes.

Derived complex words are grouped according to their readings and apart from their primary reading, they may as well exhibit multiple readings e.g. the suffix *-ism* added to proper nouns has its core meaning denoting ideologies and doctrines, and an extended meaning denoting peculiarities of language e.g. *Obamaism*. In case there is no or barely any semantic difference between affixes, doublets or triplets are listed *Barbie-ish*, *Barbieesque*, and *Barbie-like*. Regarding their formal characteristics, affixes are discussed in terms of their restrictions and overlapping domains e.g. suffixes *-ize* and *-ify* used for deriving verbs.

The detailed description of both semantic and formal characteristics of derived proper words is based on a large sample of formations. The authors list not only established words, but also the

⁷ The authors used the following electronic sources: The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), The British National Corpus (CNS), the CELEX lexical database and Google Book Corpus.

⁸ By formal considerations the authors imply phonology, orthography, selectional properties and productivity.

examples of derived proper words with grammatical particularities and their contextual use in both colloquial written and spoken English e.g. *the Chuckster*, and examples of affixes being attached to compounds and phrases with proper nouns e.g. *extra-Chinatown*, *post-Connery-as-Bond*. The collected data from corpora and lexical bases are critically compared to previous research based on dictionaries such as The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) so that certain conclusions on neologisms, low frequency forms and productivity can be drawn; for instance, hapaxes with proper nouns and verb-forming suffixes *-ize* and *-ify*, such as *Enronize* and *Chuckify*, are far more frequent in COCA than in the OED.

As for compounds, they are classified according to argument interpretation and semantic characteristics of compounds (see Chapter 9). Generally speaking, a proper noun is usually the first element of a compound and it acts as a non-head element e.g. *Bush appointee*; or two proper nouns that stand for official names of places or companies may compose coordinated compounds e.g. *Alsace-Lorraine*. However, the authors do not classify as compounds the proper names which consist of two proper nouns such as *Alice Miller*, or appositives which consist of a common and proper noun such as *Governor Dukakis*. The corpus findings show that there is a special kind of compounds with proper nouns that is frequently used in informal writing i.e. phrasal compounds in which the phrasal element has a quotative flavour e.g. *anybody-but-Bush-syndrome*.

The large sample of this work offers valuable insights into possible forms and uses of proper nouns as word-formation units thanks to its corpus-based approach. Some subtle differences between competing forms are briefly mentioned, without a more detailed explanation. Nevertheless, the guide represents the most comprehensive literature on English morphology up to now.

3 Theoretical framework: Construction Morphology

In order to analyze proper nouns as components of complex words and structures in contemporary English, it was first necessary to set a theoretical framework that would include their full description of all possible distributional features (which they may exhibit as simplex words as outlined in Chapter 2) and show their semantic contribution and potential in context. To put it shortly, the framework should *per se* allow for proper nouns to be on par with common nouns, and not put them aside as marginal. And most importantly, it should consider a crucial non-linguistic factor in their correct interpretation i.e. extra-linguistic/shared knowledge.

Construction Morphology, as a part of Construction Grammar, has assured a more prominent role of word-formation in the study of language in the 21st century (instead of being subordinate to syntax and phonology in Generative Grammar in the 20th century)⁹. The framework was gradually developed by Booij (2010a, 2010b, 2013, and 2014) who introduced a cognitive approach to analyzing complex words as instantiations of constructions as opposed to being a matter of a simple concatenation of affixes and words. Booij departed from the generative practice of treating lexicon as a separate component of language (which cannot interact with grammar i.e. a list-rule division), supported Jackendoff's graceful integration of phonology, morphosyntax and semantics (Jackendoff 1997, 2002, 2011), and put forward the idea of usage-based grammar as pioneered by Bybee (Bybee 1985, 1995, 2006). The tenets of Construction Morphology are further elaborated in the following sections.

3.1 A construction-based approach to language study

The linguistic research of the second half of the 20th century largely assumed a generative approach to language, which centered on studying underlying formal structures and regular patterns (Chomsky 1957, 1965). Much of research was carried out independently of any pragmatic (or discourse) and extra-linguistic factors and with a strong focus on investigating “the system of knowledge that underlies the use and understanding of language” (Chomsky 1986: 24). Towards the end of the 20th century, the study of peripheral language structures such as metaphor, metonymy and idioms, marked the beginning of new cognitive approaches to language which put a great emphasize on the idea of conceptualization of one's (bodily) experience. Cognitive approaches, such as Construction Grammar¹⁰, did not emerge as the antithesis of Generative Linguistics – in both theoretical frameworks, language is regarded as part of a speaker's mental or cognitive system which allows for the possibility of combining units and producing new structures (Goldberg 2003). The main difference lies in their relation to other aspects of the human mind and the study of language as a social product; according to Chomsky (1986: 18), the socio/psycholinguistic aspects of language are secondary to “the real properties of mind,” whereas Construction Grammar takes into consideration the subtle aspects of language as well:

- 1) The hypothesis behind this methodology is that an account of the rich semantic, pragmatic, and complex formal constraints on these patterns readily extends to more general, simple or regular patterns. (Goldberg 2003: 220)

⁹ The terms of both theories are capitalized as they represent unique theories of grammar alongside other theories in Cognitive Linguistics and Generative Linguistics respectively (see Croft 2010). The same holds true for the Parallel Architecture (see 3.3.2).

¹⁰ Construction Grammar evolved out of two theoretical frameworks which were advocated at the University of California at Berkeley in 1970's and 1980's: Charles Fillmore's Case Grammar and George Lakoff's Generative Semantics (for a more detailed account on Construction Grammar see Östman and Fried (2004: 1-11), and Vujčić (2016: 15-22)).

Apart from their wider scope, constructionist approaches focus on surface forms of all possible structures including both core and periphery aspects of grammar (Goldberg 2013). The instances of all possible structures are related to one another in a well-structured set i.e. a default inheritance network (Goldberg 2013), but they differ according to their level of specificity (Fried 2015). These observations are made on studying linguistic expressions as *constructions*.

The notion of a construction as *a form-meaning pairing* is often associated with Goldberg's monograph on argument structure in which she reestablished the study of constructions as the fundamental principle of any theory of grammar (Goldberg 1995); as the author pointed out the study of constructions had existed in traditional grammar but slowly started to fade during the era of transformational rules in Generative Grammar. In her later work, Goldberg (2006: 5) gives a more conventionalized definition of constructions: they represent "learned pairings of form with semantic and discourse function, including morphemes or words, idioms, partially lexically filled and fully general phrasal patterns." As the author herself explained, this definition entails varying levels of complexity and abstraction, and the equal representation of individual units (words) and larger (phrasal) units in grammar (Goldberg 2013).

Following a great interest of linguists in the constructionist methodology at the turn of the 20th century, constructions are said to "capture generalizations about conventional linguistic knowledge" (Fried 2015: 980) and therefore they provide "a uniform model for the representation of all grammatical knowledge" (Croft 2010: 463). This means that the notion of a construction has been generalized so that any construction representing a form-meaning pairing should be treated as a conventional linguistic unit, and that all levels of grammatical analysis have been fully integrated into the study of grammar. As "a sign-based grammatical model," Construction Grammar rejects the idea of independent models or "components" (Fried and Östman 2004: 12). Thus, a speaker's knowledge of language includes constructions at all possible levels: morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and discourse.

Depending on their level of analysis, linguists examine constructs i.e. actual linguistic expressions occurring in language such as sentences and phrases. In fact, constructs are realizations of constructions in speech, and people communicate in terms of constructs not constructions (Fried and Östman 2004). The most important characteristic of a construct is that it represents a well-formed linguistic expression based on "a general blueprint for *licensing*" provided by a construction (Fried and Östman 2004: 18, the authors' quotation). The speakers are not said to "generate" new and grammatically acceptable sentences or words, but they make use of their language knowledge in the right way thanks to abstract constructions which license novel constructs through constraint principles (Fried and Östman 2004: 25). In this sense there are no structures which are more important than others in language as core structures in generative approaches, and different constructions may fit together provided certain conditions are met.

3.1.1 Complex words in a construction-based approach

In generative approaches to language, the focus of language study was mainly on syntax and transformational rules, whereas lexicon was viewed as a special component placed outside the theory of grammar. Morphological phenomena were studied either within a lexicalist framework (starting with Chomsky 1970; Halle 1973)¹¹. The first attempt to delimitate the scope of word-formation and to propose a word-based theory of morphology was made in Aronoff's monograph *Word Formation in Generative Grammar* (1976). This referential work provided a detailed account of regular rules of the lexicon which operate in the production of new complex words i.e. *Word*

¹¹ This approach centers on the notion of the Lexicon i.e. a pre-syntactic component in which *Lexical Rules* operate, and morphemes are its basic units (for a more detailed account on Lexicalism see Scalise and Guevra (2005: 147-187)).

Formation Rules (WFRs). WFRs are applied to a word which is a member of a major lexical category such as nouns, verb and adjectives, and their successful application depends on two morphological conditions, productivity and blocking, which are closely related to semantic coherence and lexical listing – the most cited pattern is that of forming abstract nouns from adjectives with *-ness* and *-ity* (Aronoff 1976: 37-45).

The introduction of WFRs in linguistic theory represented a fresh view to word-formation as it diverged from the morpheme-based approach. Complex words were no longer considered as a simple concatenation of morphemes, and the examination of paradigmatic relationships between simplex and complex words gained more importance in language study. These two theoretical ideas paved a way for a construction-based approach to morphology which also assumes a set of abstract patterns and complex words as instantiations of these patterns. However, rules are always source-oriented (in the sense of applying a regular rule to one established word i.e. base), and they do not include the creation of ‘less regular’ instances. In particular, a complex word with a non-lexical item as its base (instead of an established word e.g. the word *autist* has *aut-* as its “base” borrowed from Greek), or a non-productive pattern, cannot be described as generated by a rule (see Booij and Audring 2018). Conversely, these less regular cases (alongside the regular ones) can be explained as instantiations of product- or output-oriented abstractions called constructional schemas (Booij 2010a).

3.2 Construction Morphology and its representation of complex words

Construction Morphology as word-based morphology assumes providing linguistic explanations of different kinds of words as well as accounting for various paradigms e.g. inflectional, derivational, phrasal etc. It also introduces the notion of a hierarchical lexicon with the aim of erasing the common misconception about the “rule versus list fallacy” (Booij 2013: 257). In a hierarchical lexicon, it is possible that an already listed word is used for generating a new constructional schema. Construction Morphology differentiates three key ways of creating complex words or morphological constructs: by constructional schemas, analogy and second-order schemas (or subschemas) (see also Šuković 2024b)¹².

3.2.1 Constructional schemas and their role in creating complex words

The notion of a schema is used in Construction Grammar for describing all kinds of linguistic information since schemas operate at an abstract level of cognition. With reference to complex words, schemas enable us to make generalizations about different formations (constructs) across all levels of morphological analysis, and to comprehend the patterns of word-formation and the structure of lexical knowledge. Contrary to rules that are procedural in nature and strictly placed in grammar, schemas eliminate the sharp division between lexicon and grammar (Jackendoff and Audring 2020b). In Construction Morphology, complex words can also be listed because schemas illustrate the properties of existing words and not only the way the new words are created (Booij 2010a, 2010b). In sum, schemas conceptualize all possible relations between words (following the network model by Bybee (1995)).

An abstract schema conveys a generalization about the form and meaning of a morphological construction in the mind of a speaker (Booij 2010). The speaker is able to abstract

¹² The first draft of this section was used in the author’s promotion of her doctoral research at *Anglophonia: Forging Paths International Student Conference in English Studies*, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.

away the necessary information from the existing words and coin new words by replacing the variable x :

$$I. < [[x]_{Ni} \textit{hood}]_{Nj} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Quality of SEM}_i]_j >$$

This schema is instantiated by nouns such as *sainthood* and *motherhood*, and it produces new complex words licensed by the morphological construction $[N\textit{-hood}]_N$ (Booij and Audring 2017: 278). Angled brackets are used to demarcate the schema¹³. The schema provides linguistic information about the form-meaning correspondence which is indicated by the use of an arrow \leftrightarrow . The left part of the schema specifies the form, and the right part specifies the meaning of each morphological construction which is licensed by the schema (2). The nominal base and its meaning (SEM) carry the same index i , and the meaning of the whole construction is indexed as j . According to Booij (2010a), a word as a pairing of form and meaning is a linguistic sign, and for that reason only words as construction constituents have a lexical co-index, whereas affixes do not have any. In contrast to structural (morpheme-based) approaches to words, affixes do not carry meaning on their own, but it is only within a given construction that they evoke particular meanings following the operation of unification i.e. replacing the variable x . (Booij 2014).

Speaking in layman’s terms, unification is a process of fitting together the building blocks successfully. It ensures which constituents can combine, and even more importantly, that their attributes are not of contradictory values; otherwise, they fail to combine (Fried and Östman 2004). In Construction Morphology, unification as the basic operation which creates morphological constructions may provide an explanation to certain ‘problematic’ structures; for instance, the class-changing prefix *out-* determines the class of the complex word, instead of its rightmost element as predicted by the *Right-hand Head Rule* (Williams 1981). Booij and Audring (2017: 287) illustrate that this is due to the simultaneous unification of two productive word-formation schemas: prefixation of verbs with *out-* and conversion of nouns or adjectives to verbs. In this way, schemas license new constructs without the necessary intermediate step:

$$II. [\textit{out}[x]_V]_V + [N/A]_V = [\textit{out}[[x]_{N/A}]_V]_V$$

Each schema provides information about three dimensions of words: phonological (PHON), syntactic (SYN), and semantic (SEM). These levels of representation in a constructional schema are simultaneously accessible following the tenants of the Parallel Architecture. The form of the schema in (I) is simplified, and it represents a conflation of the phonological and morphological dimension. The simplified formal representation is closely associated with Construction Morphology (as in Booij 2010a, 2010b, 2013, 2014), and it is far more often used than its elaborated counterpart in (III) which includes a linear agreement of sound segments and prosodic categories i.e. the symbols σ stands for “syllable” and ω for “prosodic word” (Booij and Audring 2017: 279):

$$III. < ((x)_{\omega-i} ((\textit{hud})_{\sigma-\textit{k}}))_j \leftrightarrow [N_i \textit{Suff}_k]_{Nj} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Quality of SEM}_i]_j >$$

The tripartite properties (PHON, SYN, and SEM) are based on the information specified by a schema. In the production of new linguistic expressions of any kind, this information is provided via inheritance relations that represent “a network of related and often overlapping grammatical patterns” (Fried and Östman 2004: 72). In Construction Morphology, inheritance is seen as motivation, which implies that complex words as morphological constructs are motivated by schemas in which the relationship between the form and meaning is non-arbitrary (Booij 2015). Motivation is not a matter of “yes or no,” but it is a rather gradient mechanism – it supports the idea of a hierarchial lexicon in which not only abstract morphological schemas instantiate complex

¹³ The demarcation of a schema has been applied to its formal representation starting from Booij (2014).

words, but also lexicalized (or stored) complex words may instantiate schemas (Booij 2010, 2015)¹⁴.

Generally speaking, schemas have a dual function: on one hand, they motivate existing words of one type (such as *sainthood* and *motherhood*) by showing the form-meaning correspondence; on the other hand, they produce new words (Booij and Audring 2017). This point of view has been further put forward by Jackendoff and Audring in a new theoretical framework named Relational Morphology which is also based on cognitive principles of both Construction Grammar and Construction Morphology (Jackendoff and Audring 2018, 2020a, 2020b). Schemas perform two roles: generative and relational. The generative role is procedural in nature like traditional WFRs, and it is activated in the creation of new complex words and expressions by unifying the schema's variable with other linguistic material (words and other units). The relational role demonstrates generalizations among stored items in the lexicon. In Relational Morphology, the emphasis is placed on the latter function of a schema which is only "implicitly invoked" in constructionist approaches, but not fully acknowledged for being "distinct from the generative function" (Jackendoff and Audring 2020a: 4). All schemas have a relational function, which explains the existence of productive and non-productive patterns in word-formation, whereas the generative function is only assigned to a schema which produces new words and gives a productive pattern.

However, the fact that some constructs are not a direct result of the schema's generative power and that they can be related to other existing (stored) items is also acknowledged in Construction Grammar and Morphology. The instances which do not represent a productive pattern but can be linked to established words and expressions are discussed as instances of analogy.

3.2.2 Analogical word-formation

The notion of analogy was described in Generative Grammar in the sense of analogic change, "the kind that actually changes the set of grammatical rules" (Chomsky 1964: 22). Given that generative linguists were more concerned with regular rules and patterns, it was much later that analogy was studied as a word-formation mechanism. Analogy as "a synchronic morphological force" is accounted for rule-creating creativity that takes place after the speaker's inspection of existing words (both simplex and complex) which may result in the incidental actuation of existing derivational patterns, but in different configurations (Van Marle 1990: 267). The reinterpretation of existing rules may give rise to ad hoc formations that can even be phonologically adapted so as to "sound good" (Van Marle 1990: 272, the author's quotation).

With reference to word-formation rules and productive patterns, Bauer (1983: 96) defines an analogical formation more closely, and states that it is "a new formation clearly modeled on one already existing lexeme and not giving rise to a productive series." Moreover, the notion of a potential word is of paramount importance in describing word-formation rules and productivity¹⁵, whereas any word is a potential word for analogical formations provided that there is a suitable model (Bauer 2001). And yet some analogical formations are never made as opposed to others that may be fairly frequent (Plag 2003). This lack of explanation makes analogy more permissive than rules and unclear regarding structural restrictions, which are essential for word-formation rules (Bauer 2001).

Apart from unpredictability, the absence of regularity sets analogy apart from word-formation rules (which illustrate only regular patterns). Analogical formations may seem regular at

¹⁴ Instantiations may also be a result of second-order schemas and paradigmatic relations (see 3.2.3).

¹⁵ Although word-formation rules and productivity imply generating new words, the notion of a potential word has particular significance as well. As Katamba (1993) notices the ability of speakers to identify words that they have not encountered before and to recognize them as potential (possible) words is directly connected to the nature of the mental lexicon which includes the knowledge of word-formation rules.

a glance, but only to the extent that “their meaning can readily be discerned on the basis of the individual forms which obviously have served as their model” (Plag 2003: 37). This is achieved through a proportional relation between a model and its corresponding items e.g. a: b :: c: d as in *eye: eyewitness :: ear: earwitness*. In principle, analogy is necessarily paradigmatic in nature in contrast to rules which are often syntagmatic (Plag 1999). It seems that whenever a syntagmatic approach fails to explain a particular morphological structure or phenomenon, an analysis in terms of paradigmatic structure or analogy is proposed (Bauer et al. 2013). As a result, analogy and rules are seen as strict alternatives in traditional linguistic accounts.

Matiello (2016, 2017) studies analogical formations in depth and proposes the following account of (surface) analogy: an analogical formation (target T) is explicitly modeled on an established word stored in the speaker’s lexicon (model M) on the basis of certain similar features which the two words or expressions share. There is at least one striking feature (be it phonological, morphotactic or semantic) which creates a direct link between the model and the target. The ideal starting point for detecting an analogical formation is by identifying its source word which serves as the model, and then the proportional relation which activates the target. The model and the target are highly conditioned by the context i.e. they have to co-occur in the same discourse – it is also far more usual for the model to occur first so that new words are more anaphoric of the preceding text than cataphoric of the following one (Matiello 2017)). Such context-dependent analogies often result in marked nonce-formations.

In Construction Morphology, the nature of the hierarchical lexicon excludes either/or word-formation (i.e. analogy or rules) owing to its different level of abstraction – it assumes that there is both “analogical word formation, based on an individual model word, and word formation based on abstract schemas” (Booij 2010a: 89). As Matiello (2016, 2017), Booij (2010a) states that in the case of analogical word-formation it is essential that one can pinpoint to an individual existing model, and that the speaker’s understanding of the target depends on the model. In other cases, analogical word-formation may occur when model words are used to create new patterns via abstraction. The emergence of a general schema is also possible after a while due to the “repeated analogical extensions” of an established form (Hilpert 2013: 471).

For instance, the word *Watergate* served as the model for all subsequent words ending in *-gate* which refer to a political scandal; thus, all the constructs were licensed by the following constructional schema (Booij 2010: 90):

IV. $[[x]_{Ni} [gate]_{N}]_{Nj} \leftrightarrow [political\ scandal\ pertaining\ to\ SEM_i]_j$

Booij defines *-gate* as a compound constituent, and the construct of the schema (IV) is a *gate*-compound. Word endings such as *-burger*, *-holic*, *-tainment*, and *-zine* are also compound constituents that have gone through the structural reinterpretation of the model words in which they first appeared¹⁶. With an increase of new words, the model word does not necessarily act as the only word that prompts target words; however, the model word is still linked to the subschema and its purpose is to strengthen the schema’s entrenchment¹⁷. The subschemas that operate at this level are also called second order schemas (Booij 2014; Booij and Audring 2017, 2018; Booij and Masini 2015).

¹⁶ In contrast, Matiello (2016: 131) treats the same elements as combining forms and names the operation ‘analogy via schema’ which takes place in “transitional phenomena between derivation and compounding.”

¹⁷ In Cognitive Grammar, Langacker (2008) compares linguistic entrenchment to a psychological process of automatization: “through repetition or rehearsal, a complex structure is thoroughly mastered, to the point that using it is virtually automatic and requires little conscious monitoring. In CG parlance, a structure undergoes progressive **entrenchment** and eventually becomes a **unit**” (Langacker 2008: 16, the author’s emphasis).

3.2.3 Second-order schemas in Construction Morphology

Second-order schemas or subschemas are literally ‘schemas of schemas’ (Booij and Audring, 2017: 289). The existence of second-order schemas supports the idea of the hierarchical lexicon and default inheritance – more specific schemas inherit some properties from the more general ones, and may also have additional properties which overrule the default properties (Booij 2014, 2015). They operate at the same level as less productive or less regular word-morphology such as affix replacement or paradigmatic morphology (Booij 2010a, 2013, 2014; Booij and Audring 2017; Booij and Masini 2015), and root-based morphology¹⁸ (Booij and Audring 2018). A more precise definition of a second-order schema is that it represents “a set of two or more paradigmatically related schemas” (Neset 2008, as cited in Booij and Masini 2015: 49). In fact, there is an inherently dual function for every second-order schema:

- 2) The notion of “second-order schemas” thus serve to spell out a view of the grammar as an intricate network of lexical relationships not only between morphological schemas and their instantiations – that is, complex words – but also among schemas. Complex words are not only related indirectly, by sharing a base word, but also directly, because they may entertain paradigmatic relationships. (Booij and Audring 2017: 291)

Some constructions which are instantiated by second-order schemas are semantically less transparent and their meaning cannot be derived from their constituents alone. This is due to the fact that their formal base (x) has no lexical entry of its own and it does not exist as an independent word (Booij 2010a). The most typical example of paradigmatic morphology is a set of complex words ending in the suffixes *-ism* and *-ist* e.g. *altruism/altruist*, *bolshevism/bolshevist*, *communism/communist*, *pacifism/pacifist* etc. Since most of these words are based on the borrowed words from other languages, there is not one precise word that actually functions as the base. Yet, the meaning of one member is interpreted thanks to the existence of the other member. Their semantics is based on a paradigmatic relationship in which the word ending in *-ism* usually triggers the creation of the word ending in *-ist*; however, paradigmatic may operate in both directions and sometimes the actual order is not evident (Booij 2010a). The formal representation of the *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic relationship is indicated by the use of the symbol \approx (Booij and Masini 2015: 50):

$$V. \langle [x-ism]_{Ni} \leftrightarrow SEM_i \rangle \approx \langle [x-ist]_{Nj} \leftrightarrow [person\ with\ property\ Y\ related\ to\ SEM_i]_j \rangle$$

The schemas in (V) may also use a lexeme as their base, such as *Marxism/Marxist* and *socialism/socialist*, and allow for several paradigmatic patterns (see 6.3.2). Lexemes which are non-native roots may display idiosyncratic allomorphy e.g. the allomorph of Plato is *platon-* as in *platonist*, *platonism*, and *platonist* (Booij and Masini 2015: 51). Such systematic paradigmatic relationships show that the words have the same degree of morphological complexity as a result of the schemas’ abstract generalizations (Booij and Masini 2015).

Second-order schemas are also used to show morphological instances which are influenced by different configurations of language. Phonetically, the use of reduction patterns in the creation of nicknames is exerted by shortening based on a prosodic and adding the suffix *-y* as in *Alfy* for Alfred or *Cammie* for Camille (Booij and Audring 2017: 291). At a semantic level, Booij and Masini (2015) provide examples of overcharacterization and lack of semantic bases in Dutch. In addition, syntactic phrases can serve as constituents of complex words and by default they take the modifier position e.g. *all-you-can-eat-buffet*, *stop-and-go-traffic*, *the know-it-all-ism* etc. (Booij 2014: 201). Given that new complex words may appear in any register, pragmatic and discourse

¹⁸ The examples of root-based morphology are established geographical names whose root is not a word on its own, and their final element is a ‘town suffix’ such as *Hamilton*, *Hereford*, *Grimsbay* (Booij and Audring 2018: 61).

values are closely associated with a corresponding (longer) form via second-order schemas as in the case of nicknames (Booij and Audirng 2017). These cases confirm that a complete morphological analysis cannot be carried out in isolation as it depends on other levels of language (or grammar), and thus it requires a full linguistic integration.

3.3 Different dimensions of grammar in Construction Morphology

As we have seen, schemas express different dimensions of language and their constructs contain complex information. Every word (both simplex and complex) has a particular sequence of sound, meaning and formal (distributional) properties. In this sense, a word is like a sentence and the task of Construction Morphology is to specify interaction between morphology and phonology, morphology and semantics, and morphology and syntax (Booij 2010a). The formal representation of a schema provides the three kinds of information, and thus enables a graceful integration of all dimensions. This was first advocated by Jackendoff in his model Parallel Architecture (Jackendoff 1997, 2002, 2011).

3.3.1 The tripartite grammar of the Parallel Architecture

The Parallel Architecture, as an approach to the study of grammar, is a direct response to Generative Grammar. Jackendoff (1997, 2002, 2011), who developed the theory progressively at the turn of the 20th century, opposed to Chomsky's syntactocentric grammar and advocated for a simultaneous access to three major generative components: phonology, syntax and semantics. Jackendoff (2002: 126) admits the special role of syntax in the grammar by stating that it is the most "isolated" component, and that two other components (phonology and semantics) show greater dependence in the sense of their relatedness to syntax i.e. interfaces. Later, Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) insert lexicon in the tripartite grammar with the aim of showing that there is no sharp division between lexicon and grammar. Their parallel architecture still centers around three generative components and interfaces between components, and lexicon simply intersects them (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005: 18).

Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) briefly mention the role of morphology, without explicitly adding it as a separate component. Morphology is described as "the extension of the parallel architecture below the word level," and words like syntactic structures provide complex pieces of information and interfaces between (morpho)phonology, (morpho)syntax, and semantics (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005: 19). This similarity between the units of two different levels suggests a need for a morphosyntactic approach to studying language structures.

3.3.2 Morphology as an individual component in the Parallel Architecture

In Construction Morphology, as word-based morphology, a word is treated as a linguistic sign with its own form and meaning – it comprises phonological, syntactic and semantic information following the model of the tripartite parallel architecture. Morphology is not included as an individual component of the grammar at the earliest stage of the constructionist theory (Booij 2010a), but its active role is assumed in the sense that it influences the three dimensions of any word. Moreover, morphology is seen as a dimension closely connected with syntax due to various degrees of schematicity, which implies the existence of phrasal lexical constructions instantiated by

second-order schemas and based on paradigmatic relationships; however, there is still a need to maintain the formal division between syntactic and morphological constructs (Booij 2014).

The idea that morphology and syntax are closely related and yet separate is best outlined in the paper titled *Construction Morphology and the Parallel Architecture of Grammar* (Booij and Audring 2017). The original tripartite grammar of the Parallel Architecture by Jackendoff (simplified as: Phonological structure ↔ Morpho-Syntactic structure ↔ Conceptual structure) now includes morphology on the same tier with syntax. All linguistic information of a construction (both morphological and syntactic) is simultaneously accessible via interface links with phonology and semantics, which are at different levels in comparison to morphology and syntax. In theory, it is more accurate to say that there is an interface between components of different levels since it refers to correspondence between different types of information (e.g. morphology-phonology or morphology-semantics), and an interaction between morphology and syntax because “the use of syntactic constructions may be intertwined with that of morphological constructions” (Booij and Audring 2017: 292).

The interaction between morphology and syntax is described in the following observations (Booij and Audring 2017: 299):

3)

- (i) Syntactic constructions may serve as building blocks of morphological constructions.
- (ii) The use of a morphological construction may depend on its occurrence in a syntactic construction.
- (iii) There may be systematic paradigmatic relationships between morphological and syntactic constructions.

These observations support the idea of “constructional continuity” on the one hand, and the absence of a lexicon-syntax dichotomy on the other hand. The merger of lexicon and grammar is reflected in actual language use, which accounts for acceptability of some otherwise “ungrammatical” structures; for example, the complex words with proper nouns as their components which will be analyzed and discussed in this thesis with regard to the above observations.

3.4 A usage-based model in the domain of morphology

The elimination of a strict division between lexicon and grammar is also advocated in a usage-based approach to diverse linguistic phenomena. Constructionist approaches are at the same time usage-based given that they assume both broad generalizations (which is in line with traditional generative practice) and item-specific knowledge related to more limited (lexical) patterns (Goldberg 2006: 45). In theory, a usage-based model examines the grammar of a language following its language use – frequency of use and similarity of form and meaning are the key factors for formulating grammatical knowledge in the mind¹⁹ (Croft 2010: 499). The greatest advantage of this approach is that it is empirically grounded and it formulates its principles on combining the speaker’s cognition and experience in their overall knowledge of language:

- 4) While all linguists are likely to agree that grammar is the cognitive organization of language, a usage-based theorist would make the more specific proposal that grammar is the cognitive organization of one’s experience with language. (Bybee 2006: 711).

¹⁹ Usage-based models also focus on language acquisition and language change (see Croft 2010).

The nature of cognitive representations of language includes high levels of repetition, categorization and automation on the one hand, and diverse usage events, dynamic change and the emergence of new linguistic structures on the other hand (Bybee 2013). In the sense of being usage-oriented, constructionist approaches study both aspects of language: “its creative and its formulaic character” (Goldberg 2013: 9); or as Lemmens (2019) put it poetically “a usage-based model gives you the best of two worlds, as it combines structural stability with adaptability.”²⁰

A usage-based model of grammar eliminates Saussure’s distinction between *la langue* and *la parole* (1972), and Chomsky’s distinction between competence and performance (1986). While Saussure acknowledges the interdependence of the two language facets²¹, Chomsky places greater importance on studying language competence. Language competence is defined as the system of knowledge which underlies the use and understanding of language i.e. internalized language or I-language. It is perceived as the primary and only object worth studying in generative theories contrary to actual or potential language behavior and the products of that behavior i.e. externalized language or E-language. The most important characteristic of I-language is that the formation of abstract rules takes place in the mind of the speaker and cannot be affected by E-language.

Construction Morphology as a usage-based account of morphological knowledge may rely on E-language data in presenting some linguistic particularities (Booij 2014); for instance, abstract rules may also be based on existing complex words, and as a result, new or second-order schemas emerge. Moreover, idiosyncrasies in form and meaning can be explained by comparing and contrasting instances of actual language use and studying their paradigmatic relationships. Finally, productivity (which was studied in relation to generative rules as represented in I-language²²) is tightly connected to frequency patterns in actual language use.

3.4.1 Morphological productivity as an indicator of actual language use

The earliest usage-based theories were applied in the domain of inflectional morphology by Joan Bybee, also known as the network model (Bybee 1985, 1995). The network model differs from exclusively generative models in its divergence from standard rules; instead, it describes words as formations which vary in lexical strength and which can be related to other words via sets of lexical connections (Bybee 1995). It also focuses on actual language use in terms of type and token frequency as indicators of productivity. Token frequency is the frequency of occurrence of individual grammatical forms, and type frequency is the frequency of word types that match up to a schema (Croft 2010: 499). For example, irregular formations such as irregular past forms in English are usually of high token frequency and do not correspond to any generative rule (Bybee 1995). Type frequency plays an important role in determining the degree of productivity inasmuch as it interacts with schematicity, and thus, it indicates the extent to which a particular category is open or restricted e.g. *-ed* suffixation for forming past tense can be applied to any new verb as result of high schematicity (Bybee and Beckner, 2012).

In Construction Morphology as a usage-based model, productivity is described as a holistic property of morphological constructions and it is discussed in terms of schema unification (Booij 2014). It is not seen as a matter of “yes or no” because there are a lot of morphological processes which are semi-productive or marginally productive. In some cases, schema unification may lead to a productive schema despite having one of its constituents unproductive. This phenomenon is called *embedded productivity* and it occurs when a typically unproductive word-formation process

²⁰ <https://journals.openedition.org/cognitextes/1616>

²¹ “Il y a donc interdépendance de la langue et de la parole; celle-là est à la fois l’instrument et la produit de celle-ci” (Saussure 1972: 37).

²² The linguistic term productivity is originally used to refer to the speaker’s capacity to produce and understand not just new sentences, but also an unlimited number of sentences, and as such, productivity is considered to be one of the design features of human language in contrast to that of animals (Crystal 2008: 389).

interacts with another (more productive) word-formation process e.g. instances of nominalizations of synthetic compound verbs in English (Booij 2010: 47).

Seen as a cline, morphological productivity correlates with the strength of the mental representation of constructions (Booij and Audring 2017) and it is connected with the speaker's overall ability to make generalisations about language. If a new form is repeatedly attested in language use and corpora, it may be regarded as the direct consequence of morphological productivity because of "the degree of cognitive ease with which speakers can produce and process new complex words on the basis of that construction" (Hilpert 2014: 81). This means that productivity should not be defined only in terms of creating specific constraints or competing forms in the production of new words, but also in terms of the actual language use.

3.4.1.1 A scope of morphological productivity

In derivational morphology, productivity is directly related to the production of new words as opposed to existing words in the mind of a speaker. Although some linguists state that productivity is a property of an affix (see Plag 2003), others discuss productivity in terms of morphological processes or rules that result in new complex words (see Bauer 2001). The latter point of view is supported in the network model since different degrees of productivity imply that there are alternate processes and that productivity of a morphological process correlates with lexical strength (Bybee 1985).

The notion of morphological productivity has been associated with other linguistic factors which may play part in the production of new words, and which are intuitively felt by speakers:

5)

- (i) *unintentionality* and *uncountability* – Schultnik's definition of productivity (1961)²³ which centers around the two notions is said to be very intuitive i.e. new formations which are the outputs of truly productive word-formation processes will go unnoticed as opposed to the outputs of unproductive processes which will be used "to shock, to amuse, or to achieve some other intentional effect" (Bayeen and Lieber 1991: 808). However, this definition has several drawbacks. We may never be certain if a speaker has deliberately coined a new word, unless it occurs in a spoken or written form in which playful expressions are expected to be found such as poetry and newspaper headlines, or in the production of a single individual (see Bauer 2005). In addition, the criterion of unintentionality is unlikely to be operationalized because it largely depends on the speaker's linguistic knowledge and whether they are able to perceive the interlocutor's word to be coined intentionally or unintentionally (Plag 1999);
- (ii) *semantic coherence* – the more coherent semantics of a WFR is, the more likely it is that the meaning of the formed word will be easily predicted (Aronoff 1976); in practice, speakers would opt for the formation without a special sense e.g. *connectiveness* vs. *connectivity*. Following the principles of level-ordered morphology (Lexical Phonology), the formations created at a higher level are created by productive processes as their formations are more semantically transparent and easier to interpret e.g. *highness* vs. *height* and *brothers* vs. *brethren* (Kiparsky 1982);

²³ "By productivity as a morphological phenomenon we understand the possibility for language users, by means of a morphological process which underpins a form/meaning correspondence in some words they know, to coin, unintentionally, a number of new formations which is in principle infinite" (Schultnik 1961, as cited in Bauer (2005: 317)).

- (iii) *blocking* – it represents the non-occurrence of a new form due to another established synonymous form (Aronoff 1976)²⁴. A typical example of blocking is the word **stealer* given the existence of *thief*. The theory of blocking was later elaborated by Rainer (1988) who defined blocking by synonymy as a mechanism which occurs due to the existence of either a synonymous word (*token blocking*) or a synonymous pattern (*type blocking*). Token blocking is conditioned by language processing which depends on the storage and frequency of established words; on the other hand, type blocking is similar to a language-specific constraint as the relationship between rival patterns should not be overgeneralized, but rather learned anew every time the patterns come into contact (Rainer 2005);
- (iv) *hapax legomena* (*hapaxes*) – these are words occurring only once in the corpus and they show the correlation between productivity and frequency. Bayeen (1992, 1993) introduces the quantification of morphological productivity with his formula $\mathcal{P} = n1/N$, n being the number of hapaxes and N being the number of tokens (separate occurrences of a word in the corpus). The value \mathcal{P} is principally measured to distinguish between productive and unproductive processes and its value is proportional to the size of the item sample or the corpus. Thus, hapaxes represent a firm indication of the use of the morphological processes that give rise to new words.
- (v) *language-specific restrictions* – generally speaking, these are constraints that delimit productivity of a morphological process and they are applied to a certain subset of possible bases or domains. They may occur at each language level: phonology, morphology, lexicology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (see Bauer 1983, 2001, 2005; Plag 1996, 1999, 2003; Rainer 2005; Zirkel 2010);
- (vi) *competition* – it is regarded as a counterpart to the notion of blocking. Both competition and blocking assume the existence of domains that may either allow for the creation of competing forms or block a new formation (Bauer et al. 2013). Competition in derivation exists between two or more synonymous (or rival) affixes that derive the same category of words e.g. verb-forming suffixes *-ify* and *-ize* or negative adjectival prefixes;
- (vii) *availability and profitability* – a morphological process is available if it is applicable in the creation of new words (or neologisms) in order to fill gaps in the lexicon, and a morphological process is profitable if it is used for the creation of a large number of words (Corbin 1987, as cited in Carstairs-McCarthy 1992: 37). Availability is seen as a matter of “yes or no,” whereas profitability can be understood as “the degree to which something can be used to create new words” and it is affected by different domains and by competition between processes (Bauer et al. 2013: 33);
- (viii) *decomposition* – another term is segmentability and it refers to our processing of complex words and their representation in the mental lexicon i.e. if complex words consist of more or less salient parts (Hay 2002);
- (ix) *creativity* – it is usually regarded as the counterpart to the notion of productivity. In generative approaches, productivity is rule-governed, whereas creativity is rule-changing. In word-formation studies, both creativity and productivity are hyponyms of *innovation* i.e. the speaker’s capacity of creating new forms; in practice, a precise distinction between productive and creative formations may be based on their meaning and function in specific contexts (see Bauer 2001).

²⁴ Blocking can also refer to the non-existence of a complex form because of the existence of a homonymous form e.g. *liver*, “someone who lives” vs. *liver*, inner organ. Blocking by homonymy is not perceived to be a significant morphological mechanism as English seems to welcome homonymy (see Bauer et al. 2013; Plag 1999).

4 Research methods: analysis, corpus and data

The principal aim of this thesis is to investigate as thoroughly as possible the contemporary state of proper nouns in English word-formation. In the past, proper nouns were rarely and superficially examined in both grammar reference books and word-formation studies. As presented in the literature overview (Chapter 2), proper nouns are traditionally considered as less probable formal bases and they are believed to be rarely involved in the creation of new words. However, it has also been demonstrated that the use of diverse methodological tools in the research on proper nouns may provide surprising results as in Bauer et al. (2013).

This thesis puts forward an alternative viewpoint that proper nouns may freely and productively form complex words given that they can act as constituents of abstract schemas which create grammatical constructions; in other words, proper nouns may be morphologically changed and be part of larger grammatical structures when activated in context. The proposed constructionist approach to analyzing proper nouns as construction constituents will be carried out in the form of qualitative corpus analysis. Therefore, the advantages of doing qualitative corpus analysis are first given in this chapter; next, the used tool the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) is described, and finally, it is explained how the corpus sample was collected for the research.

4.1 Corpus linguistics: Qualitative corpus analysis

Regardless of the linguistic field, early qualitative approaches were associated with theoretical findings, and they presumed either the data from the so-called traditional sources such as dictionaries or invented examples. The aims of the research, which were mostly to propose a new theory, justified the limited scope and sample. With the advent of modern technology and digital bases, selecting the data from the sources with larger samples resulted in a more contextual approach to analysis of words and less conceptual rigidity (Williams 2003). In due course, new methodological tools such as digital corpora and lexical databases became more frequently used.

The corpus as a tool is “a collection of machine-readable files that contain text and/or transcribed speech that were produced in a communicative setting that are supposed to be representative of a certain language, dialect, variety, etc.” (Gries 2017: 591). In this sense, corpora prototypically appear *most natural* in three key dimensions of research: settings, stimuli, and linguistic units (Gries 2013, the author’s emphasis). The corpus data may be difficult to handle due to the noisy and redundant information. On the other hand, what goes in favor of using corpora as methodological tools over the traditional ones is the fact that they can be updated and they provide a fairly wide coverage of contemporary data. Overall, the corpus analysis is systemic and extensive, and it allows for addressing various linguistic phenomena beyond either/or cases.

Corpus analysis embodies a certain kind of duality seeing that it is applicable to both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Although quantitative approaches to corpus analysis are preferred due to the fact that corpora enable large-scale observation and statistical evidence, qualitative approaches can also be adopted since corpus linguistics is said to generally “refine and redefine a range of theories of language” (McEnery and Hardie 2012: 1). With regard to qualitative corpus analysis, corpora permit researchers and scholars to replicate searches. This enables researchers to eliminate the two major drawbacks of traditional qualitative approaches: a lack of scientific reproduction and verification of the analysis (Hasko 2012).

This thesis takes a qualitative approach to corpus analysis because the research question aims at investigating a morphological phenomenon that has been rarely investigated by the linguistic scholarly community: whether proper nouns are used as word-formation elements, and if so, in what contexts. Qualitative corpus analysis fits the research perfectly because corpora offer collected samples of language in various contexts and not isolated word forms. As it will be shown,

proper nouns are not only regarded as linguistic units i.e. constituents of abstract morphological constructions, but also as part of speakers' encyclopedic knowledge which are interpreted pragmatically after being activated in context (Arnaud 2022; Héois 2020). When analyzing proper nouns as word-formation components, the social and communicative context is also included in the research, which is paramount to the qualitative corpus research paradigm in general (Hasko 2012). And more importantly, corpora as representing natural usage and partly showing native speaker intuitions are favored in the usage-based approaches (Bybee 2013).

4.2 Corpus data and usage-based approaches

Handling linguistic data in a usage-based study is not an easy task as the researcher has to multitask between raw data interpretation and theoretical postulates regarding constructional patterns. In constructionist and cognitive studies, there are three types of linguistic data: a) introspective data including the researcher's example sentences without the source of the data being explicitly cited; b) observational data based on textual recordings and corpora; and c) experimental data collected in controlled settings with subjects responding to (linguistic) stimuli (Gries 2013). The pioneering studies in Construction Grammar were mostly theoretical in nature and introspection-based, and they offered cases of what can and cannot be grammatically acceptable. In early studies with observational data, the primary unit of corpora investigation was the word and the research focus was on lexical issues (Stefanowich and Gries 2009). With the improvements in automatic tagging and grammatical annotation in corpora, there was a growing researchers' interest in grammatical issues and the relationship between lexicon and grammar. This marked the beginning of the study of collocations in usage-based approaches (Simon 2023; Stefanowich and Gries 2009)²⁵. In the last ten years, Gries (2017) notices a significant shift in the research field from qualitative corpus approaches (which implied the use of authentic examples for making some theoretical points) to quantitative approaches including frequency-based approaches, association strengths, and statistical as well as machine-learning approaches.

It is not always possible for a linguist to completely switch off their intuition when dealing with the corpus data. According to Raineri and Debras (2019), it is more likely that the data obtained from corpora will support the researcher's initial intuitive judgements, and reversely, the researcher will intuitively take part in detecting corpus oddities. Simon (2023) also believes that a pure empirical investigation of constructions in a corpus-driven approach is not attainable as it cannot be delimited from the researcher's intuitive theoretical perspectives. For this reason, any corpus is realistically representative of selected features of language use only when it is carefully examined in a critical way by the researcher. As Simon (2023: 19) suggests, defining patterns and forming theoretical proposals should be the first step in one's analysis, but the actual process of classifying one set of linguistic phenomena as (a) construction(s) should be at the end or at least at the intermediate stage of the corpus analysis.

By measuring frequencies of occurrences and co-occurrences of forms, the researcher uses the corpus as an instrument for construction identification (Simon 2023) and elaboration of theoretical usage-based postulates (Raineri and Debras 2019). Quantification is equally important when measuring the token and type frequency of a linguistic expression – high token frequency shows the repeated occurrences that lead to entrenchment, and high type frequency shows the repeated occurrences that lead to abstraction or the creation of new complex forms or novel uses (Lemmens 2019). The information collected via the quantitative corpus analysis is suitable for hypothesis testing and incorporating contemporary usage in language theory.

²⁵ Collostructional Analysis is a corpus-based quantitative method designed for studying the co-occurrence of words and constructions (in the Construction Grammar sense of the term) (see Gries 2015).

Most linguists agree that research studies benefit from combining the qualitative and quantitative approach when using the corpus data in usage-based settings (Raineri and Debras 2019). Although this thesis does not provide the quantification of morphological productivity, it takes into account frequency and hapaxes as indicators of production of new forms in contemporary English. It places greater emphasis on the theoretical interpretation of the data from actual language use with the aim of showing the schematic nature of constructions. Thus, a corpus, which is designed for an in-depth exploration of various linguistic phenomena as well as properly representative of the current state of English, was chosen as a methodological tool in the following analysis of proper nouns in word-formation.

4.3 The research tool: the Corpus of Contemporary American English

The research tool used for the thesis is up to now one of the largest corpora designed to reflect actual language use as well as linguistic variation in English. The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) contains more than one billion words of text, or more precisely over 25 million words for each year over a period of almost thirty years (from 1990 until 2019). It was designed in 2008 in order to be roughly comparable to the biggest corpus of the English language at the time: the British National Corpus (BNC). At first, it was equally divided in five genres: spoken (SPOK), fiction (FIC), popular magazines (MAG), newspapers (NEWS) and academic journals (ACAD). Afterwards, with the update in 2020, three more genres were added: TV and movie subtitles (TV/MOV), blogs (BLOG) and web pages (WEB)²⁶.

As Davies (2010) explains, COCA is a balanced corpus of English that incorporates texts from a wide range of genres and allows researchers to examine the data and language changes accurately and evenly. The genre balance of the corpus is consistently kept from year to year, and it reflects linguistic trends realistically and faithfully. Its diversity of genres together with its sample size makes COCA one of the most effective tools in corpus-based studies which strive to validate or refute existing language theories and hypotheses. However, it is of crucial importance to avoid straightforward generalizations as any corpus is essentially “a finite subset of a much larger (and in principle non-finite) entity, language” (McEnery and Hardie 2012: 15). Having this in mind, the examples in this thesis will be carefully selected and analyzed so that the misrepresentation of the language will not take place, or at least not profoundly. As the thesis will not account for detailed quantitative corpus analysis, the findings should not be deeply affected by the author’s personal occasional decisions to include or exclude some data.

4.4 Methods of collecting and managing the data from the corpus

To obtain data from the corpus, I followed the instructions given in the COCA’s five-minute tour and PowerPoint presentation. Different kinds of strategies were employed: by looking into individual words (proper nouns only) and substrings (affixes and compound elements typically attached to proper nouns e.g. *post-*, *-ism* or *-made*). I checked whether proper nouns may undergo any word-formation changes following a simple search procedure e.g. *Obama and Obama*. The collected examples were subsequently subjected to data-cleaning procedure, and as a result, all the misspelled words and the words not beginning or ending in the appropriate substring were eliminated. Proper names were not initially included in the search, but if proper names came up in a

²⁶ The date and source (the name of a text, script or show) are provided for each quoted example in the thesis. The titles of all BLOG and WEB texts are provided in this thesis. The reader may find a direct link to each blog and website page on <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.

substring or proper noun search (e.g. the search for *Paul gave the string *post-Paul Walker*), they were considered in the analysis as well.

The first phase of the research started off with a list of one hundred most frequent proper nouns in COCA. As expected, the list comprises the proper nouns related to the United States of America and people living there e.g. first names (*John, George, Mary*), last names or family names (*Smith, Jones, Williams*), names of public figures and highly influential people (*Obama, Clinton, Bush*), and places (*Washington, California, Texas*). The list also consists of countries that have had military or political confrontation with the USA (*Iran, Iraq, Russia*) or economic ties to the USA (*China, Japan, Germany*). There are also border-line cases that could be treated as common nouns as well (*God and Internet*).

The second phase included extracting the examples of proper nouns with the most frequent substrings. These substrings are either affixes typically attached to proper nouns in word-formation processes i.e. prefixation (e.g. *anti-, out-, post-*) and suffixation (e.g. *-ism, -ize, -esque*), or past participle forms as compound elements (e.g. *-based, -born*). The substrings were also combined with the most frequent proper noun collocates from the first phase; for instance, the first phase gave several examples of *pre-proper noun* and *post-proper noun* strings collocating with the word *era*, and therefore the second phase included the following search: *pre-* era* and *post-* era*. In this phase of the research, COCA was also used as a means of verification for the examples which had previously been encountered in social media or TV series and movies e.g. *Who's for Sheldon-Free Saturday?* (TV/MOV: *The Big Bang Theory, The Hofstadter Isotope*, 2009).

The collected data which are highly context dependent are interpreted with caution as the meaning and function of some complex words may be conditioned by speakers' extra-linguistic knowledge. Different meanings or readings of occurrences with proper nouns are investigated with the aim of illustrating various semantic relationships in a constructional schema as well as possible overlaps among (un)related schemas. Multiple functions of the same form (e.g. prefixed proper nouns which are typically adjectives may also be adverbials) as well as the functions of competitive forms (e.g. proper nouns with adjectival suffixes *-esque* or *-ish*) are identified with the intention of showing the huge potential of proper nouns as word-formation components. Special attention was dedicated to denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns whose form is less transparent than derived and compounded forms with proper nouns. If there are any special stylistic or discourse features, they are closely interpreted with the aim of showing a wide range of proper nouns as word-formation units.

As for additional linguistic information, the COCA's available search engine came in handy as it allows the researchers to browse through the top 60,000 words in the corpus (including proper nouns). Owing to this option, a wealth of information can be obtained such as definitions, frequency information, collocates, and clusters and so on. It also gives a chart showing the use of a word through years and in all eight genres; for example, the top three genres for *Post-Watergate* are news, spoken and popular magazines, whereas for *Post-Saddam*, they are spoken, academic journals and news.

It is necessary to point out that the thesis presents examples that are exclusively extracted from the corpus and their attestation is not validated by looking into any dictionary citations i.e. it is solely usage-based, which is in line with a constructionist approach applied in this thesis. Moreover, they are quoted in their original form without any modification or change (and without excluding ungrammatical forms or sentences). The examples that originate from other sources are verified and subsequently analyzed provided they are listed in the corpus. This means that some forms which are highly present in other kinds of texts, but not found in COCA, are not analyzed. The following qualitative corpus analysis will show only a portion of proper nouns in word-formation extracted from COCA – the number of all proper noun and names constructs counts 1872 as listed in the Appendix of the thesis. Hopefully, this will provide a solid base for further and more in-depth research in derivation, compounding and conversion as well as other word-formation processes which were not studied in this thesis.

Part 1: Derivation with proper nouns

This part is divided into three key chapters based on the main affixal processes: prefixation, suffixation and affix combination²⁷. In the fifth chapter on prefixation, the semantic classification of constructions with prefixed proper nouns is provided. The reason for deciding on the semantic instead of distributional criteria lies in the fact that in the past complex words with prefixes were analyzed as compound constituents, and as a result, even today some prefixed formations are orthographically marked by the means of a hyphen (Vujić 2020). Moreover, prefixes rarely affect class change. The collected data of prefixed proper nouns abounds in hyphenated occurrences, and generally they have not undergone class change. However, some prefixes may give rise to different word classes e.g. negative constructs with *un-* and proper nouns are either nouns or adjectives. Conversely, suffixation with proper nouns produces predictable and stable outputs – each suffix is known for its effect on the class i.e. whether it has a class-changing or class-maintaining function in deriving new words. For that reason, the classification of constructions with suffixed proper nouns is based on their distributional criteria i.e. whether they contain a noun-forming, adjective-forming or verb-forming suffix. However, the constructions with the same type of suffix are systematized on semantic grounds e.g. adjectival suffixed proper nouns with negative meaning. The sixth chapter on affix combination relies on both semantic and distributional criteria depending on the sample. In all three sections, semantics and distribution are looked at on the basis of constructions as a whole²⁸.

Each section on prefixation, suffixation and affix combination in turn provides a description of at least one construction with proper nouns and an affix, and in some cases, there are more constructions due to the existence of affixal counterparts in one fixed set, polysemy and metaphorical or metonymic sense extension. As previously mentioned, a qualitative approach is applied in the analysis, which means that not all attested constructs are included in the thesis sample. The number of constructs per each construction should reflect the productivity of the pattern – the more productive the pattern, the more constructs with proper nouns and that affix in COCA. This is due to the existence of hapaxes since derived proper nouns are more likely to be one-offs than established words.

The majority of constructs have proper nouns and affixes as their constituents, but there are also very interesting examples with proper names. Consequently, both proper nouns and proper names are regarded as constituents of constructional schemas and the term ProperN is used in their schematic representations. The 1354 constructs are also analyzed with regard to their grammatical environment, and thus, larger phrase-level constructions are also described, but without providing their schematic representation²⁹. Apart from Determination, Modification and Plural Noun constructions, derived proper names may also be part of Verb phrase, Comparative and *of*-genitive constructions. The examples of derived proper nouns and proper names from COCA are given in a wider context where necessary, and particularly in cases when the role of the speaker's knowledge and extra-linguistic reality is crucial in selecting possible connotations. This entails that the analysis includes stylistic and pragmatic features of constructions as well. Overall, the examples were chosen to illustrate the linguistic versatility of constructions and to show their frequency and salience in language use.

²⁷ Infixation is also possible with proper names as multi-word units; however, there are only a few hapaxes registered in COCA, mostly in fiction and movies: *Disney-fucking-land*, *Fort-fucking-Lauderdale*, *Jesus-fucking-Christ*, *John-fucking-Wayne*, *Johnny-fucking-Jupiter*, and *Welsley-bloody-More*.

²⁸ In non-constructionist word-formation literature (structural and generative), affixes have their own meaning e.g. 'locative' prefixes, 'similative' suffixes etc. In Construction Morphology, affixes do not have meaning on their own (see 3.2.1).

²⁹ This thesis provides exclusively schematic representations of morphologically complex words. The relevant literature on syntactic constructions and their typical "box" schematic representations in Construction Grammar is cited for further reference.

5 Prefixation with proper nouns

With reference to proper nouns that may undergo prefixation, a prefix is defined as an affix that is readily attached to a word not a root (Lieber 2005: 391). The proper nouns that are prefixed can be clearly decomposed and tend to be hyphenated e.g. *proto-Dubai*. The analysis is based on their (contextual) use and function, and all constructions with prefixes and proper nouns as constituents are illustrated by constructional schemas. Syntactically, most prefixed proper noun formations are nominal and adjectival outputs, and only the proper nouns derived with the prefix *out-* are verbal outputs in the sample. In this thesis, the constructions with proper nouns and 12 prefixes are analyzed with respect to their overall semantic meaning in the following order: attitudinal (with *anti-/pro-*), locative (temporal with *pre-/post-*, *ex-* and *proto-*; spatial and temporal with *mid-*; metaphorical with *out-*), negative (with *non-*, *un-*, and *anti-*) and quantificational (with *mini-*). Some prefixes may be attached to the proper nouns which have been previously derived with productive suffixes as in *de-Maoified*, *neo-Calvinist*, *pseudo-Washingtonism*, and *re-Stalinize* – these constructs are discussed in terms of derived proper nouns with different affix combinations (see Chapter 7).

5.1 Preliminaries

Prefixes as affixes are studied in word-formation literature on various grounds. They may be described with regard to the class of the base they are added to (whether it is a common noun, a verb, or an adjective), the origin of the base (whether it is native or non-native), or the effect they have on the base (whether they change the class of the base or not). The function of the words that take a prefix may vary, and it mainly depends on the class of new derivatives. For instance, adjectival formations are modifiers in an NP e.g. *pro-social behavior*. With reference to the proper nouns which undergo prefixation, the function of the prefixed proper noun is analyzed in the given context, and the role of a prefix as class-maintaining or class-changing is not taken to be influential in establishing the overall function of the prefixed proper nouns. As prefixation with proper nouns may result in creating different classes of words, all complex words with proper nouns are carefully examined in context. The COCA examples with proper nouns are in line with general tendencies in productivity as well³⁰.

In structural theories, prefixes are said to keep their semantic autonomy no matter what type of base they are attached to (Adams 2001). Due to their definite “lexeme-like” meaning, prefixes are not paired with bases unsystematically, but with careful semantic-pragmatic evaluation (Lehrer 1995). According to Zirkel (2010), a prefix invariably contributes to the meaning and form of the base which follows it. Even though affixes are not considered to have meaning on their own in constructional theories, the thesis relies on structural accounts regarding prefixes for the purpose of systematizing the examples more neatly and efficiently. Each prefix is presumed to have gone through the process of unification with common nouns before being added to a proper noun/name (ProperN). To put it more precisely, complex words with prefixes and common nouns are constructions which serve as the starting point for abstracting away the linguistic information and making generalizations in the analysis of all [*prefix-ProperN*] constructs.

³⁰ Vujić (2020: 142) lists 37 most productive prefixes in contemporary English out of which 7 are studied in this chapter: *anti-*, *ex-*, *non-*, *post-*, *pre-*, *pro-* and *un-*.

5.2 Prefixed proper nouns with attitudinal meaning

Prefixes *anti-* ('against/opposing') and *pro-* ('in favor of/supporting') are used with common nouns to form complex words which express either disagreement or agreement with something or someone and they are called 'attitudinal' prefixes. They are also known as non-evaluative prefixes since they only specify an attitude as opposed to giving particular evaluative connotations to something or someone (Bauer et al. 2013). The two prefixes may be added to identical bases and consequently they create parallel models or types (Carls 2000). When they are attached to common nouns, the outputs are denominal derivatives behaving like adjectives e.g. *anti-war/pro-war* (Plag 2003: 99). The prefixes are of Latin origin and they can be added to both native and non-native bases e.g. *anti-government* and *pro-life*.

5.2.1 Constructions with *-anti/-pro* and proper nouns

The corpus sample shows that *anti-* (1) and *pro-* (2) are attached to two largest groups of proper nouns i.e. the names of places (1a-1c, 2a-2c) and the names of people (1d-1d, 2d-2f), but they could be attached to other kind of names (1g-1i, 2g-2i):

(1)

- a. Had the U.S. not entered Somalia, you would have decried the Bush administration as being anti-black and *anti-Africa*. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1992)
- b. Yet, these groups and the media played a crucial role in swelling *anti-Moscow* feeling and sowing internal dissension within the ranks of the Soviet military. (ACAD: Armed Forces & Society (Transaction Publishers), 1995)
- c. So all you Texans who post here in your *anti-California* smugness, think twice, for it was your boys who had a big hand in this mess, and Texas is on the same path of destruction despite your protests. (BLOG: Works and Days, 2012)
- d. The commentators are often counterbalanced with liberal guests or contributors, but Gore campaign officials say the shows tend to help keep an *anti-Gore* message in circulation while revving up the Republican base -- "no small thing," in the words of one official. (NEWS: New York Times, 2000).
- e. After analyzing 5,000 *anti-Meghan* tweets between January and February, advocacy group Hope Not Hate told CNN that only 20 accounts were responsible for sharing 70% of negative tweets containing abusive pictures, hashtags, and memes. (MAG: Fortune, 2019)
- f. Legislation overturning Kennedy might not reflect an *anti-Kennedy* consensus so much as the absence of any consensus one way or the other. The issue might simply be controversial, such that there is no clear majority view, as by definition required to find "consensus." (ACAD: Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, 2010)
- g. Luanne took Bobby to Junie Harper's for an *anti-Halloween* church party. (TV/MOV: King of the Hill, Hilloween, 1997)
- h. Android has grown even with all the crappy phones out there but I think it's because people who are *anti-Apple* are looking for anything to make them stay clear... (WEB: Yes, there will be a physical keyboard BlackBerry 10 phone, 2012)
- i. To deny help, understanding and encouragement to people who are misunderstood, hurting and being driven to self hate and even suicidal behavior is the most non-Christian and *anti-Bible* attitude possible for a religious leader or group to take. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1990)

(2)

- a. The *pro-Japan* internees at Tule Lake congratulated her parents for her bravery while most internees looked at the family with pity. Mr. and Mrs. Yamashiro were bewildered. (FIC: Fantasy & Science Fiction, 2012)
- b. As the final seconds ticked away, Releford dribbling in a corner of the court and an overwhelmingly *pro-Kansas* crowd of 24,107 roaring, self-punched a fist into the air and he turned and started slapping hands on the KU bench. (NEWS: USA Today, 2012)
- c. Israeli police reported that Palestinians who live in Jerusalem held a large *pro-Gaza* protest outside the walls of the Old City. (WEB: News from USA TODAY, 2012)
- d. Of course people are allowed to say what they think, but it is fine, even right, that *pro-Hitler* statements are deplored. (ACAD: Academic Questions, 2002)
- e. The band's refusal to perform reflects more a *pro-Springsteen* sentiment than anything about Donald Trump. (MAG: RollingStone, 2017)
- f. "Enough about Matty. I'm *pro-Jake*." So I'll break it off with Matty, you get rid of Lissa, and we can be together. Cool. (TV/MOV: Awkward, Pick Me, Choose Me, Love Me, 2012)
- g. Ingmar Olberg (1982) mentions that the *pro-NATO* forces appealed to Frank Carlucci, the American ambassador to Portugal. (ACAD: Perspectives on Political Science, 1996)
- h. I mean it's not as if she's *pro-Confederacy*, but to treat the Civil War slavery as a set of bad facts would be like saying the Holocaust was a set of bad facts, so we aren't going to have, you know, German engineering. (SPOK: CNN_CapGang, 2001)
- i. "I'm very much *pro-Amazon*," he said, not surprisingly. "They've been good to me as a reader and as a shopper. I'm not here with any sort of agenda about them. A lot of mid-list authors like me have had a lot more success than they ever would have expected, thanks to Amazon." (BLOG: Going to the Very Edge of the Known Writing Universe, 2012)

In the selected examples, the derived proper nouns are used attributively or predicatively to describe either an opinion about or feeling towards the notion denoted by the proper noun. The attitudes of disagreement or agreement can be directly inferred from the given context as they are modeled on the respective schemas:

I. $\langle [anti [x]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Opposing SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

II. $\langle [pro [x]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Supporting SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

Following the schemas (I) and (II), the constructs with the 'attitudinal' prefixes and proper nouns are adjectives which are qualitative in nature i.e. $[anti\text{-ProperN}]_A$ and $[pro\text{-ProperN}]_A$. They are used as modifiers in the Modification construction, syntactically represented as [Mod – N] in Construction Grammar (Fried 2015). Semantically, the Modification construction represents a composition of the meaning of the modifier (typically an adjective) and the meaning of the head (typically a noun) so that the modifier is related to the head in the sense of "the former restricting the eligible referents of the latter" (Fried 2015: 975). When the $[anti\text{-ProperN}]_A$ and $[pro\text{-ProperN}]_A$ constructs are modifiers, the referents of the head are pragmatically conditioned (rather than restricted), because the choice of the modifier depends on the speaker's attitude to the topic.

Qualitative adjectives are gradable by default, and therefore, they can be marked for comparison. In Construction Grammar, Comparative construction is regarded as an exemplary model of the notion construction (see Hilpert 2010), because it represents form-meaning correspondence which integrates all linguistic information i.e. phonological and morphosyntactic features related to their unique form, and semantic and pragmatic ones to its meaning. Comparative construction is scalar in nature and it implies "the equality or non-equality of two values on a scale" (Hasegawa et al. 2010: 179). Equality is typically introduced by the means of *as*-comparatives (*as x*

as y), and non-equality by the suffix *-er* with monosyllabic adjectives and *more/less* with polysyllabic adjectives.

As expected, a lot of complex words with proper nouns and the *anti-/pro-* prefixes from COCA are marked for comparison. Given that all the constructs are polysyllabic, they can exclusively take periphrastic comparison with *more/less*. The following samples in (3) and (4) illustrate comparison in relation to a higher degree (superiority) with the *anti-/pro-* prefixed proper nouns:

(3)

- a. The Republicans who authorized this open-ended and unlimited investigation are fairly fearless, because in a mid-term election in a year with generally low turnout, the people who vote are the most active voters. And in the Republican Party that means the energized voters tend to be more conservative and tend to be *more anti-Clinton*. (SPOK: NPR_TalkNation, 1998)
- b. Perot voters were even *more anti-Bush* than the rest of the electorate, and many of them were uneasy with Perot's vagueness on the details of his program; they were willing to listen to Clinton. (MAG: Newsweek, 1993)
- c. Michael Kelly, who is *the most anti-Clinton pro-Starr* journalist who claims to have inside knowledge of what Starr's going on, said it was effective of Starr to call Blumenthal because journalists will now be afraid to talk to him. (SPOK: NBC_MeetPress, 1998)
- d. Liberals hated Reagan in the 1980s. Pure and simple. They used language that would make *the most anti-Obama* rhetoric of the Tea Party seem like, well, a tea party. (ACAD: Commentary, 2011)
- e. Of course, he is also *the most anti-Israel* President we've ever had (possibly the most anti-Semitic, too) yet a large majority of Jews voted for him. (BLOG: 'Absolutely no way' Arafat was poisoned – however he is still dead, 2012)

(4)

- a. But even by the standard of recent Washington whitewashes, the report is a disgrace. Not only is it *more pro-FBI* than the FBI itself, it ends up reviving discredited Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms charges that the Justice Department abandoned six years ago. (MAG: American Spectator, 2000)
- b. But Jordan remains *more pro-Saddam* than most nations in government offices as well as at street level. (SPOK: ABC_Jennings, 1990)
- c. Few countries are *more pro-United Nations* than the Netherlands. But no Dutch government would dream of acquiescing in the U.N. drug authority's demand for a strict prohibitionist and punitive policy toward soft drugs. (MAG: Mother Jones, 2003)
- d. Younger voters are *the most pro-Bush and pro-GOP*. (WEB: GOP pollster foresees back-and-forth race – The Christian Science, 2012)
- e. We're *the most pro-Europe* administration since Kennedy, but we feel that they ought to -- we encourage them in their own internal restructuring. (SPOK: PBS_Newshour, 1996)

Other forms of comparison with [*anti-ProperN*]_A and [*pro-ProperN*]_A, such as parallel comparison in (5a-5c) are scarcely attested in COCA. Parallel comparison, also known as *The X-er the Y-er* or Comparative Correlative construction, is an idiomatic structure which can be used productively since its slots do not necessarily have to be filled by established adjectives (Hilpert 2014: 7)³¹. The [*anti-ProperN*]_A and [*pro-ProperN*]_A constructs may also be used as adverbials

³¹ *The X-er the Y-er* construction is a formal idiom in which the correlation is based on the degree expressions of each part of the structure (Fillmore et al.1988: 506-508).

either in comparison of superiority or inferiority (5d and 5e). The qualitative nature of the constructs with proper nouns and the *anti-/pro-* prefixes is illustrated by the following contextualized examples (5):

(5)

- a. The more democratic the Middle East becomes, *the more anti-Israel* new elected governments will be. (WEB: Prioritizing Democracy: How the Next President Should Re-Orient, 2012)
- b. *The more the anti-Jonny* forces agitated, the more the public clamored for “Jonny” and *the more pro-Krenek* forces were enraged. (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 1993)
- c. On almost every Microsoft question asked in the poll, the more that people used computers, *the more pro-Microsoft* their answers were. (NEWS: New York Times, 1998)
- d. Nobody disputes that there have been evident, systematic differences in the results of these major firms: some leaning *more pro-Romney*, others leaning *more pro-Obama*. (BLOG: Another Look at Survey Bias | VOTAMATIC, 2012)
- e. As to J Street, all that need be said is that J Street couldn’t decide whom to support during Operation Cast Lead, which rendered them *less pro-Israel* than the Egyptian Foreign Ministry. (BLOG: American Jews Still Refuse to See the Light on Obama, 2012)

5.2.1.1 Stylistic features of constructs with *anti-/pro-* and proper nouns

Carls (2000) notices that the formations with the *anti-/pro-* prefixes may have a stylistic function similar to the rhetorical figure of antithesis. The *anti-/pro-* derivatives are used to present contrasting ideas and to reverse the previously mentioned (undesirable) proposition. By reiterating the same prefix with different words, common and proper nouns alike, the speaker can strengthen their argument and maximize the effect of antithesis:

(6)

- a. Most of the folks that have taken positions on environmental issues in Washington are really not necessarily establishing a position that’s pro-environment. It’s really an anti-growth position, and I’m convinced you can take care of your responsibilities to the environment without being anti-growth, anti-jobs, *anti-America*. (SPOK: PBS_Newshour, 1990)
- b. In physics there may be antimatter, but in literature there is no *anti-Shakespeare*, *anti-Faulkner*, or *anti-Conrad*, much less a coherent manifesto that sums up the anti-position. (ACAD: Academic Questions, 1993)
- c. Midnight movies were very connected to the existence of the counterculture. This whole way of going to the movies is understood as being, in some form, oppositional. That anti-establishment, *anti-Nixon*, *Anti-white* house, *anti-Vietnam* sensibility... (TV/MOV: Midnight Movies: From the Margin to the Mainstream, 2005)
- d. The company’s Hong Kong operations have been largely free of the *anti-McDonald’s* protests held elsewhere, partly because antiglobalization and anti-obesity movements are not as strong here as they are in the West. (NEWS: New York Times, 2011)
- e. But our country and our economy cannot take off like they should unless we transform America’s outdated, complex, and extremely burdensome tax code. [...] That is why we’ve proposed tax cuts that are pro-growth, pro-jobs, pro-worker, pro-family, and *pro-America*. (SPOK: THE FIVE 5:00 PM EST, 2017)
- f. It should hardly need to be emphasised that criticising Western state and corporate propaganda about events in Syria should in no way be interpreted as support for Assad. To

suggest this, as a few critics have done, is cynical, ignorant and deceitful. Over the years, we have been accused of being *pro-Milosevic*, *pro-Saddam*, *pro-Gaddafi*, *pro-Iran*, *pro-Assad*, and even *pro-North Korea*, when what we have done is expose Western media bias against these official enemies of the West. (BLOG: The Right Kind Of Terror | Dissident Voice, 2012)

- g. He writes: “By the late 1990s California was more Democratic, *more pro-President Clinton*, and more pro-abortion than the rest of America. Its population was more Hispanic and Asian. Its business community was more culturally liberal.” (MAG: National Review, 2000)

The effect of antithesis is also achieved by adding the prefixes *anti-/pro-* to the same base form (7a and 7b) or in comparison with other *anti-/pro-* derivatives (7c and 7d):

(7)

- a. People walk past a pop-up “Brexit Tattoos” tattoo shop offering satirical *anti-EU pro-Brexit* tattoos for free, in central London on June 22, 2016, ahead of the June 23 EU referendum. The shop, open for one day only, is the idea of the *pro-EU* “Remain” campaign. (NEWS: USA TODAY, 2016)
- b. This address was stamped on *pro-Castro* leaflets he handed out in the summer of ‘63 on Canal Street. The same leaflets they found in his garage in Dallas. After the arrest, 544 Camp St. never appeared on the pamphlets again. He was arrested for fighting with *anti-Castro* Cubans. But he’d contacted them already as an ex-Marine trying to join their *anti-Castro* crusade. When they heard he was now *pro-Castro*, they paid him a visit. (TV/MOV: JFK, 1991)
- c. As you look at the polls, a lot of the Clinton supporters say they’re really more *anti-Bush* than *pro-Clinton*. (SPOK: CBS_Morning, 1992)
- d. Yet this time around, almost no one seems inclined to cross party lines. Watching her four kids navigate the “starship” ride at a carnival at the Wissahickon High School near Ambler, Republican Karen Williams describes her vote as “more *anti-Kerry* than *pro-Bush*.” Kerry “waffles a lot,” she says. But while Bush has “done some good,” she also thinks “the country’s being distracted a lot by Iraq.” (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2004)

5.3 Prefixed proper nouns with locative meaning

Complex words with ‘locative’ prefixes denote a certain point either in space or time, and consequently, some may carry both spatial and temporal meaning depending on the base and context e.g. *mid-air* and *mid-year*. This group of prefixes is by far the largest with common nouns including both native and non-native prefixes which differ in productivity and the number of bases they can take. In constructions with proper nouns, locatives tend to select one reading only – the exception is the prefix *mid-* which can be the constituent of both spatial and temporal constructions depending on the proper noun and its denotation. Proper nouns which are personal names are more likely to take temporal prefixes since non-eventive bases are less context-dependent (Bauer et al. 2013).

Given the fact that the temporal reading of locatives is far more common with proper nouns, this section begins with the analysis of robustly productive temporal prefixes *pre-* and *post-*, and then, it touches upon other less frequent temporal prefixes *ex-* and *proto-*. The prefix *mid-* is the only spatial prefix discussed in this section, including its temporal counterpart. The last prefix to be analyzed is the prefix *out-*; it is a highly productive and very frequent prefix, which is in fact metaphorical in nature when used with proper nouns.

5.3.1 Constructions with *pre-/post-* and proper nouns

Prefixes *pre-* and *post-* are used in constructions which refer to events taking place before or after a certain point in time. They are attached to either adjectives or common nouns in order to form adjectives e.g. *pre-existing* and *post-traumatic*; *pre-service* and *post-war*. Despite being of Latin origin, they can attach to both native and non-native bases e.g. *pre-emptive* and *post-game*.

With proper nouns, *pre-* and *post-* are added to different kinds of names, and they are used attributively or predicatively:

(8)

- a. The play premiered in June at Pasadena Playhouse; Arena is calling its run in Washington “*pre-Broadway*.” (NEWS: Washington Post, 2008)
- b. Uploaded way back in August 2006, this legendary boxing match between BJ and Cognac is easily the most successful cat video from YouTube’s *pre-Google* era. (BLOG: The Trippiest Cat Commercial This Side of the Litterbox, 2012)
- c. Its primary circulation area was hit by a cataclysmic disaster; the population of New Orleans proper and the greater region is half what it was *pre-Katrina*. (WEB: Warren Buffett’s Newspaper Purchase Clay Shirky, 2012)
- d. What financial regulation could look like *post-Brexit*. # Britain’s government is often criticized for not clearly communicating the type of deal it wants to strike with the European Union as it prepares to leave the bloc. (NEWS: New York Times, 2018)
- e. If Martin has a tendency to get too bogged down in detail, the *post-Martin* Game of Thrones seems all too happy to gloss over them. (MAG: Mashable, 2017)
- f. Welcome to the *post-Thanksgiving* cleanse: a few days of diligence between the holidays that should make January feel less like one big hangover. (MAG: Town and Country, 2010)

In COCA, the *pre-/post-* prefixes are very frequent with proper nouns. Depending on the event or the period of their reference, the formations with the ‘temporal’ prefixes and proper nouns can be semantically categorized in five larger groups:

(9)

- i. a national or religious holiday: *pre-/post-Christmas*, *pre-/post-Easter*, *pre-/post-Halloween*, *pre-/post-Ramadan*, *pre-/post-Thanksgiving*;
- ii. a specific tragic event in contemporary history: *pre-/post-Katrina*, *pre-/post-Holocaust*, *pre-/post-Pearl Harbor*, *pre-/post-Sandy*, *pre-/post-September 11*, *pre-/post-Stonewall*, *post-Auschwitz*, *post-Fukushima*;
- iii. a historical period or cultural movement: *pre-/post-Depression*, *pre-/post-Prohibition*, *pre-/post-Renaissance*, *pre-/post-Cold War*, *pre-/post-World War II*, *post-Reconstruction*, *post-Restoration*;
- iv. a performance or show in entertainment industry: *pre-/post-Beatles*, *pre-/post-Broadway*, *pre-/post-Emmy*, *pre-/post-Grammy*, *pre-/post-Harry Potter*, *pre-/post-Oscar*, *pre-/post-Nirvana*, *pre-/post-Woodstock*, *pre-/post-Zeppelin*, *pre-Shrek*, *pre-Sopranos*, *post-Guy Ritchie*, *post-Simpsons*, *post-Quentin Tarantino*;
- v. a period related to political and/or administrative actions of leaders and politicians: *pre-/post-Bush*, *pre-/post-Castro*, *pre-/post-Clinton*, *pre-/post-Hitler*, *pre-/post-Obama*, *pre-/post-Saddam*, *pre-/post-Trump*.

There are also a few examples of the prefixed names in other fields such as the judiciary e.g. *pre-Atkins cases*, architecture e.g. *post-Hausmann Paris*, art e.g. *post-Serrano* cultural climate,

science e.g. *post-Sputnik* textbooks, technology e.g. *pre-Steve Jobs* Apple, and sports e.g. *post-Larry Bird* era. In fact, constructions with proper nouns and ‘temporal’ prefixes *pre-* and *post-* are used without any pragmatic restrictions and with the sole aim of referring to a specific event or period closely related to the notion denoted by the base. Their schematic representation is as follows:

III. $\langle [pre [X]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Happening Before the Time related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

IV. $\langle [post [X]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Happening After the Time related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

The collocations of the *pre-* and *post-* prefixed proper nouns are directly related to the real-life situations. For example, adjectives *pre-Christmas* and *post-Christmas* both collocate with *sales* given the fact that this is not only a festive season, but also a shopping season. The collocations may also have positive (and/or neutral) and negative associations that mark a specific period e.g. *pre-Christmas* party vs. *post-Christmas* blues, *pre-Katrina* conditions vs. *post-Katrina* (stress) syndrome, a *pre-Obama* level of prosperity and growth vs. *post-Bush* malaise. The most frequent neutral collocates with all types of the *pre-* and *post-* prefixed proper nouns are words indicating a longer time span e.g. *pre-Bush* era, *post-Beatles* era, *pre-World War II period*, *post-Renaissance period* etc. However, in less obvious situations or periods of time, prefixes may be added to more than just one proper noun in a sentence or a text (10a) or to the same base form (10b and 10c) as a way of providing a narrower context:

(10)

- a. Although dissent in America could convince the Iraqi dictator that he has nothing to fear, in *post-Vietnam*, *post-Watergate* America it is not likely to fade. (MAG: U.S. News & World Report, 1990).
- b. Clarkson considers the production such a personal landmark that she says her career now falls into two halves: *pre-Blanche* and *post-Blanche*. (MAG: Town and Country, 2006)
- c. “All the time growing up, I would hear the islanders talk about the big hurricane of 1962 and the flood of 1962,” Vinsko said. “I’m confident that that will be a distant memory now and people will say *pre-Sandy* and *post-Sandy*.” (BLOG: ‘This is the worst’ – Assessing Sandy’s toll on the Shore, a haven for locals, 2012)

Following schemas (III) and (IV), the *pre-* and *post-* prefixed proper nouns are adjectival constructs $[pre\text{-ProperN}]_A$ and $[post\text{-ProperN}]_A$ which take a modifying function when used with other nouns. In literature, it has been debated whether temporal prefixes *pre-* and *post-* are class-changing i.e. whether they form adjectives or nouns. Bauer et al. (2013: 338-9) give examples of common nouns with locative prefixes that are pre-modifiers to other nouns, such as *post-anthrax* (letters), and they rule out the possibility that locative prefixes can be class-changing with common nouns – nominal bases do not change to adjectives. This point of view is acceptable regarding common nouns in English given that pre-modification is not constrained to adjectives and that nouns can also take a modifying function especially in compounds e.g. *glass bowl*. As for *pre-* and *post-* in combination with proper nouns, it may be convincingly argued that they create adjectives because the prefixed complex words form an attributive string with other adjectives, and if excluded from the context, the main idea will still be successfully interpreted:

(11)

Perhaps it is too much to ask, in our timid, postmodern, *post-Mapplethorpe*, *post-Serrano* cultural climate, that artists continue to explore more possibilities, to scare and excite and mystify us in unexpected ways. (MAG: American Craft, 2001)

Constructs with *pre-/post-* and proper nouns may also take the function of an adverbial:

(12)

- a. How are those models at Fashion Week? Tall. Yeah, just you and Chuck. Tearing it up like Butch and Sundance, *pre-Bolivia*. (TV/MOV: Bull, Dressed to Kill, 2017)
- b. The direction of JP's remarks suggests an eventual return to the original holding, *pre-Justin*. (BLOG: It is Not and Has Never Been a Special Relationship – Israpundit, 2012)
- c. I believe that's illegal now, *post-Obama*, but it wasn't then. (WEB: This is a New One For Me – Whatever, 2012)
- d. We did offer free shipping during some of the time frame for this holiday, *post-Thanksgiving*. (SPOK: Fox_Cavuto, 2002)
- e. Mailer's equation of "men of letters" with "gentlemen" was revealing in its implication that Vidal's patrician background disqualified him from becoming the "champion" of American literature, *post-Hemingway*. (ACAD: American Studies International, 1997)
- f. The Protestants have been more scientific because they're more mechanical, *post-Gutenberg*. (MAG: Psychology Today, 1995)

If there are doublets, such as *post-Joyce* and *post-Joycean*, only the prefixed proper noun takes the function of an adverbial:

(13)

But I had always thought of Dublin trivia as inherently exotic. It wasn't. And yet, *post-Joyce*, it was. (ACAD: American Scholar, 2004)

5.3.1.1 Discourse features of constructs with *pre-/post-* and proper nouns

With reference to the names of people, the two prefixes can be attached to both given names and family names. It is far more common that they are attached to a family name e.g. *post-Mao*, and when attached to a given name, they are usually accompanied by the family name as well e.g. *pre-George W. Bush*. Full names are especially prefixed when the members of the same family are public figures, and the family name alone is usually prefixed for the person who is more familiar to the public i.e. forms *pre-Clinton* and *post-Clinton* refer to ex-president Bill Clinton. As for the less influential public figures, their first name alone or full name may be derived with the temporal prefixes *pre-* and *post-* in contexts in which they are clearly discerned from another person with the same family name:

(14)

- a. They certainly say they will: 74 percent told Gallup that they'd be either "somewhat" or "very" likely to vote for a woman in 2008. This number is actually on the low side compared to polls from the *pre-Hillary era*, for the obvious reason that Clinton casts a shadow over 2008, and many of the respondents are Republicans who plan to vote against her. (MAG: Washington Monthly, 2005)
- b. Well, I think not, but I do think that, in an era that is a *post-Hillary Clinton* as first lady -- so I want to separate out Hillary Clinton as first lady from Hillary Clinton the senator and now the secretary of state. (SPOK: PBS_NewsHour, 2009)

5.3.2 Construction with *ex-* and proper nouns

The non-native prefix *ex-* ('former') is added to nominal bases in order to refer to a role or position which someone does not have any more e.g. *ex-wife* or *ex-employee*.

The prefix *ex-* can be added to a variety of names: the names of places e.g. *ex-Madagascar* builder; brands e.g. *ex-Coca Cola* executive; music bands *ex-Depeche Mode* keyboardist; TV series e.g. *ex-Baywatch* beauty; institutions e.g. *ex-Berklee College of Music* student; and sports clubs e.g. *ex-Chelsea* winger. The *ex-* derivatives with proper nouns are usually used in journalism or news when reporting facts about some events or one's life:

(15)

- a. As iron cue, the former actor and *ex-California* governor came striding into the hotel. (MAG: Washington Monthly, 2005)
- b. Upon his retirement, Valentino initially named *ex-Gucci* designer Alessandra Facchinetti as his successor. (MAG: Harpers Bazaar, 2010)
- c. Tony Faddell is an *ex-Apple* insider; he helped the company create the iPod. (ACAD: Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics, 2018)
- d. Most prominently, there's The WB's Angel, in which *ex-Buffy* babe David Boreanaz starts a new life as a vampire private eye. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2006)
- e. An *ex-Lincoln Memorial University* freshman pleaded guilty to giving birth in her dormitory Jan. 16 and then dumping the baby in a trash bin at a convenience store. (NEWS: USA Today, 1996)
- f. A few former pro athletes -- including *ex-Pittsburgh Steelers* quarterback Kordell Stewart -- signed up to try to revive their pro careers, Duffy says. (NEWS: USA Today, 2007)
- g. Even Senator Thompson, who was an *ex-Watergate* prosecutor and is heading up the Senate investigation, says, If these facts are true. (SPOK: CNN_Crossfire, 1997)
- h. Private investigator Ted Kavowras spends his days tracking down copies for companies like New Balance. Kavowras is an *ex-New York* cop. (SPOK: CNN_Insight: 2005)

The formations with *ex-* and proper nouns in (15) are part of nominal compounds e.g. *California governor* is a compound form which is further derived by means of prefixation and its output is *ex-California governor*. After a closer look into the COCA's selected instances, it may be inferred that the head constituent denotes a person performing a certain position or role e.g. babe, cop, designer, freshman, governor, insider, prosecutor etc. The proper noun modifies the head and provides a more accurate reference to the position or role.

Nominal compounds in English which are right-headed can be represented as constructions as well (Booij 2010a: 4):

V. $[[a]_{Xk} [b]_{Ni}]_{Nj} \leftrightarrow [SEM_i \text{ with relation } R \text{ to } SEM_k]_j$

A constructionist representation of nominal compounding illustrates the variable *x* which stands for one of the major classes e.g. N stands for nouns. The constituents are represented as *a* and *b*, and the semantic relation between them (*R*) is not specified in the schema since it has to be inferred from the meaning of the compound constituents, but also encyclopedic and contextual knowledge (see 9.2). In this respect, Booij brings up a possibility of deictic compounding following Downing's pragmatic interpretation (1977).

As in the case of deictic compounding, all the constructs in (15) are nominal compounds whose non-head constituent serves the function of deixis – the non-head refers to a specific person or agent more closely by establishing their former connection with a certain position or role. Therefore, the constructions in (15) are licensed by the following schema:

VI. < [*ex* [[a]_{ProperNk}] [b]_{Ni}]_{Nj} ↔ [SEM_i no Longer Occupying a Position/Role Y related to SEM_k]_j >

This constructional schema is activated with nominal compounds whose proper noun constituent denotes some kind of a bounded place e.g. a geographical entity, business company, music band, sports club etc. Proper names which denote people are seldom constituents of the constructional schema (VI), and if so, they are the names of political leaders. In such cases, the relationship between the constituents (the variable Y) is not necessarily based on one's position regarding employment (16a-16d), but it can also be based on one's previous political support (16e-16f):

(16)

- a. CNN reports that special counsel Robert Mueller has continued to use aggressive tactics in his team's investigation of *ex-Trump* campaign chairman Paul Manafort, subpoenaing Manafort's former lawyer, Melissa Laurenza, an attorney with the Akin Gump law firm, and his current spokesman, Jason Maloni. (MAG: Mother Jones, 2017)
- b. An *ex-White House* intern was arrested in July for pursuing *ex-Clinton* adviser George Stephanopoulos for almost six months. (SPOK: CNN_TalkBack, 1998)
- c. Spahn and Rahm Emanuel, another *ex-Obama* chief of staff, appeared in each other's weddings. (MAG: Mother Jones, 2013)
- d. An *ex-Biden* aide's new book has been cast as a gossipy tell-all about the vice president. (WEB: Paste, 2012)
- e. Abdel Fattah Younes, Gaddafi's interior minister before he switched to the rebel cause soon after the start of the revolt, was killed by gunmen on his own side in July 2011. His death betrayed ideological splits in the rebel movement and was seen as the work of a faction that mistrusted any *ex-Gaddafi* loyalist holding a commanding position in the insurgency. (BLOG: Libyan Wartime Leader Jalil Faces Questioning Over Killing, 2012)
- f. Tuesday, these *ex-Reagan* Democrats came out to vote against some guy from Bain Capital they had been told in ads all summer was a big-time outsourcer who wrote in 2008, "Let Detroit Go Bankrupt!" (BLOG: The Politicians We Have Chosen Reflect Who We Are As A Nation, 2012)

5.3.3 Construction with *proto-* and proper nouns

The non-native prefix *proto-* ('original') is added to both nominal and adjectival bases e.g. *proto-language* and *proto-feminist*. It is added to scientific terms or other kinds of scholarly words, and due to its limited scope, it also has lower frequency. In the case of proper nouns, prefixation with *proto-* does not give rise to many new words; however, COCA's search results show that the prefix *proto-* becomes fully available in the sense of productivity when added to the names of planets e.g. *proto-Earth*, *proto-Jupiter*, *proto-Mercury*, *proto-Neptune*, *proto-Venus* etc.

In constructions with constituents denoting other notions, the prefix *proto-* selects a prototypical feature of the base to make vivid and accurate associations with the original:

(17)

- a. In another, it becomes a *proto-Dubai*, buoyed up by oil and foreign investment. (MAG: The Atlantic, 2018)

- b. Earlier descriptions of Argentina as a *proto-America* explain why American disappointment with Peron’s Argentina was felt so keenly. (ACAD: American Studies International, 2004)
- c. Rallying peasant and noble alike behind a *proto-Magna Carta*, which the historic John did indeed sign in 1215, Robin and William Marshal (William Hurt) mount a counterattack on a Channel beach in a scene that suggests a mashup of “Saving Private Ryan” and “Braveheart.” (MAG: America, 2010)
- d. What is particularly interesting is that in presenting the unformed and unblemished *proto-Conan* to us, Howard also explicitly endorses Conan as simply being a better human being than everyone else in the bar. (WEB: Ferretbrain – We Need to Talk About Conan, 2012)
- e. McConnell, after all, mastered Trump’s nihilistic brand of politics years ago; he is, in a sense, a *proto-Trump*, with the same nihilistic thirst for power that drove Trump to the Oval Office. (MAG: Slate Magazine, 2017)
- f. He would do Jim Carrey in Ace Ventura: Pet Detective and a *proto-Andy Dwyer*, the doofy, puppyish character Pratt plays on Parks and Recreation and in situations where he wants to project a likable, nonthreatening persona, like talk shows. (MAG: Esquire, 2014)
- g. Then there’s Lautrec’s canny handling of several other celebrities, including the cabaret singers Aristide Bruant, famous for insulting his patrons, and Guilbert, a *proto-Piaf* whose fame was bolstered by Lautrec’s incisive caricatures, which cut to the quick of her magnetic persona while removing (to her chagrin) all traces of glamor. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 2005)
- h. From Apollo 7 onwards, NASA equipped every astronaut with a compact Sony TC-50 cassette recorder, a sort of *proto-Walkman*. (MAG: Vanity Fair, 2018)

Direct association with the original notion is often necessary for establishing the common ground, which ensures the following reading of the constructional schema:

VII. < [*proto* [X]_{ProperNi}]_{Nj} ↔ [Prototypical Example of SEM_i]_j >

The constructs [*proto*-ProperN]_N in (17) are typically preceded by an indefinite article (*a/an*). Instead of regarding the use of proper nouns with articles as exceptions to (more basic) grammar rules, constructionist approaches aim at providing article schematization and further explaining how articles are in fact “influencing the meaning of the noun(s) they determine” (Vujić 2015: 77). Seeing that all constructions have some specific semantic content, Determination constructions (both Indefinite Determination and Definite Determination) directly contribute to the correct reading of the derived proper nouns with articles. The following Construction Grammar principles demonstrate the grammatical acceptability of all derived proper nouns with articles usage³².

The Determination construction as an abstract grammatical pattern licenses constructs which consist of an article and a noun. Each construct functions as a noun phrase in which the head is a maximal projection of a common noun [proper -] marked with values for *configuration* [count/mass] and *boundedness* [bounded +] (Fried and Östman 2004: 35). In case there are conflicting values in the head of the noun phrase, successful (strict) unification of constituents results in failure. Yet, strict unification is not the only possible way of creating acceptable Determination constructions – proper nouns may also fill the slots of heads in noun phrases with a determiner provided that “the [proper] noun has to be interpreted as a non-maximal common noun” (Fried and Östman 2004: 39). This use of a proper noun with a determiner shows that the construction as a whole is a semantically bounded entity regardless of the constituents’ values i.e. whether they are specified for boundedness or not (Fried 2015).

³² The proper nouns derived with other prefixes are also constituents in Determination construction (see. 5.4.2, 5.4.3 and 5.5.1.1).

The *proto*-proper nouns share the same semantic frame of a prototypical head (usually a common noun) in the Indefinite Determination construction i.e. they are bounded [bounded+], countable [count], and singular [sg] (Michaelis 2005: 54). As there is no semantic conflict, the realization of the Indefinite Determination construction *a* + [*proto*-ProperN]_N is possible even when there is a syntactic conflict i.e. when the projection of the base is [proper+]. This is performed by *explicit type-shifting* i.e. “a shift in the designation of a lexical item (or its projection) by a grammatical construction with which that lexical expression is conventionally combined” (Michaelis 2005: 54). In other words, one of the constituents (or the construction as a whole) is specified for the key semantic feature *boundedness* in specific syntactic surroundings.

The constructs [*proto*-ProperN]_N may also be modifying elements of nominal compounds, though less frequently:

(18)

- a. The fetishistic fascination with intricate luxury items that Balbuena had displayed in his otherwise conventional Renaissance pastoral novel, *Siglo de oro en las selvas de Erfile*, assumes its more rightful place in the mercantile Mexico City and the *proto-Baroque* esthetic of *Grandeza*. (ACAD: *Hispanic Review*, 2014)
- b. Inside the magazine, *Kidman*, 45, says she never got to throw a *proto-Katie Holmes* divorce party upon the collapse of her marriage to Tom Cruise in which she says she got involved ‘really fast and really young.’ (BLOG: Nicole Kidman, *On The Other Hand, Did Not Throw A Party* 2012)
- c. Herg’s classic comic books - about a globe-trotting teen reporter with a knack for *proto-Indiana Jones* swashbuckling - spring to life with all the kick, wit and zoom of a nonstop chase. (NEWS: *Houston Chronicle*, 2011)
- d. It was an era in which liberal ideas reached a political limit and provoked a grassroots *proto-Tea Party* populist backlash. (ACAD: *Commentary*, 2011)

5.3.4 Constructions with *mid*- and proper nouns

The ‘spatial’ prefix *mid*- is usually added to common nouns to indicate the middle position in space e.g. *mid-section*, *mid-way*. The corpus results have shown that the prefix *mid*- is very profitable with the names of geographical entities: continents and larger geographical areas e.g. *mid-Africa*, *mid-East*, *mid-West*; countries e.g. *mid-Croatia*, *mid-Mexico*, *mid-Wales*; cities e.g. *mid-Berlin*; city districts e.g. *mid-Queens*, *mid-Meadowlands*; the U.S. states e.g. *mid-California*, *mid-Florida*, *mid-Georgia*, *mid-Missouri*, *mid-Ohio*; valleys e.g. *mid-Hudson*; seas e.g. *mid-Mediterranean*; oceans e.g. *mid-Pacific*; and bays e.g. *mid-Gulf*. The complex words with *mid*- and proper nouns indicating positions in space are typically adjectives (19a-19c) or adverbials (19d-19f):

(19)

- a. *Mid-America* bus number 949 is now boarding for Indianapolis. (TV/MOV: *Chicago P.D., Wrong side of the Bars*, 2014)
- b. By early April, the severe weather threat will retreat to the north, reaching the lower Ohio and *mid-Mississippi* valleys, according to Paul Pastelok, expert long-range meteorologist and leader of the AccuWeather.com Long-Range Forecasting Team. (WEB: *Above-Normal Number of Tornadoes Expected in 2012*, 2012)

- c. Rivalries between Croats and Serbs near the *mid-Adriatic* cities of Zadar and Split have disrupted vital highways providing access to much of the coastal region. (NEWS: Associated Press, 1991)
- d. Just as curious as to how these two women knew each other is the question of what the three of us are doing ordering coc-au-vin in this near-empty, unpretentious bourgeois restaurant in *mid-Manhattan*. (FIC: Virginia Quarterly Review, 1995)
- e. The accessible population was graduate students enrolled in an online master of education degree program at a research university in the *mid-South*. (ACAD: College Student Journal, 2010)
- f. Home improvement in *mid-Cambridge* never stopped for long. (FIC: Callaloo, 2016)

As for the ‘temporal’ prefix *mid-*, it is usually added to common nouns e.g. *mid-week*, or composite numbers e.g. *mid-2013*. It is fully available in the sense of productivity with the names of the twelve months: *mid-January*, *mid-February*, *mid-March*, *mid-April*, *mid-May*, *mid-June*, *mid-July* etc., and days of the week e.g. *mid-Monday*, *mid-Tuesday*, *mid-Thursday*, *mid-Friday* etc. The temporal derivatives may also take adjectival and adverbial roles:

(20)

- a. It was *mid-Saturday* afternoon and Stu was still in his purple pajamas at the computer, a mug of coffee on the cluttered desk. (FIC: New England Review, 2016)
- b. On *mid-November* evenings, the familiar shape of Orion the Hunter clears the eastern horizon by around 9 p. m. local time. (MAG: Astronomy, 2013)
- c. Posted Friday and shared 11, 144 times by *mid-Sunday*, its comment stream ends with a link to this follow-up post. (BLOG: Saving Animals a Part of Rescue Plan for Sandy – Solon, OH Patch, 2012)
- d. Air delivery of foodstuffs eventually began in *mid-September*. (ACAD: World Affairs, 1995)

The spatial and temporal relations indicated by the construction constituents may be formally represented as follows:

VIII. < [*mid* [x]_{ProperNi/Place or Time}]_{Aj} ↔ [In the Middle of SEM_i]_j >

In some cases, personal names derived with *mid-* refer to the midpoint of a president’s four-year term of office:

(21)

- a. ‘It’s reminiscent of the *mid-Carter* administration,’ says a House Republican source. (MAG: New Republic, 1990)
- b. Weapons procurement, which fell to a post-Cold War low of about \$50 billion a year in the mid-1990s, is scheduled to rise to over \$100 billion a year by 2010 -- more than its previous (real dollar) peak in the *mid-Reagan* years. (ACAD: Foreign Affairs, 2004)

The two different uses of the temporal *mid-* with proper nouns suggest two different schemas. The first (and more frequent) schema is identical to the schema indicating spatial relations (VIII) as periods of time can be metaphorically interpreted as bounded space. In the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics, all temporal meanings in language can be linked to their core spatial senses through the application of TIME AS SPACE metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). However, the second one is based on TERM OF OFFICE FOR TIME metonymy because a four year

period is associated with the U.S. president's term of office. The metonymic transfer of the constructs in (21) can be schematically represented as follows:

IX. $\langle [mid [x]_{\text{ProperNi/Person}}]_{Aj} \leftrightarrow [\text{In the Middle of the Term of Office of SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

5.3.5 Construction with *out-* and proper nouns

The exact morphological status of *-out* is defined once the paraphrase test is applied: it is a functional morpheme (the locative *-out*) when the *out*-verb is paraphrased as V + out e.g. *outburst* < *burst out*, and it is a derivational suffix when it cannot be paraphrased as V + out due to semantic incongruence e.g. *outdo*/**do out* (Vujić 2020: 119) The latter derives transitive verbs such as *outrun*, *outnumber* or *outwit*, and in this case, the outputs with *out-* do not have the locative or spatial meaning, but the comparative one. In structural theories (see Bauer et al. 2013), the comparative reading of the *out*-verbs raises theoretical questions whether there is a completely different affix or a semantically related one to the locative *-out* by means of a metaphor.

When added to proper nouns, it is a strictly verbalizing prefix creating formations with a comparative reading and more importantly, it is usually accompanied by the original base. The derived verbs are used to reinforce the impression of Person B becoming better at performing an activity than a Person A, for which Person A is in fact well-known – Person B is expected to succeed in performing the same activity as Person A but at a higher level. It can be argued that the comparative and locative *out*-verbs are semantically related via a spatial metaphor OUT IS LEAVING A CONTAINER (Rudzka-Ostin 2003: 14-47; see 8.3.2). This goes in line with Booij's interpretation of some *out*-forms such as *outbuilding* and *outreach* in which *out-* has the meaning 'away from, beyond,' and is more closely related to its 'prefixal' and not adverbial use (Booij 2010a: 19). In the same manner, Nagano (2011: 77) analyses the *out*-verbs as forms which have the 'surpassing' meaning and Kotowski (2020: 80) says the *out*-verbs with proper nouns as bases denote one's ability to exceed in a property typical of somebody else.

Based on their extra-linguistic/shared knowledge, speakers select a typical property of Person A that Person B can surpass:

(22)

- a. A person could look like a barely pubescent teenybopper, and yet be able to *out-Socrates* Socrates in the wisdom department. (FIC: Fantasy & Science Fiction, 2003)
- b. In the aftermath, Iggy decided to *out-Morrison* Morrison, the basic idea being to get up onstage and let loose his angriest, nuttiest inner impulses. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2003)
- c. Uh, because we're a bunch of Gagas trying to *out-Katy* the Katys who just did a Gaga song featuring Marley as Katy? (TV/MOV: Glee, A Katy of a Gaga, 2013)
- d. I would think in this age of post-modern irony that Keaton would be 10 times as huge, with his acerbic roles, cynical wit, and gasp-inducing stunts skilled enough to *out-Jackie Chan* Jackie Chan. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 2002)
- e. Never have so many liberal hands been wrung over a candidate whose only memorable statements seek to *out-Bush* Bush. (WEB: Will There Be a War Against the World After November 2?, 2012)
- f. And in her remarks on Tuesday, she tried to "*out-Obama*" Obama on deportation policy. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2015)
- g. One of the things you realize as a biographer of David is you can never *out-David* David. (BLOG: David Foster Wallace as Burkean Conservative, 2012)

- h. On Diktomus's prospects of *out-Maiakovskiing* Maiakovskii in the world of letters if only Finland had opted differently in 1918, see Arvo Turtiainen 126. (ACAD: Scandinavian Studies. 1997)
- i. Republicans can never *out-Santa* Santa Claus, and the Democrats really come across as Santa Clause. (SPOK: Fox_OReilly, 1999)

The use of *out-* with a proper name is said to be first recorded in Shakespeare's tragedy Hamlet: "*It out-Herods Herod*" (Bauer 2008). Nowadays, as represented in COCA, it is most often used with family names e.g. *out-Roosevelt* Roosevelt, but it can be also used with first names only e.g. *out-Elvis* Elvis, full names e.g. *out-Tom Sawyer* Tom Sawyer, and the combination of a first name or a family name and a full name e.g. *out-Ralph* Ralph Lauren, and *out-Hitchcock* Alfred Hitchcock. The prefixation with *out-* can be also applied to other kinds of names: sports clubs e.g. *out-Texas* Texas; movies e.g. *out-French* The French Connection; *out-Moneyball* Moneyball; TV series e.g. *out-Dynasty* Dynasty; magazines e.g. *out-Cosmo* Cosmo; music bands e.g. *out-Beatles* the Beatles; companies e.g. *out-Yahoo* Yahoo, *out Google* Google etc. With this wider scope, the referents are not only people, but also places and objects:

(23)

- a. Leave it to the Aussies to *out-America* America. (WEB: Right to the City, 2012)
- b. In some ways, Chanukah *out-Christmases* Christmas, because you can get presents on all eight days and there's even legal gambling with the dreidel. (MAG: American Heritage, 2000)
- c. Writer-director Leslye Headland aimed for "Bachelorette" to *out-Bridesmaid* "Bridesmaids." (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2012)
- d. MSNBC really can't change their format -- they can't *out-Fox* Fox, and it doesn't seem effective to try and move to the middle where CNN (allegedly) is placed (CNN's failure to handle the middle effectively is one big reason why their viewership is collapsing). (BLOG: MSNBC and The Big Narrative Lie, 2012)
- e. As Sen. Harris Wofford (then a White House aide) wrote in his 1980 memoir, *Of Kennedys & Kings*, "The Attorney General was the driving force behind the clandestine effort to overthrow Castro. From inside accounts of the pressure he was putting on the CIA to 'get Castro,' he seemed like a wild man who was *out-CIAing* the CIA." (MAG: American Heritage, 1995)

The formal representation of the *out*-proper noun schema incorporates the simultaneous unification principle of prefixation and conversion (Booij and Audring 2017: 287; see 3.2.1) and the semantic information is identical to the constructional schema of *out*-verbs whose constituents are *out-* as an adverb and the variable *x* as a verb form (Booij 2010a: 19)³³:

X. < [*out* [[*x*]_{ProperNi}]_{Vj}]_{Vk} ↔ [to Exceed SEM_i in an Action Closely Associated with SEM_i]_k>

5.3.5.1 Distributional features of constructs with *out-* and proper nouns

Apart from imposing a structural issue in the theory of word-formation, the *out-* pattern is also grammatically challenging. Bauer (2008) analyses the constructions based on the expression *out-Herod Herod* as the outputs of a very productive pattern of exocentric verb compounding which can be found with both proper and common nouns, with or without congruent direct object e.g.

³³ [[*out*]_{ADV} [*x*]_{Vi}]_{Vj} ↔ [to exceed someone/thing in SEM_i]_j

outsavour rosemary. The absence of the congruent direct object (or the accompanying original base) opens another theoretical question: whether the *out*-verbs are compounds or verb phrases with an object. In Construction Grammar, the (transitive) Verb Phrase construction consists of a lexical verb head and one or more arguments which have the lexical feature [+ maximal] i.e. they are lexical nouns or pronouns (Michaelis 2005: 52).

The corpus examples with proper nouns as bases show that the [*out*-ProperN]_v constructs compose Verb Phrase constructions with different nominal elements as direct objects/arguments: the same proper noun as the base of the verb (24a), another proper noun (24b), a common noun (24c), and a pronoun (24d):

(24)

- a. “Anybody who could consider their merchandise similar to Ikea’s, they’re surely going to try to figure out a way to *out-Ikea Ikea*,” said Mary Frye, president of the Dallas-based Home Furnishings Independents Association, a trade group for independent furniture dealers. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2011)
- b. No one can out-debate this president. No one can *out-Oprah Bill Clinton*, but we hope that, and believe, that the American people will see through the facade of rhetoric and expect some concrete action which will improve their lives and their prospects for the future. (SPOK: CNN_Politics, 1996)
- c. There was a heavy sense that I could *out-MacGyver the disease*. (SPOK: PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST, 2016)
- d. We must *out-Game-of-Thrones him* by making powerful alliances. (TV/MOV: South Park, Black Friday, 2013)

Another fact that goes in favor of analyzing the *out*-verbs with proper nouns as constituents of the Verb Phrase construction is the possibility of adding pre-modifiers to the direct object:

(25)

- a. Part MacGuyver, part Krav Maga demonstration, the series made an improbable action icon out of Matt Damon, and managed in that single film to *out-Bond pretty much ever previous Bond* film. (BLOG: Jason Gorber’s Cineruminations: SKYFALL And The Bonds Of 2012)
- b. Two and a half trillion dollars of accumulated reserve currencies later, China’s economic “genius” is hailed around the planet, even if all it did was *out-Asia the rest of Asia* by pushing aside all the other piglets suckling at Mama America’s teat. (MAG: Esquire, 2011)

Finally, an incongruent direct object, be it a proper noun (26a) or a common one (26b), may be accompanied by a reflexive pronoun in post-modification:

(26)

- a. And Zachary Quinto skill-fully dons the pointy ears, perhaps “*out-Spocking*” *Nimoy himself*. (ACAD: Humanist, 2009)
- b. Her performance of Gershwin’s Fascinat’ Rhythm *out-Gershwins the great man himself*. (MAG: TIME, 1996)

The comparative prefix *out-* may be added to proper nouns to form reflexive verbs which are semantically identical to the reflexive verb *outdo oneself* i.e. do something better or more than one has done it before. In comparison to the very productive pattern *out-Herod Herod*, there are only a few examples of this usage recorded in COCA:

(27)

- a. Recently, citizen scientists/ JunoCam superstars Gerald Eichstädt and Seán Doran created one of the most incredible enhancements of a Jupiter pic we've ever seen. It's rare that Jupiter *out-Jupiters itself*, but here we are. (MAG: Gizmodo, 2017)
- b. The books have sex but not like that, and I was a fan of those first, so the show always struck me as HBO trying to *out-HBO themselves*. (BLOG: Queering SFF: Writing Sex – To Do, or Not to Do?, 2012)
- c. When you invite people over, whether it's for a normal dinner party or for the holidays, do you feel the pressure to *out-Martha yourself* every year? (SPOK: NBC_Today, 2007)
- d. Say what you will about Florida, the state continues to grow at a rate of about 900 people day. It has grown despite the hurricanes and wildfires, the racial tensions of the 1980s and the tourist shootings of the early '90s, the ever-present drug problems. # But this year it *out-Florida'd itself*: # First, the custody fight over Elian Gonzalez. (NEWS: Associated Press, 2000)

5.4 Prefixed proper nouns with negative meaning

In word-formation literature, 'negative' prefixes are usually classified according to the type of negativity they express in complex words. This classification is based on the interpretation of the relation between a positive notion and its negative counterpart. Horn (2002) follows Aristotle's model of opposition to show that the prefix *un-* may have different meanings depending on the class of the base³⁴. It is also possible that one prefix has two or more negative readings even though the base belongs to the same class³⁵ (see Bauer et al. 2013: 355). Nevertheless, there is a sense of general affixal negative meaning 'not' for most negative prefixes.

Two prefixes which are fairly productive show a wider range of use and may attribute to multiple negative readings of complex words: *non-* and *un-*. The 'negative' prefix *anti-* is somewhat less productive and frequent in COCA. Despite the fact that the three prefixes retain the general affixal meaning 'not' in complex words with proper nouns, additional information is sometimes needed for the correct interpretation of each negative reading.

5.4.1 Construction with *non-* and proper nouns

The non-native 'negative' prefix *non-* is very frequent and can be attached to both adjectives and nouns e.g. *non-existent* and *non-profit*. The prefix *non-* is freely attached to adjectives indicating regional, religious or political classification, and it is the only negative prefix with the general meaning 'not' which does not imply disapproval of not belonging to a particular group; for instance, the adjectival form *non-American* is neutral, whereas *un-American* refers to the idea of 'differing from accepted ways of life or from an accepted code of behaviour in America' (Kjellmer 2005: 161). In the same manner, the formations with the prefix *non-* and proper nouns have a neutral negative meaning:

³⁴ The model consists of contrariety (*white* vs. *black*, *rich* vs. *poor*, *happy* vs. *unhappy*), contradiction (*white* vs. *non-white*, *odd* vs. *even*, *male* vs. *female*), correlation (*parent* vs. *child*, *above* vs. *below*, *own* vs. *belong to*) and privation (*blind* vs. *sighted*) (Horn 2002: 1-3).

³⁵ Apart from contrary, contradictory and privative readings, there is also stereotype negation (*person* vs. *non-person*), scale extension (*amelodic* vs. *melodic* and *non-melodic*), reversative (*untie*, *decentralize*), and pejorative (*mal-hygienic*) (see Bauer et al. 2013: 366).

(28)

- a. Some companies (like Arizona’s Southwest Shakespeare Company) mount *non-Shakespeare* plays too, including classics by Chekov or Ibsen and musicals and comedies. (MAG: America, 2012)
- b. As *non-Obama* supporter, the mugs are hilarious and I wish I could buy them for Democrat friends without the political donation. (BLOG: Mitt Romney selling mugs with his birth certificate on them, 2012)
- c. Come to Springfield. We have more handicapped parking spots for fat guys than any *non-Chicago* city, and at this year’s Founder’s Day Parade we will unveil our new state-of-the-art statue of Jebediah Springfield. (TV/MOV: The Simpsons, Much Apu About Something, 2016)
- d. One difference she does report is that her data surprisingly suggest that, “*non-Vietnam* veterans had the least-stable family lives.” (ACAD: Armed Forces & Society (Transaction Publishers), 2002)
- e. Kobo is very similar to the other major *non-Amazon* ebookstores. (WEB: Best Sources for eBooks, 2012)
- f. He’s making his first *non-FOX News* news appearance this weekend on Bob Schieffer’s “Face the Nation.” (SPOK: PBS_NewsHour, 2012)
- g. The panel, which will include *non-NASA* scientists, will begin by examining the mirror records impounded last week from the contractor and from NASA’s own labs, and is expected to report back within three months. (MAG: Newsweek, 1990)

The constructs in all the above examples are nominal compounds with the [*non*-ProperN]_N constituent as their non-head element. The [*non*-ProperN]_N constituent has a modifying function and it is directly related to its head by the relation which indicates certain absence or lack of character – this meaning is also typical with most nominal derivatives produced by *non*- prefixation (Plag 2003). In addition, the head constituent has a wide scope, because it may denote both animate and inanimate objects. This is licensed by the following schema:

XI. < [[*non* [a]_{ProperN_k}] [b]_{N_i}]_{N_j} ↔ [SEM_i not Having Proper Characteristics of SEM_k]_j >

5.4.1.1 Semantic and pragmatic readings of constructs with *non*- and proper nouns

All the constructs with negative meaning in (28) express a stereotype negation. As defined by Bauer et al. (2013), a stereotype negation implies that the prefixed form is lacking some fundamental characteristics which the base originally has. With stereotype negation of nominal bases, both words (the base and the *non*-derivative) denote identical notions or objects. They are basically two members of one and the same category, one consisting of all necessary qualities and the other one lacking them entirely. The *non*-derivative has the meaning of ‘being x but not having the proper characteristics of x’ (Plag 2003: 101). The same reading is interpreted with *non*-proper noun forms as compound constituents. In this case, the first element that takes a modifying function is negated:

(29)

- a. Since Golden Eye, Brosnan has starred in a number of small films and had supporting roles in big ones (Mars Attacks!, The Mirror Has Two Faces), but it wasn’t until Dante’s Peak (1997) and this summer’s The Thomas Crown Affair, that he really began headlining big *non-Bond* pictures. (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 1999)

- b. Also, the raw votes from the presidential election last time, if you add up the Dole and the Perot votes, the *non-Clinton* votes, if you will, were perfectly balanced against the Clinton votes. (SPOK: Fox_Hume, 1998)
- c. It has a short well-thought-out Napa Valley wine list, with the *non-California* wines listed under the heading “Intruders.” (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1992)
- d. The next question to ask is whether iOS can run on *non-Apple* devices. (MAG: MarketWatch, 2016)
- e. The queen of hip-hop soul returns with her first *non-Christmas*, non-soundtrack album since 2011’s My Life II... (NEWS: USA Today, 2014)

A different kind of negation is evident with the *non-* prefixed proper nouns in the following examples:

(30)

- a. One meeting, on July 12, was ostensibly supposed to be about Ukraine and Georgia -- two *non-NATO* members with aspirations to join the alliance. (NEWS: New York Times, 2019)
- b. And, in Denmark, nationals under the age of 24, will be banned from marrying a *non-EU* citizen. (SPOK: CNN_Insight, 2002)
- c. Even though Toyota and the other foreign manufacturers have more and more plants in the US, the ownership of those countries is *non-US*, so there’s international competitiveness issues and so forth. (SPOK: NPR_Science, 2005)
- d. Also, why are *non-Atlanta* businesses allowed to do business in Atlanta without a city permit? (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1992)
- e. Each of the *non-Congress* parties, including those presently in government at the center and in most states, represent more focused interests than the Congress can seemingly retain. (ACAD: Journal of International Affairs, 1997)
- f. Democratic party is split now between Dean supporters who really dislike President Bush and *non-Dean* supporters at least not yet anyway, who dislike President Bush but want to be sure that they have a winner. (SPOK: CNN_Dobbs, 2003)

This type of negation resembles Horn’s contradictory negation, because there are two opposed notions. In the examples (30a) and (30b), the negation is not based on having or lacking certain characteristics, but on the fact that some entities may be automatically excluded if not holding membership in an organization. The underlying message is that holding membership is desirable, which is achieved by using either the words with positive connotations (*aspirations to join*) or words with negative connotations (*be banned from*). In the examples (30c) and (30d), the contradiction is based on the companies’ different backgrounds with the aim of highlighting competitiveness in the market. In the examples (30e) and (30f) political parties and supporters are seen as taking two different stands. Hamawand (2009: 68) describes this meaning of as “not fulfilling the requirement described by the nominal base.”

An existence of “the middle ground” between two opposites is also possible as in the following discussion about foreign movies getting nominated for the Academy Awards:

(31)

One of the three getting nominated is almost for certain, and two of the three getting nominated seems plausible. But all three making the cut just feels kind of unlikely. Just too, too *non-Hollywood*. (BLOG: The State of the Race: Leaps of Faith, 2012)

In this example, there is a three-level scale: one movie getting nominated is a realistic outcome, two movies getting nominated is a possible outcome, and all three movies getting

nominated is an impossible outcome i.e. *non-Hollywood*. When compared to the existing types of negation, this one corresponds to scale extension (Bauer et al. 2013). Scale extension requires a wider context as all three levels of a scale must be unmistakably clear and it is more likely to be the immediate result of a pragmatic mechanism, not necessarily the semantic feature of the *non*-construction with a proper noun.

The interaction of the negative prefix *non*- and a proper noun as the formal base gives different readings based on the extra-linguistic reality and speakers shared knowledge. It shows that speakers may assign specific meaning(s) to constructions; nevertheless, the [*non*-Proper]_N constructs keep the general negative meaning ‘not.’

5.4.2 Construction with *un*- and proper nouns

The native prefix *un*- is definitely the most productive of all ‘negative’ prefixes and shows a wide distribution as it can be added to adjectives, nouns, and verbs. It usually has a straight negative meaning of ‘not’ as in *untidy*. With nouns, it implies an absence of something which is expected to be found – Horn (2002: 28) demonstrates the privative meaning of the *un*-nouns by quoting George Orwell’s example *unperson* which refers to a person of no political and social importance. When compared to the term *non-person* i.e. a real human being who is not acknowledged or treated as a person (Bauer et al. 2013: 371), Orwell’s term *unperson* from his renowned novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) is more context-dependent and has a very specific narrow meaning. There is also a slightly judgmental tone to the word *unperson* identical to the *un*- negation of adjectives e.g. *unprofessional* is disapproving, whereas *non-professional* is neutral (see Allen 1978). Hamawand (2009: 132) sees these evaluative differences coming from the inherent semantic features of the prefixes: *non*- has the reading of being “different from the quality described by the adjectival base,” and *un*- implies “the antithesis of what is specified by the adjectival base.”

Horn (2002) also notices that the *un*-nouns are facilitated by a priming effect; indeed, there is the same tendency with constructions with *un*- and proper nouns as there is usually a positive original form either in the pre-text or the post-text. This implies greater context-dependency as in the following examples:

(32)

- a. Al Gore still has a very big lead over Bill Bradley nationally among Democrats. But, I think it will last as long as Bill Bradley sticks to his current strategy, which is to say very little about policy and what he stands for. Right now he’s the *un-Gore*. (SPOK: Fox_Sunday, 1999)
- b. But just a five-minute ferry ride away is a secluded, 8,000-acre island that’s been called the “*un-Hamptons*” for its tranquility, uncomplicated lifestyle, and lack of Hamptons crowds. (MAG: Business Insider, 2019)
- c. If you want to understand why General Wesley Clark is causing heartburn in the Dean camp, it’s worth studying how much the guy who is running as the *un-Dean* actually resembles him. (MAG: TIME, 2004)
- d. “I think in a very real way he is not so much the *un-Barack Obama* as he is the *un-Bill Clinton*,” said Dr. Anderson, who once ran for Senate as a Democrat from Utah, but supports Mr. Romney for president. (WEB: Romney in Crisis – Two Dark Spots in Fortunate Life, 2012)
- e. With his work ethic and humility and his triumph over his disability, Ginn has created a stark contrast between himself and Ohio State’s last game-breaking sensation. It would be fair to describe Ginn as the *un-Clarett*. (MAG: Sports Illustrated, 2005)

- f. Triumph, which recently re-entered the American market, brags about appearances by its motorcycles in films starring Elvis Presley, Daniel Day-Lewis, Richard Gere, Warren Beatty and Ann-Margret. Now it has added another notch to its belt: Pamela Anderson Lee, the star of “Baywatch,” rides a bevy of Triumphs in “Barb Wire,” a film based on the comic book series that is opening next month. All this is part of the company’s marketing effort to establish itself as the “*Un-Harley*.” (NEWS: New York Times, 1996)
- g. Then, he told a visitor from Atlanta --- the *un-Denver* when it comes to regional collaboration: “Regardless of where you are in America, the message is the same. Cooperate together as a region and be successful together as a region.” (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2015)

This usage is common with nonce-formations which are the outputs of analogy when the underlying meaning of the *un*-forms is ‘not having the proper characteristics of x’ (Plag 2003; Vujić, 2020). Plag (2003: 101) illustrates the analogical word-formation of the nonce word *uneducation* – *educated: uneducated :: education: uneducation*. Due to the existence of the positive form in examples (32a-32c), it may be argued that there is a certain model (M) which prompts an analogical relation $x:un-x :: x:y$ e.g. *happy(x):unhappy (un-x) :: Clinton(y):un-Clinton (un-y)*. However, in most examples (32d-32g), there is no overt analogical relation. Given that prefixation with *un*- and proper nouns is non-restricted, and that it is very productive, the constructs are more likely to be the outputs of an abstract pattern (instead of analogical word-formation). In Construction Morphology, there is a possibility of a structural reinterpretation of an analogical relation – the model word is no longer necessarily overt, but it still serves its purpose of strengthening the schema’s entrenchment (see 3.2.2). For that reason, only the ‘end result’ may be communicated in language use i.e. $y = un-x$. This is also in line with the unification process which may allow for generating new constructs without the necessary intermediate step (as in the case of *out*-verbs). Therefore, the constructs in (32) are licensed by the following constructional schema:

XII. $\langle [un [X]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Person/Object/Place not Having the Proper (Expected) Characteristics of SEM}_{i;j}] \rangle$

The negative meaning ‘not having the proper characteristics’ is reinforced by the use of the definite article with the $[un\text{-ProperN}]_{\text{N}}$ constructs in (32). The use of the definite article supports the idea that the negative (the *un*-proper noun) can under no circumstances become the positive (base). At the same time the negative is deprived of some expected properties of the base. The semantic feature of ‘privation’ is combined with ‘expectedness’ which is more likely to be an extra-linguistic feature because it comes from our encyclopedic knowledge about the referent (proper noun):

(33)

- a. He really chose the *un-Diana*. I don’t mean that he didn’t adore his mother, he absolutely did. But there was so much drama, so much craziness, so much tragedy, really, in his life as a child growing up that he really needed someone to be the anchor, not the drama in his life. (SPOK: ABC_Nightline, 2011)
- b. 3. Hurricane Sandy: The aftermath of hurricane Sandy will not be good for Barack Obama. Even if the press were successful in painting him as the *un-Bush* it wouldn’t really matter. (BLOG: Despite what the polls say, Mitt Romney will win by double digits, 2012)

As previously mentioned, the Determination construction takes a head with a maximal projection of a common noun [proper -] (see 5.1.3.3). In the Definite Determination constructions, the correct interpretation of the noun phrase comprising the head [proper +] and the definite article is also possible with “the additional context that explicitly encodes this (otherwise unexpected) restrictive reading of an explicitly determined entity” (Fried 2015: 991). The restrictive reference of

the proper noun is understood as a certain kind of partitioning e.g. *the London of my youth*. With *un-*proper nouns, the restrictive reference is associated with a lack of specific proper (expected) characteristics of the base form, which are usually given in context or otherwise known to the speakers via shared extra-linguistic knowledge. The proper nouns and their *un-* counterparts necessarily belong to the same type of entity and they share at least one salient property e.g. two female members of the Royal Family in the UK in (33a) and two male US presidents in (33b). The existence of the shared characteristics allows for the interpretation of partition in the sense of lacking some other proper (expected) characteristics. What characteristics will be selected depends on the speaker's extra-linguistic knowledge and personal choice; thus, the restrictive reference of the [*un*-ProperN]_N constructs reflects the speaker's decision regarding the most salient features of the notion denoted by the base.

The prefix *un-* with its privative meaning may also form adjectives when added to proper nouns. The context is provided to highlight the absence of (a) specific characteristic(s):

(34)

- a. After dark, she dresses up that healthy flush with either vivid red lips or smoky, sultry eyes (but never both-overkill is very *un-Reese*). (MAG: Cosmopolitan, 2003)
- b. Mr. Reagan's steelier character reflected his own *un-Bush* background: he was the product of an alcoholic father and modest financial circumstances who had to work his way through college, where he was elected student body president (as opposed to president of Deke). (NEWS: New York Times, 2001)
- c. I was putting in my time on Wall Street so that I could eventually make the very uncool, very *un-Harvard* move of becoming a public defender. (FIC: Commentary, 1991)
- d. The consultant, John Simmons of Chicago, and two of his colleagues are preaching very un-Soviet notions like "employee empowerment," "feedback," "value-based goals" and "a culture of trust." (NEWS: New York Times, 1993)
- e. We need a light at the end of the tunnel. The idea of Vulcan withdrawing from the Federation and the Klingons taking a beating from the Romulans just doesn't make sense. It's very *un-Trek*. (BLOG, CBS Considering New Animated Trek Series For The Web, 2012)

The privative aspect which refers to an absent trait or property is semantically incorporated in both schemas producing nominal and adjectival constructs with proper nouns:

XIII. $\langle [un [x]_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Not Having the Proper (Expected) Characteristics of SEM}_{i|j}] \rangle$

The speakers shared knowledge and extra-linguistic reality play a key role in selecting the absent trait, especially when one proper noun may carry several connotations. As the most commercially successful movie industry in the United States of America, Hollywood is associated with famous movie stars (35a) people who don't live an ordinary life (35b), and major movie studios (35c). Therefore, the term *un-Hollywood* illustrates the absence of these common associations in different contexts:

(35)

- a. The one thing *un-Hollywood* about it? It has no recognizable stars. As much as we love orphan Jamal K. Malik, many of us have to consult movie websites to find the actor's name. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2009)
- b. In an extreme example of a Hollywood guy staying *un-Hollywood* by keeping his friends close, Parker's buddies are almost entirely the same ones he had in high school and college. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2007)

- c. Their New York office, the headquarters of what many in the movie industry consider the best-run film company in the world, is modest and distinctly *un-Hollywood*. The company has fewer full-time employees than you'd find at a mail room at a major Hollywood studio. (SPOK: CBS_Sixty, 1992)

5.4.2.1 Pragmatic readings of the constructs with *un-* and proper nouns

Negative derived forms may be used with the aim of producing a euphemistic effect and/or avoiding an unpleasant revelation. Mattiolo (2009: 142) assigns the pragmatic feature 'cautious' to negative adjectives when speakers want to downgrade the effect of their own words e.g. using the adjective *unintelligent* instead of *stupid*. In the same manner the adjectival formations with *un-* and proper nouns are used e.g. *un-Reese* instead of *unsophisticated* in (34a), *un-Bush* instead of *poor* or *unprivileged* in (34b), and *un-Hollywood* instead of *ordinary* or *simple* in (35b). Interestingly enough, speakers create positive associations of the referent i.e. thanks to his unprivileged (*un-Bush*) past, Reagan became as strong as steel. This is contrary to the disparaging tone of the *un-* adjectives as suggested by Allen (1978), Kjellmer (2005) and Hamawand (2009). In contrast, speakers may also share their message of disapproval when they use a formation with *un-* and a proper noun attributively:

(36)

- a. And if the peasant girl hadn't lucked out and guessed the dwarf's name, how the hell was she planning to explain the whole thing to the baby's father, the king? All in all, a very unsatisfying, *un-Disney* tale. (FIC: Death on the Patagonian Express, 2017)
- b. Yes, it's very Middle East-centric, a too *un-Europe* centric, a little too *un-China* centric for my taste, very Middle East to AfPak centric. (SPOK: PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST, 2012)

The [*non-ProperN*]_N constructs tend to be pragmatically neutral in contrast to the *un-* adjectives with the same proper noun:

(37)

- a. Matt Mazer had already developed a successful marketing and promotional campaign for a *non-Disney* animated film, *All Dogs Go To Heaven*, and before that had spent three years as a marketing executive at Disney itself, where his accomplishments included setting up long-term promotional partners (such as McDonald's, Sony, and Lipton) for animated and live-action films. (MAG: Saturday Evening Post, 1994)
- b. Bloomberg's sources say that bringing *Honor of Kings* to markets that include the US, France, Italy, Spain and Germany. The title has already launched as *Strike of Kings* in other *non-China* Markets, including Turkey and Thailand. (MAG: Engadget, 2017)

These slight pragmatic differences cannot be inferred from the semantic information in their respective constructional schema – both constructions with *un-* and *non-* highlight the absence of 'proper' characteristics, but their different evaluative tones are identical to the ones with *un-* and *non-* adjectives (see Plag 2003). The reason for this might not lie in the semantic and pragmatic specification of the negative constructs with proper nouns, but in their morphosyntactic make-up. The [*non-ProperN*]_N constituents are modifying elements of nominal compounds and as such they are more likely to express a stereotype negation which logically necessitates a reference to a certain type or membership denoted by the head of the compound. This syntactic dependence creates a

pragmatically more neutral tone as well. On the other hand, the [*un-Prop*erN]_{N/A} constructs have a wider distribution i.e. they can be adjectives (used in modification and predication) and nouns. The privative reading of the [*un-Prop*erN]_{N/A} constructs suggests that the proper (expected) characteristics of the formal base are absent, and thus these outputs freely take on either positive or a negative tones depending on the speaker’s attitude.

5.4.3 Construction with *anti-* and proper nouns

The ‘negative’ prefix *anti-* is added to nouns denoting notions which are ‘the opposite of x’ or ‘not having the property of x.’ This meaning is typical with nominal bases as in *anti-particle* and *anti-professor*, and it is identical to the negative meaning of the derivatives with *un-* and *non-* (Plag 2003: 99-101). It is normally added to simplex nouns when the *anti-* derivative implies a failure to display the essential characteristics of the base e.g. *hero* vs. *anti-hero* (Hamawand 2009: 73).

The constructs with *anti-* and proper nouns are used in contexts with the positive base form (38a-38e) or without it (38f-38i):

(38)

- a. When Paolo walks out of there, you gotta be the first guy she sees. She’s got to know you’re everything he’s not. You’re like the *anti-Paolo*. (TV/MOV: Friends, The One with the Dozen Lasagnas, 1995)
- b. As midnight approached on Saturday, the most feared fighter in the world buried his face in a white towel, pressing it against the red welts above his eyes. Mike Tyson, the master of menace, was a loser. # He lost to a man whom many people see as the *anti-Tyson* -- Evander Holyfield, who said he would recapture the heavyweight championship not only for the greater glory of God, but also as a symbol for those who need to believe they can lift themselves up. (NEWS: New York Times, 1996)
- c. Here I thought you were all tough and scrappy like some sort of grown-up Oliver Twist, but really you’re like the *anti-Oliver Twist*. You’re, like, not a child who was taught how to steal things by a creepy old man. (TV/MOV: Freelancers Anonymous, 2018)
- d. The housing market in Detroit is a mess. Such a mess that nobody tries to deny it, not even the real estate agents. “The market is very, very bad,” laments Jennifer Weight, hosting a deserted Sunday open house in the suburb of Bloomfield Hills. “It’s terrible.” Across the country, in the *anti-Detroit* that is San Diego, real estate is also slumping. The gloom, however, is far less pervasive. (MAG: TIME, 2007)
- e. Brooklyn may define itself as the *anti-Manhattan*, but the Bronx is proud of its affiliation with the mother ship. “Of all the places in Manhattan’s general orbit, the Bronx is (and this is its enduring strangeness) both the poorest and the least alienated. That every other place is more distinguishable is true in part because every other place has taken greater pains to contrast itself with Manhattan,” writes New York’s Ben Wallace-Wells in a graceful paean to his home borough (MAG: Newsweek Global, 2015)
- f. He’s sort of the *anti-Kobe* I call him because he gets along with others, he plays well, and you know, he’s no drama. He’s drama-free. (SPOK: News & Notes 9:00-10:00 AM, 2008)
- g. If Carter is the *anti-Jefferson*, the man who did not lack the will to free his own slaves, but who did lack the eloquence to make his love of freedom memorable, then the Deed of Gift is the *anti-Declaration of Independence*, a document that makes liberty look dull, but that is so devoid of loopholes and contradictions that no result but liberty could prevail. (ACAD: American Scholar, 2001)
- h. Beers that tell a story. And you know, focus on the quality of the beer above all else. It’s the anti-macro beer, it’s the *anti-Budweiser*, it’s the *anti-Coors* light. Beer produced by

passionate people with only the glass of beer in focus. (TV/MOV: Craft: The California Beer Documentary, 2015)

- i. Rotten and the Sex Pistols were a threat - short-lived, as it turned out - to the Rolling Stones rep as Britain's baddest boys. Raised by socialists and agnostics in a working-class London suburb, Richards by 18 was a rhythm-and-blues purist who considered himself "anti-showbiz" and his new band "the *anti-Beatles*." (NEWS: Washington Post, 2010)

The use and meaning of constructs with *anti*- and proper nouns in (38) are identical to the use and meaning of constructs with *un*- and proper nouns (see 5.4.2) – they are both used in the Determination construction and their constructional schemas have the same semantic information:

XIV. < [*anti* [x]_{ProperNi}]_{Nj} ↔ [Person/Object/Place not Having the Proper (Expected) Characteristics of SEM_i]_j >

As in the case of the [*un*-ProperN]_N constructs, the [*anti*-ProperN]_N constructs indicate a lack of proper (expected) characteristics based on the speakers' shared knowledge and experience. However, *anti*- also implies "judging something in comparison with something else" (Hamawand, 2009: 144) and therefore, it is used to highlight a different point of view as in (39):

(39)

- a. Across the kitchen table, Nigella seems the same as ever, but on camera, she is the *anti-Martha* Stewart -- dark and lusty, with a devil-may-care confidence about using full-fat cream and frozen peas. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2002)
- b. What's interesting is that they have been fashioning themselves as the -- you know, as what they think of as the *anti-FOX*, as the liberal network. (SPOK: FOX_OReilly, 2007)
- c. There's Aubrey Wolfhouse. She's the *anti-Martha Stewart*. It's not about making it perfect. It's about knowing it won't be. (TV/MOV: Royal Pains, Rebound, 2015)
- d. Although she has been compared to Martha Stewart, Branch, whose career has paralleled her fellow self-made homemaker, sees herself as the *anti-Martha*. "My books are pretty much the opposite," she says. Branch's how-tos are more along the lines of placecards made by writing guests' names on fall leaves in correction fluid or gold pen. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2004)

The negative [*anti*-ProperN]_N constructs are also attested as modifying elements of nominal compounds but this use is poorly recorded in COCA:

(40)

- a. You're almost like the *anti-NFL* coach, even how you answered that question. You're always very -- you're quiet, you're reserved, yet you're able to get something out of people. How has this approach served you best? (SPOK: ABC_GMA, 2007)
- b. David Carr -- David Carr was the *anti-New York* Times man, if The New York Times is the guy who went to the best boarding schools, and knows the best wine and has two last names, basically. (SPOK: PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST, 2015)

5.5 Prefixed proper nouns with quantificational meaning

After looking into COCA's selected examples, it is evident that most 'quantificational' prefixes have failed to give rise to new words with proper nouns as their bases. There are only a few

examples of the augmentative prefix *super-* added to the names of planets denoting another planet similar to the one denoted by the base, but larger in size e.g. *super-Earth*, *super-Venus*. As for diminutive prefixes, only the prefix *mini-* is productively attached to proper nouns. It is predominantly used with proper nouns unlike other quantificational prefixes denoting objects of a smaller dimension: *micro-* and *nano-*. The three prefixes derive complex words which are identical in meaning, but out of the three, the prefix *mini-* is far more frequent and colloquial. The prefixes *micro-* and *nano-* are used in scientific texts and there are only few examples of their proper name derivatives in the corpus such as *micro-Alaska*, *micro-Milky Way*, *micro-Neptune*, and *nano-Saturn* as a hapax.

5.5.1 Construction with *mini-* and proper nouns

A noun which takes the non-native prefix *mini-* denotes a small object e.g. *mini-van* and *mini-bar*. When added to proper nouns, it also derives a noun which denotes a notion similar to the one denoted by the base, but smaller in size:

(41)

- a. Like *mini-Eiffel Towers*, the 130-foot-tall latticework rigs can occasionally be spotted around town, emitting an airplane-engine hum punctuated by screeches and periodic clouds of smoke. (NEWS: USA Today, 2008)
- b. More than half a million people have paid money to visit this odd attraction, to gaze at fellow humans voluntarily trapped in the glass and steel cage they call Biosphere 2. For the eight people who live there, this experiment in existence on a *mini-Earth* was supposed to serve as a dress rehearsal for colonizing Mars. (SPOK: ABC_Nightline, 1993)
- c. Barstow. A hundred and fifty miles west of Vegas, a *mini-Vegas*. (FIC: Antioch Review, 2015)
- d. Cassiodorus looks through time's telescope the other way: faced with a ruined sewer, he imagines it as a *mini-Roman Empire* and uses it to infer the same monumentality from which the earlier visitors had inferred decay. (ACAD: Raritan, 1991)
- e. Think of Switzerland as a *mini-Europe*, representing the ideal of commonality within its tiny borders, and then maybe Zurich, the artists' home, can be seen as a *mini-Switzerland*, with its quaint architecture and its improbably scenic lake-and-mountain layout. (MAG: Art in America, 1997)
- f. Many of these countries seem likely to elect Islamist governments in coming elections, potentially creating a bunch of theocratic *mini-Irans* throughout the Middle East and North Africa. (WEB: Why The Rest of the World Should Tell the U.S. to F*cK Off, 2012)

The prefixed proper noun may select any property of the original proper noun based on the extra-linguistic reality and shared knowledge, and not only its size. For example, the formation *mini-Manhattan* may convey the idea of resemblance to Manhattan regarding its architecture (42a) or traffic congestion (42b):

(42)

- a. Suddenly, incongruously, after the miles of emptiness in southern Mozambique, the towers of the capital, Maputo, rise above the acacia tree line like a *mini-Manhattan*. (MAG: National Geographic, 2001)

- b. “As your vehicle gets old, you don’t get another one,” he said. “We get it off the island, and that’s it. I call Nassau a *mini-Manhattan* now. It’s unfortunate what’s happened there, and I want to see it doesn’t happen here.” (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 2004)

The prefix *mini-* can be also attached to personal names with the aim of showing physical resemblance (43a), and even more often other types of resemblance (43b-43e):

(43)

- a. Indeed, in the past the revue has relied heavily on standard send-ups of Merman, Channing, Martin, Brynner, et al., supported by rather lame material, but this foursome is perfectly balanced: Suzanne Blakeslee, Bob Rogerson, Linda Strasser (whose Streisand should be filmed, it’s so perfect -- all overwrought finishes, clawing hands and dramatic profiles) and, most varied of all, tiny, beetle-browed Jeff Lyons, who resembles a *mini-Anthony Newley*. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1990)
- b. If you bring in some dickhead who thinks that he’s *mini-Steve* and he, too, is a visionary and, he, too understands what people need, but cannot express. So this dickhead is gonna say: “All right, so this is what I’ve decreed people will want. And I’m the new Steve Jobs.” (TV/MOV: Welcome to Macintosh, 2008)
- c. In this brave new world, the bloated and lavish infrastructure of Hollywood will give way to thousands of *mini-Tarantinos* who produce hit after hit on shockingly low new-world budgets that redefine the content creation business. (WEB: When It Comes to Television Content, Affiliate Fees, 2012)
- d. Lightening things up, Cranston (who picked “new media” for its role in the Middle East uprisings) also threw out some names in the sports and entertainment arenas, including Jeremy Lin, Usain Bolt, Adele and “*mini-Beatles* sensation” One Direction. (WEB: Who Should Be Time’s Person of the Year?, 2012)
- e. The product of a musical family, this *mini-Mozart* was only three when he heard his father Shawn playing and begged him for a lesson. (SPOK: Ind_Oprah, 2003)

In practice, the prefix *mini-* is freely added to the largest group of proper nouns denoting people and places. The prefixed names of people include both public figures e.g. *mini-Britney*, *mini-Romneys*, and fictional characters e.g. *mini-Frankenstein*, *mini-Ferris Bueller*. The prefixed names of places are geographical entities: countries e.g. *mini-Bangladesh*; cities e.g. *mini-Dubai*, *mini-London*; and city parts or landmarks e.g. *mini-Alcatraz*, *mini-Broadway*, *mini-Hollywood*, *mini-Silicon Valley*. What’s more, the prefix *mini-* is also attached to the notions denoting inanimate entities: organizations e.g. *mini-United Nations*, *mini-Davos*; planets e.g. *mini-Neptune*; sightseeing attractions e.g. *mini-Eiffel Tower*, *mini-Parthenon*, *mini-Stonehenges*; sports events and music festivals e.g. *mini-Olympics*, *mini-Super Bowl*, *mini-Woodstock*. It can be also added to the bases denoting a historical period or cultural movement e.g. *mini-Enlightenment*, *mini-Depression*, and festivities e.g. *mini-Christmas*, *mini-Thanksgiving*. Owing to this wider scope, the [*mini-ProperN*]_N construction licenses the constructs which are not exclusively diminutive in size when compared to the base, but also any kind of a replica of the base:

XV. < [*mini* [X]_{ProperNi}]_{Nj} ↔ [(Smaller) Replica of SEM_i]_j

5.5.1.1 Distributional features of constructs with *mini-* and proper nouns

The constructs [*mini-ProperN*]_N are marked with the same grammatical features like prototypical common countable nouns i.e. determination (44a-44d), modification (44e-44h) and number contrast (44i-44l):

(44)

- a. And I think it would be a lot harder if I was trying to go out there and be a *mini-Beyonce* with blond hair and, you know, doing the uh-oh and that type of thing. (SPOK: PBS_Tavis, 2004)
- b. “This is a *mini-Alaska*,” declared New York Attorney General Robert Abrams, referring to last year’s 11 million-gal. spill from the Exxon Valdez. (MAG: TIME, 1990)
- c. One CERN scientist calculated that the chance of a *mini-Black Hole* swallowing the Earth is less than 1 in 50,000,000. (WEB: The Global Language Monitor, 2012)
- d. The idea here is to build empathy and give *your mini-Mike Tyson* a look at how his punching bag is suffering in the aftermath. (MAG: Parenting. School Years, 2012)
- e. So, knowing we would face opposition at the point of Faculty and Senate approval of the new educational program, we bruted it about that we were after a full ninety-credit program - in effect *our own mini-Faculty of Arts and Science* - which elicited no few howls of pained indignation from our opponents. (ACAD: Academic Questions, 2002)
- f. My family had *its own mini-Japan* going on in the middle of suburban San Diego. (BLOG: 10 customs you must know before a trip to Japan 2012)
- g. In the most ambitious part of its new role, Singapore is creating what are in effect *mini-Singapores*. (MAG: Fortune, 1996)
- h. As today’s Slate posting correctly points out, a far more credible threat is that Texas could conceivably split itself into *5 mini-Texases*. (WEB: Go Ahead and Secede, Texas. We Dare You, 2012)
- i. Okay. So, is there a Mrs. Case? Any little Cases running around? No *mini-Cases*. (TV/MOV: Never Back Down: No Surrender, 2016)

The three constructions Indefinite Determination, Modification and Plural Noun unify their constituents under certain conditions. In syntactic structures, unification operates when their entities do not have contradictory values – the entities are either matching attribute-values pairs or one of the entities has an unspecified value (Fried and Östman 2004: 71). Indefinite Determination and Plural Noun constructions take a noun constituent with specific values for the attributes *boundedness* [bounded+], *configuration* [count+], and *number* [num sg] in Indefinite Determination, [num pl] in Plural Noun (Michaelis 2005: 54). Modification construction [Mod – N] shows a wide range of possible modifier slots. Modifiers are typically adjectives, but it could be any other constituent provided there is “restricted reference of the noun by the property expressed by the modifier” (Fried 2015: 981). The restriction feature is not necessarily an inherent property in the Modification construction, but a result of unification of its constituents. These theoretical principles of Construction Grammar help us define the grammatical meaning of the constructs [*mini-ProperN*]_N more closely – they are indeed bounded entities (human beings, objects, and geographical entities) and as such they could be counted and restricted in terms of possessiveness (*your, its own*).

5.6 Summary

In this Chapter, we have analyzed the prefixed formations with proper nouns as formal bases from COCA. Having in mind the process of unification in Construction Morphology, the analysis has been based on existing word-formation accounts in which prefixes are studied as “lexeme-like” morphemes with unique semantic readings: ‘attitudinal’ *anti-/pro-*; ‘locative’: ‘temporal’ *pre-/post-*, *ex-* and *proto-*, ‘spatial’ and ‘temporal’ *mid-*, and ‘metaphorical’ *out-*; ‘negative’ *non-*, *un-* and *anti-*, and ‘quantificational’ *mini-*. The usage-based approach has confirmed some of the previous findings on pragmatic, stylistic and discourse properties of complex words derived by prefixation: a) the effect of antithesis is achieved when the constructs with the prefixes *anti-/pro-* and proper nouns are used in political discourse; b) the priming effect (the use of the positive form) facilitates the production of the negative constructs with the prefix *un-* and proper nouns; c) different evaluative tones of the prefixed proper nouns with negative reading may be conveyed: the *non-* outputs tend to be neutral, whereas the *un-* and *anti-* outputs are mostly negative, but sometimes even positive depending on the speaker’s attitude. The usage-based approach has also shown that some prefixed formations may have a wider scope in use and meaning: a) the verbal constructs with the prefix *out-* and proper nouns may take any kind of object in verb phrases, and not only follow the pattern *out-Herod Herod*; b) the constructs with the prefix *mini-* and proper nouns denote any kind of a replica not only the one in a smaller size.

When prefixes are added to proper nouns as formal bases, novel formations have the same grammatical properties as established words. This is demonstrated by the use of the [*prefix- ProperN*] constructs in larger (syntactic) structures in which existing lexemes prototypically occur. The [*prefix- ProperN*] constructs may fill the open slots of syntactic constructions in the same manner as common nouns, verbs and adjectives: a) the [*prefix- ProperN*]_N constructs may be used in Modification, Determination and Plural Number constructions; b) the [*prefix- ProperN*]_A constructs may form an attributive string, be used in Comparative constructions and serve as adverbials; c) the [*prefix- ProperN*]_V constructs form the Verb Phrase construction with different kinds of objects. The formation of the prefixed proper nouns, as well as their application in syntactic constructions, may be grammatically acceptable on the condition that proper nouns are interpreted as bounded entities on the basis of their denotation (people, places, and objects) or via metaphoric or metonymic transfer (for proper nouns denoting time).

6 Suffixation with proper nouns

Suffixes are considered to be unique and easily recognizable as morphological elements which are added to bases finally. Although suffixation with common nouns never presupposes hyphenation, suffixed proper nouns may as well be hyphenated. Hyphenated and non-hyphenated forms are attested in COCA, and when doublets occur, the non-hyphenated form is usually more frequent in language use e.g. *Clintonesque* has 56 hits, whereas *Clinton-esque* has only 7 hits. The hyphenated forms are not taken as ‘less grammatical’ or ‘more colloquial,’ but they are more likely to be one-offs or hapax legomena. The examined constructs with proper nouns and 17 suffixes are grouped according to the class of complex words they produce when licensed by constructional schemas i.e. constructions with two verb-forming suffixes (*-ize* and *-ify*), with nine noun-forming suffixes (*-(i)ana*, *-dom*, *-ese*, *-hood*, *-ness*, *-ism*, *-ist*, *-ite*, and *-ship*) and with six adjective-forming suffixes (*-esque*, *-free*, *-ish*, *-less*, *-like* and *-oid*)³⁶. The constructions are further classified and analyzed according to the semantic reading they express. As in the previous section on prefixation with proper nouns, the analysis is based on the (contextual) use and function of all [ProperN-suffix] constructs which are formally represented by constructional schemas.

6.1 Preliminaries

Early accounts on suffixes gave a comprehensive description of their structural properties i.e. distribution and phonology, which were inseparable in any analysis. Suffixes as final bound morphemes trigger base modifications and phonological change. As a rule, suffixes of Latinate origin have stress and phonological effects on bases, whereas the native ones do not; for instance, the suffix *-esque* of French origin may reduce a primary stress to a secondary one, whereas its synonymous suffix of English origin *-ish* shows neither stress shift nor allomorphy. Apart from shifting the main stress of the base, some suffixes may attract the stress directly to them. Moreover, suffixation may lead to the deletion of material at the end of the base or result in taking an extender e.g. *-i-* in *-(i)ana*. The morphophonological properties of complex words with common nouns and suffixes are extensively discussed in the theoretical framework of Generative Linguistics (see Bauer 1983; Katamba 1993; Lieber 1980). It is presumed that the same morphophonological rules apply to proper nouns – they are inferred from each constructional schema as a conflation of the phonological and morphological dimension (see 3.2.1).

In more structural-based approaches, suffixes are divided in two groups based on their semantics: the purely transpositional ones which are class-changing and do not provide any additional semantic information such as the adverb forming suffix *-ly*, and the suffixes which are “contentful” and have their own semantics (Bauer et al. 2013)³⁷. In this thesis, the second group of suffixes is examined with the aim of showing subtle usage-based differences in meaning of constructions with rival final forms e.g. *-ify* vs. *-ize*, *-dom* vs. *-ness*, and *-esque* vs. *-ish* vs. *-like*. In addition, some suffixed proper nouns show possible alternations in connotation and discourse use e.g. constructions with *-ify*, *-ese*, and *-oid* as their final constituent.

Orthographically, regardless of the kind of base, whether it is a common or a proper noun, complex words with suffixes in English are normally non-hyphenated forms in traditional linguistic resources such as dictionaries. In fact, English morpheme junctures are fairly visible and speakers are more or less aware of them – this means that English has a mid-level index of fusion (Lieber

³⁶ Two ‘suffix-like’ final elements *-free* and *-like* are also considered to be suffixes on semantic grounds given that they share the same meaning as other adjective-forming suffixes, the privative suffix *-less* and the simulative suffixes *-esque*, *-ish* and *-oid* respectively. A short literature overview on their morphological status is provided in the thesis as well (see 6.4.2.2 for *-free* and 6.4.1.3 for *-like*).

³⁷ In Construction Morphology, affixes do not have meaning on their own (see 3.2.1).

2016). However, the COCA texts abound in hyphenated examples with proper nouns as well. The choice of hyphenation is made by text writers or transcribers, and consequently doublets are often found e.g. *Hollywoodish* and *Hollywood-ish*. Nevertheless, the COCA engine search shows the most frequent suffixed hits tend to be non-hyphenated forms. This may be due to the fact that only the non-hyphenated forms are established words and far more frequent (e.g. *Marxism*). On the other hand, one-offs or hapax legomena are more commonly hyphenated or tend to be put in quotation marks, which is probably a writer's choice and not an orthographic rule.

The restrictive nature of new formations with proper nouns and suffixes is intuitively felt to most speakers regardless of their linguistic knowledge. Even a brief insight into the corpus examples shows that suffixed proper nouns are more often used with inverted commas or likely to be preceded by other means of explicitly marked reference than the prefixed proper nouns. Generally speaking, the semantic and phonological stability of most prefixes enables a straightforward interpretation of complex derivatives with prefixes and proper nouns. The surrounding context is not as necessary for most prefixed proper nouns as it is for most suffixed proper nouns, and particularly in discerning the correct reading of seemingly synonymous constructs.

When proper nouns act as derivational bases, it seems that the choice of a suffix does not merely depend on the speaker's preference, but sometimes it may be extrinsically conditioned especially when there is a need for naming and identifying new notions and concepts. The following examples show the speaker's awareness of the extra-linguistic influence on language use more closely:

(1)

- a. The identification of America with a general idea or concept has gone so far as to have given birth to new words that are treated nowadays as normal categories of thought, such as "Americanization" or "Americanism." (By contrast, no one speaks of *Venezuelanization* or *New Zealandism*.) (ACAD: Public Interest, 2003)
- b. She sent him to the bar for another drink. She felt *Hemingwayesque*. Was there such a word as Hemingwayesque? (FIC: Triquarterly, 2001)
- c. LANGUAGE IS a lens turned toward the culture of those who speak it, and in pop-cultural terms, we are now viewing the *Jurassicization* of American English. Put another way, it is the process by which movie titles morph into parts of speech with intrinsic meanings of their own. It is meaningful only to readers who have a high degree of pop-cultural literacy. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1993)
- d. This looks *Salinger-ish* to me. Okay. What I mean by *Salinger-ish*, is that something about the area makes me think that one of the most famous writers in the world would live here if he - - if he wanted to hide from everyone. (TV/MOV: Coming Through the Rye, 2015)

6.2 Suffixed proper nouns as verbs

Only two verb-forming suffixes are attested with proper nouns in COCA: *-ize* and *-ify*. As it has already been discussed in theory and validated in practice (see Bauer et al. 2013; Lieber 2004; Plag 1999), the suffix *-ize* is far more productive and frequent with non-formation than the suffix *-ify*. The previous studies based on the data from different dictionaries and corpora show that the two rival suffixes are almost synonymous in meaning, and they stand in almost complementary distribution due to phonological restrictions. The suffix *-ize* takes the bases which are mostly disyllabic and end in a consonant e.g. *symbolize*, and the suffix *-ify* takes the bases that carry main stress on the syllable preceding *-ify* with a possibility of deleting the final *y* e.g.

*beautify*³⁸. Nevertheless, Bauer et al. (2013: 270-1) also notice that both suffixes may even form doublets if the base is trochaic and ends in a high front vowel whether it is a common noun or a proper noun e.g. *dandy*, *Dolby*, *Disney*, *orgy*, *Nazi*, *Turkey*, *wiki*. According to Plag (1999), doublets occur with less frequent words which are not blocked.

Given that both suffixes may combine with less frequent words, proper nouns and proper names constitute possible bases. And yet, in reference books the suffix *-ize* is predominantly discussed as a verb-forming suffix that combines with proper nouns despite the fact that both suffixes show a wide range of almost identical polysemy (see Lieber 2004; Plag 1999). The following analysis of proper nouns based on the sample from COCA aims at showing the semantic and distributional properties of the *-ify/-ize* verbs from a constructionist perspective.

6.2.1 Construction with proper nouns and *-ify*

Being less frequent and less productive than its counterpart suffix *-ize*, the suffix *-ify* has not sparked off much interest among linguists. The semantics of *-ify* forms slightly differ whether the suffix is added to nominal or adjectival bases i.e. with nominal bases the reading is ‘make into’ as in *personify* and with adjectival bases the reading is ‘make’ as in *humidify* (Bauer and Huddleston 2002: 1714). Marchand (1969: 300) also notices the reading ‘make look like, give the (undesirable) appearance of’ with both nominal and adjectival bases as in *whiskify* and *Frenchify*, and the same derogatory tone may be with proper nouns e.g. *Swiftify*.

Within the theoretical framework of Lexical Conceptual Semantics, Plag (1999: 196) illustrates the following meaning of *-ify* in the OED neologisms: ‘locative’ e.g. *tubify*, ‘ornative’ e.g. *youthify*, ‘causative/factitive’ e.g. *aridify*, ‘resultative’ e.g. *trustify*, and ‘inchoative’ e.g. *mucify*. The author, however, does not list any neologisms with performative and similitive readings. Adams (2001: 26) provides new derivatives which are only ‘ornative’ e.g. *massify* and ‘resultative’ e.g. *pulpify*, and Lieber (2005: 411) notes that established and nonce words ending in *-ify* may have the ‘performative’ meaning as in *speechify* and *boozify*, but no ‘similitive’ meaning.

With proper nouns, the suffix *-ify* is attested in low-frequency formations which are mostly neologisms and not dictionary entries. Bauer et al. (2013) back up Plag’s findings (1999) on the productivity of *-ify* by investigating hapaxes from COCA and the BNC. The authors mainly focus on phonological restrictions and the systematic overlap of *-ify* and *-ize*.

The examples collected from COCA show that the verbs consisting of proper nouns and the suffix *-ify* are transitive, and they are used in either active or passive voice. The core meaning of constructs with proper nouns and *-ify* is ‘causative’ i.e. ‘make x or cause to become x,’ as previously suggested by Lieber (2004: 77):

(2)

- a. Al-Masri has taken Al-Qaeda in Iraq in a different direction. On one hand, he has worked to build a coalition of insurgent groups and has sought to incorporate Iraqi tribes under his banner. In essence, he is trying to “*Iraqify*” Al-Qaeda. (ACAD: Middle East Quarterly, 2007)
- b. Polygram decided to back “*Bean*” because of the character’s built-in international appeal. Markets outside the United States have been the initial focus, but Polygram seems determined to make inroads with Americans. “Our biggest challenge with this movie is to *Beanify* America,” said Russell Schwartz, president of Gramercy, the American subsidiary of Polygram that is releasing the film here. “*Bean*’s an odd character; he doesn’t have

³⁸ See Plag (1999) for a more detailed analysis of *-ize* and *-ify* as phonologically conditioned allomorphs.

- traditional one-liners that you can cut a trailer out of. He's a little more subtle." (NEWS: New York Times, 1997)
- c. Makbule was an ethnic Turk, a refugee from a city in the interior into which Bulgarian security police had swept, obliterating from their path all things Turkish. The inhabitants' names were forcibly *Bulgarified*. (FIC: Southern Review, 1998)
 - d. The idea that he saved Russia from the Mongols hordes is ridiculous -- the Mongols, who eventually became *Turkified*, lasted for several centuries after Nevsky's death, and as late as the 1480s were still able to invade deep into Poland. (BLOG: Review time! with Nevsky: A Hero of the People, 2012)
 - e. The 1981 group was different. They were not thinking about emigration. Some were traveling, some were on academic fellowships, some were exhibiting their work. They would be home by Christmas, many figured. But martial law intervened. Phone lines were broken, flights were canceled. They got stuck. # "You can't just sit in front of the TV set and wait," said Rafal Olbinski, a Polish-born illustrator and painter. Like everyone else, Mr. Olbinski found work. When martial law was lifted a few years later, he had become too busy to go back. "I got Americanized," he said. "*New York-ified*." (NEWS: New York Times, 1994)
 - f. "It seems to be a universal way of adapting," Professor Keller says, "getting smaller and reproducing faster." By having more offspring in a shorter period of time, organisms accelerate evolution and improve their lineage's survival chances. # But overly specialized species like the California condor - or, by extension, the dinosaurs -- cannot "*Lilliputify*" fast enough. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2006)
 - g. Though it may seem that carte blanche has been offered up on a sterling silver platter-this wedding was rumored to cost more than a million dollars -- Gatti is reputedly respectful about budget, even if it's not in writing, and he's occasionally dipped into his own pocket to *Gattify* an event if need be. (MAG: Town and Country, 2000)

The above examples fully illustrate the nature of causatives i.e. they are basically dynamic actions which are supposed to produce specific (either desirable or undesirable) outcomes in complex situations by a volitional agent (Lieber 2004). The complexity of each situation is portrayed in great detail, and each situation generally requires certain steps to be taken by the agent. In fact, the meaning of each formation is highly context-dependent, which allows the interlocutor to interpret the correct reading effortlessly even if the interlocutor does not possess the same shared knowledge as the speaker.

Among the selected *-ify* formations with proper nouns as bases there are also a few of those with the similitive meaning – a somewhat surprising finding given that no *-ify* formations with common nouns or adjectives as bases are recorded as having this kind of reading in previous theoretical accounts. Thanks to COCA's large sample, the examples with the reading 'do/act/make in the manner of/like x' are attested as well:

(3)

- a. Preserve Main Street. The ubiquity of its products notwithstanding, Life Is Good doesn't want to be Starbucks. The Jacobses detest the homogenization of retail that is turning downtowns into Stepford zones and possess an abiding affection for the mom-and-pops that have always been their backbone. Rather than *Gap-ify*, they plan to open no more than five to 10 corporate stores in total. (MAG: Inc., 2006)
- b. Add another email address to Gmail via Add an email account under Accounts and Import in the online settings, and during the setup process you can opt to "*Gmailify*" it -- giving you the same spam protection and auto-sorting for your other accounts as well as your Google one. (MAG: Gizmodo, 2019)

- c. “There’s a part of most of us that gets *Scroogified* during the year,” Williamson continues. “In all the difficulties of living, we sometimes tend to get closed off. Dickens’s story is about coming together with family and friends around the hearth.” (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 1990)
- d. The Grinch spawned an animated special that has become a Christmas staple and soon will get the big-screen treatment as a live-action movie starring Jim Carrey. And, on Nov. 7, Marshall Field’s, national sponsor of the Seuss exhibit, will unveil its Grinch-themed State Street Christmas windows. Twelve windows tell the story of How the Grinch Stole Christmas and the Walnut Room tree will be *Grinchified*. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1998)

The examples in (3) do not focus so much on the (un)desirable effect of a dynamic action, but rather illustrate the action itself, and more closely its manner. The simulative reading comes from the descriptions provided in a wider context. This commonly occurs when proper nouns with the suffix *-ify* are used as participial adjectives and act as modifiers of noun phrases:

(4)

- a. Certainly it’s a nice theme: a heart-string-tugging, *Disney-ified*, storybook theme that never leads the audience into thinking that any of their characters will be in any real danger or do anything (rather, be made to do anything) that’s not strictly speaking perfect. (WEB: No One is Here Except All of Us, 2012)
- b. So neurobiology with its attribute of ‘hard science’ can fool you into some *Platonified*, reductive statement. (WEB: Opacity, 2012)
- c. Essentially, she’s a *McCarthyified* version of the Hateful Film Businessman, glued to his cell phone and perpetually missing his kids’ piano recitals or sporting events, and primed for a magical lesson about what’s really important in life. (MAG: The Verge, 2016)
- d. JARDIN: When Tony hit about \$300,000 in debt, he declared bankruptcy. He tried to sell his *Trekkified* flat on Ebay for a price he knew was high, \$2 million. Mr-LEONARD-NIMOY-: (as Spock) Live long and prosper. JARDIN: Nobody bought it, but he’s still hoping to cash in on his growing fame. He recently finished another remodel, which updates the apartment to more closely resemble the Star Trek: Voyager period. He blocked out all the windows with thick, black Plexiglas to enhance the illusion you’re hurtling through space. (SPOK: NPR_Daybreak, 2006)

It is also possible that a formation has two readings at the same time:

(5)

Recall that Mr. Stephens is said to have left the Journal because he was swimming against the currents of the *Trumpified* right. (NEWS: Baltimore Sun, 2017)

The noun phrase *the Trumpified right* in example (5) may be interpreted as a body of politicians made to become like Donald Trump (‘causative’), or a body of politicians acting in the manner of or like Donald Trump (‘simulative’). The dual reading in (5) supports Lieber’s interpretation (2004) that performative and simulative meanings are non-core cases created by the means of sense extension from causatives and resultatives. The semantic reading which combines the causative and simulative meanings is unified in the constructional schema and can be formally represented as follows:

- I. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperNi}} \textit{ify}]_{\text{Vj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Cause to Become in the Manner of/like SEM}_{ij}] \rangle$

Sometimes the [ProperN-ify]_v constructs are used in a disparaging tone, and thus they are analogous to Marchand's *Frenchify* and *whiskify*. This use is very common in blogs and web comments where speakers freely express their opinion:

(6)

- a. WB hired Nolan to *Nolan-ify* Superman. That Superman is going to be in the Justice League. They can't turn the tone of that standalone around on its heels and put out an Avengers-like JLA. (BLOG: Joseph Gordon-Levitt would consider joining Justice League if asked, 2012)
- b. If FISA is worth another term or two of *Bushified* foreign policy and fiscal nightmares, then please. (BLOG: Making Light: Back on the Table, 2012)
- c. You are still doing classic *Foxified* right wing BS. Throwing out a statement with absolutely no connection to reality and ignoring all the facts brought to your attention that falsify your statement. (BLOG: Forget the top 1% — Look at the top 0.1% 2012)
- d. The "Chinese" ramen had become very *Japanified*. I don't agree with you that "ramen" is Chinese any more. (WEB: Sushi Chefs-do they have to be Japanese? 2012)

6.2.2 Construction with proper nouns and *-ize*

Being labeled as the most productive verb-forming suffix on the verge of creating unnecessary proliferation (Bauer and Huddleston 2002: 1715), the suffix *-ize* is commonly used in creating neologisms especially in scientific and technical registers (see Montero-Fleta 2011; Plag 1999). Apart from being more productive and frequent, the suffix *-ize* takes on a wider range of meanings than its counterpart *-ify*. Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1715) highlight its fixed meaning with adjectival bases 'make' as in *urbanize*, but with nominal bases there is no single generalized meaning. Historically, the suffix *-ize* comes from the Greek language, and according to Marchand (1969: 318-321), three meanings are found in Greek words i.e. 'subject to,' 'make,' and 'act as' which are also kept in transitive English verbs that take common nouns and adjectives as bases e.g. *hospitalize*, *legalize* and *patronize* respectively. With personal names such as *Petrarchize*, Marchand notices a slightly depreciative tone and underlying negative implication 'imitate the manner or style of.'

Plag (1999: 125) illustrates that the suffix *-ize* is polysemous in nature like the suffix *-ify* and gives seven specific meanings: 'locative' e.g. *hospitalize*, 'ornative' e.g. *patinize*, 'causative' e.g. *randomize*, 'resultative' e.g. *peasantize*, 'inchoative' e.g. *aerosolize*, 'performative' e.g. *anthropologize*, and 'similative' e.g. *powellize*. Lieber (2004) agrees with Plag's classification of the *-ize* derivatives with the exception to the derivatives with proper nouns as bases. While examining the OED neologisms with proper nouns such as *Coslettize*, *Hooverize*, *Lukanize*, *Maoize*, *Mandelize*, *Marxize*, *Powellize*, *Stalinize*, *Sherardize* and *Taylorize*, Plag (1999: 138-140) concludes that there are two possible meanings: a) similative 'act like x' or 'imitate x' e.g. *The socialists Marxize the West*, and b) ornative 'provide with x' e.g. *Taylorize* meaning 'to introduce the Taylor system into.' The author also draws attention to the role of metonymy in interpreting the meaning of not only *Taylorize*, but also *Marxize* which does not refer to the person, but to the doctrines of Marx (*Marxism* being its parallel nominal form). The ornative reading is far less expected, and conversely, most *-ize* derivatives with proper nouns have the similative reading. Following the interpretation of *Marxize*, Plag also points out that most *-ize* derivatives with the similative reading denote an action of implementing ideas and manners of a certain person. According to the author, this automatically implies acting like that person. Lieber (2004: 77), however, highlights the manner argument of the *-ize* derivatives with proper nouns e.g. *Bosweillize* 'act or do in the manner of,' but says that *Marxize* may be also interpreted as 'x caused the doctrines of Marx to go somewhere.' As

a matter of fact, Liber argues that most transitive *-ize* verbs with proper names are not similitives, but rather resultatives and ornatives which necessarily require a volitional agent.

The sample taken from COCA truly justifies the increasing frequency and high productivity of the suffix *-ize* in contemporary English. If phonological make-up of the base does not restrict the suffix *-ize*, it may be attached to almost any kind of proper names e.g. *Apple-ized*, *Billy Bob-ized*, *Clintonize*, *Ferberizing*, *Iraqize*, *Kuwaitize*, *Lebanonizing*, *Madonna-izing*, *Mississippi-ize*, *NASCAR-ized*, *Routledgizing*, *Spielberg-ized*, *Twitterized*, *Vegas-ized*, *Venezuelaize*, *Vietnamized*, *Walmartize* (also attested *WalMartized*, *Wal-Martize*, *Wal-martize*) etc. The *-ize* derivatives like the *-ify* derivatives are mainly causatives with the meaning ‘make x or cause to become x’:

(7)

- a. Their main grievances are economic, the persistent inflation, the huge accumulated federal debt and continued federal budget deficits. They speak of an economic “mess” that threatens to “*Argentize*” both Canada and Quebec. (NEWS: New York Times, 1991)
- b. “In five years, I think software in Japan will be written in a radically different way than it is now,” said Sheridan Tatsuno, editor of NeoConcepts, a Los Altos newsletter that tracks technology trends in Japan. “I think they are going to emulate the American model and *Japanize* it.” (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1992)
- c. They have asked for Ukraine to become *Finlandized*, to become more neutral. (SPOK: PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST, 2014)
- d. After decades of backing Elvis Presley, it’s a no-brainer for guitarist Scotty Moore and drummer D.J. Fontana to fall into step with Keith Richards, Joe Ely, Tracy Nelson, Jeff Beck, Ron Wood and their other guests on this compilation, a tribute to their landmark rock’n’roll licks. Some, naturally, can’t resist *Elvis-izing* their tunes. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1997)
- e. Every effort the GOP made to win the House by trying to *Reaganize* local campaigns (on the assumption that Reagan’s election was ideological and that it could be replicated in 435 districts) only seemed to deepen the slide. (MAG: New Republic, 1990)
- f. Tackling these jobs beyond Europe should be a core new mission of NATO. The Bush administration missed a historic opportunity to lead the alliance into this new era in Afghanistan. Belatedly, it is correcting its mistake by *NATO-izing* the International Security Assistance Force. (ACAD: Foreign Affairs, 2003)
- g. The paper explains it as possible price-fixing or collusion on the part of the payday loan vendors. But over time, you should still see the industry *Wal-martize*, and there’s no such evidence of collusion, there shouldn’t be, because they’re in business to make money and the way to make money is to go big. You just can’t make a lot of money out of a small storefront with a \$100K loan inventory. (BLOG: Badtux the Snarky Penguin: On the other hand..., 2012)
- h. He was one of the first major designers to make runway clothes as hip as the clothes seen on urban streets. He has *Chanel-ized* the rap influence, the motorcycle look and the messenger look. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1992)
- i. Mastai and his wife, Marie-Louise, who is in her 70s, accused Baldwin of trying to “*Hollywoodize*” this community in the Hamptons, which is accustomed to celebrity-turf disputes, and claimed he would never have got the town zoning board’s permission if he weren’t a celebrity.

As in the case of the *-ify* causatives with proper names, the *-ize* causatives refer to a (un)desirable goal by a volitional agent. The *-ize* similitives with the meaning ‘do/act/make in the manner of/like x’ are also possible when the *-ize* verbs simply depict an action. The following examples show that one and the same *-ize* verb with a proper noun (*McDonaldizing*) may have both

readings depending on the intended message. In (8a), it conveys a message of undesirable consumerism, whereas in (8b) it gives a description of how the company operates:

(8)

- a. We are also the greediest consumers of the world's resources and have been "*McDonaldizing*" the planet by exporting our consumerist society into every corner of the globe. (MAG: U.S. Catholic, 2001)
- b. They say that they want to solve homelessness and that they're not necessarily "*McDonaldizing*" as we've termed the street paper movement, by just opening shop in every city that they possibly can. (SPOK: NPR_Saturday, 1998)

The *-ize* similatives may portray physical appearance and style with the aim of imitating the notion denoted by the base. In contrast to Marchand's account on negative imitation of the *-ize* verbs with personal names (Marchand 1969), the connotations may be either neutral (9a) or positive (9b):

(9)

- a. She's a natural blonde. We enhance it a little bit, a little *Marilynizing*, and we don't always agree on things. I like it more looser, in front of her face. She likes it nipped behind the ear. (SPOK: ABC_GMA, 2006)
- b. On the other hand, said Papelis, Las Vegas could grow extravagantly if it "*Manhattanized*," growing up instead of out. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 2005)

As in the case of the schema which generates constructions with proper nouns and *-ify*, a certain kind of semantic unification is also in effect. The largest group of the *-ize* derivatives with proper nouns combine the causative and similative readings, and this can be schematically shown in the same way as in the *-ify* constructional schema in (II):

II. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *ize*]_{vj} ↔ [Cause to Become in the Manner of/like SEM_i]_j >

Unlike the [ProperN-*ify*]_v constructs which take on a strongly negative tone by default, the [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs may be used in a disapproving (10a), neutral (10b), or positive (10c) tone, which largely depends on the proper noun and the speakers' perception of it. The speakers' shared knowledge of the referent reflects their attitude, and thus a verb ending in *-ize* may be created with the aim of neutralizing inappropriate actions as well (10d):

(10)

- a. You've already addressed the race issue, but what about this idea that people are trying to *Hitlerize* our legitimately elected president. (SPOK: NPR_TalkNat, 2009)
- b. "It was in many ways a risky thing, first in hiring me, second to support the things that were extremely unorthodox," Vandeweghe said. "Now they've become much more commonplace to do. We were sort of doing them first - salary dumps, focusing on caps. Every trade we did for years had to have a draft choice in there, accumulating draft choices."- Because of those moves, a new verb, "*Denverize*," entered the NBA vocabulary of rival GMs. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2006)
- c. The move to Atlantic unleashed Ms. Franklin. Wexler brought her together with a group of Southern session men – "a rhythm section of Alabama white boys who took a left turn at the blues," he said. More important, he made Ms. Franklin, a gifted pianist, her own

accompanist. “Putting me back on piano helped *Aretha-ize* the new music,” she later said. (NEWS: The Boston Globe, 2018)

- d. What began as a parking-lot brawl ended in a gunfight, and in the course of making arrests police recovered some 118 handguns and a rifle. Bikers have subsequently tried to *Ferguson-ize* the events, calling them an example of police overreaction. (MAG: National Review, 2015)

The combined causative and similitive readings are quite common whenever the underlying topic is assimilation into a new culture and/or cultural change. The *-ize* derivatives consisting of place names are used in either passive or active voice. Depending on the speaker’s point of view, the tones may be disapproving (11a and 11b) or neutral (11c-11e):

(11)

- a. Increased Mexican migration to Texas was especially contested, and nativists there explicitly pointed to the example of California and Chinese immigration to allude to their state’s future. “To *Mexicanize* Texas or *Orientalize* California is a crime,” raged one nativist. (ACAD: Journal of American Ethnic History, 2002)
- b. There is, however, another version of the meaning of diversity for America, one that would reinforce its vibrant cultural center rather than *balkanize* it. (NEWS: New York Times, 1993)
- c. Yeah, this book deals primarily with the boys’ relationship with Diana. And I think it’s important that we make -- you know, we acknowledge of the fact that, you know, yes, indeed, to some extent, they have been *Windsorized* since Diana’s death, that they enjoy polo, and fox hunting, and all of those various, you know, royal pastimes -- summers at Balmoral. (SPOK: CNN_King, 2001)
- d. Since a vast majority of them are of the second and third generations who were born and raised in Brazil, they are culturally *Brazilianized* to a considerable degree and have become Japan’s newest ethnic minority. (ACAD: Anthropological Quarterly, 1998)
- e. “It’s funny because I’ve been here longer than where I’m from. So I guess you can say I’m from Compton. My friends say I’ve been ‘*California-ized*.’ ” (NEWS: Orange County Register, 2014)

6.2.3 Arguments of constrcuts with proper nouns and *-ify/-ize*

The *-ify/-ize* verbs are prototypically transitive verbs and they can be used in passive voice as in (11c-11e). In English, the Passive construction has “rigid word order” always consisting of an auxiliary verb *be* and the past participle verb form, and sometimes the agent may be introduced via the preposition *by* (Croft 2005: 302). The agent is an optional cue and has an “oblique function” – in the specification of the Passive construction, the semantic part indicates “an entity [is] affected by a potentially unidentified cause” and the pragmatic function serves as “discourse prominence of the result of an action” (Fried and Östman 2004: 49). In the Passive construction with the [ProperN-*ify*]_v and [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs, there is no overt agent; however, given that the denotation of each proper noun in (11c-11e) is a geographical place, we may infer that the agent is the people/nation living in that place and sharing the same customs and cultural values.

In her analysis of the core cases of the verbs ending *-ize* and *-ify*, Lieber (2004) elaborates the claims made by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) regarding the alternation from causatives (‘make x’ or ‘cause to become x’) to inchoatives (‘become x’). It is possible for causatives to detransitivize and turn into inchoatives if an external agent is not necessary e.g. *the milk solidified* (Lieber 2004: 85). Similarly, it is also possible for the [ProperN-*ify*]_v and [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs

to become reflexive and have an internal agent, and then, their meaning is ‘assimilate oneself into a new culture’³⁹:

(12)

- a. “I hope I have a classic, timeless style with a little twist in details. But I have completely *California-ized* myself-I like anything easy, comfortable, casual.” (MAG: Bazaar, 2005)
- b. Besides his popular blogs and films, Colville-Andersen owns a marketing firm that specializes in helping cities “*Copenhagenize*” themselves. (BLOG: Want to be like Copenhagen, 2012)
- c. BORGER# Did she say he was *Blitzer-izing* himself? BLITZER# She always liked my beard, too, you know. Maybe she likes - maybe encouraged Jay to grow his. (SPOK: THE SITUATION ROOM 5:00 PM EST, 2014)
- d. In this, his last semi-serious work, Koestler suggested that Ashkenazi Jews were actually descended from the lost people of Khazaria, who before vanishing from the northern Caucasus a thousand years ago had somehow opted to *Judaize* themselves. (MAG: The Atlantic Monthly, 2009)
- e. And I don’t think we can afford to have a society in which we *Balkanize* ourselves into central cities versus suburbs. (SPOK: ABC_Brinkley, 1992)

The internal agent is not always grammatically marked by reflexive pronouns. A verb ending in *-ify/-ize* may inherently hold the idea of ‘an inside action and/or agent’ especially in idiomatic expressions. For instance, the verb *Balkanize* (or *balkanize*) lost its original reference to the fragmentation of the countries in the Balkans (by the local nations not an external force), and it acquired a specialized meaning ‘to break up (a region, a group, etc.) into smaller and often hostile units’⁴⁰. The internal agent is demonstrated in different contextual uses of the verb *Balkanize/balkanize*:

(13)

- a. But the current system is highly *balkanized*; the computers at one managed-care company cannot communicate with those at another. (NEWS: New York Times, 1998)
- b. As a result, great gains have been made, but it’s also true that as medicine became *Balkanized*, primary care became health care’s unwanted sibling. (MAG: Washington Monthly, 1993)
- c. “It will be choice for the few, based on illusion.... Choice will *balkanize* Berkeley schools. Some schools will become the good schools, some will be less desirable.” (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1993)

6.3 Suffixed proper nouns as nouns

Constructions with proper nouns and noun-forming suffixes comprise the largest group in this section: *-(i)ana*, *-dom*, *-ese*, *-hood*, *-ness*, *-ism*, *-ist*, *-ite*, and *-ship*. Interestingly enough, most of the suffixes in this group are added to common nouns as bases, be it as their default category such as *dom*, or not such as *-ness*. Most of them are also added to nominal bases that denote persons and create abstract or collective nouns e.g. *dukedom*, *adulthood* or *citizenship*. When added to nominal

³⁹ The examples include only the [ProperN-ize]_V constructs. This does not mean that there are no reflexive constructs of the [ProperN-ify]_V pattern, but they are not attested in COCA to the researcher’s knowledge.

⁴⁰ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/balkanize>

bases that denote inanimate objects or adjectival bases, the suffixes create complex words that denote persons such as *Highness*, *columnist* or *socialite*. Some constructs with suffixes such as *-ism* and *-ese* denote a certain kind of behavior exclusively related to people such as *terrorism* or (speak) *journalese*. Having this in mind, it is reasonable to expect that these suffixes are added to proper nouns denoting people. However, the same suffixes may be added to other kinds of proper nouns denoting places, objects or time.

In this section, the complex words with proper nouns and *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ness* and *-ship* are compared and contrasted together since they mostly share the same semantics in new formations and produce equivalent outputs i.e. abstract nouns denoting quality or state. The two suffixes *-ism* and *-ist* stand in a paradigmatic relationship within the sets they comprise, and consequently they attach to the same proper nouns as bases. Constructions with the suffixes *-(i)ana*, *-ese* and *-ite* are discussed independently due to their unique meaning.

6.3.1 Nominal suffixed proper nouns with abstract meaning

The suffixes *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ness* and *-ship* are added to either nominal or adjectival bases to form abstract nouns denoting quality or state. The three rival suffixes which typically take nominal bases are *-dom*, *-hood* and *-ship*, whereas the suffix *-ness* prototypically takes adjectival bases. The rival counterpart to the suffix *-ness* is the suffix *-ity*; however, the suffix *-ity* is not found with proper nouns at all in the corpus. The corpus analysis of proper nouns as derivational bases is in line with traditional theoretical accounts on the difference in productivity between rival suffixes *-ness* and *-ity* (Aronoff 1976)⁴¹.

Knowing that abstract nouns are more closely “specified in a particular instance” (Marchand 1969: 336), the corpus examples are suitable for demonstrating subtle semantic differences of the constructions with proper nouns and the four suffixes. The contextual use is expected to provide significant insight inasmuch as the reading of state nominalizations may depend more on their surroundings than on “any inherent quality of the affixes or processes involved” (Bauer and Huddleston 2002: 1700). In theory, proper nouns may be derived with all four suffixes in a basically unrestricted way; and yet, the preference for one suffix over another one is demonstrated in actual realization and use.

6.3.1.1 Construction with proper nouns and *-ness*

The native suffix *-ness* is one of the most studied suffixes in structural accounts and there are several reasons for that. Firstly, even though it is added to adjectives (both of native and Latinate origin as in *happy – happiness* or *destructive – destructiveness*), it may be attached to less likely bases and still produce semantically possible outputs e.g. *thingness*, *as-suchness*, *off-beatness*, *up-to-the minuteness*, *us-ness* (Adams 2001: 32). In fact, it may be attached to almost any category except for the verb category, which makes the suffix *-ness* “a sort of default way of forming abstract nouns from non-verbal categories in contemporary English” (Bauer et al. 2013: 246). Secondly, it is rendered semantically the simplest of all abstract noun-forming suffixes (Bauer 1983) and almost entirely regular (Bauer and Huddleston 2002)⁴²; consequently, it produces complex words which are highly compositional and predictable in meaning e.g. the word *redness* denotes the quality of being red in color. Thirdly, it is not subject to lexical restriction since novel formations are almost never blocked (Aronoff 1976). It also allows for co-existence of parallel forms alongside the listed outputs

⁴¹ It is important to point out this is only the case when proper nouns are derivational bases. In practice, the suffix *-ity* is more productive in contemporary English than originally considered (see Arndt-Lappe 2014).

⁴² Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1703) list *business*, *Highness*, *wilderness* and *witness* as few lexicalized exceptions.

of *-ity* suffixation without any seeming differences in their semantics e.g. *curiosity* – *curiousness*. Finally, when compared to its rival suffix *-ity*, the suffix *-ness* does not cause any morphophonological changes, nor does it impact the stress pattern of the base.

Given their semantic and structural properties, the *-ness* derivatives are expected to be abundant with proper nouns in the COCA's texts. With proper nouns, the suffix *-ness* is productively found with personal names in all their forms e.g. *Dannyness*, *Kanye-ness*, *Michael J. Foxness*, *Shakespeare-ness*, and place names: city quarters e.g. *Brooklyn-ness*; cities e.g. *New York-ness*; states e.g. *Ohion-ness*; *Maine-ness*; and countries e.g. *Kenya-ness*.

The suffix *-ness* is invariably added to personal names with the aim of highlighting an abstract quality of the person denoted by the base. The abstract quality is not accidentally selected by speakers, but rather intentionally. The selected quality embodies the very essence of the person denoted by the base, which is also typical of the *-ness* derivatives that have common nouns as their bases e.g. *babeness* (Bauer et al. 2013: 261). The formations with proper nouns and *-ness* tend to be neutral or positive in their application, and they are often preceded by adjectival collocates which highlight the person's unique quality:

(14)

- a. On The WB's much-too-short-lived The L.A. Complex, he played the ultra--conservative patriarch and creator of a show called Saving Grace and while he wasn't playing himself -- Donald Gallagher was much less warm and cuddly -- his inherent *Alan Thicke-ness* added authority to the show-within-a-show, made it believable. (MAG: Hollywood Reporter, 2016)
- b. Just when the Stones seemed to be fading away, they shadoobied back to life with some of their toughest songs ever: the punk sleaze of "Shattered," the soulful *Keithness* of "Beast of Burden," the late-night-disco desolation of the chart-topping "Miss You." (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2001)
- c. So, if you are really worried that Stacy's distracted, then you need to turn her focus back on you, remind her why she loves you. You know, show her your *Fred-ness*. (MOV/TV: Drop Dead Diva, Toxic, 2011)
- d. I feel like in general though, she got a little away from herself, like she was going for this "new 80s reborn" kind of theme and it got away from her, and throughout the process, she lost her unique "*Gaganess*." (BLOG: Lady Gaga's 'Born This Way' sells 1.1 million in first week of release, 2012)
- e. The film is based on Stanley Donen's "Charade" (1963), treasured mostly for scenes of Audrey Hepburn purring over the mystery man played by Cary Grant in his last gasp of *Cary Grant-ness*. (NEWS: New York Times, 2002)

The connotations are also positive with place names when the abstract quality or the essence of the place evokes a feeling which should be first-hand experienced:

(15)

- a. Given those statistics, I had come to Las Vegas fully prepared to accept its transformation into the new all-American city. As it turns out, I wasn't even off the plane before Vegas began to assert its very *Vegasness*. (MAG: Sunset, 1998)
- b. The fair-like atmosphere draws crowds from all over who revel in the "*Austin-ness*" of it all. (BLOG: The most famous trailer park in America, 2012)
- c. Jackson grins, a tad embarrassed, amused by the *San Francisco-ness* of his experience. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 2004)
- d. Chicago continues to mature as a city that sells services, atmosphere, and experiences rather than locally manufactured goods or animal parts, and blues enjoys a corresponding new importance in the packaging of *Chicagoness*. The most readily consumed packages

condense *Chicago-ness* into images and atmospheres with familiar associations: the view from the Michigan Avenue bridge; the historical charge of big shoulders and hog butchers; the nostalgic appeal of robber-baron swankiness and the salt-of-the-earth charm of the urban village; a smokestack city rising from the prairie grass, a city of skyscrapers and high-end chain stores rising from the ruins of the smokestack city; sports, lots of sports; ethnic foods and ethnic music. (ACAD: American Scholar, 2002)

- e. In a February 1997 review in ARTnews, Suzanne Muchnic wrote, “The selected artworks delivered a profound message about the city’s amorphous nature, silent spaces, and elusive atmosphere,” while Peter Frank in LA Weekly stated, “In City of Vapor,’ the 17 mostly current residents of the world’s largest mirage capture the ephemeral nature of *Los Angelesness*.” (MAG: American Artist, 1998)

Apart from personal names and place names, hapaxes are found with the names of months and days of the week, and with brand names. The following constructs embody the true essence of an event or activity related to a specific time (16a-16c), and a unique product with the aim of creating a positive brand image (16d-16f):

(16)

- a. Can we hear Clio start to tune up when we realize the *Thursday-ness* of the first Independence Day? [...] But other dates, most in fact, have lost their day-ness in our historical recollections and imaginations, even such a recent one as the day now known and referred to by its date alone, September 11th, trivialized into advertising shorthand by the Twenty-Four-Seven, 7-Eleven-minded as 9/11. The *Tuesday-ness* of that day in 2001, coming right after Labor Day and opening schools for so many students across the country, would seem to be a particularly salient feature of Clio’s song (ACAD: Southwest Review, 2007)
- b. But there was this quiet day for which to be grateful. Blake wished he could find comfort in its *Sunday-ness*, but he could not. His upbringing had been left too far behind him, to the sorrow of so many. He had still read the Bible for a time after leaving his mother’s faith, but that came largely from habit, partly from guilt. (FIC: Cain at Gettysburg, 2012)
- c. # Which, apparently, and for whatever reason, is just the way it’s going to be. It’s October. He’s fired up. He’s firing up everybody else. And balls are flying off his bat over the fence. # Whatever it is, in the autumn, he’s no longer just Jim Leyritz. # He’s The King. # His *Octoberness*. # Awesome in autumn # (NEWS: USA Today, 1998)
- d. As at every step in the development of Diet Coke, which, incidentally, was and still is marketed with a lowercase d on the label to indicate “that its dietary qualities were secondary to its Coke-ness,” the concept of the product was carefully calculated by the company. (MAG: American Heritage, 2006)
- e. *Jaguarness*, Rabinowitz says, will take care of the rest if all of that falls into place. (MAG: The Atlantic, 2018)
- f. A Harley-Davidson gets its distinctive staccato exhaust note from a design compromise William Harley made in 1907. Harley created his first V-twin by grafting a second cylinder onto an existing single, using a forked connecting rod to join both pistons to a single crankshaft throw. This single-pin crank design can’t rev very high and produces excessive vibration, but it’s the very essence of *Harleyness*. (MAG: Popular Mechanics, 1996)

Without any exception, all the above [ProperN-ness]_N constructs are abstract nouns denoting a (unique) quality of the base, and this semantic information is incorporated in the following schema:

III. < [[X]_{ProperNi} ness]_{Nj} ↔ [(Unique) Quality of SEM_i]_j >

Syntactically, the [ProperN-ness]_N constructs are frequently used in of-genitive constructions, either as heads or modifiers. Formally represented as [DET N_{head} of NP_{mod}] in Construction Grammar (Stefanowitsch 2003: 414), the of-genitive construction is one of the most semantically complex constructions in English due to numerous relations between the modifier and the head noun. In Cognitive Grammar, Langacker (1992: 484) describes an of-phrase as a relationship between two entities in which the trajector or subject is *an inherent and restricted subpart* of the landmark or object (the author's emphasis). For instance, the quantifier scope is more "accessible" in an of-phrase than in other phrases because of an inherent intrinsic relationship e.g. *fathers of many children/fathers with many children* vs. *fathers of few children/*fathers with few children* (Langacker 1992: 494, the author's quotation and examples). Stefanowitsch (1998) finds Langacker's abstractionist approach to be overgeneralized and unclear at first, but later in another study, Stefanowitsch (2003: 438) concludes that "[...] the of-genitive assigns roles that I have called, for want of a better, ENTITY and INTRINSIC ENTITY."

Despite being too broad, this general interpretation of the of-genitive construction is in accordance with the dual use of the [ProperN-ness]_N constructs in of-genitive constructions: a) they are entities as heads e.g. *the soulful Keithness of "Beast of Burden", the "Austin-ness" of it all, the San Francisco-ness of his experience, the Thursday-ness of the first Independence*; and b) they are intrinsic entities as modifiers e.g. *his last gasp of Cary Grant-ness, the packaging of Chicagoness, the ephemeral nature of Los Angeles-ness, the very essence of Harley-ness*. A larger sample of the [ProperN-ness]_N constructs would provide an insight into more specific semantic roles in of-genitive constructions, especially regarding the two central meanings: *possession* and *partition* (Miladinović 2015; Stefanowitsch 1998, 2003)⁴³. These examples simply confirm that -ness suffixation is a default way of producing abstract nouns which could stand for any kind of entity as they are not semantically or pragmatically restricted by other constituents of a more complex syntactic structure (such as of-genitive).

Analogical word-formation is also possible when the nonce-formations with proper nouns and the suffix -ness are modeled on the lexicalized expression *Your Highness* (Šuković 2024b: 80-81)⁴⁴. In this case, the -ness derivative is preceded by a possessive adjective, which serves as the starting point for establishing the proportional relation and connection with the model i.e. *Your Highness* :: Possessive Adjective + ProperN-ness. The analogical link is based on the semantic meaning of the model (referring to an important person/royalty) even though it is not used in the immediate context. The model and target words have a different pragmatic function, though. The target words are not used to show respect but rather the speaker's disapproval and they are meant ironically:

(17)

- a. # COMES NOW WORD THAT MR. DONALD Trump is getting into the golf course business in a big way, with the imminent opening of his new Trump International Club in the Palm Beaches. To the prospect of *His Donaldness* being in golf, the true believer must have but one reaction: # Oh. My. God. # But fear not. (MAG: Forbes, 1998)
- b. Q What kind of market can Barry Bonds expect? A The last time *His Barryness* hit the market, he received exactly zero offers to leave San Francisco. (MAG: Sporting News, 2006)

⁴³ The sense of possession in of-genitive constructions with derived proper nouns as the syntactic constituents is explained in reference to the combination of suffixes -ify/-ize and -(c)ation with proper nouns (see 7.3.1), and the sense of partition in reference to the suffix -(i)ana with proper nouns (see 6.3.5). Different semantic relations of possession are also encoded in the -dom constructs (see 6.3.1.2).

⁴⁴ The examples in (17) and the findings were presented in the author's promotion of her doctoral research at the conference *Anglophonia: Forging Paths International Student Conference in English Studies* (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb) and published afterwards (Šuković 2024b).

- c. I think we may have got it all wrong, here is an exclusive interview with *His Charlieness* on impending climate catastrophe. (BLOG: The ‘secret’ list of the BBC 28 is now public 2012)
- d. Things just get more sublimely ridiculous from here. If you ever needed to make a case for how invaluable *Her Kateness* is to saving this show’s bacon circa 2019, this is exhibit A. DF # 5. (MAG: rollingstone.com, 2019)
- e. I’m a one Star Butterfly. And you must be Baby. Oh. Food. Yes, I prepared this spread for you, Miss Baby. Please help yourself... More, please. That took me all day to make. Please. I would love to make you more. So, *Your Baby-ness*, how does this evaluation work? (TV/MOV: Star vs. the Forces of Evil, Baby/Running with Scissors, 2017)

6.3.1.2 Construction with proper nouns and *-dom*

In word-formation literature, the accounts on the semantics of *-dom* seem diverse because of its overlapping meanings. From a diachronic point of view, Marchand (1969: 262-4) shows that *-dom* was originally an independent word (meaning ‘jurisdiction, state, statue’), and it was part of compounds with adjectives as non-heads e.g. *freedom* and *wisdom*. Later as an affix, it was added to nominals and developed several connected meanings. Its literal sense ‘territory, domain, region’ as in *dukedom*, *earldom* and *kingdom* was extended to its figurative sense ‘land, world of’ as in *boydom*, *fandom*, and *ladydom* as well as to the meaning of ‘inhabitants’ as in *artistdom*, *spinsterdom* and *teacherdom*. Marchand also illustrates the meaning of collectivity with nouns denoting ‘status, realm, collectivity’ as in *crookdom*, *gangdom* and *nazidom*, and nouns denoting ‘group united by a common interest’ e.g. *bookdom*, *fandom*, *moviedom* etc. Nouns denoting ‘collective body of people representative of’ have their *-ism* counterparts denoting doctrines as in *attorneydom/attorneyism*, *gangsterdom/gangsterism* and *Nazidom/Nazism*. The author pays less attention to its neutral ‘status, condition’ meaning as in *stardom* and *bachlerdom*. The suffix is said to be particularly productive in American English, and it may be used in humorous or disapproving contexts.

In contrast, Adams (2001: 60-1) highlights the ‘state’ meaning of the suffix *-dom* as the most typical one as in *apedom*, *clerkdom* and *yuppiedom*, and enumerates other meanings: ‘collectivities’ e.g. *dollardom*, *gangdom* and *studentdom*; ‘realm’ e.g. *crookdom*, *golfdom* and *teacherdom*; ‘(politically and otherwise) defined territory’ e.g. *citydom*, *cookdom* and *kingdom*; and ‘title’ e.g. *earldom*, *cookdom* and *popedom*. Both Marchand and Adams point out that there is a certain overlap in meaning of some words, and therefore they list them twice.

Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1701) also address the issue of etymological relatedness of the suffix *-dom* with the noun *doom* to highlight its former nominal character. They take the sense of ‘state/condition of being’ as the most general or neutral with nominal formations ending in *-dom* e.g. *boredom*, *martyrdom* and *stardom*. They also include the reading of ‘territory under the jurisdiction of/associated with’ as in *dukedom*, *earldom*, and *fairydome*, and ‘collectivity of’ as in *gangsterdom* and *officialdom* (with a derogatory tone) and *puppydom* (with a jocular tone). The suffix *-dom* is also said to be very productive in American English.

The most comprehensive description of nominals ending in *-dom* is provided by Bauer (2001: 163-72) who compares the use of Proto-Germanic **-dōm* in three modern languages Danish, English and German. The author systemizes Marchand’s list of all *-dom* meanings and identifies four main senses using Marchand’s examples: ‘territory,’ ‘collectivity,’ ‘state or condition,’ and figurative ‘world of’ (which is associated with not only the meaning of ‘territory,’ but also with the meaning of ‘people as a class’ and the meaning of ‘a group with a common interest’). Out of four senses, the general abstract meaning ‘state or condition’ is taken as the oldest one, which also appears in all three languages; on the other hand, the ‘territory’ and ‘collective’ meaning are considered as separate inasmuch as there is no meaning of collectivity in Danish, which is on the contrary very common in English and German.

The examples from COCA confirm that all four meanings as in (Bauer 2001) can be assigned to new formations with proper nouns and *-dom*⁴⁵:

(18)

- a. One rainy day last spring, an eager group huddled in hooded parkas to follow Porter here, there and everywhere around Soho, then to that Holy Grail of *Beatledom*, Abbey Road. (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 2001)
- b. Sting does not need the windfall. He has homes in London, Southern California and New York and a villa in Tuscany, where the Police rehearsed for four weeks this spring. Copeland calls it “the magic *Stingdom*.” (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2007)
- c. The Tea Party movement is active across the country, but it has had only limited success in the three nations of the northern alliance. Of the sixty members of the House Tea Party caucus, only three hail from *Yankeedom*, and not one comes from the Left Coast or New Netherland. (MAG: The Washington Monthly, 2011)
- d. Spider-Man, then Marvel’s flagship character, survived Ditko’s departure (artist John Romita took over the book), but *Marveldom* was shaken to the core when Jack Kirby defected to DC in 1970. (MAG: Entertainment Weekly, 2003)
- e. That issue, along with countless others from the ‘50s through the ‘80s, were illustrated by Samm Schwartz, who offered teenage readers an alternative to the monotony of *Archie-dom*. (MAG: A.V. Club, 2016)
- f. Smiley is also a cuckold of near-mythic proportions: his wife, the glamorous and rarely-at-home Lady Ann, seems to sleep with everybody but him. (She has doubtless slept at least once with James Bond: he’s just her type.) When John le Carr dies, there will be no pseudo-le Carrs, rotating the clichs of *Smileydom* through their potboilers. (MAG: The Atlantic Monthly, 2011)
- g. It’s not one of the best episodes, but the scene of the giant loaf pinning Lucy to the sink is part of the iconography of *Lucydom* and of the ‘50s -- and no, we weren’t really hip to phallic symbolism back then. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1997)
- h. The 29 men who wrote home about their motivations immediately after the battle did not touch on exhortative patriotic themes as often as they had before the battle. There was less talk of “the cause,” “the preservation of the Union,” the struggle against “subjugation by *Lincolndom*,” or the “upholding of the Constitution.” (ACAD: Armed Forces & Society, 1991)
- i. Now a drum roll, please, as Santa goes for three cats, the triple axel, the trifecta, the hat trick of pet *Santadom*. (SPOK: CBS_SunMorn, 1999)
- j. Many a denizen of *Harry Potterdom* had higher hopes for this week’s Fantastic Beasts: The Crimes of Grindelwald. (MAG: Vanity Fair, 2018)
- k. # This is the last uniformed Brave, other than Bobby Cox, to have been a part of the entire 14-year division-title streak. To have been there for the worst-to-first season and every season since. # He and Chipper Jones, and Cox, have been the faces of the Braves. Now that Mount Rushmore of *Bravesdom* is losing its bearded face, and how much longer will Chipper and Bobby be around? (Judging from Chipper’s comments today, perhaps not as long as we thought). (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2009)
- l. “I’m pro-choice,” she says-then adds, with utter conviction, “but I personally would never have an abortion.” This she relates to the gun issue, explaining that she recognizes the right to own a gun, but would never pick up one herself. # AN OLD PRO REFLECTS # In light of the ongoing controversies of *Rosiedom*, it’s of more than passing interest to hear from one

⁴⁵ The examples in (18) and the findings of this section were presented in the author’s poster presentation (Šuković 2024a).

of her beloved forerunners: Mike Douglas, the smooth-voiced host who ruled the afternoon air for years. (MAG: National Review, 2000)

- m. Forced to defend such an expansive area and to find ways to finance his operations, Smith exercised more and more control over civil affairs, until detractors began referring to his command as the “*Kirby Smithdom*.” When confronted by an enemy incursion, Smith preferred to fight delaying actions until he could evaluate the threat, then concentrate his dispersed military assets. (MAG: Military History, 2010)
- n. But the book didn’t seem to satisfy Lily’s need for *Marthadom*. So one night while she was ironing shirts I asked her flat out why she thought Martha Stewart was special. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1995)
- o. Not just any beautiful blonde can land a network anchor job. But almost any blonde has a shot at *Marladom*. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1990)
- p. It’s Pop music, but *Gaga-dom* is the thing: a persona, something like the incarnation of Pop stardom itself that she has foisted upon the world. (MAG: The Atlantic Monthly, 2010)

The ‘territory’ meaning of the constructs with proper nouns and *-dom* is the most obvious one, because it can be related to an actual physical place: a city quarter (18a), a villa (18b), a country (18c). The schema which underlies the formation of these constructs is represented as follows:

IV. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *dom*]_{Nj} ↔ [Territory of SEM_i]_j >

The ‘world of’ meaning is interpreted with the names of fictional charecters from comic books (18d and 18e), books (18f) and TV series (18g), but also with historical figures (18h). All the constructs are used figuratively, and thus, this piece of information should be incorporated into the schema’s representation:

V. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *dom*]_{Nj} ↔ [(Figuratively) World of SEM_i]_j >

The ‘collective’ meaning of examples (18i-18k) is straightforward given that context provides a sense of group members e.g. *many a denizen*, *trifecta*, (faces of) *Mount Rushmore*. This use of proper nouns with *-dom* is figurative as well as a bit derogatory and/or jocular. Moreover, as Bauer (2001) suggests, it can be linked to the meaning ‘world of’ in (18j and 18k) in the sense that a group makes its own reclusive realm. The constructs (18i-18k) are licensed by the following schema:

VI. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *dom*]_{Nj} ↔ [Group Members of SEM_i]_j >

The sense of an abstract ‘state or condition’ may be conveyed by *-dom* suffixation with proper nouns denoting people. This sense implies unique qualities of a person, wheter it is related to their attitudes (18l), behaviour (18m-18o), or exceptional traits (18p). Schematically, this meaning is identical to the meaning of the *-ness* construction in (III); one of the constructs has an attested doublet e.g. *Gagadom* – *Gaganess*. Thus, the schema is represented as follows:

VII. < [[x]_{ProperNi} *dom*]_{Nj} ↔ [(Unique) Quality of SEM_i]_j >

In Construction Morphology, the co-existence of more than one meaning may be motivated by sense extension and polysemy (Booij 2010a, 2017). A construction may specify related meanings which are linked to more than one schema i.e. subschemas; for instance, *-er* nominalizations which denote agents and instruments may be formally represented in terms of two separate subschemas

originating from one dominating schema (Booij 2017: 36)⁴⁶. The advantage of this approach is that it does not require the exact direction of sense extension for each construct on the one hand, and it is suitable for diachronic cases such as the conflation of historically different suffixes on the other hand.

The four proposed readings ‘territory of,’ ‘(figuratively) world of,’ ‘group members of’ and ‘(unique) quality of’ share the sense of *possession*. In Cognitive Grammar, possession is a relation between a possessor (typically a human) and a possessed thing (Radden and Dirven 2007: 279-280). In many world languages including English, the possession relation is also encoded as location; this is exhibited in the interchangeability of static verbs *be* and *have* in describing a location or possession e.g. *There are five floors in this building* vs. *This building has five floors*, and *He’s got a sister* vs. *She’s his sister*.

The meaning of possession is more closely studied in Genitive constructions either within the prototype theory (Taylor 1989) or the conceptual theory of metaphor (Nikiforidou 1991). Stefanowitsch (1998) applies both approaches to analysing *s*-genitive and *of*-genitive constructions in English and shows that the semantic relation Possessed-Possessor can be linked to other productive meanings. There are three productive semantic extensions from the Possessed-Possessor relation which can be applied to the analysis of the meaning of the constructs with proper nouns and *-dom*: the Thing at Location-Location relation can be interpreted in the examples (18a-18h) in the sense that the person in the place is the owner or creator of that place⁴⁷; Social and Professional relations are encoded in the meaning of groups whose members have close relationships and shared interest as in (18i-18k)⁴⁸; and the Attribute-Holder of Attribute relation is applied to the domain of (personal) attributes and characteristics as in (18l-18p)⁴⁹. Based on these semantic relations, it can be argued that four *-dom* subschemas (which might have diachronically developed as separate ones) originate from one dominating constructional schema:

VIII. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}_i} \text{ dom}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{SEM}_i \text{ in Possession of } Y]_j \rangle$

The variable Y in the dominating schema stands for the notion which is more closely specified in the semantic information of the four subschemas: territory, (figuratively) world, group members, and (unique) quality. All the [ProperN-*dom*]N constructs can be associated with the dominating schema in (VIII), and the semantic information of the dominating schema can be further segmented (Šuković 2024a):

IX. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}_i} \text{ dom}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow \{ \langle [\text{Territory of SEM}_i]_j \rangle, \langle [(\text{Figuratively}) \text{ World of SEM}_i]_j \rangle, \langle [\text{Group Members of SEM}_i]_j \rangle, \langle [(\text{Unique}) \text{ Quality of SEM}_i]_j \rangle \}$

6.3.1.3 Other constructs with proper nouns and abstract noun-forming suffixes

The two abstract noun-forming suffixes *-ship* and *-ness* are infrequently used with proper nouns as recorded in COCA. The suffix *-ship* is attested once (creatively) in the *Waterworld* movie

⁴⁶ The dominating schema is formally represented as $\langle [V_i\text{-er}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [x \text{ involved in SEM}_i]_j \rangle$, and the subschemas as $\langle [V_i\text{-er}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{AGENT involved in SEM}_i]_j \rangle$ and $\langle [V_i\text{-er}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{INSTRUMENT involved in SEM}_i]_j \rangle$.

⁴⁷ The meaning of possession in the semantic relation Thing at Location-Location is accessed via metonymy (see Stefanowitsch 1998).

⁴⁸ Stefanowitsch (1998) provides the examples of Social and Professional relations which are modeled on Kinship relations and metaphor RELATIVES ARE POSSESSIONS (Nikiforidou 1991).

⁴⁹ According to Stefanowitsch (1998), the relation Attribute-Holder of Attribute implies *possession* in *s*-genitive constructions e.g. *Mary’s intelligence*, but *partition* in *of*-genitive constructions e.g. *the beauty of the woman*. This difference seems applicable in terms of internal vs. external attributes (*intelligence* vs. *beauty*). The [ProperN-*dom*]N constructs interpreted as having a ‘unique quality’ are more likely to be associated with internal attributes in the domain of possession.

transcript e.g. *Your Deaconship* after a character named Deacon. The constructs with proper nouns and the suffix *-hood* have the same form [ProperN-*hood*]_N and the collective meaning, but may be produced in different ways (Šuković 2024b: 82-83)⁵⁰:

(19)

- a. We're a brotherhood. A brotherhood of Santas. A *Santahood*, if you will. (TV, *Deadbeat, The Ghost of Christmas Presents*, 2015)
- b. *Obamahood*, steals from the responsible, gives to the irresponsible. (BLOG: Bank of America reports \$15.8 billion in homeowner relief, 2012)
- c. Christian didn't revel in his *Brando-hood*, friends and neighbors say. "I've known him eight years, and up until four years ago I didn't even know he was Marlon Brando's son," says Tommy Bina, co-owner of the Canyon Country Store, 15 minutes from the Brando compound. (NEWS: USA Today, 1990)

The formation *Santahood* (19a) may be categorized as an analogical formation given that there is an anaphoric model (i.e. brotherhood of Santas) which serves as the starting point for creating the proportional relation $x: x\text{-hood} :: \text{Santa}: \text{Santahood}$. Thanks to our extra-linguistic knowledge about a legendary outlaw who stole from the rich in order to help the poor, we may identify a link between *Obamahood* (19b) and the model which is not used in the immediate context (i.e. Robin Hood) and establish the proportional relation $\text{Robin Hood} :: \text{Obamahood}$. Due to a lack of the model in the immediate context, *Brando-hood* (19c) is most likely an output of an abstract schema which licenses the words of the same form-meaning correspondence as *childhood*, *adulthood*, *motherhood*, *sainthood* etc. It may be formally represented as a [ProperName-*hood*]_N morphological construct denoting a certain kind of quality.

6.3.2 Paradigmatic constructions with proper nouns and *-ism/-ist*

The suffix *-ism* is perhaps the most obvious choice for creating highly acceptable new formations with proper names as derivational bases. In practice, it has already given rise to a large number of established words and dictionary entries such as *Darwinism*, *Leninism*, *Marxism* etc. It is used as a default way of forming abstract nouns which denote one person's field of study and/or doctrine. The suffix may change the orthography of the base and cause phonological alternations e.g. *Socratism*.

A lot of the *-ism* suffixed proper nouns that are once formed as nonce words tend to be reused in the same genre of text in the corpus e.g. the nonce-formation *Fishism* is used in the transcripts of the TV series *Ally McBeal* eleven times. Nevertheless, it is more likely that the *-ism* suffixed proper nouns are used across different genres in COCA. For example, the browse option gives different frequency sections for the *-ism* derivatives of the two most prominent political figures of the 1980's, Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. *Reaganism* is most often used in blogs, websites and magazines, whereas *Thatcherism* is most often used in academic journals, magazines and news. Another interesting piece of information regarding the suffix *-ism* is that its use was a fad of the 90's (especially in the magazines and news reporting current events), and later in the 2000's and 2010's it was brought back by bloggers. These tendencies are documented in the COCA's charts for two *-ism* derivatives *Clintonism* (76 tokens) and *Obamaism* (77 tokens).

⁵⁰ The examples in (19) and the findings of this section were presented in the author's promotion of her doctoral research at the conference *Anglophonia: Forking Paths International Student Conference in English Studies* (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb) and published afterwards (Šuković 2024b).

The doctrine reading of the complex words with the suffix *-ism* is readily interpreted even with neologisms and highly context-dependent nonce-formations. The *-ism* derivatives are habitually preceded or followed by a short definition or a further explanation:

(20)

- a. On a spectrum that runs from “fully institutionalized liberal democracy” to “Totalitarian nightmare” *Putinism* is somewhere in the middle. (WEB: The Pussy Riot Trial Is Bad, But It’s Definitely Not “*Stalinism*,” 2012)
- b. “Moreover, whereas a more “viable, regulated capitalism” at first distinguished *Obamaism* from socialism, it now defined Obama’s brand of socialism.” (ACAD: Commentary, 2010)
- c. It was this spiritual condition that sustained his optimism as he attempted to share with the Indian people, not the cowardly or servile nonviolence of the weak, but the “nonviolence of the strong,” which is based on courage. It is on this spiritual plane that we find the true essence of *Gandhism*. (BLOG: Is that the wrong word?, 2012)
- d. Whether colonialism, fascism and *Nazism*, *Francoism*, denatured democracy, *Stalinism*, it’s always the same enemy: the evil which in one man desires to subjugate and humiliate another, to force the other into baseness, the meanness that seizes the occasion to resist in the name of some illusory cause. (ACAD: October, 1998)
- e. I am not defending *Don Juanism*, you know, sex for grades and so forth. (MAG: Harpers Magazine, 1993)
- f. Mr-WHY: What Ken does, is he draws out white America’s deep-seated fears about black people. GOLDBERG: You think he’s an Uncle Tom? Mr-WHY: I call him a marquee Uncle Tom, meaning that he -- he takes his *Uncle Tomism* and he markets it. (SPOK: CBS_EyeToEye, 1994)
- g. Paige. It’s beautiful. It’s for meditation? Tell me what you see. You know, like a Rorschach. What is this, *Zen Freudism*? (TV/MOV: Wild Palms, Risisng Sons, 1993)
- h. After a long debate they decided to find out: They would visit a large city, for example, New York, in order to convince themselves just how many of the principles of “*Mosesism*,” “*Jesusism*” and Socialism regulate the lives of modern people. (FIC: MELUS, 2003)

The suffix *-ism* is mostly added to personal names of individuals who are public and political figures with a powerful or major impact on modern society or throughout history e.g. *Blairism*, *Caesarism*, *Calvinism*, *Cameronism*, *Carterism*, *Forbesism*, *Fordism*, *Gorbachevism*, *Lewinskiism*, *Platonism*, *Rockefellerism*, *Romneyism*, *Rooseveltism*, *Titoism* etc. The more influential the person is, the wider interpretation of the *-ism* derivative is. The *-ism* derivatives with the same base may take different evaluative tones depending on the speaker’s point of view:

(21)

- a. Dallek portrayed Reagan as a reactionary throwback: “*Reagan-ism* is a return to old-fashioned Republicanism -- large tax cuts for the rich, less government help for the poor, weaker enforcement of civil rights, fewer controls on industry, less protection for the environment, and emotional rhetoric on the virtues of hard work, family, religion, individualism, and patriotism.” (ACAD: Commentary, 2011)
- b. It would appear that the know-nothing spirit of *Reagan-ism* has been revived for the 1990s, as senators and representatives assert once again with a straight face that trees and volcanoes cause smog. (ACAD: Humanist, 1996)

The suffix *-ist* is often discussed alongside the suffix *-ism* as it takes the same proper nouns in creating established words and dictionary entries such as *Darwinist*, *Leninist*, *Marxist* etc. Marchand (1969: 308) gives its basic meaning ‘one connected with’ and Bauer et al. (2013: 234)

state that *-ist* derivatives denote followers or proponents of a prominent person or doctrine. The ‘follower’ meaning is rejected by Booij (2010a) on the grounds that in the course of time a doctrine may embrace further ideas than the ones which were originally shared; therefore, a person is an adherent of the doctrine and not a follower of one particular individual as in the case of *Marxism*. The unambiguous definition given by the author is “person with the ability, disposition or ideology denoted by the word in *-ism*” (Booij 2010a: 33). This meaning is also more evident with other bases – the established word *socialist* can only be defined in comparison with the *-ism* formation and not its formal base alone e.g. *socialist* – *socialism* vs. **socialist* – *social*.

The *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic relationship has already been discussed as an exemplary case of second-order schemas (see 3.2.3). There are two formal representations with proper nouns, the one with specified semantic information ‘disposition/ideology’ following Booij and Audring (2017: 290) as in schema (X), and the one without it following Booij and Masini (2018: 50) as in schema (XI):

- X. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Person with Property Y related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$
- XI. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow \textit{SEM}_i \rangle \approx \langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Person with Property Y related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

Based on the sample, the $[\textit{ProperN-ist}]_N$ constructs denoting individuals are less frequent than their counterparts $[\textit{ProperN-ism}]_N$ in COCA. It is more likely that they are established words (22a-22e), and there are only a few hyphenated hapaxes (22f and 22g):

(22)

- a. What are you now then? I’m a *Bonapartist* and a Democrat. (TV: *Les Misérables*, 2019)
- b. “He is kind of a *Calvinist* about the law,” Navaln said. “Once he comes to his conclusion, nothing stops him.” (MAG: *Mother Jones*, 2005)
- c. Yes. Well, I, you know, I introduced it to him because I study it and he was curious, and he was very skeptical at first being a *Darwinist* and not at all interested in spirituality, but... (SPOK: *CNN_KingWknd*, 2002)
- d. No, I quoted W.E.B. Du Bois, who was a *Stalinist*, not a *Marxist*, to establish where the concept of white privilege did come from, and that it predated postmodernist theory by a quarter of a century. (WEB: *The Privilege Delusion*, 2012)
- e. Likewise, it could be run by the most ardent *Platonist*, according to whom the truth makers for theories of languages are eternal facts about relations among nonnatural objects. (WEB: *Do you want to know how to tell when you’re getting old*, 2012)
- f. “I think Adolf is a *Malcolm-X-ist*,” a Troutsky sidekick says. (FIC: EBSCO, 2010)
- g. “Even though it is said that I am a *Trotskyist-ist* -- when I first came to Lima I was told: In Arequipa, you are branded as a *Trotskyist* -- I have never been one. But it is not a plague that can be transmitted to other people... #” (ACAD: *World Affairs*, 1993)

The adjectival *-ist* derivatives with proper names are very frequent either as established words or hapax legomena in COCA as in *Castroist* practices, *Fidel-ist* Cuba, *Napoleonist* democrat, *Peronist* electoral victory, *Reaganist* regime, *Rousseauist* golden age, *Titoist* Yugoslavia, *Trotskyist* theoretician, *Trumpist* narrative etc. Bauer (1983) labels the adjectival suffix *-ist* as transpositional, but also states that it is marked for particular discourse use because it is added to personal names to indicate a connection with a political leader and their group. The $[\textit{ProperN-ist}]_A$ constructs have the same semantic reading of ‘disposition/ideology’ as their nominal counterparts $[\textit{ProperN-ist}]_N$ and therefore, they may be as well interpreted as the members of the *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic relationship; otherwise, we would use *s*-genitive construction e.g. *Fidel’s* Cuba, *Peron’s* victory, *Reagan’s*

regime etc. Moreover, the adjectival *-ist* derivatives with proper names may serve as the first-level derivatives to which productive prefixes are unrestrictedly added (see 7.4.2.3 and 7.4.2.5). For this reason, the adjectival *-ist* is schematically subschema of the *-ism* construction:

$$\text{XII. } \langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ist}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Having Property Y related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$$

As Booij (2010a: 34) also notices, a paradigmatic relationship between any set of the *-ist* and *-ism* derivatives may operate in both directions e.g. *abolitionist* may have preceded *abolitionism*. If a possibility of the two-way direction in a paradigmatic relationship is indeed a linguistic phenomenon, a lack of one member in the *-ism/-ist* set may be expected as well. By default, the missing member of any set is a possible word, because there are no pragmatic restrictions to be applied.

In case that the *-ism/-ist* set consists of words which are not dictionary entries such as proper nouns, there can be two members with slightly different meanings in the same set. In the news article (23a), the opinion columnist argues against Hillary Clinton's political campaign strategy, whereas in an example taken from a blog (23b), a commentator illustrates Hillary Clinton's overall performance in the U.S. politics:

(23)

- a. *Hillaryism* embodies the essence of modern liberalism. Having reached the limits of a welfare state grown increasingly sclerotic, bureaucratic and dysfunctional, the mission of modern liberalism is to patch the fraying safety net with yet more programs and entitlements. (NEWS: ORegister, 2016)
- b. Yes, Hillary is a socialist, but she's first-and-foremost a *Hillary-ist*. And that means she's not a dogmatic ideologue who would allow her ideological beliefs to threaten her power. In other words, like her husband, she's a chameleon. She'll adapt to the winds-of-change to stay in power. (BLOG: Closing Time at the Club of Disaffection, 2012)

6.3.2.1 Connecting meanings in constructions with proper nouns and *-ism/-ist*

There is also another reading of the complex words with the suffix *-ism* which refers to peculiarities of language or speech, and as such it primarily attaches to adjectives e.g. *Britishism*, *colloquialism*, *neologism* etc. Although Marchand (1969) and Bauer et al. (2013) list this use of the suffix as productive with proper nouns, a closer inspection of the COCA examples suggests that this use is virtually non-existent even with the proper nouns denoting individuals who use language in any kind of its form i.e. writers, singers, actors, orators/politicians and local inhabitants. In the selected examples (24), the meaning of the *-ism* derivatives is more likely to be interpreted as a system of beliefs or principles and actions connected to the person denoted by the base⁵¹. This reading is identical to the reading of the *-ism* derivatives which have either common nouns or adjectives as bases e.g. *capitalism* and *nationalism*. The meaning 'peculiarities of language' is excluded when the larger context is provided:

⁵¹ Bauer et al. (2013: 266) identify two separate *-ism* readings: 'system of belief or doctrine' and 'pattern of action.' Adams (2001: 60) defines three major *-ism* senses: a) 'state/condition,' b) 'activity' and c) 'system of belief/theory/principles.' Out of these three senses, only the 'system of belief/theory/principles' reading is interpreted with proper nouns.

(24)

- a. The Byronic hero started as a unique, novel individual. But as *Byronism* swept through Europe, it gradually became a recurrent recognizable literary type and finally an all-too-familiar cliché figure. (ACAD: Style, 1990)
- b. A more apt description of Clooney's personal philosophy might be another *Sinatraism*: "I did it my way." Unafraid to speak his mind, the actor recently took on Fox's Bill O'Reilly after the abrasive talk-show host criticized the pace of charitable distributions from the Sept. 14 "A Tribute to Heroes" telethon, which Clooney helped organize. (MAG: Newsweek, 2001)
- c. I don't go, "I gotta make sure I put some of that *Denzel Washington-ism* in the movie." I don't want tricks. I don't want to lose my mojo. (The thing that seems to come back is that Denzel Washington doesn't want to know how he does what he does. I believe this. I think this fact is basic to his charisma. There is something about the way he is so self-contained, the sense that everything he feels and every decision he makes exists independently of whomever he's talking to.) (BLOG: Denzel Washington, the Oscars, and 'Flight,' 2012)
- d. Their cousin Shunkichi, enrolled in the literature department of his own university, appeared to have likewise set his sights on a writer's career. Nobuko had long been on friendly terms with him, and now their common interest in literary topics made for even closer ties. He did not, however, share her unbridled enthusiasm for *Tolstoyism*, then very much in vogue. (FIC: New England Review, 2007)
- e. Why are they destroying the engines on these "clunkers"? To save the planet (*Al Goreism*); another farce. This corporate welfare is just one more proof of the Feral Gov. inept handling (or skillful mishandling??) of trillions of dollars, which don't even exist yet. (BLOG: Cash for Clunkers: Victims of Their Own Success?, 2012)
- f. Make enough money, everything else will follow. Quote me. It's a *Fishism*. (TV: Ally McBeal, Pilot, 1997)

The [ProperN-*ism*]_N constructs in (24) are licensed by the following schema:

XIII. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *ism*]_{Nj} ↔ [System of Beliefs/Principles/Actions related to SEM_i]_j >

The suffix *-ist* is also added to either the names of writers or characters to indicate an individual whose main occupation is the study of the people and/or their work denoted by the base:

(25)

- a. "Unlike the fictional Don Juan or the Marquis de Sade, Casanova wasn't a sexual predator," says Ted Emery, Ph.D., an assistant professor of Italian at Dickinson College and a noted *Casanovist*." (MAG: Mens Health, 2001)
- b. Any *Cervantist* who has made his way through the copious studies of encyclopedic commentators and biographers such as Rodriguez Marn, Ameza, and Astrana Marn, the sociologically-oriented interpretations of such influential historians as Castro and Maravall, and the compilations of information and ephemera provided more recently by the numerous disciples of Braudel's school of historical materialism, would certainly find difficult to accept the premise that something radically new is being done. (ACAD: Hispanic Review, 2003)

The semantics of the above formations cannot be associated with any doctrines or ideologies to which a person may show inclination in the sense of adopting them and being committed to them. In this case, nouns denote agents, and according to Bauer et al. (2013), this is the most productive

use of the suffix *-ist* in modern English⁵². The reading is much closer to that of a professional in a specialized field or studies as in established common nouns *agronomist*, *classicist*, *economist*, and *physicist* (Bauer and Huddleston 2002: 1699). This meaning in complex words with proper nouns as bases can be schematically represented as follows:

XIV. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}_i} \textit{ist}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{Skilled Professional related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

In word-formation accounts on *-ism/-ist* suffixation, there is no mention of a possible semantic overlap between complex words ending in *-ism/-ist*. On the contrary, different readings are always listed separately, which could be due to a high degree of productivity and wide distribution of the two suffixes.

Alternatively, the meanings of the paradigmatic *-ism/-ist* constructions could all be connected. It could be argued that all the $[\text{ProperN-ism}]_N$ constructs denote certain kind of *inclination* in the sense of showing a tendency to particular ideology, beliefs, actions, profession etc., and that all $[\text{ProperN-ist}]_N$ constructs denote people with this particular inclination. It is important to point out that this connection of meanings is not identical to the systematic polysemous relations of *dom-* constructions with proper nouns as a result of metaphorical mapping (see 6.3.1.2). Actually, we may only assume that the sense connections might be a result of *an inherited property* of some part of the paradigmatic *-ism/-ist* schema and not the construction as a whole as in the case of the *-dom* constructs. In syntactic constructions, inheritance can be interpreted in terms of particular “networks as strict type hierarchies (with a single common root) or as a web of family-resemblance relationship” (Fried and Östman 2004: 72). The latter is polysemy, but the former is problematic at the word level, in the sense of defining what *hierarchy* is exactly.

We might argue that the unique denotation of the proper noun (i.e. person) is an inherited feature in all *-ism/-ist* schemas and subemas. If the highly productive *-ism/-ist* constructions share an inherited feature of *unique person denotation* via paradigmatic relationships, then a possible second-order schema with each member of the set is as follows:

XV. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN/Person } \textit{ism}}]_{\text{N}_i} \leftrightarrow [\text{Inclination}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN/Person } \textit{ist}}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{Person with Property Y related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

Following the main schema (XV), the second-order schemas may be further represented as follows:

XVI. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN/Person } \textit{ism}}]_{\text{N}_i} \leftrightarrow \{ \langle [\text{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle, \langle [\text{Beliefs/Principles/Actions}]_i \rangle \}$

XVII. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN/Person } \textit{ist}}]_{\text{N}_j} \leftrightarrow \{ \langle [\text{Follower/Adherent/Supporter of SEM}_i]_j \rangle, \langle [\text{Skilled Professional related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle \}$

6.3.3 Construction with proper nouns and *-ite*

In the previous section, it is demonstrated that constructions with proper nouns and *-ist* surpass the ‘follower’ meaning. Actually, the ‘follower’ reading is exclusively assigned to personal names which take the suffix *-ite* (Bauer et al. 2013). With regard to proper nouns denoting individuals⁵³, the suffix *-ite* is not as productive as the suffix *-ist*; it is mostly added to the names of politicians e.g. *Brezhnevite*, *Gorbachevite*, *Nixonite*, *Romneyite*, *Trotskyite* (its doublet is

⁵² Other two readings are ‘experiencer’ and ‘instrument’ (Bauer et al. 2013: 234).

⁵³ The suffix *-ite* is more commonly added to place names to denote inhabitants and such outputs have neutral connotations and create established words (see 2.6.2).

Trotskyist) etc. The form and meaning of the *-ite* construction can be represented in the following way:

XVIII. <[[x]_{ProperN/Person} *ite*]_{N_j} ↔ [Follower of SEM_i]_j >

The [ProperN/Person-*ite*]_N constructs usually have neutral or positive connotations (26a-c); however, in some contexts when speakers express an opposing viewpoint, they may also have negative connotations (26d-f):

(26)

- a. In news reports, an individual is called a communist, a *Hitlerite*, among others. (ACAD: Reading Improvement, 2015)
- b. I am not an *Obamanite*, as someone put it although I am considering voting for him. (WEB, ABC News, 2012)
- c. “This is a peek back to a better time,” he told a reporter a short while later as he walked through a sea of makeshift stands. “I’m a Jeffersonian and a *Reaganite*, and I like to remember how good things once were.” (NEWS: Washington Post, 2014)
- d. No, he’s an academic. He’s not a *Clintonite*. He’s not a rabid partisan on the left. He just isn’t. He’s an expert and he’s an academic. (SPOK: CNN_CapGang, 2001)
- e. I was surprised to hear one backbencher commend Johnson as “the only Conservative at the top able to put Thatcherite ideas in a way that is persuasive and convincing”. Johnson is not a *Thatcherite*. He is a risk-taker who will go for anything he thinks has a fair chance of working. (MAG: New Statesman, 2012)
- f. But do you expect a *Paulite* to know that or care, nope! (BLOG: Time to take car keys away from your father, 2012)

6.3.4 Construction with proper nouns and *-ese*

The suffix *-ese* belongs to the group of suffixes which derive words denoting inhabitants and language users e.g. *Burmese*, *Maltese*, *Viennese* etc. It is also the final element of words referring to a ‘characteristic jargon’ – according to Bauer (1983: 250), this suffix is completely homophonous to the suffix *-ese* in words denoting nationalities. However, following Marchand’s semantic description of the suffix *-ese* (1969: 286), the two suffixes are actually polysemous: the peculiarity and novelty of exotic places and their inhabitants and languages resulted in forming words “denoting a strangely peculiar style, a negatively characteristic jargon” as in *Nepalese*, *Senegalese*, *Vietnamese* etc. In his lexical entry of the *-ese* suffix, Bauer (1983: 251) also lists the ‘derogatory’ feature of the suffix and that the base must be a noun. Both linguists note a slight preference for proper nouns as bases in the dictionary data (Marchand 1969) and in actual language use (Bauer 1983).

When the suffix *-ese* is added to place names, new formations imply the speaker’s disparaging tone towards a particular ‘jargon’ associated with the place⁵⁴. The negative peculiarities related to a language may stem from one’s accent (27a and 27b), pronunciation (27c), vocabulary use (27d) or pragmatic implications (27e and 27f):

⁵⁴ The term ‘jargon’ refers to the unique semantic feature of the suffix (not a stylistic one).

(27)

- a. The R-dropping of *Harvard-ese* is no better than that of a Georgia farmer. (WEB: 50 Incorrect Pronunciations That You Should Avoid, 2012)
- b. “Wheah is he?” bleated a woman in some variation of *New Englandese*. (FIC: Fantasy & Science Fiction, 2007)
- c. In extreme cases, such as this fellow, I can only describe how to speak *New Zealandese* thusly: Pinch your nose (for the appropriate nasal tone), mumble, then swallow what remains, all the while keeping your teeth clenched. (MAG: Backpacker, 1998)
- d. In a language known as *Hollywoodese*, Grant is becoming a hyphenate: actor-producer. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1999)
- e. Because when I ask her if she’s leaning one way or the other on Arrested Development’s future, she gives me another sentence beginning with “Well...” which is *Los Angelese* for “I’m thinking of a good lie...” (MAG: Esquire, 2004)
- f. I don’t want to know the *Time-ese* or the *Newsweek-ese* version -- that omniscient, sort of ‘this is the way it was.’ (SPOK: NPR_ATC, 1993)

However, the *-ese* suffix can be also used in a neutral or positive manner with not only the names of places, but also the names of people and institutions. The ‘jargon’ feature remains unchanged:

(28)

- a. “I can’t help it. I love her. She’s so beautiful,” the woman agrees, her accent vintage *Brooklynese*. (MAG: Omni, 1994)
- b. Anthony, who grew up in Spanish Harlem, had a certain New York quality about him that attracted Scorsese. “We both grew up in ghetto-type neighborhoods,” the director says in his rat-a-tat *Manhattanese*.” (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1999)
- c. Others described the day in *Bostonese*: Conditions were “wicked good, top (tawp) to bottom (bawtom).” (MAG: Skiing, 1995)
- d. Prepared for a raging river, the guys instead found battling birds and friendly foreigners. (How do you translate “rope swing” from *Jersey-ese* to Japanese?) (MAG: Boys Life, 2002)
- e. Football coaches tend to be fluent in *John Wayne-ese*. So Colts Coach Chuck Pagano got on a call with reporters on Wednesday and described Denver quarterback Peyton Manning as a “man’s man.” (NEWS: New York Times, 2014)
- f. So then after -- after Carter had had a chance to -- see, I think that answer in *Clintonese* as we know now, was a bit narrow. (SPOK: Ind_Limbaugh, 1994)
- g. Bigger problems lie with the solar arrays that power Hubble and the Rate Sensor Units (in *NASA-ese* called RSUs, they are essentially gyroscopes) that help point the telescope. (MAG: Astronomy, 1994)
- h. Now, traders were also continuing to buzz about the chip stocks as Intel extended yesterday’s big loss. The catalyst today: shares of Micron, down more than 9 1/2. DLJ cut its rating on the chip-maker to an “underperform.” That’s essentially what Intel analyst Ashok Kumar said about Intel’s shares yesterday if you strip away all the *Wall Street-ese*. (SPOK: CNN_Movers, 2000)
- i. Phrases floated of their own accord across his dreaming mind. That term mad pact was involuntarily happening within him. Mutual assured destruction pact in *Pentagonese*, the lingua franca of the fighting man’s command. (FIC: Review of Contemporary Fiction, 2000)

The following example illustrates the double nature of the ‘jargon’ suffix *-ese* vividly:

(29)

The New York accent, variously called Bowery Dialect, *Brooklynese* and *New Yorkese*, has always been a point of both pride and shame. On the one hand, it was considered unrefined, something to be erased through education. On the other, it was gloried in, a code that linked New Yorkers in colorful communication that was both common and exclusive. (NEWS: New York Times, 1993)

In a nutshell, ‘jargon’ (as a distinctive language used by a particular group) is the inherent semantic feature of the constructional schema creating constructs with proper nouns and *-ese*:

XIX. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *ese*]_{Nj} ↔ [Jargon of SEM_i]_j >

In creative usage, the ‘jargon’ feature of the constructs [ProperN-*ese*]_N does not necessarily imply language peculiarities in general, but also a specific topic known to a tightly-knit group of people (30a) or a larger cultural community (30b):

(30)

- a. Have you ever dated two guys at the same time? Forgive me. It’s just that I’ve been juggling Ben and Josh for a couple of months now, and I think I need to make a decision. - Boy trouble? Now you’re talkin’ *Jackanese*! Come on. (TV, Will & Grace, New Will City, 2000)
- b. A sloppy Italian beef from Al’s, a gooey deep-dish pizza from Gino’s, a char cheddar Polish from the Wiener Circle, that’s *Chicagoeese* for ... (speech interrupted) (SPOK: ABC_GMA, 1996)

6.3.5 Construction with proper nouns and *-(i)ana*

Constructions with proper nouns and the suffix *-(i)ana* are analyzed in this thesis since relevant literature provides empirical evidence that proper nouns typically take this suffix (Bauer 1983; Bauer et al. 2013). Unfortunately, the suffix *-(i)ana* does not show a clearly discernible form in the COCA texts due to the fact that a lot of proper names of foreign origin which end in *-(i)ana* are listed as well e.g. *Svetlana* (a frequent personal name in the Slavic countries), *Tijuana* (a name of a city in Mexico), *Rivista Geografica Italiana* (a name of an Italian academic journal) etc. Therefore, the search had to be carried out manually and the examples were collected on the grounds of their semantic and pragmatic relevance.

According to earlier accounts based on dictionary entries, the suffix *-(i)ana* is attached mainly to proper nouns denoting people, and it gives rise to uncountable nouns meaning ‘things, especially literary facts, connected with the person in the base’ (Bauer 1983: 221). More recent research on corpus examples shows that the suffix *-(i)ana* is added to the names of people and places and it forms collective nouns denoting collections of any kind of specific (or memorable) items associated with the person or place e.g. *Washingtoniana*, *Houdiniana* (Bauer et al. 2013: 265). Its low frequency and a great number of new formations in corpora indicate high productivity.

The fact that the suffix *-(i)ana* may refer to a vast array of items is best illustrated by the most frequent derivative containing this suffix i.e. *Americana* (the total number of its tokens is 1487). The following examples show that the word *Americana* refers to any kind of products or associations with the American culture or way of living:

(31)

- a. “I love rooms decorated with touches of *Americana*, or just her colors. It reminds us that, in the words of John Philip Sousa, “The red and white and starry blue is freedom’s shield and hope.” (BLOG: Ketutar says so: A couple of notes about USA, 2012)
- b. “She can look classic *Americana*, and then she will have a bag on her shoulder that’s from Ghana. It’s all the layers. She is full of references.” (MAG: Harpers Bazaar, 2011)
- c. The menu has several *Americana* dishes that can satisfy the appetites of most patrons. (WEB: All tenderloins, all the time, 2012)
- d. “We’ve not reached our peak,” he adds. “I think in not too many years we’ll be the biggest professional sport around.... It’s a clean sport that’s a true slice of *Americana* with true American heroes.” (NEWS: USA Today, 1990)
- e. Shipley describes his music as a mix of country and *Americana*, styled after musicians like John Mayer and Jack Johnson. (NEWS: New York Times, 2009)

The use of the suffix *-(i)ana* with proper nouns denoting geographical places does not only indicate a collection of particular items associated with the place, but it also conveys an impression of cultural uniqueness with a clearly positive connotation. In examples (31a-31e), the *-(i)ana* derivative *Americana* might as well be replaced with a noun phrase consisting of the modifier *American* and noun as a head, but then the connotations would be neutralized. In the following examples, the ‘collective’ suffix *-(i)ana* with place names also highlights the historical or socio-cultural aspect of a place:

(32)

- a. Oatlands is owned these days by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and has a past full of *Washingtoniana*. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1997)
- b. The Poipu Bay course is affiliated with the Hyatt Regency Kauai Resort & Spa, a 500-room hotel stretching along 50 acres of prime real estate at Keonelo Bay, appreciated locally for the retention of *Hawaiiana* in its decor, especially its open breezeways and native koawood furniture. (MAG: Golf Magazine, 1996)
- c. There are abundant references to places and things that anyone growing up in Southern Ontario can easily identify with. The CN Tower, the CNE, Crystal Beach, Niagara Falls, pickle flavored chips, grocery shopping at No Frills, private school uniforms, and even jos louis snacks. There is a lot of *Canadiana* described in these pages. (WEB: Where We Have to Go by Lauren Kirshner, 2012)
- d. We have completely different tastes in decor. He loves clutter and heavy *Victoriana*, whereas I am more into black and white deco and clean lines. (TV/MOV: A Very Serious Person, 2006)
- e. Reading Leonard Woolf’s novel *The Village in the Jungle*, the “Colonial Cloth” edition of which Stevens added to his growing collection of *Ceyloniana*, surely endorsed the idea that the recuperative powers of the inhuman world of Ceylon far surpass any effort of will made by the people (as by Westerners observing those people) to endow local institutions with significance. (WEB: Chapter 3 of Alan Filreis’s *Wallace Stevens and the Actual World*, 2012)

The names of digital libraries containing historical data and cultural heritage end in *-(i)ana* as well: *Encarta Africana*, *Europeana* and *Michigana*.

With the names of people, the suffix *-(i)ana* is mostly used to indicate a collection of one’s written work as in *Woolfiana* and *Chauceriana* or a collection of essays about the person denoted by the base as in *Darwiniana* and *Shakespeariana*. Apart from the written work, the suffix may refer to

all kinds of memorabilia officially exhibited or collected in order to honor one's life (real or fictional):

(33)

- a. To celebrate the centenary of the birth of psychoanalysis, and to examine its impact on our culture, the Library of Congress -- the largest repository of *Freudiana* in the world -- planned a major exhibit on Freud for late 1996. (ACAD: Public Interest, 1996)
- b. The new exhibition opening on Friday at the Jewish Museum, 'Houdini: Art and Magic,' adds yet another transfiguration, a posthumous one, showing that though Houdini died in 1926 on Halloween after suffering a ruptured appendix, his protoplasmic presence seems undiminished. First his widow kept the flame, then came generations of other magicians (James Randi, David Blaine, David Copperfield, Penn and Teller), whose love of *Houdiniana* shaped their careers. (NEWS: New York Times, 2010)
- c. Frank J. Williams, the recently retired chief justice of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island who also has a vast collection of *Lincolniana*, said, "We want to think that he's a reflection of ourselves and the best that we can be." Lincoln also embodies what Williams called the American "right to rise" -- the idea that "if you wanted to be someone, you could be," he said. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2009)
- d. Maybe it's this ubiquity of *Mozartiana* that makes me hardly look twice when, on one of my last nights in town, I come across a group of about 20 locals clad in 18th-century dress-all powdered wigs and white gloves and fur-rimmed tricorne hats-having drinks at the bar of the Arthotel Blaue Gans (Blue Goose). After all, if you spend time in Mozart's town, sooner or later you see people dressed up like Mozart. (MAG: National Geographic, 2004)
- e. In the morning I stroll down the block to The Nation's Only James Madison Museum, which is a gem, a jewel among museums, my favorite kind. In its three rooms, the *Madisoniana* -- a chair he liked to sit in, bedspreads, a slide show, a letter of Dolley's about some wheat -- has been padded out with amiable non sequiturs: turn-of-the-century paper dolls, handmade nails, yellowed newspaper articles, postcards, somebody's eyeglasses, recipes for cure-alls, samplers and, downstairs, a miniature house surrounded by plows. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1992)
- f. If you turn onto Craven Passage, you'll find the Sherlock Holmes Pub. Franklin lived in a world without Sherlock Holmes, but that shouldn't keep you from stopping in, enjoying a pint, and surveying the pub's collection of *Sherlockiana*, including the re-creation of Holmes's famous sitting room that was originally built for the Festival of Britain in 1951. (MAG: American Heritage, 2006).
- g. For better and for worse, Thompson has lived large; too bad his biographers write small. # When The Going Gets Weird offers the densest bale of *Thompsoniana*. However, Peter O. Whitmer has already limned Thompson in *Aquarius Revisited*, ranking him among several Americans whose attitudes and experiences predicted and perhaps helped precipitate the '60s. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1993)
- h. Unfortunately, these collections of *Martiniana* are not complete shows from the series. Instead they are highlights tossed together, sometimes sloppily and clumsily. We see what looks like half of a big production number satirizing a New Year's Eve broadcast from the golden age of radio, with Sinatra, Ruth Buzzi and [Dean] Martin. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2004)
- i. When the difficulty of his voyage of discovery was put into question, Columbus challenged his interlocutors to balance an egg. When they failed, he did it by cracking the shell. In German, as well as Spanish, "the egg of Columbus" has become proverbial for solving a difficult problem by a surprisingly simple knack or expedient. Fine. A welcome solution. But why have I chosen this obscure item of *Columbiana* for my essay on this quincentenary? (MAG: Natural History, 1992)

- j. The rain had stopped and they had a half-hour between the guided tours given by volunteers from the Melville Society, and had the choice of cooling their heels either in the barn where there was an exhibit of *Melvilliana* or outside on the damp lawn. (FIC: Southwest Review, 2000)
- k. The clues to his perverse identity lie concealed beneath a plethora of *Nixoniana*, a good deal of it manufactured by the president himself. Indeed, his published works constitute a white paper that maximizes his diplomatic triumphs and cozy ties with world leaders and skids over his self-described “mistakes.” (ACAD: Raritan, 1995)

Regardless of the type of the base, whether it is a proper noun denoting a person or a place, all the above [ProperN-(i)ana]_N constructs refer to unique collections from a historical and cultural point of view. This semantic piece of information is also accessed via the syntactic structure in which the [ProperN-(i)ana]_N constructs are most often used: *of*-genitive construction.

In traditional grammars, the *of*-genitive construction is equivalent in meaning to the *s*-genitive construction because they share the same sense of *possession*, whereas other possible senses (such as *partition*, *quality*, *quantity*, and *attributes*) are listed as other uses of the *of*-phrase (see Quirk et al. 1985: 703). However, Stefanowitsch (1998) shows that the meaning of partition (Part-Whole) is more central and frequent in *of*-genitive constructs than that of possession (Possessed-Possessor) after looking into the examples from Bank of English (Collins Cobuild 1995).

The [ProperN-(i)ana]_N constructs are used in *of*-genitive constructions with partitive meaning and they can be more closely classified following Miladinović’s semantic reading of some relations between the head (h) and the modifier (d) in *of*-genitive structures (Miladinović 2015: 232):

(34)

- (i) [h is collection of d] as in *his growing collection of Ceyloniana, these collections of Martiniana, the pub’s collection of Sherlockiana, a vast collection of Lincolniana, the largest repository of Freudiana, a past full of Washingtoniana*;
- (ii) [h is type of d] as in *an exhibit of Melvilliana, this obscure item of Columbiana*;
- (iii) [h is quantity of d] as in *a plethora of Nixoniana, the densest bale of Thompsoniana, a lot of Canadiana, a true slice of Americana* (metaphorical usage).

The partitive interpretation of the *of*-genitive constructions with [ProperN-(i)ana]_N constructs as modifiers helps us to narrow down the semantic information embedded in the constructional schema – the constructs refer to a historically or culturally relevant collection or element(s) (in the sense of a specific ‘type’ or ‘quantity’) in relation to the person or place denoted by the base:

XX. <[[x]_{ProperN/Person or Place} (i)ana]_{N_j} ↔ [Historically/Culturally Relevant Collection/Element(s) related to SEM_i]_j >

6.4 Suffixed proper nouns as adjectives

According to Bauer (1983: 268), there are eight adjective-forming suffixes which are typically added to proper nouns: *-an/-ian*, *-ese*, *-esque*, *-ic*, *-ine*, *-ish*, *-ist*, and *-ite*. Out of these eight suffixes, only the complex words with the suffixes *-esque* and *-ish* are analyzed in this thesis. The transpositional suffixes *-an/-ian*, *-er*, *-ese*, *-i*, *-ic*, *-ish*, and *-ite*, which primarily form adjectival derivatives from place names, are not discussed in this thesis. These suffixes produce established

words which are undoubtedly in the mental lexicon for the majority of speakers; they have been previously described in detail in literature (see 2.6.2). The suffixes *-an/-ian* and *-ite* are predominantly transpositional suffixes with personal names e.g. *Aristotelian* teleological methodology, *Beethovenian* recitatives, *Jeffersonian* democracy, *Raphaelite* tradition, *Thatcherite* ideas etc. The suffix *-ist* belongs to the *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic set as suggested in the section 6.3.2. The suffix *-ine* is discredited on the grounds that it is not satisfactorily documented, because the suffix is not attached to many proper nouns, and if so, it only occurs with female names such as *Bernadine*, *Clementine* and *Pauline* (see also Bauer and Huddleston 2002; Marchand 1969).

As the analysis is usage-based, it is no wonder that other adjective-forming suffixes have shown their inclination to proper nouns as well. The suffixes *-free*, *-less* and *-oid* are unexpectedly found in complex words with proper nouns as bases. The suffix *-less*, which has never been investigated as an affix on proper noun bases, serves as a correlative of the suffix *-free* e.g. *Trump-less* vs. *Trump-free*. Despite being used only in one-offs, the suffix *-oid* shows particular discourse use and has negative or mocking connotations when attached to proper nouns. Together with more frequent ‘contentful’ suffixes, these three suffixes are classified according to the semantic reading of the complex words they create: ‘similative’ with *-esque*, *-ish*, *-like* and *-oid* and ‘negative’ with *-less* and *-free*.

6.4.1 Adjectival suffixed proper nouns with similative meaning

The suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, *-like* and *-oid* derive new words which denote notions that are similar to the notion denoted by the base. Bauer et al. (2013: 311) name the four elements ‘similative’ and present the data from different corpora and lexical databases. However, their corpus analysis is more concerned with overall English word-formation processes and potential bases, and it only provides a partial description of the derivatives with proper nouns as bases.

Being nearly synonymous in meaning, morphological constructions with four suffixes may produce doublets and sometimes triplets; and yet, even when the derivatives share the same semantics, their connotations and discourse use may differ. The following analysis gives a full description of constructions licensing proper noun derivatives with the aim of showing that the choice of a particular suffix (*-esque*, *-ish*, *-like* and *-oid*) is not random.

6.4.1.1 Construction with proper nouns and *-esque*

Strangely enough, the suffix *-esque* appears to be barely productive when added to common nouns, but highly productive with proper nouns, especially personal names (Bauer 1983). Originally used in French loans, the suffix derives its whole “semantic field” from the word *picturesque* (*pittoresque* in French), and therefore, it carries the meaning ‘having the (artistic, bizarre, picturesque) style of’ (Marchand 1969: 286). Bauer (1983: 268) disregards the ‘artistic, bizarre, picturesque’ feature of the suffix, and gives a more general explanation ‘having the manner or style characteristic of the person in the base.’ Moreover, the author adds that the derogatory use of complex words with *-esque* cannot be contributed directly to the suffix *per se*. Finally, the author finds the suffix *-esque* to be synonymous to other qualitative adjective-forming suffixes added to proper nouns e.g. *Dickensian*, *Dickensesque*, *Dickenesque*, *Dickensish*, *Dickensy* and *Dickeny*.

In terms of competition in derivation, it seems that affix synonymy exists with the systems which have not been fixed yet, as it is with the adjectivalization of proper names. According to Bauer (2006), it would probably take some hundreds of years before it becomes a firm set and some of its competing forms become perceived as established for stylistic or other reasons. The underlying reason for affix synonymy in qualitative adjective-forming suffixes remains unknown

due to a lack of theoretical description. However, language use shows that speakers do make subtle differences e.g. *a Dickensian slum* vs. *a Dickens-esque novel* (Bauer 1983: 269). The chosen sample from COCA aims at increasing our overall knowledge of possible affix synonymy in proper noun derivatives with the ‘similative’ suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, *-like*, and *-oid*.

The collected corpus examples of the complex words with proper nouns and *-esque* confirm Bauer’s general interpretation of the suffix *-esque* derivatives (1983). The outputs denote the style and manner characteristics of the person denoted by the base and they are used in the contexts in which physical or psychological traits of the person are described more closely.

Regarding physical aspects of a person, the formations with proper nouns and *-esque* describe one’s physical appearance or body type (35a and 35b) and fashion or style (35c and 35d):

(35)

- a. He’s leaning back in his too-small office chair, stretching his legs out in front of him (he’s six-foot-five) and occasionally tugging at his *Darwin-esque* beard. (MAG: Popular Science, 2015)
- b. Think of this as part of a post-Vietnam Reagan reboot, a time when the U.S. in *Rambo-esque* fashion was quite literally muscling up and over-arming in a major way. (MAG: Salon, 2016)
- c. “I just got back, and all my clothes are filthy!“, she laughs as she throws open the door in a very *Goldie-esque* outfit: a long black cotton ruffled camisole over slim black workout pants, finished off with two large gold cocktail rings-one jade, one opal-and gold bangle bracelets. (MAG: Bazaar, 2005)
- d. There were *Dorothy-esque* gray skirts and dresses appliqued with Totos, striped trousers cropped just under the knee and a series of sleeveless dresses that looked like giant springs covered with satin. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2000)

Other examples in the sample depict one’s physical appearance and fashion as well: *Audrey Hepburn-esque* skinniness, *hitler-esque* mustache, *Barney Rubble-esque* good looks, *Bono-esque* sunglasses, *Garbo-esque* hat, *Lady Gaga-esque* wardrobe, *MacGyver-esque* charm, *Madonna-esque* cone top, *Schwarzenegger-esque* build and *Springsteen-esque* leather boots.

When it comes to psychological aspects of a person, the suffix *-esque* refers to either people’s behavior (36a and 36b) or performance (36c and 36d):

(36)

- a. While I wanted to go into a “*Jim Carrey-esque*” meltdown, i.e. slamming my head into the steering wheel, I started crying angry defeated tears instead. (WEB: My 30 Going on 13 Moment, 2012)
- b. From his seat in the top row, Mr. Bush -- often relied upon for humor -- raised his arms over his head in a *Nixonesque* victory gesture. (NEWS: New York Times, 2000)
- c. Given the extent to which Ferrer loves to sit back on his heels in his own backhand corner and dictate with his inside-out forehand, not having to worry about a *Djokovic-esque* down-the-line backhand blast surely made his life in this match much more comfortable. (BLOG: Davis Cup Final: Ferrer d. Stepanek, 2012)
- d. Of all these bands, the White Stripes are the most original, which makes their success even more surprising. Their music is raw and meaty, ranging from bottleneck-blues dirges to childlike ballads to squealing *Zeppelin-esque* guitar stomps. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2002)

Other examples in the sample which link typical behavior or performance to particular individuals include *Jagger-esque* swagger, *Pushkinesque* humor, *Ramboesque* chauvinism,

Ripleyesque pickpocket, *Robin Hood-esque* shenanigans, *Tarantinoesque* violence, *Travoltaesque* disco dancing and *Sherlock-esque* asskicking.

However, it is more likely that there is a wider semantic interpretation which could serve as an umbrella term to both style and manner features discussed above. The umbrella term may be simple called ‘type’ as in the following example:

(37)

My favorite kind of music is *Coldplay-esque*. (MAG: People, 2005)

The *-esque* derivative in (37) implies that the speaker’s favorite kind of music is remarkably similar to the notion denoted by the base i.e. the music by the band named *Coldplay*. The base serves as a prototype regarding a particular type of music the speaker likes. In this sense, the complex word has a general similitive meaning. By introducing ‘similar to’ or ‘resembling’ as the main semantic feature of all *-esque* derivatives, a range of new words derived by *-esque* suffixation broadens substantially, and the suffix is no longer restricted to personal names as in previous theoretical accounts. It takes on various proper names (place, product and other names):

(38)

- a. Jackson’s early films -- the gross alien movie “Bad Taste,” the very gross puppet apocalypse “Meet the Feebles” and the really unbelievably gross zombie movie “Braindead” -- are comic and strangely childlike, full of *Monty Python-esque* farce and an obvious passion for the goriest, squishiest special effects that next-to-no-money can buy. (MAG: Newsweek, 2001)
- b. The front doors display the most striking elements of individualism, often lacquered with vibrant blues, reds, yellows, and greens. This is enhanced by individual polished fittings over which intricately designed *Dublineseque* fanlights (open fan-shaped windows) illuminate the entry. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2003)
- c. But much as we love her style, we worry about her inexperience and *Bambi-esque* naiveté. (TV/MOV: The West Wing, Debate Camp, 2002)
- d. The *Apollo-esque* capsule won’t have any other means of slowing down -- no sky crane or delta wings to create an upward force. (BLOG: Photo of the Day: NASA Tests Gigantic Parachutes for the Next, 2012)
- e. “The really interesting thing starts happening when people rate their wines,” says Saunders, revealing that the company’s more than six million wine reviews is enough data to do *Netflix-esque* “if you liked X you should try Y” recommendations for wine. (MAG: TechCrunch, 2016)
- f. That’s how much the *Rolls-Royce-esque* coupe costs under current exchange rates from its European price of 46,900 euros -- just about the same as the Porsche Cayman R (\$66,300) and Cayenne S Hybrid (\$67,700). (WEB: The MINI Cooper That Costs As Much As A Porsche, 2012)

Similarities can be based between any notions regarding any features: *Apple-esque* solution, *Beckett-esque* play, *Brooklyn-esque* accents, *DiCaprio-esque* career, *Goonies-esque* treasure hunt, *Hamlet-esque* characters, *Harry Potter-esque* Berkeley College, *Hitler-esque* manifesto, *Honda-esque* campaign, *Malibu-esque* sand beaches, *Mount Vernon-esque* mansion, *MTV-esque* DVD, *Napa-esque* wines, *Reformation-esque* fun, *Tudoresque* architecture, *Vladimir Putin-esque* political leader, *Watergate-esque* investigation and so on.

Having all this in mind, the *-esque* schema licenses the constructs which denote similarity to the base:

XXI. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *esque*]_{Aj} ↔ [Similar to/Resembling SEM_i]_j >

The similarity feature, though neutral *per se*, is based on one's experience of the notion denoted by the base. The use of a [ProperN-*esque*]_A construct reinforces a vivid image of the notion especially in a more detailed context. In fact, the semantics of the construction and the surrounding context combined together evoke the notion's 'picturesque' aspect:

(39)

- a. That vacation was spent seeking *Fellini-esque* visions in every alley, every fountain, every old man's iris. (FIC: Southern Review, 2013)
- b. And it is this kind of *Groundhog-esque* over and over and over again. (SPOK: TODAY SHOW 7:00 AM EST, 2017)
- c. Ernest Hemingway said Africa was the one place "it pleased me to live, to really live. Not just let my life pass." I'm in East Africa determined to have a *Hemingwayesque* experience. Well, Hemingway minus the avid shooting and stuffing of wild animals to ship home to decorate the walls of a den. I want that connection with the primal self, being on the edge, completely alive and engaged in the moment. (MAG: National Geographic, 2009)
- d. Facebook has always focused on personal updates, but this mobile feature allows users to re-post a brand's or friend's photos, comments or links, making the experience more *Twitteresque* (think retweet). (WEB: Top Law News, 2012)

6.4.1.2 Constructions with proper nouns and *-ish*

The native suffix *-ish* shows its linguistic versatility because it is added to different word classes: adjectives e.g. *blackish*, verbs e.g. *ticklish*, numbers e.g. *sixtyish*, particles e.g. *offish*, pronouns e.g. *selfish*, and even phrases in colloquial speech e.g. *too-girlish*. When added to common nouns, complex words usually have a derogatory tone e.g. *bookish*, *freakish*, *womanish* etc. Marchand (1969) points out that when the suffix is attached to proper nouns, the same derogatory tone is conveyed in colloquial speech and journalistic texts. Adams (2001) reiterates this statement and compares it to other adjective-forming suffixes which may be less disapproving in tone such as *-esque*. However, in some rare cases as Hamawand (2007: 67) notices, it has positive connotations with bases denoting fashion e.g. *modish* and *stylish*. When it comes to the semantic reading of the suffix, Marchand (1969: 305) assigns the basic meaning of 'appurtenance' to it, Adams (2001: 36) the meaning 'of the nature or character of, resembling NOUN,' and Hamawand (2007: 138) 'having the character of the thing specified by the nominal root.'

Having such broad scope, it is no wonder that the suffix *-ish* is productively added to proper nouns as bases as well. It seems to be almost interchangeable with its French cognate and somewhat more productive adjective-forming suffix *-esque*. According to Adams (2001: 36) both suffixes produce complex words meaning 'like NOUN' or 'having NOUN.' This interpretation is identical to Beard's analysis of qualitative adjectives in which denominal qualitative adjectives are divided broadly into two groups: similitudinal adjectives [LIKE (XY)] and possessional adjectives [POSSESS (XY)] (Beard 1995: 220). In his theoretical findings, however, Beard (1995) places derivatives with the suffixes *-esque* in the former group exclusively, and derivatives with the suffix *-ish* in both groups.

Proper nouns with the suffix *-ish* also have the similitive meaning i.e. resembling the notion denoted by the base. As in the case of complex words with proper nouns and the suffix *-esque*, the suffix *-ish* may be added to different kinds of proper names as well:

(40)

- a. After spraying Lysol from Garvey's leg to his crotch, Hinder drummer Cody Hanson – who's so wasted that his eyes are half-shut underneath his *Axl Rose-ish* red hair and blue bandanna - sparks up a lighter. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2006)
- b. In 2010, Portland's city council passed a 20-year, \$613 million plan to more than double bikeway mileage and help biking reach 25% of all trips - *Amsterdam-ish* levels. (MAG: E : the Environmental Magazine, 2011)
- c. So also in the paper there was a kind of a *New Yorkish* story. A cabbie was driving a woman and her child in the back, and the child got sick and threw... (SPOK: Today 7:00 AM EST NBC, 2010)
- d. They all wear *Gap-ish* clothing, even if it's secondhand or Kmart. (FIC: The Atlantic Monthly, 2002)
- e. If we had *Star Trek-ish* scanners and instruments that could scan every cell's workings in realtime, then we might be able to identify for any given patient whether treatment helped or hurt, how long they truly would live treated or untreated. (BLOG: A Lesson in Treating Illness, 2012)

The *-ish* constructional schema is semantically identical to the *-esque* constructional schema:

XXII. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *ish*]_{Aj} ↔ [(Similar to/Resembling SEM_i)_j] >

Although the [ProperN-*ish*]_A constructs have the same readings as the [ProperN-*esque*]_A constructs, COCA helps us to notice some interesting usage-based preferences. The engine search for **esque* displays approximately two thirds of denominal proper names ending in *-esque* merely in the first one hundred hits, whereas there is not a single denominal proper name ending in the simulative *-ish* suffix (disregarding the inhabitant/language *-ish* suffix as in *English, Polish, Swedish* etc.). What's more, the *-esque* formations tend to be non-hyphenated dictionary forms with moderate or high frequency such as *Kafkaesque* or *Rubenesque*. On the contrary, a reasonable proportion of the *-ish* proper name derivatives consists of hyphenated one-offs e.g. *Aaron Sorkin-ish* chapters, *Beatles-ish* ballad, *Betty Boop-ish* flirt, *Brooklyn-ish* accent, *Game of Thrones-ish* move, *Hampton-ish* scenes, *Ikea-ish* structure, *Joan Miro-ish* tie, *Las Vegas-ish* big band, *Meg Ryan-ish* hair, *Robinson Crusoe-ish* straw-thatched hut, *Roseanne-ish* issues, *Sinatra-ish* mooning, *Teddy Roosevelt-ish* populism, *Tudor-ish* place, *Wikipedia-ish* feel etc. The examples of complex words with non-fused *-ish* endings also speak in favor of the speaker's high awareness of morpheme junctures.

Sometimes the choice between two suffixes seems to be only a matter of personal preference. Generally speaking, synonymous adjective-forming suffixes and non-dictionary forms such as proper names may yield different possible constructs (41a and 41b) or doublets (41c) in the same context:

(41)

- a. Holding back on *Biden-esque* smirks and *Al Gore-ish* disdain, feigning interest while keeping their talking points in mind, looked to take a singular toll. (WEB: The Global Language Monitor, 2012)
- b. Actually, there's one caveat to this - as we've got more and more *Bond-ish* or *Bournean* films being made, there are other films that take the trappings of this type of cinema and try and make it their own. (BLOG: Jason Gorber's Cineruminations: SKYFALL And The Bonds Of Nostalgia, 2012)

- c. Let's talk about "Go." A lot of people are saying one of the great things about this movie, it is *Tarantino-ish*, *Tarantino-like*, but it's smart, which is what a lot of younger movies sort of lack these days. (SPOK: CBS_Morning, 1999)

Some constructs with proper nouns and the suffix *-ish* may have another meaning 'approximating x' (following Bauer et al. 2013: 313) which is identical to the meaning of *-ish* derivatives with numbers as their bases e.g. *fortyish*. This reading is very frequent with the names denoting time (42a-42d) and poorly attested with the names denoting places (42e):

(42)

- a. It, it was like they met *December-ish*, I'm thinking, in 2007. (SPOK: 20/20 9:01 PM EST, 2014)
- b. I don't 7 but I start trial September. So I'm looking at being home around October-ish. (SPOK: CBS News: 48 Hours Mystery, 2019)
- c. "I foresee me being close to 100 percent, I would say *February-ish*," Bishop said. "I'm just focused on positive energy to get this leg right and get back to regular form, or even better actually." (WEB: Green Bay Packers Official Blog, 2012)
- d. "Whenever I find myself growing grim about the mouth, whenever it is a damp, drizzly November in my soul," Herman Melville wrote, "I account it high time to get to sea as soon as I can." I feel you, Herman. In my line of work, grimness of the mouth sets in after I've eaten too many things that are trying so hard to impress that they lose touch with anything that comes close to pleasure. And each time I see a roomful of people handing hundreds or thousands of dollars over to a chef who stopped caring a long time ago, my mood turns distinctly *Novemberish*. (NEWS: New York Times, 2015)
- e. The auroras – that's the best one. If you find -- if we're really lucky, we'll have conditions that will allow us to see the northern lights at places you don't normally see them, like, you know, middle latitudes, US, maybe the East Coast, the Eastern seaboard, you know, *Pennsylvania-ish*, around that latitude. (SPOK: NPR_Morning, 2003)

The time and place dimensions are incorporated in the semantic information of the following constructional schema:

XXIII. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *ish*]_{Aj} ↔ [Approximating SEM_i in Time or Space]_j >

6.4.1.3 Construction with proper nouns and *-like*

The morphological status of *-like* has never been easy to define. Marchand (1969: 356) applies the term 'semi-suffix,' because it is halfway between a word and a suffix, though it clearly keeps its word character. He gives two reasons for regarding the morpheme *-like* as a 'semi-suffix' rather than a compound element: a) it is mostly added to nouns deriving adjectives e.g. *godlike*, *manlike*; b) which could take a negative prefix as well e.g. *unmanlike*. Dalton-Puffer and Plag (2000: 243) reject the term 'semi suffix' as theoretically undesirable, because an in-depth investigation can show the demarcation between derivation and compounding despite some of the structural or semantic properties being less represented in a morpheme⁵⁵. The authors also notice that some problematic elements such as *-like* are automatically listed as suffixes on the grounds of

⁵⁵ Instead, the authors use the term 'productive formative' in their analysis of three problematic morphemes (*-ful*, *-type* and *-wise*) as their status stands midway between the suffix and the right-hand member of the compound. Despite their theoretical proposal, the term 'productive formative' has not surpassed the term 'semi-suffix' in word-formation literature.

their frequency of occurrence and adjectival features (modification, negation, markedness for comparative and superlative form), and propose that the relation between the elements should be the decisive factor regarding a precise morphological status. Hamawand (2007: 74) introduces the term ‘de-nominal free suffix’ due to its dual role i.e. it can be used as a separate word and as a suffix in complex words. Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1711) note that *-like* is highly productive in terms of availability i.e. new words may not be coined for the purposes of institutionalization, but to satisfy the speaker’s immediate need. They take *-like* to be a head of a compound due to its form and meaning but describe it together with other adjectival suffixes because of its adjectivalizing role. Bauer et al. (2013: 289) state that structurally *-like* is more likely to be a compound element than a suffix but place it with three rival suffixes (*-esque*, *-ish* and *-oid*) expressing resemblance.

Regardless of their shared semantics, there are fine distinctions between the rival simulative suffixes seeing that the connotations of complex words may significantly vary i.e. neutral with *-like*, academic with *-esque*, and scientific with *-oid* (Bauer et al. 2013: 312-313). An interesting point is also made by Hamawand (2007: 141-142) who observes ‘the vice-virtue distinction’ between *-ish* and *-like* depending on the qualities the words are supposed to designate e.g. *childish outbreaks of temper* vs. *childlike curiosity*, *owlish eyes* (of a wicked person) vs. *owl-like wisdom*.

From a morphological point of view, all four rival suffixes (*-esque*, *-ish*, *-like*, and *-oid*) can be added to different kinds of proper nouns and names readily and unrestrictedly. The suffix *-like* may be freely added to proper names as single units as well as composite units: *Bonnie-and-Clyde-like* couple, *Caravaggio-like* technique, *Fourth of July-like* Americanism, *Goldilocks-like* balance, *Iran-like* sanctions, *Johnnie Cash-like* singer, *Hogwarts-and-Narnia-like* environment, *Matrix-like* simulation, *May-like* temperatures, *Othello-like* jealousy, *Toyota-like* vehicle, *Watergate-like* scandals, *Yugoslavia-like* upheaval etc.

Semantically, *-like* belongs to the group of ‘simulative’ suffixes denoting resemblance. Its core reading ‘resembling’ is encoded in the situations when one notion is being compared to another one based on our encyclopedic knowledge which stems from specific contexts e.g. Christmas, war, hairstyle (Šuković 2023)⁵⁶:

(43)

- a. Retail sales in this country took their biggest fall on record last month, a harbinger of a *Scrooge-like* Christmas season. (SPOK: Fox_News, 2008)
- b. If there’s an entrenched civil war? If it devolves into *Somalia-like* chaos? What then? (SPOK: NBC_Meet the Press, 2011)
- c. We were a great team together. And it was a doll with... Zahn: *Don King-like* hair. McEwen: Yeah, back in -- it was fads. (SPOK: CBS_Morning, 1992)

However, the chosen salient feature on which the similarity is grounded may differ from context to context depending on the topic in question and the number of associations that speakers make with respect to the notion denoted by the base. The similarity may be based on a very specific single feature such as a word (44a) or gesture (44c) or a general impression (44d). This is best illustrated by the use of the adjectival formation *Oprah-like* in different situations and genres:

(44)

- a. Now, the FBI used, as someone said, the *Oprah-like* word, saying it had been victimized, the director did. In your judgment, what is the culpability of the FBI here? (SPOK: ABC_Brinkley, 1996)

⁵⁶ The examples (43a-43c) and (44a) were used in the author’s analysis of *-like* and *-free* with proper names in spoken genre of COCA (Šuković 2023). The analysis was conducted by applying a mentalist approach of Relational Morphology. This approach highlights what speakers store in memory and what kind of knowledge they possess including both knowledge of language and knowledge beyond language (see also Jackendoff and Audring 2020b).

- b. And the extraordinary press coverage of Clinton’s *Oprah-like* moment and the apology, is it just because it’s a compelling story, is it because we still love anything having to do with Monica Lewinsky, or is it also that the press loves this is Bill Clinton hurting Al Gore storyline? (SPOK: CNN_Reliable, 2000)
- c. Elizabeth twirls the microphone up to Henry’s mouth with an *Oprah-like* sweep of her arm. (FIC: The end of an error, 2003)
- d. O God, the sky is about to open the and now I’ll get a new force! Thanks to your *Oprah-like* psychological intuition. (TV: Malcolm in the Middle, Future Malcolm, 2003)
- e. Sometimes, though, you’ve just got to go moan, and so the newer Tour dads have formed an early-morning, *Oprah-like* coffee klatch. (MAG: Golf Magazine, 2004)
- f. She stepped off the rostrum, took an *Oprah-like* stroll down one of the creaky-floored aisles. (FIC: High crimes, 2011)
- g. Along the way she transformed herself into an *Oprah-like* role model and guru, showing special concern for women and girls with body image issues. (BLOG: The Hottest Women of All-Time, 2012)

These findings are contradictory to the ones provided by Bauer et al. (2013: 213) who suggest that the *-ish* and *-like* derivatives denote different kind of resemblance with the same base: *dwarfish* implies similarity based on the quality of size, and *dwarf-like* refers to a kind of person. In Cognitive Linguistics, any resemblance between two notions is explained by the existence of the LINK schema in the mind of a speaker (Johnson 1987). It is conceptualized as a non-physical connection between two objects provided that they share at least one similar feature. This means that the proper nouns with *-like* may have multiple readings as in (44). Thus, the formations are highly context-dependent and based on extra-linguistic knowledge:

(45)

- a. When his rap collective Odd Future Wolf Gang Kill Them All (“Odd Future” is fine) caught buzz around 2010, it was because of their delirious energy and *Eminem-like* love of mayhem. (MAG: The Atlantic, 2017)
- b. Wouldn’t that be more productive than spending trillions on a *Kyoto-like* treaty to make tiny reductions in fossil-fuel emissions that would have almost no effect on bear populations for years? (WEB: The Edge of Extinction, 2012)
- c. There’s no question Foo Fighters comes directly out of Grohl’s experience with Nirvana. Many of the songs were written when he was still a member of the band, and overall, Foo Fighters is the most *Nirvana-like* of all the Foo Fighters albums. (BLOG: Foo Fighters’ debut was a bridge between Nirvana and mid-‘90s, 2012)
- d. Cubo’s overall objective is to fast-track São Paulo’s startup scene, foster entrepreneurs and provide them with *Silicon Valley-like* perks, a close-knit community, more serendipity and vital business connections. (MAG: TechCrunch, 2016)
- e. “This is an opportunity for New Yorkers to have a *Vegas-like* experience without having to leave the city,” said Michael Speller, the president of Resorts World Casino New York City, who started off as a blackjack dealer in his native London when he was 18. (NEWS: New York Times, 2011)
- f. Tina’s voice suddenly broke into her thoughts. It seemed shrill, tense, not *Tina-like*. (FIC: India Currents, 2006).

The *-like* proper noun derivatives constitute doublets with the *-ish* derivatives such as *LeBron-ish/LeBron-like*, *MIT-ish/MIT-like*, *Martha Stewart-ish/Martha Stewart-like*, and *-esque* derivatives such as *Netflix-esque/Netflix-like*, *Reaganesque (Reagan-esque)/Reagan-like*, *Sopranoesque/Soprano-like* etc. Triplets are found with high frequency bases e.g. *Clintonesque (56)/Clintonish (2)/Clinton-like (18)*; *Disneysesque (35)/Disney-ish (2)/Disney-like (27)*; and *Google-*

esque (3)/*Google-ish* (1)/*Google-like* (27). Judging by the number of single occurrences/tokens indicated in the brackets, the suffix *-ish* is the least frequent with proper names, the suffix *-esque* creates attested adjectives with fused endings⁵⁷, and the suffix *-like* shows moderate frequency (especially with non-attested forms). The preference for one suffix over the other two is more likely to be due to their overall frequency and the speaker's choice, and not differences in meaning. The similitive reading of the constructs with all three suffixes is identical.

The search results show that the constructs with all three kinds of constructs [ProperN-*esque*]_A, [ProperN-*ish*]_A, and [ProperN-*like*]_A share the same semantic information. This implies that the constructional schema of *-like* adjectives with proper nouns is as follows:

XXIV. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *like*]_{Aj} ↔ [Similar to/Resembling SEM]_{ij} >

6.4.1.4 Distributional features of constructs with proper nouns and *-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like*

Formal schemas for the constructions with the 'similitive' suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, *-like* and proper nouns show that the licensed constructs are all adjectives. They are most often used attributively in the Modification construction i.e. their prototypical function is that of a modifier in a noun phrase. The Modification construction with any of the three similitive modifiers (i.e. the [ProperN-*esque*]_A, [ProperN-*ish*]_A or [ProperN-*like*]_A construct) has a fully compositional meaning in which the combination Y_{adj} + X_N is understood as '*X has the quality Y*' (Vujić 2016: 126):

(46)

- a. MORALES: He's got the brown sweater, lush... Ms-GREENFIELD: Coffee, cocoas, and these are all those kind of *Thankgivingesque* colors. (SPOK: NBC_Today, 2007)
- b. She wrote *Poe-ish* couplets gloating over perfect murders. (FIC: Literary Review, 2006)
- c. But Garvey's roots message took hold in Jamaica, it spread through the countryside, even to Nine Miles, a northern hamlet set among *Eden-like* beauty and desperate poverty. (TV/MOV: Bob Marley: The Legend Live, 2003)

The suffix *-esque* as an adjective-forming suffix produces almost fully qualitative reading with new formations which means that they are gradable (Lieber 2005). All the constructs with proper nouns and 'similitive' suffixes (*-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like*) may be marked for comparative and superlative form. The constructs may be used in Comparative constructions indicating superiority (47a-47d), inferiority (47e), and parallel comparison (47f):

(47)

- a. You're not black enough. You need to be more afro-American. *More Harlem-esque*. (TV/MOV: True Identity, 1991)
- b. Primo is much *more Google-like* than most articles databases and facilitates this kind of skill building. (ACAD: Reference & User Services Quarterly, 2015)
- c. Much has been made of Ethan's abrupt turnaround, encapsulated in a single image of Wayne lifting the rescued Debbie (Natalie Wood) into his arms, but moving though it is, it is also *the most Hollywoodish* moment in the film. (MAG: American Heritage, 1998)
- d. Because they are so cold and dry, these valleys are considered *the most Mars-like* places on Earth. (MAG: Astronomy, 1993)

⁵⁷ Non-fused endings with the same bases are less frequent e.g. *Clinton-esque* (7) and *Disney-esque* (22).

- e. Also, there was a time when Bruce Wayne made Alfred a sandwich after Alfred had been stabbed, and Bruce got worried he didn't cut the bread slices the correct thickness, and started crying. It was *the least Batman-like* thing I have ever seen. (MAG: Gizmodo, 2016)
- f. I've always thought that *the more Bassey-esque* one goes for a Bond opening credits theme, the better (thought I probably should label it "smoking lounge music"). (BLOG: And You Thought It Was...Safe(?), 2012)

The similitive proper noun constructs may also occur in predication with verbs denoting physical resemblance; in addition, the salient features of physical similarity may be emphasized with the use of degree modifiers (48a, 48d, and 48e):

(48)

- a. "When you delve into what is cool about any person, it's never just one thing. It's all of those things that somehow get balled up into one person and make this great package," said actor John Fredo, who looks strikingly *Sinatraesque*, but makes no attempt to impersonate him in "My Way." (NEWS: Denver Post, 2005)
- b. Her heroes were Abraham Lincoln and Albert Einstein. Lincoln was out of the question, but with a little work I could look *Einsteinesque*. I grew a dark mustache, adopted wild graying hair. (FIC: Omni, 1995)
- c. My little man now looks *Bieber-ish* in all his scale-free glory. Seriously though, this stuff has made his hair really soft and shiny. (WEB: Bright Horizons, 2012)
- d. Even though diamonds and fur may have been a departure from her own day-to-day style, onscreen (in her first Oscar-winning role) she made it seem as if she lived in them. A look from Ralph Lauren is uncannily *Hepburn-like*. (MAG: Bazaar, 2003)
- e. And more than once, Perry's mannerisms and manner struck me as eerily *Bush-like*. (MAG: Newsweek Web Exclusives, 2011)

Unlike the constructs with proper nouns and *-esque* and *-ish* which are exclusively used in pre-modification, the constructs with proper nouns and *-like* may be used in post-modification:

(49)

- a. The 5000-pound, awd Acadia's grip was amazing and the steering accuracy *Honda-like*. (MAG: Popular Mechanics, 2007)
- b. But far more, there was a genuine desire to see an underdog triumph, *Rocky-like*, and to find once again, in the best Hollywood tradition, that love conquers all. (NEWS: New York Times, 1997)

The constructs with proper nouns and *-like* may also take the function of an adverbial, though very rarely. Interestingly enough, adverbial *-like* formations can occur initially or in apposition:

(50)

- a. And because there are inside forces that push to the other direction, the ruling block has been working for decades now to keep the country tapped so it has no easy way out – if Greece wants to play it *Iceland-like* it will be plunged to war and destruction. (WEB: Greece will have to wait for next round of cash, 2012)
- b. The land stretched *Kansas-like* to her left; the sky had lightened into day. (FIC: Iris, 2002)

- c. Men and women of greatness do not rise *Aphrodite-like* from the sea of youth with talents and abilities full-blown, ready to offer their gifts and talents to society. (ACAD: Roeper Review, 2006)
- d. Alice Tully Hall To Be or Not To Be A Chamber Hall # Across the street to the north is Alice Tully Hall. *Hamlet-like*, it never made up its mind. (NEWS: New York Times, 1997)
- e. MTV-like, they spin toward you, framing half-animated preteen rock stars, or away from you, blending into video-game landscapes. (MAG: Mother Jones, 1991)
- f. Then he leads them, *Moses-like*, across four lanes of traffic to the rear parking lots of several commercial buildings - an auto-parts store, a dry cleaner, a gas station, an empty video game store. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2008)
- g. You conclude you've married the wrong person - but that's because you're accustomed to thinking, *Cinderella-like*, that there is only one right person. (MAG: Psychology Today, 2012)

The outputs of *-esque*, *-ish* and *-like* suffixation with proper nouns may be used in existential clauses with the dummy pronoun *there* and the verb *be*. They are typically preceded by an indefinite pronoun (*something*, *anything*, and *nothing*) and a degree modifier – this kind of NP specifies a more accurate degree of resemblance to the notion denoted by the base. Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 250) suggest that only adjectives denoting temporary states could be used in existential clauses with the dummy pronoun *there* e.g. *there's something missing/present/wrong*. In examples (51), the *-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like* formations with proper nouns are not temporary *per se*, but they are more likely to be 'circumstantial' because the speakers are presenting their point of view in particular circumstances:

(51)

- a. There is something rather *Dali-esque* about the chorus of dichotomous elements here. The overall effect pleases and enthralls, like good jazz, a delicately balanced Calder mobile or an abstract painting that really works. (MAG: Horticulture, 2013)
- b. But there is something dauntingly *Stanton-esque* in the museum's endeavors, too, for it turns out there is but one women's history scholar at work in the national park system, trying to catch up with an overlooked eon of American history. (NEWS: New York Times, 1994)
- c. Prague is a bunch of American English teachers sitting around in cafes, using the word *Kafkaesque* a lot. There's nothing *Kafkaesque* about it nothing strange ever happens there. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 1998)
- d. There was something *Shangri-La-ish* about this scene: the merry, ageless workers with their sea buckthorn juice, the snowcapped mountains, the indigo sky. (MAG: Town and Country, 2012)
- e. There's something *Clark Kent-ish* about the glasses. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2009)
- f. There was something almost *Samuel Beckett-ish* in the absurdist mini-plays involving Spike, Snoopy's lonely brother in the desert; the Great Pumpkin, like Godot, never comes. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2000)
- g. There's almost something *Frankenstein-ish* about it in the sense that, like Frankenstein is a brain inside this body that the brain doesn't belong in. So the body just doesn't know how to move. (SPOK: Fresh Air 12:00 AM EST, 2012)
- h. And nobody could accuse her of being a racist. For all she cared, people could be yellow or blue, and believe in what they wanted. No, there certainly wasn't anything *Hitler-like* about her. (FIC: Literary Review, 2008)
- i. He's courageous, he's optimistic, he's representing everything that Mickey Mouse should have represented but never did. There's even something *Jesus-like* about him-a 9-year-old Jesus after 15 packets of Junior Mints. (MAG: Atlantic Monthly, 2009)

- j. Most of the new structures on the surrounding blocks squeeze pedestrians into formal spaces or traffic-heavy walkways. The Still will serve as an ad hoc picnic spot. The museum “begins at the curb,” Cloepfil says. It is “not an object to be entered, but something you experience.” # Some of this design’s inspiration is a mystery. There is nothing obviously *Still-like* in the thinking; the building is compact, defined, not abstract. Nor is there anything particularly *Denver-like* about it. It thumbs its nose at any reference to the architecture of the West or the natural beauty of the surrounding landscapes. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2010)

6.4.1.5 Construction with proper nouns and *-oid*

The suffix *-oid* is the only adjective-forming suffix of Greek origin which can be attached to proper nouns (Šuković 2024b)⁵⁸. It is far less productive than its three rival suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like*. In English, the complex words ending in *-oid* have a scientific tone to them, and this feature can be traced to astronomical terms coined in the 18th and 19th century – the first recorded astronomical term ending in the suffix *-oid* is believed to be *asteroid* probably after the Greek word *asteroeidēs* meaning *star-like*, *starry* from *aster-*, *astér* “star, the plant *Aster amellus*, starfish” + *-oeidēs* “resembling, having a specified form”⁵⁹. Apart from having a scientific tone to it, the suffix *-oid* has the ‘similative’ meaning with no apparent differences from *-esque*, *-ish* and *-like* (Bauer et al. 2013). Base truncation occurs with bases ending in *-o* as in *Plutoid* and *Picassoid*, and an extender (e.g. *-n-*) may be added when the base ends in another vowel as in *Obamanoid*. Generally, the suffix is used with proper nouns in scientific discourse – journals and texts discussing astronomical objects which are similar to the notion denoted by the base e.g. *Kuiperoid*, *Plutoid*, *Saturnoid*, *Uranoid* etc. With proper nouns that denote individuals, it keeps the meaning ‘similar to/resembling’ a person, either their style (52a and 52b) or behaviour (52c):

(52)

- a. Here it is the coarser, *Picassoid* drawings that stand out: for example, the untitled charcoal and pastel that brings together a disembodied and distorted profile from Picasso with the faucets from the artist’s bathtub. (NEWS: New York Times, 1990)
- b. On the surface his approach is scientific and slightly *Dawkins-oid*: in *Cracked* he briskly locates the source of addiction in “a tiny region of the brain called the nucleus accumbens,” and suggests that the emotional dissociation of the trauma victim is “an evolutionary remnant of the risky strategy of feigning death.” (MAG: Atlantic Monthly, 2009)

When the suffix *-oid* is added to the names of public figures or celebrities, strongly negative or mocking connotations may be conveyed:

(53)

- a. Acquittal, for that matter, is a possibility in the courtroom of Judge Paul Friedman, a Clinton appointee who previously dismissed five felony counts against Hsia, only to see them reinstated on appeal, and who currently refuses to admit the grand-jury testimony of two nuns who have fled the country. The *Clintonoid* damage control continues. Trent Lott ushered two more Clinton judges through confirmation, thwarting an attempt by Oklahoma senator Jim Inhofe to block the nominations. (MAG: National Review, 2000)

⁵⁸ The examples and the findings of this section were presented in the author’s promotion of her doctoral research at the conference *Anglophonia: Forging Paths International Student Conference in English Studies* (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb), and published afterwards (Šuković 2024b).

⁵⁹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/asteroid>

- b. We should deport all those brainless metrosexual *Obamanoid* idiots, who have NO concept of American History, to the lawn outside of the Hague. (BLOG, 2012)
- c. Last summer Helsinki Watch reported more than 60 political trials in the first half of 1989 as Kafka’s intense embryonic vision merged uncannily with the bizarre and deadly machinations of *Stalinoid* sludge that suffocated the nation. (FIC: Massachusetts Review, 1990)
- d. “U Smile” is a gorgeous *Jacksonoid* pianopumper, with Bieber suffering chivalric agonies- “Tour lips, my biggest weakness / Shouldn’t have let you know / I’m always gonna do what they say”- as his voice bears the melody aloft on a cluster of vowel sounds plump as Renaissance putti. (MAG: Atlantic Monthly, 2011)

Another possible reading of the *-oid* outputs could be that they are analogically modeled on the word android in its original science fiction use i.e. a mobile robot usually with a human form. The sci-fi meaning of android is probably borrowed from Late Greek *androeidēs* “in the form of a man, like a man,” from Greek *andr-*, *anēr* “man, husband, human” + *-oeidēs*⁶⁰. The idea of ‘android’ resemblance to a particular public figure (i.e. Bill Clinton, Barack Obama, Joseph Stalin, and Michael Jackson) is communicated via negative associations which are evoked by expressions such as *damage control* (54a), *brainless [...] idiots* (54b), *bizarre and deadly machinations* (54c), *suffering chivalric agonies* (54d). In this sense, the *-oid* derivatives are used to indicate an existence of a particular ‘absurd’ notion similar to the original and they describe individuals who lack reasoning (54a-54c) or emotions (54d) like robots.

Despite the possible connection to the established words *asteroid* and *android*, there is a conventional form-meaning correspondence in all [ProperN-*oid*]_A constructs, which suggests a regular abstract pattern. This regular abstract pattern might have emerged from repeated analogical extensions via subschemas inasmuch as the possible model words are both of Greek origin (see 3.2.2). Without specifying pragmatic differences based on the speaker’s attitude and precise model words, the most general representation of the constructional schema licensing the [ProperN-*oid*]_A constructs is as follows:

XXV. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *oid*]_{Aj} ↔ [Similar to/Resembling SEM_i]_j >

6.4.2 Adjectival suffixed proper nouns with negative meaning

Negative forms with nominal bases in English are derived by the prefixes *de-*, *dis-*, *non-*, *un-* and only one suffix with a recognized affixal status *-less*. In earlier accounts, the suffix *-less* is described as an adjective-forming suffix with a high degree of productivity due to the absence of other competing suffixes to some extent (Bauer 1983). In contemporary English, its dominant position has been challenged with the appearance of *-free* which attaches readily to noun bases. Despite being an independent form, the final element *-free* is more often labeled as a suffix than a compound constituent based on the semantic contrast with the suffix *-less* e.g. *sugarless* vs. *sugar-free*. Both *-less* and *-free* are combined with proper nouns and create highly compositional derivatives.

⁶⁰ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/android>

6.4.2.1 Construction with proper nouns and *-less*

The suffix *-less* gives rise to denominal adjectives (*breathless*, *meaningless*) with a possibility of creating deverbal adjectives (*resistless*, *tireless*). In structural-oriented accounts, it has a privative meaning ‘without’, and in some cases it constitutes semantic correlatives with the suffix *-ful* e.g. *harmful* – *harmless*, but only in well-established adjectives created no later than the 15th century (Marchand 1969: 325). It has a strongly negative evaluation in its derivatives, which Górska (1995: 35) quotes in her examples taken from the OED: ‘destitute of’ for *rainless*, ‘devoid of’ for *powerless*, ‘deprived of’ for *legless*, ‘void of’ for *profitless*. Adams (2001: 38) agrees that the suffix *-less* has strongly evaluative overtones that are typical of older attested adjectives, either in a positive or negative manner e.g. *fearless* vs. *homeless*. However, Adams also points out that its evaluative implication is neutralized in more recent examples e.g. *cordless*.

Complex words with proper nouns and the suffix *-less* have the same privative meaning when bases denote people. They can carry both positive (54a-54c) and negative evaluations (54d-54f) depending on the context:

(54)

- a. Can we just get back to Christmas... the way it should be? *Grinch-less*? Merry Christmas! (MOV: *How the Grinch Stole Christmas*, 2000)
- b. For those of you on a blocking-horrible-people roll, Aux also has a Nickelblock plugin available. Do they take requests? Because a *Dr. Drew-less* Internet is looking pretty good right now. (BLOK: *Want to Block Chris Brown’s Stupid Face Forever and Ever?*, 2012)
- c. Okay, granted Reagan may have been a better candidate (even though Santorum and Newt saw it as a flaw to run in more than one election and this was Reagan’s second... out of three) but Reagan wasn’t running against Carter with four years of disaster behind him, Carter had four years of *Watergate-less* promise in front him. (WEB: *The Metrics in Favor of a Romney Win*, 2012)
- d. We strained to see a tell-tale red sole on the bottoms of those glam kicks, but alas, she was *Louboutin-less*. (WEB: *Who will be the first lady of fashion?*, 2012)
- e. She called in to say a *Simon-less* “Idol” will be a snooze fest. (SPOK: *CNN_Showbiz*, 2010)
- f. An *Eddie Murphy-less* Oscars. We’re disappointed, too. (MAG: *Esquire*, 2012)

Górska (1995) analyses negative evaluations of the suffix *-less* as motivated by possession metaphors within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics⁶¹. It is a loss of (an inalienable) possession which activates negative implication of the ‘privative’ suffix *-less* as in *legless*, *motherless*, *waterless* etc. With proper nouns, the suffix *-less* does not refer to a loss of a person, but member exclusion (‘without’) which may or may not have a negative outcome. In contrast to the negative overtones in privative adjectives with common nouns as bases, the neutralized *-less* is more typical of the derivatives with proper nouns as bases:

(55)

- a. The group’s only *Cindy-less* album, “Good Stuff,” is released in June 1992. (NEWS: *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, 2002)

⁶¹ Górska (1994, 1995, and 2001) also discusses the *-less* and *-free* adjectives in terms of intention and control which speakers can or cannot exert (*smoke-free city* vs. *moonless nights*). Hammond (2011: 15) observes that this analysis is overgeneralized seeing that it is not always possible to determine the presence or absence of intention and human control in the *-less* derivatives e.g. *stainless watch*.

- b. “Good Vibrations,” “Surfer Girl” and plenty of other classic California rock from the *Wilson-less* band led by Mike Love and longtime Beach Boy Bruce Johnston. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2001)
- c. But let’s call a spade a spade: Does this stillgelling show have the chops to pacify a grieving, *Jerry-less* nation? (MAG: Entertainment Weekly, 1998)
- d. Netflix later announced that the forthcoming *Spacey-less* season would be the show’s final run and would focus on Robin Wright’s Claire Underwood. (MAG: Hollywood Reporter, 2018)
- e. Meanwhile, the cast members are gradually prepping themselves for a *Kyra-less* existence with more than a little personal difficulty. (WEB: The Cast of “The Closer” Prepare to Spin-Off, 2012)
- f. The last American team that went *Tiger-less* was Azinger’s 2008 squad of overachievers, and that one turned out just fine. (MAG: Golf Magazine, 2014)
- g. Saturday’s matchup against the *Dwyane Wade-less* Miami Heat followed the same forgettable script of most games this season. (BLOG: Miami Heat 97, Phoenix Suns 88 – Groundhog Day 2012)

It is interesting to point out that the suffix *-less* with personal names is normally used in discourses presenting news and events from sports and entertainment industry e.g. *Aniston-less* sequel, *Brian-less* Beach Boys, *Bryce Harper-less* Phillies, *Coppola-less* Godfather, *Griffin-less* offense, *Hagar-less* rock titans Van Halen, *Jordan-less* post-season, *Kobe-less* coverage, *LeBron-less* postseason, *Nadal-less* final, *Owens-less* squad, *Rooneyless* 60 Minutes etc. The *-less* derivatives can be also added to the names of clubs e.g. *Diamondback-less*, *Brave-less*, *Mariner-less* (season) etc.

In terms of their distributional properties, the *-less* derivatives are adjectival formations which are either modifiers in noun phrases (56a and 56b) or heads of adjectival phrases when used predicatively (56c and 56d). In narrative texts, they are used in apposition as well (56e and 56f):

(56)

- a. They upset the *Shaq-less* Lakers and will face the *Chuck-less* Rockets after being off Tuesday. (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 1999)
- b. “The complexity lies in the fact that Nike is not acting in an *Adidas-less* vacuum. Adidas is on trend, in high demand, and getting stronger, which likely complicates or prolongs Nike's recovery.” (MAG: MarketWatch, 2017)
- c. He’s still *Oscar-less* after all these years. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1993)
- d. We strained to see a tell-tale red sole on the bottoms of those glam kicks, but alas, she was *Louboutin-less*. (WEB: Who will be the first lady of fashion?, 2012)
- e. Kat, *Giles-less*, pulled the sleeve of her T-shirt tight to dab at her eyes. (FIC: Virginia Quarterly Review, 2013)
- f. In 1965, arriving at college, *Google-less* of course, I went deep underground and spun The New York Times on microfilm as far back as it went. (NEWS: New York Times, 2012)

The [ProperN-*less*]_A constructs can also take the function of an adverbial, though less frequently:

(57)

- a. Marth noted a few things to quell the disappointment he felt when he returned *Roy-less* to the smash mansion. (BLOG: FanFiction, 2012)
- b. In the National League, the New York Mets are in the playoffs but playing poorly and *Pedro-less*. (SPOK: NPR_Saturday, 2006)

- c. I know you've been punished because you had to spend the last hour *Ralph-less*. (TV: Married with Children, T-R-A Something, Something Spells Tramp, 1992)

The *-less* derivatives with proper nouns may be used in the constructional idiom *find oneself + adjective* as well:

(58)

- a. I know the guys (my husband included) will give in to the shocking relaxation of finding themselves *Facebook-less* in a place like Stehekin, even if it takes a day or two to adjust. (MAG: Sunset, 2008)
- b. After weeks of preparing for a smash-mouth debate with Donald J. Trump, 14 Republican candidates found themselves instead *Trump-less* but sandwiched into a constricting format on Monday night, delivering strikingly uneven performances just days before the first big test of the presidential primary contest. (NEWS: New York Times, 2015)
- c. It's opening night in Hell's Kitchen, and the red team... Get out, Gina. Once again finds themselves *Gina-less* in the kitchen. While on the blue side...(TV: Hell's Kitchen, Nineteen Chefs Compete, 2013)

Having in mind the distributional and semantic characteristics of the constructs with proper nouns and *-less*, the constructional schema is as follows:

XXVI. < [[X]_{ProperNi} less]_{Aj} ↔ [Without/Excluding SEM_i]_j >

6.4.2.2 Construction with proper nouns and *-free*

There seems to be no unanimous descriptive account of the final element *-free* in literature on derivational morphology in English. Adams (2001) notices its suffix-like character following Marchand's interpretation of *-like*. Lieber (2005) stays indecisive in choosing between the terms suffix and combining form and contrasts its positive connotation to the negative one of the privative adjective-forming suffix *-less* e.g. *sugarless* and *sugar-free*. Górska (2001: 191) uses the term 'co-functional suffixes' to describe both privative elements *-less* and *-free*, but without precisely describing their function, only their semantics. Hamawand (2007: 74) names *-less* and *-free* 'denominal free suffixes' due to their dual role i.e. they can be used as separate words and they act like suffixes in complex words. Bauer et al. (2013: 351) state that *-free* with common nouns is undoubtedly a compound element when all its properties are taken into account and not only its semantics.

Regarding their semantics, complex words with *-free* are solely discussed in comparison with the corresponding *-less* derivatives, because both *-less* and *-free* are accounted for creating privative adjectives that have the same central sense 'without' (Górska 1995: 36). However, the suffix *-free* is becoming more and more frequent in creating new words with the privative meaning, thus surpassing its forerunner *-less* in contemporary English in terms of frequency and productivity. For instance, Górska (1995: 43) first argues for the unacceptability of *mother-free*, *father-free* and *child-free* on the grounds of social expectations because a loss of a relative cannot be evaluated as positive, but later shows that the nonce-formation *child-free* can be accepted when it conceptualizes an intentional action (Górska 2001: 190). In fact, a new modern way of living has prompted the creation of complex words with *-free* such as *fat-free milk*, *gluten-free diet*, *hands-free cell phones*, *stress-free lifestyle* etc. The privative *-free* formations are always evaluated as positive and/or neutral, and never negative.

The suffix *-free* has been of great interest to linguists inasmuch as its domain is not limited to a specific group of nouns, and it attaches readily to almost any nominal. According to Górska (1994, 1995, 2001), the *-free* formations conceptualize one's intention and refer to the course of events which are within human control i.e. one freely chooses to be without the notion denoted by the base as in *smoke-free city*. Hamawand (2007: 77) elaborates two readings of *-free*: 'lacking the desirable thing imparted by the nominal root' and 'lacking the undesirable thing imparted by the nominal root.' The former refers to something that an individual dislikes all the time e.g. *cloud-free sky*, and the latter to something that an individual occasionally dislikes e.g. *child-free gathering*. As it is impossible to determine frequency of a personal disliking (unless there is psycholinguistic evaluation), this dichotomy seems less plausible; however, Hamawand (2007: 77) also states that the notion denoted by the base is "categorically unwanted" i.e. it is desirable to be without the notion denoted by the base.

In practice, intentional action and undesirability are based on our experience and they follow from our perception and attitude to something e.g. pain, smoke etc. The positive evaluation of the complex words ending in *-free* (which comes from the state of being without the notion denoted by the base) is more likely to be a pragmatic feature, and not an intrinsic semantic reading of *-free* (Šuković 2023). Their privative reading is interpreted via cognitive domain of containment and its inherent inside – outside contrast (Kikuchi 2017); an item x is negated when it is located outside a definite bounded space, which illustrates the negation of the CONTAINMENT schema.

Seeing that the privative meaning implies absence, the *-free* formations have the semantic reading of 'not containing' the notion denoted by the base:

(59)

- a. Every year the Christmas frenzy hits earlier. Now, before it's too late, I would like to propose *Christmas-free* zones. In the mall, there would be a quiet place with no glitter, bows or evergreens, where a person could have tea or coffee in a plain mug - where one could hear only conversation or (gasp!) silence and eat a sandwich that is neither shaped like a reindeer nor served by an elf. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1994)
- b. She told me: "After a couple of weeks *Fortnite-free*, I noticed my son was calmer, happier, slept better, and was not avoiding activities with friends and family as he was during his Fortnite life." (MAG: Fox News, 2019)
- c. Perhaps the only *Nokia-free* environment in all Helsinki is the sauna. (MAG: Smithsonian, 2007)
- d. Eastern Libya is on an adrenaline high, as people revel in a *Gaddafi-free* existence for the first time in 41 years. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2011)
- e. When he says romantic, does he mean *Brad-free*? Yep, just me, my guy and no witch hunter. (TV/MOV: Sabrina, the Teenage Witch, Ice Station Sabrina, 1999)
- f. You see, I've been trying to keep my life one hundred per cent *Justin Bieber-free* and to have his girlfriend just waltz her way into my unassuming heart was a bit of a shock to my system. (BLOG: Some kind of madness is swallowing me whole, 2012)

The idea that complex words with the suffix *-free* embody the negation of the CONTAINMENT schema is supported by their collocates denoting space e.g. *Butthead-free* world, *Firefox-free* environment, *Saddam-free* Iraq, *Twinkie-free* country, *Wal-Mart-free* zones, *Zach-free* areas, etc. Moreover, as time is metaphorically construed as space (Lakoff and Johnson 1980), the *-free* outputs also collocate with words denoting time e.g. *Cole-free* future, *Game of Thrones-free* months, *Jenny-free* holiday season, *Kevin-free* evening, *Mike-free* Thanksgiving, *Nikon-free* moments, *Washington-free* week etc.

The formal representation of the constructional schema with proper noun and *-free* as constituents is as follows⁶²:

XXVII. < [[X]_{ProperN_i} *free*]_{A_j} ↔ [Without/Not Containing SEM_i]_j >

6.4.2.2.1 Pragmatic use of the constructs with proper nouns and *-free*

From a pragmatic point of view, the [ProperN-*free*]_A constructs are indeed sometimes used in contexts which illustrate a positive outcome of being better off without the notion denoted by the base. This is particularly common in discourses about social relationships in which the undesirable notion is an individual (60a-60c). On the other hand, in technical registers, the neutral tone is conveyed as the topic is related to an object (60d-60f):

(60)

- a. Dr Crane, are you all right? - Daphne, shh. Do you hear that? - What? - The sound of a *Sherry-free* apartment. I've been basking in it for the last 30 minutes. My God. I feel like a seafront village after the Vikings have left. (TV/ MOV: *Fraiser*, *Three Dates and a Breakup*, 1997)
- b. I can't stand her. I can't. I can't. - We talked about this, Breena. It's a *Deborah-free* zone for our own sanity. (TV/ MOV: *Won't Back Down*, 2021)
- c. The recent pictures of her- robust, fully a woman now, the copper-colored Marilyn Monroe curls, the sequined gowns now filled out with curves, *Bobby-free*, her own self perhaps for the first time in her life, working on a new film playing diva mother in a remake of a movie from her glory years. (MAG: *Essence*, 2012)
- d. In an *Android-free* world where Apple's first serious competitor, Windows 8, was just leaving the starting blocks, just how successful, profitable and unassailable would iOS have grown in the meantime? (BLOG: *Google vs. Samsung*, 2012)
- e. We also pit Windows XP against the latest in Linux to reveal the ins and outs of *Microsoft-free* computing. (MAG: *PC World*, 2002)
- f. Besides instantly doubling the IQ of the Senate, Agre would be the first Nobel Prize winner for science to be elected to Congress. While the Senate has been *Nobel-free* for more than six decades, he would join three prior senators and one vice president (the president of the Senate) who received Nobel Peace Prizes. (NEWS: *USA Today*, 2007)

In journalism and news coverage, complex words with proper nouns and *-free* have two specialized negative readings 'not informed about' and 'not commenting about' which are inferred from a lack of information about an individual (based on the author's findings in Šuković 2023). In this case, a metonymic shift PERSON FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE PERSON takes place, and owing to our encyclopedic knowledge about the current state of affairs, this transfer is easily understood⁶³:

(61)

- a. Brian Lamb, who launched C-SPAN 15 years ago out of an apartment building, says his network is "the *O.J.-free* zone." (NEWS: *Washington Post*, 1994)

⁶² The semantic information 'not containing' is taken from the author's analysis of *-like* and *-free* formations in the theoretical framework of Relational Morphology (Šuković 2023).

⁶³ All the examples in (61) are taken from the author's presentation on proper names with *-like* and *-free* in spoken English (Šuković 2023).

- b. Well, first of all, they -- what he managed for this whole week was to more or less take the accent off the whole question of Monica, it was practically a *Monica-free* week here in Washington. (SPOK: NPR_Saturday, 1998)
- c. Did anything change in the way the media has covered this story? Jane Hall, let's go to you first. Have you noticed an evolution there? JANE-HALL-AMERICA: Well, I haven't noticed exactly an evolution. I've noticed more and more intimate details. I've been trying to live in an *Amber Frey-free* zone in the past (UNINTELLIGIBLE), and had to look at the coverage sort of. (SPOK: Fox_Saturday; 2004)
- d. This is a *Lewinsky-free* zone this week. We're not talking about impeachment, we're talking about education. (SPOK: NPR_TalkNation, 1998)
- e. I have been keeping my commentary *Tebow-free*. And I'm going to maintain that. (SPOK: ABC_ThisWeek, 2012)

Since there is a lack of information about someone, the semantic information of the *-free* constructional schema should contain the privative marker 'without' (instead of the general negative 'not' marker):

XXVIII. < [[X]_{ProperNi} *free*]_{Aj} ↔ [Without Being Informed/Commenting about SEM_i]_j >

6.5 Summary

In this Chapter, we have analyzed the suffixed formations with proper nouns as formal bases from COCA. The analysis of proper nouns with 'contentful' (as opposed to transpositional) suffixes has led to interesting findings on the form and meaning of the suffixed outputs, especially in the case of rival suffixes. The [ProperN-*suffix*] constructs are examined in various grammatical and usage-based settings, and their overall constructionist representation takes into account not only their form-meaning correspondence but also their constituent role in syntactic structures.

The rival verb-forming suffixes *-ify/-ize* show different degrees of productivity and pragmatic interpretation with proper nouns; the suffix *-ize* is more frequent and productive and it is generally unmarked, whereas the less productive and infrequent suffix *-ify* gives rise to novel words which have a strongly negative tone to them. As for the semantic meaning and distributional properties of the *-ify/-ize* suffixed proper nouns, the [ProperN-*ify*]_v and [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs share the identical grammatical design: the novel verbs have a combined causative and simulative reading and they are transitive verbs which are often used in Passive constructions with no overt agent.

The four rival abstract noun-forming suffixes *-dom*, *-hood*, *-ness* and *-ship* illustrate systematic and creative mechanisms for expanding the lexicon of English: their outputs with proper nouns as formal bases are not only produced by abstract morphological constructions but also by analogical word-formation in which we may pinpoint a model word and proportional relation that triggers analogy. In addition, the proper nouns with noun-forming suffixes may exhibit underlying semantic and pragmatic features. Being the most productive and frequent with proper nouns, the suffix *-ness* creates new words in a semantically and pragmatically unrestricted way – its use in *of*-genitive constructions (both as a head and a modifier) demonstrates that *-ness* suffixation is a default way of producing abstract nouns that could stand for any kind of entity. The sense extensions from a single dominating schema to four subschemas suggest polysemy with *-dom* constructions. Inheritance of unique person denotation might explain the meaning connections between paradigmatic *-ism/-ist* constructions. The proper nouns with the suffixes *-ite* and *-ese* incorporate a specific feature ('follower' and 'jargon' respectively) in their semantic information. The 'collective' reading of the [ProperN/Person or Place-(*i*)*ana*]_N constructs stems from their syntactic role as a modifier in the partitive *of*-genitive construction.

The rival adjective-forming suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, *-like* and *-oid* produce novel formations with the meaning ‘similar to/resembling’ the proper noun denoted by the base. The similarity is conceptualized as a non-physical connection/link between two entities that share at least one similar feature of any kind. The four constructional schemas bear the same semantic information, but their constructs are licensed in certain usage-based settings: the [ProperN-*esque*]_A constructs highlight the ‘picturesque’ aspect of the proper noun in context and create established words/dictionary forms, the [ProperN-*ish*]_A constructs are hyphenated one-offs, the [ProperN-*like*]_A constructs are neutral, and the [ProperN-*oid*]_A constructs have a scientific or disparaging tone. The similative [ProperN-*esque*]_A, [ProperN-*ish*]_A and [ProperN-*like*]_A constructs are qualitative adjectives, and as such, they are modifiers in the Modification construction and can be used in Comparative constructions and existential *there*-constructions. The ‘negative’ correlative suffixes *-less* and *-free* form privative adjectives with proper nouns as formal bases; the semantic negation is expressed as exclusion in the [ProperN-*less*]_A constructs and the negation of containment in the [ProperN-*free*]_A constructs.

7 Affix combination with proper nouns

The term ‘affix combination’ refers to a morphological make-up of complex words which consist of a base and at least two affixes. A single word may show a specific pattern of prefix combinations e.g. *non-anti-Trump*, suffix combinations e.g. *Harvardization*, or prefix and suffix combinations e.g. *de-Stalinize*. In this thesis, the collected sample includes the formations with proper nouns as bases which are the outputs of the second-level derivation i.e. constructs consisting of only two affixes i.e. two prefixes [*prefix-[prefix-ProperN]*], two suffixes [[*ProperN-suffix]-suffix*], or one prefix and one suffix [*prefix-[ProperN-suffix]*] and less often [*prefix-ProperN]-suffix*]. The combinations principally consist of at least one affix which is highly productive and attested in use with proper nouns from the previous chapters on prefixation and suffixation. The total of 21 affixes, 12 prefixes (*anti-*, *de-*, *ex-*, *neo-*, *non-*, *post-*, *pre-*, *pro-*, *proto-*, *pseudo-*, *re-* and *un-*) and 9 suffixes (*-(c)ation*, *-esque*, *-ic*, *-ify*, *-ish*, *-ism*, *-ist*, *-ize* and *-ness*), are involved in affix combinations with proper nouns. As for the formations with proper nouns and three or more affix combinations, they are also attested in COCA, but mostly as hapax legomena – having this in mind, only highly productive patterns are listed with the aim of highlighting a possibility of subsequent derivation.

7.1 Preliminaries

As the inventory of the English language comprises a variety of native and non-native affixes, some of which create new complex words with more or less the same semantics, linguists have always been interested in testing their productivity and combinatorial properties. At first, generative theorists tried to assign specific mechanisms of extrinsic level-ordering in order to explain in what way complex words could be affected by phonological and morphological behavior of affixes belonging to different strata. The models justified possible combinations of affixes belonging to the same level or stratum and gave a strong reason for excluding unacceptable combinations of different strata⁶⁴.

Later, Plag and Bayeen (2009: 110-111) drew attention to a few potential problems regarding the stratum-based approaches: firstly, the stratification based on etymology fails to explain how native speakers become highly skilled in combining different affixes without any prior etymological knowledge; secondly, even though the level-ordering hypothesis is constructed on the basis of phonological behavior of affixes, it has been shown that affixes of the same stratum do not undergo the same morphophonological alternations, which results in “a continuum, rather than with a discrete two-level system;” thirdly, doublets may exist, which means that some suffixes belong to both strata e.g. *comparáble* and *cómparable*; and finally, dual membership may occur as well e.g. stress-neutral *-ist* is followed by a stress-shifting *-ic* as in *natural-ist-ic*, or stress-neutral *-ize* is followed by stress-shifting *-ation* as in *colon-iz-ation*.

The stratification model was first rejected by Fabb (1988) who investigated the combinatorial properties of 43 suffixes, which were attested in only 50 two suffix combinations, whereas the stratificational model would predict 459 out of the 1849 combinations. Instead of level restrictions, Fabb introduces individual selectional restrictions. Later, it was empirically demonstrated that these restrictions were arbitrary and did not account for all possible restrictions (see Plag 1996, 1999). Nevertheless, Fabb’s paper remains of the utmost importance in the literature due to its illuminating insights into the level-ordering hypothesis and bracketing paradoxes i.e. a

⁶⁴ For instance an adjective ending in the first level suffix *-ic* combines with a noun-forming suffix of the same level i.e. *-ity*, whereas an adjective ending in the second level suffix *-less* combines with a noun-forming suffix of the same level i.e. *-ness*; the combinations of different level suffixes are considered ungrammatical such as **-ic-ness* and **-less-ic* (see Siegel 1974; Allen 1978; Selkirk 1982; Kiparsky 1982; Mohanan 1986; Geigerich 1999).

level I suffix may freely attach to the words derived with level II prefix as in *un-grammatical-ity*, or instances of level II suffixes occurring immediately before level I suffixes in existing combinations such as *-abil-ity*, *-ist-ic*, and *-ment-al* (Fabb 1988: 527).

Soon after, Plag (1996, 1999) shows that selectional restrictions are not solely affix-driven as suggested by Fabb (1988), but also base-driven e.g. bases with verb-forming suffixes *-ize*, *-ify* and *-ate* select only the noun-forming suffix *-(c)ation*. Generally speaking, selectional restrictions may rule out possible combinations on structural grounds (see Zirkel 2010). There are also other factors involved in creating derived words such as paradigmatic factors and blocking, which are more likely to occur with less productive affixes.

Apart from structural restrictions underlying certain grammatical and semantic features, the combinability of affixes depends on processing factors as proposed by Hay (2002). Hay's hypothesis, subsequently dubbed Complexity-Based Ordering by Plag (2002), predicts that more separable affixes will occur outside less separable affixes, and it represents the starting point for both prefix and suffix ordering (Hay 2002: 532). Affixes that are more decomposable and highly separable are more productive as well. However, decomposition (or morphological segmentability or separability of affixes) is not a matter of "yes or no," but it is rather a gradient phenomenon as it depends on processing factors and the representation of a complex word in the mental lexicon; for instance, the suffix *-ment* may be easily decomposed and accessed via 'decomposed route' in *discern-ment* and less transparent and accessed by 'whole word route' in *govern-ment* (Bauer et al. 2013: 496).

The idea that a morphologically complex word is seen as a structure with an open, schematic slot is in line with cognitive and constructionist principles which specify that morphological constructions belong to different levels of schematization. In fact, separability represents a type of entrenchment given that existing slots are more freely filled when constructions are more easily segmented in the mind of the speaker (Hilpert 2014). This means that there is a certain hierarchy of constructions in the speaker's inventory of all constructions (constructicon), and it is related to certain processing factors as well.

While investigating the role of processing factors in suffix combinations, Hay and Plag (2004) and Plag and Baayen (2009) show that hierarchical suffix ordering is positively correlated with productivity e.g. less productive affixes are placed closer to the base as in *child-hood-less*, *king-dom-less*, *lead-er-less* etc. In her research on prefix combinations, Zirkel (2010) also confirms the Complexity-Based Ordering predictions i.e. more productive prefixes appear as outermost prefixes in complex words such as *anti-sub*, *non-inter*, *un-pre* etc. Bauer et al. (2013: 496) also notice that low frequency forms favor more separable affixes such as *-ish* in contrast to *-ic* which is found in established complex words.

The biggest advantage of the abovementioned empirical testing of affix ordering lies in their manifold sources and large databases. Some instances of empirically attested affix combinations were not previously found in traditional sources such as dictionaries. For examples, Zirkel (2010) finds that the prefix *un-* can be recursive and used as an outermost suffix in combinations with other negative prefixes such as *mis-* and *dis-* (without violating Complexity-Based Ordering principles and posing any structural and semantic restrictions), whereas Lehrer (1995) does not come up with any attested combinations with the same prefixes in her dictionary search, and thus dismisses them as possible. As Bauer et al. (2013) notice some co-occurrences of two affixes do not come about regularly and only large samples with up-dated texts may show possible affix combinations in a single word.

Having in mind decomposition and productivity as key factors in predicting possible affix combinations, proper nouns appear as suitable bases for testing affix combinations, because their constructs are predominantly of low frequency and easily decomposable due to their easily discernible morphophonological shape with obvious morpheme junctures. Thus, it is expected that the corpus examples confirm the previous findings in research based on Complexity-Based Ordering principles (Bauer et al. 2013; Hay 2002; Hay and Plag 2004; Plag and Baayen 2009; Zirkel 2010).

7.2 Prefix combinations with proper nouns: Attested constructs

With regard to potential prefix combinations, Zirkel (2010) notices that hierarchical prefix ordering correlates exclusively with morphological productivity⁶⁵. Her research on 15 prefixes (*anti-*, *be-*, *counter-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *fore-*, *inter-*, *mis-*, *non-*, *pre-*, *re-*, *sub-*, *super-*, *trans-*, and *un-*) shows that more productive prefixes appear as outermost prefixes and they are less likely to occur closer to the base. However, the author doubts whether productivity can be taken as a strong indicator in prefix combinations, or it may be that some other processing mechanism takes place since a large number of potential two-prefix combinations are structurally and semantically acceptable such as *sub-interface* and *inter-sub-culture* and even the cases of recursion as *sub-sub-section* (Zirkel 2010: 260).

In general, prefixes show a higher degree of separability and flexibility than suffixes. Plag (2004) highlights two important reasons behind this: a) prefixes are rarely phonologically restricted; b) they are not heavily constrained with regard to the category of the base they may be added to. The restrictions regarding prefix combinations are almost exclusively due to semantic reasons such as *mis-pre-* and *counter-super-* (Zirkel 2010: 254). After having studied two-prefix combinations with 15 different prefixes, Zirkel concludes that only *non-be-* is a syntactically restricted combination. Lehrer (1995) also states that in prefix combinations any syntactic restriction should be first tested because some syntactic restrictions may be alternatively overridden provided they are semantically and/or pragmatically possible. What's more, some prefix combinations should not be automatically ruled out because their non-occurrence may be due to their absence in corpora and not actual unacceptability of the form; Bauer et al. (2013: 498) find that four prefix combinations with prefixes *inter-*, *sub-*, and *pre-* in first position, which were originally ruled out by Zirkel (2010), are attested in a larger sample.

The right order of prefixes in any combination is determined by looking at the overall morphological make-up of a complex word. This is especially relevant when non-native prefixes are included in the combination. It may be that an outermost prefix has scope over the whole complex word (consisting of the innermost prefix and the base), and not just the base itself as in *anti-postmodern* and *postantibiotic* (Bauer et al. 2013: 498). Lehrer (1995: 142) notices that this is typical of prefix combinations consisting of Latinate prefixes such as *anti-*, *counter-*, *ex-*, *meta-*, *mini-*, *pro-*, *pseudo-*, *super-*, *sub-*, and *vice-* in complex words. Most of the listed prefixes may combine in either order resulting in derivatives with different meanings e.g. *pro-anti-government* vs. *anti-pro-government*.

With proper nouns, attested two-prefix combinations are infrequent and they all create the formations which are one-offs or hapax legomena. From a structural point of view, the outermost prefix has the scope over the proper noun with the innermost prefix, and it is either more productive (1a and 1b) or has the same degree of productivity as the innermost prefix (1c and 1d). In the selected examples from COCA, it is interesting to note that at least one of the prefixes in each combination is evaluative e.g. *anti-* (1a and 1c), *pro-* (1c), *proto-* (1d), and *pseudo-* (1b):

(1)

- a. In fairness, I suppose that's exactly how Assange and the rest of what I've previously described as the "*non-anti-Trump* left" view the situation. (MAG: Salon, 2019)
- b. "It's not a *mini-pseudo-Medici* affair where you're commissioning work for your own pleasure and retention," he said by telephone from London. (NEWS: New York Times, 2007)

⁶⁵ Apart from decomposition and productivity, other parsibility measures (such as type parsing ratio, token parsing ratio and average rank in boundary strength) are studied in suffix combinations as well (see Hay and Plag 2004; Plag and Baayen 2009).

- c. Nina, who was very *pro-anti-Gamsakhurdia*, repeated all the complaints against the man. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 1991)
- d. Among the gifts those *proto-demi-Celts* had given Alston was a girl they'd taken prisoner from the Earth Folk, the Fiernan Bohulugi, the megalith-building natives of Alba. (FIC: On the oceans of eternity, 2000)

Owing to their easily segmented morphological make-up, the formations with proper nouns and two prefixes are structurally and semantically acceptable. This also applies to less likely cases of repetition of the same prefix or recursion. It has been debated whether duplicating semantic features in derivation by means of repetition results in redundancy, and to what extent it should be permitted. Lieber (2004) stresses that there is a possibility of repetition in affix combinations provided it is informative and acceptable on pragmatic grounds. Lehrer (1995) also regards repetition of the same prefix as semantically acceptable unless the derived form is ruled out for stylistic reasons. Bauer et al. (2013: 499) point out that repetition may be bypassed when other lexical units or synonymous prefixes are introduced e.g. *re-elect again* instead of *re-re-elect*, and *mega-superstars* instead of *super-superstars*.

With proper nouns, the repetitions of the temporal prefix *post-* (2a and 2b) and evaluative prefixes *anti-* and *proto-* (2c and 2d) are attested in COCA. The repetition of the prefix *post-* and *anti-* creates semantically acceptable outputs because it is possible to determine the scope of prefixation; both kinds of formation have a morphological make-up [*prefix-[prefix-ProperN]*]. By determining the exact scope we are able to narrow down a certain event in time and a group of people with the same attitude. The repetition of the prefix *proto-* may seem informative in the sense of narrowing down a specific scope of people with the same qualities, but it could be also a way of emphasizing one's (extreme) behavior:

(2)

- a. On what seems like the first true *post-post-Katrina* record, homegrown instrumental funkateers Galactic have found a way to celebrate New Orleans by forging forward without looking back at the disaster. At least not directly. (MAG: Esquire, 2007)
- b. The nation's 36 four-star and 121 three-star generals and admirals, who have risen through the ranks of 185,000 commissioned officers, are the military's *post-post-Vietnam* generation. (MAG: U.S. News & World Report, 1990)
- c. It's not that his anti-Bush, anti-SUV, *anti-anti-Muslims*, anti-war, anti-Ariel Sharon, anti-Israeli policy, anti-black neo-cons, anti-homophobia, pro-choice, pro-Palestinian, pro-environmental political stance is particularly rare in Berkeley, where he lives. Yet, there aren't many cartoonists in the country drawing from his perspective -- that of an Algerian Muslim American who alternately identifies himself as an Arab, a Semite, an African and a Maghreb, although he has been increasingly foregrounding his religious identity since "that's what's most threatened since 9-11." (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 2003)
- d. You forgot to mention that Engels was another *proto-proto-Nazi*: he proposed the extermination of the "reactionary" Slavic races except for the Poles: here is a difference with Herr Hitler. (BLOG: American Jews Still Refuse to See the Light on Obama, 2012)

Without enough data, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions regarding the schemas of the above constructs, but only to note that their morphological make-up is most likely [*prefix-[prefix-ProperN]*]_{N/A}. Semantically, the outer prefix has the scope over the first-level derivative, and this makes each formation highly compositional and easy to process in context.

7.3 Suffix combinations with proper nouns: Constructions and constructs

With regard to suffix combinations, multiple suffixes may be added to a base following a specific hierarchy introduced by Hay (2002). The hierarchy hypothesis predicts possible and impossible suffix combinations depending on their separability – if the suffix A is more separable than suffixes X, Y and Z, but less separable than suffixes B, C and D so that the hierarchy of suffixes is X-Y-Z-A-B-C-D, some of possible combinations are BASE-A-B, BASE-X-A-C and BASE-Y-Z-A, whereas *BASE-A-Z, BASE-Y-A-Z and BASE-X-A-Y are impossible (Hay and Plag, 2004: 572-573). Any range of possible combinations is subsequently constrained by selectional restrictions, which indicates that Complexity-Based Ordering and selectional restrictions operate side by side: the ordering of suffixes takes place based on a hierarchy of boundary strength (suffixes with weaker boundaries precede those with stronger boundaries in derived words), and it is subsequently curtailed by phonological, morphological, syntactic or semantic constraints. The hierarchy of suffixes established on the interaction of processing separability and grammatical constraints results in the structures that are easier to process.

This was first empirically tested on 15 derivational suffixes (*-dom, -ee, -en, -er, -ess, -ful* (adjectival) and *-ful* (nominal), *-hood, -ish, -less, -ling, -ly, -ness, -ship, -th*) most of which belong to level II suffixes given their Germanic origin (Hay and Plag 2004). The research produced surprising results; out of 210 potential two-suffix combinations, only 36 combinations were attested in the British National Corpus (BNC), the CELEX lexical database, the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and web search, as opposed to 184 two-suffix combinations which the traditional stratum or level-ordering hypothesis would predict. Later, Plag and Baayen (2009) came to the same conclusion in their research on suffix ordering and morphological processing when they included the same 15 suffixes and added 16 more suffixes of Germanic and Latinate origin: *-age, -ary* (nominal) and *-ary* (adjectival), *-(e)ry, -ette, -fold, -(i)an, -ism, -ist, -ive, -ment, -or, -ous, -ster, -wise, -ly*). They also addressed some problems that had been raised by Hay and Plag (2004), but not dealt with directly. The most important one is the case of suffixes that could appear inside and outside each other such as *-less-ness* and *-ness-less*. What is interesting about the given pair of suffixes is that the alternation is not anticipated by complexity-based ordering. This fact led the authors to question constituent-driven processing and place more importance on the role of memory.

With proper nouns, there are only very few patterns with attested two-suffix combinations. However, there are a lot of hapax legomena, which indicates that at least one suffix in each combination is highly productive. The innermost suffix is also the one which derives a huge number of one-offs and it is by default productive, whereas the outermost suffix has the same or higher degree of productivity. In two-suffix combinations with proper nouns, there are four innermost suffixes which freely and unrestrictedly take another suffix. The verb-forming suffixes *-ify* and *-ize* take the nominalizing suffix *-(c)ation*, the noun-forming suffix *-ist* is followed by the adjective-forming suffix *-ic*, and the adjective-forming suffix *-ish* combines with the suffix *-ness* to form abstract nouns. All suffixes in their patterns show strong combinatorial properties, which is in line with Complexity-Based Ordering and selectional restrictions.

7.3.1 Constructions with proper nouns and *-ify/-ize* and *-(c)ation*

The first-level derivatives with the verb-forming suffixes *-ify* or *-ize* exclusively select the most productive non-native nominalizing suffix *-(c)ation*. Complex words with the suffix *-(c)ation* never denote concrete things and their semantics may vary (Marchand 1969: 261). With deverbal proper nouns, the nominalizations ending in the suffix *-(c)ation* have different meanings which are likely to be a result of the interaction between the semantics of the first-level derivative and an

extra-linguistic factor. Moreover, the nominalizations are highly context-dependent and the correct reading can be sometimes inferred only within the given context.

Given that the first-level derivatives [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v have combined causative and similitive meanings, the second-level derivatives (their nominalizations) normally take an argument which is a patient in an *of*-genitive construction [DET N_{head} of NP_{mod}] e.g. the *Beirutization* of Karachi, the *CNN-ization* of journalism, the *Dr. Philization* of America, the *Gorbachevization* of American mystery fiction, the *Oscarization* of world cinema, the *Sovietization* of Karabakh, the *Turkification* of the nation etc. The semantic role assigned to these *of*-genitive constructions is Action-Patient in which the head represents an action and the modifier a patient. The Action-Patient relation is an extended sense linked to the sense Possessed-Possessor (Stefanowitch 1998); what's interesting, this is also encoded by the *s*-genitive construction (see Miladinović 2015; Stefanowitsch 1998). However, the *s*-genitive constructions are not attested with proper nouns in COCA. The explanation for this lies in the interpretation of genitive constructions as information-structure constructions (Stefanowitsch 2003).

In the representation of the two genitive constructions as information structures, the head nominal is active and the modifier is inactive in terms of activation state, which is in line with the Action-Patient relation in both constructions. The difference between the two structures lies in the animacy value of the head and the modifier. The information packaging hypothesis predicts that the modifier has a higher animacy value than the head in *s*-genitive constructions. On the other hand, according to the corpus findings (Stefanowitsch 2003: 426), the modifier in an *of*-genitive construction may be at the higher, lower or the same level of animacy as the head e.g. *a picture of Lisa*, *a man of honor*, and *the son of my neighbor*. These findings are also confirmed with the examples from COCA if we compare the animacy value of the base of the head and the modifier in *of*-genitive constructions:

(3)

- (i) the modifier has a lower animacy value than the base of the head e.g. *the cuddly Clintonization of prime-time TV*;
- (ii) the modifier is at the same animacy level as the base of the head e.g., *the Beirutization of Karachi*, *the "Paris Hiltonization" of young girls*;
- (iii) the modifier has a higher animacy value than the base of the head e.g. *the 'Japanization' of the Westerners*.

The nominalizations are most frequent with proper nouns denoting geographical entities i.e. countries, states, cities and city quarters. The patient is most commonly another geographical entity politically or socially affected by an action specified in the first-level derivative. The connotations are mostly disparaging (4a-4f), sometimes even jocular (4g), and neutral only in historical accounts (4h):

(4)

- a. The anti-growth and rent control regulations enacted in the '70s are coming home to roost. Those laws stunt the growth of new units and have prevented the housing industry in San Francisco from responding to the dramatic increase in demand over the last two decades. Without these laws investors would provide the homes needed by the area's residents. In San Francisco, this would mean more highrise housing and furthering the dreaded *Manhattanization* of our beautiful town. But for a city that prides itself on its tolerance of people's differences, wouldn't that be preferable to bashing some newcomers just because they are young and successful? (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1999)

- b. The “Growing a new Atlanta” series decries the *Los Angeles-ization* of metro Atlanta. Downtown is decaying while the exurbs are “spreading across the Georgia countryside like kudzu.” (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1997)
- c. Even if the Egyptian military is able to curtail the Islamist forces at home, its grip over the Sinai Peninsula is tenuous. Under Gen. Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, attempts to dislodge the Sunni jihadists roaming Sinai have increased, but full Egyptian sovereignty has not been restored. This could lead to the “*Somalization*” of the peninsula, negatively affecting the safety of naval trade along the Mediterranean, the approaches to the Suez Canal, and the Red Sea. (ACAD: Middle East Quarterly, 2014)
- d. Anti-Americanism in Kenya is mitigated by Obama’s presidency and a history of close cultural, military, and political relations with the United States. But this should not be taken for granted. If it is, there is a distinct danger of the *Pakistanization* of Kenya -- its transformation into a country plagued not only by stark economic inequalities and a venal elite but also by broad sympathies for policies and ideas inimical to U.S. interests. (ACAD: Foreign Affairs, 2010)
- e. But in seeking to contain the security threat, Washington must not repeat the errors of the Bush administration in Afghanistan and Iraq, where the US focused excessively on solving immediate security problems without addressing the larger context of the terrorist threat. [...] If President Obama wants to avoid the *Afghanization* of Yemen, he should reach out to the Saudi monarch. (WEB: Yemen doesn’t have to be the next failed terrorist state, 2012)
- f. I think they would like to avoid the *Lebanonization* of Iraq where the country fragments, where the Kurds in the North are fighting the central government in Baghdad, and perhaps even fighting amongst themselves in the same, with the Shiites in the South, and then the split within the Sunis, Baathist supporters, non-Baathist supporters, so that you have confessional groups throughout Iraq that are fighting one another, and you have a replay of the Lebanon scenario. (SPOK: PBS_Newshour, 1991)
- g. If you’d like to talk about the *Floridification* of America or about the unlikely confluence of sobriety and satire in politics, or just to tell us the best Florida jokes you’ve heard over these past three weeks, give us a call or send us an e-mail. (SPOK: NPR_TalkNation, 2000)
- h. Historians have justifiably made much of the “*Carolization*” that took place in Georgia after 1750 as Carolina planters moved onto the coast, bringing with them enslaved Africans and the plantation system that exploited them. (ACAD: Georgia Historical Quarterly, 2007)

If the patient is a nation or a group of people, it may be either external or internal. The external patient refers to a nation that is affected by another country’s actions i.e. the *Bulgarization* of the Turkish population, the *Iraqization* (of the people of Kuwait), the *Israelification* (of East Jerusalem Palestinians), the ‘*Japanization*’ of the Westerners, the *Palestinization* of the Israeli Arab minority, and so on. The internal patient refers to a nation which is the largest majority of the country and takes its name after it. In this case, the nominalization denotes a special kind of policy or program introduced by the country’s government in order to create political or economic changes:

(5)

- a. Iraqification. The reality for U.S. commanders in Iraq is that they must conduct a sustained campaign with the current force, since U.S. troop levels are not expected to increase and few additional foreign troops are being pledged to share the burden. It is the commanders’ hope that the occupation army can do battle with a shadowy mix of Baath Party remnants, foreign jihadists, and ordinary criminals until Iraqis can be phased in to take charge of their own security. # It’s called “*Iraqification*,” a term of art that unfortunately evokes the failed “*Vietnamization*” three decades ago. (MAG: U.S. News & World Report, 2003)

- b. Getting more Saudis into the work force, a goal of a government “*Saudization*” program, would first mean overhauling the education system, which is run by the religious establishment and provides little practical training for the real world. (NEWS: New York Times, 2005)
- c. There was a sense that these days had come to an end, and the Gabonese government attempted to make this clear in a series of pronouncements once again stressing “*Gabonization*” and encouraging Gabonese citizens to work hard and enter jobs they had previously snubbed. (ACAD: Africa Today, 1998)

This use of the [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v nominalizations is probably analogically modeled on the established terms *Vietnamization* or *Finlandization*. *Vietnamization* implies a policy of introducing the Vietnamese troops while at the same time withdrawing the U.S. troops from Vietnam during the Vietnam War⁶⁶. The first known use of the term *Finlandization* was in 1969 and it referred to a policy of maintaining Finland’s sovereignty while at the same time acknowledging the dominant role of the Soviet Union in international affairs⁶⁷. The analogical proportion in which *x* stands for the name of the country is *Vietnamization/Finlandization* :: *x-ification/x-ization*. In practice, the two model words may give rise to new formations without any restrictions and they may prompt a new subschema in the same way as the existing lexeme *Watergate* (see 3.2.2).

When the patient is not a country or a nation, the nominalizations based on place names may refer to various kinds of situations and phenomena. As a result, the constructs are more likely to be accompanied by an explanation in the immediate context. Depending on the topic, speaker’s attitude and associations, the connotations may vary from neutral (6a and 6b) to strongly negative (6c-6f):

(6)

- a. There’s a phenomenon that geologists call ‘*New Jerseyization*’, which is, you take a sand island and you turn it into concrete in the attempt to keep it rigid and to keep from moving away and out from under the housing. (SPOK: NPR_Weekend, 1995)
- b. In Phoenix at least five high-rises are planned, touting proximity to downtown and swanky amenities like concierge service. The big question is whether the *Manhattanization* of this market, where condos make up just 8% of the housing stock, will take off. (MAG: Fortune, 2007)
- c. “We’re facing a step-by-step *Balkanization* of the global Internet,” says Columbia University law professor Tim Wu. “It’s becoming a series of national networks.” (NEWS: Associated Press, 2008)
- d. One is the “*Californization*” of world culture: Mindless diversions such as heavy-metal music may sap the Asian work ethic. (MAG: Futurist, 1993)
- e. California’s schools, once among the best-funded in the nation, have skidded to the bottom - - a process that author Peter Schrag dubbed “*Mississippification*” after the state that perennially ranks last. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1998)
- f. At the public screening, he said that in his career, there were “plenty of things I would do over” but then knocked “the corporatization, politicization, and *Hollywoodization* of news, where news is trivialized.” (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2015)

If the base of the nominalization denotes a person, the patient is necessarily a bounded entity i.e. it may be a geographical entity, a group of people or individuals, or a product upon which the influence is exerted. Again, the connotations may be neutral or positive (7a and 7b), but more often negative (7c-7i):

⁶⁶ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Vietnamization>

⁶⁷ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Finlandization>

(7)

- a. It's been called the '*Oprahization* of America,' and politicians are in on it. Tell the world about your personal life, and maybe they'll like you more. (SPOK: CBS_EyeToEye, 1995)
- b. Radio became a huge business. It's sort of like the *Reaganization* of everything. Everything became big business. (MAG: Rolling Stone, 1990)
- c. This postwar urban condition raised a "familiar modernist dilemma," one exemplified in Charles Baudelaire's nineteenth century experience of the *Hausmannization* of Paris. (ACAD: October, 2003)
- d. He calls his mission the '*Hannitization* of America.' It's a pretty simple message: conservatives, good; liberals, bad. (SPOK: CBS_Morning, 2004)
- e. Sebastian's journal is a nuanced, gracefully written and often spellbinding account of the Nazification of Europe; or more precisely, the *Nazification* of some of the best and brightest minds of the European intelligencia. (SPOK: NPR_FreshAir, 2000)
- f. The "*Saddamification*" of the Palestinian people has begun but will not end with Iraqi aggression in Kuwait. In short, you can take Saddam out of Kuwait but it will be more difficult to take Saddam out of the radicalized Palestinian mind set. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1990)
- g. As a writer, Quindlen champions women, and these days, when she gives a lecture, women in the audience want her to talk about two things: whether Hillary Clinton can win the presidency and the "*Paris Hiltonization*" of young girls today. (MAG: Good Housekeeping, 2006)
- h. Mozart's *Entführung aus dem Serail* set in a Berlin brothel: Verdis masked ball with the assembled cast, squatting on toilets so as to void their bowels- not to speak of the routine *Hitlerization* of any opera, from *Fidelio* to *Tosca*, that can be squeezed into Nazi uniform. (MAG: American Spectator, 2010)
- i. James Wolcott examines in a surprisingly sharp tone of voice the cuddly *Clintonization* of prime-time TV by Billpal Linda Bloodworth-Thomason's PC sitcoms. (MAG: American Spectator, 1992)
- j. In a score-settling book published last year, Warren Littlefield, Zucker's predecessor, wrote: "The *Zuckerization* of NBC in recent years has been marked by the belief that viewers exist to be manipulated rather than nourished." (NEWS: Washington Post, 2013)

The nominalizations which have a proper noun denoting a product or a company as their base are the least frequent. Their connotations may be neutral (8a) or positive (8b), but mostly negative (8c-8e):

(8)

- a. Since Darwin, we've basically taken a nineteenth-, twentieth-, and now a twenty-first century view of contemporary society, and we've projected them onto the past. We've imagined that the distant past to be very much like the present, just with some modifications around the edges. In the book we refer to it as "*Flintstonization*" because the Flintstones are the so-called modern Stone Age family. It's a nuclear, suburban existence, but in prehistory. (ACAD: Humanist, 2011)
- b. If the "*Wal-Martization*" of America - and increasingly, the world - stands for anything, it's this: Good ideas backed with hard work can reach unimaginable heights. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2012)
- c. I predict that the *twitterification* of our society is going to lead to an exponential increase in early-onset Alzheimer's. (MAG: Time, 2009)
- d. The *Disneyization* of "The Scarlet Letter" represents American filmmaking at its most spectacularly superficial. (NEWS: New York Times, 1995)

- e. In addition, she says, Slow Food’s message is particularly appealing to individuals who are searching for a way out of the “*McDonaldization*” of everyday life. [...] Slow Food is a way of exercising choice and freedom, and expressing our preferences, making an identity that’s separate from what’s imposed on us by the corporate commercial bureaucratic enterprises that are out there. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2001)

The *-ify/-ize* deverbal formations represent a highly productive pattern in modern English, and consequently, their nominalizations should be frequent as well. Owing to the fact that the deverbal nominalizations with proper nouns are not restricted by any specific semantic or pragmatic factors, new constructs can be readily made at any point depending on the speaker’s choice. Thus, their wide scope can be schematically represented as:

- I. < [[[X]_{ProperNi} *ify*]_{Vj} *ation*]_{Nk} ↔ [Action of Making something Similar to SEM_i under the Influence of SEM_i]_k >
- II. < [[[X]_{ProperNi} *ize*]_{Vj} *ation*]_{Nk} ↔ [Action of Making something Similar to SEM_i under the Influence of SEM_i]_k >

7.3.2 Construction with proper nouns and *-ist* and *-ic*

If a certain suffix produces a lot of new forms as the outputs of the first-level derivation, it is very likely to be productive at the second level of derivation as well – this is especially evident with neologisms ending in *-ist-ic* (Bauer et al. 2013: 303). Given that the [ProperN-*ist*]_N constructs denote individuals directly related to a doctrine denoted by an *-ism* derivative, the *-ist-ic* suffix combination with proper nouns is used to point out some characteristics in connection with the doctrine of the [ProperN-*ism*]_N constructs. The pattern is mainly used in academic and journalistic discourse on various social issues:

(9)

- a. In fact, no amount of padding could protect the inhabitants of the Bauhaus from continuous charges of communist leanings, with their festivities cited as evidence of political radicalism. The Ministry of Culture in Weimar responded to allegations in 1920, for example, that the school was “*spartacistic* and *bolshevistic*,” noting that “a complaint has been made that the neighborhood of the Bauhaus... is often disturbed by noise during the night hours.” (ACAD: Art Bulletin, 2003)
- b. Organizations may, of course, adopt all or part of the attributes necessary for a high-performance organization, which -- as I use the term -- is an ideal type that contrasts with traditional or “*Tayloristic*” organizations in American industries, governments and schools. (ACAD: Journal of International Affairs, 1994)
- c. Congressman Ellison, even before this hearing began, you branded the whole premise of it as *McCarthyistic*. (SPOK: PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST, 2011)
- d. In the wake of Starobinski’s book, I believe I would classify the *Rousseauistic* ideal of transparency – Rousseau’s own synonym for sincerity -- as one of the chief enemies of autobiography. As Rousseau himself discovered progressively, transparent sincerity is an impossible ideal: we cannot even hope to be perfectly transparent to ourselves, let alone to others. (ACAD: Symposium, 1998)
- e. Also I think, Larry, that one of the things that -- we have all been trained to pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off and start all over again. It’s kind of a *Calvinistic* way of life. (SPOK: CNN_King, 1999)

- f. Kant rejected Wolff's logic as metaphysical and *Platonistic*. (WEB: Birth of a New Science: History of Ontology from Suárez to Kant, 2012)
- g. I mean, I think in British terms, of the word "yuppy," which was so much a part of the '80s that to use the word almost conjures up that whole *Thatcheristic* experience. (SPOK: NPR_Saturday, 1998)

Under the condition that the speakers share the same encyclopedic knowledge, the meaning of adjectives referring to a doctrine's characteristics is easy to process even in less detailed contexts. This semantic information may be retrieved from the following second-order schema:

$$\text{III. } < [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Disposition/Ideology}]_i > \approx < [[[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ist}]_{\text{Nj}} \text{ic}]_{\text{Ak}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Having Characteristics related to SEM}_i]_k >$$

7.3.3 Constructs with proper nouns and 'similative' suffixes and *-ness*

The 'similative' suffix *-ish* is shown to be less frequent with proper nouns when compared to its rival counterparts *-esque* and *-like*. However, it produces a lot of hapaxes, which is one of the indicators of its high productivity. With respect to its combinatorial properties, it is attested as the innermost prefix in a two-suffix combination with *-ness*, whereas there are no attested two-suffix combinations with *-esque* in complex words with a proper noun as the base. With the suffix *-like*, there is only one attested combination in a single complex word: *Christlikeness* (7)/*Christ-likeness* (6).

The proper noun constructs with the *-ish-ness* combination refer to an abstract quality based on some unique personality traits of the person denoted by the base:

(10)

- a. You can't call the documentary muck-raking since the muck has been pretty well raked, but the playful illustrations and ironic pop songs have a touch of *Michael Moore-ishness* that I thoroughly enjoyed. (SPOK: NPR_FreshAir, 2005)
- b. Drew Barrymore is and isn't what you'd expect. *Her Drewishness* is evident, but while one might assume she skips through life, a metaphorical daisy tucked behind her ear, she is made of much tougher stuff. (MAG: Harpers Bazaar, 2007)
- c. What was unusual was that Tom was beginning to, too - as if Jackson's *Peter-Panishness* was infecting him. (FIC: Critical Matrix, 1994)

When used with the names of organizations, the proper noun constructs ending in *-ish-ness* denote a collective quality similar to the one which a nation possesses as in *Britishness*:

(11)

- a. Yet there is a grain of truth in the saying, 'Once a Whig, always a Whig.' And *Whiggishness* is not simply a matter of how a man votes in the House. (FIC: Mr. Darcy's dream: a novel, 2009)
- b. Gurney, a chronicler of gentility and *Waspishness* in such dapper plays as *The Dining Room*, *The Middle Ages* and *Love Letters*, would seem just the fellow for the job. (MAG: TIME, 1994)

An insufficient number of proper nouns ending in *-ish-ness* suggests that this way of forming abstract nouns is far less common than simply adding *-ness* to proper nouns (see 6.3.1.1). It could be personally motivated and driven by some other (psycho) linguistic factors.

7.4 Prefix and suffix combinations with proper nouns: Constructions and constructs

When proper nouns serve as bases in successive affixation, the first level of derivation is almost always suffixation and the second level of derivation is prefixation i.e. in prefix and suffix combinations with proper nouns, the suffix is the primary affix, whereas the prefix is the secondary affix (unless otherwise specified). Thus, the morphological specification of a new formation entirely depends on the nature of the suffix given that suffixes act as heads in derivational morphology. This means that suffixes determine the word class and morphological make-up of new words.

The proper nouns which are derived by the means of successive affixation (suffixation first then prefixation) produce constructs which are highly compositional, and thus easily interpreted. What's more, the prefix is semantically conditioned by a [ProperN-*suffix*] construct i.e. the choice of the prefix is restricted by the meaning of the first-level derivative. It is far less common that a suffix is attached to a proper noun which has already been derived by prefixation i.e. a [*prefix*-ProperN] construct.

The collected sample is divided in three groups according to the suffix in prefix-suffix combinations i.e. whether the formations have a verb-forming, noun-forming or adjective-forming suffix (see Chapter 6). Most of the derivatives have an already attested first-level derivative in COCA, which is usually non-hyphenated e.g. *Clintonism*. On the other hand, prefixes are always accompanied by a hyphen when added to the first level derivative with a proper noun e.g. *anti-Clintonism*.

7.4.1 Constructions with prefixes *de-* and *re-* and proper nouns and verb-forming suffixes *-ify/-ize*

As previously discussed, the verb-forming suffixes *-ify* and *-ize* are productively used for creating complex verbs with proper nouns as derivational bases. The negative prefix which is added to the *-ify/-ize* verbs is exclusively the prefix *de-* typically characterized as a privative prefix. Marchand (1969: 153-4) highlights that the meaning of complex verbs formed with *de-* and *-ify/-ize* is 'undo the action of,' which indicates that the action originally denoted by the *-ify* or *-ize* derivative takes reverse direction and that the entity associated with the action returns into its previous state e.g. *demilitarize*. Generally speaking, according to Adams (2001: 43), a semantic overlap is often possible with the *de-* derivatives, and therefore some complex verbs may have both privative and reversative readings. The privative reading is more frequent with complex verbs which have a noun as a base such as *decarbonize* (Bauer et al. 2013: 369). The same nominal base may be used in deriving a set of near-antonyms with causative meaning, one member of the set being a complex verb formed with the suffix *-ize* and the other one with the prefix *de-* e.g. *colorize* and *decolor* (Lieber 2004: 110). However, denominal verbs such as *decolor* can be interpreted as negative causatives meaning 'cause not to' (see Lieber 2005), whereas most complex verbs with *de-* and either *-ify* or *-ize* (such as *demilitarize* and *degasify*) are less likely to be marked for a double causative reading. Instead, the prefix *de-* simply changes the original positive value of the complex verb formed with *-ify* or *-ize* (Lieber 2004: 111). This pattern with common nouns as derivational bases is highly productive in specialized scientific or technical registers.

The prefix *de-* is usually added to the [ProperN-*ify*]_V and [ProperN-*ize*]_V constructs denoting actions associated with political leaders or important public figures. The negated verbs are always

transitive and take direct objects as arguments denoting countries (12a-12d), organizations (12e) and national or political groups (12f):

(12)

- a. In the enthusiasm of the period, China was not only to be “*de-Maoified*,” it was expected to increasingly approximate a Western democracy with all the institutional appurtenances of such a system, including a professional and nonpolitical military. (ACAD: Armed Forces & Society, 1991)
- b. US planners, then, must balance their desire to *de-Saddamize* Iraq with the realistic need to co-opt the expertise of his entrenched supporters into a friendly regime. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2003)
- c. “Spain has not been ‘*de-Francoized*,’ as Germany has been *de-Hitlerized*,” explains Flix Ortega, a sociology professor and expert in public opinion in the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2013)
- d. But in the meantime, no radical changes are in the works. “There is no official plan to *de-Robertsonize* CBN,” says Norman Mintle, executive producer of The 700 Club. “It won’t happen while he’s alive.” (MAG: Christianity Today, 1995)
- e. In a phrase, said Podhoretz, Clinton had “*de-McGovernized*” the Democrats. Never again would the party show any skepticism about the military-industrial state, or the corporate world order. (MAG: Mother Jones, 2000)

The meaning of the constructs in (12) can generally be interpreted as to ‘remove one’s undesirable influence from a specific place or entity,’ which means that the pattern has a privative reading. As opposed to the same pattern with common nouns, the outputs with personal names as bases change the original negative value of the *-ify* and *-ize* causatives.

In other contexts, the verbal constructs have a general semantic reading ‘remove influence from’ and their connotations may be neutral (13a and 13b), negative (13c and 13d), or positive (13e and 13f) depending on the original value of the *-ify* and *-ize* causatives:

(13)

- a. Mercury then further *de-Platonizes* love, which he insists “is nothing more than a desire for sexual pleasure through union with the love object” : “Apolon, tu me confesseras, qu’Amour n’est autre chose qutun desir de jouir, avec une conjonction, et assemblment de la chose aymee (my emphasis)” (Debat 5.1264-1266). Here again is the insistence of love’s jouissance at the heart of this verbal exchange. (ACAD: Symposium, 1992)
- b. In a fascinating quantified sociological study of Poles in Buffalo in the mid-1920s, Niles Carpenter and Daniel Katz concluded that their interviewees had been “Americanized” without being “*de-Polandized*.” (ACAD: Journal of American Ethnic History, 1997)
- c. But some experts say an aggressive US effort to “*de-Baathify*” Iraq without broad international support and input could backfire. (NEWS: New York Times, 2003)
- d. For the next six months more or less, we are going to be attempting to stabilize the country, to establish security, to recreate a police force that has been *de-Ba’athized*. (SPOK: PBS_Newshour, 2003)
- e. *We de-Nazified* Germany. (SPOK: CNN_Crossfire, 1991)
- f. And in that regard, I’ve had many revealing Tweet conversations with some Sudanese and it never ceases to surprise me how many Sudanese out there desire a post-Elbashir Sudan complete with what they call “Turkish model” democracy. What these Sudanese forget is that modern day Turkey (former centrality of the despised Ottoman Empire), *de-Islamized* itself through the very Attaturkization that these same Sudanese once derided, prior to this

newly transformed Turkey. But now they hail Turkey’s Democratic Islam as a modern exemplary democracy. (BLOG: A Message To Sudanese, 2012)

The constructional schemas licensing the privative verbs with the suffixes *-ify* and *-ize* and the prefix *de-* are as follows:

IV. $\langle [de \text{ } [[X]_{\text{ProperNi}} \text{ } ify]_{Vj}]_{Vk} \leftrightarrow [\text{Remove the Influence of SEMi}]_k \rangle$

V. $\langle [de \text{ } [[X]_{\text{ProperNi}} \text{ } ize]_{Vj}]_{Vk} \leftrightarrow [\text{Remove the Influence of SEMi}]_k \rangle$

Booij (2010b) illustrates that the verbs which are the outputs of simultaneous attachment of the prefix *de-* and suffixes *-ate* and *-ize* (*de-caffein-ate* and *de-mytholog-ize*) are the constructs of a unified word-formation schema. Generally speaking, unified schemas do not require a necessary intermediate step (as in the case of *out-*verbs), because speakers can interpret a complex word even when it is “two or more derivational steps away from the base word” (Booij 2010b: 8)⁶⁸. This is supported by COCA’s search results; for instance, there is no base form *Harvardize* attested, but *de-Harvadization*, *de-Harvardizing* and *Harvardization* are recorded in COCA.

The privative *-(ca)tion* nominalizations as the outputs of the third-level derivation are also attested in COCA e.g. *de-Ba’athification*, *de-Clintonization*, *de-Gorbachevization*, *de-Harvardization*, *de-Israelification*, *de-Japanization*, *de-Leninization*, *de-McDonaldization*, *De-Nazification*, *de-Stalinization*, *de-twitterification* etc. Some of these derivatives may have been created without intermediate derivational steps because they are the result of multiple schema unification.

From a syntactic point of view, this pattern is highly flexible and allows for a wide range of grammatical forms apart from the canonical verb forms in active and passive voice. The verb forms are also used in causative (14a), infinitive (14b and 14c), past participle (14d), and gerund (14e-14g). The agent is more often internal (the entity itself or part of it) without the verb being formally marked for reflexivity:

(14)

- a. Oh, my God! You’ve got a crush on your sister’s stalker. – I’m just going to help him. You know. Get *de-Ursula-ized*. Like, you know. Like I did for Joey after he went out with her. (TV: Friends, The One with the Jam, 1996)
- b. Yet Reza Shah’s authoritarian rule, which had attempted to “*de-Islamize*” Iran (similar to what Ataturk was attempting in Turkey) had been defeated in its efforts, and had again left the country with an identity crisis and an incomplete revolution. (ACAD: Journal of International Affairs, 1996)
- c. Exhibit One being, your guiding light, Eric Hobsbawn,... a genius, yet he went to his grave refusing to *de-Stalin-ize*. Could not get out of the box into which he’d locked himself at age 13. (BLOG: Hartmann, in Manly Gesture, Sacrifices Himself to MN Prosecutors to Save his Family, 2012)
- d. Zochrot declares support for a “*de-Zionized* Palestine” and refers to Israel as having an “ethnicized and racialized Zionist” system. (ACAD: Middle East Quarterly, 2015)
- e. Famous for his use of three dots (“...”) in the sprawling paragraphs of his books, Cline -- to me -- has created a new and perfectly original way of *de-Salinger-izing* your first bildungsroman and turning it into a strange fucked up masterpiece. (BLOG: 25 Points: Journey to the End of the Night, 2012)

⁶⁸ The semantic information of Booij’s [*de-x-ize*] unified schema is [REMOVE PROPERTY RELATED TO SEM_i]; however, as illustrated in the above example, it is not any property, but the influence of the base because of the causative reading of the *-ify/-ize* verbs with proper nouns as formal bases.

- f. In my opinion, JIS should publish education research, as should all academic accounting journals with a commitment to “*de-balkanizing*” accounting scholarship, serving the profession, and serving the public interest. (ACAD: Journal of Information Systems, 2004)
- g. U.S. institutions of higher learning have for too long followed Harvard’s style of trying to excel at everything -- liberal arts, library collections, science and all the rest -- he said at a Cornell symposium last December. But given today’s rapid accumulation of information in an ever-expanding array of disciplines, that is impossible now, even for Harvard. Proclaimed Rhodes, “The next century, I believe, will belong to those that are successful in *de-Harvardizing*.” (MAG: Technology Review, 2000)

Based on the attested examples with proper nouns as derivational bases in COCA, another prefix which can be added to the [ProperN-ize]_v constructs is the prefix *re-* signaling a repeated action⁶⁹. Although these formations are infrequent, they serve as counterparts to the privative deverbal proper nouns [de-ProperN-ize]_v given that their semantic reading is ‘introduce one’s influence again’:

(15)

- a. Castro’s friend, the Soviet Union, was to an extent *re-Stalinizing* under Leonid Brezhnev, after the heady years of liberalization under the now deposed Khrushchev. (MAG: Saturday Evening Post, 1991)
- b. This is a process which began in the early 1970s and culminated in the 1990s with a visible shift in strategy among groups, from relying solely on terrorism while *re-Islamizing* their environment to complementing terrorism with the use of the electoral process to advance their sacred causes. (ACAD: Journal of International Affairs, 1996)
- c. By *re-Judaizing* this sacrament and reclaiming its Jewish elements, Christians will come to see what it means to be Jews with the Jews or, in Paul’s terms, to be grafted into Israel. (ACAD: Cross Currents, 2000)
- d. “Putin is definitely *re-Sovietizing* the oil and gas industry,” said Michael J. Economides, a professor at the University of Houston and the co-author of “The Color of Oil.” (NEWS: New York Times, 2004)
- e. The GOP may yet conclude that it drove Jim Wright and Tony Coelho from office a year early. Hence its efforts to *re-Democratize* the scandal by shrinking the Keating Five (which includes one Republican senator, John McCain) to the more egregious Keating Three (all Democrats -- Alan Cranston, Dennis DeConcini, Donald Riegle -- none of whom, however, is up this year). (MAG: National Review, 1999)

The prefix *re-* is highly productive and frequent in modern English, and therefore, a lack of examples with proper nouns is not taken as an indicator of low productivity. Potentially, speakers may create any new construct by applying the following constructional schema:

VI. < [*re* [[x]_{ProperNi} *ize*]_{vj}]_{Vk} ↔ [Reintroduce the Influence of SEM_i]_k >

7.4.2 Constructions with prefixes and proper nouns and noun-forming suffixes *-ism/-ist*

Proper nouns are readily derived with either member of the *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic set associated with a person’s disposition, ideology or doctrine. Such *-ism/-ist* formations may be subsequently prefixed with virtually no restrictions. As a matter of fact, they make the most

⁶⁹ This does not mean that the prefix *re-* cannot be combined with the *-ify* verbs, only that the [*re*-[ProperN-*ify*]]_v constructs are not attested in COCA to the researcher’s knowledge.

productive pattern with proper noun bases considering a range of possible prefixes which can be added to the [ProperN-*ism*]_N and [ProperN-*ist*]_N constructs. In COCA, the first-level derivatives with the ‘doctrine’ suffixes often take prefixes which are ‘attitudinal’ (*anti-*, *pro-* and *pseudo-*), ‘temporal’ (*pre-*, *post-* and *neo-*) and ‘negative’ (*anti-* and *non-*). Other prefixes with this pattern are also attested, but they are more likely to appear rarely or as hapax legomena such as *hyper-Calvinist* or *macro-Marxism*.

7.4.2.1 Constructions and constructs with *anti-/pro-* and proper noun-*ism/-ist*

The semantic reading of this particular combination of affixes with proper nouns is correctly interpreted only in context. As Lehrer (1995: 143) pointed out in her study on prefixes, the exact scope of the *anti-* and *-ism* affixes may vary: *anti-racism* means ‘being opposed to racism’, *anti-Americanism* is ‘the ideology of being anti-American’ and *anti-liberalism* can refer to both ‘being against a liberal ideology’ and ‘the ideology of being anti-liberal.’ The complex words with the prefix *anti-* have two separate meanings ‘attitudinal’ and ‘negative’ (see 5.2.1 and 5.4.3 respectively) and therefore, the wider context is necessary for deciphering the precise meaning of the second-level derivatives. Each meaning is paired with a particular scope of affixes i.e. [*anti-ProperN*]-*ism*]_N or [*anti*-[ProperN-*ism*]]_N.

In the following examples, the disapproval is openly expressed towards a disposition/ideology and towards an individual or a group of people associated with that disposition/ideology:

(16)

- a. To what degree, the White House having anonymously leaked tidbits and so forth, did the media go to work on this story and pump it up, give it an awful lot of extra buzz, because of a kind of feeling, an *anti-Clintonism* emerging in the media, because of the behavior of the president and Mrs. Clinton under harsh criticism of the points that Howie listed at the outset? (SPOK: CNN_Reliable, 2001)
- b. The United States is expected to meet the Aussies in the medal round. Is Carter destined to be another Sydney villain, joining U.S. swimmers in an unanticipated wave of Down Under *anti-Yankeeism*? (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 2000)
- c. I found striking the anti-Unionist sentiment among New Yorkers, the parrot squawking “Hang Abe Lincoln” and the Irish opposing our national icon, Abe. (MAG: America, 1994)
- d. At its annual meeting in June, the Southern Baptist Convention received a report from its special Calvinism Advisory Committee, which addressed charges both of *anti-Calvinist* prejudice within the denomination and of unfair dealing by Calvinists. (NEWS: New York Times, 2014)
- e. But the violence spurred the student strike and the most significant *anti-Marxist* protests in Yugoslavia’s largest republic since Communists took power after World War II. (NEWS: Associated Press, 1991)
- f. Over time this was bound to have an important influence on academics and intellectuals. For anyone who thought of himself as “of the Left” -- and that of course included many students and not a few professors -- it was becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a firmly *anti-Peronist* stance, since as far as the Argentine working class was concerned, Peronism remained the only political show in town. (ACAD: American Scholar, 1993)

In examples (16) the second-level derivatives have a strong attitudinal meaning. The attitudinal sense ‘opposing’ does not imply an existence of another kind of doctrine (see 7.4.2.5),

but a certain state or activity against the prevailing disposition/ideology. The second-order constructional schemas licensing the attitudinal meaning are formally represented as follows:

$$\text{VII. } \langle [\textit{anti} \text{ [x]}_{\text{ProperNi}}]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Opposing SEM}_i]_j \rangle \approx \langle [[\textit{anti} \text{ [x]}_{\text{ProperNi}}] \textit{ism}]_{\text{Nk}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Disposition/Ideology Opposing SEM}_i]_k \rangle \approx \langle [[\textit{anti} \text{ [x]}_{\text{ProperN}}] \textit{ist}]_{\text{Al}} \leftrightarrow [\text{Having the Characteristics of SEM}_k]_l \rangle$$

The positive ‘attitudinal’ suffix *pro-* is seldom used with the *-ism/-ist* derivatives. It may be that there is a pragmatic constraint as the $[\text{ProperN-ism}]_{\text{N}}$ constructs already denote approval and support of an ideology or doctrine. The second-level derivatives are usually compared with another derivative (formed with the prefix *anti-*) indicating a sharp contrast between the two notions and thus creating the effect of antithesis as in (17a-17c):

(17)

- a. Obama’s big problem isn’t lack of prior executive experience; it’s the *pro-Marxist* anti-American attitude. (BLOG: Rick Perry’s Scandalous Skeletons Come Out of the Closet, 2012)
- b. The formation of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, which Hook helped to organize (he served as its first chairman), was a direct response not to Joe McCarthy, but to Soviet sympathizers such as Lillian Hellman and Paul Robeson, who had been participating in *pro-Stalinist*, anti-American cultural festivals in Europe. (MAG: New Republic, 1990)
- c. In the past few years, we have seen the rise and growth of a group that the public sphere has labeled the “new atheists” -- people who are aggressively pro-science, especially *pro-Darwinism*, and violently anti-religion of all kinds, especially Christianity but happy to include Islam and the rest. (WEB: Why I Think the New Atheists are a Bloody Disaster, 2012)
- d. Charged with mobilizing *pro-Gaullist* intellectuals, Aglion initially sought to get them to support a manifesto on behalf of Free France; however, by his own account, he abandoned the project in the face of hesitations and divisions, and instead had the idea of doing something simpler, and which would not draw anyone into the political arena. (ACAD: Social Research, 1998)
- e. Others, like Iraqi-born Adel Abidin, dealt directly with dictatorship, in his case through videos of blonde torch singers singing the patriotic *pro-Baathist* songs of his youth. (WEB: Taking It to the Street, 2012)
- f. But when it comes to American Jews who are clearly in the Peter Beinart and Jeremy Ben Ami mold, Brog’s hope of bringing them -- along with their non-Jewish counterparts -- back to genuine *pro-Israelism* is sadly misplaced. (BLOG: 5 Reasons Why Liberal Jews Will Never Support Israel, 2012)
- g. Chamberlain is a lawyer and the current publisher of Human Events, a 75-year-old conservative newspaper that he purchased and revamped with a “*pro-Trumpism*” spin in March, installing Breitbart alum Raheem Kassam as its editor in chief. The outlet now publishes pieces such as “Tucker Carlson is Right: Ilhan Omar is an Ungrateful Immigrant” and “Drag Queen Reading Hour Can Be Stopped.” (MAG: Slate Magazine, 2019)

The use of the *-ism* derivatives with *pro-* is more likely to be for stylistic and discourse reasons; the nominal derivative may be overemphasized as in (17f) or used as a modifier as in (17g). The *-ist* derivatives with *pro-* are prototypically the adjectival constructs which imply a positive attitude towards a disposition/ideology. As there might be a pragmatic constraint on the *-ism* derivatives with *pro-*, we may only suppose that the second-order constructional schemas licensing the adjectival constructs is as follows:

VIII. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{pro} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Supporting SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

7.4.2.2 Constructions with *pseudo-* and proper noun-*ism/-ist*

The Latinate prefix *pseudo-* meaning ‘not genuine’ is mainly used in a specialized (mostly scientific) register and it may be interchangeable with the suffix *quasi-* e.g. *pseudo-religious/quasi-religious*, *pseudo-democracy/quasi-democracy* etc. However, in colloquial usage, it takes on an evaluative attitude which is strongly negative and as a result the *pseudo-* derivatives do not only imply a lack of genuineness, but also an intentional act of deception (Bauer et al. 2013: 416). The same negative implications are evident with the first-level derivatives consisting of proper nouns and the ‘doctrine’ suffixes:

(18)

- a. Meanwhile, the liberal gets trapped in the caricatured class struggle of *pseudo-Marxism* that he thinks he set up to catch the *pseudo-Marxist* revolutionary, while never realizing that the *pseudo-Marxist* was more authentically revolutionary than he will ever be. (BLOG: Žižku seems simple, but in fact it is supremely complicated, 2012)
- b. This is undoubtedly apocryphal, like many other quotations attributed to Lincoln or Washington. No one has ever found any evidence that Washington said it. In the next edition of the Yale Book of Quotations, barring any further discoveries, I will list it as a *pseudo-Washingtonism*. (WEB: Government Is Not Reason, It Is Not Eloquence – It Is Force, 2012)
- c. Following the waterless flood and the demise of consumer capitalism, the Gardeners’ *pseudo-Buddhist* philosophy, and particularly its ban on harming sentient life, is tested and moderated by the pragmatic need to survive on extremely limited resources. (ACAD: Studies in the Novel, 2018)
- d. Entitled? Is that what your *pseudo-Platonist* argument leads to? Entitlement? That is one of the sillier things I’ve read in a while. (BLOG: More Than a Feeling, 2012)

Strong negative attitudes towards a wrongly interpreted or ‘false’ disposition/ideology are created via the following second-order constructional schemas:

IX. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{pseudo} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Quasi/False Form of SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

X. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{pseudo} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Having a Quasi/False Form of SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

7.4.2.3 Constructions with *pre-/post-* and proper noun-*ist*

The ‘temporal’ prefixes *pre-* and *post-* with the *-ist* first-level derivatives refer to a specific point in time before or after one’s doctrine:

(19)

- a. Many travel and missionary accounts from the *pre-Maoist* era evince a righteous level of disgust at how the Chinese state organized welfare and charity. (ACAD: Anthropological Quarterly, 2009)
- b. After the emergence of Peronism, the PS's spatial image approximated that of the conservative parties. Moreover, the PS never again embodied the somewhat vague profile of *pre-Peronist* radicalismo. (ACAD: Latin American Research Review, 1998)
- c. The modernist avant-garde, for example, has its roots in a *pre-Marxist* disdain for bourgeois philistinism. (MAG: AmericanCraft, 1994)
- d. Socialism entered his vocabulary only as he sought a viable *anti-* and *post-Gaullist* political grouping, which, as a result of his artful machinations, came together in the Socialist Party in 1971. (MAG: New Statesman, 2013)
- e. Yet, as the ripples of discomfiture surrounding Johanna attest, those bodies have a stubborn materiality, an inertia that when awkwardly asserted presents an obstacle to the flexibility of dematerialized flows of information, finance, affect, and creativity in the *post-Fordist*, *post-Taylorist* era of hyperperformance. (ACAD: Art Journal, 2012)
- f. *Pre-Reaganist* Republicans I can support, but not the current hypocrites. (BLOG: Giant reed seen as biofuel -- or another kudzu disaster - U.S. News, 2012)

Since a doctrine is usually associated with a particular geographical entity where its influence was most prominent, the 'temporal' prefixes *pre-/post-* are added to the *-ism/-ist* derivatives to describe the same geographical entity before or after that doctrine:

(20)

- a. W. Bruce Lincoln has taken as his task, in his majestic new history *The Conquest of a Continent: Siberia and the Russians*, to recapture for us the historic, *pre-Stalinist* Siberia, the wild, wild East of the Russian imagination. (NEWS: Houston Chronicle, 1993)
- b. Anyone with any doubts over whether Turkey had been transformed under the AKP in the past decade should now be able to lay them to rest: Turkey has all but abandoned its secularist nation-state ethos, for which Ankara has served as a symbol, and embraced its *pre-Kemalist* Ottoman heritage, centered in Istanbul. (WEB: Why Secretary Clinton Is Going to Istanbul, 2012)
- c. Of course, the Idea of the Research University did not just descend from the heavens into Hyde Park any more than the idea of the modern state simply descended out of the World Spirit onto *post-Bonapartist* Prussia. (WEB: The Idea of the University Colloquium: Donald N. Levine, 2012)
- d. These are the paradigmatic building types of *post-Kemalist* Turkey, much as government buildings, schools, post offices and railway stations were symbols of Kemalist Turkey in the 1930s. (ACAD: Journal of International Affairs, 2000)
- e. In 1956, unrest among Polish workers signaled growing discontent in *post-Stalinist* Eastern Europe; in 1980, the birth of the Solidarity trade union began the unraveling of the Soviet bloc; and in 1989, Poland spearheaded Eastern Europe's rejection of communism as a Solidarity-led government took power. (ACAD: Foreign Affairs, 1998)

The meaning of the $[pre-PropN-ist]_A$ and $[post-PropN-ist]_A$ constructs is understood following the cognitive operations of generalization and abstraction from the paradigmatic *-ism/-ist* constructions:

- XI. $\langle [[X]_{PropN} \text{ism}]_{Ni} \leftrightarrow [Disposition/Ideology]_i \rangle \approx \langle [pre \ [[X]_{PropN} \text{ist}]]_{Aj} \leftrightarrow [Happening \text{ Before the Time related to SEM}_i]_j \rangle$

XII. $\langle [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{post} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Happening After the Time related to SEM}]_j \rangle$

7.4.2.4 Constructions with *neo-* and proper noun-*ism/-ist*

The Latinate prefix *neo-* meaning ‘new’ is productively used with any derived proper noun denoting a doctrine, and as Marchand (1969: 179) notices, these formations are “possible ad libitum”. The prefix *neo-* added to an existing *-ism* derivative refers to a novel doctrine which has been ‘revived from an older form’ (Bauer et al. 2013: 347). In most cases, the prefix *neo-* and the first-level derivative denote a revival of an old doctrine:

(21)

- a. We should probably stop calling it Communism and just call it *neo-Stalinism*. (WEB: Commodity Brokerage, 2012)
- b. Lipietz coins the term ‘*neo-Taylorism*’ to mean the return to forms of exploitation of labor in the “*post-Fordist*” North that are unmitigated by Fordist levels of capacity to consume, and with employment unprotected. (ACAD: Arab Studies Quarterly, 1999)
- c. We encourage teachers to present the case for Darwin’s theory of evolution as Darwin himself did: as a credible, but contestable, argument. Rather than teaching evolution as an incontrovertible “truth,” teachers should present the arguments for modern *neo-Darwinism* and encourage students to evaluate these arguments critically. In short, students should learn the scientific arguments for, and against, contemporary evolutionary theory. (NEWS: USA Today, 2005)
- d. Such paradigms offered little hope for racially mixed Latin American countries with progressive aspirations. In contrast, the theory posited by French naturalist Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet Lamarck—that acquired characteristics could be inherited -- was much more optimistic. Through manipulation of the environment, negative traits could be slowly altered and eliminated over time. *Neo-Lamarckism* thus offered hope that genetic improvement could be engineered through human agency via social welfare and sanitation programs. (ACAD: Latin American Research Review, 1997)
- e. Two canons of the new code of Canon Law promulgated in 1917 (numbers 589 and 1366) stipulated that henceforth Catholic philosophy and theology were to be taught in Thomas’s spirit (*mens*) and in accordance with his method and principles. This is not the place to retell the fascinating story of neo-Thomism from its humble beginnings to its anticlimactic decline since the end of Vatican Council II in 1965. (ACAD: Perspectives on Political Science, 1997)
- f. AS DEBATES over Germany’s Third World immigration policies continue and as Bonn grapples with a disturbing rise in *neo-Nazism*, historians continue to learn more about the Nazi era. It did not, scholars now know, stop with the Holocaust -- the murder of millions of Jews in the name of ethnic purity. The Hitler regime made a similar attempt to wipe out people of color. (NEWS: Washington Post, 1994)

There are also some *neo-* formations implying a doctrine/ideology which incorporates new principles or beliefs into the original ones:

(22)

- a. The turn from *Marxism* to *neo-Marxism*, which took into account world trade relationships with the Third World, was a fundamental change in the development of *Marxist* theory. (ACAD: Cross Currents, 1992)
- b. Equally important, whereas Garveyism attracted withering polemical attacks from black liberals and social democrats, the *neo-Garveyism* of the Million Man March attracted widespread support from more mainstream black politicians, intellectuals, clergymen and others, all of whom vainly attempted to separate the event from the fanatics who originally planned it. (MAG: New Republic, 1995)
- c. What are they gonna do next, give you guys urine tests? I didn't know drugs and alcohol were such a big problem... that they had to resort to *neo-McCarthyism*. I think they're afraid... some of us might be having too good a time. It's the old age suppressing youth thing. *Neo-McCarthyism*. (MOV: Dazed and Confused, 1993)

The prefix *neo-* is also added to the *-ist* member of the *-ism/-ist* paradigmatic set:

(23)

- a. At some point, traveling through Cairo, she ran across a neo-Buddhist who turned her onto words like inner-peace and equilibrium. (FIC: Chicago Review, 2001)
- b. Please, if you are a *neo-Darwinist* who wants me to die, don't bother writing in. Or if you advocate traditional Chinese medicines, also don't bother writing in. (MAG: The American Spectator, 2009)
- c. Jacob Lerner, a *neo-Platonist*, compared his penmanship with Leonardo da Vinci's. (FIC: Commentary, 2004)
- d. This notion of "relative truth" made little sense to a *neo-Thomist* like Cardinal Louis Billot, who regarded this combination of words as essentially meaningless. (ACAD: Theological Studies, 2007)
- e. The drum I've been beating is that the reform process Gorbachev set into motion in 1985 was utterly historic. That was in a time when you and your associates were referring to Gorbachev as a *neo-Stalinist* and as the reforms as being inconsequential. (SPOK: CNN_Crossfire, 1991)
- f. A *Neo-Confucianist*, Li T'ang also professed the Tao; the mind observing nature not simply for the sake of learning, but to achieve oneness with the universe. (ACAD: Lancet, 1996)

Based on all collected examples in (21), (22) and (23), the prefix *neo-* refers to a revival of a doctrine/ideology that may or may not include some new elements. Having in mind this important piece of information, the constructional schemas are as follows:

- XIII. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{neo} [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Revival of SEM}_i \textit{ with or without New Elements}]_j \rangle$
- XIV. $\langle [\textit{neo} [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Revival of the Doctrine/Ideology associated with } x \textit{ with or without New Elements}]_j \rangle \approx \langle [\textit{neo} [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Nk}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Person with Property Y related to SEM}_j]_k \rangle$

7.4.2.5 Construction with ‘negative’ *anti-* and proper noun-*ism/-ist*

The productive suffixes *-ism/-ist* are frequently combined with the ‘negative’ prefix *anti-* so as to create the second-level derivatives which refer to a completely contradictory notion to their first-level counterparts expressing the original doctrine:

(24)

- a. The world was divided into black and white, *Peronism* versus *anti-Peronism*. (ACAD: Latin American Research Review, 1998)
- b. But to reject ideology, or the priority of a specific intellectual tradition for understanding politics, that is, *Marxism* or *anti-Marxism*, or an economic typology (capitalism vs. socialism) as a guide to political action, in our present political situation, suggests not the victory of capitalism over socialism, or one form of *anti-Marxism* or another over *Marxism*, but the constitution of a new political terrain, where democracy is a revitalized political ideal under very significant economic, political, and cultural constraints. (ACAD: Social Research, 1990)

This use is most common in academic register or in news providing a summary of one’s political activity:

(25)

- a. But she does so without any overt reference to politics besides a vague and uncontroversial *anti-Robespierism* -- a wise approach for a woman who had incurred ire from both the left and the right. Instead, she and her portraitist trade in the universal language of youth and beauty. (ACAD: ArtBulletin, 2011)
- b. Dean has been the Democratic candidate of the moment for some time now. It may be that rather than a flash-in-the-pan, Dean is the presidential candidate who simply best represents the contemporary Democratic party: not just its angry mood, but: its principles and priorities. He famously captured the party’s wholesale opposition to the Iraq war and its unyielding *anti-Bushism* sooner than his major rivals. (MAG: National Review, 2003)
- c. Throughout the 1960s, his big idea was *anti-Gaullism*. He championed liberalism in the face of overweening personal and presidential power. (MAG: New Statesman, 2013)
- d. Sarkozy represents the old, *anti-Gaullist* French right. [...] Sarkozy wanted to embody “la rupture” change and show that France is America’s friend. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2010)
- e. Mr. SMITH: He experimented with movies that were *anti-Stalinist*. He experimented with opinion polls before anybody else was doing that. He experimented with various different kinds of semi-capitalistic behavior. I mean, he was well ahead of Gorbachev. (SPOK: CNN_King, 1990)

As the nominal constructs illustrate a contradictory disposition/ideology to an already existing one, the [*anti*-[ProperN-*ism*]]_N constructs have a specialized reading ‘disposition/ideology y not having the proper characteristics of disposition/ideology x.’ The adjectival counterparts are used to describe the characteristic of the contradictory disposition/ideology. Therefore, the paradigmatic relations may be formally represented as follows:

$$\text{XV. } < [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ism}]_{N_i} \leftrightarrow [\text{Disposition/Ideology}]_i > \approx < [\text{anti} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ism}]]_{N_j} \leftrightarrow [\text{Disposition/Ideology Y not Having the Proper Characteristics of SEM}_i]_j > \approx < [\text{anti} [[X]_{\text{ProperN}} \text{ist}]]_{A_k} \leftrightarrow [\text{Having the Characteristics of SEM}_j]_k >$$

7.4.2.6 Construction with *non-* and proper noun-*ism/-ist*

Somewhat marginally productive is the ‘negative’ prefix *non-* with the *-ism/-ist* derivatives. The constructs with the prefix *non-* have the most general reading ‘not’ in any context:

(26)

- a. But while I think some clarifications in our own ranks may help maintain good social history, I don’t hold great hope that more careful boundary-setting will do much good, where the committed conservatives are involved, in the short run: the other traits of social history, the *non-Whiggism* and the attribution of causation to ordinary people, will continue to do us in for this camp. (ACAD: Journal of Social History, 1995)
- b. Must we side with either the power-God of Calvinism or the love-God of *non-Calvinism*? (BLOG: What Does Nicea Have to Do with Geneva? 2012)
- c. It seems not to have occurred to him, however, that he might be put down as a conservative by *non-Stalinist* liberals because of the very nature of his attack on liberalism. (MAG: American Spectator, 1994)
- d. The military junta told the world that it had destroyed the guerrilla movements of the Left, *Peronist* (the Montoneros) and *non-Peronist* (the E. R.P. -- the People’s Revolutionary Army), and that Argentina was stable, its population contented, even if thousands of people had ensured it with their lives, thanks largely to Lopez Rega’s Triple A. (ACAD: Studies in Latin American Popular Culture, 1994)
- e. I say this because to a *non-Calvinist* I am sure that it appears aninominist compared to what the anti-Calvinist believes which is more humans have more control and God less control. (WEB: Too often, God gets blamed for what He did not cause, 2012)

The constructs mostly take a neutral evaluative tone and the semantic information is easily accessed via the following second-order schemas:

XVI. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [non [x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Not SEM}]_{ij} \rangle$

XVII. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [non [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Nj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Person with no Property Y related to SEM}]_{ij} \rangle$

XVIII. $\langle [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ism}]]_{\text{Ni}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Disposition/Ideology}]_i \rangle \approx \langle [non [[x]_{\text{ProperN}} \textit{ist}]]_{\text{Aj}} \leftrightarrow [\textit{Not having Property Y related to SEM}]_{ij} \rangle$

7.4.3 Constructions and constructs with proper nouns and adjective-forming suffixes *-esque/-ish/-like* and negative prefixes

Highly productive adjective-forming suffixes *-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like* do not substantially differ in the creation of new formations with proper nouns as formal bases, but they do show specific usage-based preferences (see 6.4.1). The *-esque*, *-ish*, and *-like* derivatives may be negated by the means of *un-* prefixation to indicate an absence of some specific characteristic(s) associated with the base. The privative reading of the formations suggests a lack of similarity to the original notion denoted by a proper noun. As with their first-level derivatives, the correct interpretation of

the second-level derivatives relies heavily on the speaker’s extra-linguistic knowledge, or more habitually, it is inferred from the immediate context:

(27)

- a. The argument has been made that “in a house we all feel of the proper proportions. Everything is subordinated to us, fashioned for our use and our pleasure,” but only a true *Dombey* could say such a thing and mean it. Oscar Wilde, whose argument it is, goes on to say with very *un-Dombeyesque* irony that “egotism itself, which is so necessary to a proper sense of human dignity, is entirely the result of indoor life.” (FIC: Critical Matrix, 1994)
- b. “There was nothing starry about the way we got together. It was very *un-Hollywood-esque*, in fact,” he recalled. “We met and got talking. Afterwards I asked my friend if I could call her and ask her out. My friend called Jessica and Jessica said yes, and so I called her.” (BLOG: Justin Timberlake on Dating Jessica Biel, 2012)
- c. Although the game begins in an *un-Trek-ish* war campaign, STO’s story eventually turns into something with themes and messages you’d expect from a Star Trek tale, focusing on protecting the ideals of compassion and unity from threats that would destroy them. (MAG: Gizmodo, 2017)
- d. I was a party to my puberty, quarrelsome, sometimes cruel, *un-Edenish* expelled -- was I so different from her? (FIC: The Runaway Soul, 1991)
- e. Selick says one of the biggest fights on the movie was over the spider who wears very *un-Disneyish* stiletto heels on all eight legs. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1996)
- f. The courtship was very *un-Murphy-like*. The couple cuddled while watching old Elvis Presley movies and tapes of Amos and Andy shows on TV. (MAG: People, 1993)
- g. Water Mill homeowners pride themselves on being very *un-Hamptons-like*: averse to big parties or going out clubbing, preferring intimate dinners at home instead. (MAG: Town and Country, 2002)
- h. It’s hardly a new premise, but Glazer’s snappy direction and fine acting by all the cast (particularly Kingsley, in the most *un-Ghandi-like* role imaginable) put this film at the top of its genre. (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 2001)
- i. The old 30-pin adapter was ugly and cumbersome, and always struck me as one of the most *un-Apple-like* designs in the company’s history. Its design served several practical purposes - - but those purposes only made sense a decade ago. (BLOG: Daring Fireball, 2012)
- j. Ironically, it was her use of some very *un-Mary Poppins-like* profanity that launched Andrews career as an author 30 years ago. (SPOK: CBS_48Hours, 2002)

The constructs in (27) have a combined privative and simlative meaning ‘not being similar to or resembling’ the base. A failure to draw a comparison between two objects is the result of a lack of an expected bond between them. The expected bond comes from the speakers’ shared knowledge about the most salient/prototypical feature of the unique referent; for instance, parties at Hamptons are expected to be lavish (27g), and Julie Andrews is expected to behave like one of her most famous characters Mary Poppins (27j). Although the feature of ‘expectedness’ is extra-linguistic i.e. based on our encyclopedic knowledge, it could be embedded in the three constructional schemas:

- XIX. < [*un* [[X]_{ProperNi} *esque*]_{Aj}]_{Ak} ↔ [(Not Resembling SEM_i due to a Lack of a Similar (Expected) Charecteristic]_k >
- XX. < [*un* [[X]_{ProperNi} *ish*]_{Aj}]_{Ak} ↔ [(Not Resembling SEM_i due to a Lack of a Similar (Expected) Charecteristic]_k >

XXI. < [*un* [[*x*]_{ProperNi} *like*]_{Aj}]_{Ak} ↔ [(Not Resembling SEM_i due to a Lack of a Similar (Expected) Charecteristic]_k >

Another negative pattern is formed with the prefix *non-* and it is only attested with the adjective-forming suffixes *-esque* and *-like* in COCA. However, this does not mean that the same pattern with the suffix *-ish* is impossible knowing that the suffix *-ish* is very productive and produces a lot of hapax legomena. The formations keep the general meaning ‘not,’ but in closer inspection their semantic interpretation may vary. The constructs may indicate an absence of specific ‘proper’ characteristic and thus have privative meaning as in (28a-28d); or they may refer to a lack of all fundamental qualities related to the notion belonging to the same category as the original which implies stereotype negation in (28e-28g):

(28)

- a. First, one cannot read the Court’s argument transcripts without noticing a somewhat Scaliaesque -- and very much *non-Thomas-esque* -- attribute of Justice Gorsuch: He is not only an active but also an exceptionally persistent questioner. (ACAD: Criminal Justice, 2019)
- b. About the only *non-Hestonesque* thing about him is his musical preference in the operating room: show tunes. (FIC: Doing harm, 2014)
- c. He’s everything like me. Too emotionally shut off. He’s too in his head. This thing with Ava is completely *non-McNamara-like*. I’ll give you that. (TV/MOV: Nip/Tuck, Agatha Ripp, 2004)
- d. So anyway, it looks like this will be a year for a metamorphosis of sorts (hopefully in a *non-Kafkaesque* way). (WEB: The Idea of Order, 2012)
- e. The recent Motown’s MoWest Story is a good example, gathering decidedly *non-Motown-esque* tracks by the likes of country-rockers Lodi and the spacey soul act Odyssey that were recorded for Motown’s more experimental West Coast venture. (BLOG: A guide to the music of Motown, 2012)
- f. And if one worries enough, basic SF concepts like generation ships or colonizing *non-Earth-like* planets are problematic with or without gene-hacking. Raising children on low-gravity Mars and never seeing an Earthlike atmosphere would be a huge experiment. (WEB: SF, big ideas, ideology: what is to be done?, 2012)
- g. They had reported it as an EsKay site? the first ever to be uncovered on a *non-Marslike* world. (FIC: The Ship Who Searched, 1992)

Due to a shortage of examples, we may only suppose that this pattern is less productive than the one with the negative prefix *-un* and the similitive first-level derivatives. As in the case of the proper nouns ending in *-ish-ness* (see 7.3.3), we may also say that other (psycho)linguistic factors are involved in the creation of the constructs in (28).

7.5 Summary

In this Chapter, we have examined the form and meaning of complex words with proper nouns as formal bases and two affixes, which are formally represented as [*prefix*-[*prefix*-ProperN]], [[ProperN-*suffix*]-*suffix*], [*prefix*-[ProperN-*suffix*]] and less often [[*prefix*-ProperN]-*suffix*]. Affix combination with proper nouns as formal bases supports the theory of Complexity-Based Ordering in its predictions on productivity. In two-prefix combinations, the outermost prefix is either more productive or has the same degree of productivity as the innermost prefix. The most productive prefixes are ‘temporal’ and ‘attitudinal’ prefixes which can also occur in recursion as long as the repetition of prefixes is informative and pragmatically acceptable. The morphological constructs

[*prefix*-[*prefix*-ProperN]] are fully separable, easy to process and highly compositional at the same time. In two-suffix combinations, the outermost suffix is more productive or has the same degree of productivity as the innermost suffix. Moreover, many attested first-level derivatives (either as established words or hapaxes) serve as the bases for the second level of derivation, which indicates that both innermost and outermost suffixes are very productive. There is a greater role of shared knowledge and a possibility of analogical word-formation in producing novel morphological constructs with two suffixes and proper nouns as formal bases. Overall, the morphological constructs [[ProperN-*suffix*]-*suffix*] are semantically acceptable and easy to process, especially in fixed grammatical surroundings such as *of*-genitive constructions. A possibility of dual scope in prefix and suffix combinations i.e. [*prefix*-[ProperN-*suffix*]] and [[*prefix*-ProperN]-*suffix*], is attributed to the semantics of the first-level derivatives with proper nouns. The morphological make-up [*prefix*-[ProperN-*suffix*]] is more consistent with highly productive prefixes such as ‘negative’, ‘attitudinal’ and ‘temporal’ prefixes. However, the correct interpretation may sometimes be inferred only from the immediate context.

Part 2: Conversion and compounding with proper nouns

The second part of analysis centers on two highly productive non-affixal processes in word-formation: conversion and compounding. As opposed to derivation which has always been defined as a word-formation process, conversion and compounding are regarded as borderline processes in word-formation literature due to the morphosyntactic characteristics of their outputs (Vujić 2020); a converted form represents paradigmatic change of its base form, and consequently, a shift in syntactic function, and a compound demonstrates a specialized syntactic relationship between its elements.

In the creation of new words, conversion and compounding follow the principles of transparency (in meaning) and simplicity (of form) (Booij 2005: 239); thus, they are highly productive processes which are often applied when coining new words. A language community has its own morphological preferences which are typically demonstrated whenever speakers use highly productive patterns in the construction of new forms; for instance, children who are not familiar with an established form would resort to compounding inasmuch as compounded forms are more discernible e.g. *magic man* vs. *magician* (Clark 2010: 113). Conversion and compounding with proper nouns, however, suggest the contrary tendency in contemporary English: converted and compounded proper nouns are not always semantically transparent and their simple form does not necessarily imply high frequency.

Unlike the three processes of derivation with proper nouns which show straightforward schematic representations of constructions (or a lack of it as in the case of analogy), conversion and compounding are more challenging in the theoretical framework of Construction Morphology. Conversion is not discussed only at the level of word-formation, but also at the level of syntax, given that the two components of grammar highlight different characteristics of denominal verbs i.e. the former is more suitable for studying the semantics of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns, and the latter for establishing their function in the immediate surroundings. In addition, conversion is discussed as a process that triggers coercion effects, which would mean that denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns depend on other syntactic elements (e.g. particles in phrasal verbs or other constituents in idiomatic constructions); therefore, they may vary in schematicity in their formal representation. On the other hand, compounds with proper nouns as non-head elements can be easily (formally) represented as morphological constructions due to the existence of the semantic relation R (see 5.3.2). The exact nature of R between the proper noun as the non-head constituent and the head constituent is discussed in the sections on nominal and deverbal compounding. Schematicity is available in compounding with both kinds of heads; however, the full formal representation of compounds with proper nouns and deverbal heads is more closely linked to the internal syntax of compounds because proper nouns serve as arguments of deverbal heads.

As in the analysis of prefixation, suffixation and affix combination with proper nouns in the first part of the thesis, a qualitative approach is applied in the analysis of converted and compounded forms with proper nouns. Since the converted and compounded forms are expected to display fixed morphosyntactic characteristics, the contextualized examples are more thoroughly studied with a view to pragmatics and semantics. The significance of shared knowledge is investigated in denominal conversion verbs and the relevance of semantic verbal categorization in compounds with proper nouns and deverbal heads. As in Part 1, the 518 converted and compounded constructs selected from COCA should illustrate linguistic variety and language use.

8 Conversion with proper nouns

Conversion typically presupposes a word-formation process in which an established word or lexeme changes its class without any overt change in its form. The most common directions of change include open word-classes i.e. nouns to verbs, verbs to nouns and adjectives to verbs⁷⁰. Proper nouns can become verbs almost unrestrictedly, which was investigated in the pioneering article on denominal verbs by Clark and Clark (1979). Therefore, it was expected that COCA should abound in denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns. Surprisingly enough, the instances of denominal verbs with proper nouns were somewhat infrequent and inconspicuous confirming Plag's observation that corpus-based programs are less reliable than dictionaries when studying converted forms, especially verbs as products of conversion (Plag 1999). The total of only 36 denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns has been extracted as listed in the Appendix of this thesis. The selected contextualized examples are analyzed in comparison with the suffixed proper nouns ending in *-ify/-ize* and in reference to their morphosyntactic surroundings. The main aim of the following analysis is to explore the possibilities of formally representing conversion with proper nouns in a construction-based model i.e. as a constructional schema or a coercion effect.

8.1 Preliminaries

Considering the wide scope and implications of conversion, it is no wonder that the issue of conversion has been debated at length in different linguistic fields such as syntax, morphology, word-formation and semantics. Valera (2004: 20) gives a loose definition that it is "traditionally a matter of same form and different word-class," which seems best to illustrate conversion as a true cross-linguistic phenomenon⁷¹. However, this definition could not satisfy word-formation enthusiasts who have turned conversion into "a sort of battleground over which various theoretical camps have fought over the years" (Lieber 2005: 418). This has often come as a result of different perspectives i.e. which aspect of conversion as a morphological process is highlighted and thoroughly studied⁷². In particular, the semantic-pragmatic meaning of converted forms and their morphosyntactic properties have sparked off most interest among linguists.

Instead of the term conversion, *zero-derivation* may as well be used in the study of word-formation; indeed, Marchand (1969: 360) mentions conversion and functional shift as possible terms, but more suitable for denoting the syntactic transposition of a word which is "a purely grammatical matter." According to Marchand (1969: 359), zero-derivation follows the same syntactic-semantic pattern as derivation by the verb-forming suffixes (*-ate*, *-ify* and *-ize*), but without any phonemic realization of a zero-morpheme which is the same *in content* as verb-forming suffixes (my emphasis). The semantics of denominal verbs can be paraphrased with 'make, render' e.g. *urbanize* means 'make urban' and *empty* means 'make empty.' Zero-derivation as a highly productive process in English word-formation may be due to a lack of competitive types (see Marchand 1969: 364).

⁷⁰ Other word-classes may also be converted, though rarely (see Valera 2005 and Vujić 2020). On the other hand, a change of secondary class (such as proper nouns to common nouns) is not considered to be a result of conversion (see Bauer and Huddleston 2002).

⁷¹ The term conversion is ascribed to Sweet (1898) who defined it as a phenomenon in which a word is converted into "another part of speech without any modification or addition, except the necessary change of inflection, etc" (Sweet (1898) as cited in Balteiro 2006: 20).

⁷² The difference between class change as a syntactic process and conversion is not included in this thesis (see Bauer 1983 for the discussion on conversion as a syntactic process in word-formation within the theoretical framework of Generative Linguistics). The study of conversion at the phonological level following the principles of the level-ordering hypothesis is not included either (see Allen 1978 and Kiparsky 1982 for the treatment of conversion as zero-affixation which takes place at the same level as level II suffixation).

The existence of a zero-affix in converted forms is challenged by several claims, out of which two may apply to denominal verbs: a) it is not certain that a zero-morpheme is a suffix or prefix; b) denominal verbs without an overt affix may have far more senses, some of which are purely idiosyncratic (Plag 1999, 2003)⁷³. Despite these objections, conversion is indeed perceived as a word-formation process rather than a syntactic one; Plag (2003: 107) defines it as “the derivation of a new word without any overt marking” and Bauer et al. (2013: 562) underline that conversion is “parallel to operations of affixation.” Conversion is morphological in nature because of its feature of directionality and relatedness of the converted form to its base e.g. one may clearly link the noun *land* to the verb of the same form meaning ‘arrive on the ground or land.’ Therefore, it is more closely defined as “a directional process which links an input and an output form that are formally but not semantically identical” (Bauer et al. 2013: 544).

A nominal base and denominal verb may be so tightly linked that the base form is also called ‘parent noun’ i.e. the converted form or denominal verb may assume a fixed sense and denotation from its parent noun in an expected way (Clark and Clark 1979). For example, the expression *saddle the horse* has a straightforward locative meaning ‘put a saddle on the horse.’ However, not all denominal verbs have a fixed sense and denotation as their overall meaning may be interpreted owing to other linguistic means i.e. pragmatic interpretation. In this case, denominal verbs are only understood in the context following the cooperative principles of the shared knowledge between the speakers; they are classified as innovative denominal verbs or ‘contextuals’ which may have an indefinitely large number of possible meanings (Clark and Clark 1979: 781-783). This account on the semantics of conversion is insightful in the analysis of neologisms because most new words are at first ambiguous and context-dependent until they gain wider acceptance in the speech community and develop semantic autonomy (Schmid 2008). On the other hand, Bauer et al. (2013: 565) draw our attention to the fact that all neologisms are contextual (not just denominal verbs) and that there is a cline from a great deal of pragmatic information to relatively little pragmatic information when interpreting their meaning. For that reason, this feature should not be viewed as distinctive in the studies of conversion (Bauer et al. 2013).

The role of pragmatics in conversion as advocated in Clark and Clark (1979) inspired Lieber (2004, 2005) to consider another possible view to conversion in word-formation i.e. conversion as a lexical process of relisting and not as a directional morphological process of affixation. In comparison to new words entering the lexicon, Lieber (2004: 90) asserts that “[C]onversion occurs when an item already listed in the lexicon is re-entered as an item of a different category.” In her earlier research on conversion, Lieber shows that the base and converted forms may be treated independently since converted forms display a broad range of argument structures (see Lieber 2005). Lieber (2004) compares the semantics of denominal verbs to the polysemous *-ize* verbs using the semantic verbal categories by Plag (1999) and concludes that there are far more meanings and many denominal verbs are in fact idiosyncratic. As a matter of fact, denominal verbs behave in the same manner as simplex coinages and conversion is thus seen as a form of coinage in which nouns get relisted in the mental lexicon as verbs.

In constrictivist approaches there is a greater focus on category change or type shift in the analysis of converted forms – denominal verbs are interpreted as a result of coercion. With respect to constructions as complex structures in grammar, coercion is seen as a side effect whenever there is incompatibility between the semantic or lexical meaning of a construction and its morphosyntactic surroundings (Michaelis 2004). For instance, mass uncountable noun may be coerced into countable in certain contexts as in *I’ll have a coffee*. In the case of morphological constructions, coercion allows the correct interpretation and resolution of the conflict thanks to the context which “enforces a particular reading of a word” (Audring and Booij 2016: 617). For example, the meaning shift as semantic coercion is typical of the negative verbs *unlike* and *unfriend* in the context of social media (Audring and Booij 2016: 622).

⁷³ The zero-derivation analysis may still be applied in the study of word-formation (see Bauer and Valera 2005).

It is interesting to note that constructionist approaches favor linguistic (morphosyntactic) context over the pragmatic information and extra-linguistic (conceptual) knowledge in the interpretation of denominal verbs as converted forms. Hilpert (2014) shows that the immediate linguistic context determines the meaning of denominal verbs; the correct interpretation could not be made in isolation, but it is primarily based on the type of the verb construction (Passive, Progressive or Transitive) and then on our conceptual knowledge (see 8.3). Moreover, Okada (2022) suggests that N to V converted forms which are nonce-formations should be treated as instances of coercion as they cannot exist outside that particular syntactic context.

The analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper names will be based on the combination of the two approaches discussed above: a semantic-pragmatic approach, in which the [ProperN]_V constructs are compared with the [ProperN-ify]_V and [ProperN-ize]_V constructs, and a morphosyntactic approach with a particular view to coercion. The reason for applying these two different strategies lies in our attempt to decide on the best possible representation of conversion with proper nouns i.e. either as a constructional schema or a coercion effect.

8.2 A semantic-pragmatic approach to denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns

In his account on the semantics of converted verbs, Plag (1999: 220) illustrates the same seven meanings which the *-ify/-ize* verbs may have: ‘locative’ e.g. *jail*, ‘ornative’ e.g. *staff*, ‘causative’ e.g. *yellow*, ‘resultative’ e.g. *bundle*, ‘inchoative’ e.g. *cool*, ‘performative’ e.g. *counterattack*, and ‘similative’ e.g. *chauffer*. Three more categories are added to the semantics of denominal verbs: ‘instrumental’ e.g. *hammer*, ‘privative’ e.g. *bark*, and ‘stative’ e.g. *hostess*. Lieber (2004: 91) confirms Plag’s key findings that there are more semantic categories exhibited by denominal verbs than by derived verbs, and highlights that the three categories indicating an instrument (*cartwheel*), a manner (*jet*), and location (*quarterdeck*) share the ‘motional’ meaning. Denominal verbs are also far more often performative and similative than the *-ize* verbs and they could be both dynamic and stative. Lieber also notices that converted verbs may have a wider range of meanings than the *-ize* verbs and excludes the possibility of polysemy. Instead, she suggests that converted verbs fall into five basic semantic categories, four of them are identical to the classes of simplex verbs (stative, activity, inchoative and manner) and the fifth one is causative.

The fact that the semantic categorization of denominal verbs is immensely complicated was first demonstrated by Clark and Clark (1979). In their detailed categorization of established denominal verbs, Clark and Clark show that there could be a lot of miscellaneous verbs on the one hand, and on the other hand, some verbs could have multiple senses and thus belong to more categories at once (1979: 781). This is typical of instrument verbs which could be interpreted as locatives e.g. *net*. In addition, some verbs may have lost their connection with the parent noun e.g. *park in a garage*, and others may have become completely idiomatic e.g. *boycott*.

According to the authors, these issues do not emerge in the analysis of innovative denominal verbs or contextuials which have a shifting sense and denotation. The semantic meaning of contextuials is determined by the pragmatic interpretation and the extra-linguistic knowledge of the speakers who can readily compute the correct reading in the immediate context; Clark and Clark (1979: 784) provide a contextualized example *My sister Houdini’d her way out of the locked closet* to illustrate their theory. Out of context, most innovative verbs may have indefinitely large number of potential senses i.e. as many as speakers may ascribe to them. The one selected meaning depends entirely on the predominant features of the parent noun and their salience to the speakers who share the same extra-linguistic knowledge of the parent noun⁷⁴.

⁷⁴ Clark and Clark (1979: 788) draw a distinction between generic and particular knowledge of the speakers’ mutual world knowledge. This distinction is not taken as relevant in the following analysis.

Extra-linguistic knowledge includes all kinds of readily computable information in communication between speakers – it may be accessed via words in the surrounding context, but also accompanied by visual contextuels such as gestures (Rabrenović 2020: 157). In her study on proper names as nonce-formations, the author gives an example from a sitcom scene in which two police officers are trapped on the roof and one of them sees a fire hose and says *I'm definitely Die-Harding off this roof. Yipee ki-yay!* (Rabrenović 2020: 156). This particular study analyzes proper names as nonce-formations which refer to the elements of popular culture (such as the movie *Die Hard*) and it discusses the (non-)lexicalizability of these formations by focusing on their meaning and discourse function. It is underlined that in such situations novel formations are created with the aim of highlighting a certain salient property of the parent noun and with the aim of producing a strong pragmatic effect in communication.

Having this in mind, we will try to determine the semantic categorization of denominal verbs with proper nouns and examine to what extent the encyclopedic knowledge is relevant in understanding their overall meaning. If it is possible to determine the exact semantic categorization, certain meanings will stand out as core meanings as in the case of the [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v constructs, which will allow us to propose the schematic representation of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns.

8.2.1 Schematic representations of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns

As we have seen, the verbal *ify/-ize* constructs with proper nouns have a combined causative and similitive meaning ‘cause to become in the manner of/like’ (see sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 respectively). Most of these verbs belong to the category of contextuels like denominal verbs since they are created as ad hoc formations. The [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v constructs were easily extracted from the COCA’s search engine due to the visibility of the *-ify/-ize* suffixes. On the other hand, it was difficult to gather denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns as bases due to a lack of an overt morpheme. Thus, the process of extraction had to be adjusted and the following sample from COCA includes only the forms which are inflected.

The converted forms with proper nouns denoting individuals are fairly productive and attested in COCA. They are mostly used as creative formations in informal writing or TV series and movies:

(1)

- a. Sinuhe is gifted in many ways-skiing, mountain biking, joke telling, *Don Juaning*. But in the common-sense department, he is a relative null set. (MAG: Skiing, 1996)
- b. This is about your... compulsive vacuum of need. You need to be liked. You need to be important. You need to be the center of attention. I mean, Dad was right. Here you are just *Joan-of-Arc-ing* it. (TV/MOV: Tales of the City, Not Today, Satan, 2019)
- c. I was trying to play it cool. There you go. He was doing the same thing. You were both *James Dean-ing* it, trying to keep it professional. (TV/MOV: Gilmore Girls, Keg!Max!, 2003)
- d. Last week, Kalanick was reported as saying he was “*Steve Jobs-ing* it” -- in other words, he would be coming back for a triumphant second stint at the company’s helm. (MAG: Fortune, 2017)
- e. John’s a former Chicago cop on disability who broke his back on the job, been *Santa-ing* for more than 10 years, the last three at Field’s on State Street. Three days is all he can handle -- got ta be careful of the back. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 2003)
- f. You and Susan, you ever discuss how to keep this affair secret from Mr. Bender? - Well... of course. - Hmm. You, uh, you made plans. You, uh, went to great lengths to preserve the lie?

- Pope Paul! - Pope... Paul? Once again I, I apologize, Your Honor. In England, in objections to sarcasm, barristers would often say, "He's *Winston-Churchilling* the witness." Over the years, it was shortened to just "church." At some point, it morphed into "Pope Paul." (TV/MOV Ally McBeal, Do You Wanna Dance?, 2000)

- g. That came after McCarville had torn down the 7-foot hoop on the chimney of the chicken coop. "I *Shaq-ed* it," she says of a thunderous dunk. (NEWS: USA Today, 2004)

The formations in (1) are used to refer to a kind of behaviour or activity which is closely associated with the person denoted by the parent noun. The salient property of each person, their personality such as charm (*Don Juan*) and professionalism (*James Dean*), or an activity they are famous for such as present giving (*Santa*) and basketball shots (*Shaq*), becomes readily computable to the interlocutors with the same extra-linguistic knowledge. If the meaning of the verb is not easily understood due to the lack of shared knowledge (*Winston Churchill*), the necessary additional information is provided by the speaker in the immediate context.

All the constructs have the similitive meaning 'act like,' and therefore, denominal verbs with proper nouns denoting people can be schematically represented as follows:

- I. <[[X]_{ProperNi/Person}]_{Vj} ↔ [Act in the Manner of/like SEM_i]_j >

The converted forms with proper nouns denoting objects or products are found across all genres and they are very frequent in COCA:

(2)

- a. The folks at Las Vegas Sports Consultants are no ducks. As the preeminent oddsmaking firm in the land of the midnight sun, when the estimable Michael "Roxy" Roxborough and his staff set point spreads and other numbers, literally millions of dollars in bets may move for clients in Nevada and now in 12 other nations *Internetting* worldwide. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1997)
- b. I found a guy online who says he can trade intel on Max for cash. - All we gotta do is make a little money. - We don't have money. We're gonna go *PayPal-ing* some kid in a basement who's most likely lying? (TV/MOV: The Losers, 2010)
- c. "I'd just have to have something in advance, and I don't take credit cards. They charge me a percentage." My mind went into high gear, tossing out strategies such as wiring her the money, or *FedEx-ing* a check. All seemed logistically nightmarish. (FIC: A Fall in Denver, 1995)
- d. In truth, I have always been one to jump on a bandwagon. I wore parachute pants in the 1980s, flannel in the 1990s and was unemployed in the 2000s. So when everyone around me seemed to be *Facebook-ing*, it made perfect sense for me to do the same. (MAG: America, 2009)
- e. It exploded from there. At last count, about 64 million people were *Napster-ing* their hearts out. # Days before the judge's deadline, we downloaded the Napster software in five minutes by clicking onto www.napster.com. (The Post has a high-speed, Internet T1 line.) (NEWS: Denver Post, 2001)
- f. Love is the one thing in this world that people will always need. E-Mate brings 'em together, and E-Dump pulls them apart. I control both ends of love's production. It's capitalism at its finest. You're *Microsoft-ing* break-ups? (TV/MOV: The Break-Up Artist, 2009)
- g. Thanks for your time, I hope you didn't miss anything on television while reading this, if so I hope you *TiVo-ed* it. (BLOG: 150 Watts of Awesome: Lance Armstrong Applies for Martyr Status, 2012)

- h. D' you wanna rent a movie tonight? - That sounds like fun. - Just nothing with horror in it. Or romance. Or men. I guess we're *Thelma and Louise-ing* it again? Mm-hm. Good call. (TV/MOV: *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, Ted, 1997)

The proper names denoting objects and products are converted into verbs with the instrumental meaning 'use,' which is the most frequent meaning of denominal verbs with common nouns as bases as well (see Plag 1999: 221). The constructional schema of the above constructs is as follows:

II. < [[X]_{ProperNi/Object}]_{Vj} ↔ [Use SEM_i]_j >

The names of movies and other elements of popular culture may not necessarily have the instrumental meaning as the converted form *Thelma and Louise*, because they may also have the simulative meaning. The difference lies in the selected property and whether it refers to the movie as a product or the character that the movie is famous for. In the second case, the [ProperN]_v constructs are the instantiations of the simulative constructional schema (I):

(3)

- a. Lewis said: "One of the things I really love about this study is that it's my type of science -- finding new ways to use existing data and *MacGyver-ing* a brand new science instrument." (MAG: *Gizmodo*, 2019)⁷⁵
- b. Natalie, 22 *Bridget Jones-ing* "I was on spring break in Miami with my friend, and we decided to hit up a luxe beachside bar. I really wanted to wear this sexy white dress, but all the underwear I'd brought with me were visible through it. So my friend let me borrow her pair of nude Spanx. We were totally hitting it off with hot rugby players from London, who were buying us drinks all night. As we were lounging on the outside beds, my dress started creeping up my leg, revealing the Spanx. I had completely forgotten about my heinous underpants until one of the guys started referring to me as Bridget Jones." (MAG: *Cosmopolitan*, 2009)
- c. - There's more wall, uh... - Dad! Dad...! - And you know, and it feels good to help, - It's spinning! to protecting our-our border. LUCILLE: My God, he *Steamboat Willied* it. - It's a heart project. - Dad! Dad! We love America. - We love America. (TV/MOV: *Arrested Develoment*, Queen B., 2013)

The proper nouns denoting places are very scarce as parent nouns of the denominal verbs, and if so, they are formed via metonymical transfer PLACE FOR PEOPLE:

(4)

To military colleagues, she was guilty of "*Hollywooding*": commanding the attention to herself in a culture that is all about the team. (NEWS: *Charlotte Observer*, 2016)

The denominal verb *Hollywood* is an output of the constructional schema (I) since it has the simulative meaning and may be paraphrased as 'acting like a Hollywood star.' This insight is of significant importance for the following comparison between the verbal constructs with proper nouns.

⁷⁵ The transitive verb *MacGyver* has its entry in the OED since March 2019: "to construct, fix, or modify (something) in an improvised or inventive way, typically by making use of whatever items are at hand" (taken from Rabrenović 2020: 160).

8.2.2 The comparison between the denominal conversion verbs and denominal *-ify/-ize* verbs with proper nouns

The above analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns as denominal verbs has shown that the denotation of a proper noun plays an important role in determining the meaning of the [ProperN]_v constructs. The simulative meaning is expressed with parent nouns denoting a person e.g. *Bridget Jones* or *Steve Jobs*, and the instrumental meaning with parent nouns denoting an object e.g. *Facebook* or *PayPal*. Interestingly enough, proper nouns denoting a geographical place are converted into verbs via a metonymical transfer.

When we compare the denominal conversion verb *Hollywood* to the denominal verb with the same proper noun and the *-ize* suffix *Hollywoodize*, it is clear that the two verbs do not carry the same meaning:

(5)

- a. To military colleagues, she was guilty of “*Hollywooding*”: commanding the attention to herself in a culture that is all about the team. (NEWS: Charlotte Observer, 2016)
- b. Mastai and his wife, Marie-Louise, who is in her 70s, accused Baldwin of trying to “*Hollywoodize*” this community in the Hamptons, which is accustomed to celebrity-turf disputes, and claimed he would never have got the town zoning board’s permission if he weren’t a celebrity. (MAG: People, 1993)

The suffixed verb *Hollywoodize* may be paraphrased as ‘turn the Hamptons into a hotspot for celebrities,’ and it has a combined causative (‘make x or cause to become x’) and simulative (‘do/act/make/in the manner of/like x’) meaning. In the formal representation of the constructional schemas with proper nouns and the *-ify/-ize* suffixes, we have seen that the [ProperN-*ify*]_v and [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs have the meaning ‘cause to become in the manner of/like x’ (see 6.2). As for the denotation of the *-ify/-ize* verbs with proper nouns as formal bases, a lot of them denote geographical places and may be used to refer to a physical change e.g. *Las Vegas could grow extravagantly if it “Manhattanized,”* or a cultural change e.g. *To Mexicanize Texas or Orientalize California is a crime.* When a proper noun denotes a person, the *-ify/-ize* verbs specify a change of becoming like that particular person e.g. *Marilynizing* means becoming blond like Marilyn Monroe, or their direct influence on something e.g. *WB hired Nolan to Nolan-ify Superman.* When a proper noun denotes a name of a company, the *-ify/-ize* verbs usually refer to a business change e.g. *Rather than Gap-ify, they plan to open no more than five to 10 corporate stores in total.*

As in the case of the comparison between *Hollywood* and *Hollywoodize*, the denominal conversion verb *gmail* and the denominal verb with the same proper noun and the *-ify* suffix *Gmailify* do not share the same meaning:

(6)

- a. I now have to resort to *gmailing* myself or creating a whole new google doc for every clip I want to see later?? (BLOG: Official Google Notebook Blog: Stopping development on Google, 2012)
- b. Add another email address to Gmail via Add an email account under Accounts and Import in the online settings, and during the setup process you can opt to “*Gmailify*” it -- giving you the same spam protection and auto-sorting for your other accounts as well as your Google one. (MAG: Gizmodo, 2019)

The denominal conversion verb has the instrumental meaning and can be paraphrased as ‘use Gmail,’ where as the *-ify* verb has a combined causative and simulative reading ‘cause to become like Gmail.’ Generally speaking, the verbs comprising of a proper noun denoting an object

and the *-ify/ -ize* suffixes are relatively infrequent (the total of 13 in the sample) and they all have a combined causative and similitive meaning.

The difference in meaning is also noticeable with proper nouns denoting elements of popular culture:

(7)

- a. I'll be lucky if I have a job in the morning. It would take a miracle to convince him that he's wrong. You know something, I don't like that look on your face. Uh-uh. We're *Scrooging* Blake, right. Right. Right. And I think we should just keep at it. Keep at it? And give him the Ghost of Christmas Future. (TV/MOV, A Little Miracle - December 24, 1962, 1990)
- b. "There's a part of most of us that gets *Scroogified* during the year," Williamson continues. "In all the difficulties of living, we sometimes tend to get closed off. Dickens's story is about coming together with family and friends around the hearth." (NEWS: Christian Science Monitor, 1990)

The denominal conversion verb *Scrooging* has the similitive meaning 'act in the manner of the story Christmas Carol' i.e. replicate the events of the story whose main character is Scrooge. The correct interpretation is indeed highly context-dependent as we realize that the interlocutors perceive the third person as Scrooge, and not that they are acting like Scrooge. On the other hand, the suffixed verb in the causative construction get *Scroogified* has a combined causative and similitive reading 'cause to become like Scroodge,' which is again understood in the context; Scrooge is the person who 'gets closed off' instead of being with his family and friends.

8.2.3 Ending the semantic-pragmatic battle of conversion in a construction-based model

In the preliminaries of this chapter, different approaches to conversion in word-formation are introduced and most of them focus on the issue of deciphering the meaning of denominal verbs. In the theoretical accounts on conversion, there has been a "battle" between semantics and pragmatics i.e. whether the meaning of denominal verbs is produced by semantic verbal categorization or pragmatic interpretation. The usage-based analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns as bases (parent nouns) has shown that the two "opponents" work hand in hand in order to produce a readily computable converted form.

With reference to the semantics of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns, we have seen that Marchand's explanation of conversion as zero-affixation (zero-derivation) seems less plausible – denominal conversion verbs and the *-ify/-ize* verbs are not necessarily competitive types as they are not the same in (semantic) content because denominal verbs are not automatically paraphrased as 'make, render x.' Nevertheless, it is confirmed that conversion is *derivation without any overt marking* (my emphasis) because of its directionality and relatedness of the converted form to its base (Plag 1999) – this is formally represented in each constructional schema instantiating the [ProperN]_v constructs which are also form-meaning pairings like the [ProperN-*ify*]_v and [ProperN-*ize*]_v constructs.

Apart from showing the feature of directionality, the constructionist representation of denominal conversion verbs specifies the semantic part of the schemas more closely. After making a parallel between denominal conversion verbs and denominal *-ify/-ize* verbs, we may draw new conclusions regarding the semantic verbal categorization. Denominal conversion verbs may have the similitive or instrumental meaning depending on the parent noun i.e. the denotation of the proper noun. The denotation of the proper noun is not a crucial factor in determining the meaning of the *-ify/-ize* verbs as most of them have a combined causative and similitive meaning which is formally represented in their constructional schemas. There are a few exceptions of purely

similative or causative readings depending on the context, but this is less relevant when compared to the combined causative and similative meaning which is highly productive.

Although constructional schemas do not specify any extra-linguistic knowledge about the variable *x* (i.e. a proper noun), we have seen that some pragmatic information is needed for the correct understanding of denominal conversion verbs. It may be that this piece of information is in the surrounding context, but it is more likely that it is based on shared knowledge, which means that the role of the context as such is minimized. On the other hand, when the speakers do not share the same encyclopedic knowledge, the role of the context is maximized i.e. the interlocutor has to provide relevant information as in the case of *Winston Churchill*. This means that the pragmatic interpretation is more of secondary nature in deciphering innovative denominal verbs with proper nouns, not the driving force. The proposal in this chapter that denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns may be formally represented via constructional schemas speaks in favor of their semantic categorization and against being completely pragmatically dependent.

The most convincing argument for the supremacy of semantics over pragmatics in determining the overall meaning of denominal conversion verbs lies in the non-shifting denotation of proper nouns – this is contradictory to Clark and Clark’s hypothesis that denominal verbs have a shifting sense and denotation (Clark and Clark 1979: 782). Our analysis has shown that denominal conversion verbs keep their parent noun denotation which is necessary in differentiating between the similative and instrumental meaning. The only exception to this is a proper noun denoting an object which is in fact an element of popular culture (a movie or a story); the exact meaning of this kind of the [ProperN]_v construct is more context-dependent because the parent noun may denote either an object or a person/character.

Having a fixed sense and denotation, denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns are not entirely contextuals, although sometimes the exact meaning may be interpreted only in context. This is, however, more likely to be a result of insufficient extra-linguistic knowledge of the interlocutors and not the possibility of having more senses. There’s usually one salient property in the case of each denominal verb which enables the speakers to readily compute the meaning of the verb. If there are more associations with the proper noun, there will also be more salient properties. This only means that a novel formation is highly context-dependent because it has not yet developed semantic autonomy which is only relevant in terms of lexicalizability i.e. whether it will ever become a dictionary entry as *MacGyver* (Rabrenović 2020). In fact, the same “problem” may arise with the *-ify/-ize* verbs with proper nouns that have more associations and therefore more salient properties (see the examples of the formation *McDonaldizing* in 6.2.2).

After prioritizing semantics over pragmatics in determining the meaning of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns, coercion as a side effect in different syntactic surroundings is studied next. In the following sections, denominal conversion verbs with proper names are discussed as parts of larger syntactic constructions with the aim of identifying the exact role of syntax in morphological constructions.

8.3 A morphosyntactic approach to denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns

In Construction Grammar, the primary unit of any linguistic investigation is construction, as first introduced in the study of argument structures in syntax (Goldberg 1995). One of the key features of a construction as a grammatical form-meaning pairing is its non-compositionality i.e. “[...] a construction as a whole is not just a sum of its parts but presents more complex and less transparent relationship between the constituents and what they amount to when combined” (Fried and Östman 2004: 27). The feature of non-compositionality is not only ascribed to syntactic constructions, but also to morphological constructions without overt marking such as innovative denominal verbs. According to Hilpert (2014), their non-compositionality is seen as a direct result of their morphosyntactic surroundings i.e. innovative denominal verbs have no established verb

meaning and it is only in the given syntactic context that their meaning is assigned via the principle of coercion.

The principle of coercion is viewed as an “accommodation mechanism” in the situations in which the lexical meaning of an item is overridden – this is also known as the Override principle:

- 1) If a lexical item is semantically incompatible with its morphosyntactic context, the meaning of the lexical item conforms to the meaning of the structure in which it is embedded (Michaelis 2004: 25).

This necessarily implies that words may change their semantics within a specific constructional context. In other words, the same verb in isolation may have several meanings depending on the given context. Hilpert (2014: 132-133) illustrates coercion with his made-up verb *monk* which may have three possible meanings depending on its immediate syntactic context. In the Passive construction it would mean ‘turn someone into a monk,’ in the Progressive construction it would mean ‘behave like a monk’ and in the Transitive construction it has a reading of ‘populate some place with monks.’

Okada (2022: 98) also defines denominal verbs as “ad hoc syntactic categorization within a specific constructional pattern,” because they cannot exist with the relevant meaning outside the context. This is especially the case of converted nouns with the particle *out* such as *nerd out* and *freak out*, which cannot be used in isolation as denominal verbs e.g. **nerd*, **freak*. In this sense, denominal verbs are syntactically-conditioned and cannot be free standing lexemes (see also Michaelis and Hsiao 2021).

The role of syntax is especially advocated by Michaelis and Hsiao (2021) who do not take conversational context to be the sole trigger of novel denominal verbs. The authors propose a combination of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic approaches since the valid interpretation of denominal verbs may only come as a result of a procedure which is “neither pure syntax nor pure pragmatics” (Michaelis and Hsiao 2021: 4). Their analysis is based on four coherent strategies e.g. nominal frame computation, verb-construction integration, co-composition and conceptual blending (including metaphorical mapping) which illustrate the interplay of shared knowledge and syntactic surroundings. To put it briefly, according to Michaelis and Hsiao (2021: 5), denominal verbs evoke semantic frames associated with their source (parent) nouns and their syntactic expression is “the job of argument-structure constructions, not “context” in a general sense.”

Given that coercion is defined as the resolution of conflict when “[I]nterpretation favours syntactic meaning over lexical meaning” (Michaelis 2004: 62), we will look more closely at the syntactic surroundings of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns in the following sections. A special attention is dedicated to phrasal constructions with the particles *up* and *out* in which denominal verbs may occur. We also look into their possible occurrence in more complex syntactic structures such as the English *Way*-construction which is said to trigger coercion effects (Michaelis 2005).

8.3.1 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and their immediate syntactic surroundings

The semantic-pragmatic analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns in the first part of this chapter has shown that the [ProperN]_v constructs do have a fixed sense based on the parent noun denotation. This means that both the simulative meaning (based on the person denotation) and instrumental meaning (based on the object denotation) are expected to be expressed in different syntactic contexts. The simulative meaning is mostly found in Transitive constructions e.g. *I Shaq-ed it*, and Progressive Transitive constructions e.g. *You were both James Dean-ing it*. The denominal verbs with the instrumental meaning are frequently used in Progressive Transitive

constructions e.g. *You're Microsoft-ing break-ups*. When the argument of the verb denotes people, there is a slight preference for Active Constructions (8a-8c) over Passive Constructions (8d):

(8)

- a. Lou Dobbs is amazing. For 20 years, he's been nothing but sexy. They're not booing him. They're *Lou-ing* him. I've got the dibs on the Dobbs. (SPOK: THE FIVE 5:00 PM EST, 2014)
- b. Everybody, get up here! - (rats murmuring) - Everybody, it sounds intense. – He's "*Lassie-ing*" us. - Mike, come on, hurry up. (TV/MOV: Animals, Dog, 2017)
- c. I swear she did it simply because she realized no one gave a shit about her anymore off in babyland. She had to stir up some controversy so people would pay attention to her. She *Ann Coulter-ed* us! Tricky bitch!! (BLOG: Project Babies Wants You To Think About The "Big Picture", 2012)
- d. You know why I was fucking with you? Because that's what celebrities do to each other. You were just *Clooney-ed*. What? You won. I'm getting my own network talk show? You're about to be a TV star! (TV/MOV: Between Two Ferns: The Movie, 2019)

Denominal conversion verbs commonly take a direct object as their argument and they are frequently used in transitive and active constructions. This is in line with their semantics and extra-linguistic reality – the [ProperN/Object]_V constructs are conceptually related to physical objects, whereas the [ProperN/Person]_V constructs are conceptually related to a salient property (behavior or activity) of a person (see 8.2.1). An absence of the argument would create a mismatch or misunderstanding – if the denominal conversion verb *Lou* wasn't followed by an object pronoun, the statement would not have a clear contrast to the transitive verb *boo* which is used anaphorically and the desirable effect would probably be lost. As suggested by Michaelis and Hsiao (2021), our complete understanding of a novel denominal verb relies on our ability to apply multiple linguistic strategies simultaneously.

Given their syntactic environment, denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns can be seen as effects of coercion. For instance, there is no single salient property of the novel verb *Lou*, such as typical behavior or activity, which would help us understand the verb by simply relying on our extra-linguistic reality and shared knowledge. In contrast, the meaning of the novel verb *Lou* is computed thanks to the transitive verb *boo* and the information in the pre-text e.g. *Lou Dobbs is amazing*. Thus, the lexical meaning of the verb *Lou* is 'praise Lou for being amazing' and it is based on the overall syntactic interpretation in relation to the meanings of surrounding lexemes in context. However, these cases of conversion as coercion are substantially rare when compared to other denominal conversion verbs with proper names in (9) whose simulative semantics is effortlessly understood provided that the speakers have the necessary encyclopedic knowledge about Lassie, Ann Coulter and George Clooney.

8.3.2 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and particles

Effects of coercion may be discussed with denominal verbs that take a particle. Generally speaking, phrasal verbs display unusual specification in the grammar of English – they are compositional in form as syntactic constructions, but also semantically unique in meaning as full lexemes (Vujić 2013). Given that particles generally have their own semantics and that they influence the meaning of the simplex verbs (Rudzka-Ostin 2003), the analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and the particles *up* and *out* is carried out in this section.

In COCA, there are several examples of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and the particle *up*:

(9)

- a. This “date” is particularly weird and wonderful, with Eugene showing off his Yars’ Revenge skills, then impressing the ladies by *MacGyver-ing up* a small explosive device while tunelessly humming “The 1812 Overture.” (MAG: RollingStone, 2017)
- b. What are you doing here? *Bible-ing up*, dude. Joseph, go home. Nuh-uh, hold on. This is my Bible study crass. (TV/MOV: King of the Hill, The Good Buck, 2003)
- c. It would be wise if we tried every peaceful solution before we got all *Rambo-ed up*. (TV/MOV: The West Wing, The State Dinner, 1999)
- d. “I am not dumbing-down the paper,” Mr. Britton said in response to a question. “I am crime-ing it down and *Pollyanna-ing it up*, because I am looking for a positive spin on things -- because I want people to read every page of the paper.” (NEWS: New York Times, 1996)

Michaelis and Hsiao (2021: 5) emphasize that denominal verbs with particles are ideal candidates in a study applying “the integration-based approach” given that denominal verbs with particles combine syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features: event structure, metaphor and linguistic convention. Speakers do not only rely on their encyclopedic knowledge in processing denominal verbs, but they also intuitively feel the interdependence of figurative sense and syntactic function (Michaelis and Hsiao 2021).

The particles in phrasals play a key role in creating marked lexical items – Hampe (2000) illustrates this feature by comparing simplex verb *face* and the phrasal verb *face up to*. The author’s comparison shows the key differences in form and use: the phrasal verb has additional linguistic material and it is more restricted, less frequent and stylistically marked (Hampe 2000: 84). When we compare the simplex denominal conversion verb *MacGyver* (e.g. *MacGyver-ing a brand new science instrument*) and the denominal conversion verb with the particle *MacGyver up* (e.g. *MacGyver-ing up a small explosive device while tunelessly humming “The 1812 Overture”*), we can identify the more restricted and informal use of the denominal conversion verb with the particle *up*. Moreover, all denominal verbs in (10) are resultative and perfective verbs, which is a prerequisite for the verbs to take on an idiomatic meaning when paired up with the particle *up* (Lindstromberg 2010: 194). The figurative meaning is based on the spatial metaphor UP IS POSITIVE VERTICALITY which captures the idea of moving to a higher degree, value or measure, and in abstract domains, it refers to higher standards and quality or a higher level of knowledge or feelings (Rudzka-Ostin 2003: 75-103). The syntactic construction that produces the figurative meaning of phrasal verbs is Transitive Resultative Construction with the CAUSE-RESULT semantic frame (Olson 2013: 77). In this sense, denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and the particle *up* are conceptually closer to the [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v constructs than the [ProperN]_v constructs – if we apply a substitution test and use the formation *Biblifying* or *Bible-izing* instead of *Bible-ing up*, the causative-resultative meaning would be the same but the degree of higher knowledge (on the vertical axis) would not be communicated to the interlocutor. From a syntactic point of view, the phrasal verbs have the feature of transitivity as the [ProperN-ify]_v and [ProperN-ize]_v constructs; this is not surprising given that the feature of transitivity may be displayed in phrasal verbs even if the simplex counterpart is intransitive e.g. *run off* vs. *run* (Vujić 2013: 50).

The same causative-resultative meaning (with a stronger focus on end-result) is conveyed with denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns and the particle *out* in Passive Constructions:

(10)

- a. So, with this experience behind him, is he all *Stones-ed out*? Not at all. He says that at the film’s premiere in New York City earlier this week, he addressed Mick, Keith, Charlie and Ron. (BLOG: ‘Crossfire Hurricane’ Director Brett Morgen On Brian Jones, 2012)

- b. We're all *Seinfeld-ed* out by now, right? I don't need a "Seinfeld" blooper tape, or a signed photo of Jerry on the set. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 1999)
- c. Well, Mt. Rainier is like old faithful friend for me. It is always nearby and it never cease to amaze me how beautiful the place is. However to be honest, I was a little *Mt.Rainier-ed* out from last year. I visited it a lot last year. During the peak summer and the fall time, I was probably there almost every week. (BLOG: Mt. Rainier – I Am Back To See You Again, 2012)
- d. *Miramax-ed out*. Who could have guessed that for the final Academy Awards of the '90s, Miramax, the one-time small distributor that has scored eight best-picture nominees in the past seven years and grew from scrappy art house to quality powerhouse, would offer its weakest slate in ages. (NEWS: USA Today, 1999)

According to Rudzka-Ostin (2003: 14-47), the figurative sense of the phrasal verbs with the particle *out* is based on the spatial metaphor OUT IS LEAVING A CONTAINER which may be applied to abstract domains of emotions, knowledge, work and social relations. The phrasal verbs which are part of these abstract domains are usually paraphrased as 'cease to.' For instance, *Miramaxed-out* is used to refer to an event which caused Miramax to lose its image of a scrappy art house and which resulted in creating a new image of a quality powerhouse. The particles are again used in more restricted contexts – the degree modifiers *all* in (10a-b) and *little* in (10c) are conceptually related to the idea of (surface) expansion and stretching (Rudzka-Ostin 2003: 32). This degree feature would probably be lost if the [ProperN-ify]_V and [ProperN-ize]_V counterparts are used to replace the existing phrasals in (10).

Our comparison between the *-ify/-ize* verbs and the denominal conversion verbs with particles *up* and *out* has shown that the two kinds of constructs are very close in their semantic reading; they share the causative-resulative meaning but show a difference of degree. The meaning shift from the similitive or instrumental meaning to the causative-resultative meaning can be directly ascribed to particles when they are added to the [ProperN]_V constructs. This means that conversion with proper nouns may be interpreted as coercion because the meaning of the verb conforms to the meaning of the structure as a whole.

8.3.3 Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns in idiomatic constructions

Denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns may be also constituents of the *Way*-construction which is said to be almost entirely productive in English (Goldberg 1995: 137):

(11)

- a. At least Jerry could sing, dance, and act. Biden is certifiable. He really needs a TEAM of mental health experts. This is what happens when liberals age. Libs, if you continue *Biden-ing your way* through life, this is who you become. Truths will accidentally be expelled when you least expect it, like gas. I guess Biden expelled some truth today without even realizing it. (WEB: Another Biden Gaffe? VP Admits Middle Class Has Had a Rough Go, 2012)
- b. She didn't like anyone wearing shoes in the house. Some Feng Shui thing. So, you *Feng Shui-ed* your way to the bed? (TV/MOV: CSI: Crime Scene Investigation, Butterflied, 2004)
- c. So, why me? I mean, you say you don't do this, so why's you come home with me? You *Travolta'ed your way* into my pants. (TV/MOV: #Stuck, 2014)

Described as constructional idiom due to its specialized syntactic form and idiomatic meaning (Jackendoff 1990), the *Way*-construction provides an example of how arguments can be added to

the event structure of lexical verbs i.e. how the valency of a verb can be increased (Goldberg 1995, 2006; Hilpert 2014, Michaelis 2005). Michaelis (2005: 59) points out coercion effects in the *Way*-constructions: the lexical verb of the construction usually entails an activity which does not involve directed motion, but the construction as a whole implies the motion of an agent along a path or in a particular manner e.g. *She talked her way into the shareholders' meeting*. Out of two main interpretations of the *Way*-construction i.e. the means and the manner interpretation (Goldberg 1995), only the manner interpretation is valid with denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns. The examples of the *Way*-construction in (12) do not convey the creation of a path (the means interpretation), but the manner which “occurs simultaneously to a movement” (Hilpert 2014: 39). The path and goal arguments *through life* (12a), *to the bed* (12b) and *into my pants* (12c) indicate a necessary simultaneous motion in the above examples of the *Way*-construction. The denominal verb of the construction denotes an individual and has the simulative reading ‘act in the manner of/like’ (see 8.2.1), which is in line with the type of a lexical (non-denominal) verb that frequently occurs in the *Way*-construction – it is an intransitive verb which does not involve directed motion (Michaelis 2005). This is contrary to the prevailing opinion that syntactic surroundings may influence denominal conversion verbs; as a matter of fact, the denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns in the *Way*-construction naturally appear as its constituents. Thus, the *Way*-construction does not trigger coercion effects, but rather it illustrates the inevitable interaction between morphology and syntax (see 3.3.2).

8.4 Summary

In this Chapter, we have identified conversion as a word-formation process and laid out different approaches to studying conversion in English. Two linguistic aspects of conversion have been discussed: the semantic-pragmatic interpretation and the morphosyntactic surroundings of denominal verbs. The analysis of denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns has shown that the [ProperN]_v constructs have two possible senses based on the denotation of the parent noun; the [ProperN/Person]_v constructs have the simulative meaning, whereas the [ProperN/Object]_v constructs have the instrumental meaning. It has also been illustrated that there is a difference in meaning between the *-ify/-ize* verbs and denominal conversion verbs with the same proper noun as the base form. The pragmatic interpretation is of secondary importance in deciphering the meaning of the [ProperN]_v constructs; it is only relevant for the interlocutor’s full understanding of the salient property of the proper noun which may be provided in context when necessary. This primacy of the semantic over the pragmatic interpretation speaks in favor of schematically presenting denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns as morphological constructions. When the denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns as formal bases are used with the particles *up* and *out*, there is an unavoidable meaning shift – such phrasal verbs have the causative-resultative reading. As a result, these constructions are similar in meaning to their *-ify/-ize* suffixed counterparts, but they express a higher degree. In this case, we may speak of conversion as a coercion effect. However, when denominal conversion verbs with proper nouns are used in the idiomatic *Way*-construction, the lexical meaning of the verb does not fully conform to the meaning of the structure as a whole, but rather it represents the inevitable interaction between morphology and syntax.

9 Compounding with proper nouns

A compound as an output of compounding is loosely defined as a combination of two words with a modifying relation between its elements. As one of the most productive processes in word-formation, compounding allows for free combination of the open categories, and other categories and even whole phrases (see Vujić 2020). It is also “a contact point between several crucial linguistic and non-linguistic notions” including syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships, syntax and morphology, linguistic and pragmatic knowledge (Scalise and Vogel 2010: 2). This unrestrictedness of compounding suggests that proper nouns and proper names can be elements of compounds as well. Indeed, the total of 477 compounds with proper nouns has been extracted as listed in the Appendix of this thesis. The selected compounds are analyzed in reference to the position of proper nouns in most frequent combinations. As elements of compounds, proper nouns always take the position of the first modifying element i.e. the non-head, whereas the head is either a common noun or a deverbal element⁷⁶.

9.1 Preliminaries

Compounding involves at least two words (or elements) by default. In English there can be more than two elements in a compound (also known as compound constituents) which are usually broken in two parts – compounds are prototypically binary structures e.g. [[[*university* [*teaching award*]] *committee*] *member*] (Plag 2003: 171). This binary structure is very important when determining the exact number of compound constituents (especially if the process of compounding is applied recursively). Moreover, it is crucial in the analysis of grammatical relations between compound constituents since the compounds’ exhibition of “internal syntax” is covertly present (Scalise and Vogel 2010). Such grammatical relations have often been studied according to the rules of syntax and with a view to the semantic properties of compound constituents.

In early generative approaches, Lees (1960) proposed his transformational account of compounding i.e. he introduced the notion of nominalizations with the aim of showing that nominalizations are noun-like versions of sentences which are derived from sentences by transformation. For example, the compound *population growth* has undergone two stages (first *the population grows* and then *the growth of population*) before reaching its final shape as a compound. However, the meaning of some nominal compounds (such as *flour mill* and *windmill*) could only be explained by the introduction of deletion transformations, and for that reason, the lexicon was introduced as an alternative way of explaining differences and idiosyncrasies in word-formation (see Scalise and Guevara 2005).

Despite its drawbacks, the transformational approach to compounding had a great influence on other linguists, one of them being Hans Marchand (1967, 1969). Although Marchand agreed with the assumption that compounds are connected with the underlying kernel sentence, he also focused on the interrelation between the grammatical relation (syntagmatic relation) and semantic relation. Marchand noticed that in verbal nexus combinations both syntagmatic and semantic relations are explicit thanks to the verbal element, whereas in non-verbal nexus compounds “the grammatical relations are less in evidence than semantic patterns” (Marchand 1967: 382). Moreover, he realized that the semantic content of the constituent morpheme is crucial in predicting the syntactic relation of verbal nexus compounds in the underlying sentence e.g. *eating apple* vs. *apple eater* vs. *apple eating*. Overall, Marchand’s new approach to compounding introduced the inevitable interplay of word-formation and syntax.

⁷⁶ The head position of a proper noun in a two-word combination usually suggests a syntactic phrase of the type A + N: *loving Jack* (syntactic phrase) vs. *Jack-loving* (compound).

Seeing that the focus changed from transformation rules to the lexicon and from the underlying sentence to the semantic interpretation of compounds, new approaches to compounding emerged such as Allen's introduction of lexicalist compounding rule (1978). Allen's IS-A Condition (if [XY] of Z is a compound, Z is a Y) is said to be the forerunner of Williams's Right Hand Head Rule (Williams 1981), which started the debate on the notion of *the head* and *headedness* in compounding.

Following the first records of compounds in Sanskrit (see Bloomfield 1933), theorists tend to make compound classifications based on the notion of the head in English as well. The head, which represents the centre of the (endocentric) compound, is generally the second or right compound constituent (the Right-Hand Head Rule), and the first compound constituent, also known as *the non-head* (Booij 2005) or *the dependent* (Haspelmath 2002), modifies and narrows the denotation of the head e.g. *school bus* is a kind of a bus. Therefore, an endocentric compound is a hyponym of its second constituent and it is usually represented as [X Y]Y, X being the non-head and Y the head of a compound. The headedness of a compound is crucial for specifying the formal properties of a compound and its syntactic category. Furthermore, the inflectional properties of the whole compound are applied to the head alone, for example *school buses*. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there must be some kind of the semantic relation between the compound constituents. Even though there are no major restrictions on the kinds of possible relations, the first constituent must be "in some kind of pragmatically sensible relation" to the head (Haspelmath 2002: 87).

Apart from endocentric compounds, there are also exocentric compounds whose head is "outside" the compound i.e. neither of the compound constituents is the head. Their exact meaning can be determined when applying synecdoche e.g. *redskin* is a person who has red skin i.e. a Native American person. Most exocentric compounds are lexicalized since they are totally unproductive in English (Bauer 2006). Copulative compounds, following dvandva compounds in Sanskrit, are perceived as "two-headed" compounds seeing that both compound constituents are equally important when deciding on the meaning of the compound e.g. *bittersweet*, *Austria-Hungary*. The relation between the compound constituents in copulative compounds is that of coordination and can be paraphrased as [X and Y].

As Bisetto and Scalise (2005) notice, endocentric and exocentric compounds are defined on the basis of the presence or the absence of the head, whereas coordinative compounds on the basis of the grammatical relation between compound constituents. This intersection of criteria is a bit problematic along with certain compound classifications which may consist of different subclassifications; for instance, Marchand (1969) differentiates between two types of endocentric compounds, verbal nexus (synthetic) and non-verbal-nexus compounds. For that reason, Bisetto and Scalise (2005: 326-328) propose a new classification of compounds that is based on the grammatical relation between constituents: subordination, attribution and coordination⁷⁷. The relation of subordination is based on a complement relation between the constituents (*love story*, *cut throat*), the relation of attribution shows an attribute of the head (*blackboard*, *greeneyed*), and the relation of coordination implies the "and" link between two heads (*woman doctor*, *Austria-Hungary*). The three main classes of compounds (subordinate, attributive and coordinate) can be both endocentric and exocentric (as in the provided examples respectively).

Another classification based on the grammatical relation between the constituents is proposed by Bauer et al. (2013: 465): argumental vs. non-argumental compounds. In this classification, the principles of argument structure are applied – argumental compounds have one element as the argument of the other element (be it a subject e.g. *family member*, an object e.g. *cheese grater*, or a prepositional object e.g. *mountain peak*), and non-argumental compounds do not exhibit an underlying argument structure (they can be attributive e.g. *leather jacket* or coordinative e.g. *deaf-mute*).

⁷⁷ Bisetto and Scalise (2005) do not disregard other levels of analysis involving the internal structure, the semantic relation between the constituents, the origin of compound constituents or the categorial status of the constituents; however, they state that all these criteria have to be applied after the grammatical level of classification.

The semantic interpretation of compound constituents has been of interest to many linguists, particularly in determining the meaning of a compound as a whole. Some studies predominately focus on the compositionality of compounds inasmuch as compounding has a communication purpose of compressing the information usually expressed in a single utterance (Guerva and Scalise 2009). Other accounts highlight the conceptual and cognitive aspects of compounding such as Jackendoff's Parallel Architecture and Conceptual Semantics or Štekauer's Onomasiological Theory (see Ten Hacken 2016).

The output of compounding is not necessarily a lexeme as compounds may be highly contextualised and ephemeral. Then, compounds only serve the function of deixis as in Downing's often quoted example *apple juice-seat* (Downing 1977: 818). Booij (2005: 76) does not rule out the possibility of contextualised compounds becoming lexicalized as it was the case with the compound *butt call*. This is a strong case for their special communication purpose and high degree of productivity in English.

The following analysis is to show that compounds with proper names as the non-head constituents are freely and productively created by speakers in order to compress important piece of semantic information (related to the nominal or deverbal head). This unique effect is achieved by applying the fundamental rules of syntax to compound constituents. Therefore, the constructionist proposal in this chapter aims at showing that the form-meaning correspondence in compounds is the interplay of syntax and morphology.

9.2 Compounds with proper nouns and nominal heads

Nominal compounds with proper nouns [[ProperN][N]]_N are highly productive in contemporary English. They exhibit the same morphosyntactic properties as typical nominal compounds with common nouns (see Adams 2001); they are binary structures which may be modified e.g. [*first* [*Detroit event*]], prefixed e.g. [*ex*-[*Brexit secretary*]] and suffixed e.g. [[[*South Pacific*] *island*]*er*]. In addition, their heads are always grammatically inflected e.g. *the California governor's race*, *a few Yale students*.

Most novel nominal compounds are right-headed (endocentric) and compositional in meaning. When both compound constituents are common nouns, the head assigns the denotation of the compound as a whole, whereas the non-head constituent receives a generic (non-referential) interpretation (Lieber 2005). For instance, the compound *flower pot* does not imply a certain type of a flower such as a rose or a tulip. On the other hand, when a proper noun is the non-head constituent of a compound, it may be either referential or generic. Adams (2001: 80) illustrates a possible dual interpretation of the compound *Wittgenstein argument*: it's referential in the sense 'an argument advanced by Wittgenstein' and it's generic when it implies an argument which is 'one of the kind associated with [him]' Wittgenstein. However, Plag (2003) notices that dual interpretation with nominal compounds depends on the conceptual relationship between the compound constituents and the surrounding discourse. This is related to the broad communicative and discourse function of compounding i.e. to "squeeze complex concepts into very short expressions" (Plag 2003: 151).

One of the most controversial issues concerning nominal compounds is the possible range of the semantic relationships between the constituents. Many linguists agree that semantic categorization would be an impossible and futile attempt (Bauer 1983; Plag 2003). A possible categorization could include the following: 'location,' 'cause,' 'manner,' 'possessor,' 'material,' 'content,' 'source,' 'instrument' etc. (Plag 2003: 148). The same problem comes up with nominal compounds whose non-head constituents are proper nouns since the exact semantic relation depends on their denotation – place names may presuppose a locative relationship between compound constituents e.g. *Wellington airport*, but personal names are less straightforward in the interpretation of the semantic relationship (Bauer 1983: 204).

Given the inconsistency and ambiguity of semantic relations with nominal compounds in general, the analysis in terms of existing grammatical relations (argument structure) is more reliable with nominal compounds consisting of a proper noun as the non-head constituent and a common noun as the head constituent. Such compounds are exclusively non-argumental endocentric compounds. This is illustrated in the following examples from COCA in which proper nouns as non-heads denote a person, place or an object (without any restrictions) and the head constituent is a very frequent common noun e.g. *area*, *style*, *era*, *type* and *speak*:

(1)

- a. At the rally on Saturday, supporters clutched banners and artwork dedicated to Jazmine, who was in second grade at a *Houston-area* school. (NEWS: New York Times, 2019)
- b. By Plane Below, you'll find a list of *NYC-area* airports, along with the best ways to get from those airports to Manhattan. (WEB: NYC Transportation: Getting Here, 2012)
- c. In *The Butterfly Murders* (1979), Hark fuses wuxia spaces and concepts with conventions of the modern mystery-thriller, and his fantastical *Zu Warriors* from the *Magic Mountain* (1983), in many ways the *Star Wars* of wuxia cinema, incorporates *Hollywood-style* special effects to a previously unparalleled degree. (ACAD: Style, 2009)
- d. Some Apple watchers also expect the company to follow up on the iPod with additional devices designed to make the Mac the premier hub for what Jobs calls the "digital lifestyle." Will we see Apple-branded digital still cameras and camcorders? Those categories could certainly use some *Apple-style* ease of use. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 2001)
- e. President Obama proposed Monday that the *Bush-era* tax cuts for individuals making over \$250,000 a year be rescinded. (BLOG: Corporations Are People Any Way You Look at Them, 2012)
- f. He never had a Twitter account, hand-wrote thank-you notes and could be heard at his home on New York's Upper East Side singing *Depression-era* songs like "Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?" (MAG: Rolling Stone, 2018)
- g. Nuclear-industry executives maintain that a *Chernobyl-type* accident could not happen at Diablo Canyon or any other U.S. nuclear plant, because of the rigorous safety standards imposed in this country. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1993)
- h. Analysts say that it will cement RasterOps' position as the leading supplier of sophisticated true-color and video products for both the *Macintosh* and *IBM-type* personal computers. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1991)
- i. "Monitor this race closely" is *Washington-speak* for "maybe spend money on it." (WEB, 2012)
- j. They were outfitting the shuttle with something called a multifunctional electronic display system, which in *NASA-speak* is basically improved digital displays and a better workplace for the astronauts. (SPOK: NPR_ATCW, 2003)

The constructs in (1a-1f) may be paraphrased as 'in the area/style/era of x' and the constructs in (1g-1j) as 'the kind/talk of x' and the interpretations are available to any compound regardless of the denotation of the proper noun (a person, a place or an object). The non-head constituent in all examples has an adjectival function, which means that the compound type is an attributive compound; similar findings are provided by Bauer et al. (2013: 476) who demonstrate that the meaning of the compound *Shaker bed* is 'from a Shaker design, in the Shaker style.' In other words, any proper noun as the non-head constituent serves as a more specified descriptor of the head.

In Construction Morphology, a more detailed schematic representation for the right-headed nominal compounds includes the specification [α F] which stands for the shared properties between the head of the compound and the independent nominal N (Booij 2010a: 17-18). This specification suggests that the head is not only the formal head, but also the semantic head of the compound:

$$\text{I. } \begin{array}{c} [[a]_{Xk} [b]_{Ni}Nj] \leftrightarrow [SEM_i \text{ with relation R to } SEM_k]_j \\ | \quad | \\ [\alpha F][\alpha F] \end{array}$$

The constructional schema of a nominal compound with a proper noun as the non-head constituent and a common noun as the head constituent is formally represented as follows:

$$\text{II. } \begin{array}{c} [[a]_{\text{ProperNk}} [b]_{Ni}Nj] \leftrightarrow [SEM_i \text{ with relation R to } SEM_k]_j \\ | \quad | \\ [\alpha F][\alpha F] \end{array}$$

The denotation of the whole compound is always assigned to the second constituent in the right position (the head) regardless of the relation R between compound constituents. For instance, the compounds with a non-head constituent denoting a place refer to a certain entity related to a certain place x i.e. *Harvard professor* is a professor from Harvard University, *Philadelphia stadium* is a stadium in Philadelphia, and *CNN producer* is a producer at/for CNN. The exact nature of R is left unspecified as it may depend on encyclopedic and contextual knowledge (Booij 2010a).

As for the function of nominal compounds with proper nouns as the non-head constituents, they are often used as adjectives in compounds with multiple constituents (2a) and they can also take the adverbial function (2b):

(2)

- a. You can't classify the Wisconsin brat like you would a *Chicago-style hot dog* or *Buffalo-style wing*, foods with a specific order of assemblage. (MAG: A.V. Club, 2017)
- b. Then he swooped down and kissed me *Hollywood-style*. (MAG: Essence, 2013)

9.3 Compounds with proper nouns and deverbal heads

A compound with a verbal element as its head is typically argument-taking i.e. it has a certain argument structure in its internal syntax. The grammatical relation between the constituents of a deverbal compound is more straightforward because it can be analyzed in syntactic terms. In particular, the non-head element is interpreted as an argument referencing element. Bauer et al. (2013: 467) differentiate between three kinds of argument referencing elements: *subject referencing*, *object referencing* and *prepositional object referencing*. The non-head constituent that is interpreted as the subject referencing argument is the least common with deverbal heads, but it is fairly frequent in journalism (Bauer et al. 2013).

Deverbal heads which are usually derived by suffixation are often called synthetic compounds in literature (see Lieber 2005). Prototypical synthetic compounds have the second deverbal constituent ending in *-er* and they are either agentive such as *truck driver*, *fire fighter* and *book lover*, or instrumental such as *bottle opener* and *coffee-maker*. Other suffixes that may create deverbal heads are *-ee*, *-ation*, *-ment*, *-ure*, *-al*, *-ing*, *-ent*, and *-ive* (following Bauer et al. 2013).

Out of these eight suffixes, proper nouns may be combined with a deverbal constituent ending in *-er* (*Obama lover*, *Trump supporter*, *Japan-basher*), *-ee* (*Bush appointee*), *-ing* (*America-bashing*, *Israel-hating*, *Harley-loving*) and *-ation* (*Clinton administration*, *FBI investigation*, *Ukraine occupation*). These suffixes seem not to derive many deverbal heads with proper nouns as there are not that many hits in the COCA engine search; nevertheless, they do suggest that deverbal compounds have argument structure and semantic verbal categorization. When proper nouns are object-referencing non-heads, they are combined with a deverbal base denoting an emotional

reaction such as *love*, *hate* and *bash*, or action such as *support* and *occupy*, whereas proper nouns as the subject-referencing non-heads are combined with a deverbal head denoting an action performed by a well-known agent such as *administer*, *appoint*, *investigate* etc. This means that the nature of R should not be left unspecified in the schematic representation of deverbal compounds, because it is not entirely based on encyclopedic or contextual knowledge as in the case of nominal compounds.

As the semantic categorization of a deverbal head may impact the semantic specification of the whole compound, we will look more closely into the most frequent type of compounds with deverbal heads and proper nouns: the compounds with past participle forms as the head constituents. Just like with synthetic compounds, the verbal semantic categorization is expected to shape the nature of R, which will be included in the overall constructionist representation of compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms.

9.3.1 Compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms

Many classes of verbs exhibit identical syntactic behavior, and as Levin (1993) showed in her seminal work on English verbs, the syntactic behavior of a verb is tightly connected to its meaning. To put it more precisely, “verbs that fall into classes according to shared behaviour would be expected to show shared meaning components” (Levin 1993: 5). Payne (1997: 54-61) provides a selective list of universal verb classes which display distinctive morphosyntactic properties and which are semantically defined as follows: *weather verbs*, *states*, *involuntary processes*, *bodily functions*, *motion* (including *locomotion*), *position*, *action*, *action-processes*, *factives*, *cognition*, *sensation*, *emotion*, *utterance*, and *manipulation*. Generally speaking, all the verbs belonging to one class might evoke specific grammatical treatment depending on their syntactic patterns and restrictions and the semantic information of the particular verb class.

Having in mind Payne’s semantic categorization of verbs, proper nouns are frequently combined with past participle forms of three classes: *action-processes*, *factives* and *position*⁷⁸. The compounds with proper nouns as the non-head constituents and the past participle forms of the three verbal classes show specific argument structure, semantic specification and discourse function. Most of the extracted compounds from COCA are used attributively i.e. the compound with the proper noun and the past participle is the non-head constituent in a two or more constituent compounds e.g. *New York-centered exhibitions* (two constituent compound), *Disney-branded animated films* (three constituent compound), *KGB-backed World Peace Council* (four constituent compound), or they are part of larger phrasal compounds e.g. *Virginia-based Gun Owners of America*. The grammatical relation between the compound constituents is that of attribution.

9.3.1.1 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle of action-process verbs

Defined as situations which involve a voluntary actor and a distinct affected patient (Payne 1997: 59), the action-process verbs belong to the class of transitive verbs with (at least) two arguments. Action-processes denote violent events such as *hit* or *kill*, and change of state such as *break* or *melt* (when used as transitive verbs). The action-process verbs put emphasis on the action and its outcome at the same time – they simultaneously provide an answer to the questions about the subject (*What did A do?*) and the object (*What happened to B?*).

⁷⁸ The following analysis of compounds with deverbal elements is based on Payne’s classification, and its aim is to illustrate the role of proper nouns as the non-head constituents of deverbal compounds. Levin’s categorization comprising 193 distinct classes of English verbs should provide more subtle differences in meaning, which would be more relevant in a detailed study of the head constituent.

In deverbal compounds with proper nouns, the past participle forms of action-process verbs denote an intended action by an agent in authority who exerts their influence on a larger community. The agent is the non-head constituent of the compound and it is always the subject-referencing argument of the compound. It may denote an individual, a place (government metonymically) or an organization:

(3)

- a. Chechnya is currently ruled by *Moscow-appointed* leader Ramzan Kadyrov. (ACAD: International Affairs, 2010)
- b. We can expect nothing but retrograde action from this *Bush-appointed* court. They have severely damaged the electoral process with their outrageous Citizens United finding. (WEB: Supreme Court Takes Up Racial Discrimination in College Admissions, 2012)
- c. Women will have free access to all *FDA-approved* contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures and patient education and counseling without a co-pay. (WEB: Free contraception for women provision of Obama health care law, 2012)
- d. In 2009, two students at Georgia Tech got a dorm room makeover from *Oprah-approved* organization expert Peter Walsh. (NEWS: Atlanta, 2011)
- e. The attackers have not been formally identified. *Uganda-backed* rebels who control that part of Congo deny responsibility. (SPOK: CBS_Rather, 2001)
- f. Brown also told HuffPost that no *Peterson-backed* group sponsored this year's debates. (MAG: Huffington Post, 2016)
- g. Diplomatic relations are renewed between Iraq and Iran after a decade of hostility. Reconciliation could help Iraq circumvent *U.N.-ordered* trade embargo. (NEWS: Associated Press, 1991)
- h. Considering all this, plus the devastating impact of *U.S.-imposed* sanctions on the people of Iraq and the Clinton-ordered bombing of a pharmaceuticals plant in Sudan, an excellent case can be made for prosecuting President Clinton as a war criminal. (NEWS: San Francisco Chronicle, 1999)
- i. In the 1980s, by contrast, the years of *IMF-imposed* "liberalization" and privatization programs, practically every Latin country registered an absolute fall in real per capita income. (ACAD: Theological Studies, 1992)
- j. A French defense official recently told The Associated Press that France was preparing to transfer by year-end two unarmed surveillance drones to Africa from Afghanistan, where French combat troops have been pulling out of the *NATO-led* mission. (WEB: France rules out any use of air power in Mali, 2012)
- k. Secondly, American administrations provided covert assistance to such groups as the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) and the Total Union for the Independence of Angola (UNITA) in 1975 seeking to win preindependence elections or the overthrow of governments and movements, as in Chad, viewed as radical or *Moscow-led*. (ACAD: Africa Today, 1992)

Proper nouns are always the subject referencing non-heads in this particular deverbal compounding and they are often coined in journalism. The past participle forms of action-process verbs may also denote intended actions in the field of economy, industry or entertainment; then, they illustrate an expected relation between the producer and the product or the agent and the event. The non-head constituent is a subject referencing argument when the proper noun denotes an individual or a company and a prepositional object referencing argument when the proper noun denotes a place:

(4)

- a. Google could, however, choose not to work with partners on *Google-branded* devices, which might be the case with the Acer situation. (BLOG: Google Doesn't Require Google Search On Android, 2012)
- b. President Trump's son didn't give the foreign policy speech he was scheduled to deliver today while promoting *Trump-branded* properties in India. (SPOK: PBS: PBS NewsHour, 2018)
- c. Data gathered in a National Institutes of Health (NIH) study - with which the HIV/AIDS Education Project collaborated - confirm the findings of the *UNICEF-sponsored* study. (ACAD: Human Ecology, 2004)
- d. Athletes competing for *Reebok-sponsored* national Olympic committees won 154 medals, up from 19 four years ago. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1996)
- e. This *Steven Spielberg-produced* big-budget, man-vs. -dinosaur drama, sends a group of colonists from 2149 back to 85 million B.C., where they'll have a second chance to rebuild civilization. (NEWS: USA Today, 2011)
- f. "Select a late-harvest oil, such as those described as buttery or smooth, and save the stronger, darker varieties for salads and savory dishes," she adds. Spanish, French, and *California-produced* oils are good choices. (MAG: Vegetarian Times, 2012)
- g. Carlson makes one wine that's a blend of *Colorado-grown* pears and apples. (MAG: Sunset, 2004)
- h. One day, research may establish regional patterns if enough identifiably *Delaware-made* chairs come to light. At that time too, influences of Maryland furniture on the Delaware furniture making communities may also be investigated. (MAG: Magazine Antiques, 2001)
- i. The car seen here is a front-wheel-drive *Chrysler-built* minivan with a 3.3-liter V6. (MAG: PopMech, 2006)
- j. But it is Coke that is putting the heavy money behind the first *Africa-hosted* World Cup, which could eventually attract more than 26 billion non-unique television viewers. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2010)
- k. The brand has become a touchstone in its own right; Saturday Night Live fans may remember an *Alec Baldwin-hosted* episode that featured a sketch spoofing Inside the Actors Studio, in which Baldwin appeared as Charles Nelson Reilly -- a regular Match Game panelist in the 70s. (MAG: Vanity Fair, 2016)

A deverbal compound may also illustrate an acquired skill as a result of a dynamic action when the proper noun denotes the place where the necessary skill is acquired. The subject referencing interpretation is straightforward with the proper nouns denoting educational institutions (5a, 5e and 5f) or training centres (5b); such non-head constituents are understood metonymically via PLACE FOR PEOPLE WORKING AT THE PLACE transfer. On the other hand, the prepositional object referencing element denotes the geographical place where the skill is acquired (5c, 5d, 5g and 5h):

(5)

- a. A *Harvard-trained* pediatrician and reformer, Berwick has spent the past 30 years analyzing the American health care system (SPOK: PBS_NewsHour, 2011)
- b. But he and nearly 300 other *CIA-trained* comrades have taken their fight to a new battleground, filing an \$ 11.2 million federal lawsuit seeking the back wages that were denied their families while they were imprisoned in Vietnam. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1995)
- c. A *London-trained* economist who has also worked in France and the United Kingdom, Makryniotis is the new managing director of Endeavor Greece -- the newest affiliate of the

- worldwide non-profit that supports high-impact entrepreneurs in emerging markets. (BLOG: “Focus on growth to get out of the crisis”: a feature on Endeavor, 2012)
- d. This difficult situation was grasped by an *Oxford-educated* Armenian, James Malcolm, who had privileged contacts with high British officials. (ACAD: Arab Studies Quarterly, 1990)
 - e. The *Columbia- and Princeton-educated* Oren’s first book was a best-selling history of the 1967 Middle East war in 2002. (MAG: Newsweek Global, 2015)
 - f. I think one of the main things that attracted upper-middle-class liberals to Obama was his manner of speaking... he talks in a way associated with *Ivy-League-educated* elites. (BLOG: Why Does Obama Want to Keep Being President? - Chicago Boyz, 2012)
 - g. In an early cross-cultural study, Gay and Cole (1967) assessed classification competencies between school and unschooled Liberians and *U.S.-schooled* children by using tasks involving culturally appropriate content: bowls of rice and geometric blocks. (ACAD: School Psychology Review, 1992)
 - h. Also in Huffington’s office is a portrait of the woman many observers call his mainspring: his wife, Arianna Stassinopoulos Huffington, 44, a Greek-born, *Cambridge-schooled* socialite-author known for her spicy best-selling biographies of Maria Callas (1981) and Pablo Picasso (1988) and for her latest book, *The Fourth Instinct: The Call of the Soul*, in which she asserts that the way to spiritual fulfillment is through good deeds. (MAG: People, 1994)

9.3.1.2 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle forms of factive verbs

The factive verbs denote an action of “coming into existence of some entity” as in *build*, *create*, or *make* (Payne, 1996: 59). Payne also suggests that there could be some similarity between action and factive verbs, but does not compare the two categories in detail. The difference between the two verbal categories is shown in the compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms: the action verbs are always voluntary, whereas factive verbs denote an action that happens to somebody (by chance). The non-head constituent is a proper noun denoting a place of one’s birth or upbringing and it can be paraphrased with prepositional structures *in x* or *at x*. As in the case of compounds with the past participle of action verbs, the non-head constituent is always a prepositional object referencing argument:

(6)

- a. They would have been even more mystified had they known that this *Brooklyn-raised*, Harvard-educated Ph.D. -- a man who looks about as outdoorsy as Alan Greenspan in hiking boots -- spent many of the project’s early days camped out in rough terrain miles from the nearest motel. (MAG: Fortune, 2017)
- b. Korean-born, *Houston-raised* filmmaker Annabel Park was there at ground zero (along with her partner and co-director, Eric Byler) to cover the situation in 9500 Liberty, the acclaimed documentary opening today in Houston at the Angelika Film Center. (BLOG: Filmmaker was in the right place at the right time for 9500 Liberty, 2012)
- c. “We’re both *New Jersey-born and bred*, and we like living here,” he adds. “Even if I had all the money, I’d still probably stay in this area.” (NEWS: USA Today, 2007)
- d. Elusive Quality, the sire of Smarty Jones, actually has his home in Kentucky. Still, Smarty Jones is considered a *Pennsylvania-bred* because he was born on Chapman’s Someday Farm in Chester County. (NEWS: New York Times, 2004)

9.3.1.3 Compounds with proper nouns and the past participle forms of position verbs

The position verbs illustrate the static position of an object e.g. *stand*, *sit* and *lie* (Payne 1997: 58). The past participle forms of position verbs which are combined with place names denote the exact physical position of an entity. The proper noun as the non-head constituent is always a prepositional object referencing element i.e. it can be paraphrased with prepositional structures *at x* or *in x*⁷⁹:

(7)

- a. Last Friday, *Texas-based* rocket company Firefly announced it had reached an agreement to develop manufacturing facilities and a launch site at the Cape Canaveral Spaceport in Florida. (MAG: Ars Technica, 2019)
- b. Jill Hanauer, the president of Project New America, a *Denver-based* Democratic research firm, said women were worried about Romney's stances on women's health care and, particularly Planned Parenthood. (NEWS: Denver Post, 2012)
- c. Obviously not everyone shares nostalgic memories for the genre, but *UK-based* developer Super Massive Games wants to tap into the awkward world of teen scares with their latest game, *Until Dawn*. (WEB: Video Game Previews, 2012)
- d. From Ansley Park to Central Park West, curious eyes and ears will be trained on this *Broadway-bound* pop-rock musical. (NEWS: Atlanta Journal Constitution, 1998)
- e. He's a wiry, remarkably fit-looking fellow, energetically jumping out of his chair to open up a file drawer and show me copies of one of his most-prized documentary finds: the handwritten British government survey records of *America-bound* colonists made in the 1770s, which lists the name, origin, occupation and age of the departing, one of the few islands of hard data about who the early Americans were. (MAG: Smithsonian, 2013)
- f. Some no-name player from an unfamiliar school -- Lipscomb? Is that a mustache tool? -- will make a shot to beat a big-name college that serves as a waiting room for *NBA-bound* players. (NEWS: Chicago Sun-Times, 2018)
- g. Then there are sections of later works not primarily set in California, chiefly *The Right Stuff* -- his 1979 treatment of the first American astronauts -- and his *Atlanta-set* novel *A Man in Full* (1998). (BLOG: Tom Wolfe's California « pundit from another planet, 2012)
- h. A study of *Berlin-set* cinema that provokes nostalgia for the city's past; focuses on films made in the 1920s, the pre-wall 50s, the late 80s and early 90s, and the early 2000s. (ACAD: Chronicle of Higher Education, 2016)

9.3.2 Schematic representations of compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms

The three identified semantic verbal categories suggest that this particular categorization should be considered in the overall constructionist representation of deverbal compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms. The semantic category of the past participle form presupposes the choice of a proper noun (based on its denotation) and determines its status as the non-head constituent i.e. whether the non-head constituent is subject or prepositional object referencing element. With action-process verbs, the non head constituent is mostly subject referencing and occasionally prepositional object referencing, whereas with factive and position

⁷⁹ The past participle *bound* can also belong to the category of *locomotion* when there is "a change of place, and simple motion" (Payne 1997: 56). The compounds with proper nouns and the locomotion *bound* are used in the context of traffic and they are paraphrased as *to x* e.g. *the Baltimore-bound passenger train*, *Canada-bound planes*, *New York-bound commuters* etc.

verbs, the non-head constituent is always prepositional object referencing. The non-head constituent can never be an object referencing element in argument structure – this is pre-conditioned by a past participle form as the head of a deverbal compound given that past participles are either intransitive or they already have a verb-object relationship if they are transitive (Adams 2001: 93).

Having in mind the semantic and syntactic properties of compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms, the constructionist representations of deverbal compounding should include all possible proper noun denotations in the formal part of each schema and a more specified argumental relation in the semantic information of each schema:

III.

- a. compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms of action-process verbs e.g. *Reagan-appointed, Washington-imposed, CIA-led*:

[[a]_{ProperNk/Person or Government or Organization} [b]_{PastParticiple_i}]_{A_j} ↔ [Authority Exerted by SEM_k]_j

- b. compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms of action-process verbs e.g. *Harry Potter-branded, Hawaii-grown, Ford-built, CNN-hosted*:

[[a]_{ProperNk/Person or Place or Company or Organization} [b]_{PastParticiple_i}]_{A_j} ↔ [Product/Event Made by/at SEM_k]_j

- c. compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms of action-process verbs e.g. *Kansas-educated, Yale-trained*:

[[a]_{ProperNk/Place or Educational Institution} [b]_{PastParticiple_i}]_{A_j} ↔ [Skill/Knowledge Acquired at/in SEM_k]_j

- ### IV. compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms of factive verbs e.g. *Texas-born, Chicago-bred, Bronx-raised*:

[[a]_{ProperNk/Place} [b]_{PastParticiple_i}]_{A_j} ↔ [(Somebody) Coming to Existence/Cause to Happen to Somebody at/in SEM_k]_j

- ### V. compounds with proper nouns and past participle forms of position verbs e.g. *Broadway-bound, Los Angeles-set, Florida-based*:

[[a]_{ProperNk/Place} [b]_{PastParticiple_i}]_{A_j} ↔ [(Somebody/Something) Positioned at/in SEM_k]_j

The three semantic verbal categories (*action-process*, *factives*, and *position*) are represented in five constructional schemas (IIIa, IIIb, IIIc, IV and V) and the arguments of the non-head constituents are understood via prepositional structure – the agentive preposition *by* implies the subject referencing non-heads and the locative prepositions *at* and *in* suggest the prepositional object referencing non-heads. Verbal arguments (such as *authority*, *product*, *event*, *skill*, *somebody* and *something*) are also included in the constructional schemas since they are part of our conceptual knowledge and we would normally associate them with the above transitive verbs e.g. *acquire a skill* or *make a product/an event*.

9.4 Summary

In this Chapter, we have looked at the form and meaning of nominal and verbal compounds with proper nouns as non-head constituents. The two types of compounds are usually used attributively in larger (two-binary) structures which produce endocentric (right-headed) compounds. The nominal compounds with proper nouns as non-head constituents and common nouns as heads are schematically represented as morphological constructions with the unspecified relation R between its constituents; although the proper noun as the non-head constituent serves as a descriptor, the exact nature of R is fully understood via encyclopedic and contextual knowledge. The deverbal compounds with proper nouns as non-head constituents and past participle forms as heads show particular internal syntax due to the presence of argument structure; proper nouns as non-heads can be either subject or prepositional object referencing elements depending on their denotation and the semantics of deverbal heads. The three semantic verbal categories (*action-process*, *factives* and *position*) show that the choice of the proper noun (i.e. the denotation) is closely connected to the meaning of the deverbal head. This shows a greater interdependence between form and meaning in the schematic representation of this type of deverbal compounds as morphological constructions. It also presupposes certain conceptual knowledge that would allow us to interpret possible arguments in this particular deverbal compounding.

10 Discussion

The corpus-based method of analysis has enabled us to perform an in-depth exploration of an interesting linguistic phenomenon: proper nouns in English word-formation. With 1872 instances taken from eight different genres covering the period of last thirty years, the COCA data are fairly representative of contemporary usage of proper nouns as language units. More importantly, the data have indeed helped to lay the foundations for empirically testing traditional and structural-oriented hypotheses in English morphosyntax. After carefully examining proper nouns as word-formation components in a constructionist and usage-based manner, this chapter looks at the nature of conceptualization, schematization and context-dependency of proper nouns as word-formation components.

The aim of this discussion is to confirm the status of proper nouns as construction constituents which like any other construction constituents have “universal as well as language-specific properties in certain combinatorial strategies that are based on general cognitive principles and regular communicative strategies” (Fried 2015: 977). As construction constituents, proper nouns may form grammatically acceptable outputs that are realised in actual language use. There are three levels of knowledge which should allow us to back up this claim: conceptual (cognitive), grammatical (morphosemantic and morphosyntactic) and contextual (including shared extra-linguistic knowledge).

In the first part of the discussion, the arguments for proper nouns as construction constituents are illustrated with a view to cognitive principles of boundedness and reference. In the second part, their schematization at the word level as well as their entrenchment at the sentence level is demonstrated; the former focuses on the form-meaning strengthening and the latter on the interaction between syntax and morphology. In the third part, the significance of context for the full and correct interpretation of non-lexicalized occurrences with proper nouns is examined.

10.1 Proper nouns as construction constituents – cognitive grounding

In the literature overview of the thesis, it is emphasized that the main criteria for categorizing proper nouns as simplex words are based on their grammatical properties and unique denotation. Distributionally, a proper noun is the head of a noun phrase which may exhibit special and otherwise untypical properties under certain conditions such as determination, modification and number. In terms of its conventional interpretation, a proper noun identifies and renders an entity more distinct and recognizable thanks to its unique denotation and semantic definiteness. Traditionally, the use of grammatical devices that renders entities more identifiable is an immediate consequence of the loss of its unique denotation e.g. *Madrid* vs *the Madrid I was born in*. This shift from proper to common features is understood as determined by exceptional contextual factors:

- 1) All of the expressions [...] can be used in English, but *the context must be such* that the referents are taken as not automatically identifiable. This is *an unusual circumstance* for the use of proper names. (Payne 1997: 39, my emphases)

In Construction Grammar, the shift in status from proper to common noun is a result of the changes in attribute-value specifications of a proper noun (Fried and Östman 2004: 39). The formal representation of the form and meaning of a common noun shows the syntactic features of [proper -], [max+], and [lex+], and the semantic features [count +], [sg], [bounded +]. When a proper noun shifts to a common noun, it takes the same features i.e. it can be instantiated by another lexeme (or) phrase [lex+], it may be further expanded [max+], it is countable [count+], singular [sg] and bounded [+]. This happens when a proper noun is used in the Determination construction and it is

understood as a certain kind of partitioning, either in the form of boundedness or reference (see 5.3.3, 5.4.2, and 5.5.1.1).

The two phenomena *boundedness* and *reference* do not only provide explanation for the use of proper nouns as simplex words in particular grammatical context, but they also account for morphological changes of proper nouns, thus enabling the productive creation of complex words with proper nouns as well. Both boundedness and reference are defined in Cognitive Grammar (Radden and Dirven 2007) and Cognitive Semantics (Talmy 2000) with respect to abstract patterns and processes in language and the overall linguistic structuring of conceptual content. This cognitive organization of language provides a description of conceptual categories used for distinguishing entities (boundedness) and mental spaces built on the shared conceptual knowledge available in communication (reference).

In the following two sections, cognitive notions boundedness and reference are applied to the discussion of formal properties of complex words consisting of a proper noun as one of its elements. It is also proposed that the semantic and pragmatic features based on our conceptual thinking (boundedness and reference respectively) condition the grammatical acceptability of proper nouns as word-formation elements despite changes in their structural and distributional properties. The aim of the following discussion is to advocate for grammaticality of proper nouns as word-formation units.

10.1.1 Boundedness as a cognitive and semantic feature

State of boundedness is a conceptual category consisting of two principal members entailed by the notion of a boundary (Talmy 2000: 50). The boundary either encloses a quantity and it forms an individuating entity around that quantity, or there is no boundary to demarcate a quantity, in which case the quantity conveys an impression of continuing on indefinitely. The former represents a bounded entity and the latter an unbounded entity⁸⁰. In grammar, nouns and verbs prototypically conceptualize state of boundedness. Boundedness corresponds to countable nouns (*an apple*) and perfective verbs (*Mark read a book*) and unboundedness to mass nouns (*coffee*) and imperfective verbs (*Mark was reading a book*)⁸¹. An entity may shift its basic state and change its value following the operation of bounding from unbounded to bounded state e.g. *I like coffee* vs. *I'll have a coffee*, or debounding from bounded to unbounded state *You're eating an apple* vs. *You have apple on your T-shirt*⁸².

The categorial distinction bounded/unbounded can also be applied to proper nouns denoting geographical places (Radden and Dirven 2007: 100-101): entities which represent a political entity with administrative boundaries such as countries or national parks are bounded e.g. *France* and *Yellowstone*, whereas natural phenomena lacking clear boundaries such as rivers or deserts are unbounded e.g. *the Amazon* and *the Gobi Desert*. Proper nouns denoting animate beings are also bounded entities (since any physical body has a clear boundary from *another* body) and so are objects e.g. *Maria*, *Venus*, *Toyota*, *Big Ben*, etc. Finally, TIME AS SPACE metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) can be applied to proper nouns denoting time i.e. time is construed as a physically bounded entity and proper nouns denoting time such as days and months have a starting point and an endpoint e.g. *Thursday*, *January*.

In constructionist approaches, the attribute value of boundedness is unspecified for proper nouns allowing the shift from proper to common noun and thus overriding strict unification in

⁸⁰ There is also a partially bounded entity in linguistic structuring (see Talmy 2000).

⁸¹ The state of boundedness in perfective verbs is illustrated with the grammatical element “in NP_{extent-of-time}”. This specification indicates that there is a boundary at the initial point of the action and another boundary at the terminal point (Talmy 2000: 50-55).

⁸² In this use the word *apple* denotes a mass type and it illustrates the semantic count-mass coercion in a specific context, also known as the Override Principle (Michaelis 2004: 52).

constructions with other word-level constituents such as Determination, Modification, Number constructions etc. Michaelis (2005: 52) shows that underspecification is necessary in particular grammatical instantiations, specifically with features which would otherwise be in conflict such as boundedness [-] and maximality [+]. Likewise, the categorial distinction bounded/unbounded is also attributed to the use of the definite article with weak proper names (*the UK, the Netherlands*) as “[...] these multiplex units are (still) seen as having a certain independence and may even be discontinuous and further extensible” (Radden and Dirven 2006: 100).

Conceptually, bounded entities entail a boundary which may or may not be further expanded; another floor may be added to an existing house, an animate being grows its body during its lifetime e.g. *a child/a grown-up, a kitten/a cat* etc. Gramatically, common nouns may be further expanded both syntactically (*a book/an interesting book*) and morphologically (*a book/a booklet*) – the bounded [+] attribute-value of common nouns entails their maximal projection [+]. On the other hand, unbounded entities are conceptually perceived of having “no necessary characteristic of finiteness” (Talmy 2000: 50), and grammatically require change in their status for further expansion.

10.1.1.1 Proper nouns as bounded entities

In this thesis, it has been shown that proper nouns are construction constituents of morphological schemas licensing new constructs. When a proper noun is perceived as a bounded entity, it serves as a formal base for creating new words. The denotation of the proper noun plays a key role in establishing boundedness as a cognitive and semantic feature which enables word-formation. In particular, proper nouns denote three principal kinds of bounded entities: a person, an object and a place or time as a defined space⁸³. The feature of boundedness is in accordance with Van Langendock and Van de Velde’s typology of proper names in which the names of people, places and months are described as the most typical names (Van Langendock and Van de Velde 2016)⁸⁴. Arnaud (2022) also advocates for the ‘nounness’ of proper names – a proper name is identical to a common noun in its denotation: a concrete entity with an outside surface.

In the creation of novel nouns, proper nouns may function like common nouns which have the bounded [+] attribute-value. The novel constructs with may have the same denotation as their formal bases i.e. proper nouns. A new formation may denote a person e.g. *proto-Conan, un-Bill Clinton, anti-Oliver Twist, mini-Mozart, Harry Potterdom* (fans), *Malcom-X-ist, Hitlerite, proto-proto-Nazi, neo-Platonist*; an object e.g. *proto-Magna Carta, un-Harley, anti-Budweiser, mini-Eiffel Tower*; a place e.g. *proto-Dubai, un-Hampton, anti-Detroit, mini-Manhattan*; and time e.g. *mini-Enlightenment*. These constructs illustrate how proper nouns as bounded entities may be morphologically expanded in the same manner as common nouns (*a book/a booklet*).

When the novel constructs share the same type of a bounded entity as the base, they represent a category and not unique referents (Mauri and Mansini 2024; further elaborated in 10.3). This means that the denotation is different i.e. *Mozart* and *mini-Mozart* are two different persons in reality (a unique person and a category embodying the idea of their possible “replica”), but

⁸³ Person is taken as a representative of the class of animate entities. It usually refers to an individual, be it real or imaginary (*Reagan, Indiana Jones*), but it could also be a group of people (*the Beatles, Pittsburgh Steelers*). A defined space may be either physical or temporal. Physically bounded spaces are geographical places (*Spain, the Nile*) and temporally bounded spaces are time referents (*June, Christmas*). Sports and musical events as well as cultural and historic movemnets are temporally bounded (*Woodstock, the Great Depression*). The names of institutions, organizations and companies (*Yale, UNICEF and Google*) may refer to the people involved, the product(s) and the headquarters; consequently, they may denote all three kinds of bounded entities (person, object and place). The names of movies/books/stories may denote an object or a character which is usually a person (*Harry Potter, Mary Poppins*) and seldom an animal (*Lessie, Nemo*).

⁸⁴ Van Langendock (2007) and Van Langendock and Van de Velde (2016) also argue for the prototypical nominal character of proper names (see 10.1.2).

conceptually they share the same type of boundedness (person). There is also a possibility of shifting denotation and boundedness from one type of a bounded entity to another type e.g. *Americana*, *Canadiana* (place-object), *Freudiana*, *Sherlockiana* (person-object), *Stingdom*, *Beatlesdom* (person-place). In both cases, when a proper noun and a novel construct share the same type of boundedness or when they differ in the type of boundedness, proper nouns are instantiated by bounded constructions as a whole having the semantic feature [bounded +], which is in line with Construction Grammar postulates (Fried 2015).

If a bounded entity (a person, an object, and a defined space) is identified in the base form and in the novel construct, the novel construct cannot have the negative syntactic feature of maximal projection [-]. Otherwise, the operation of unification between a proper noun as a base and an affix would fail. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the morphological construction as a whole may also be conceptually unbounded when nominal constructs denote abstract notions: ideology and disposition e.g. *anti-Marxism*, *Tolstoyism*, *neo-Putinism*, *pseudo-Washingtonism*, *non-Calvinism*; personal characteristics and behavior e.g. *Shakespeareanness*, *Gaga-dom*, *Denzel Washington-ism*; non-personal qualities (of an object, place or time) e.g. *Harleyness*, *Chicagoness*, *Octoberness*; and language e.g. *Bostonese*, *John Wayneese*. Despite being unbounded as a whole, the morphological constructions licensing these constructs have a constituent which is a bounded entity, be it a person, an object, or a defined space. For the same reason, proper nouns as formal bases may be used in the creation of novel adjectives which are conceptually unbounded: *anti-Microsoft*, *pro-Holocaust*, *pre-Bolivia*, *post-Hemingway*, *mid-September*, *Tarantinoesque*, *Watergate-like*, *MIT-ish*, *Kobe-less*, *Lewinsky-free*, *non-Kafkaesque*, *un-Trek-ish* etc. Thus, the inherent conceptual feature of boundedness in proper nouns necessitates the creation of all nominal and adjectival constructs with proper nouns as formal bases.

In the creation of novel verbs, the feature of boundedness is connected with the idea of a complete action i.e. the perfective verb form. All derived verbal constructs with proper nouns as formal bases are perfective such as *out-Ikea*, *Nolan-ify*, *Hollywoodize*, *de-Baathify*, and *re-Stalinize*, as well as denominal conversion verbs e.g. *Winston Churchill*, *Facebook*, and denominal conversion verbs with particles and in idiomatic constructions e.g. *McGuyver up*, *Miramex out*, *Travolta (your) way*. All the productive constructs with a deverbal element and a proper noun, such as the *-ify/-ize* nominalizations e.g. *Paris Hiltonization*, *Saddamification*, *de-McDonaldization*, and deverbal compounds e.g. *Oprah-approved*, *Reebok-sponsored*, *Princeton-educated*, *Houston-raised*, *UK-based*, involve perfective bounded actions at their core as well.

The novel constructs that are created via a metaphorical or metonymic transfer usually have a proper noun constituent which is conceptualized as a bounded entity. The ‘metaphorical’ prefix *out-* can be added to any kind of bounded entity e.g. *out-Jane*, *out-Asia*, *out-HBO*, *out-Game-of-Thrones*, *out-Christmas*, and not only the personal name as in its original pattern *out-Herod Herod*. The metaphorical transfer TIME AS SPACE is identified in novel constructs with locative affixes e.g. *mid-September*, *December-ish* (approximating December). The metonymic transfer is far more frequent with proper nouns given that the feature of boundedness is closely related to the cognitive domain of CONTAINMENT: for instance, *a Monica-free week* refers to absence of any information about Monica Lewinsky. According to Mauri and Masini (2024), the metonymic shift can be interpreted in most word-formation process in which a proper noun constituent denotes a person, because there is at least one context-specific property which is extracted from a unique referent (person) and serves as the link between the referent and a non-lexicalized form. Mauri and Masini’s metonymic shift argument can be backed up by many examples from our analysis when a proper noun constituent denotes a person. It may also be applied to other two types of bounded entities i.e. an object and a defined space. Our analysis has shown that the metonymic shift is related to the productivity of an affix as well – the more productive the affix is, the more entities it “shifts” e.g. the adjective-forming suffix *-like* can be added to any proper noun and produce grammatically acceptable novel constructs with similar properties as the ones associated with the unique referent e.g. *Caravaggio-like*, *Toyota-like*, *Yugoslavia-like*, *Fourth of July-like* etc.

Apart from being morphologically expanded, proper nouns as conceptually bounded entities may also be syntactically expanded. Nominal constructs form NPs e.g. *its own mini-Japan*, *many a denizen of Harry Potterdom*, *his innate "Alan-ness;"* adjectival constructs are compared periphrastically e.g. *the most anti-Klaus*, *the least Batman-like*; and verbal constructs may become reflexive e.g. *"Copenhagenize" themselves*, *out-Martha yourself*. Having in mind various grammatical contexts in which proper noun constructs are used, we may infer that the feature of boundedness does not operate on its own, but interacts with the syntactic feature of maximal projection.

The syntactic feature of maximal projection is not easily defined due to "such contexts" and "unusual circumstances" in which a proper noun can occur. A proper noun as a word-formation unit could be interpreted as "a non-maximal common noun," as Fried and Östman (2004: 39) suggest in their analysis of the Determination construction. It is more likely that the syntactic feature of maximal projection is generally unspecified with proper nouns. This would imply that a proper noun is compatible with its (morpho)syntactic surroundings and that there are no formal restrictions that would impede the operation of unification in complex grammatical structures. Once the condition of boundedness is met, proper nouns may be engaged in producing complex morphological and syntactic constructions, because the syntactic environment does not restrict the word-formation of proper nouns but rather facilitates it (see 10.2.2).

10.1.2 Reference as a cognitive and linguistic phenomenon

When speakers are engaged in a communicative act, they may make a reference to something i.e. they draw attention to a particular instance of a thing (referent) by using a certain word or phrase (a referring expression). Reference is a cognitive phenomenon in which the referring expression is used as a tool with which "the speaker "anchors", or grounds, a referent in the current discourse situation" (Radden and Dirven 2006: 88, the authors' emphasis). In a successful act of reference, the speakers share the same conceptual knowledge, they are equally familiar with the referent in communication, and they use referring expressions with grounding elements which render the referent easily identifiable⁸⁵. Reference is closely connected with the idea of accessibility and mental space (defined as "short-lived packages of knowledge evoked on-line in communication" (Radden and Dirven 2007: 30)).

Proper names are often described as linguistic devices that canonically display reference. Their status in an act of reference is seen as an unshakable maxim:

- 2) Phrases and words of these types [proper names], not only in English, but where they appear in any other natural language, unenivocally "pick out" some particular, definite individual or object. The point is, if **these** things don't exhibit the phenomenon of "reference," then we should all close up shop on this particular topic and find something else to work on. (Carlson, 2006: 76, the author's emphases)

Proper names are by default unique referents as they are part of the socio-cultural knowledge shared by the speakers in communicative situations. In practice, proper names are "inherently unique by virtue of being the only instances of their kind" (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 100). They are inherently definite and have a conventionalized denotation i.e. Paris is a city in France. Even if proper names are not part of the shared knowledge, speakers may assume which entity they refer to as a result of applying accepted norms e.g. male or female names in language are intuitively understood by native speakers.

⁸⁵ In the referring expression *your dog*, the word *your* as the grounding element "anchors" the word *dog* in communication (Radden and Dirven 2007: 88, the authors' emphases).

Reference as both cognitive and linguistic phenomenon is associated with proper names, because in theory, proper names cannot be defined in terms of prototypes in the same way as common nouns (Van Langendonck 2007: 61). A proper name (which denotes a unique entity by default) does not require special devices which would identify the entity as an exemplar of the category (Arnaud 2022). In actual language use, however, proper names may exhibit grammatical features typical of common nouns such as definiteness and number, which would reduce their unique denotation and reference (see Chapter 2). For this reason, Van Langendonck argues that proper names should be treated as the most prototypical nominal category. To make this matter more complex, Van Langendonck does not only argue for the nominal character of proper names, but he also places them midway between pronouns and appellatives – this practise is taken from language philosophers who have considered proper names as indexical and very similar to personal pronouns or demonstratives (see Van Langendonck 2007; Van Langendonck and Van de Velde 2016). Their demonstrative character is particularly striking when proper names are word-formation components i.e. they act as grounding elements in complex words in the same way as demonstratives in NPs.

10.1.2.1 Proper nouns as unique referents and salient grounding elements

When proper nouns are used as word-formation units, they may take on a dual role in an act of reference. A proper noun is at the same time a unique referent and a grounding element in a complex word when the whole reference is accessed via the speakers' shared extra-linguistic knowledge, and when the novel construct takes the same conceptual category as the entity denoted by the proper noun e.g. *Diana* was a woman who was the Princess of Wales (Diana as a unique referent) and *un-Diana* is also a woman, but the one lacking the proper characteristics of Diana, Princess of Wales (Diana as a grounding element in the referring expression *un-Diana*). In this case, it is necessary that both the proper noun as a simplex word and the proper noun as a construction constituent denote the same kind of a bounded entity: a person, an object or a defined space. This kind of reference is displayed with the nominal constructs whose semantic specification is based on the shared proper characteristics (or a lack of it) with the unique referent e.g. *proto-Trump*, *un-Apple*, *anti-Everest*, *mini-Thanksgiving*, *ex-Buffy* (babe), *non-California* (wines), *Casanovist*, *Reaganite*, *neo-Darwinist*, *pseudo-Marxist* etc.

As we have seen, a new complex formation may be different from its proper noun constituent in the type of boundedness i.e. the construct may be grammatically unbounded, but the proper noun constituent is still specified for [bounded +]. In addition, the proper noun still acts as the unique referent and a ground element of a new formation/referring expression. For instance, *Sting* is a proper noun denoting a famous singer and a former member of *The Police*, whereas *Stingdom* is a villa in Tuscany, a place owned by Sting. *Sting* is a grounding element in the morphological construct *Stingdom* in the same manner as the word *your* in the expression *your dog* (see footnote 85). The entity of the referent is accessed in context via the *-dom* morphological construction by abstracting away the semantic information i.e. we know that an established word ending in *-dom* may denote a place as in *kingdom*. The correct reading is inferred from context, and this is necessary whenever a morphological construction has multiple connected semantic specifications as the polysemous *-dom* construction (see 6.3.1.2).

In the case of a morphological construction with a single semantic specification, the interpretation of the referring expression may be almost context independent, especially when the unique referent is not restricted to a small group of speakers e.g. *Coldplay-esque* as the kind of music similar to that of the band Coldplay will probably be the first association to many people (some other association may include the band's live performances, philanthropy or political activism). However, the overall specification (including both formal and semantic properties) is necessary for understanding some morphological constructions such as denominal conversion verbs. For instance,

a denominal conversion verb whose formal base denotes a person will have the similative ‘act like’ meaning e.g. *James Dean*, whereas the ones whose formal base denotes an object will have the instrumental ‘use’ meaning e.g. *FedEx* (see 8.2.1). This shows that speakers must first apply the process of abstraction and then unification of a proper noun constituent so that the proper noun could serve as a grounding element in an act of reference. For full meaning interpretation, speakers usually rely on context and shared extra-linguistic knowledge (see 10.3).

Although proper nouns are unique and inherently definite, they become *salient* in an act of reference when they are used as word-formation units. Both unique and salient referents are part of our larger shared extra-linguistic knowledge, but salience is more connected with a “socially recognized sector of life or discipline in a given world of reference” and it is typically displayed in common mass nouns such as *coffee* and *tea* (Radden and Dirven 2007: 100). When speakers use proper nouns as word-formation units, it is not enough to know just what kind of entity the proper noun denotes, but also all the characteristics that speakers have learned about it from their own experience and placed in their mental space. For instance, it is not enough to know that Oprah Winfrey is a woman, but also that she is a talk show host, actress and producer well-known for her talk show the Oprah Winfrey Show with which she is most frequently associated by general public. The salient feature(s) of the unique referent then act as the grounding element in word-formation e.g. the verbal construct *out-Oprah* means ‘out-debate’ (see 5.3.5.1). The speakers choose which characteristics will be grounding elements based on their shared knowledge, and as often happens, there may be several salient characteristics as in *un-Hollywood* (see 5.4.2), *mini-Manhattan* (see 5.5.1), *McDonaldize* (see 6.2.2) and *Oprah-like* (see 6.4.1.3). The various meanings are understood in context and when we compare different usages. According to Mauri and Masini (2024: 190), it is crucial to identify the $P_{R,C}$ variable when interpreting a non-lexicalized occurrence in discourse. The $P_{R,C}$ variable is a property P of the referent R that is relevant in the context C, and its identification is necessary at an early stage or until lexicalization takes place. The identification of the three variables (R, $P_{R,C}$ and C) is not much needed once the novel word becomes an official dictionary entry as in the case of the denominal conversion verb *MacGyver* (see footnote 75).

10.2 Proper nouns as construction constituents – abstracting away from morphological and syntactic constructions

Proper nouns as construction constituents are grammatically acceptable owing to the conceptual and semantic feature of boundedness [+] intrinsically ascribed to them. This “equates” them with common nouns as typically bounded entities, and allows for their positive maximal projection – they can fill in the open slots in complex grammatical structures i.e. morphological and syntactic constructions. Moreover, proper nouns are unique referents and salient grounding elements in an act of reference – they simultaneously qualify and classify the novel constructs in which they occur. In the production of referring expressions which consist of proper nouns (such as *un-Diana* and *Stingdom*), the process of abstracting away the linguistic information from abstract morphological constructions takes place; the speakers are able to understand the semantic meaning and identify the syntactic function of a new word or phrase even if they hear it for the first time. This cognitive operation shows that speakers use their knowledge of existing words and phrases and are able to (re)interpret abstract patterns when producing new words. The idea that a speaker’s inventory of language structures (constructions) and abstract patterns (schemas) represent a well-defined but still infinite set is communicated in Bybee’s intuitive judgement: “[S]peakers are at once impressively creative and impressively repetitive” (Bybee 2013: 8).

The first part of the following discussion centres on the linguistic information that is abstracted away from existing morphological patterns without which a successful unification with a proper noun as a construction constituent would fail. It is demonstrated that a speaker’s schematic organization of linguistic knowledge relies on the semantic mechanisms of inheritance and

motivation for the meaning strengthening. As morphological constructions are never isolated, but part of larger language structures i.e. syntactic constructions, the interdependence of morphology and syntax is discussed in the second part of this section. It is argued that simultaneous access to the linguistic information in syntactic and morphological constructions increases the entrenchment of proper nouns as their variables.

10.2.1 Schematization at the morphological level: Inheritance and motivation

It has already been pointed out that constructionist and non-constructionist approaches to word-formation differ in their analysis of complex words with regard to pattern abstraction and morphological shape. In non-constructionist (generative and structural) approaches, productive (regular and source-oriented) rules are applied to simplex words and affixes contribute to the meaning of a complex word as a whole. This approach implies the idea of affix addition to a word and linking things together in a chain i.e. concatenation. On the other hand, Construction Morphology disregards the theoretical postulate that a morpheme could be the minimal meaning-bearing unit considering that “[T]he meaning of complex words can *better* be defined over the entire word than over their individual morphemes” (Booij and Audring 2018: 61, my emphasis).

In the production of new words, affixes as construction constituents are abstracted away from an existing pattern or constructional schema and unified with other elements to produce an independent output which still remains linked to the former instantiations of the schema. The former instantiations are in fact established and stored complex words, and they support the idea of a ‘vertical’ relationship in the lexicon because “abstract word formation schemas dominate their individual instantiations” (Booij 2017: 18). The lexicon is a hierarchical network in which the information is inherited from the dominating schema as well as from the base word (Booij 2010a). The notion of (default) inheritance⁸⁶ is defined as:

- 3) [...] the specification of a word for a particular property is inherited from the dominating node, unless the actual lexical entry has another specification for that property. The mechanism of default inheritance is necessary because we want to be able to express that a word has an *exceptional property*, although it is *regular* in most respects. (Booij 2010a: 27, my emphases).

With proper nouns as derivational bases, it is expected that some semantic properties from existing complex words with common nouns as bases will be inherited as exceptional property. This is perfectly illustrated by constructs which were instantiated by words of foreign origin such as *picturesque* and *asteroid*; the [ProperN-*esque*]_A constructs are used in contexts in which the topic/subject is vividly portrayed and [ProperN-*oid*]_A constructs denote scientific entities resembling other entities. Similarly, the [ProperN-*ize-ation*]_N constructs denoting a program based on internal policy inherit this specialized meaning from the existing words *Vietnamization* and *Finlandization*.

In other cases, it is not easy to pinpoint the exact complex word from which a proper noun construction inherited the semantic information and its exceptional property. There is an intuitive connection with the established lexemes as their counterparts, which is a result of high frequency and productivity of constructional schemas. The proper noun constructs of productive schemas may have one prevailing semantic feature: attitude e.g. *anti-EU*, *pro-Brexit*; place e.g. *mid-Wales*; time reference e.g. *pre-Christmas*, *post-Christmas*, *mid-April*; similarity e.g. *Disneysque*, *Disney-ish*, *Disney-like*; jargon e.g. *Harvard-ese*, position e.g. *ex-California governor* and prototypicality e.g. *proto-Neptune*. Novel complex words with negative meaning are not only very productive, but also

⁸⁶ Inheritance refers to all shared properties not just meaning, and the notion of default inheritance also implies overridden properties as well. In this thesis, only inherited semantic properties are discussed.

easy to process, be it an adjectival construct e.g. *un-Reese*, *Watergate-less*, *Nikon-free*, a nominal construct e.g. *un-Hamptons*, *anti-Declaration of Independence*, or a nominal compound e.g. *non-NASA scientists*. Even when expressing less specialized meanings, it appears that the constructs of productive schemas are very frequent and used in wider contexts e.g. the [ProperN-*ness*]_N constructs with abstract meaning as in *Gaganness*, *Vegasness*, *Coke-ness*, *Sunday-ness*. The more productive the schema is, the more semantic properties are inherited – this is especially manifested in verbal constructions which have connected or combined causative, resultative and simulative meanings e.g. *Trumpify*, *de-Ba'athify*, *re-Stalinize*, and *Steve Jobs* and *Seinfeld-ed out* (as denominal conversion verbs).

An exceptional property may as well be inherited via the formal specification whenever a constructional schema selects a certain type of proper noun. In other words, unique denotation is an inherited feature. Highly productive *-ism/-ist* constructions share an inherited feature of unique person denotation via paradigmatic relationships at multiple levels (suffixation and affix combination) e.g. *Denzel Washington-ism*, *neo-Putinism*, *Bonapartist*, *post-Peronist* etc. Some morphological constructs may have only one type of unique denotation e.g. the [ProperN/Person-*ite*]_N constructs such as *Hitlerite*; others may have more two possible unique denotations e.g. the [*mid*-ProperN/Place or Time]_N constructs such as *mid-Mexico* and *mid-Monday* and the [ProperN/Person or Place-(*i*)*ana*]_N constructs such as *Elvisiana* and *Americana*. The same abstract pattern may also have different semantic specifications because of proper noun denotation – denominal conversion verbs [ProperN/Person]_V have simulative meaning and denominal conversion verbs [ProperN/Object]_V have instrumental meaning. Finally, deverbal compounds with a proper noun as the non-head element display argument structure and semantic verbal categorization in their schematic representation which excludes unique time denotation; these constructs may select person, object or place denotation e.g. *Peterson-backed*, *Reebok-sponsored*, *New Jersey-born*, *NBA-bound* etc.

Inheritance is described as motivation inasmuch as it shows that there is a non-arbitrary relationship between instantiations regarding the form-meaning correspondence (Booij 2017). Motivation is seen as hypernym of inheritance as a vertical mechanism of meaning stretching, but it also includes ‘horizontal’ and traditional mechanisms of meaning extensions such as polysemy, metaphor and metonymy. This means that a hierarchical lexicon does not only provide different levels of schemas, but also their different dimensions. Both mechanisms are equally important in organizing linguistic knowledge and provide arguments for the existence of a correlation between different constructs of the same form.

Traditionally, polysemy represents the semantic relatedness in which connected meanings of different words are intuitively felt (by language speakers) as having been created “by some discernible process of metaphorical or figurative extension” (Lyons 1977: 552). Without a precise model of meaning extension to draw upon, polysemy is a vague phenomenon in Generative Grammar since it “produces purely lexical ambiguities” (Lyons 1977: 569). In Construction Morphology, related meanings which originate from one central sense are formally represented in subschemas. As it has been shown in the analysis of the [ProperN-*dom*]_N constructs, the subschemas are motivated by a dominating schema since different senses may be connected via metaphorical mappings (see 6.3.1.2).

In Cognitive Linguistics, metaphor is a cognitive mechanism for understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another one (see Kövecses 2010; Lakoff and Johnson 1980). An abstract concept (the target domain) is understood through the use of a physical concept (the source domain), which is usually studied at the sentence level e.g. *His criticisms were right on target* (Kövecses 2010: 6). Metaphorical mappings of conceptual domains such as TIME AS SPACE can be applied at the word level and with proper noun constructs as well e.g. the [*mid*-Proper]_A constructs have both spatial and temporal meanings e.g. *mid-Nile*, *mid-September*, but the spatial one is taken as more basic and concrete. Conceptually, proper nouns are perceived as bounded entities and this feature of proper nouns makes them possible source domains e.g. the [*out*-ProperN]_V constructs are metaphorically interpreted in the sense of going beyond or exceeding which implies that there is a

boundary as a physical characteristic (see 5.3.5); the [ProperN-*free*]_A constructs are construed on the in-out orientation of the CONTAINMENT domain which also implies existence of a bounded entity (see 6.4.2.2); and the [ProperN-*esque*]_A and [ProperN-*like*]_A and [ProperN-*ish*]_A constructs base their similarity on the LINK schema which connects two bounded entities (see 6.4.1.3).

Being conceptually bounded entities, proper noun constructs are more likely to be construed metonymically. In a metonymic transfer, an entity is understood in terms of another entity i.e. one entity provides mental access to another one (Koevecses 2010: 172). Proper nouns as bounded entities and unique referents are easily accessible and interpreted in the mental space. In institutional contexts in which people assume clear roles (doctor-patient, waiter-customer, teacher-student etc.), employing the “metonymical strategy for the sake of referencing” is universal and expected to the extent that the speakers are not even aware of their metonymical use (Dirven 1999: 276). Whenever a proper noun is at the same a unique referent and a salient grounding element (see 10.1.2.1), the communicative situation in which the reference is used produces a metonymical shift UNIQUE ENTITY FOR ANOTHER PRINCIPALLY DIFFERENT (BOUNDED/UNBOUNDED) ENTITY. This metonymically induced change results in creating new categories, and thus, it may be considered as the index-to-symbol shift of proper names (Mauri and Masini 2024; see 10.3). It is also far more frequent than metonymy at the word level. Semantically, there are only a couple of obvious metonymical meaning extensions of a particular schema e.g. the [*mid*-ProperN/Person]_A constructs have additional temporal meaning based on TERM OF OFFICE FOR TIME metonymy e.g. *mid-Carter* (administration), and the [ProperN-*free*]_A constructs denote a lack of information via the metonymical transfer PERSON FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE PERSON e.g. *Tebow-free* (commentary).

10.2.2 Entrenchment at the sentence level: interaction with syntax

Different kinds of complex constructions as form-meaning pairings are studied in Construction Grammar. They are usually syntactic structures consisting of at least two constituents (words) in a non-arbitrary relationship. Morphological constructions at the word level resemble syntactic constructions; they are form-meaning pairings comprising at least two constituents unified in a non-arbitrary relationship. Both syntactic and morphological constructions have access to phonology and semantics as necessary interfaces for the integration of full linguistic information.

The analysis of proper nouns as word-formation components has shown that proper nouns may be constituents of morphological constructions and be used in larger grammatical structures i.e. syntactic constructions which may be partially or fully schematic depending on the fixedness of their slots. The coprus examples and their contextual uses have made it possible for us to identify all syntactic structures in which the novel morphological constructs (consisting of a proper noun as one of its constituents) may fill in the open slots. In addition, we have seen that morphological constructions may be affected by syntactic constructions – a controversial point of view in generative and other syntactocentric approaches which placed syntax at a higher level than morphology in the organization of grammar. In cognitive and constructionist approaches, it has been advocated for a greater connection between syntax and morphology in the sense of simultaneous availability of syntactic and morphological information (Booij and Audring 2017: 293). However, there is a conventional distinction between syntax and morphology inasmuch as “[S]yntax defines grammaticality of potential building blocks of morphology, and morphology defines which types of syntactic constituents it allows for” (Booij 2014: 201).

In Chapter 3, three key theoretical observations with respect to the interaction between morphology and syntax were given (see 3.3.2 following Booij and Audring 2017: 292), and in the following discussion, each observation is applied to morphological constructions in which a proper noun is a construction constituent:

1. *Syntactic constructions may serve as building blocks of morphological constructions* – this observation implies that complex linguistic expressions such as phrasal units and whole sentences may be constituents of morphological constructions. In this thesis, the form of each morphological construction includes the ProperN constituent as a part of its specification since not only proper nouns as word level units are variables, but also proper names as composite units (sometimes even the ones with a common noun as the head). Some constructional schemas are particularly inclined to composite units as their construction constituents – the constructional schemas licensing new adjectives indicating time reference e.g. *pre-September 11*, *post-World War II*, and compounds in which the proper noun as the non-head constituent denotes institution e.g. *Ivy-League-educated elites*, *ex-Berkley College of Music student*. Regardless of the morphological process and construction type, the names of books and movies as unique referents are used in their full composite form e.g. *Game-of-Thrones-ish*, *Bonny-and-Clide-like*, *Thelma and Louise* (as a denominal verb). The names of people as unique referents may be used as a single or composite unit even when the unique referent is the same e.g. *un-Bill Clinton*, *pro-President Clinton*, and *Clintonize*.

2. *The use of a morphological construction may depend on its occurrence in a syntactic construction* – to put it more precisely, “a specific morphological form may be required by a syntactic construction” (Booij and Audring 2017: 295). Principally, there are two ways of demonstrating this kind of interaction. The first one is embedded productivity in which a word-formation process becomes more productive in specific syntactic surrounding, and the construction as a whole may acquire “a life of its own” (Booij and Audring 2017: 295). This is especially evident in verbal constructs which are used in different grammatical forms, show a wide distribution, take multiple arguments, and may even become reflexive e.g. the [*out-ProperN*]_V, [*ProperN-ify*]_V, [*ProperN-ize*]_V, [*de-ProperN-ify*]_V, [*de-ProperN-ize*]_V, [*re-ProperN-ize*]_V and [*ProperN*]_V constructs (see 5.3.5, 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 7.4.1 and Chapter 8). Moreover, some *-ify/-ize* nominalizations in *of*-genitive constructions may create a specialized meaning i.e. a process of a cultural or political assimilation e.g. *Manhattanization of San Francisco*, *Pakistanization of Kenya*. The second one refers to syntactic constructions in which a morphological construction has acquired a new interpretation. For instance, the [*ProperN-esque*]_A, [*ProperN-ish*]_A, [*ProperN-like*]_A constructs are interpreted as circumstantial when used in existential *There*-constructions (see 6.4.1.4). Based on the analysis of corpus examples, another kind of interaction between syntax and morphology has also been identified in this thesis: *a morphological construction may take part of its specification owing to its occurrence in particular syntactic surroundings*. The [*ProperN/Person or Place-(i)ana*]_N constructs share the same property of partition in the sense of a collection/element/quantity as *of*-genitive constructions in which they frequently occur e.g. *a vast collection of Lincolniana*, *this obscure item of Columbiana* and *a lot of Canadiana*. Denominal conversion verbs may take particles which results in their change of meaning from similative/instrumental to causative/resultative e.g. *MacGyver* vs. *MacGyver up* (see 8.3.2).

3. *There may be systematic paradigmatic relationships between morphological and syntactic constructions* – this means that the interpretation of morphologically complex words is based on phrasal lexical expressions. Some lexical items may share the same base which serves as a reliable indicator of a paradigmatic relationship e.g. the [*ProperN-ism*]_N and [*ProperN-ist*]_N constructs and all their subsequent derivatives. Others are more likely to be fixed phrases with conventional and idiosyncratic meaning; Booij and Audring (2017: 296) give examples of Greek complex adjectives based on nominal compounds the *Third World* and *Cold War*. The paradigmatic relationships are typically based on the reference and the meaning of corresponding lexical expressions as found in analogical word-formation; the

meaning of some proper noun constructs ending in *-ness* is understood with reference to a stored item *Your Highness* (see 6.3.1.1). This kind of interaction between morphology and syntax in analogical word-formation supports the idea of a hierarchical lexicon and provides a valid argument against a lexicon-grammar division.

10.3 Proper nouns in non-lexicalized occurrences – in and out of context

The first two parts of the discussion have focused on proper nouns as word-formation units from a conceptual and linguistic perspective. After adopting a cognitive and constructionist approach to proper nouns, the theoretical arguments for their acceptability as construction constituents have been laid out: the feature of boundedness [+] and their dual role in an act of reference allow for the successful unification of proper nouns as variables in constructional schemas, and further proper noun schema entrenchment is supported by motivation and inheritance at the word level and the interaction with syntactic structures at the sentence level. The contextual use of proper nouns has also been mentioned in the sense of particular grammatical context (see 10.1) and with regard to the interpretation of non-lexicalized occurrences in discourse (as text content). In discourse, the correct interpretation of a complex word consisting of a proper noun as one of its elements necessitates the identification of the referent, context and property, which is in fact a multi-layered indexicality process (Mauri and Masini 2024). As it has already been demonstrated, proper nouns are at the same time unique referents and salient grounding elements in an act of reference; that being said, this section deals with context and property as two other important variables in deciphering the exact meaning of complex words with proper nouns.

10.3.1 Property and context

Unlike reference which is central to proper names, context and property are neither conceptually nor linguistically typical of proper names. In his eclectic approach to semantics which is based on ethological, psychological, philosophical, anthropological and linguistic accounts (and which serves as a forerunner to usage-based models), Lyons (1977) provides a comprehensive study on meaning and communication. From his semantic theory, we may infer that proper names as truly unique and completely arbitrary units exclude context and property in their specification:

- 4) Proper names, when they are employed as referring expressions, identify their referents, *not by describing them in terms of some relevant property or properties which the name denotes*, but by utilizing the unique and arbitrary association which holds between a name and its bearer. (Lyons 1977: 214, my emphasis)
- 5) *Context*, it must be emphasized, is a theoretical construct, *in the postulation of which the linguist abstracts from the actual situation and establishes as contextual all the factors which*, by virtue of their influence upon the participants in the language-event, *systematically determine the form, the appropriateness or the meaning of utterances*. (Lyons 1977: 572, my emphases)

Properties are easily identified in common nouns provided we are familiar with their denotation and category e.g. a teacher is someone who teaches, a driver is someone who drives, a baker is someone who bakes etc. The three common nouns *teacher*, *driver* and *baker* denote people and their shared property ‘do/have a job’ separates them from other categories with the same denotation such as *child*, *girl*, *grandfather* etc. In the relation category – property, the property of

the category represents “the possession of which is a condition of the correct application of the expression” (Lyons 1977: 208). If we say *a teacher is someone who drives a car*, this utterance does not conform to the principle of the category – property relation. There seems to be an inherent incompatibility between the meaning of the word *teacher* and the whole utterance, because the relevant property is mismatched within the type of the verb (V-er). Likewise, *teachers is someone who teaches* would result in an ungrammatical form of the utterance due to the plural form of the word *teacher*. This shows that the correct application of an expression complies with the form and meaning of that expression and context demonstrates its actual realisation and the appropriateness of an utterance as a whole (regarding its form and meaning).

Unlike common nouns, proper nouns do not rely on relevant properties and context in their application in an utterance. As mentioned in Chapter 2, denotation and reference are crucial in their correct application. However, as Lyons (1977: 214) points out, proper names may also have a certain property in a more liberal sense when speakers imply that “to be called such-and-such is to have a certain property.” This property depends on some extra-linguistic information which is part of our shared (encyclopedic) knowledge e.g. if we say that somebody is *a new Mozart*, we refer to their exceptional talent for music. Moreover, the relevant property is salient only in particular grammatical context (Determination construction). This means that some relevant encyclopedic property and a changed (grammatical) context work together hand in hand when proper names become categories as a result of a multi-layered indexicality process (Mauri and Masini 2024).

10.3.2 Proper nouns as word-formation components and multi-layered indexicality

As a unified mechanism for interpreting non-lexicalised occurrences in discourse, multi-layered indexicality demonstrates how proper names shift their purely indexical meaning to a symbolic one and how proper names become new categories (Mauri and Masini 2024)⁸⁷. It is based on cognitive and semantic principles of abstraction, metonymy, analogy⁸⁸ and coercion, and it is applied to both morphological and syntactic constructions in which proper names are constituents e.g. *la cenerentolitudine* (Cinderella-hood), *tanti Obama* (many Obamas). In practice, this process allows the correct interpretation of context-dependent and creatively used occurrences with subjective connotations (either ironic or derogatory). In theory, Mauri and Masini (2024: 193) assert that constructions with proper names are indexical linguistic phenomena which “can be interpreted *only* by assigning a particular value to the relevant variables” (my emphasis).

The mechanism consists of three different layers which act simultaneously in discourse. At the first layer, the referent of the proper name (the variable R) is identified based on shared knowledge and the speakers’ ascribed value to that referent. The second layer sets the frame of the referent i.e. the relevant context in which the value is accessed (the variable C). Once the referent and context are identified, the context-relevant property with a specific value is singled out via abstraction and metonymy (the variable P_{R_C}). The whole process is triggered by coercion which causes proper names to function as common nouns⁸⁹. As a result, proper names are no longer unique entities, but they are used to refer to a new category based on shared knowledge between speakers e.g. *many Obamas* are ‘many people like Obama’ whose behaviour in politics is in line with Obama’s governorship as highly ethical and professional conduct (Mauri and Masini 2024: 184). The greater the shared knowledge, the easier it is for speakers to process the non-lexicalized occurrences.

⁸⁷ The paper analyses ‘multi-layered indexicality’ constructions with proper names denoting humans in Italian.

⁸⁸ Analogy is understood as a primary cognitive and comparative process based on a common property between a person and another referent i.e. a representative of a new category (Mauri and Masini 2024: 187).

⁸⁹ Masini and Mauri agree with Leclercq’s view that coercion is “semantically-constrained pragmatic process” and “a kind of saturation” (Leclercq’s 2019: 284).

In their proposal, Mauri and Masini offer “the linguistic strategies that involve the use of a proper name (PN) to creatively convey a category, focusing on non-lexicalized occurrences” (Mauri and Masini 2024: 172). As the authors themselves emphasize their proposal is based on semantic mechanisms and it provides the necessary steps for the interpretation of ad hoc (symbolic) meaning i.e. “three semantic “ingredients” whose identification relies on contextual knowledge” (Mauri and Masini 2024: 173). In their approach, the formal properties of constructions with proper names are not studied in great detail, because all the constructions can be interpreted through the same indexical process regardless of the structural differences (Mauri and Masini 2024: 193). The idea of constructions as form-meaning pairings is slightly deprioritized at the cost of contextual factors “since the interpretation of the non-lexicalized cases *cannot rely on a stable association between form and meaning* but is inherently dependent on context” (Mauri and Masini 2024: 172, my emphasis). However, the authors do not entirely reject constructions as form-meaning pairings, but rather name contextual factors as the driving force in the overall interpretation:

- 6) In Construction Grammar, constructions are mentally stored signs that bear some properties, but there is indeed no reason to believe that their symbolic nature is at odds *with contextual factors, that intervene (and in fact do so quite often)* when constructions are instantiated in discourse. (Mauri and Masini 2024: 192, my emphasis)

The importance of contextual factors, shared knowledge and extra-linguistic information in interpreting complex words with proper nouns as word-formation elements has been recognized in our analysis as well. However, our results speak in favour of form-meaning correspondence over contextual factors in interpreting the meaning of non-lexicalized occurrences given that this thesis is based on significantly larger data (1872 corpus instances) and includes the analysis of five productive word-formation processes in which proper nouns denote different entities (not only humans).

We have demonstrated that there is a stable association between form and meaning of constructions in which proper nouns are one of the constituents. This stability is a result of the speakers’ abstraction and generalization based on existing productive patterns (morphological schemas) and established lexemes i.e. common nouns, adjectives and verbs as morphological constructs. The unchanging nature of constructions as form-meaning pairings is fully realized with locative constructions which are easily understood out of context if we are familiar with the unique referent e.g. *mid-Nile, pre-Halloween, post-Cold War, December-ish*. The context does not play a key role in deverbal compounding either, especially when the head element is the past participle form of factive and position verbs and when the proper noun as the non-head element denotes a place e.g. *Brooklyn-born, Virginia-bred, Australia-raised* (factive verbs); *Houston-based, America-bound, Earth-centered* (position verbs). Moreover, in deverbal compounding with past participle forms, the overall understanding of the constructions with proper nouns comes from our knowledge of argument structure; we may not know anything about Stanford, but we do understand that *a Stanford-educated astronaut* is someone who has acquired necessary skills at a place/educational institution called Stanford. Adjectival constructs with proper nouns as formal bases are also easily understood in their immediate grammatical context i.e. Modification constructions; we do understand that *a Kafkaesque scenario* refers to a story associated with Kafka, or that *anti-Bush protestors* do not support Bush. We may not know who the unique referents are (Kafka and Bush), but in the same manner we may not know anything about the Cold War and still understand that *our new post-Cold War world* refers to a place and time after a certain war. This means that our full understanding of non-lexicalized occurrences with proper nouns is based on our familiarity with the unique referent as part of our shared knowledge. Nevertheless, even when we are not familiar with the referent, the grammatical context provides enough information for us to interpret novel formations (at least partially) owing to their correct application.

Sometimes the interpretation of a non-lexicalized occurrence requires the knowledge of not only the referent but also of the referent’s property which cannot be identified in immediate grammatical surroundings. This is the case of all the verbal constructs with proper nouns as formal

bases; we generally understand their semantic meaning, whether they are causative, resultative, similitive, instrumental or privative, but we do need some extra-linguistic information to acquire the full understanding of constructs such as *out-Moneyball*, *Beanify*, *Kuwaitize*, *de-Harvardize*, *re-Islamize* etc. The negative constructions imply negation of a certain property, and therefore, speakers have to rely on their shared knowledge for the correct interpretation e.g. *anti-Manhattan*, *un-Reese*, *non-Apple* (devices), *Aniston-less* (sequel), *Justin Bieber-free* etc. The speakers' shared knowledge of the referent's property is also essential in interpreting paradigmatic *-ism/-ist* constructions and their subsequent derivatives. In practice, the unique referent may have more than one property (as illustrated with *un-Hollywood*, *mini-Manhattan*, *McDonaldize* and *Oprah-like*), but only one is selected by a speaker in one particular discourse. Regardless of the chosen property and discourse use, the semantic specification of morphological constructions as well as their grammatical context (i.e. syntactic constructions in which they are used) would always remain unchanged.

As for their connotations, we have seen that novel formations with proper nouns may range from positive/neutral to negative, which challenges their status of creative occurrences with strictly subjective connotations. Their strong evaluative tone is sometimes identical to the established lexemes which have served as the blueprint for generalization and abstraction e.g. the [ProperN-*esque*]_A constructs have the 'picturesque' character, the [ProperN-*oid*]_A constructs may have either a scientific or derogatory tone (if we take *asteroid* or *android* their possible model words), and the [ProperN-*ify*]_V constructs are often disparaging as Marchand previously suggested (1969). Their discourse use is often conventional: the [ProperN-*ism*]_N and their derivatives are typically used in academic and journalistic texts, the [*proto*-ProperN]_N constructs are fully available in scientific and technical register, and the [ProperN-*ify*]_V and [ProperN-*ize*]_V nominalizations are often used in political and cultural discourses on assimilation. They may even produce the same pragmatic effects as their established counterparts e.g. the [ProperN-*free*]_A constructs evoke the feeling that an entity is undesirable (as in *smoke-free*), the [*anti*-ProperN]_A and [*pro*-ProperN]_A constructs are applied together to produce the effect of antithesis, and the use of the positive form facilitates the production of the [*un*-ProperN]_N constructs (known as the priming effect). In addition, some morphological constructions which are believed to produce only constructs with negative associations have generated constructs with neutral and positive associations e.g. the 'jargon' [ProperN-*ese*]_A constructs.

Perhaps the strongest argument for their "non-creative" character is a high degree of productivity of morphological constructions with proper nouns as variables – this is best seen in the production of the verbal *-ify/-ize* constructs which may take any kind of proper noun despite its denotation and form (including composite proper names). In other productive morphological processes, the degree of "creativity" is conditioned by the rules of syntax and semantics i.e. argument structure and semantic verbal categorization limit the scope of proper nouns in deverbal compounding as well as the semantic categorization of denominal verbs in conversion. Finally, in affix combinations, the outermost affix is always either more productive e.g. *mini-pseudo-Medici* and *Peter-Panishness*, or has the same degree of productivity as the innermost affix e.g. *pro-anti-Gamsakhurdia* and *Gabonization*, which supports the theory of Complexity-Based Ordering in its predictions on productivity.

On the whole, the non-lexicalized occurrences with proper names may be felt as creative from a speaker's point of view, but actually, they are fairly more conventional and consistent in form and meaning than we would expect them to be. Creative usage is unambiguous only in the case of analogical word-formation in which new words are understood with reference to a stored item e.g. the target words modeled on lexicalised expression *Your Highness* do not show respect but rather disapproval.

10.3.2.1 A new proposal

Instead of saying that the constructs with proper nouns/names are context-dependent, we propose that they are *context-specific*⁹⁰. By context, we mean different grammatical contexts i.e. constructions in which they are realized (Determination, Modification, Comparative, Verb Phrase etc.) as well as shared knowledge which may or may not be provided in discourse as a piece of extra-linguistic information (as it was provided with the utterance *Winston-Churchilling the witness* (see 8.2.1)). Context serves as a way of building up our overall understanding of non-lexicalized occurrences and not intervening with the semantic meaning which is fixed at the schematic level. Greater shared knowledge (which includes the knowledge of the referent and the referent's property) does facilitate better interpretation of a novel formation, but the inherent semantic meaning remains stable regardless of the referent or the referent's property. The meaning is clear and precise because it is paired with the appropriate form. As quoted in the introduction of this thesis, "the relationship between form and meaning [...] is taken as basic and inherent in any grammatical description" (Östman and Fried 2005: 2), including that of non-lexicalized occurrences with proper nouns/names. Regardless of its "creative and untypical" constituent i.e. a proper noun/name, the correct application of each form-meaning pairing results in a grammatically acceptable and well-formed construct.

Bearing this in mind, we propose that the application of multi-layered indexicality process is necessary for speakers' *full* understanding of non-lexicalized occurrences but it does not intervene with the semantic specification of morphological constructions at the schematic level. In correct application, non-lexicalized occurrences with proper nouns/names are *conventional* and *consistent* in form and meaning. Once the prerequisites for proper nouns/names as construction constituents are fulfilled as discussed in the first two parts of this chapter (see 10.1 and 10.2), complex words with proper nouns/names are activated in discourse in which their form-meaning correspondence remains *stable* even though their instantiation becomes *context-specific*.

⁹⁰ Mauri and Masini (2024) also use the term *context-specific* interchangeably with the term *context-relevant* to describe the variable P (property). The term *context-dependent* is used to describe morphological and syntactic constructions.

11 Conclusion

This thesis has empirically tested a tacitly entailed theoretical hypothesis in English morphology that proper nouns are not *prototypically* word-formation units. In order to refute this implication, it was necessary to look into 1872 examples of proper nouns as components in complex words and syntactic structures selected from eight different genres in COCA so that we would gain an illuminating insight into their contemporary usage. The contextualized instances of complex words with proper nouns have shown their universal and language-specific properties in an analysis in the framework of Construction Morphology. Formally represented as morphological constructions, complex words with proper nouns as variables are indeed form-meaning correspondences at different levels of abstraction. However, they also depend on their immediate surroundings as well as the overall (grammatical and extra-linguistic) context. In this sense, there is a correlation between the knowledge of language as a set of generalizations and the products of its use, which confirms the constructionist postulate that “[U]sage events create linguistic knowledge” (Bybee 2013: 13).

As linguistic knowledge is shaped by multiple cognitive factors interacting simultaneously, speakers will apply all their knowledge of language units and word-formation processes when creating novel complex words with proper nouns in a communicative act. As linguistic units, proper nouns resemble common countable nouns regarding their conceptualization i.e. they are bounded entities, and they denote three principal kinds of bounded entities: a person, an object and a place or time as a defined space. In an act of reference, they are at the same time unique referents and salient grounding elements which are socially recognized by speakers. By being unspecified for the syntactic feature of maximal projection, proper nouns also fulfill grammatical conditions for successful unification in both syntactic and morphological constructions. Once they fill in the open slots and they are “granted” the status of variables, proper nouns as constituents fully participate in the entrenchment of constructions which is accomplished thanks to the semantic mechanisms of inheritance and motivation at the word level and the interaction between morphology and syntax at the sentence level.

Being linguistic units, proper nouns may undergo morphological changes and serve as bases and compound elements of complex words. This occurs in the process of morphological reinterpretation of productive abstract patterns – speakers are able to draw parallels and make generalizations between existing instantiations and new words in their mind while accessing the semantic information of well-formed constructions on the one hand and via morphosyntactic interaction between constructions on the other hand. As a result of this cognitive multitasking, the speakers’ linguistic knowledge (of proper nouns in particular and language in general) is organized as a network of various kinds of relations operating at different levels. When these relations are studied as a part of hierarchical lexicon which encompasses all grammatical components, it is possible to go a step closer to understanding the scope of linguistic knowledge.

Although the non-lexicalised occurrences with proper nouns are usually felt as creative coinages or novel words by speakers (e.g. they are often put in quotation marks) and they are often one-offs or hapax legomena, our findings show that they preserve their fixed form-meaning correspondence which is identical to their lexicalised counterparts or established lexemes (nouns, adjectives and verbs) produced by the same constructional schemas. As a matter of fact, these occurrences are far more consistent and conventional in their use than we would expect them to be. Even though we do have to rely on our shared knowledge of their unique reference and their properties so as to make the right interpretation based on a multi-layered indexicality process, complex words with proper nouns are not context-dependent occurrences, but rather context-specific. In other words, two key contextual factors, grammatical context and shared knowledge, enable their correct application and demonstrate their appropriateness in discourse use.

This doctoral thesis studied the relationship between the form and meaning of complex words with proper nouns in contemporary English. Following the analysis of five productive word-

formation processes (prefixation, suffixation, affix combination, conversion and compounding), the key linguistic findings on proper nouns as word-formation components indicate the interplay of five cognitive and constructionist phenomena in the creation of novel words i.e. boundedness, reference, inheritance, motivation and morphosyntactic interaction. These five phenomena may be further investigated in research on proper nouns in other marginal word-formation processes such as blending. Likewise, the linguistic phenomena which were not analyzed in detail in this thesis such as coercion may be studied in future research on proper nouns. Future research based on other discourses, such as social media, may also offer new insights given that different usage events may lead to new conclusions. Other areas in linguistics which base their study on usage events and communicative situations (such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis) could also benefit from these findings. Facing these exciting prospects, proper nouns are yet to show their full linguistic potential.

References

- Adams, V. (2001). *Complex Words in English*. Harlow: Pearson Education/Longman.
- Allen, M. R. (1979). *Morphological Investigation*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Arnaud, P. (2022). Metaphor, metonymy and the nounness of proper names. *Lexis – Journal in English Lexicology*, 20/2022 (issue devoted to “Proper names and the lexicon”), retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6617>, last accessed 30 January 2025.
- Arndt-Lappe, S. (2014). Analogy in suffix rivalry: The case of English-ity and-ness. *English Language and Linguistics*, 18(3), 497-548.
- Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word-Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Audring, J. and G. Booij (2016). Cooperation and coercion. *Linguistics*, 54(4), 617-637.
- Baayen, H. (1992). Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity. *Yearbook of Morphology 1991*, 109-49.
- Baayen, H. (1993). On frequency, transparency and productivity. *Yearbook of Morphology 1992*, 181-208.
- Baayen, H. and R. Lieber. (1991). Productivity and English derivation: a corpus-based study. *Linguistics*, 29, 801-843.
- Baker, M. (2003). *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Balteiro, I. (2006). *A Contribution to the Study of Conversion in English*. Münster, Waxmann.
- Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, L. (2005). Productivity: Theories. In P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of Word-formation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 315-334.
- Bauer, L. (2006). Competition in English word formation. In A. van Kemenade and B. Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*, Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 177-198.
- Bauer, L. (2008). Exocentric compounds. *Morphology*, 18, 51-74.
- Bauer, L. and R. Huddleston (2002). Lexical word-formation. In R. Huddleston and G. K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1621-1722.
- Bauer, L. and Valera, S. (2005). Conversion or zero-derivation: an introduction. In L. Bauer and S. Valera (eds.), *Approaches to Conversion/Zero-Derivation*, Münster: Waxmann, 7-17.
- Bauer, L. et al. (2013). *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, L. et al. (2015). *Semantics of Complex Words (Studies in Morphology 3)*. Cham: Springer.
- Beard, R. (1995). *Lexeme-Morpheme Base Morphology: a general theory of inflection and word formation*. (SUNY Series in Linguistics.) Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bisetto, A. and S. Scalise (2005). The classification of compounds. *Lingue e linguaggio*, IV(2), 319-332.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Booij, G. (2005). *The Grammar of Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booij, G. (2010a). *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booij, G. (2010b). Construction Morphology. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Booij, G. (2013). Morphology in Construction Grammar. In T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 255-273.
- Booij, G. (2014). Language use and the architecture of grammar: a Construction Morphology perspective. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 40(78), 193-212.
- Booij, G. (2015). Inheritance and motivation in Construction Morphology. In N. Gisborne and A. Hippisley (eds.), *Defaults in Morphological Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 18-39.

- Booij, G. (2018). *The Construction of Words: Advances in Construction Morphology (Studies in Morphology 4)*. Cham: Springer.
- Booij, G. and F. Masini (2015). The Role of Second Order Schemas in the Construction of Complex Words. In L. Bauer et al. (eds.) *Semantics of Complex Words (Studies in Morphology 3)*. Cham: Springer, 47-66.
- Booij, G. and J. Audring (2017). Construction Morphology and the Parallel Architecture of grammar. *Cognitive Science*, 41(S2), 277-302.
- Booij, G. and J. Audring (2018). Partial motivation, multiple motivation: the role of output schemas in morphology. In G. Booij (ed.), *The Construction of Words: Advances in Construction Morphology (Studies in Morphology 4)*, Cham: Springer, 59-80.
- Bybee, J. (1985). *Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bybee, J. (1995). Regular morphology and the lexicon. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 10(5), 425-455.
- Bybee, J. (2006). From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language*, 82(4), 711-733.
- Bybee, J. (2013). Usage-based theory and exemplar representations of constructions. In T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-69.
- Bybee, J. and C. Beckner (2012). Usage-Based Theory. In B. Heine and H. Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 827-855.
- Cacchiani, S. (2022). From proper name to epithet: motivation and change in the fashion industry. *Lexis – Journal in English Lexicology*, 20/2022 (issue devoted to “Proper names and the lexicon”), retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6872>, last accessed 15 January 2025.
- Carls, U. (2000). Anti- and pro- in Indian English. In C. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt (eds.), *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function: A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 35-43.
- Carlson, G. (2006). Reference. In L.R. Horn and G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 74-96.
- Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (1992). *Current Morphology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chalker, S. (1992). Proper noun. In T. McArthur (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 813.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton
- Chomsky, N. (1964). *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1970). Remarks on Nominalization. In R. Jakobson and P. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Boston: Ginn, 184-221.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Clark, E. V. (2010). Creativity in language. In A. Barber and R. J. Stainton (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford: Elsevier Ltd, 112-115.
- Clark, E. V. and H. Clark. (1979). When nouns surface as verbs. *Language*, 55(4), 767-811.
- Croft, W. (2005). Logical and typological arguments for Radical Construction Grammar. In J. Östman and M. Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 273-309.
- Croft, W. (2010). Construction Grammar. In D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 463-508.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 6th edition. Malden/ Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Culicover, P.W. and R. Jackendoff (2005). *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dalton-Puffer, C. and I. Plag, (2000). Categorywise, some compound-type morphemes seem to be rather suffix-like: On the status of -ful-, -type-, and -wise in present day English. *Folia Linguistica*, XXXIV/3-4, 225-244.
- Davies, M. (2010). The Corpus of Contemporary American English as the first reliable monitor corpus of English. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 25(4), 447-464.
- Dirven, R. (1999). Conversion as conceptual metonymy of event schema. In K. U. Panther and G. Radden (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 275-287.
- Downing, P. (1977). On the creation and use of English compound nouns. *Language*, 53, 810-842.
- Fabb, N. (1988). English suffixation is constrained by selectional restrictions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6(4), 527-539.
- Fried, M. and J. Östman (2004). Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch. In M. Fried and J. Östman (eds.), *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective (Constructional Approaches to Language 2)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 11-86.
- Fried, M. (2015). Construction Grammar. In A. Alexiadou and T. Kiss (eds.), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis: An International Handbook, Vol. 2*, Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 974-1003.
- Givon, T. (2001). *Syntax: An Introduction, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Giegrich, H. (1999). *Lexical Strata in English: Morphological Causes, Phonological Effects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2003). Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(5), 219-224.
- Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2013). Constructionist approaches. In T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 14-31.
- Górska, E. (1994). Moonless nights and smoke-free cities, or what can be without the other? A cognitive study of privative adjectives in English. *Folia Linguistica*, 28, 413-435.
- Górska, E. (1995). Possession frame in word derivation: A case of English privative adjectives. In G. Persson and H. Kardela (eds.), *New Trends in Semantics and Lexicography*, Umeå: Acta Universitatis, 35-51.
- Górska, E. (2001). Recent derivatives with the suffix -less: A change in progress within the category of English privative adjectives. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 36, 189-202.
- Gries, S. Th. (2013). Data in Construction Grammar. In T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 93-108.
- Gries, S. Th. (2015). More (old and new) misunderstandings of collocation analysis: on Schmid and Küchenhoff (2013). *Cognitive Linguistics*, 26(3), 505-536.
- Gries, S. Th. (2017). Corpus Approaches. In B. Dancygier (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 590-606.
- Guevara, E. and S. Scalise (2009). Searching for Universals in Compounding. In: S. Scalise et al. (eds.), *Universals of Language Today (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 76)*, Dordrecht: Springer, 101-128.
- Halle, M. (1973). Prolegomena to a theory of word formation. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4(I), 3-16.
- Hamawand, Z. (2007). *Suffixal Rivalry in Adjective Formation: A Cognitive-Corpus Analysis*. London/Oakville: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Hamawand, Z. (2009). *The Semantics of English Negative Prefixes*. London/Oakville: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

- Hampe, B. (2000). Facing up to the meaning of ‘face up to’: A cognitive semanticopragmatic analysis of an English verb-particle construction. In A. Foolen and F. van der Leek (eds.), *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 178)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 81-101.
- Hasegawa, Y et al. (2010). On expressing measurement and comparison in English and Japanese. In H. C. Boas (ed.), *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar (Constructional Approaches to Language 10)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 169-200.
- Hasko, V. (2012). Qualitative corpus analysis. In C. Chapelle (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 4758-4764.
- Haspelmath, M. (2002). *Understanding Morphology*. London: Arnold.
- Hay, J. (2002). From speech perception to morphology: Affix ordering revisited. *Language*, 78(3), 527-555.
- Hay, J. and I. Plag (2004). What constrains possible suffix combinations? On the interaction of grammatical and processing restrictions in derivational morphology. *Natural Language and Linguistics*, 22(3), 565-596.
- Héois, A. (2020). When proper names become verbs: a semantic perspective. *Lexis – Journal in English Lexicology*, 16/2022 (issue devoted to “Diachronic Lexical Semantics”), retrived from <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.4681>, last accessed 15 January 2025.
- Héois, A. (2022). What can verbal derivation tell us about proper names? *Lexis – Journal in English Lexicology*, 20/2022 (issue devoted to “Proper names and the lexicon”), retrived from <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6589>, last accessed 15 January 2025.
- Hilpert, M. (2010). Comparing comparatives: A corpus-based study of comparative constructions in English and Swedish. In H. C. Boas (ed.), *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar (Constructional Approaches to Language 10)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 21-42.
- Hilpert, M. (2013). Corpus-based approaches to constructional change. In T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 458-475.
- Hilpert, M. (2014). *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Horn, L. R. (2002). Uncovering the un-word: a study in lexical pragmatics. *Sophia linguistica*, 49, 1-64.
- Huddleston, R. et al. (2002). Relative constructions and unbounded dependencies. In R. Huddleston and G. K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1031-1096.
- Huddleston, R. and G.K. Pullum (2005). *A Student’s Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1997). *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (2011). What is the human language faculty? Two views. *Language*, 87, 586-624.
- Jackendoff, R. and J. Audring (2018). Morphology and memory: toward an integrated theory. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 12(1), retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12334>, last accessed 16 January 2025.
- Jackendoff, R. and J. Audring (2020a). *The Texture of the Lexicon. Relational Morphology and the Parallel Architecture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. and J. Audring (2020b). Relational Morphology: a cousin of Construction Grammar. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:2241, retrived from doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02241, last accessed 16 January 2025.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Kastovsky, D. (2005). Hans Marchand and the Marchandians. In: P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of Word-formation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 99-124.
- Katamba, F. (1993). *Morphology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kikuchi, Y. (2017). A review on the suffix -free related to negation and spatial cognition. *Osaka University Press in English Linguistics*, 18, 27-37.
- Kiparsky, P. (1982). Lexical Morphology and Phonology. In I. S. Yang (ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Seoul: Hanshin, 3-91.
- Kjellmer, G. (2005). Negated adjectives in modern English: a corpus-based study. *Studia Neophilologica*, 77(2), 156–170.
- Kotowski, S. (2020). The semantics of English out-prefixation: a corpus-based investigation. *English Language and Linguistics*, 25, 61-89.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1992). The symbolic nature of cognitive grammar: The meaning of of and of periphrasis. In M. Pütz (ed.), *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution (Studies in Honour of Réne Dirven on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 483-502.
- Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leclercq, B. (2019). Coercion: A case of saturation. *Constructions and Frames*, 11(2), 270 – 289.
- Lees, R (1960). *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lehmann, C. and E. Moravcsik (2000). Noun. In G. Booij et al. (eds.), *Morphology: An International Handbook of Inflection and Word-formation, Vol. 1*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 732-756.
- Lehrer, A. (1995). Prefixes in English Word Formation. *Folia Linguistica*, 29(1-2), 133-148.
- Lemmens, M. (2019). Acknowledgement to Newmeyer. *Cogni Texts 19* (special issue “Corpora and representativeness”), retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4000/cognitextes.1664>, last accessed 16 January 2025.
- Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lieber, R. (1980). *On the Organisation of the Lexicon*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Lieber, R. (2004). *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieber, R. (2005). English word-formation processes. In P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of Word-Formation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 375-427.
- Lieber, R. (2016). *Introducing Morphology*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lipka, L. (2000). Word-formation and (proper) names: a neglected field. In C. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt (eds.), *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function: A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 187-204.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics, Vol. 1 and Vol 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marchand, H. (1967). On the description of compounds. *Word*, 23(1-3), 379-387.
- Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-Formation*, 2nd edition. Munchen: C. H. Beck.
- Mattiolo, E. (2009). A morphopragmatic analysis of English and Italian negative prefixes. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, XLVII, 125-156.
- Mattiolo, E. (2016). Analogical neologisms in English. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 28(2), 103-142.
- Mattiolo, E. (2017). *Analogy in Word-formation: A Study of English Neologisms and Occasionalisms*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McEnery, T. and A. Hardie (2012). *Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

- McArthur, T. (1992). Name. In T. McArthur (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 678-679.
- Michaelis, L. (2004). Type shifting in construction grammar: An integrated approach to aspectual coercion. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 15(1), 1-67.
- Michaelis, L. (2005). Entity and event coercion in a symbolic theory of syntax. In J. Östman and M. Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 45-88.
- Michaelis, L. A. and A.M. Hsiao (2021). *Verbing and Linguistic Innovation*. *Frontiers in Communication*. 6:604763, retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.604763>, last accessed 17 January 2025.
- Miladinović, N. (2015). *Razvoj, strukturalne i semantičke osobnosti sintetičkog i analitičkog gentiva u engleskom jeziku*. Neobjavljena doktorska disertacija. Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu.
- Mohanan, K. P. (1986). *The Theory of Lexical Phonology*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Montero-Fleta, B. (2011). Suffixes in word-formation processes in scientific English. *LSP Journal – Language for special purposes, professional communication, knowledge management and cognition*, 2(2), 4-14.
- Nagano, A. (2011). The right-headedness of morphology and the status and development of category-determining prefixes in English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 15(1), 61-83.
- Nikiforidou, K. (1991). The meanings of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic change. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2, 149-205.
- Okada, Y. (2022). A constructional analysis of conversion and coercion in English. In Y. Ono and M. Shimada (Eds.) *Data Science in Collaboration, Vol. 5*, Tsukuba: inext Co., Ltd, 93-101.
- Östman, J and M. Fried (2004). Historical and intellectual background of Construction Grammar. In M. Fried and J. Östman (eds.), *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective (Constructional Approches to Language 2)*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1-10.
- Östman, J. and M. Fried (2005). The cognitive grounding of Construction Grammar. In J. Östman and M. Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1-13.
- Palmer, F. et al. (2002). Inflectional morphology and related matters. In R. Huddleston and G. K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1565-1620.
- Payne, T. E. (1997). *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, J. and R. Huddleston (2002). Nouns and noun phrases. In R. Huddleston and G. K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323-523.
- Plag, I. (1996). Selectional restrictions in English suffixation revisited: a reply to Fabb (1988). *Linguistics*, 34(4), 769-798.
- Plag, I. (1999). *Morphological productivity. Structural constraints in English derivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Plag, I (2003). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R. et al., (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Plag, I. and H. Baayen (2009). Suffix ordering and morphological processing. *Language*, 85(1), 109-152.
- Rainer, F. (1988). Towards a theory of blocking: the case of Italian and German quality nouns. *Yearbook of Morphology*, 1, 155-185.
- Rainer, F. (2005). Constraints on productivity. In P.Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of Word-formation*. Dordrecht: Springer, 335-352.

- Raineri, S and C. Debras (2019). Corpora and representativeness: Where to go from now? *Cogni Texts 19* (special issue “Corpora and representativeness”), retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4000/cognitextes.1311>, last accessed 16 January 2025.
- Rabrenović, T. (2020). “You just Fredo-kissme?” The (non-)lexicalizability of nonce word-formation. In B. Čubrović (ed.), *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies, BELLS90 Proceedings, Vol. 1*, Belgrade: Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 153-164.
- Radden, G. and R. Dirven (2007). *Cognitive English Grammar (Cognitive Linguistics in Practice 2)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rudzka-Ostyn, B. (2003). *Word Power: Phrasal Verbs and Compounds: A Cognitive Approach*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- de Saussure, F. (1972). *Le Cours de Linguistique Générale*. Saint-Germain, Paris: Éditions Payot.
- Scalise, S. and E. Guevara (2005). The lexicalist approach to word-formation and the notion of the lexicon. In P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.), *Handbook of Word-formation*. Dordrecht: Springer, 147-187.
- Scalise, S. and Vogel, I. (2010). *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schmid, H. (2008). New words in mind: concept-formation and entrenchment of neologisms. *Anglia*, 126(1), 1-36.
- Selkrik, E. (1982). *The Syntax of Words (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 7)*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Siegel, D. (1974). *Topics in English Morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Simon, G. (2023). Constructions, collocations, and patterns: alternative ways of construction identification in a usage-based, corpus-driven theoretical framework *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Construction Grammars and NLP (CxGs+NLP, GURT/SyntaxFest 2023)*, 12-20, retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2023.cxgsnlp-1.0/>, last accessed 16 January 2025.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (1998). Possession and partition: The two genitives of English. *C.L.E.A.R Cognitive Linguistics: Explorations, Applications, Research 23*. Seminar für Englische Sprache und Kultur, Universität Hamburg.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2003). Constructional semantics as a limit to grammatical alternation: The two genitives of English. In G. Rohdenburg and B. Mondorf (eds.), *Determinants of grammatical variation in English (Topics in English Linguistics 43)*, 413-444.
- Stefanowitsch, A. and S. Th. Gries. (2009). Corpora and grammar. In A. Lüdeling and M. Kytö (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook, Vol. 2*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 933-951.
- Šuković, T. (2023). A corpus-based analysis of -like and -free with proper names. Paper presented at the 34th European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information (ESSLLI2023 Student Session), 01 August 2023, Faculty of Information and Computer Science, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Available online: <https://2023.esslli.eu/courses-workshops-accepted/week-1-and-2-schedule.html>
- Šuković, T. (2024a). A corpus-based analysis of complex words with proper names and -dom in American English: A constructionist representation of polysemy. Paper presented at the 13th International Conference on Construction Grammar (ICCG13), 26-28 August 2024, Department of Swedish, multilingualism, language technology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Šuković, T. (2024b). Expanding the lexicon via analogy and schema: A constructionist approach to analyzing proper names with suffixes as novel lexemes in English. *Patchwork*, 12/13, 68-91.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Towards a Cognitive Semantics (Volume 1: Concept Structuring Systems)*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Taylor, J. R. (1989). Possessive genitives in English. *Linguistics*, 27, 663-686.
- Ten Hacken, P. (2016). *The Semantics of Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Valera, S. (2005). Conversion vs. unmarked word-class change. *SKASE: Journal Theoretical Linguistics*, 14(2), 2-18.
- Van Marle, J. (1990). Rule-creating creativity: analogy as a synchronic morphological process. In W. Dressler et al. (eds.), *Contemporary Morphology*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 267-273.
- Van Langendonck, W. (2007). *Theory and Typology of Proper Names (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 168)*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Langendonck, W. and M. Van de Velde (2016). Names and grammar. In C. Hough (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17-38.
- Vujić, J. (2013). Sintaksički i leksičko-semanitički status partikule kod nekih dvočlanih glagola u engleskom jeziku. In N. Silaški and T. Đurović (ur.), *Zbornik "Aktuelne teme engleskog jezika"*, Ekonomski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu.
- Vujić, J. (2015). Deconstructing English articles: A Construction Grammar approach to teaching articles In English. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 12, 67 - 81.
- Vujić, J. (2016). *Konstrukcione teme*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Vujić, J. (2020). *Osnovi morfologije i leksikologije engleskog jezika*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu/Philologia.
- Vujić, J and T. Rabrenović (2019). A constructionist approach to morphological creativity: a study of first and/or last name nonce-formations in English. *Jezici i kulture u vremenu i prostoru*, VIII (1), 573-585.
- Vujić, J and T. Šuković (2024). Personal-name blends as instances of morphological creativity in English and their equivalents in Serbian: a constructionist view. In A. Stopar and I. Fabijanić (eds.), *Exploring English by Means of Contrast*, University of Ljubljana Press, 165-192.
- Williams, E. (1981). On the notions 'lexically related' and 'head of a word'. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 12, 245-274.
- Williams, G. (2003) From meaning to words and back: Corpus linguistics and specialised lexicography. *ASp, la revue du GERAS*, 39/40, 91-106.
- Zirkel, L. (2010). Prefix combinations in English: Structural and processing factors. *Morphology*, 20(1), 239-266.

Other sources

Corpus

Davies, Mark. (2008-) The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.

Online dictionary entries

“android.” Merriam-Webster.com. 2025. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>, last accessed 19 February 2025.

“asteroid.” Merriam-Webster.com. 2025. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>, last accessed 19 February 2025.

“balkanize.” Merriam-Webster.com. 2025. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>, last accessed 19 February 2025.

“Finlandization.” Merriam-Webster.com. 2025. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>, last accessed 19 February 2025.

“Vietnamization.” Merriam-Webster.com. 2025. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>, last accessed 19 February 2025.

Appendix – List of attested instances

Chapter 5

Section 5.2.1

<i>anti-</i> + proper noun/name	<i>pro-</i> + proper noun/name
1. anti-Africa	52. pro-Amazon
2. anti-America	53. pro-America
3. anti-Apple	54. pro-Assad
4. anti-Bible	55. pro-Brexit
5. anti-Boston	56. pro-Bush
6. anti-Bush	57. pro-Castro
7. anti-California	58. pro-China
8. anti-Castro	59. pro-Christ
9. anti-China	60. pro-Clinton
10. anti-Christ	61. pro-Confederacy
11. anti-Clinton	62. pro-Damon
12. anti-Conrad	63. pro-Denmark
13. anti-Dale Earnhardt	64. pro-EU
14. anti-Danny Rand	65. pro-Europe
15. anti-Daniel McGowan	66. pro-FBI
16. anti-Dubai	67. pro-Frank
17. anti-Eagles	68. pro-Fred
18. anti-Erdogan	69. pro-Gaddafi
19. anti-EU	70. pro-Gaza
20. anti-Faulkner	71. pro-Gore
21. anti-Garcia	72. pro-GPO
22. anti-Gore	73. pro-Hitler
23. anti-Halloween	74. pro-Holocaust
24. anti-Harper	75. pro-Iran
25. anti-Isreal	76. pro-Isreal
26. anti-Japan	77. pro-Jake
27. anti-Jefferson	78. pro-Japan
28. anti-Jonny	79. pro-Kansas
29. anti-Kennedy	80. pro-Kerry
30. anti-Kerry	81. pro-Kiev
31. anti-Klaus	82. pro-Krenek
32. anti-Kremlin	83. pro-Libya Dawn
33. anti-LeBron	84. pro-Lincoln
34. anti-McCain	85. pro-Milosevic
35. anti-McCarthy	86. pro-Microsoft
36. anti-McDonald's	87. pro-Moscow
37. anti-Meghan	88. pro-NATO
38. anti-Microsoft	89. pro-North Korea
39. anti-Moscow	90. pro-Obama
40. anti-NATO	91. pro-O.J.
41. anti-Nixon	92. pro-Prada
42. anti-Obama	93. pro-President Clinton
43. anti-Pentagon	94. pro-Russia
44. anti-Quebec	95. pro-Romney
45. anti-Rosetta Stone	96. pro-Rowand

46. anti-Russell	97. pro-Saddam
47. anti-Shakespeare	98. pro-Soviet
48. anti-Trump	99. pro-Springsteen
49. anti-Vietnam	100. pro-Starr
50. Anti-white house	101. pro-Tony Abbott
51. anti-Wikipedia	102. pro-Trump
	103. pro-United Nations

Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.1.1

<i>pre-</i> + proper noun/name	<i>post-</i> + proper noun/name
104. pre-Amazon	157. post-Amazon
105. pre-Atkins	158. post-Auschwitz
106. pre-Beatles	159. post-Beatles
107. pre-Blanche	160. post-Blanche
108. pre-Bolivia	161. post-Brexit
109. pre-Broadway	162. post-Broadway
110. pre-Bush	163. post-Bush
111. pre-Castro	164. post-Castro
112. pre-Christmas	165. post-Christmas
113. pre-Clinton	166. post-Clinton
114. pre-Cold War	167. post-Cold War
115. pre-Columbia	168. post-Depression
116. pre-Depression	169. post-Easter
117. pre-Easter	170. post-Emmy
118. pre-Emmy	171. post-EU
119. pre-EU	172. post-Grammy
120. pre-George W. Bush	173. post-Gutenberg
121. pre-Google	174. post-Guy Ritchie
122. pre-Grammy	175. post-Fukushima
123. pre-Halloween	176. post-Halloween
124. pre-Harry Potter	177. post-Harry Potter
125. pre-Hillary	178. post-Hausmann
126. pre-Hitler	179. post-Hemingway
127. pre-Holocaust	180. post-Hillary Clinton
128. pre-Hollywood	181. post-Hitler
129. pre-Katrina	182. post-Holocaust
130. pre-Mickey Mouse	183. post-Joyce
131. pre-Nirvana	184. post-Katrina
132. pre-Nixon	185. post-Larry Bird
133. pre-Obama	186. post-Mao
134. pre-Oprah	187. post-Mapplethorpe
135. pre-Oscar	188. post-Martin
136. pre-Pearl Harbor	189. post-Nirvana
137. pre-Prohibition	190. post-Obama
138. pre-Qaddafi	191. post-Oscar
139. pre-Ramadan	192. post-Pearl Harbor
140. pre-Renaissance	193. post-Prohibition
141. pre-Reebok	194. post-Quentin Tarantino
142. pre-Ronald Reagan	195. post-Ramadan
143. pre-Saddam	196. post-Reconstruction
144. pre-Sandy	197. post-Renaissance

145. pre-September 11	198. post-Restoration
146. pre-Shrek	199. post-Saddam
147. pre-Sopranos	200. post-Sandy
148. pre-Stalin	201. post-September 11
149. pre-Steve Jobs	202. post-Serrano
150. pre-Thanksgiving	203. post-Simpsons
151. pre-Thatcher	204. post-Sputnik
152. pre-Trump	205. post-Thanksgiving
153. pre-Wikipedia	206. post-Trump
154. pre-Woodstock	207. post-Vietnam
155. pre-World War II	208. post-Watergate
156. pre-Zeppelin	209. post-Woodstock
	210. post-World War II
	211. post-Zeppelin

Section 5.3.2

<i>ex- + proper noun/name</i>	
212.	ex-Apple
213.	ex-Arkansas
214.	ex-Baywatch
215.	ex-Berklee College of Music
216.	ex-Biden
217.	ex-Buffy
218.	ex-California
219.	ex-Carolina
220.	ex-Chelsea
221.	ex-CIA
222.	ex-Clinton
223.	ex-Coca Cola
224.	ex-DEA
225.	ex-Depeche Mode
226.	ex-East Bloc
227.	ex-Europa Cup
228.	ex-FBI
229.	ex-France
230.	ex-Gaddafi
231.	ex-Google
232.	ex-Gucci
233.	ex-Houston
234.	ex-Harvard
235.	ex-IRA
236.	ex-Illinois
237.	ex-KBG
238.	ex-Kmart
239.	ex-Levi Strauss
240.	ex-Lincoln Memorial University
241.	ex-Madagascar
242.	ex-Metallica\
243.	ex-Missouri
244.	ex-NASA
245.	ex-NASCAR

- 246. ex-New York
- 247. ex-Nokia
- 248. ex-Obama
- 249. ex-Oregon Ducks
- 250. ex-Philippine
- 251. ex-Pittsburgh Steelers
- 252. ex-Reagan
- 253. ex-Rolling Stone
- 254. ex-Seattle
- 255. ex-Soviet Union
- 256. ex-Texas Southern University Ocean of Soul
- 257. ex-Trump
- 258. ex-UCLA
- 259. ex-Utah
- 260. ex-Vietnam
- 261. ex-Virginia
- 262. ex-Watergate
- 263. ex-White House
- 264. ex-West Berlin
- 265. ex-Yale
- 266. ex-YouTube
- 267. ex-Yugoslavia

Section 5.3.3

proto- + proper noun/name

- 268. proto-America
- 269. proto-Andy Dwyer
- 270. proto-Austin
- 271. proto-Baroque
- 272. proto-Conan
- 273. proto-Disney
- 274. proto-Dubai
- 275. proto-Earth
- 276. proto-Hubert Selby
- 277. proto-Indiana Jones
- 278. proto-Jupiter
- 279. proto-Katie Holmes
- 280. proto-Kinsey Institute
- 281. proto-Magna Carta
- 282. proto-Mercury
- 283. proto-Monopoly
- 284. proto-Neptune
- 285. proto-Piaf
- 286. proto-Stark
- 287. proto-Tea Party
- 288. proto-Trump
- 289. proto-Venus
- 290. proto-Walkman

Section 5.3.4

<i>mid-</i> + proper noun/name	
291.	mid-Adriatic
292.	mid-Africa
293.	mid-America
294.	mid-April
295.	mid-Atlantic
296.	mid-August
297.	mid-Berlin
298.	mid-Brazil
299.	mid-California
300.	mid-Cambridge
301.	mid-Carter
302.	mid-Croatia
303.	mid-Cumberland
304.	mid-December
305.	mid-East
306.	mid-February
307.	mid-Florida
308.	mid-Friday
309.	mid-Georgia
310.	mid-Gulf
311.	mid-Hudson
312.	mid-Indiana
313.	mid-January
314.	mid-June
315.	mid-July
316.	mid-Kansas
317.	mid-Manhattan
318.	mid-March
319.	mid-May
320.	mid-Meadowlands
321.	mid-Mediterranean
322.	mid-Mexico
323.	mid-Michigan
324.	mid-Mississippi
325.	mid-Missouri
326.	mid-Monday
327.	mid-Nile
328.	mid-November
329.	mid-October
330.	mid-Ohio
331.	mid-Pacific
332.	mid-Paleozoic
333.	mid-Queens
334.	mid-Reagan
335.	mid-Saturday
336.	mid-September
337.	mid-Sunday
338.	mid-South
339.	mid-Thursday

- | | |
|------|-------------|
| 340. | mid-Tuesday |
| 341. | mid-Wales |
| 342. | mid-West |

Sections 5.3.5 and 5.3.5.1

<i>out-</i> + proper noun/name

- | | |
|------|-------------------------|
| 343. | out-America |
| 344. | out-Apple-ing |
| 345. | out-Asia |
| 346. | out-Beatles |
| 347. | out-Bond |
| 348. | out-Bridesmaid |
| 349. | out-Bush |
| 350. | out-Christmases |
| 351. | out-CIAing |
| 352. | out-Cosmo |
| 353. | out-David |
| 354. | out-Dynasty |
| 355. | out-Elvis |
| 356. | out-Florida'd |
| 357. | out-Fox |
| 358. | out-French (Connection) |
| 359. | out-Game-of-Thrones |
| 360. | out-Gershwins |
| 361. | out-Google |
| 362. | out-HBO |
| 363. | out-Hitchcock |
| 364. | out-Ikea |
| 365. | out-Jackie Chan |
| 366. | out-Janes |
| 367. | out-Jesus |
| 368. | out-Junes |
| 369. | out-Jupiters |
| 370. | out-Katy |
| 371. | out-MacGyver |
| 372. | out-Maiakovskiing |
| 373. | out-Martha |
| 374. | out-Moneyball |
| 375. | out-Morrison |
| 376. | out-Obama |
| 377. | out-Oprah |
| 378. | out-Ralph |
| 379. | out-Roosevelt |
| 380. | out-Santa |
| 381. | out-Socrates |
| 382. | out-Spocking |
| 383. | out-Texas |
| 384. | out-Tom Sawyer |
| 385. | out-Trumping |
| 386. | out-Yahoo |

Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.1.1

<i>non-</i> + proper noun/name	
387.	non-Alzheimer
388.	non-Amazon
389.	non-Apple
390.	non-Arlington
391.	non-Atlanta
392.	non-Berkson
393.	non-Bond
394.	non-Boston
395.	non-Briton
396.	non-Broadway
397.	non-California
398.	non-Chicago
399.	non-China
400.	non-Christmas
401.	non-Clinton
402.	non-Congress
403.	non-Dean
404.	non-Disney
405.	non-Earth
406.	non-EU
407.	non-Florida
408.	non-FOX News
409.	non-Frank Herbert
410.	non-Gary Beban
411.	non-Gmail
412.	non-GOP
413.	non-Halloween
414.	non-Harrison
415.	non-Hollywood
416.	non-Idaho
417.	non-Jackson
418.	non-Jefferson
419.	non-Katrina
420.	non-Kyoto
421.	non-LeBron
422.	non-Levi
423.	non-Lily White
424.	non-Madonna
425.	non-Maryland
426.	non-Microsoft
427.	non-NASA
428.	non-NATO
429.	non-New York Cit
430.	non-Norton
431.	non-Obama
432.	non-Portland
433.	non-Saturday
434.	non-Shakespeare
435.	non-Thompson

- 436. non-Tuesday
- 437. non-UK
- 438. non-US
- 439. non-Vietnam
- 440. non-Wal-Mart
- 441. non-Warsaw Pact
- 442. non-Washington
- 443. non-York

Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.2.1

<i>un-</i> + proper noun/name	
444.	un-America
445.	un-Apple
446.	un-Barack Obama
447.	un-Berkley
448.	un-Bill Clinton
449.	un-Bush
450.	un-Carter
451.	un-China
452.	un-Clarett
453.	un-Clinton
454.	un-Cola
455.	un-Dean
456.	un-Denver
457.	un-Diana
458.	un-Disney
459.	un-Don Draper
460.	un-Europe
461.	un-Franklin
462.	un-Gore
463.	un-Hamptons
464.	un-Harley
465.	un-Harvard
466.	un-Hollywood
467.	un-Huckabee
468.	un-India
469.	un-Jolly Green Giant
470.	un-L.A.
471.	un-Miley
472.	un-Milwaukee
473.	un-MTV
474.	un-Narnia
475.	un-Nina
476.	un-NY
477.	un-Reese
478.	un-Romney
479.	un-Soviet
480.	un-Trek
481.	un-Washington

Section 5.4.3

<i>anti-</i> + proper noun/name	
482.	anti-Beatles
483.	anti-Budweiser
484.	anti-Coors
485.	anti-Declaration of Independence
486.	anti-Detroit
487.	anti-Everest
488.	anti-FOX
489.	anti-Kobe
490.	anti-Manhattan
491.	anti-Martha
492.	anti-Martha Stewart
493.	anti-New York Times
494.	anti-NFL
495.	anti-Oliver Twist
496.	anti-Paolo
497.	anti-Tyson
498.	anti-Trump

Sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.1.1

<i>mini-</i> + proper noun/name	
499.	mini-Alaska
500.	mini-Alcatraz
501.	mini-Bangladesh
502.	mini-Beyonce
503.	mini-Beatles
504.	mini-Black Hole
505.	mini-Britney
506.	mini-Broadway
507.	mini-Case
508.	mini-Christmas
509.	mini-Davos
510.	mini-Depression
511.	mini-Dubai
512.	mini-Earth
513.	mini-Enlightenment
514.	mini-Europe
515.	mini-Faculty of Arts and Science
516.	mini-Ferris Bueller
517.	mini-Frankenstein
518.	mini-Eiffel Towers
519.	mini-Georgetown
520.	mini-Hollywood
521.	mini-Holocaust
522.	mini-Hudson
523.	mini-Iran
524.	mini-Japan
525.	mini-Jerry Maguire
526.	mini-Jolie

- 527. mini-Kevin Mack
- 528. mini-Lehman
- 529. mini-London
- 530. mini-Lucy
- 531. mini-Manhattan
- 532. mini-Mike Tyson
- 533. mini-Monet
- 534. mini-Mozart
- 535. mini-Neptune
- 536. mini-Olympics
- 537. mini-Parthenon
- 538. mini-Rasputin
- 539. mini-Roman Empire
- 540. mini-Romney
- 541. mini-Silicon Valley
- 542. mini-Singapore
- 543. mini-Stonehenge
- 544. mini-Switzerland
- 545. mini-Texas
- 546. mini-Thanksgiving
- 547. mini-Trump
- 548. mini-United Nations
- 549. mini-Vegas
- 550. mini-Woodstock

Chapter 6

Section 6.2.1

proper noun/name + *-ify*

- 551. Beanify
- 552. Bulgarified
- 553. Bushified
- 554. Disney-ified
- 555. Foxify
- 556. Gap-ified
- 557. Gattify
- 558. Gmailify
- 559. Grinchified
- 560. Iraqify
- 561. Japanified
- 562. Lilliputify
- 563. McCartified
- 564. New York-ified
- 565. Nolan-ify
- 566. Platonified
- 567. Scroogified
- 568. Trekkified
- 569. Trumpified
- 570. Turkified

Sections 6.2.2 and 6.3.3

proper noun/name + <i>-ize</i>	
571.	Apple-ized
572.	Aretha-ize
573.	Argentize
574.	Balkanize
575.	balkanize
576.	Billy Bob-ized
577.	Blitzer-izing
578.	Brazilianized
579.	California-ized
580.	Chanel-ized
581.	Clintonize
582.	Copenhagenize
583.	Denverize
584.	Elvis-izing
585.	Ferberizing
586.	Ferguson-ize
587.	Finlandized
588.	Hitlerize
589.	Hollywoodize
590.	Iraqize
591.	Japanize
592.	Judaize
593.	Kuwaitize
594.	Lebanonizing
595.	Madonna-izing
596.	Manhattanized
597.	Marilynizing
598.	McDonaldizing
599.	Mexicanize
600.	Mississippi-ize
601.	NATO-izing
602.	Oprah-cized
603.	Orientalize
604.	Platonizing
605.	Reaganize
606.	Routledgizing
607.	Saddamizing
608.	Spielberg-ized
609.	Twitterized
610.	Vegas-ized
611.	Venezulaize
612.	Vietnamized
613.	Walmartize
614.	WalMartized
615.	Wal-Martize
616.	Wal-martize
617.	Walt Disney-ized
618.	Windsorized

Section 6.3.1.1

proper noun/name + <i>-ness</i>	
619.	Alan-ness
620.	Alan Thicke-ness
621.	Amanda-ness
622.	Anna Nicole Smith-ness
623.	Austin-ness
624.	Baby-ness
625.	Baldwin-ness
626.	Barryness
627.	Boston-ness
628.	Brooklynness
629.	Cary Grant-ness
630.	Charlieness
631.	Chicagoness
632.	Chicago-ness
633.	Coke-ness
634.	Dannyness
635.	Doctor Who-ness
636.	Donaldness
637.	Fred-ness
638.	Frida-ness
639.	Gaganess
640.	Harleyness
641.	Jaguarness
642.	Jane-ness
643.	Jill-ness
644.	Jobsness
645.	Joe-ness
646.	Kanye-ness
647.	Kateness
648.	Keithness
649.	Kennedyness
650.	Kenya-ness
651.	L.A.-ness
652.	Los Angelesness
653.	Lucyness
654.	Maine-ness
655.	Michael J. Foxness
656.	Mitt-ness
657.	New Yorkness
658.	New York-ness
659.	Octoberness
660.	Off Broadwayness
661.	Ohioness
662.	Romney-ness
663.	Ron Moore-ness
664.	San Franciso-ness
665.	Shakespeareness
666.	Stalin-ness
667.	Sunday-ness

668.	Texas-ness
669.	Thursday-ness
670.	Tommy-ness
671.	Tuesday-ness
672.	Vegasness
673.	WASP-iness

Section 6.3.1.2

proper noun/name + <i>-dom</i>	
674.	Archie-dom
675.	Beatledom
676.	Bravesdom
677.	Gaga-dom
678.	Harry Potterdom
679.	Kirby Smithdom
680.	Lincolndom
681.	Lucydom
682.	Marladom
683.	Marthadom
684.	Marveldom
685.	Rosiedom
686.	Santadom
687.	Smileydom
688.	Stingdom
689.	Yankeedom

Section 6.3.1.3

proper nouns/names in attested occurrences	
690.	Brando-hood
691.	Deaconship
692.	Obamahood
693.	Santahood

Sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.2.1

proper noun/name + <i>-ism</i>	proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>		
694.	Al Goreism	738.	Bonapartist
695.	Byronism	739.	Brennanist
696.	Blair-ism	740.	Calvinist
697.	Bush-ism	741.	Casanovist
698.	Caesarism	742.	Castroist
699.	Calvinism	743.	Cervantist
700.	Cameronism	744.	Darwinist
701.	Carterism	745.	Fidel-ist
702.	Clintonism	746.	Hillary-ist
703.	Denzel Washington-ism	747.	Malcom-X-ist
704.	Don Juanism	748.	Marxist
705.	Francoism	749.	Napoleonist
706.	Forbesism	750.	Platonist

707. Fordism	751. Peronist
708. Freudism	752. Reaganist
709. Gandhism	753. Rousseauist
710. George Wallace-ism	754. Stalinist
711. Gorbachevism	755. Titoist
712. Hillaryism	756. Trotskyist
713. Japonism	757. Trotsky-ist
714. Jesusism	758. Trumpist
715. John Cage-ism	
716. Lewinski-ism	
717. Marxism	
718. McCarthy-ism	
719. Mosesism	
720. Nazism	
721. Obamaism	
722. Peronism	
723. Platonism	
724. Putinism	
725. Putin-ism	
726. Reagan-ism	
727. Robin Hood-ism	
728. Rockefellerism	
729. Romneyism	
730. Rooseveltism	
731. Sinatraism	
732. Stalinism	
733. Thatcherism	
734. Tolstoyism	
735. Titoism	
736. Trump-ism	
737. Uncle Tomism	

Section 6.3.3

proper noun/name + <i>-ite</i>	
759.	Brezhnevite
760.	Clintonite
761.	Gorbachevite
762.	Hotlerite
763.	Nixonite
764.	Obamanite
765.	Paulite
766.	Reaganite
767.	Romneyite
768.	Thatcherite
769.	Trotskyite

Section 6.3.4

proper noun/name + <i>-ese</i>	
770.	Bostonese
771.	Brooklynese

- 772. Chicagoese
- 773. Clintonese
- 774. Harvard-ese
- 775. Hollywoodese
- 776. Jackanese
- 777. Jersey-ese
- 778. John Wayne-ese
- 779. Los Angelese
- 780. Maddie-ese
- 781. Manhattanese
- 782. MBA-ese
- 783. NASA-ese
- 784. New Englandese
- 785. Newsweek-ese
- 786. New Yorkese
- 787. New Zealandese
- 788. Pentagonese
- 789. Starbucks-ese
- 790. Time-ese
- 791. Wall Street-ese
- 792. Washington-ese

Section 6.3.5

proper noun/name + *-(i)ana*

- 793. Americana
- 794. Arizoniana
- 795. Canadiana
- 796. Ceyloniana
- 797. Chauceriana
- 798. Columbiana
- 799. Darwiniana
- 800. Elvisiana
- 801. Encarta Africana
- 802. Europeana
- 803. Freudiana
- 804. Hawaiiiana
- 805. Hitchcockiana
- 806. Hollingworthiana
- 807. Houdiniana
- 808. Johnsoniana
- 809. Lincolniana
- 810. Madisoniana
- 811. Martiniana
- 812. Melvilliana
- 813. Michigana
- 814. Mozartiana
- 815. Nixoniana
- 816. Shakespeariana
- 817. Sherlockiana
- 818. Thompsoniana
- 819. Victoriana

- | |
|---------------------|
| 820. Washingtoniana |
| 821. Woolfiana |

Sections 6.4.1.1 and 6.4.1.4

proper noun/name + <i>-esque</i>

- | |
|---------------------------|
| 822. Apple-esque |
| 823. Apollo-esque |
| 824. Audrey Hepburn-esque |
| 825. Bambi-esque |
| 826. Barney Rubble-esque |
| 827. Basseys-esque |
| 828. Beckett-esque |
| 829. Biden-esque |
| 830. Bono-esque |
| 831. Brooklynesque |
| 832. Clintonesque |
| 833. Clinton-esque |
| 834. Darwin-esque |
| 835. DiCaprio-esque |
| 836. Disneyesque |
| 837. Disney-esque |
| 838. Djokovic-esque |
| 839. Dorothyesque |
| 840. Dublinesque |
| 841. Fellini-esque |
| 842. Garbo-esque |
| 843. Google-esque |
| 844. Goldie-esque |
| 845. Goonies-esque |
| 846. Groundhog-esque |
| 847. Hamletesque |
| 848. Harlem-esque |
| 849. Harry Potteresque |
| 850. Hemingwayesque |
| 851. Hitler-esque |
| 852. Hitleresque |
| 853. Honda-esque |
| 854. Jagger-esque |
| 855. Jim Carrey-esque |
| 856. Katy Perry-esque |
| 857. Lady Gaga-esque |
| 858. MacGyveresque |
| 859. Madonna-esque |
| 860. Malibu-esque |
| 861. Monty Python-esque |
| 862. Mount Vernon-esque |
| 863. MTV-esque |
| 864. Napa-esque |
| 865. Netflix-esque |
| 866. Nixonesque |
| 867. Pushkinesque |

- 868. Rambo-esque
- 869. Reformation-esque
- 870. Reaganesque
- 871. Reagan-esque
- 872. Ripleyesque
- 873. Robin Hood-esque
- 874. Rolls-Royce-esque
- 875. Schwarzenegger-esque
- 876. Sherlock-esque
- 877. Sinatraesque
- 878. Simpsons-esque
- 879. Sopranoesque
- 880. Springsteen-esque
- 881. Stevensonesque
- 882. Tarantinoesque
- 883. Thankgivingsque
- 884. Travoltaesque
- 885. Tudoresque
- 886. Twitteresque
- 887. Vladimir Putin-esque
- 888. Watergate-esque
- 889. Zeppelin-esque

Sections 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.4

proper noun/name + *-ish*

- 890. Aaron Sorkin-ish
- 891. Al Gore-ish
- 892. Amsterdam-ish
- 893. Axl Rose-ish
- 894. Beatles-ish
- 895. Betty Boop-ish
- 896. Brooklyn-ish
- 897. CIA-ish
- 898. December-ish
- 899. Disney-ish
- 900. February-ish
- 901. Frankenstein-ish
- 902. Game of Thrones-ish
- 903. Gap-ish
- 904. George W. Bushish
- 905. Google-ish
- 906. Hampton-ish
- 907. Hollywoodish
- 908. Ikea-ish
- 909. Joan Miro-ish
- 910. Las Vegas-ish
- 911. LeBron-ish
- 912. Martha Stewart-ish
- 913. Meg Ryan-ish
- 914. MIT-ish
- 915. New Yorkish

- 916. Novemberish
- 917. October-ish
- 918. Pennsylvania-ish
- 919. Poe-ish
- 920. Pollyanna-ish
- 921. Rex Harrisonish
- 922. Robinson Crusoe-ish
- 923. Roseanne-ish
- 924. Salinger-ish
- 925. Sinatra-ish
- 926. Star Trek-ish
- 927. Taratino-ish
- 928. Teddy Roosevelt-ish
- 929. Tudor-ish
- 930. Wikipedia-ish

Sections 6.4.1.3 and 6.4.1.4

proper noun/name + *-like*

- 931. Alice-in-Wonderland-like
- 932. Anderson-like
- 933. Aphrodite-like
- 934. Batman-like
- 935. Bonnie-and-Clyde-like
- 936. Broadway-like
- 937. Bronson-like
- 938. Bush-like
- 939. Caravaggio-like
- 940. Cinderella-like
- 941. Clinton-like
- 942. Denver-like
- 943. Disney-like
- 944. Disneyland-like
- 945. Don King-like
- 946. Eden-like
- 947. Emerson-like
- 948. Eminem-like
- 949. England-like
- 950. Fourth of July-like
- 951. Goldilocks-like
- 952. Google-like
- 953. Hamlet-like
- 954. Hemingway-like
- 955. Hepburn-like
- 956. Hitler-like
- 957. Hogwarts-and-Narnia-like
- 958. Holland-like
- 959. Honda-like
- 960. Hudson-like
- 961. Iceland-like
- 962. Iran-like
- 963. Ireland-like

- 964. Jack Nicholson-like
- 965. Jefferson-like
- 966. Jesus-like
- 967. Jetson-like
- 968. Johnnie Cash-like
- 969. Johnson-like
- 970. Kansas-like
- 971. Kyoto-like
- 972. LeBron-like
- 973. Lollapalooza-like
- 974. Mars-like
- 975. Martha Stewart-like
- 976. Matrix-like
- 977. May-like
- 978. Michael Jackson-like
- 979. MIT-like
- 980. Moses-like
- 981. MTV-like
- 982. Netflix-like
- 983. Nirvana-like
- 984. Oprah-like
- 985. Othello-like
- 986. Reagan-like
- 987. Rickey Henderson-like
- 988. Rocky-like
- 989. Samson-like
- 990. Scrooge-like
- 991. Silicon Valley-like
- 992. Simpson-like
- 993. Somalia-like
- 994. Soprano-like
- 995. Still-like
- 996. Tarantino-like
- 997. Tina-like
- 998. Toyota-like
- 999. Vegas-like
- 1000. Watergate-like
- 1001. Yoda-like
- 1002. Yugoslavia-like
- 1003. Zen-like

Section 6.4.2.1

proper noun/name + *-less*

- 1004. Adidas-less
- 1005. Aniston-less
- 1006. Armstrong-less
- 1007. Bobby Hurley-less
- 1008. Brave-less
- 1009. Brian-less
- 1010. Bryce Harper-less
- 1011. Chuck-less

1012.	Cindy-less
1013.	Coppola-less
1014.	Diamondback-less
1015.	Dr. Drew-less
1016.	Dwyane Wade-less
1017.	Eddie Murphy-less
1018.	Emmy-less
1019.	Facebook-less
1020.	Giles-less
1021.	Gina-less
1022.	Google-less
1023.	Griffin-less
1024.	Grinch-less
1025.	Hagar-less
1026.	Jerry-less
1027.	Jordan-less
1028.	Kobe-less
1029.	Kyra-less
1030.	LeBron-less
1031.	Louboutin-less
1032.	Macon-less
1033.	Mariner-less
1034.	Mimi Parker-less
1035.	Nadal-less
1036.	O.J.-less
1037.	Oscar-less
1038.	Owens-less
1039.	Pedro-less
1040.	Ralph-less
1041.	Rooneyless
1042.	Roy-less
1043.	Simon-less
1044.	Spacey-less
1045.	Tiger-less
1046.	Tiger Woods-less
1047.	Trump-less
1048.	Watergate-less
1049.	Wilson-less

Sections 6.4.2.2 and 6.4.2.2.1

proper noun/name + <i>-free</i>	
1050.	Amber Frey-free
1051.	Android-free
1052.	Blackberry-free
1053.	Bobby-free
1054.	Brad-free
1055.	Buffy-free
1056.	Butthead-free
1057.	Cole-free
1058.	Christmas-free
1059.	Deborah-free

1060.	Firefox-free
1061.	Fortnite-free
1062.	Gaddafi-free
1063.	Game of Thrones-free
1064.	Georgia-free
1065.	Halloween-free
1066.	Hezbollah-free
1067.	Hulk-free
1068.	Iran-free
1069.	Isreal-free
1070.	Jenny-free
1071.	Jim Carrey-free
1072.	Justin Bieber-free
1073.	Kevin-free
1074.	Lewinsky-free
1075.	Microsoft-free
1076.	Mike-free
1077.	Monica-free
1078.	Nikon-free
1079.	Nobel-free
1080.	Nokia-Free
1081.	O.J.-free
1082.	Parker-free
1083.	Saddam-free
1084.	Sheldon-free
1085.	Sherry-free
1086.	Sudan-free
1087.	Tebow-free
1088.	Trump-free
1089.	Twinkie-free
1090.	Wal-Mart-free
1091.	Washington-free
1092.	Zach-free

Chapter 7

Section 7.2

prefix + prefix + proper noun/name	
1093.	anti-anti-Muslims
1094.	mini-pseudo-Medici
1095.	non-anti-Trump
1096.	pro-anti-Gamsakhurdia
1097.	proto-demi-Celts
1098.	post-post-Katrina
1099.	post-post-Vietnam
1100.	proto-proto-Nazi

Section 7.3.1

proper noun/name + <i>-ify</i> + <i>-(c)ation</i>	proper noun/name + <i>-ize</i> + <i>-ation</i>
1101. FBI-ification	1112. Afghanistanization

1102. Floridification	1113. Balkanization
1103. Iraqification	1114. Beirutization
1104. Israelification	1115. Bolshevization
1105. Jerryification	1116. Bulagarization
1106. Keurigification	1117. Californization
1107. Mississippification	1118. Carolinization
1108. Nazification	1119. Chechenization
1109. Saddamification	1120. Clintonization
1110. Twitterification	1121. CNN-ization
1111. Turkification	1122. Coca-Colonization
	1123. Disneyization
	1124. Dr. Philization
	1125. Finlandization
	1126. Filipinization
	1127. Flintstonization
	1128. Gabonization
	1129. Gorbachevization
	1130. Hannitization
	1131. Harvardization
	1132. Haussmannization
	1133. Hitlerization
	1134. Hollywoodization
	1135. Iraqization
	1136. Japanization
	1137. Lebanonization
	1138. Los Angeles-ization
	1139. Manhattanization
	1140. McDonaldization
	1141. New Jerseyization
	1142. Oprahization
	1143. Oscarization
	1144. Pakistanization
	1145. Palestinization
	1146. Paris Hiltonization
	1147. Reaganization
	1148. Saudization
	1149. Somalizacion
	1150. Sovietization
	1151. Stalinization
	1152. Vietnamization
	1153. Walmartization
	1154. Wal-Martization
	1155. Washingtonization
	1156. Zuckerization
	1157. Zoey Deschanel-ization

Section 7.3.2

proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i> + <i>-ic</i>
1158. Bolshevistic
1159. Calvinistic
1160. McCarthyistic

1161. Platonistic
1162. Rousseauistic
1163. Spartacistic
1164. Thatcheristic
1165. Tayloristic

Section 7.3.3

proper noun/name + <i>-ish</i> + <i>-ness</i>	proper noun/name + <i>-like</i> + <i>-ness</i>
1166. Drewishness	1171. Christlikeness
1167. Michael Moore-ishness	1172. Christ-likeness
1168. Peter-Panishness	
1169. Waspishness	
1170. Whiggishness	

Section 7.4.1

<i>de-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ify</i>	<i>de-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ize</i>
1173. de-Baathify	1176. de-Ba'athized
1174. de-Maoified	1177. de-balkanizing
1175. de-Nazified	1178. de-Francoized
	1179. de-Harvardizing
	1180. de-Hitlerized
	1181. de-Islamize
	1182. de-McGovernized
	1183. de-Platonizes
	1184. de-Polandized
	1185. de-Robertsonize
	1186. de-Saddamize
	1187. de-Salinger-izing
	1188. de-Stalinize
	1189. de-Stalin-ize
	1190. de-Ursula-ized
	1191. de-Zionized

<i>de-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ify</i> + <i>-(c)ation</i>	<i>de-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ize</i> + <i>-ation</i>
1192. de-Ba'athification	1196. de-Appleization
1193. de-Israelification	1197. de-Clintonization
1194. De-Nazi-fication	1198. de-Gorbachevization
1195. de-twitterification	1199. de-Harvardization
	1200. de-Japanization
	1201. de-Leninization
	1202. de-McDonaldization
	1203. de-Sovietization
	1204. de-Stalinization
	1205. de-Washingtonization

<i>re-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ize</i>
1206. re-Democratize
1207. re-Islamizing
1208. re-Judaizing

1209. re-Sovietizing
1210. re-Stalinizing

Section 7.4.2.1

<i>anti-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ism</i>	<i>pro-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ism</i>
1211. anti-Clintonism	1220. pro-Drawinism
1212. anti-Francoism	1221. pro-Israelism
1213. anti-Machiavellism	1222. pro-Trumpism
1214. anti-Menckenism	
1215. anti-Nicodemism	
1216. anti-Obamaism	
1217. anti-Saddamism	
1218. anti-Stalinism	
1219. anti-Yankeeism	

<i>anti-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>	<i>pro-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>
1223. anti-Buddhist	1235. pro-Marxist
1224. anti-Calvinist	1236. pro-Stalinist
1225. anti-Chamounist	
1226. anti-darwinist	
1227. anti-Kemalist	
1228. anti-Nasserist	
1229. anti-Marxist	
1230. anti-Platonist	
1231. anti-Peronist	
1232. anti-Taylorist	
1233. anti-Thomist	
1234. anti-Unionist	

Section 7.4.2.2

<i>pseudo-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ism</i>	<i>pseudo-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>
1237. pseudo-Marxism	1239. pseudo-Buddhist
1238. pseudo-Washingtonism	1240. pseudo-Marxist
	1241. pseudo-Platonist

Section 7.4.2.3

<i>pre-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>	<i>post-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-ist</i>
1242. pre-Ba'thist	1250. post-Bonapartist
1243. pre-Kemalist	1251. post-Calvinist
1244. pre-Maoist	1252. post-Fordist
1245. pre-Marxist	1253. post-Gaullist
1246. pre-Peronist	1254. post-Kemalist
1247. pre-Reaganist	1255. post-Maoist
1248. pre-Stalinist	1256. post-Marxist
1249. post-Taylorist	1257. post-Nasserist
	1258. post-Stalinist
	1259. post-Taylorist

Section 7.4.2.4

<i>neo- + proper noun/name + -ism</i>	<i>neo- + proper noun/name + -ist</i>
1260. neo-Calvinism	1273. neo-Buddhist
1261. neo-Confucianism	1274. neo-Calvinist
1262. neo-Darwinism	1275. Neo-Confucianist
1263. neo-Garveyism	1276. neo-Darwinist
1264. neo-Lamarckism	1277. neo-Marxist
1265. neo-Marxism	1278. neo-Platonist
1266. neo-McCarthyism	1279. neo-Stalinist
1267. neo-Nazism	1280. neo-Thomist
1268. neo-Platonism	
1269. neo-Putinism	
1270. neo-Stalinism	
1271. neo-Taylorism	
1272. neo-Thomism	

Section 7.4.2.5

<i>anti- + proper noun/name + -ism</i>	<i>anti- + proper noun/name + -ist</i>
1281. anti-Bergsonism	1288. anti-Baathist
1282. anti-Bolshevism	1289. anti-Gaullist
1283. anti-Bushism	1290. anti-Leninist
1284. anti-Gaullism	1291. anti-Stalinist
1285. anti-Marxism	
1286. anti-Peronism	
1287. anti-Robespierism	

Section 7.4.2.6

<i>non- + proper noun/name + -ism</i>	<i>non- + proper noun/name + -ist</i>
1292. non-Calvinism	1295. non-Calvinist
1293. non-Sheilism	1296. non-Leninist
1294. non-Whiggism	1297. non-Marxist
	1298. non-Peronist
	1299. non-Stalinist
	1300. non-Trotskyist

Section 7.4.3

<i>un- + proper noun/name + -esque</i>	<i>un- + proper noun/name + -ish</i>
1301. un-Dombeyesque	1304. un-Clever-ish
1302. unDylanese	1305. un-Disneyish
1303. un-Hollywood-esque	1306. un-Edenish
	1307. un-IBM-ish
	1308. un-Pentagonish
	1309. un-Trek-ish

<i>un- + proper noun/name + -like</i>
1310. un-Apple-like
1311. un-Bertie-like

1312. un-Bo-like
1313. un-Clinton-like
1314. un-Dwight-like
1315. un-Ellis-like
1316. un-Emma-like
1317. un-Ford-like
1318. un-Ghandi-like
1319. un-Gore-like
1320. un-Hamptons-like
1321. un-Harvey-like
1322. un-Hello-Kitty-like
1323. un-Hulk-like
1324. un-Ichiro-like
1325. un-Karl-Farbman-like
1326. un-Kennedy-like
1327. un-Kobe-like
1328. un-Lola-like
1329. un-Mac-like
1330. un-Maine-like
1331. un-Marino-like
1332. un-Mary Poppins-like
1333. un-Mercedes-like
1334. un-Mina-like
1335. un-Murphy-like
1336. un-NASA-like
1337. un-Parker-like
1338. un-Pinceton-like
1339. un-Ray-like
1340. un-Romney-like
1341. un-Sam-like
1342. un-Sammy-like
1343. un-Thoreau-like
1344. un-Toyota-like
1345. un-Vegas-like
1346. un-Walter-like
1347. un-Washington-like

non- + proper noun/name + <i>-esque</i>	<i>non-</i> + proper noun/name + <i>-like</i>
1348. non-Hestonesque	1352. non-Earth-like
1349. non-Kafkaesque	1353. non-Marslike
1350. non-Motownesque	1354. non-McNamara-like
1351. non-Thomasesque	

Chapter 8

Sections 8.2.1

proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb
1355. Bridget Jones-ing
1356. Don Juaning
1357. Facebook-ing
1358. FedEx-ing

1359. Hollywooding
1360. Internetting
1361. James Dean-ing
1362. Joan-of-Arc-ing
1363. MacGyver-ing
1364. Microsoft-ing
1365. Napster-ing
1366. Pay Paul-ing
1367. Santa-ing
1368. Shaq-ed
1369. Steamboat Willied
1370. Steve Jobs-ing
1371. Thelma and Louise-ing
1372. TiVo-ed
1373. Winston Churchilling

Section 8.2.2

proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb	proper noun/name + <i>-ify/-ize</i>
1374. g mailing	1377. Gmailify
1375. Hollywooding	1378. Hollywoodize
1376. Scrooging	1379. Scroogified

Section 8.3.1

proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb
1380. Ann Coulter
1381. Clooney-ed
1382. Lassie-ing
1383. Louing

Section 8.3.2

proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb + up	proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb + out
1384. Bible-ing up	1388. Mt. Rainer-ed out
1385. MacGyver-ing up	1389. Miramax-ed out
1386. Pollyanna-ing up	1390. Seinfeld-ed out
1387. Rambo-ed up	1391. Stones-ed out

Section 8.3.3

proper noun/name as a denominal conversion verb + your + way
1392. Biden-ing your way
1393. Feng Shui-ed your way
1394. Travolta'ed your way

Chapter 9

Section 9.2

proper noun/name + area	proper noun/name + era
1395. Atlanta-area	1434. Apollo-era
1396. Austin-area	1435. Bush-era
1397. Baltimore-area	1436. Carter-era
1398. Boston-area	1437. Clinton-era
1399. Charlotte-area	1438. Cold-War-era
1400. Chicago-area	1439. Confederate-era
1401. Cincinnati-area	1440. Depression-era
1402. Cleveland-area	1441. Eisenhower-era
1403. Dalas-area	1442. Holocaust-era
1404. D.C.-area	1443. Hussein-era
1405. Denver-area	1444. Johnson-era
1406. Detroit-area	1445. Kenendy-era
1407. Houston-area	1446. Mao-era
1408. L.A.-area	1447. McCarthy-era
1409. London-area	1448. Mubarak-era
1410. Los Angeles-area	1449. Nixon-era
1411. Madison-area	1450. Prohibition-era
1412. Memphis-area	1451. Reagan-era
1413. Miami-area	1452. Reformation-era
1414. Miwaukee-area	1453. Renaissance-era
1415. Minneapolis-area	1454. Obama-era
1416. New Orleans-area	1455. Soviet-era
1417. New York-area	1456. Trump-era
1418. NYC-area	1457. Vietnam-era
1419. Omaha-area	1458. Watergate-era
1420. Orlando-area	1459. Weimar-era
1421. Philadelphia-area	1460. WWI-era
1422. Philly-area	
1423. Phoenix-area	
1424. Pittsburgh-area	
1425. Rochester-area	
1426. Sacramento-area	
1427. San Diego-area	
1428. San Francisco-area	
1429. Seattle-area	
1430. Tampa-area	
1431. Toronto-area	
1432. Tucson-area	
1433. Washington-area	

proper noun/name + speak	proper noun/name + style
1461. Bible-speak	1470. Broadway-style
1462. Bush speak	1471. California-style
1463. Clinton speak	1472. Chicago-style
1464. Crayola speak	1473. England-style
1465. Doris-speak	1474. Hollywood style
1466. FBI-speak	1475. Las Vegas style

1467. Goldman-speak	1476. New Orleans-style
1468. Hollywood-speak	1477. New York-style
1469. Jerry-speak	1478. Queen Anne-style
	1479. Renaissance style
	1480. Soviet-style
	1481. Texas-style
	1482. Tudor-style
	1483. US-style
	1484. U.S.-style

proper noun/name + type
1485. Chernobyl-type
1486. Hitler-type
1487. Hollywood-type
1488. IBM-type
1489. James Bond-type
1490. NFL-type
1491. Obama-type
1492. Vietnam-type

Section 9.3.1.1

proper noun/name + appointed	proper noun/name + approved
1493. Beijing-appointed	1515. APA-approved
1494. Bush-appointed	1516. Atkins-approved
1495. Carter-appointed	1517. EPA-approved
1496. China-appointed	1518. FDA-approved
1497. Clinton-appointed	1519. Google-approved
1498. EPA-appointed	1520. MTV-approved
1499. Fox-appointed	1521. NASA-approved
1500. Hynes-appointed	1522. NSF-approved
1501. Islamabad-appointed	1523. Obama-approved
1502. Jackson-appointed	1524. Oprah-approved
1503. Kennedy-appointed	1525. UN-approved
1504. Kremlin-appointed	1526. U.N.-approved
1505. London-appointed	1527. U.S.-approved
1506. McKinley-appointed	1528. Vatican-approved
1507. Moscow-appointed	
1508. Mubarak-appointed	
1509. Obama-appointed	
1510. Reagan-appointed	
1511. UN-appointed	
1512. U.N.-appointed	
1513. US-appointed	
1514. U.S.-appointed	

proper noun/name + backed	proper noun/name + branded
1529. Al Qaeda-backed	1548. Adidas-branded
1530. Bush-backed	1549. Blackberry-branded
1531. CIA-backed	1550. Bentley-branded
1532. Elon Musk-backed	1551. Disney-branded

1533. Iran-backed	1552. Emma-branded
1534. Kremlin-backed	1553. Facebook-branded
1535. Moscow-backed	1554. Google-branded
1536. NRA-backed	1555. Harley-branded
1537. Obama-backed	1556. Harry Potter-branded
1538. Pakistan-backed	1557. Lenovo-branded
1539. Peterson-backed	1558. NFL-branded
1540. Soviet-backed	1559. Nokia-branded
1541. Trump-backed	1560. Oprah-branded
1542. Uganda-backed	1561. Playboy-branded
1543. UN-backed	1562. Starbucks-branded
1544. U.N.-backed	1563. Trump-branded
1545. US-backed	1564. Yahoo-branded
1546. U.S.-backed	
1547. Washington-backed	

proper noun/name + built	proper noun/name + educated
1565. Chrysler-built	1571. Cambridge-educated
1566. Microsoft-built	1572. Cornell-educated
1567. Mitsubishi-built	1573. Dartmouth-educated
1568. Soviet-built	1574. Harvard-educated
1569. US-built	1575. Ivy League-educated
1570. U.S.-built	1576. Ivy-League-educated
	1577. Juilliard-educated
	1578. Kansas-educated
	1579. Minnesota-educated
	1580. MIT-educated
	1581. Oxford-educated
	1582. Paris-educated
	1583. Princeton-educated
	1584. Stanford-educated
	1585. Tokyo-educated
	1586. U.S.-educated
	1587. Yale-educated
	1588. Wharton-educated

proper noun/name + grown	proper noun/name + hosted
1589. Arizona-grown	1607. Africa-hosted
1590. California-grown	1608. Alec Baldwin-hosted
1591. Carolina-grown	1609. CNN-hosted
1592. Colorado-grown	1610. Facebook-hosted
1593. Earth-grown	1611. Google-hosted
1594. Hawaii-grown	1612. Houston-hosted
1595. Holland-grown	1613. Howard Cosell-hosted
1596. Island-grown	1614. Jack Nicklaus-hosted
1597. Iowa-grown	1615. Leno-hosted
1598. Kentucky-grown	1616. Mandel-hosted
1599. Kerala-grown	1617. Neil Patrick Harris-hosted
1600. Maine-grown	1618. Orvis-hosted
1601. Mexico-grown	1619. Ray Benson-hosted
1602. Ohio-grown	1620. Tampa-hosted
1603. Oregon-grown	1621. U.S.-hosted

1604. Texas-grown	
1605. US-grown	
1606. U.S.-grown	

proper noun/name + imposed	proper noun/name + led
1622. Apple-imposed	1635. CIA-led
1623. EU-imposed	1636. FBI-led
1624. FDA-imposed	1637. IMF-led
1625. IMF-imposed	1638. Iran-led
1626. NBA-imposed	1639. Moscow-led
1627. NFL-imposed	1640. NATO-led
1628. Robinson-imposed	1641. Soviet-led
1629. Soviet-imposed	1642. UN-led
1630. UN-imposed	1643. United States-led
1631. U.N.-imposed	1644. US-led
1632. US-imposed	1645. U.S.-led
1633. U.S.-imposed	1646. Yale-led
1634. Washington-imposed	

proper noun/name + made	proper noun/name + ordered
1647. Apple-made	1664. Clinton-ordered
1648. California-made	1665. EU-ordered
1649. China-made	1666. Jordan-ordered
1650. Colorado-made	1667. Kremlin-ordered
1651. Delaware-made	1668. NASA-ordered
1652. Detroit-made	1669. Soviet-ordered
1653. Earth-made	1670. UN-ordered
1654. Georgia-made	1671. U.N.-ordered
1655. LG-made	1672. Wilson-ordered
1656. Michigan-made	
1657. Ohio-made	
1658. Oregon-made	
1659. Soviet-made	
1660. Texas-made	
1661. US-made	
1662. U.S.-made	
1663. Vermont-made	

proper noun/name + produced	proper noun/name + schooled
1673. Bruckheimer-produced	1693. Cambridge-schooled
1674. California-produced	1694. Harvard-schooled
1675. Carolina-produced	1695. Kansas-schooled
1676. China-produced	1696. Oxford-schooled
1677. Disney-produced	1697. Soviet-schooled
1678. Greg Berlanti-produced	1698. U.S.-schooled
1679. Hollywood-produced	
1680. Idris Elba-produced	
1681. Jermaine Dupri-produced	
1682. Judd Apatow-produced	
1683. Mark Ronson-produce	
1684. Monatana-produced	

1685. Pixar-produced	
1686. Quincy Jones-produced	
1687. Ricky Martin-produced	
1688. Steven Spielberg-produced	
1689. Timbaland-produced	
1690. Tom Hanks-produced	
1691. US-produced	
1692. U.S.-produced	

proper noun/name + sponsored	proper noun/name + trained
1699. Adidas-sponsored	1720. America-trained
1700. CIA-sponsored	1721. Berkley-trained
1701. CNN-sponsored	1722. Bologna-trained
1702. EPA-sponsored	1723. Cambridge-trained
1703. FDA-sponsored	1724. Chicago-trained
1704. Kremilin-sponsored	1725. CIA-trained
1705. NASA-sponsored	1726. Harvard-trained
1706. NATO-sponsored	1727. Juilliard-trained
1707. NSF-sponsored	1728. London-trained
1708. Nike-sponsored	1729. MIT-trained
1709. Pakistan-sponsored	1730. Oxford-trained
1710. Pentagon-sponsored	1731. Paris-trained
1711. Reebok-sponsored	1732. Soviet-trained
1712. Soviet-sponsored	1733. Stanford-trained
1713. UN-sponsored	1734. UCLA-trained
1714. U.N.-sponsored	1735. US-trained
1715. UNESCO-sponsored	1736. U.S.-trained
1716. UNICEF-sponsored	1737. Yale-trained
1717. United Nations-sponsored	
1718. US-sponsored	
1719. U.S.-sponsored	

Section 9.3.1.2

proper noun/name + born	proper noun/name + bred
1738. Alabama-born	1762. Arkansas-bred
1739. Atlanta-born	1763. Boston-bred
1740. Boston-born	1764. Bronx-bred
1741. Bronx-born	1765. Brooklyn-bred
1742. Brooklyn-born	1766. California-bred
1743. California-born	1767. Chicago-bred
1744. Chicago-born	1768. Detroit-bred
1745. China-born	1769. Evanston-bred
1746. Connecticut-born	1770. Florida-bred
1747. Dublin-born	1771. Georgia-bred
1748. Georgia-born	1772. Illinois-bred
1749. Indiana-born	1773. Indiana-bred
1750. Kentucky-born	1774. Iowa-bred
1751. London-born	1775. L.A.-bred
1752. Louisiana-born	1776. Kentucky-bred
1753. Mexico-born	1777. Manhattan-bred
1754. Mississippi-born	1778. Maryland-bred

1755. New York-born	1779. Mississippi-bred
1756. Ohio-born	1780. Montana-bred
1757. Philadelphia-born	1781. Nebraska-bred
1758. Somali-born	1782. New Hampshire-bred
1759. Texas-born	1783. New Jersey-bred
1760. US-born	1784. New York-bred
1761. U.S.-born	1785. Pennsylvania-bred
	1786. San Francisco-bred
	1787. Texas-bred
	1788. Virginia-bred
	1789. U.S.-bred

proper noun/name + raised
1790. Bronx-raised
1791. Brooklyn-raised
1792. California-raised
1793. Colorado-raised
1794. Connecticut-raised
1795. Detroit-raised
1796. England-raised
1797. Florida-raised
1798. Georgia-raised
1799. Harlem-raised
1800. Houston-raised
1801. Iowa-raised
1802. Kentucky-raised
1803. Lisbon-raised
1804. London-raised
1805. Massachusetts-raised
1806. Michigan-raised
1807. Milwaukee-raised
1808. New Jersey-raised
1809. New York-raised
1810. San Francisco-raised
1811. Seattle-raised
1812. U.S.-raised

Section 9.3.1.3

proper noun/name + based	proper noun/name + bound
1813. Atlanta-based	1840. America-bound
1814. Austin-based	1841. Baltimore-bound
1815. Baltimore-based	1842. Broadway-bound
1816. Brooklyn-based	1843. Brooklyn-bound
1817. California-based	1844. California-bound
1818. Chicago-based	1845. Chicago-bound
1819. Colorado-based	1846. Detroit-bound
1820. Dalas-based	1847. Europe-bound
1821. D.C.-based	1848. Florida-bound
1822. Denver-based	1849. Gaza-bound
1823. Florida-based	1850. Illinois-bound
1824. London-based	1851. London-bound

1825. Los Angeles-based	1852. Manhattan-bound
1826. Houston-based	1853. Miami-bound
1827. Miami-based	1854. NBA-bound
1828. Minneapolis-based	1855. New York-bound
1829. New Jersey-based	1856. Paris-bound
1830. New York-based	1857. Stanford-bound
1831. Paris-based	1858. UCLA-bound
1832. San Diego-based	1859. US-bound
1833. San Francisco-based	1860. U.S.-bound
1834. Texas-based	
1835. Toronto-based	
1836. US-based	
1837. U.S.-based	
1838. Virginia-based	
1839. Washington-based	

proper noun/name + set
1861. Atlanta-set
1862. Belfast-set
1863. Berlin-set
1864. Colorado-set
1865. London-set
1866. Los Angeles-set
1867. Melbourne-set
1868. New York-set
1869. San Francisco-set
1870. Texas-set
1871. Venice-set
1872. Wyoming-set

Author biography

Tijana Šuković was born in Belgrade in 1987. She obtained a Bachelor's degree in English Language and Literature (2010) at the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, and afterwards a Master's degree (2011). After graduating, she gained work experience in teaching English as a foreign language at primary and secondary schools. She is currently working as an English teacher at Petar Petrović Njegoš Elementary School in Belgrade. During her PhD program, she was appointed by the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, to teach an undergraduate course in Contemporary English Language and to provide lessons in English as a foreign language to the University's staff and faculty outside the English Language and Literature program (2017/18).

She participated in a project carried out by North Dakota State University and the University of Belgrade – Trans-Atlantic and Pacific Project (TAPP): Researching and Writing Grant Proposals (2017/18). Based on this experience, she co-authored a chapter on collaborative writing in an edited volume. She also co-authored a chapter and a paper on morphological creativity with her PhD supervisor Jelena Vujić. She presented her doctoral research findings at academic conferences in Serbia and abroad, including the 13th International Conference on Construction Grammar (2024). Her presentation at the 34th European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information (ESSLLI 2023) received the Honourable Mention for Outstanding Talk. She co-chaired the Language and Logic track of the ESSLLI 2024 conference.

She has always been immersed in the study of English and she is especially thankful for being acknowledged for the feedback she provided on Jelena Vujić's coursebook on morphology and lexicology for the students of English.

Прилог 1.

Изјава о ауторству

Име и презиме аутора Тијана Шуковић

Број досијеа 2016/30065

Изјављујем

да је докторска дисертација под насловом

Proper Nouns as Word-formation Components in English

- резултат сопственог истраживачког рада;
- да дисертација ни у целини ни у деловима није била предложена за стицање дипломе студијских програма других високошколских установа;
- да су резултати коректно наведени и
- да нисам кршила ауторска права и користила интелектуалну својину других лица.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _____

Прилог 2.

Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторског рада

Име и презиме аутора Тијана Шуковић

Број досијеа 2016/30065

Студијски програм Језик, књижевност и култура

Наслов рада Proper Nouns as Word-formation Components in English

Ментор проф. др Јелена Вујић

Изјављујем да је штампана верзија мог докторског рада истоветна електронској верзији коју сам предао/ла ради похрањивања у **Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета у Београду**.

Дозвољавам да се објаве моји лични подаци за добијање академског назива доктора наука, као што су име и презиме, година и место рођења и датум одбране рада.

Ови лични подаци могу се објавити на мрежним страницама дигиталне библиотеке, у електронском каталогу и у публикацијама Универзитета у Београду.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _____

Изјава о коришћењу

Овлашћујем Универзитетску библиотеку „Светозар Марковић“ да у Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета у Београду унесе моју докторску дисертацију под насловом:

Proper Nouns as Word-formation Components in English

која је моје ауторско дело.

Дисертацију са свим прилозима предала сам у електронском формату погодном за трајно архивирање.

Моју докторску дисертацију похрањену у Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду, и доступну у отвореном приступу, могу да користе сви који поштују одредбе садржане у одабраном типу лиценце Креативне заједнице (Creative Commons) за коју сам се одлучила:

1. Ауторство (CC BY)
2. Ауторство – некомерцијално (CC BY-NC)
3. Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада (CC BY-NC-ND)
4. Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима (CC BY-NC-SA)
5. Ауторство – без прерада (CC BY-ND)
6. Ауторство – делити под истим условима (CC BY-SA)

(Молимо да заокружите само једну од шест понуђених лиценци.
Кратак опис лиценце је саставни део ове изјаве.)

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _____

1. **Ауторство.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора и начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце, чак и у комерцијалне сврхе. Ово је најслободнија од свих лиценци.
2. **Ауторство – некомерцијално.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела.
3. **Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, без промена, преобликовања или употребе дела у свом делу, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела. У односу на све остале лиценце, овом лиценцом се ограничава највећи обим права коришћења дела.
4. **Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце и ако се прерада дистрибуира под истом или сличном лиценцом. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела и прерада.
5. **Ауторство – без прерада.** Дозбољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, без промена, преобликовања или употребе дела у свом делу, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела.
6. **Ауторство – делити под истим условима.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора и начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце и ако се прерада дистрибуира под истом или сличном лиценцом. Ова лиценца дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела и прерада. Слична је софтверским лиценцама, односно лиценцама отвореног кода.