

Scare Quotes and Glosses: Indicators of Lexical Innovation with Affixed Derivatives

Mark Kaunisto
University of Jyväskylä

1. Introduction

Out of the variety of processes involved in the formation and use of new words, one perspective that deserves closer attention is the ways in which we express the special nature of the words in question. One might assume that they may not be very systematically applied, and sometimes conveying the notions of novelty may manifest different degrees of explicitness or subtlety. Some characteristic features relating to the issue can be observed in the following example, found in the written section of the *British National Corpus* (BNC):

- (1) But did you find that the overall thing is an obsession with speed. I mean, you are aware that we now have “Satriani-esque” in the language! (BNC, C9K 140)

This short extract from an article originally published in the *Guitarist* magazine includes a number of explicit markers which are indicative of the status of the word *Satriani-esque* as a neologism. Firstly, we have an overt metalinguistic reference to the novelty of the word (*we now have . . . in the language*). In addition, quotation marks surround the word, separating it from the rest of the text. Thirdly, we may also assume that the use of the hyphen between the base of the new word (the last name of the guitarist) and the suffix *-esque* is deliberate, added in order to help the reader interpret the individual elements that the word is made up of. Finally, the meaning of the word, ‘a style of playing guitar very fast’ is made clear by the phrase *an obsession with speed* in the first sentence.

Perhaps the most notable earlier study on the issue, exploring the different types of accompanying markers which provide clues to the interpretation of neologisms in general, is that of Renouf and Bauer (2000). One of their preliminary hypotheses when examining the occurrence of such markers was that there might be a perceivable connection between the type of word-formational process of the new word and the kind of additional assistance provided to the reader. In other words, they were interested in finding out whether, for example, new compound words are more prone to be presented inside quotation marks, while instances of acronyms could perhaps be more likely accompanied by a gloss. As Renouf and Bauer observe in their article, they did not find any clear connection between the types of assisting marker and the type of word-formational process used, but instead turned their attention to the characteristics of the different types of markers or “clues” themselves.

The present paper returns to the preliminary goals of Renouf and Bauer’s study but with a slightly different focus. Instead of comparing between word-formational processes, attention is drawn to affixation, or, more narrowly to suffixation: is it possible that some suffixes in new words are more likely to trigger the use of an accompanying “novelty marker”? For example, does the suffix *-esque*, as seen in *Satriani-esque* in example (1), stand out from other suffixes as regards how often quotation marks, glosses, or hyphens are typically used together with words ending with this suffix? This study examines the uses of additional markers of novelty among the so-called *hapax legomena* of words with ten different suffixes in the 90-million-word written section of the *British National Corpus*. The aim is to observe whether any differences can be perceived in the use of such markers between the suffixes selected for closer study, and whether the findings provide us with further insights into the nature of the individual suffixes themselves.

2. Background

One observation on the connection between neologisms and more or less explicit expressions pointing to the status of the words as new items was made by Baayen and Neijt (1997), who, upon examining hapax legomena (words occurring only once in the data) in a Dutch corpus, noted a perceivable tendency for words with the Dutch suffix *-heid* to have some kind of “contextual anchoring”. The very idea for examining hapax legomena (or “hapaxes” for short) stems from studies such as Baayen and Lieber (1991) and Baayen (1993), which observed the connection between the number of hapaxes of different word-formational processes in corpus data and the morphological productivity of those processes and patterns. Although hapaxes in corpora are not necessarily always genuine neologisms, but may also include words that are just rare or even becoming obsolete, it has been suggested that the numbers of hapaxes could be regarded as one measurement of productivity of a word-formational process.

In their study, Renouf and Bauer (2000) examined altogether 4,760 neologisms from the 1988–1999 issues of the British newspaper *The Independent*, and observed the different types of overt and covert ways of assisting readers interpret the meaning of the words. The characteristics of each type were then discussed, along with general assessments of their relative frequency in the data. The overt “clues” singled out in their study included quotation marks, introductory or following phrases (expressions such as *so-called*, *what he terms as*, etc.), and glosses, while covert help is provided by a variety of means, such as collocation, the repetition of the root, base, or the entire word in the surrounding context, and the co-occurrence of semantically similar words. In this paper, the focus is on the occurrence of overt, more or less explicit clues which reflect a degree of conscious effort on the part of the author to highlight the special nature of the new word in question.

It is important to note that different types of markers or clues occurring with new words do not necessarily have exactly similar functions. As Renouf and Bauer (2000: 236) note, quotation marks can act as a marker to indicate novelty, conveying the notion of “a probable need to look to the context to interpret the meaning of the signalled word”. Quotation marks would then have a slightly different function from glosses, which, while marking newness, also provide the needed paraphrase or definition outright. Renouf and Bauer also make a point on the ambiguity of quotation marks, and the problematic task of objectively assessing the rationale behind their use in individual cases—in addition to novelty, “scare quotes”, as they are also called, may be used to signal formal awkwardness or to simply quote a third party. For example, different motivations for the use of quotation marks can be perceived in the following instances of the word *blurb*:

- (2) Your statement as to the editorial in the Atlanta Journal is unbelievable as it is beyond my imagination to visualize an editor so rash as to publish an advertising “Blurb” in his editorials. (*Time*, Oct 4, 1926)
- (3) The “blurb” before the main articles [of European Community Treaties] has consistently been thought by the British to be too “general” and without sufficient specific meaning to merit much attention. (BNC, H91 10)

Considering example (2), in 1926 the word *blurb* had been used in the language for less than twenty years, and it is conceivable that the use of quotation marks was at least partly motivated by the sheer novelty of the word (which is further supported by the occurrence of the explanatory modifier *advertising*). As for example (3), dating from 1992, it is possible that the quotation marks were used because of the new semantic extension in the use of the word, or because the word was still considered somewhat odd, regardless of its actual age.

As regards the overt techniques of expressing lexical novelty (or, arguably, other special characteristics of words that warrant drawing particular attention to them), there are some indicators that Renouf and Bauer (2000) do not discuss at all, namely, separating the base and the affix with a hyphen and italicisation. A number of practical considerations when examining corpus data may make these types of markers more difficult to examine, but their role alongside other types cannot be denied.

With new derivative coinages, the inclusion of a hyphen between the base and the affix may be regarded as a subtle way to assist the reader in interpreting the constituent parts of the word, as observed in connection with example (1) above. Additional factors worth pointing out can be noted in the following example:

- (4) Even during the height of his post-convention surge-let, Bush's numbers didn't much improve in Michigan, and there's no reason to believe he's likely to do better in Michigan than any of several other battleground states, such as MN, WI, OH, PA, FL, etc. (*Daily Kos* web site; Sept. 22, 2004¹)

As regards the potential benefits of hyphenation in the word *surge-let* in example (4), it is possible that without the hyphen, it might take the reader more time to interpret *-let* as a diminutive suffix. It is furthermore important to note that the above example was found on a web site, with the word occurring in its entirety at the middle of the line, which means that the inclusion of the hyphen was most likely a conscious decision made by the author rather than an automatic addition by the word-processing or desktop publishing software to optimise the typographical alignment. Indeed, this factor is slightly problematic when considering the analysis of electronic editions of originally printed data (and it might explain why Renouf and Bauer (2000) did not include hyphenation in their discussion): how well are such typographical matters represented in electronic editions? Similar considerations arguably also hold for italicisation; italics are known to be used when introducing new terms, but it is again possible that italics are not always faithfully reproduced (or even indicated by means of tags) when converting written data from one format to another.

Another, albeit marginal, type of a potential novelty marker includes cases which in some way indicate hesitation, and may have a function comparable to quotation marks. Such instances are probably rare, and characteristic of informal style of writing, resembling speech, as in example (5) below:

- (5) In the lastability stakes, Puzznic is, erm, lastable -- with 144 screens covering 36 stages you won't be contemplating it in a hurry! (BNC, EB6 2276)²

Renouf and Bauer (2000: 254) found that contrary to their expectations, contextual anchoring was relatively rare in their collection of neologisms, with approximately 2.5% of the new words being accompanied by some kind of overt or covert help. In similar fashion, it is the lack of such markers rather than their occurrence that has been considered characteristic of individual word-formational processes. For example, Lehrer (2007: 115) has noted that blend words "are typically presented without glosses or explanations". However, as pointed out, the occurrences of such items have not been examined in connection with suffixes. The following section will discuss the practical steps taken to study the issue in greater detail.

3. The setup of the empirical analysis

In order to examine the issue further in connection with suffixation, hapaxes ending with ten suffixes were studied in the 90-million-word written section of the BNC.³ The suffixes selected for closer analysis were *-ability*, *-able/-ible*, *-dom*, *-ee*, *-esque*, *-hood*, *-ification*, *-less*, *-let*, and *-wise*. The ten items here represent different types of suffixes in terms of their etymological origin, morphological structure and function, degree of formality, and productivity. Single-occurrence words ending with

¹ <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2004/09/22/52702/-Is-Michigan-a-Lock-ACT-Closing-Shop-Moving-Staff-to-Ohio-and-Florida>; retrieved on Sept. 22, 2004.

² Renouf and Bauer (2000: 238) found one instance of this type in their data, which they categorised as an introductory phrase.

³ Although the present study focuses on suffixation, an examination of the use of assisting clues with prefixed derivatives would naturally be of interest as well. As noted by Adams (1973: 161), prefixes in general show less variation than suffixes with regard to their basic semantic features, and suffixes furthermore have a stronger tendency to be influenced by their bases. It is nevertheless possible that differences between prefixes could be perceived as regards how frequently new formations occur inside quotation marks or other similar markers.

these suffixes were retrieved by using the lemma frequency search option in the *BNCweb* interface (developed at the University of Zürich),⁴ and the surrounding context of the words was examined separately. In cases which required viewing the word in a context larger than that provided by *BNCweb*, searches were also made with *BYU-BNC* (at <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc>), another online search program for the BNC (created by Mark Davies at Brigham Young University). What was observed in the analysis of each suffix was the types of markers used with the hapaxes, as well as the overall proportion of markers used in relation to the total number of hapaxes ending with the suffix. Of the overt types of markers described in the previous section, the use of italics could not be examined, as typeface information on the original texts is not provided by either of the corpus interfaces used for the present study. Instead, the types of markers primarily noted were quotation marks, introductory or following phrases, hyphens, and hesitation markers.

The total number of relevant hapaxes analysed was 929. It is worth noting that the initial lists of single-occurrence lemmas with a specific ending, produced as search results, require a great deal of post-processing to exclude the numerous irrelevant cases such as typographical errors, spelling variants (of which hyphenation causes several false hits), and items occurring in quoted passages. The latter cases are problematic considering that a pair of quotation marks is one type of the markers examined. For the study, all those hapaxes were categorically excluded from the analysis if they occurred in a clause-length (or longer) quotation; as for quotation marks around a single word, the instances were excluded if the context specifically suggested that a third-party source was being cited. In some instances, what appeared to be a hyphen was actually a dash, resulting in another false hit, as in example (6), where *murder-let* is not, after all, a word for ‘a small murder’ (if such a word is even conceivable):

- (6) Marek’s suggestion, and I assume it is Marek’s, that I discussed Graham’s murder-let alone confessed to it -- when I was with Tatyana that night is total lunacy. (BNC, G15 2000)

4. Results of the corpus study

Before presenting the results of the analysis of hapaxes ending with each individual suffix, some general observations can be made. Renouf and Bauer (2000) observed that different types of overt or covert anchoring often occur together. This was also seen among the hapaxes found in the BNC, with example (1) being a good illustration of the tendency. A notable difference was found in the overall numbers of markers found: out of the 929 hapaxes, as many as 157 had at least some kind of an overt marker suggesting the special nature of the word, i.e., 16.9% of the hapaxes. As such, this might lead one to conclude that suffixed derivatives are more prone to receive “contextual anchoring” than all types of neologisms analysed together. However, there are notable differences between the research conducted by Renouf and Bauer and the present study which must be taken into consideration and which make the direct comparison of the results less than straightforward. Firstly, because of the more meticulous methods used in compiling the 4,760 items for their analysis, the words in Renouf and Bauer’s study could more likely be regarded as genuine neologisms, whereas the hapaxes in the BNC might also include words that are just rare. Secondly, the present analysis also included hyphenation as one type of marker, which significantly increases the percentage of cases with marking – there were as many as 117 hyphenated cases (12.3%) out of all the hapaxes analysed.⁵ Thirdly, one could argue that

⁴ For further information on *BNCweb*, see <http://homepage.mac.com/bncweb/manual/bncwebman-home.htm>.

⁵ The number of hapaxes involving other types of markers than hyphenation was 44, that is, 4.7% of all the hapaxes analysed. Compared to the observations of Renouf and Bauer (2000), one interesting feature was the low number of glosses in the BNC data (2). The instances categorised as glosses here only include direct glosses, i.e., instances where the meaning of the word is indicated before or after the glossed word (e.g., *Machiavellian, characterised by duplicity*). Renouf and Bauer (2000: 240) examine the notion of the gloss more broadly, noting that “the borders of what should count as a gloss are far from clear”. They further discuss a variety of cases which they characterise as “deviations from the direct gloss” (e.g., giving a superordinate term for the word, or providing a specifying example), which help one to interpret the meaning of the word in question. On the other hand, it is also possible that the low number of glosses found in the examined data is simply a reflection of the semantic transparency of the suffixes, or the fact that many of the hapaxes were just rare words instead of actual neologisms.

the differences in the nature of the materials studied could affect the results as well: Renouf and Bauer examined newspaper data, whereas the written section of the BNC consists of different types of texts. What further complicates the comparison of the results is that Renouf and Bauer's percentage includes all types of contextual help, overt as well as covert types, whereas the focus here is only on the overt, explicit markers. Considering these factors, it might be reasonable not to draw too far-reaching conclusions between different types of word-formational processes on how likely authors will be to use some kinds of expression to help the reader on how to analyse or approach the new words appropriately. Instead, with respect to the occurrence or non-occurrence of such markers, it is more useful to observe and compare the behaviour of hapaxes ending with different suffixes against each other. The findings for each suffix analysed will be presented in the following sections.

4.1. *-ability*

The status of *-ability* as a suffix deserves some closer attention, as many words ending in *-ability* could be regarded as derivatives from adjective bases ending in *-able*, or they may have been derived directly from a base verb (see also Marchand 1969: 313; *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*; henceforth referred to as OED3, s.v. *-ability*). There could even be cases where it is ultimately difficult to determine the actual sequence(s) in which a noun ending in *-ability* has been coined. For the present study, all relevant hapaxes ending in *-ability* were analysed without further consideration of the coining process; with adjectives ending in *-able/-ible* also being examined in this study, an interesting thing to look into is whether there is any difference as regards the use of novelty markers between these endings. With *-ability* being arguably more complex in structure, one might assume that hapaxes with this ending would be more frequently accompanied by some type of marker than those ending in *-able/-ible*.

Out of a total of 98 relevant hapaxes ending in *-ability*, nine cases (9.2%) had an overt marker. All of these nine cases were presented with quotation marks (e.g., "*feelability*", "*compromiseability*", "*tellability*"), and one instance had the base and suffix separated with a hyphen as well ("*pull-ability*").

4.2. *-able, -ible*

The written section of the BNC included 261 hapaxes ending in *-able* or *-ible*. Of the ten suffixes examined for the study, the number of hapaxes was the highest for this suffix. This correlates with the observations made on the high productivity of the suffix in present-day English (e.g., Bauer 2001: 160). Only 13 instances (5.0%) were presented with an overt marker, the majority of them (9) being quotation marks, as in "*abusable*", "*catalogueable*", "*guessable*", and "*priceable*". Hyphenation was not as prominently used with this suffix, with three out of four hyphenated hapaxes having phrasal verb bases (*get-at-able*, *pick-up-able*, *take-off-able*), and in one instance (*scramble-able*), the reason for the use of the hyphen probably is the similarity between the end of the base and the suffix. One instance, seen in example (5), involved hesitation, while one case was accompanied by an introductory phrase as well as quotation marks (*let us say, "priceable"*). All in all, markers of novelty or explanatory phrases were not very frequent among hapaxes with this suffix.

4.3. *-dom*

The Germanic suffix *-dom*, which has been used in English since the Old English period (and was also used independently as a word), is still used today to produce new words. Marchand (1969: 262–264; see also Adams 2001: 60–62) observes that while the uses of the suffix today mostly relate to the original sense of 'status, realm, and collectivity', some subsenses have also emerged, such as 'referring to the land or world of something' (e.g., *butlerdom*, *flowerdom*) or 'referring to a group of people united by a common interest' (e.g., *footballdom*, *fraternitydom*). In his view, *-dom* as a suffix "is now

very productive, though most of the words are slightly humorous and not exactly recognized as standard vocabulary” (Marchand 1969: 263). The playful and humorous nature of the words is also visible among the 27 hapaxes ending in *-dom* found in the data, including items such as *celebritydom*, *country-squirdom*, *independent labeldom*, *scruffdom*, *slobdom*, and *squatterdom*. This type of vocabulary is probably less frequent in the most formal types of written texts, but very popular in newspaper language where word-play is quite common.

It is interesting to observe that only one hapax (i.e., 3.7% of the cases) in the data was presented with an overt marker. The reason for this could perhaps be found in the overall perceived character of such formations, the original motivation behind the coinage of the words, and the idea of how “a joke” should be best presented. One could argue that if the word is intended to be humorous, explicit markers drawing attention to the special character of the word would only diminish the comic impact of the word. In such instances, achieving the humorous effect would override any concerns about the reader being at all puzzled about the word, as that very possibility is expected to lead to the appreciation of the use of the word. This obviously raises the question of whether this kind of rationale for the non-use of any markers applies to other suffixes as well. While it is, of course, almost impossible to objectively measure the degree of humourousness or playfulness of words, it could be noted that, in contrast, the hapaxes ending in *-able* with no markers were usually rather neutral and pedestrian, e.g., *annotatable*, *compilable*, *farmable*, *pickable*, *sayable*, and *shippable*.

4.4. *-ee*

The search for hapaxes ending with the noun-forming suffix *-ee* resulted in 32 relevant items, e.g., *auditionee*, *awardees*, *dischargee*, *disclosee*, *educatees*, *migraine*, *instructees*. Four instances (12.5%) were presented with quotation marks – “*circumcisees*”, “*decantees*”, “*dilutees*”, “*relocatees*”—with no other overt markers used. Bauer (1983: 244) has observed the “whimsical usage” involved with the formations in *-ee* (the examples cited including *huggee*, *rushee*, and *squeezee*), which again might partly explain the lack of markers used, although among the BNC hapaxes this feature was perhaps not quite as prominent as with the words in *-dom*.

Instead of explicit markers, one type of covert help discussed by Renouf and Bauer (2000) which is very visible among the BNC hapaxes in *-ee* is the repetition of the word base. With this particular suffix, this tendency is emphasised by the fact that very often the words ending in *-ee* appear together with a corresponding noun ending in *-er*, as in “No one among the instructors or instructees at London’s trendy Pineapple Dance studios had heard of these things” (BNC, AK6 1142). It is therefore possible that the semantic transparency enhanced by the nouns in *-er* may further decrease the need to caution the reader in any way when faced with creative formations in *-ee*.

4.5. *-esque*

The adjectival suffix *-esque*, another highly productive suffix in modern English, is typically attached to proper names (examples among the BNC hapaxes including *Bowiesque*, *Chamberlainesque*, *Keatonesque*, *Rembrandtesque*, and *Rubensesque*), but sometimes also used with common noun bases (e.g., *gardenesque*, *hippyesque*, *snoozesque*). The productivity of *-esque* is also reflected in the number of BNC hapaxes, of which there were as many as 111. Overt markers of novelty were found in 25 instances (22.5% of the hapaxes), the most typical marker (in 23 cases) being the hyphen, as in *Jesusesque*, *Lowdenesque*, *Nicoesque*, and *Watersesque*. There does not seem to be any factor that would systematically trigger the use of a hyphen; although hapaxes with bases ending with a vowel often are spelt with a hyphen (e.g., *McCartneyesque*, *Narniaesque*, and *Ramboesque*), similar unhyphenated instances were also found (e.g., *Daleyesque*, *Hockneyesque*, *Ionescoesque*, *Rivieraesque*). Formations with bases ending with the letter *e* were spelt either with a hyphen (e.g., *Caleesque*, *Kylieesque*, *Sylvester Stallonesque*) or without a hyphen, blending the base and the suffix (e.g., *Aeroplanesque*, *Bowiesque*, *Hoddlesque*). What is notable, however, is the relatively large number of hyphenated instances in general, which is in contrast with the examples presented, e.g., in Jespersen (1942), Marchand (1969), Bauer (1983), and Adams (2001), all spelt without a hyphen.

4.6. *-hood*

Going back to Old English, the history of the suffix *-hood* resembles that of *-dom* (both had also been used as independent words). Marchand (1969: 293) notes that “‘nonce-words’ with the meaning ‘status of –’ are fairly frequent” (e.g., *bearhood*, *doghood*, *I-hood*). Adams (2001: 62) makes a distinction between the senses ‘state’ (citing examples such as *tadpole-hood* and *toddlerhood*), and ‘(animate) collectivity’ (e.g., *anthood*, *footmanhood*, *officerhood*), but also mentions the pattern of forming words with *-hood* as “comparatively rarely used” (2001: 8). The written section of the BNC includes 34 hapaxes ending with *-hood*, mostly representing the sense of ‘state’ (e.g., *ghosthood*, *good chaphood*, *only-childhood*, *warriorhood*). Seven instances (20.6%) had an overt marker, which were quotation marks (e.g., “*clienthood*”, “*patienthood*”) or hyphens (e.g., *pet-hood*, *self-hood*). Compared to the hapaxes ending in *-dom*, with which it even shares some semantic characteristics, one can observe that the words in *-hood* appear to be accompanied by some type of marker of novelty, whereas with words ending in *-dom* they are almost resisted, perhaps consciously.

4.7. *-ification*

The suffix *-ification* may be regarded as a subcategory of the suffix *-ation* (e.g., Marchand 1969: 259–260), forming nouns corresponding to verbs in *-ify*. According to OED3, which has a separate entry for the suffix (s.vv. *-fication*, *-ification*), *-ification* finds its origins in the Latin nominal endings attached to verbs in *-ficāre*. However, nouns in *-ification* have been formed without the actual prior existence of an underlying base verb in *-ify*. For example, while OED3 has an entry for the noun *desertification* (*desert* + *-ification*), it does not list *?desertify*. In some cases where both a noun and a verb exist, it may be difficult to say conclusively which word was used first. Notwithstanding potential problems in clearly determining the suffixal status of *-ification*, for the present study nouns ending in *-ification* can nevertheless be regarded as showing a higher degree of structural complexity, against which the use of novelty markers will be observed (cf. the discussion on *-ability* above; see also Adams 2001: 136).

The BNC data examined included 22 hapaxes ending in *-ification*, e.g., *Beattification* (a nonce-word based on the proper name *Beattie*), *Hollywoodification*, *prettification*, and *sandification*, a number of which were actually older, rare words rather than genuinely new formations, which may also have been reflected in the uses of additional markers or disclaimers. In fact, only two hapaxes (9.1%) had such markers, one inside quotation marks and another with an introductory phrase (“Soil erosion by water also increases and there is the possibility of what Sioli describes as sandification”; BNC, B1E 300). The use of overt markers thus does not appear to be a particularly striking feature among the hapaxes with this suffix.

4.8. *-less*

As noted in OED3 (s.v. *-less*), the adjective-forming suffix *-less* is nowadays frequently used to form nonce-words, and the hapaxes in the examined BNC data were likewise numerous, totalling as many as 246. The suffix can be attached to almost any kind of noun, and many of the hapaxes found (e.g., *cricketless*, *electricityless*, *ratless*) will probably not be listed in dictionaries because of the availability and transparency of the process. Overt markers were used with altogether 40 of the hapaxes found (16.3%), of which the majority of instances (33) were hyphenated, as in *bike-less*, *baton-less*, *ego-less*, *kroner-less*, *libido-less*, *pronoun-less*, and *satisfaction-less*. Compared to the hapaxes without a hyphen, no clear reason could be detected for why the hyphen was used or not, but the relatively large number of hyphenated occurrences is nevertheless striking. Another eight hapaxes were presented inside quotation marks (e.g., “*jetless*”, “*narratorless*”, and “*standardless*”), and two were accompanied by introductory or following phrases (with the different types of markers occasionally used in conjunction).

4.9. *-let*

Although one might think that the number of available bases for the diminutive suffix *-let* is considerable, potentially even including all countable nouns, the use of the suffix with available bases has clearly not been all that extensive. The suffix appears to have been used primarily with monosyllabic bases (Adams 2001: 56), as also evidenced by the hapaxes in the data (e.g., *branchlet*, *cracklet*, *flaglet*, *gooselet*, *sonlet*; a two-syllable base was found in *manorlet*). Out of the 28 hapaxes found, overt markers were used in only two instances (“*bulglet*”⁶ and “*maplet*”, representing 7.1% of the cases). It may be that the suffix even in nonce-words is regarded as familiar and unsurprising, and therefore special markers are rarely felt to be necessary.

4.10. *-wise*

In the last fifty years, the suffix *-wise* has seen a considerable rise in popularity, as observed by a number of scholars (e.g., Houghton 1968; Plag, Dalton-Puffer and Baayen 1999), even to the degree that the use of the suffix has met with some prescriptive opposition. In particular, the suffix has become very popular in the sense of ‘with regard to’, as in “Speedwise, the 433S didn’t let us down” (BNC, FT8 753). Such instances of “viewpoint adverbs”, as termed by Dalton-Puffer and Plag (2000), can be distinguished from the use of the suffix in manner adverbs, referring to a style, manner, or direction (e.g., *clockwise*, *breadthwise*, *altarwise*).

As for the hapaxes in the written corpus, the use of overt markers with adverbs ending in *-wise* was markedly different from all the other suffixes examined. Focusing on viewpoint adverbs, out of the 69 hapaxes found, the majority (54 instances; 78.3%) had an overt marker, which was in almost all cases (52) a hyphen. Typical examples of hyphenated adverbs of this type include *bass-wise*, *hygiene-wise*, *laughter-wise*, and *personality-wise*, suggesting no clear formal or notional reason for the use of the hyphen when comparing them to unhyphenated instances (e.g., *beachwise*, *formatwise*, *profitwise*, *public imagewise*). In addition to viewpoint adverbs, some manner adverbs in *-wise* were found among the hapaxes, but they were much fewer in number, including both hyphenated cases (e.g., *crocodile-wise*, *turban-wise*) and unhyphenated (e.g., *altarwise*, *sarongwise*, *seamwise*).

The suffix *-wise* has recently been the subject of a number of studies, some of which also touch upon the focus of the present study. The tendency for using a hyphen with hapaxes ending in *-wise* has also been noted by Sicherl (2009: 173), who sees the use of a hyphen as indicating a sense of “uneasiness” felt by the author. Another interesting finding is also made by Cowie (2006), who examined the uses of hapaxes in *-wise* in different sections of the BNC: in spoken language sections of the corpus, a number of hesitations were observed before the hapaxes, which could be regarded as indicators of novelty, as discussed earlier. Together with the results of the present analysis, these findings suggest that hyphenation is a prominent feature among the use of the suffixes in *-wise*, which has particular emphasis when the suffix is used to coin new words.

5. Summary of the findings

Considering the analyses of the ten suffixes with regard to the use of overt markers or instances of contextual anchoring among hapax legomena, one immediate observation that can be made is the heterogeneity between the suffixes, as presented in Table 1 below. Although the study by Renouf and Bauer (2000) showed no evident differences in this respect between different types of word-formational processes, based on the findings here it appears that the choice of the suffix may have some repercussions on the context in which the word is used; e.g., giving rise to the use of quotation marks. The endings differ notably also as regards the use of a hyphen between the base and the suffix: with hapaxes in *-esque*, *-less*, and *-wise*, hyphenation is very frequent, whereas with the other suffixes

⁶ It is worth mentioning that the expected spelling of this word is *bulgelet*; however, the single occurrence of *bulglet* found in the corpus did constitute a hapax, as no alternatively spelled instances were found of the word.

hyphens were rarely used. Considering other types of markers, differences can also be seen between the suffixes in the use of quotation marks, where, for example, *-hood* and *-dom* show an interesting contrast, the words in *-dom* seldom being presented with scare quotes, although further examination with a larger set of material might shed more light on the matter. Another point worth mentioning is the relative rarity of glosses and introductory or following phrases in the data. It is possible that the text type or register might have an influence on this.

Table 1. The types of contextual anchoring used with hapaxes in the BNC.

suffix	hapaxes, total	hapaxes with a novelty marker	quotation marks	glosses	introductory or following phrases	hyphens	others
<i>-ability</i>	98	9 (9.2%)	9	-	-	1	-
<i>-able/-ible</i>	261	13 (5.0%)	9	-	1	4	1
<i>-dom</i>	27	1 (3.7%)	1	-	1	-	-
<i>-ee</i>	32	4 (12.5%)	4	-	-	-	-
<i>-esque</i>	111	25 (22.5%)	3	2	2	23	-
<i>-hood</i>	34	7 (20.6%)	4	-	-	4	-
<i>-ification</i>	22	2 (9.1%)	1	-	1	-	-
<i>-less</i>	246	40 (16.3%)	8	-	2	33	-
<i>-let</i>	28	2 (7.1%)	2	-	-	-	-
<i>-wise</i>	69	54 (78.3%)	1	-	1	52	-

The examination of the suffixes also suggests that the different characteristics of the suffixes may play a role in how words ending in these suffixes are treated by the authors. Some features that suggest themselves are the perceived complexity or level of formality of the suffix, which likewise deserve further research in the future. Suffixes with a large number of hapaxes did not necessarily show similarities in the uses of novelty markers: for example, although the numbers of hapaxes in *-able* and *-less* were roughly equal, the use of a hyphen with words in *-able* was nowhere as common as with words in *-less*.

It was also observed that the hapaxes ending in some suffixes were not, in fact, novel formations at all, and it is possible that the average ages of the hapaxes could vary drastically between different suffixes. An examination of words which could more reliably be regarded as genuine neologisms (as in the study by Renouf and Bauer) would undoubtedly benefit exploring the topic of the present study as well. However, it is unclear how crucial the question of the actual age of the hapaxes in the analysis of the BNC data ultimately is, as there is no way of verifying whether the authors considered the words old or new at the moment they used them.

6. Conclusion

The present study shows that a number of factors potentially influencing the use of overt markers could be postulated, if perhaps not conclusively proven with the set of data examined. However, it was shown that the occurrence of such markers can be regarded as a notable feature of some suffixes in present-day English, as the use of the markers was not uniform with all the suffixes examined. It could be argued that in connection with individual suffixes, the findings on novelty markers could contribute to the sketches usually provided of various elements in textbooks on word-formation.

Further research on a greater number of affixes could provide more insights on the issue, and bring about new perspectives on the transparency of affixes as well as the overall process of introducing new

words into the lexicon. In practice, several aspects could be studied in greater detail, such as the role of the fact that some of affixes may be more transparent because of their existence as independent words (e.g., *able*, *less*, *wise*), as well as the possible effect of genres or registers on the use of novelty markers. Diachronic studies would likewise offer interesting avenues of research. What kind of markers have been typically used in earlier times? Another point of interest would be to look into whether affixes differ as to how long or how stubbornly various markers hang on to new formations; considering that affixes differ in many respects, some neologisms might characteristically take more time to escape the confines of scare quotes, for example.

All in all, it appears that several different factors may have an influence on the use of quotation marks, hyphens, glosses or other markers. Conversely, these markers are interesting to examine as they might be indicative of emerging trends as regards connotations or attitudes towards different suffixes. The trends and fashions in the application of suffixes manifest themselves in complex ways; whereas today the use of words ending in *-wise* and *-esque* might even be associated with a sense of self-indulgence, resulting in the use of a hyphen, the future may see similar trends with words in *-dom* or *-let*.

References

- Adams, Valerie. 1973. *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.
- Adams, Valerie. 2001. *Complex Words in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Baayen, Harald. 1993. "On frequency, transparency and productivity", in *Yearbook of Morphology 1992*, edited by G. Booij and J. van Marle. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 181–208.
- Baayen, R. Harald and Anneke Neijt. 1997. "Productivity in Context: a case study of a Dutch suffix", in *Linguistics*, 35: 565–587.
- Baayen, R. Harald and Rochelle Lieber. 1991. "Productivity and English derivation: a corpus-based study", in *Linguistics*, 29: 801–843.
- Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowie, Claire. 2006. "Economical with the Truth: Register Categories and the Functions of *-wise* Viewpoint Adverbs in the British National Corpus", in *ICAME Journal*, 30: 5–36.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane and Ingo 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", in *Folia Linguistica*, 34: 225–244.
- Houghton, Donald E. 1968. "The Suffix *-wise*", in *American Speech*, 43: 209–215.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part VI. Morphology*. London and Copenhagen: George Allen & Unwin and Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 2007. "Blendalicious", in *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*, edited by Judith Munat. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 115–133.
- Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. 2nd edition, 1st edition 1960. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- OED Online*. June 2012. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oed.com>> (last accessed June 15, 2012). [OED3]
- Plag, Ingo, Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Harald Baayen. 1999. "Morphological Productivity Across Speech and Writing", in *English Language and Linguistics*, 3: 209–228.
- Renouf, Antoinette and Laurie Bauer. 2000. "Contextual Clues to Word-making", in *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 5: 231–258.
- Sicherl, Eva. 2009. "The English Suffix *-Wise* and its Productivity from the Non-Native Speaker Perspective", in *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies*, 7: 168–187.

Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)

edited by R. W. McConchie,
Teo Juvonen, Mark Kaunisto,
Minna Nevala, and Jukka Tyrkkö

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-455-3 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Kaunisto, Mark. 2013. Scare Quotes and Glosses: Indicators of Lexical Innovation with Affixed Derivatives. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3)*, ed. R. W. McConchie et al., 97-106. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2839.