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1. Introduction

One of the characteristic features of human language is that it changes constantly. The world around us is seen and experienced in different ways by every generation. Everything develops and changes, and so does the language, which “does not stand still any more than our other institutions” (Foster 1968, 10). Older generations will notice this, as they are confounded by the unfamiliar ways in which the language is used by their children; equally, the youth will be aware of this, as they find that their parents or grandparents, or even their teachers in school, do not understand (not to mention approve of) their way of using their language.

Language change is caused by various factors, and it occurs among every developing society and community of speakers; in fact, changes in society are mentioned in virtually every major work that is concerned with word-formation or some other aspect of language. In Foster’s words, languages “are powerfully affected by social, political, economic, religious and technical change” (1968, 13). In modern society, where social and technical conditions change rapidly, there is a constant demand in a language for new vocabulary and new expressions (ibid., 10). Algeo adds another dimension to what triggers language change, stating that “language is not limited to the practical values of conceptualization, communication, management, and cooperation. Language is also a field for play and poetry” (1991, 14).

Language allows its users to be creative and invent new words to serve their needs, and some communities or groups of people are more creative than others. Sometimes, words coined and regularly used by an influential or popular group become widely accepted and end up in the lexicon of the language. Other words, however, end up forgotten, being mere nonce formations invented to serve the requirements set by the immediate situation at hand.

According to Ullmann, there are three things that can be done when demand arises to name a new object or an idea: existing elements can be used to form the new word; we can
“borrow” a new term from another language; or, we can use existing words with an altered meaning (1967, 209-10). The first point is the most relevant from the point of view of the present study, as it covers different methods of word-formation available to the speakers: discussion related to word-formation comprises the majority of this thesis. Bauer defines word-formation as “the production of complex forms” (1983, 30), while Lipka prefers to use the term *lexeme-formation*, as this term underlines the fact that word-formation always results in new *lexemes* (*write* ≠ *writer*), and not new *word forms*, which are created by using inflectional affixes (*write* ≠ *writes*) (1990, 75).

Borrowing, which is the second point provided by Ullmann above, is a marginal phenomenon for the present purposes. Altering the meaning of existing words, on the other hand, is definitely worth a closer look, as Ullmann claims that “the possibilities of … semantic change are being fully exploited [as] change of meaning is the simplest, the most discreet and perhaps the most elegant way of keeping pace with the process of civilization” (1967, 210). This phenomenon is discussed later under the heading “semantic shift”, and it is the only process included here that is not considered to represent word-formation in any way.

The present study is concerned with language change on the one hand, focusing on the changes that are taking place in the English vocabulary as used in film journalism, reflecting developments in the world of cinema. In addition, this study is concerned with the means by which the changes become visible in the language, that is the different sources of new vocabulary. According to Lipka, one of the most important functions of word-formation is to condensate information in order to achieve “the economical expression of the communicative needs of the speaker of a language” (1990, 91); this can be extended to include other methods of adding new lexemes in the English language.

It is the purpose of this chapter to introduce the present study, by discussing the background of the subject matter and some reasons for undertaking the study, as well as by
introducing the goals that were pursued. In addition, this chapter discusses some subjects that are considered relevant from the point of view of the present study. Chapter 2 takes a closer look at eight selected methods of adding new lexemes to the English language, after which the materials and methods that were employed to conduct the study are discussed in chapter 3. Chapter 4 forms the main part of this thesis, introducing the findings and analyzing them in relation to the theory discussed earlier. This will be followed by comparative discussion on the findings in chapter 5, after which concluding remarks are made in chapter 6.

1.1 Choice of the Topic

Film is undoubtedly one of the most important media in the world. In economical terms it is an enormous one, providing various forms of employment for millions of people. For the creators of films, it is a medium of self-expression, and for the audiences film provides a way to experience sensations, to escape, if you will, from their daily routines for a short period of time. A more selective consumer of films may gain a great deal of knowledge by watching them, learning, for instance, about important issues, other cultures, and history. In this case, the impact of the medium has the potential to be life-defining.

Personally, I have had a long and affectionate relationship with films, which in recent years has indeed become somewhat life-defining: by watching films, I discovered an affinity for East Asian cultures, and specifically for the Chinese language, which not only became a hobby of mine, but has since also become a highly potential provider of a career. In short, cinema has given me a new direction in life. Based on personal experience, I can truly claim that the impact of films on an individual can be enormous. I have thus grounds for stating that studying anything related to this medium is no less important than studying some other fields. As Algeo puts it, “art frequently leads life” (1991, 15).
I read my first issue of *Total Film* (hereafter *TF*), the object of the present study, in 2002. I remember trying different British film magazines, only to end up a loyal reader of *TF* as I found it to be stylistically different from the other options available. I used to read each issue from cover to cover, and I have continued the tradition until this day. It was in the course of my first three years of English studies that I began to become aware that *TF* would serve as an ideal source material for lexicological research (see chapter 3 for a more detailed introduction of the magazine). I began gathering vocabulary for academic purposes, writing an essay for a word-formation course first, and following that one later with a Bachelor’s Thesis. The present study is a further extension of those two studies.

The world of cinema changes constantly, and it goes without saying that the language used to describe the phenomena related to it changes as well. Below, some of the changes are commented upon. Not all of them result in a demand for new vocabulary, but I consider an overview useful nevertheless, as it gives the reader a general idea of the different ways in which such a field – one that effectively combines technology with artistic expression or the desire to entertain – may change.

Although Hollywood has been associated with the lack of originality for a very long time, it is frequently stated that these days, more than ever so, films are produced that are based on existing characters or stories: as a result, sequels, “remakes”, and “reboots” are increasingly common (see 4.9.4). In addition, graphic novels and comic books, and even videogames, are being adapted at an increasing rate, meaning that dozens of films featuring some kinds of superheroes are produced annually. It must be admitted that producing such films makes sense in financial terms: profit on investment is practically guaranteed, as the stories have already been written and commonly a wide fan base exists for the upcoming film.

Digitalization and some technological developments have brought both opportunities and challenges for the film industry. At the turn of the century, DVD was becoming dominant,
overtaking the now obsolete VHS as the standard video format. DVD remains in the leading position, but a newer, improved format is currently in the process of taking over: Blu-ray became the leading “next-generation” format after a short period of competition against another would-be leader, HD-DVD. Both DVD and Blu-ray have provided film studios with an opportunity to profit by rereleasing their old classics on the new platforms.

One major downside of digitalization has been the rise of internet piracy, which is claimed to cost film studios and retailers around the world great amounts of money. A further blow towards the industry dependent on ticket and video sales has been stated to be the improving quality of television drama: during the past ten years or so, television series have become increasingly cinematic, boasting production values and budgets as well as talent in producing, directing, acting, and writing unlike ever before – see the likes of *The Sopranos*, *The Band of Brothers*, *The Wire*, and *24* for reference.

The ace in cinema’s sleeve to counter the abovementioned attacks can be claimed to be 3D technology, which made its breakthrough in 2009 with James Cameron’s *Avatar*, and which has enjoyed a reasonable success ever since, even if many people watching 3D films are still getting their eyes hurt rather than enjoying the experience. It has nevertheless become a new way to lure people into cinemas to experience something they currently cannot experience from their sofas; also, 3D is a problem for pirates, making it impossible for them to reproduce illegal copies of the films by taking their video cameras to screenings. However, 3D technology is developing at a rapid speed as well. This means that, in only a few years’ time, more and more people will be able to enjoy 3D experiences at their homes, perhaps even without having to wear the uncomfortable glasses that are still required in cinemas.
1.2 Aims and Scope of the Present Study

This study is concerned with various techniques of adding new vocabulary into the English language. In chapter 2, eight different techniques are introduced, after which chapter 3 introduces the corpus (comprising 13 issues of *TF*) and the methods employed in undertaking the study. In chapter 4, the findings from the corpus are introduced and discussed from various points of view related to what has been discussed earlier.

Chapter 2 has a very prescriptive flavour to it, discussing how new lexemes in English “should” be created according to writings on word-formation. However, this is a descriptive study, as the major chapter will illustrate what happens in reality. Ideally, the results should support what has been said earlier regarding the different methods, as well as add something new to the theories made, so that this study could help linguistic theory in this field develop and become more up-to-date. The research questions set for the present study are as follows:

1. What sources of new vocabulary are there in the English language? In what ways are they employed in the field of film journalism, more specifically in *Total Film*? What are the most commonly employed and productive sources? Are there sources that are seldom (or never) used?

2. What kinds of new film-related vocabulary occurred in the pages of the 13 issues of *Total Film* examined? Does their formation support the theories presented in earlier literature? Are there any findings that are new?

As regards the scope of any study on neologisms, lexicologists often begin by acknowledging that they are not attempting to provide a “complete” account on the vocabulary of the field they are researching. Language changes constantly, as new words come and go on a daily basis, even more so in fields where things change rapidly and where development in different directions takes place. Bearing this in mind, I also wish to begin by stating that this study is by no means meant to be exhaustive: it is merely one account, a partial record of the vocabulary used in film journalism, as only one of the numerous English-
language film magazines is under scrutiny, and as the resources and time available as regards the corpus were limited to a manual search through one year’s worth of issues of *TF* (note that in addition to film magazines, innumerable other publications regularly provide film news and reviews). The following statement from Barnhart et al (1973, 14) is illuminating and helps to establish a sense of what is being pursued by the present study:

> Any record of a living language is at best a haphazard affair. It must be only a sampling, but if it is a broad sampling it is a mirror of current cultural modes and fancies, of technical achievements and social growth or squalor…

What follows, then, is a sampling of new film-related vocabulary that is far from complete but that nevertheless is a relatively broad one, one that definitely mirrors some of the recent developments and changes as well as technical achievements in the world of cinema. It should be kept in mind that new vocabulary is only part of the aims of this study, another aim being to study the processes through which new words come to being in the English language.

1.3 Earlier Studies on Neologisms and Word-Formation

I connect the study of neologisms (see 1.4.2 for further information) strongly with the study of word-formation, as the origin of new words should, ideally, always be somehow explained. However, there is no necessary connection between the two: an article may list new words without referring to the method involved, while an account of word-formation may employ vocabulary that is no longer “new” to illustrate the different processes available.

Excluding the *International Dictionary of Broadcasting and Film (IDFB)*, which turned out heavily production-oriented and will be discussed later on in this thesis, I could not find works that are specifically concerned with film-related neologisms. Moreover, as I searched through Ayto’s account of a century’s worth of new vocabulary (1999), I found it to be
surprisingly light on film-related vocabulary: there are some strong decades, especially the first three decades of the century when several new film-related words appeared; however, the accounts on the 1980s and the 1990s, for instance, only include three film-related neologisms in total. Nevertheless, in the process of examining the two dictionaries (see chapter 3) used in determining whether certain words should be considered “new”, it was discovered that film-related vocabulary is strongly represented in general dictionaries.

As regards studies of new vocabulary in general, that is words which need not be domain-specific, Algeo represents one of the most well-known continuous studies. His book *Fifty Years among the New Words: A Dictionary of Neologisms* (1991) is based on a semi regular column titled “Among the New Words” in the journal *American Speech* that has since 1941 recorded a wealth of new lexemes that have been formed in the English language. The “newness” of the words included in the column is based on their not being included in the following new-word dictionaries, the combination of which can be considered to provide a wide perspective on English neologisms: *Third Barnhart Dictionary of New English, Longman Register of New Words, New New Words Dictionary, Longman Guardian New Words, 12,000 Words*, and *The Barnhart Dictionary Companion*.

Many of the earlier works on word-formation that are considered prestigious are referred to in this thesis, and a list of references can be found in the bibliography. Linguists who have made a significant contribution to the study of word-formation include, in alphabetical order, Valerie Adams, Laurie Bauer, Otto Jespersen, Leonhard Lipka, Hans Marchand, Ingo Plag, and Randolph Quirk with his co-authors. Needless to say, many others have contributed to the study of this field, some of whose main works focus on other aspects of the English language but also touch upon word-formation; other writers, on the other hand, publish regularly in linguistic journals such as *Language* and *American Speech*. 
1.4 Basic Concepts

The following three sub-sections introduce some basic concepts that are either useful or necessary to address in a study focusing on word-formation and other sources of new vocabulary. The concept of ‘word’ is discussed first, after which some ideas related to neologisms and synonymy are brought up.

1.4.1 The Concept of ‘Word’ in English

Bauer states that in a study concerned with word-formation, two basic assumptions need to be made: “that there are such things as words, and that at least some of them are formed” (1983, 7). Furthermore, he states that if we wish to discuss how new words are formed, we must first know what counts as a word in a given language (ibid., 9). Word-formation and other means of adding new lexemes into the English language are discussed in depth in chapter 2, the concept of ‘word’ itself being addressed here first. This concept may appear very simple, and it is in fact seldom given serious thought by people who are not familiar with the field of linguistics. However, defining a ‘word’ remains one of the issues related to lexicology upon which no consensus has been reached. Moreover, what is considered a word in one language does not necessarily apply in another language.

It is appropriate to begin with Marchand’s statement that word denotes “the smallest independent, indivisible, and meaningful unit of speech, susceptible of transposition in sentences” (1969, 1). Cruse recommends an approach that describes what a prototypical word is like, and gives two crucial attributes:

(i) It can be moved about in the sentence, or at least its position relative to other constituents can be altered by inserting new material.
(ii) It cannot be interrupted or its parts reordered.
Cruse goes on to state that, in writing, words are separated by spaces, and that prototypically words have one lexical root (*govern* is the root in *government*), the alternatives being a “fused root” (*black + board* is the fused root of *blackboard*) and a word not having a lexical root at all (grammatical words such as *the* and *of*) (2000, 87-88).

Adams points out that a word can be morphologically either *simplex* (composed of one constituent) or *complex* (with two or more constituents), and states that in both the order of the constituents is fixed and the words (usually) cannot be interrupted (1973, 7-8). Note that what we are interested in here are *lexemes*, which can be defined as words that have their own dictionary entries (Adams 2001, 1), while *word forms* are the various different (orthographic or phonological) realizations of a lexeme created by using inflectional affixes. Furthermore, the term *grammatical word* is used to further separate word forms, as sometimes grammatically different word forms have identical spellings, as is the case with the singular *sheep* and its plural form, *sheep* (ibid.). Another term related to this subject is *orthographic word*: a compound such as *spaghetti western* is composed of two orthographic words (separated by a space in writing), and yet the compound is a single lexeme.

Plag’s definition of a word includes comments related to sound structure, sentence structure, integrity, and meaning. He describes words as “syntactic atoms” that should always have a part of speech specification. In addition, he states, words should have one main stress and they should be indivisible units. In relation to the latter two conditions, Plag adds in parentheses the word *usually*, pointing out that there are marginal counterexamples to these rules (2003, 5-8). It seems that nearly all conditions given to what is thought to be a word in English can be challenged in at least some ways, but I feel that the points referred to above have helped create a basic knowledge about the elusive concept that a ‘word’ is.
1.4.2 Neologisms and other Related Concepts

Alongside the concept of ‘word’, another term that should be discussed in a study that is concerned with new vocabulary is neologism. CD s.v. defines neologism as ‘a new word, phrase or doctrine; a new use of an established word…’, while the definition given in OED (s.v.) is more restricted: ‘a word or phrase which is new to the language; one which is newly coined’. To support the latter definition, Maurer and Clay treat new lexemes that are the result of semantic shift separately, not regarding them as neologisms: they call existing words that acquire fresh meanings in new situations neosemanticisms (1980, 184). In this thesis, the distinction is acknowledged as well, so that words whose form is new in English are referred to as neologisms, while the products of semantic shift are called neosemanticisms. For the sake of variation (and perhaps clarity as well), however, some more general phrases such as “new word”, “new vocabulary”, and “new lexeme” are used throughout this thesis.

Some attributes given to a new word are given by Bauer, who points out that when using a new word, “speakers are aware of its newness, [being] aware that they are exploiting the productivity of the language system” (1983, 42). An immediate need for a new word may not always exist, and yet one is created. The reasons for this vary, but the following suggestions by Bauer are of interest in the present study: he states that there may be a desire to gain an effect behind such coinage, or the coinage may simply occur due to the limitations in space, as is often the case, for instance, in newspaper headlines (ibid., 43).

According to Bauer, there is a tendency in journalistic language to place new words in inverted commas, or either explain them in the textual context or have them accompanied by a phrase that may soften their impact (such as “what has been called X” or “as it is termed”) (1983, 42). Individual readers will react to new words in different ways: some words may be approved of and later become more widely used, while others will cause disapproval and perhaps end up abandoned and forgotten. Adams points out that new vocabulary may arouse
strong feelings in people who usually do not think about the language very much. She goes on to state, however, that “to protest against lexical innovations is very often to appear ridiculous to later generations” (1973, 1).

There are, however, some factors that push a new word towards a more widespread approval even if the word in question is disapproved of initially. Bauer states that the more influential the person or publication using the word, the more likely it is that the word has a chance to survive. Readers’ attitudes towards the word are naturally crucial, but if we are truly dealing with a new word that fills a newly-arisen lexical gap in the language, the word is more likely to persist and survive (ibid., 43). In time, Bauer adds, a new word becomes accepted by people, so that using it or seeing or hearing it used no longer results in any kinds of “unusual” reactions – the word is thus considered part of the language just as any other word (ibid., 44).

The new words introduced in chapter 4 share certain characteristics with slang words that are, in Fowler’s words, the result of “playing with words and renaming things and actions” by people who wish to “invent new words, or mutilate or misapply the old, for the pleasure of novelty” (1965, s.v. jargon). McArthur states that ‘slang’ as a concept is not an easy one to define, but he does suggest that it includes informal usage and technical jargon, frequently arising within groups that work together (1992, s.v. slang). Several reasons for employing slang words are provided by Partridge, some of which can be applied to TF as well. Here are the reasons that I considered the most suitable, based on my knowledge of the magazine:

[Slang is used] … in playfulness and waggishness; As an exercise in wit and ingenuity or in humour. … To be ‘different’, to be novel. … To enrich the language. … To be on a colloquial level with either one’s audience or one’s subject matter. … To show that one belongs to a certain school, trade, profession or social class… (1970, 6)
The term *stunt* has appeared in many publications. A stunt, according to Marchand, is a neologism “coined for the sheer pleasure of coinage”. He states that stunts are especially common in newspapers, radio, and comic strips, but points out that only seldom does a stunt stand the test of time and become more widely used (1969, 9-10). According to Algeo, a stunt is “a nonce word intended as a joke or a clever display of the coiner’s virtuosity” (1991, 3). A stunt can thus be regarded as a subclass of a similar type of new word, that is *nonce formation*. Bauer defines the term as “a new complex word coined by a speaker/writer on the spur of the moment to cover some immediate need”, and goes on to state that new words are initially nonce formations regardless of what will happen to them in the future (1983, 45). Both Bauer and Algeo state that a nonce formation or a stunt may well enter the lexicon and become established, especially if its formation is regular (i.e. follows some pattern of word-formation) and the entity denoted by it is important enough so that the word becomes used more frequently by different writers or speakers (ibid.).

1.4.3 Synonymy

Synonymy refers to a state where two or more words in one language designate the same concept (Picht and Draskau 1985, 101). Synonymy is of interest in the present study, as a large number of the findings are indeed synonyms (or near synonyms) for already existing, established words known by most readers. Ullmann regards synonymy as an invaluable stylistic resource, stating that “[t]he possibility of choosing between two or more alternatives is fundamental to our modern conception of style” (1967, 151). Picht and Draskau point out that “[i]n general, synonymy is unwelcome in terminology [as it] makes communication more difficult by insinuating non-existent differences [which is] contrary to the basic principles of terminology: unambiguity and transparency of communication” (ibid., 102).
However, in a film magazine, film articles, reviews and other film-related texts provide a context that favours the use of words synonymous to one another: otherwise, certain words and phrases would occur too frequently and make the texts repetitive. The results of Oversteegen and van Wijk’s study support this view: they conclude that using synonyms in a text makes it more attractive, in spite of the fact that a text written using many synonyms may be considered less coherent and not as easy to understand by readers (2003, 150-167).

Most linguists state that there is no such thing as true synonymy, where two or more terms are interchangeable in every conceivable context. According to Cruse, there are *propositional synonyms* that can be used interchangeably without any effect on the “truth-conditional properties” of the sentence; however, these synonyms still feature at least one of the following characteristics that differentiate them from one another: their expressive meanings may be different; they may differ in stylistic level; or, they may be used in different fields of discourse (2000, 157). Fowler adds to the list the elements of frequency of use and the fact that one word may occur more frequently in certain geographical or social regions (1965, s.v. *synonyms*). McArthur contributes to the discussion with the notion of *connotation*, yet another point of view from which synonymy is to be examined: different words in a set of “synonyms” may evoke different reactions in the reader or hearer. Furthermore, he states that the concept of ‘synonymy’ is a challenging one: even if linguists tend to agree that there is no true synonymy, their reasons for arguing so may differ (1992, s.v. *synonym*).

Cruse emphasizes the importance of *field* in relation to synonymy: he states that people working in a certain field have their own area of discourse and are thus likely to use their own technical vocabulary, even if the entities denoted have names in the everyday language. His example is *pyrexia*, which is used by doctors, but which to ordinary speakers is commonly known as a *fever* or a *temperature* (2000, 61). Finally, another concept that is interesting from the point of view of the present study is *hyponymy*. Cruse uses the statements *I saw a reptile*
and *I saw a snake* to illustrate this: neither statement is in theory vaguer than the other, as they may well be used to refer to the same event. However, the latter statement (*snake being a hyponym of reptile*) is much more specific, whereas the former denotes a more inclusive class (ibid., 51). In chapter 4, we will see that hyponymy is a common phenomenon in the field of film journalism: often, when using the existing genre terms is not sufficient for writers, terminology to denote the sub-genres needs to be employed.
2. Selected Sources of New Vocabulary in Present-Day English

I would like to begin this chapter by pointing out that the present study does not cover all the possible sources of new vocabulary in the English language. As regards information concerning some of the further methods not included here, the reader is referred to the various works that are cited in this thesis. The reason for excluding some of the types is that either no new film-related lexemes representing those categories occurred in TF, or if some did, their number was considered far too small. Thus, it was decided that introducing them in the present study would not serve any purpose.

In this chapter, eight sources of new vocabulary in English are introduced. Two methods that involve the combining of existing components are discussed first, as they are commonly said to be the most productive types in present-day English (see, for instance, Algeo 1991, 4-5): affixation (2.1) involves the attachment of an affix into a base word, while compounding (2.2) is a process where two or more base words are combined to form a new lexeme. These are followed by a conversion (2.3), which is a process similar to affixation, the major difference being that the morpheme added is a “zero affix”; the section also includes notes on partial conversion and syntactic processes. The subsequent three sections introduce clipping (2.4), blending (2.5), and abbreviation (2.6), each of which involves the omitting of parts of the original word(s) in order to form a new lexeme. Analogical formation is discussed next (2.7), after which this chapter will end with the introduction of semantic shift (2.8), which is not considered to belong to the domain of word-formation, but which nevertheless is an important, productive source of new vocabulary in English.

2.1 Affixation

*Affixation* is a term used to refer to a process where a new word is derived from a base word by attaching an affix to it (for instance, *paint* + *-er* ⇒ *painter*). Some writers prefer the term
derivation, but there is a tendency to use the more specific affixation in relation to this method of word-formation. One reason for this is that there are further types of derivation where nothing “concrete” is actually added to the base word (see 2.3 about conversion, also known as zero-derivation). I decided to use the term affixation in this thesis as well, while the term derivative will be used to denote words that are the result of affixation.

According to Bauer, affixes are “bound morphs which do not realize unanalysable lexemes”. There are three kinds of affixes: a prefix is added before a base (order ÷ preorder), an infix inside a base (hallelujah ÷ halle-bloody-lujah), and a suffix in the end of a base (kill ÷ killer). Bauer states that the use of infixes is extremely rare in English, but prefixation and suffixation are used frequently (1983, 18). The three types are discussed separately in the sub-sections below.

Bauer divides affixation into two further types of processes, based on grammatical effects: a class-maintaining process results in a word that belongs to the same part of speech as the base (N king ÷ N kingdom; note, however, that the semantic class of the word changes), while a class-changing process produces a lexeme belonging to a part of speech different from that of the base (N king ÷ -ly ÷ ADJ kingly). According to Bauer, prefixation is commonly a class-maintaining process, while suffixation tends to have a class-changing effect (1983, 31).

2.1.1 Prefixation

As the term suggests, a prefix is added in front of a base. Adams (2001, 41-2) states that the base can be either verbal, adjectival, or nominal, and that the syntagma resulting from the process of adding a prefix usually belongs to the same part of speech as the base word. She goes on to divide prefixes roughly into four categories – ‘locative’ (preabdomen),
‘quantitative’ (dioxide), ‘reversative’ (untie), and ‘negative’ (disloyal) – but points out that these categories sometimes overlap and can be further analyzed.

According to Marchand, a prefix normally functions as a determinant for the base to which it is attached (1969, 129). This implies that prefixes resemble the left-hand member in the modifier–head type of compounds. In addition, Marchand points out that a prefix “can only modify the word to which it is affixed without having any hold on its grammatical position” (ibid., 228). Thus a syntagma formed by using a prefix should represent the same grammatical category as the original base word. This supports the claims by Bauer and Adams, but there is one crucial difference: the latter say that prefixation is commonly or usually a class-maintaining process, while Marchand seems to suggest that the word class always remains the same. In section 4.1.1, evidence is given to show that Marchand’s view is obsolete.

2.1.2 Infixation

Infixation is a rarely used type of affixation in English, and therefore it will only be mentioned briefly here. Michael Adams mentions two interesting aspects about infixed words, pointing out that “they add little or no lexical meaning to the unextended form … [and] they are spoken with pleasure, for the sake of the way they sound, rather than for what they mean”. His examples include absofuckinglutely and fanfuckingtastic (2009, 120-1). For further details, the reader is referred to the various publications on word-formation cited in this thesis.

2.1.3 Suffixation

First of all, it should be pointed out that there is a major category of suffixes that is irrelevant from the point of view of the present study. Inflectional suffixes (such as the plural -s or -ed signifying past tense) will not be discussed here, as they are merely used to inflect words
According to the requirements of their grammatical context. Derivational suffixes, on the other hand, are involved in the creation of new lexemes – they are of primary interest in this section.

According to Matthews, suffixation is the commonest type of affixation, as suffixes are involved in the majority of lexical derivations and inflectional formations (1991, 131). Plag (2003, 86-98) divides suffixes into four categories, based on the different parts of speech of the derivatives formed: nominal (coverage), verbal (solidify), adjectival (fashionable), and adverbial (shortly). According to the list of different suffixes provided by Plag, the nominal type seems to be the largest in number. Nominal suffixes, he states, often derive person nouns and various kinds of abstract nouns from verbs (arrival), adjectives (curiosity), and nouns (kingdom). When it comes to semantics, he points out that practically every suffix can have more than one meaning, and the meanings of different suffixes may overlap (ibid.).

Marchand considers a suffix to be the determinatum, that is the head, of a syntagma (1969, 209). He calls suffixes “categorizers” and divides them into two groups: those which transpose a word into another word class and another semantic class (that is class-changing, if we use Bauer’s terminology), and those which only change the semantic class of the word in question (class-maintaining). Marchand goes on to state that suffixes are semantically and grammatically dominant – as the head is in a compound – determining the meaning and the part of speech of the resulting syntagma; his examples include fatherhood and fatherly. However, Marchand does mention some exceptions that are “based on the underlying theme of appreciation”. In such combinations, the base seems to remain in a dominant position. This is the case for instance in nouns with a diminutive/endearing or pejorative suffix (daddy, booklet, boykin), in adjectives with an approximative suffix (yellowish), and verbs having a diminutive or frequentative suffix (crackle, patter) (1969, 215, 228).
Adams uses the term *hypocoristic* in connection with nouns that have been formed by using a pet suffix such as -ie, -y, -o, or the non-plural -s; sometimes the base is shortened before the addition of such suffix (see also 2.4.1). According to Adams, the use of a hypocoristic noun always signifies some sort of attitude towards the referent – the attitude can be one of affection or familiarity, but also one of contempt. Her examples include *bookie*, *druggy* ‘addict’ (denominal type, animate referent), *baddy*, *toughie*, *weirdo* (de-adjectival, animate), and the inanimate, denominal *nightie* and *thingy* (2001, 58). Rastall states that words with the suffixes -y and -ie (which he considers to be the same suffix, only with different spellings) are “clearly part of the familiar, colloquial or everyday register”. In addition, he mentions that such formations tend to be specialist vocabulary, restricted to specific domains (2005, 24).

2.2 Compounding

Commonly used methods of word-formation tend to be challenging when it comes to their definition, and compounding is not an exception: according to Plag, it is the most productive method of word-formation in English, but also “a field of study where intricate problems abound, numerous issues remain unsolved, and convincing solutions are generally not so easy to find” (2003, 132). Bearing in mind this and the limits imposed by the scope of this study, it was decided that this section will mainly concentrate on those issues related to compounding that are central from the point of view of the findings (discussed in 4.2). This quotation from Marchand (1969, 11) is appropriate for introducing the concept of compounding:

The principle of combining two forms arises from the natural human tendency to see a thing identical with another one already existing and at the same time different from it. If we take the word *steamboat*, for instance, identity is expressed by the basis *boat*, the difference by the word *steam*. *Steamboat* as compared with *boat* is a modified, expanded version of *boat* with its range of usage restricted…
2.2.1 General Definition of Compounding

According to Bauer, a compound lexeme is formed when “two (or more) elements which could potentially be used as stems are combined to form another stem … [and] since each potential stem contains at least one root, a compound must contain at least two roots” (1983, 28). Commonly quoted examples include *blackbird, bookcase, and word-formation*. Bauer goes on to state that words where a compound has undergone a derivational process (such as affixation in *school-masterish*) should not be called compounds (ibid., 29). A compound is in many descriptions defined as a structure where the left-hand constituent acts as a modifier and the right-hand one as a head. Plag analyzes this modifier–head structure, stating that in most cases the former element “somehow motivates” the latter one, and that most of the semantic and syntactic information of the resulting compound (such as the part of speech it represents) comes from the head (2003, 135).

Sometimes the meaning of a compound is not predictable on the basis of the individual words involved in its formation. Matthews illustrates this point with *blackbird*, which denotes a particular species and not just any bird that is black (1991, 82-3). This leads us to one problem concerning compounding: how to decide whether a combination should be treated as a compound (*blackbird*) or simply as a set of words that happen to succeed one another (*black bird*)? Marchand sees compound status as a continuum, pointing out that it is easy to give two examples, such as *blackbird* and *beautiful day* above, that occupy the two ends of the continuum and are thus easy to classify; it is the compounds in the middle of the continuum, he states, that present difficulties (1969, 122). To complicate matters further, Adams says that any attributive–noun combination is a potential compound, and “if it happens to be used often enough”, it will become one (1973, 58).

Compounds are often defined by stating that they consist of two or more *orthographic words*. This, however, is a problematic approach, as compounds can be written in different
ways: *word formation*, *word-formation*, and *wordformation* are all possible formations that refer to the same concept, even if only the first one is actually composed of two orthographic words, with an empty space in between them.

A somewhat more satisfactory criterion is that of stress, or accent. Compounds frequently have primary stress on the first element, as illustrated by Adams’ examples, including *bottleneck*, *wär crime*, and *Súnday school*. According to Adams, however, there are exceptions: in the adjective–noun kind of compounds the placing of the stress varies (*cómmon room*, *common cóld*), and in the participial adjective–noun kind the stress is always on the latter constituent (*minced méat*) (1973, 59). Bauer states that considering a particular stress pattern as a criterion for a compound status is a source of controversy among scholars, and disagrees with any such theories (1983, 102).

Compounds in English are primarily divided into two main categories: nominal compounds, which is by far the most common type, and adjectival compounds. Verbal compounds exist as well, but the type is very rare in English: they are often not recognized as proper compounds; instead, they are seen as being the result of other word-formation processes, such as inversion (*to expand the volume* ‡ *to volume-expand*), conversion (*consumer test* ‡ *to consumer-test*), and back-formation (*globe-trotter* ‡ *to globe-trot*) (examples from Adams 1973, 106-8). Marchand states that pronoun, conjunction, and preposition compounds also exist, albeit in very limited numbers (1969, 30).

Adams (1973 and 2001) has formed rather exhaustive lists of different types of compounding based on the meaning-relation between the constituents involved. However, I am not going to discuss them here, as following such classifications would be complicated by multiple interpretations of many compounds, and because the number of compounds I have gathered is relatively small – more examples would be needed in order to be able to do this successfully. Related to this, however, is Bauer’s point that noun–noun compounds always
involve a “disappearance” of a verb that is found in the underlying sentence, or paraphrase, behind the compound (1983, 159). This means that a noun–noun compound can potentially have an unlimited number of interpretations and meanings. Bauer uses the word police-dog to illustrate this: according to him, the underlying sentence behind this compound could be, for instance, ‘the dog serves the police’, ‘the police use the dog’, ‘the dog works with the police’, or something entirely different (ibid.). Marchand calls the relationship between a compound and its underlying sentence “grammatical deep structure”, and points out that all compounds are explainable like this. His examples of compounds with their underlying sentences include the following:

- **dining room** ‘(we) dine in the room’
- **eating apple** ‘(we) eat the apple’
- **steamboat** ‘steam (operates) the boat’
- **oil well** ‘ the well (yields) oil’ (1969, 55)

Bauer, among many others, provides a useful way to roughly classify compounds based on semantic criteria. The four main types are as follows (1983, 30-1, 203):

- **Endocentric** beehive (beehive is a kind of hive (the most common type))
- **Exocentric** redneck (metaphorical or synecdochic, compound a hyponym of an unexpressed head)
- **Copulative** Austria-Hungary (the two elements are combined, forming the entity denoted by the resulting compound (rare in English))
- **Appositional** maid-servant (maid-servant is a type of maid and a type of servant)

A number of tests regarding compound status have been introduced. However, as Matthews among many others points out, the results of such tests are often contradictory, and may even vary between individual speakers (1991, 99-100). The reader is referred to works by Matthews and Adams for detailed descriptions of such tests.
Synthetic compound is a term used for a compound that has a nominalized verbal element as its head, while the first element serves as an object for the head. Examples given by Plag include *beer drinker, bookseller, and window-cleaning. Plag states that the suffix may have been attached either to the entire compound or only to its right-hand word (2003, 149). Looking at the examples above, it is clear that the suffixes were added to the right-hand word before the compound was formed, as *beer drink, *booksell, or *window-clean are not possible formations. Marchand does not accept synthetic compounds as genuine compounds, calling them “nothing but derivations from a verbal nexus” instead (‘one who makes watches’ + watchmaker). However, he admits that in morphological terms they do meet the conditions of a compound (1969, 15-6).

2.2.2 Other Types of Compounding

Compounds can be formed of nominal phrases by joining the individual words by a hyphen, examples including jack-in-the-box and good-for-nothing. These are usually interpreted as compounds, even if Plag disagrees, calling them instead lexicalized phrases that are memorized holistically by the speakers. His opinion is based on the fact that such formations do not have the modifier–head structure that compounds typically have (2003, 136-7). Adams points out that structures premodifying nouns are often hyphenated (easy-to-read stories) as well, and warns that they should not always be regarded as compounds. Furthermore, a hyphen in an adverb–adjective sequence does not necessarily make it a compound: the adverb in badly-needed, for instance, merely serves as an intensifier (1973, 90).

There are further types of compounding that do not adhere to the principal modifier–head view of a compound: for instance, there may be a reduplicative element in the syntagma. In such cases, the formation is motivated by the phonological features of the words combined. Adams’ illustrations include alliteration, as in twing-twang, and rhyming, as in helter-skelter.
In her analysis of such formations, Adams decides to exclude compounds such as *hot head* and *dream team* because the latter are examples of the modifier–head type of compound structure (2001, 127-8). Bauer calls the above-mentioned types ablaut-motivated compounds and rhyme-motivated compounds, respectively, and states that ablaut-motivated compounds are probably most productive when used as nonce formations (1983, 212-3).

In the formation of neo-classical compounds, at least one neo-classical element, often referred to as a combining form (either an initial combining form (ICF) or a final combining form (FCF)), is used, frequently with a linking element -o- between the two elements. Combining forms resemble affixes, but, as Plag states, they are in fact lexemes that have been borrowed from classical languages such as Latin and Greek. They are bound forms that cannot appear on their own, but they are special because they can be combined with bound roots, words, and other combining forms. What makes such compounds neo-classical, then, is the fact that the combinations where they are used are modern in origin. Plag’s examples include *astrology* (ICF astro- ‘space’ + FCF -logy ‘science of’), *democracy* (demo- ‘people’ + -cracy ‘rule’), and *morphology* (morpho- ‘figure’ + -logy ‘science of’) (2003, 74, 156-7).

2.3 Conversion, Partial Conversion, and Syntactic Processes

According to Adams, conversion is a process where “a word which has hitherto functioned as a member of one class undergoes a shift which enables it to function as a member of another” (1973, 16). The word’s part of speech, then, changes, even though the word itself does not change. This change is similar to what happens when a class-changing affix (see 3.1) is used to create a new word – therefore, the non-existent yet powerful “nothing” that can change the word grammatically is often referred to as the zero suffix: no morphological element is added, yet there is a change in meaning.
Conversion is another phenomenon related to the English language that is referred to by using more than one term. *Conversion* is what Adams calls the ‘traditional’ term, and that is the term used in this thesis as well, even if it may be considered unsatisfactory by some scholars. There are other naming possibilities, which are said to describe the process more accurately, including *zero derivation*, *zero suffixation*, *derivation by a zero suffix* and *transposition*. However, Plag does not agree with the view that a zero affix exists. His argument is based on a listing of the different types of meaning that converted verbs may have, upon which he states that “none of the overt verb-deriving affixes of English can express such a wide range of meanings … Hence, there is no basis for the assumption of a zero-affix” (2003, 112-3).

Adams also recognizes the semantic diversity of what she calls, using quotation marks, the “zero affix”, stating that it has many functions and that it is very important in forming verbs in English, since the number of verb-forming affixes in the language is small. However, she goes on to state that the zero affix is important in forming nouns as well, even though there are several noun-forming affixes available in English (1973, 37).

According to Plag, the four main types of conversion are the following: noun to verb (*jail* † *to jail*), verb to noun (*to fear* † *fear*), adjective to verb (*cool* † *to cool*), and adjective to noun (*wealthy* † *the wealthy*). Plag points out that further types exist as well (such as Prep *down* † V *to down*), but that they are marginal in their number (2003, 108). Bauer states that conversion seems to be a “totally free process” as there are no morphological restrictions as to what kinds of forms can be subjected to the process: they can be simplex or complex words of practically any kind (1983, 226).

There are types that may resemble converted words, but that do in fact not qualify as such. Bauer distinguishes conversion from *partial* conversion, of which there are two types: when there is a shift of stress in the verb/phrasal verb to noun type (*discόunt* † *discount*,
show off or in the adjective to verb type (fréquent or freqúent), and when a noun to verb type is accompanied by a sound change at the end of the word from a voiceless fricative to the corresponding voiced fricative (bath or bathe). This latter type, however, is no longer productive (1983, 228-9).

Other phenomena that do not qualify as conversion – or even as types of word-formation – are the various syntactic processes, as described by Bauer; in these cases, the word changes only within one word class. The different types are as follows: a countable noun is made of an uncountable noun (tea or two teas) or vice versa (goat or a slice of goat); a common noun is made of a proper noun (Which John do you mean?); a gradable adjective is made of a non-gradable adjective (English or more English than him), and when a transitive verb is made of an intransitive verb (fly or the army flew the civilians to safety). Furthermore, Bauer states that cases where a noun is used in the attributive position in a compound do not qualify as instances of noun to adjective conversion, but should be treated as a type of syntactic process: although some scholars consider, for instance, model in model airplane to be an adjective, Bauer says that “such collocations should be seen as compounds, which makes it unnecessary to view such elements as instances of conversion” (1983, 227-8).

2.4 Clipping

Clipping is a method of word-formation that is relatively easy to define but that does not seem to be based on any definitive or predictable rules. Marchand simply states that clipping “consists in the reduction of a word to one of its parts” (1969, 441), while Adams elaborates by saying that words that become clipped consist of two or more syllables and are usually nouns (1973, 135). Bauer goes on to point out that the shortened lexeme can be either simplex or complex, and that the end result, that is the clipping, has the same meaning and belongs to the same word class as the original word (1983, 233). According to Marchand, the most
common part of speech to undergo clipping is nouns, while clipped verbs and adjectives are rarer (ibid., 447). Plag prefers the term *truncation* instead of *clipping* (2003, 116), but since most scholars use the latter term, it is used in this thesis as well.

Bauer comments on the unpredictability of the process by pointing out that sometimes “there seem to be no limitations on the clipping except that the clipped form should be a possible word” (1983, 234). Thus, if we have a word of two or more syllables, or a compound, it may or may not be easy to predict what kind of clipping will be formed on the basis of it: for instance, the noun *advertisement* has two clipped forms, *advert* and *ad*.

All writers seem to agree that clipped words are most often associated with stylistic change: they are used in more informal contexts, often in order to express familiarity. According to Adams, the familiarity expressed can be either towards the object denoted, or towards the audience (1973, 135). Marchand is rather strict about the distribution of clippings and their longer versions, stating that they “are not interchangeable in the same type of speech” and that clippings are only used in the slang of special groups. In general, Marchand seems to be negative towards clippings, calling them “mutilations” used by special groups “in the intimacy of a milieu where a hint is sufficient to indicate the whole” (1969, 441-2, 447).

In the course of time, a clipped word may become so well-established that it is no longer recognized as a clipping. Adams illustrates this with the words *curio* and *fan*, both of which now have a meaning that is different from that of the longer versions *curiosity* and *fanatic*. *Lunch* and *pram* are further examples of words whose original forms (*luncheon*, *perambulator*) are either obsolete or no longer that commonly used (1973, 135-6). Marchand claims that “the moment a clipping loses its connection with the longer word … it ceases to belong to word-formation, as it has then become an unrelated lexical unit” (1969, 441).
Clippings are divided into the following categories: back-clipping, fore-clipping, and back and fore clipping. In addition, a large number of clipping compounds exist. The categories are introduced in the following sub-sections.

2.4.1 Back-Clipping

The most common type of clipping is back-clipping, a process where elements are removed from the end of the original word (either a single word or a composite), so that the beginning is retained. Commonly quoted examples of back-clipping include *pub* from *public house*, *perm* from *permanent wave*, and *ad* from *advertisement*.

A relatively common phenomenon associated with the back-clipping of names and other words is the addition of the suffixes -ie, -y, -o, and -s (terms such as *pet suffix*, *diminutive suffix*, and *hypocoristic suffix* are frequently used in relation to these suffixes). Most scholars discuss this phenomenon in connection with clippings rather than suffixation, and I decided to follow their example. Examples include *Charlie* from *Charles*, *Andy* from *Andrew* (Marchand 1969, 442-3), *ammo* from *ammunition*, and *turps* from *turpentine* (Adams 2001, 142). Plag states that in addition to the familiarity expressed by such clippings as illustrated above, they also tend to signify a positive attitude towards the referent (2003, 117).

A special type of shortening is referred to by Adams and Marchand, and it is appropriate to discuss it here in connection with clippings as well. When the latter element of an adjective–noun phrase is dropped without any change in the meaning (such as *weekly* from *weekly newspaper* and *final* from *final examination*), it may not be clear whether the result should be regarded as a shortening or as a case of adjective to noun conversion (see 2.3). Adams’ rule of thumb is as follows: if the head noun is specific in meaning (*newspaper*, *examination*), it is fairly safe to talk about shortening; however, if the head noun is more general (*one, man, people, thing*), it is more likely that we are talking about conversion (1973,
19). Marchand analyzes these as elliptical expressions, that is shortenings comparable to clippings: the noun is not there, but it can always be added (1969, 361).

2.4.2 Fore-Clipping

When a word is fore-clipped, material is removed from its beginning so that the last part is retained. Among the illustrations provided by Adams are bus from omnibus, copter from helicopter, and plane from airplane (1973, 136). Marchand states that fore-clippings are relatively rare, but mentions that first names are sometimes fore-clipped (Bert, Fred; with a diminutive suffix: Betty, Sandy); he goes on to claim that surnames are not fore-clipped in English, and that fore-clipped compounds are very rare (1969, 443-4). Another point by Marchand concerns the shortenings where an unstressed first syllable is dropped from the word, as in mend from aménd and fence from déféncé. He does not include words of this kind (often referred to as aphetic forms) in the domain of word-formation (ibid.).

2.4.3 Back and Fore Clipping

This type of clipping is much rarer than the two other types discussed above. Back and fore clipping involves removal of material from both the end and the beginning of a word, so that the middle part is retained. Commonly quoted examples include fridge from refrigerator and flu from influenza. Marchand points out that this type of clipping is used infrequently, but he does quote several examples of first names, among them Liz, Fy, Ves, and Tish (1969, 444).

2.4.4 Clipping Compounds

In the formation of clipping compounds at least one of the parts of the compound is clipped, but it is also common that both halves are clipped. Marchand observes that one reason for the clipping of a compound is that the compound may be overlong to begin with. His illustrations
include *capacitance* ‘capacity + reactance’, *greycing* ‘greyhound racing’, and *navicert* ‘navigation certificate’ (1969, 445).

As regards the definition of clipping compounds, Bauer states a problem: when both parts are clipped, it may be problematic to decide whether the result is a clipping or a blend. He continues to point out that it is generally not easy to make the distinction between the two types, but suggests that only those forms should be treated as clipping compounds that retain compound stress (1983, 233). Quinion (1996) states that it is preferable to consider a combination a clipping compound if the elements used in the formation are the beginnings of the words involved; his examples include *kidvid* (*kid* + *video*) and *nicad* (*nickel* + *cadmium*). This statement creates a contradiction, however: if this definition was followed, only one of Marchand’s examples quoted above would qualify as a clipping compound. The distinction between clipping compounds and blends is further discussed in 2.5.

Clipping compounds may also be the result of more than two words being clipped. In addition, sometimes the derived word may be difficult to analyze without additional knowledge of the object denoted. Some examples, provided by Adams, are *alnico* ‘an alloy of aluminium, nickel and cobalt’, *tacsatcom* ‘Tactical Satellite Communications’, and *g-force* ‘gravity force’ (1973, 137-8).

2.5 Blending

Blending is another method of word-formation that involves the reduction of more than one word in order to produce a new lexeme. A blend (sometimes also called a *portmanteau word*) is produced when two (or, rarely, more) words are combined into one morphologically unanalyzable word (*breakfast* + *lunch* ≡ *brunch*). It is often stated by scholars that it can be difficult to define what counts as a blend – in many cases, it may not be easy to tell the
difference between a blend and a clipping compound. For this reason it is appropriate to have
the previous section on clipping compounds followed by this section on blending.

Marchand states that blending is a method “relevant to word-formation only insofar as it
is an intentional process of word-coining”. He defines blending as a process where parts of
words are merged into one new word which is always an unanalyzable, simplex word (smoke
+ fog ≠ smog). He points out that blends are coined owing to the “fancy of individuals”
(e especially of those who write for magazines), and goes on to state that these “facetious”
coinages do not usually pass into general usage (1969, 451-2).

Bauer points out that there seem to be no rules concerning how a blend is formed based
on two words (1983, 234-5). This point reminds one of the nature of clippings and clipping
compounds, but there is one difference. If two words are given as material for a blend, one
can look at the possibilities: some combinations will sound more natural than others,
especially if the two words share elements that could overlap in the resulting blend. A good
example of this is the following, used in an exercise on a course on word-formation: when the
words tangerine and lemon are blended, tangemon is a more suitable candidate than lengerine.
Not only does lengerine resemble the completely unrelated word lingerie, it also lacks a point
where elements of the two original words overlap.

Adams, too, mentions overlapping as something that is usually involved in blends.
Among her examples that illustrate this are privilegentsia (privilege + intelligentsia) and
motel (motor(ist) + hotel). She also states that there is a possibility to create a punning effect
or one of word-play with a blend: foolosopher sounds like philosopher, while the overlapping
of syllables results in the effect of word-play in balloonatic and shamateur (1973, 150).
Elsewhere, Adams states that the punning effect is partly due to the fact that quite often “a
blend conforms, or approximates, to the shape of one of the source words, almost always the
final one”. Her examples include camelcade ‘camel cavalcade’ and keytainer ‘key container’ (2001, 139).

Supporting Adams’ claims, Plag has made an interesting observation concerning the length of blends. His data shows that it is not uncommon for a blend to be comprised of two words that in their original form have the same number of syllables, and that the resulting blend also has the same length in terms of the number of syllables. Naturally, this is not always true – in such cases, Plag suggests that the blend is most likely to have the same number of syllables as its second element in its original form: brunch (breakfast + lunch), boatel (boat + hotel), guesstimate (guess + estimate) (2003, 125).

Like clipping compounds, blends are problematic in that their meaning may be difficult to comprehend if the audience is not familiar with the topic in question. Adams states that often “blends are puzzling until one has met them in context, or learned where their constituents come from”. She argues that owing to this reason blends are not that widely used, and points out that many of the examples that she presents are between inverted commas (1973, 151). Blends are commonly used in advertisements, trade names, or in newspaper headlines because they have the tendency to draw attention to themselves (Adams 2001, 140).

The problem of whether to classify a new lexeme as a blend or a clipping compound is commented on by Plag, who distinguishes blends from proper blends. He says that if existing compounds are shortened (breath analyzer, science fiction), their shortened forms (breathalyzer, sci-fi) should not be treated as proper blends. This gives us a rule of thumb: we are dealing with a proper blend if the words involved, combined in their full form, did not exist as a compound before the shortening. Plag adds another element to distinguish between the two types by stating that proper blends “denote entities that share properties of the referents of both elements”. His example is boatel, which is both a boat and a hotel (2003, 121-2). Plag compares proper blends to copulative compounds, that is, compounds which can
be characterized by the formula ‘AB is a combination of A and B’ (see 2.2.1). This means that
the original words of a proper blend should be semantically related, so that it is not only the
words which are merged, but also their properties. A further requirement is given by Plag: the
words a proper blend is formed of should represent the same part of speech (ibid., 123).

The different ways to combine the original words in order to make a blend are few. Plag
gives a “blending rule” that can be applied to the majority of blends: AB + CD \(\rightarrow\) AD. Here,
A represents the first part of the first word, while B stands for its latter part; C and D, in turn,
represent the respective parts of the second word. In this formula, B and/or C can be null,
which is the case when at least one of the elements combined is retained in its full form in the
resulting blend. Plag illustrates this with *guesstimate* from *guess* + *estimate*; note that with
blends we should think both orthographically and phonologically (2003, 123).

Several different kinds of relation between the two elements of a blend are identified by
Adams (1973, 153-5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject–verb</td>
<td><em>screamager</em> ‘screaming teenager’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb–object</td>
<td><em>breathalyser</em> ‘breath analyser’, <em>bus-napper</em> ‘bus-kidnapper’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- coordinate</td>
<td><em>escalift</em> ‘escalator-lift’, <em>transceiver</em> ‘transmitter-receiver’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- non-coordinative</td>
<td><em>bromidiom</em> ‘bromide idiom’, <em>refujews</em> ‘refugee jews’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td><em>automania</em> ‘mania caused by automobiles’, <em>beermare</em> ‘nightmare caused by beer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td><em>chunnel</em> ‘channel tunnel’, <em>daymare</em> ‘day nightmare’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resemblance</td>
<td><em>bomphlet</em> ‘pamphlet like a bomb’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition</td>
<td><em>plastinaut</em> ‘plastic astronaut’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective–noun</td>
<td><em>bit</em> ‘binary digit’, <em>positron</em> ‘positive electron’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adams points out, however, that not all blends are unproblematic to classify in this way. Such
blends include those where a punning effect is involved; adjectival blends where the two
elements are synonymous, combined for the sake of emphasis (*fantabulous* from *fantastic* +
*fabulous*); verbal blends, which she considers relatively rare (*baffound* from *baffle* +
*confound*); or blends where the first element is neo-classical and not shortened (*aquacade*
from *aqua* + *cavalcade*) (1973, 155-6). Many blends based on the above-mentioned relations between the two words would match Plag’s description of a proper blend.

### 2.6 Abbreviation

Abbreviation is yet another way of creating new words by shortening an already existing one, in this case one that is composed of more than one orthographic word. According to Plag’s definition, the most common way to form an abbreviation is by combining the initial letter of each word in a multi-word sequence. His examples include *BA* ‘Bachelor of Arts’, *DC* ‘direct current’, and *FAQ* ‘frequently asked questions’. Plag points out that sometimes an abbreviation can be partly formed by non-initial letters as well: *Inc.* ‘incorporated’, *kHz* ‘kilohertz’ (2003, 126). Marchand separates “letter-words”, such as the examples above, from “syllable-words” (such as *sial* ‘silicon and aluminium’) and the combination of these two types (*radar* ‘radio directing finding and range’) (1969, 452).

Frequently, the individual letters of an abbreviation are pronounced separately, such abbreviations being known as *initialisms*. Sometimes, however, the word is pronounced as if it were a single word: examples include *HALO* ‘High Altitude Low Opening’ and *NATO* ‘North Atlantic Treaty Organization’. Adams calls all of the types illustrated so far simply *acronyms*, regardless of the pronunciation (1973, 136), but most scholars agree with Bauer’s claim that in order to qualify as an acronym, an abbreviation must be pronounced as a single word, not as a mere series of letters (1983, 237). This view is followed in this thesis as well.

Marchand states that abbreviations are commonly used in the naming of scientific discoveries, trade products, organizations, and new foundations or offices. He also says that, especially in American English, abbreviations that stand for personal or geographical names are found (1969, 452). Adams illustrates an interesting development that some frequently used abbreviations may undergo: in time, if an abbreviation becomes widely used, it may
receive a ‘pronunciation-spelling’: the abbreviations DJ, MC, and OK, for instance, have received the alternative written forms deejay, emcee, and okay, respectively (1973, 136).

2.7 Analogical Formation

New words may appear in English whose formation does not seem to be based on any rules of word-formation. One such phenomenon is known as analogy, and words resulting from the process are called analogical formations. The following quotation from Fowler (1965, s.v. analogy) provides an illuminating introduction to the subject matter:

In the making of words, and in the shape that they take, analogy is the chief agent. Wanting a word to express about some idea a relation that we know by experience to be expressible about other ideas, we apply to the root or stem associated with it what strikes us as the same treatment that has been applied to the others. That is, we make the new word on the analogy of the old…

Bauer defines an analogical formation as “a new formation clearly modeled on one already existing lexeme” that usually does not give rise to a productive series. According to him, genuine analogical formations are “coined because of a chance phonetic resemblance”, but he does acknowledge that his definition is stricter than those provided by other writers. Bauer illustrates a productive series with words ending in -scape that are based on landscape, including seascape, cloudscape, skyscape, and dreamscape; the genuine formations, based on a phonetic resemblance, given by Bauer include ambisextrous (based on ambidextrous) and wargasm (orgasm) (1983, 96).

The process of analogy usually begins with an “influential” word, upon which the new analogical formation is based; Plag uses the term model word. To explain analogy, Plag has formed an illustrative model of proportional relations between the words involved. In the
illustration below, “the relation between two items … is the same as the relation between two other, corresponding items”:

a. a : b :: c : d  
b. eye : eyewitness :: ear : earwitness  
c. ham : hamburger :: cheese : cheeseburger  
d. sea : sea-sick :: air : air-sick  

A common characteristic of an analogical formation is that its meaning is relatively easy to understand by looking at the word, as the model word can be identified without effort by most speakers. Plag states that this factor is something that makes analogical formations regular. However, he points out that they are nevertheless irregular in the sense that their coinage is not based on any word-formation rules or larger patterns. He goes on to state that should a case of analogy lead to a productive pattern, it may no longer be easy to distinguish analogical patterns from word-formation rules (ibid., 37-8).

Adams states that the model word may have become so frequently used that people are familiar with a particular element it contains; as a result, this element is more likely to be used in new formations. She illustrates the point with -nik and -tron (extracted from beatnik and neutron, respectively), both of which are productive, even though the former has a foreign feel to it and the latter is quite esoteric by nature (1973, 194). Elements such as these, then, become used like normal suffixes, even if they did not have such status in the English language before.

When analyzing potential instances of analogy, more than just one possible interpretation may arise. A good example is hamburger and the further types of hamburger derived from the model word: Plag considers them to be examples of analogy (2003, 37), while Marchand argues that the pattern has in fact arisen through the fore-clipped version of hamburger, that is burger, whose semantic status is identical to that of the longer version.
Marchand states that *cheeseburger* therefore is not an analogical formation but a clipping compound based on *cheese hamburger*. He calls the element -*burger* a “pseudo morpheme” (*hamburger* originates from G *Hamburgler* ‘a native or inhabitant of Hamburg’ (*OED* s.v.)), and states that it is an example of the many unmeaningful sound groups that have in time become not only analyzable, but also productive in English (1969, 2, 213).

2.8 Semantic Shift

This section discusses another phenomenon that does not qualify as word-formation, but that is nevertheless an important source of new vocabulary in English. As any language changes over time, the meanings of existing words are prone to change as well; such a process is known as *semantic shift*, or *semantic change*. Ullmann discusses the possible reasons for semantic change: it may occur, for instance, when different generations use words in different ways, sometimes as a result of children misunderstanding words and then persisting in using them in the “wrong” way. Other reasons mentioned by Ullmann that may affect the meaning of words include the vagueness of the meaning of many words as well as the possibility to use them in ambiguous contexts where more than one interpretation is possible; furthermore, he states that “the vocabulary of a language is an unstable structure in which individual words can acquire and lose meanings with the utmost ease” (1962, 193-5).

It is frequently the case that the new sense given to a word is metaphorically based on the original sense. Cruse (2000, 214) offers a useful, five-stage pattern that illustrates one possibility of how semantic shift can take place diachronically:
(1) Word W has established a literal sense, S1.
(2) Some creative person uses W in a new figurative sense, S2 …
(3) S2 ‘catches on’, and becomes established … so that W becomes polysemous between S1 and S2. S1 is still perceived as literal, and S2 as figurative.
(4) S1 begins to become obsolescent. S2 begins to be perceived as literal, and S1 as figurative.
(5) S1 is lost, at which point the meaning of W has changed from S1 to S2.

Cruse illustrates this pattern with the verb expire, which originally had the meaning ‘to die’: at some point in history, the meaning of the verb was metaphorically extended to ‘to come to the end of a period of validity’. Cruse states that if a class of students were asked about the senses of expire today, it is likely that the sense ‘die’ would now be interpreted as being a metaphorical extension rather than the original sense (ibid., 215).

According to Ullmann, it is practically impossible to give rules that would cover all possible reasons for semantic shift: there will always be words whose meaning undergoes a shift based on some unique pattern not covered by the rules (1962, 197). He does, nevertheless, provide a list of possible causes for semantic change, and the reader is referred to his work for further information. In this thesis, the main interest is on the specialization of meaning that occurs when a word “passes from ordinary language into … the terminology of a trade, a craft, a profession or some other limited group” and in the new context becomes more restricted in its meaning. Ullmann states that this kind of development is common in English, and that it is one of the main sources of polysemy; among his examples is Latin ponere ‘to place’, which in French acquired the form pondre with the more restricted meaning ‘to lay eggs’ (ibid., 199-200).
3. Material and Methods of the Study

This chapter will first take a closer look at the source material upon which the present study is based. The brief introduction of TF in 3.1 focuses on some details concerning the magazine, including an outline of the structure of an individual issue of the magazine; this enables the reader to gain a general sense of the source material (see 1.2 for the reasons why TF was chosen as the object of study). Section 3.2 introduces the different steps that were taken in order to answer the research questions stated in 1.3.

3.1 Material

Launched in 1997 as a film magazine that wanted to devote itself to films that are above all entertaining, TF slowly but steadily succeeded in expanding its readership. The magazine has since secured its status as the second best-selling film magazine in the United Kingdom, being outsold only by Empire, the leading film magazine in the country. Since 1997, the magazine has widened its scope as regards its preferred subject matter, gladly devoting space for any kinds of films these days. However, what has not changed is TF’s original statement that reading about films should be “fun”. In my opinion, this attitude can be clearly seen on the pages of the magazine, and there are grounds for claiming that the written style is one of TF’s major selling points, making it the popular magazine that it is today.

The magazine has a clear structure, being divided into four parts. The first major section, titled “Buzz”, introduces readers to what is going on in the world of cinema, providing news and small interviews especially related to upcoming films and future productions, so that the reader knows what has happened and what to look forward to. The following section, “Screen”, is devoted to reviews of films that are currently in cinemas or about to premiere in the UK. The reviews section is followed by the extensive middle part featuring, among other things, on-set reports of upcoming films (perhaps to be reviewed in the following issue), or
longer interviews of people connected with those films. “Lounge”, a section primarily filled with DVD and Blu-ray reviews, constitutes the remaining pages of the magazine.

During the period of time when data was gathered for the purposes of this study, the number of pages in an individual issue of TF was commonly 170 (there were exceptions, including two issues that consisted of 162 pages and one 186-page issue, while one 178-page issue was accompanied by a 35-page booklet titled “James Cameron Special”, which was also included in the corpus). The total number of pages in the corpus added up to 2,261 pages. However, as roughly one fourth of the pages were advertisements, the actual size of the corpus was calculated to consist of approximately 1,700 pages of film-related texts.

3.2 Methods

In order to find answers to the research questions, I carried out a manual search through 13 issues of TF, gathering vocabulary from texts written by film journalists. This means that, for instance, advertisements as well as comments made by interviewees were not considered relevant, as they do not represent the language used by film journalists. Based on my knowledge of the world of cinema, as well as my long history as a reader of TF, I decided to rely on intuition in the search for interesting new lexemes to be included in the inventory. Thus, while reading the magazine, I made a choice on every individual film-related word on whether it should be included. If the word was considered “new” or in other ways striking, or if it reflected some recent developments in the world of cinema, it was included. The place of occurrence was also recorded, so that the word would be easy to locate in case an illustration of its use was later needed. If a lexeme that was considered new came up more than once in a single issue, the page number of only the first occurrence was written down. However, the total number of occurrences was calculated so as to gain a sense of the frequencies of the new
lexemes. Thus, the hand-written notes based on each issue of *TF* looked like the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 26</th>
<th><em>cameo-tastic, the Governator</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 28</td>
<td><em>update (2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 32-3</td>
<td><em>romcom (7), reboot (3)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 36-7</td>
<td><em>a horror (2), X-starrer, re-tread, bio-thriller, to be given the green light, scribe (2), to helm, biopic (9)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel confident in stating that I succeeded in finding a large number of relevant and interesting vocabulary, and that it is likely that I have not missed anything that is of crucial interest, such as words reflecting the developments of and the changes in the industry. However, there is a possibility that certain types of formations were neglected – any such doubts are commented upon in chapter 4.

A manual search of this kind has its pros and cons. On one hand, it allows the researcher to gather large amounts of interesting data, as every single word included in the corpus is actually read – the researcher does not need to know exactly what they are looking for. This may not only result in a larger number of findings, but also in several surprises that might be missed when the corpus is not manually read through. On the other hand, the researcher conducting a manual search does not have a chance to “go back” at any stage of the search, as the time available is likely to be limited. That said, the process of manually reading through a corpus is extremely slow. Also, as the corpus is not in electronic form, it is not possible to search for further examples of certain patterns that have come up, which is something that can commonly be done when using an electronic corpus.

By the time the search was completed, an inventory of more than 500 items of vocabulary had been compiled. The words were then analyzed and grouped according to the source of new words involved. In order to narrow down the number of lexemes and to ensure
that the study is relevant for present-day purposes, I included in the final inventory only
words that were not listed before the year 2000 in two dictionaries. The dictionaries consulted
were the online edition of *The Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter *OED*) and a 1998 edition
of *Chambers Dictionary* (*CD*). The former is a natural choice for any work involving the
study of vocabulary, while the latter was recommended to me by a teacher. Both dictionaries
are considered large and reliable, and like the source material, they are British.

If a lexeme considered new was not listed in either of the dictionaries, or if there was no
pre-2000 reference to it in *OED*, it was considered new and included in the final inventory.
Barnhart et al’s reasoning was also followed in that no “film dictionaries” were included at
this stage, as the aim of the study was to see whether words that have originated in the field of
film journalism have found their way into the common vocabulary (1973, 14). However, *The
International Dictionary of Broadcasting and Film* (*IDBF*) was consulted, but it is used only
in reference to some chronological observations and comparisons in section 5.1. It should be
kept in mind that even though a lexeme passed as “new” and was included in the inventory, it
does not necessarily mean that it was never used before the turn of the century. As Algeo
points out, it is often not possible “to be sure of when a word was actually first formed, [as]
some words have a long underground existence before they are reported” (1991, 2).

The following chapter introduces a great proportion of the new lexemes gathered from
the corpus, a full index of the findings being found in the appendix. The definitions of some
new words are either given in my own words or explained in the running text by providing
more information related to them. In addition, I have carefully selected a number of
quotations in order to shed more light into the meaning and usage of some of the lexemes;
sometimes, a particular quotation was chosen because it included not only the word under
discussion, but also other words discussed elsewhere in the chapter.
4. New Film-Related Vocabulary in *Total Film*

The search through the corpus yielded 405 new film-related words as well as 61 personal names. In this chapter, the frequencies of individual words are not commented upon, unless the lexeme in question occurred remarkably often; roughly speaking, more than half of the lexemes only came up once in the corpus. This fact might lead to an argument that nonce formations and stunts are especially common in *TF*. However, it should be kept in mind that the corpus available for the present study was relatively small. Had it been possible to access, for instance, *all* 169 issues of *TF* electronically, the figures would certainly look different and provide more information. However, as Bauer states, the more influential the publication, the more likely it is that a word used in it will find its way into general acceptance and an established status (1983, 43). *TF* is the second best-selling film magazine in the United Kingdom, so there are grounds for claiming that practically every new word introduced in this study has the potential to survive and gradually gain more ground.

In Table 1 below, the number of lexemes gathered is presented according to the different sources of new vocabulary. As we can see, the total number of neologisms gathered from the corpus is 466, including 61 personal names. Names are normally not listed in dictionaries, and it could be argued that gathering them does not serve any purpose. However, I decided to include them in my inventory, as they do inform us about the workings of three interesting methods of word-formation (clipping, abbreviation, and blending).

Compounding (129 new lexemes), clipping (124), and affixation (120) in their different forms were by far the three most common sources of new film-related vocabulary in the corpus, adding up to 80.1 percent of the total number of lexemes gathered. Semantic shift was also a relatively common source (36 new lexemes), followed by the rarer processes abbreviation (19), analogical formation (15), the different processes related to and including conversion (13), and finally blending (10).
Table 1  Sources of new film-related vocabulary in *Total Film*  
(the number of lexemes gathered and percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of vocabulary</th>
<th>Personal names</th>
<th>Other lexemes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8 %</td>
<td>27.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocentric compounds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.3 %</td>
<td>17.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyphenated nominal phrases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-classical compounds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others/unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipping</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.5 %</td>
<td>20.0 %</td>
<td>26.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back-clipping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.3 %</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
<td>10.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fore-clipping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clipping</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6 %</td>
<td>17.5 %</td>
<td>16.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affixation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.6 %</td>
<td>25.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefixation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffixation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.4 %</td>
<td>24.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semantic shift</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9 %</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6 %</td>
<td>1.00 %</td>
<td>4.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analogical formation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blending</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntactic processes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial conversion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3 %</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following eight sections, overviews of the corpus findings are given, following the order of classification introduced in chapter 2. In addition, section 4.9 will take a closer look at four selected groups of vocabulary that were considered worthy of having sections of their own. The quotations from *TF* are followed by information stating where the quotation in question can be found. Thus, the numbers “164/77” in parentheses means that the quotation preceding it can be found in issue 164, page 77.

4.1 Affixation in *Total Film*: An Overview

The findings turned out very uneven, as the number of prefixed words (5) and infixed words (0) was small in comparison to the 115 examples of suffixation that were gathered. In the following, some of the lexemes gathered are illustrated, and in the case of prefixation and infixation, reasons for the lack of findings are also discussed.

4.1.1 Prefixation in *Total Film*

Not a great number of specifically film-related prefixed derivatives came up in *TF*. The examples gathered are unlikely to be found in dictionaries in future, as they were formations that were based on personal names or used mainly to serve the immediate purpose of the writer. However, the findings are illustrated here, and section 4.9.4 will further discuss the numerous words prefixed with *re-*, which turned out to be the only prefix that was frequently used. However, it was not an easy task to decide whether or not the words in *re-* should be categorized under prefixation: they could also be placed under semantic shift, as they are also found in the general lexicon, only not with definitions that specifically connect them to films. Therefore, the words are discussed in a section of their own.

Not counting the examples with *re-* in this category, only five examples of prefixed words occurred, all of them attached to a nominal base; two of the words were nouns derived
from nouns, and the other three were adjectives derived from proper nouns (surnames). In the light of this, Marchand’s comment about the powerlessness of a prefix, referred to above (1969, 228), feels somewhat outdated.

The low number of prefixed words included may be partly explained by the “intuition factor” that affected the process of gathering vocabulary, that is, the fact that I conducted a manual search and therefore had to make a subjective judgement on every word over whether or not I consider it worthy of including. In the course of one year of gathering vocabulary, my judgment towards certain kinds of formations seems to have been subject to alteration. Thus, even if I have only one example of, for instance, the prefix co-, as in co-scribe ‘co-screenwriter’, other words with the prefix certainly were and are used (consider words such as co-star and co-director). For one reason or another, however, they were not included when they occurred.

Non- ‘not having the proper characteristics of X’ (Plag 2003, 213) was found attached to the noun sequel. Non-sequel is a useful word in today’s film world where film franchises are “updated” or “rebooted” (see 4.9.4) if the studio suspects that audiences are growing tired of the output: for instance, the two latest Batman films are in no way connected to the four films released between 1989 and 1997; other examples include the Spider-Man and Incredible Hulk films. In my corpus, the derivative was used because there was a clear need to underline that the upcoming Superman film is not a sequel to the “remake” released in 2006, but a piece of work independent from it. Based on this, another sense for the prefix could be ‘against what is expected, not having the proper characteristics of X’:

(1) Meanwhile, Warner Bros has asked Christopher Nolan to godfather the resurrection of the Superman franchise. Expect less gloss and more dirt in this non-sequel. (166/16)
Pre- ‘before in time, beforehand, in advance’ (CD s.v., sense 1) was found used as expected, describing a stage in Orson Welles’ career before he created his masterpiece Citizen Kane (example (2) below). The prefix sub-, on the other hand, occurred twice but the sense in which it was used was not given in any of the source materials – the closest one was ‘subordinate, subsidiary, secondary’ (CD s.v., sense 2). In TF, sub- was used to create adjectives referring to films that somehow aim to match the work of a master, but cannot quite succeed in doing it. In both examples that occurred, the derivative in sub- served as a modifier to the following noun that described a feature the director or actor in question is well-known for (examples (3) and (4)):

(2) …Richard Linklater’s patchy period piece [follows] student Zac Efron as he blags his way into a pre-Kane Orson Welles’ (McKay) Julius Caesar theatre production. (167/137)

(3) Anthony DiBlasi over-directs, suffocating character in sub-Fincher grunge chic and starving the final-act savagery of emotional punch. (166/141)

(4) Sadly, the haphazard plotting and sub-Chaplin clowning tumble far below the director’s best. (169/131)

In his discussion of these two prefixes, Marchand gives no examples based on proper nouns, which to some extent explains why the examples he does give (including pre-exist and sub-editor) are all class-maintaining (1969, 184, 194). As no definition for sub- was given in the source materials that would explain the examples gathered, another, possibly new, sense for the prefix should be acknowledged: ‘below the standards set by X’ (X being a proper noun).

4.1.2 Infixation in Total Film

Unsurprisingly, no infixed words exclusively related to films occurred in TF. This is not to say that infixes were not used at all, only that when they were, they could hardly qualify as
words that should be included in this study. The lack of relevant findings supports the claims that this type of affixation is rare, as stated by virtually all writers on word-formation.

4.1.3 Suffixation in *Total Film*

Out of the 115 examples of suffixation gathered, as many as 61 were nouns derived from verbs by using the suffix *-er*. Alongside *-er*, a commonly occurring pair of suffixes were the adjective-forming *-esque* (24 examples) and *-ian* (16) that resemble one another semantically (an in-depth discussion of these two suffixes is found in section 4.9.1). What remains is 14 examples of a handful of more rarely used affixes; they are discussed briefly first, after which the majority of this section is concerned with derivatives in *-er*.

The suffix *-ite* is used to denote people, indicating their ‘origin, affiliation, loyalties, etc’ (*CD* s.v.). Three examples in the ‘affiliation, loyalty’ sense came up in *TF*, two of which are derived from the name of a film director and one from the name of a film franchise or a character. It is unclear why there is a hyphen in *Cameron-ite* (example (5)), based on James Cameron, while there is no hyphen in *Leonite* (from Sergio Leone) and *Potterite* (from the *Harry Potter* series of fantasy novels and films): a glance at *OED* and *CD* as well as Marchand’s illustrations did not provide any examples of the suffix being used with a hyphen.

(5) You can’t polish a crap-storm, but *Piranha II* doesn’t lack interest to *Cameron-ites*. (162/12)

Some film-related examples of hypocoristic nouns (involving pet suffixes) came up in the corpus. However, most of the examples were names and/or there was a degree of clipping involved, so they are discussed in section 4.3.1 instead. Nevertheless, some examples remain that can be qualified as “true” affixation – long-established ones listed in dictionaries include *cheapie* ‘a film, book, etc., produced on a low budget’ (*OED* s.v., sense A) and *weepie/weepy*
'a sentimental film, story, play, etc.' (OED s.v.). With these two words, it is not easy to decide whether the attitude signified towards the referent is positive or negative: history of cinema is full of films that either are cheap or make one weep; some of them are good, while some are not. A more clearly affectionate attitude is present in the following two derivatives: baldie (often as golden baldie) was frequently used to denote the bald-headed statuette more commonly known as the Academy Award, or the Oscar; another derivative was used to refer to Star Wars enthusiasts: Star Warsie. In fact, the latter example does not seem like standard usage of the suffix, but perhaps it can be compared with words ending in -ie such as bolshie and commie:

(6) Yep, 390,000 Star Warsies listed the Force ahead of Judaism, Sikhism and Buddhism [sic] as their call-to-prayer in a 2001 UK census. (166/21)

Deverbal -ing can attach to almost any verb to denote processes (running) or results (wrapping), or to form adjectives in attributive positions (Plag 2003, 90, 96). Surprisingly, most of the examples gathered from TF were listed in at least one of the two dictionaries, including lensing ‘photography’, scoring ‘composing of the music in a film’, scripting, scriptwriting, and the adjective scene-stealing that occurred in an attributive position. -ing has been added to the nowadays more commonly seen verb remake, resulting in the noun remaking (example (7) below, see also 4.9.4); peculiarly, the suffix has also been attached to the noun thesp, so that thesping (example (8)) has become a word for a process of heavyweight acting in films (see also section 4.8 about the words thesp and thespian):

(7) But does a somewhat cheesy stop-motion fantasy really need remaking at all? Is The Incredible Hulk director Louis Letterier the man for the job? (165/86)

(8) City girl meets country boy, whose pa doesn’t approve… Simple yet lyrical, thesping and lensing hold a gorgeous glow. (150/149)
Lastly, four examples of derivatives with the suffix -ism occurred in the corpus. In two examples the suffix was attached to a surname (Lee-ism from director Ang Lee, Shatnerism from actor William Shatner), once to a director’s full name (Guy Ritchie-ism), and once to a given name (Spike-ism from director Spike Lee). One of the senses given by Marchand for the suffix is ‘idiom, peculiarity of speech’ (Americanism, newspaperism), to which he adds that sometimes the sense denotes “a peculiarity of style when tacked on to the name of the writer, as in Carlylism…” (1969, 307). Based on the findings, the derivatives in -ism here may have a slightly extended meaning ‘a peculiarity of style or dialogue in directing or performing’. The first two examples below almost certainly refer to spoken dialogue, whereas the latter two allow more than one interpretation: as I have not seen the films in question, there were not enough clues in the textual context to be absolutely sure:

(9) The usually-dependable [Ang Lee] glitches, offering up a hybrid monstrosity of talky Lee-isms and CGI stupidity. (168/124)

(10) The director reins in the Spike-isms but doesn’t skimp on style or intelligence. (168/167)

(11) Fantasy then loses the turf war to terror when Eddie Marsan’s Weapons Man arrives, prompting a surreal twist on gangland Guy Ritchie-isms. (168/64)

(12) Pine plays it cocky and coltish – with just enough Shatnerisms to embellish rather than irritate. (161/151)

The suffix -er was by far the most productive suffix used in creating new words in TF. It can be used for coinages based on many kinds of words: Plag states that -er is added most commonly to verbs, but also to nouns, numerals, and phrases – his examples include the denominal whaler and noser, the denumeral fiver and tenner, and fourth-grader, which is derived from a phrase (2003, 89). Adams adds adjectival (foreigner) and prepositional bases (downer) to the list (2001, 52).
In *TF*, the suffix *-er* was used in various ways, and sometimes it would not have been easy to tell the meaning of the derivative without the aid provided by the textual context. Plag, among many others, acknowledges the semantic diversity of the suffix. He avoids giving specific definitions of the semantic domain of the suffix; instead, he defines derivatives in *-er* as “simply meaning something like ‘person or thing having to do with X’” (X being the base), and states that the meaning of formations in *-er* should be identified individually (2003, 89). Adams concurs with Plag – here is an illuminating paragraph written by her about the nature of *-er*:

Many nouns in *-er* have nominal bases … but more have verbal bases. They denote entities of various kinds connected in various ways with events. They most often name performers of actions, like builder, programmer, surfer, racer, retriever, warbler, or instruments crucially involved in actions, as in blender, digger, jammer, ionizer, mixer, steamer, tourer, toaster. Referents of *-er* nouns may be linked in some other way with the event signalled by the verb. Cooler and fermenter name vessels in which something is cooled or fermented; a burner is part of an apparatus near the flame, a bedder is a plant suitable for bedding. Boater, diner, loafer, loungers, sleeper, trainer, wader also denote entities associated with the (human) activity of the base. Fermenter ‘organism’, nail-biter, page-turner, thriller are causes of activities. The referents of broiler ‘chicken for broiling’, cooker, eater ‘apple’, folder ‘folding bicycle’, trailer correspond to the objects or patients of the base verbs. (2001, 29)

Amidst his many examples, Marchand points out that *-er* is a very productive suffix among slang words. He illustrates this claim with the various possible senses of derivatives such as scorcher: it can mean ‘hot day’, ‘rebuke’, or ‘a person who motors furiously’ (1969, 275). The general meaning Marchand assigns to *-er* is “he who or that which is connected with or characterized by his or its appurtenance to –”; persons and things (whether material or immaterial) are all included, but the definition that can be applied in any formation remains vague (ibid., 279).
Ryder comments on the semantic nature of derivatives in -er, comparing them to noun–noun compounds: he states that both “are best viewed as abbreviated noun phrases”. This is because, in spite of the transparency of the base word and the familiarity of the suffix, the derivative itself does not define the relationship between the two elements of the syntagma, thus allowing multiple interpretations. He goes on to state that this ambiguity makes the interpretation of derivatives in -er more dependent on context than many other kinds of syntagmas (1999, 277).

Based on the quotations and the points above, the suffix -er is clearly one of the elements related to the English language and English word-formation for which it is not possible to provide a simple, all-encompassing definition. When the suffix is used, we can often only say with any degree of certainty that the resulting syntagma is “somehow” related to its base – the meaning is to be found individually with the help of the context and one’s knowledge of the word and the world.

The findings in TF confirm that the statements above are accurate: the suffix turned out to have several semantic nuances. For this section, I have divided the majority of the lexemes into appropriate groups, each member of which has a similar relationship between the base word and the resulting derivative.

A frequently occurring type of -er was the denominal kind where the suffix has been added to a noun base that is normally used to describe a film, either by itself (‘toon ‘cartoon’ ‡ tooner) or headed by a word such as film, drama, or story (stop-motion film ‡ stop-motioner, sci-fi film ‡ sci-fier). Actioner (‘slang) a film or story which has plenty of action’ (CD s.v.) and policier ‘a film based on a police novel’ (OED s.v., sense 2) or, more simply put, ‘a police film’, are established examples of this type – in fact, actioner is so common these days that as many as 65 instances of the derivative were gathered in the 13 issues of TF examined. The examples of this type found more than once in TF are arthouser ‘an arthouse
film’ ((13) below), coming-of-ager ‘a coming-of-age story’, revenger ‘a revenge film’, sci-fier ‘a sci-fi (film)’ and suspenser ‘a suspense film’. Most of the examples occurring only once, however, are no less interesting: cat-and-mouser, sword and sandal-er (see 4.2.2 for a discussion of the compound swords-and-sandals), costumer, crimer, ensembler, kitchen-sinker (example (14)), and road-tripper are all good examples, illustrating how freely the suffix can be used with nouns.

(13) Another vampire movie! And if Thirst was the smart arthouse and Priest the kick-ass actioner … then Daybreakers looks like a slick sci-fi for genre fans. (160/36)

(14) A blueprint for the British New Wave, Tony Richardson’s pessimistic kitchen-sinker turns up the tension between arrogant graduate Richard Burton and his wife Mary Ure. (160/147)

Deverbal derivatives in -er were also numerous. Many of the following words are listed in dictionaries, only in a sense usually not easily applicable to films. For instance, snoozer in the sense ‘one who snoozes’ (OED s.v., sense 1a) can hardly be applied to a film; however, in the examples gathered, snoozing is the effect that the film may have on the viewer (example (15) below). This and the following examples can all be paraphrased as ‘the film makes the viewer X or feel X’: a comedy can be called chuckler or laffer ‘laugher’, a horror screamer or shrieker, while other types of film include downer, sniveler, and swooner. A similar type where -er is attached to a verb can be paraphrased as ‘the film X-s the viewer’ or ‘the film is X-ing/X-y’. Eight examples of this type were gathered, including the frequently used shocker and chiller, as well as the rarer scarer, gripper ((16) below), and spooker, all of which denote horror films or films that are otherwise very exciting. I have analyzed each example in these two categories as deverbal; however, it should be noted that in most cases the base word may as well be a noun.
(15) But the films deserve revisits, displaying more energy and style than your average period *snoozer* and providing credible settings for Keira. (169/140)

(16) At least the climax isn’t a straightforward sew-up; en route, emphatic acting, brooding atmosphere and fits of snappy action acquit Fred Cavaye’s debut as a solid Gallic *gripper*. Extras missing. (161/155)

Several examples of words with the suffix -er derived from phrases were also gathered. Examples denoting films include *big/low-budgeter* ‘the films has a big/low budget’ (example (17) below), and *big-hitter* ‘the film is a big hit’; derivatives that have arisen owing to the need to describe DVD and Blu-ray editions as well as the special features on the discs include *double-dipper* ‘release of more than one DVD edition of the film in order to make more profit’, *behind-the-scener* ‘a behind-the-scenes featurette’ (example (18)), *talking-header* ‘a featurette resembling a documentary’, and *twodouble/three/four-discer* ‘the edition has N discs’. Finally, some examples based on proper names came up: fans of films or regular attenders in film festivals can be described using -er, as in *Star Trekker, Twilighter, FrightFest-er*, and *Sundancer*.

(17) Sure enough, *Away We Go* is different. No brains being blown out. No megastar cast. No glossy, art-school cinematography. Just a small, delicate romcom that’s shot like an indie *low-budgeter*. (159/36)

(18) We also get a straight-up *behind-the-scener*. Clocking in at 51 mins but avoiding chat-track overlap, it sees Neveldine and Taylor explaining the expansion of an unlikely franchise they initially had no interest in… (159/141)

4.2 Compounding in *Total Film*: An Overview

During the process of examining the corpus, it was not always an easy task to decide which words should be counted as “new compounds”, and which should be excluded. Combinations such as *gangster movie* and *gangster epic* are clearly compounds, but it is unlikely that they will be granted their own dictionary entries. Collecting too many examples of compounds
such as these would have resulted in a long list of vocabulary, tedious not only to analyze but also to read about. Therefore, I decided to focus on new formations that reflect new phenomena and the changes that have taken place in the world of cinema in recent years; in addition, attention was paid to productive patterns where a certain element (such as *flick* or *noir*) was frequently used in forming compounds. The total number of the compounds gathered was 129, and the findings are introduced and discussed below.

4.2.1 Endocentric, Exocentric, Copulative, and Appositional Compounds in *Total Film*

Unsurprisingly, endocentric compound was the most common type found in *TF*: altogether 82 examples were gathered, out of which 33 were synthetic compounds and 10 were categorized as phonologically motivated. Owing to the phonological motivation, these ten words are discussed in 4.2.2 in relation to other types of compounding, but as they all follow the modifier–head structure, they are nevertheless *counted* as endocentric compounds (some examples, however, are referred to in both sections). Most of the endocentric compounds gathered were noun–noun formations created either when the technology related to films has developed, or when there has been a need to refer to different or new kinds of films or genres.

One of the selling points that distinguished DVD from its predecessor VHS was the possibility to accompany the film with a wealth of *special features* (or *extras*). Perhaps the most interesting one of these extras is the *audio commentary* (see also 4.2.2 below), an audio track that can be played simultaneously while watching the film. On the commentary, the creators of the film (most often the director and/or actors) discuss the film as it proceeds, perhaps referring to the process of creating the scenes, or to any issues they aimed to touch upon. Only one instance of the compound *audio commentary* occurred; however, many synonyms have been coined to replace the clumsy word, including the equally clumsy *commentary track*, the clipped form *commentary* (see 4.3.1), and the different variations with
the word *track* as the head: *chat-track*, *yack-track*, *talk-track*, and even *jabber-track* were frequently used as a replacement of *audio commentary* (see also 4.2.2).

The arrival of Blu-ray with its *high-definition* picture quality and improved sound has so far not resulted in many new lexical formations. This is partly because the new format does not offer *that* much new in comparison to DVD. Instead, Blu-ray is a format that is quite like DVD, only a remarkably upgraded version of it. However, the term *high-definition* was not yet in use in connection with DVD, even though the word has existed for a long time: *OED* has a quotation including *high-definition television* from 1943. Interestingly, the high-definition available to us today has brought with it a need for a word to describe the picture quality that DVDs offer. As a result, the compound *standard definition* has been adopted:

(1) Even better, your Blu-ray player will upscale your *standard definition* movies and TV shows, and while they won’t have the same zing as HD they’ll still look a darn sight better. (164/138)

This shows that time and development change the meaning of words as well: what used to be considered high definition in the past is nothing like that any longer; and what is considered *high definition* today will most likely be called *standard definition* in ten or twenty years’ time, as new, improved formats are introduced in the market.

*Motion-capture* is a compound denoting a new kind of technology that became well-known in connection with *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy. The term is strongly associated with actor Andy Serkis, who worked on the technology and helped create two iconic, computer-generated characters in the 21st century: Gollum in the aforementioned trilogy and later King Kong in the second remake of the monster classic. Liverman defines *motion-capture* as follows: “[t]he process of obtaining and recording a three-dimensional representation of a live-action performance or event by capturing the object’s position and/or orientation in
physical space…” (2004, 6-7). See sections 4.3.4 and 4.6 for further neologisms formed on the basis of motion capture.

(2) Arriving in 2011 is Steven Spielberg’s motion-capture 3D film of Hergé’s The Adventures Of Tintin. ... It’s going to be very big in Belgium. (160/101)

The noun flick is a colloquial synonym of film and movie (OED s.v. flick n.1, sense 1e). Interestingly, it seems that the noun is hardly ever used independently; however, many instances occurred in TF where it served as the head of an endocentric compound. Among the eight examples gathered are fear flick, teen flick, scare flick, and road flick (some of the other examples are mentioned later in connection with rhyme-motivated compounds). Another pattern, some examples of which include a neo-classical element (see 4.2.2 below), is compounds with the word noir ‘film noir’ as one of the elements. In one example, noir serves as the modifier (noir-thriller), but in all the others it is the head, including revenge noir, high-school noir, kitchen sink noir. The modifier preceding noir can be almost anything: in the three examples above they denote, respectively, the theme (‘the noir is about revenge’), the setting (‘the noir takes place in the world of high-school’), and the “genre” (‘the noir features elements of kitchen sink drama’) of the film in question.

Synthetic compounds turned out to be a relatively productive category in TF: a total of 33 interesting words were gathered. Some long-established synthetic compounds were also used frequently; these include heart-breaker, crowd-pleaser, showstopper ‘an item … in a show that wins so much applause as to bring the show to a temporary stop; also fig.’ (OED s.v. show n.1, sense C3), scene-stealer, and scriptwriting. All new film-related synthetic compounds that were recorded were formed with the suffix -er, and each of them were used to denote a film by describing how it is likely to affect the viewer. Each example could in theory be replaced with the general word film.
Many of the synthetic compounds gathered have as the object for the nominalized head a part of a human being that is thought to be responsible for emotions or thinking, or something related to them. A film that has an intricate plot or that is otherwise confusing may be called *brain-bender, brain-bleeder* (example (3) below), *brain-scrambler*, or, by referring to the human mind, *mind-bender or mind-muddler*. The figurative compound *head-scratcher* (example (4)) has a similar meaning: it can be paraphrased as ‘the film is so confusing that it makes the viewers scratch their heads’:

(3) The overwrought religious symbolism that permeates every pore of Adrian Lyne’s metaphysical *brain-bleeder* is the key [to understanding the film]. (169/69)

(4) [The upcoming *Inception* is an] elusive action-y, science-fiction-y *head-scratcher* about dreams and ‘crimes of the mind’. Or something. (168/24)

Synthetic compounds are used to refer to emotionally strong films as well. Alternatives for a touching *heart-breaker* include *heart-stirrer* and *heart-wrencher*; if the viewing experience *really* makes one cry, the compounds *tear-jerker* and *tear-tugger* can be used. Sometimes, however, a film can make the viewer feel strongly in other ways: a *nerve-shredder* is an extremely tense film; a *gut-churner* features scenes so unpleasant that the viewers may feel sick; a *wrist-slitter* is a film so depressing that the viewers will want to slit their wrists after watching it (not in reality, of course, but try Lars von Trier’s *Dancer in the Dark*):

(5) Finally scheduled for a DVD release in the UK … this Gallic *gut-churner* matches *Switchblade Romance, Frontier(s)* and *Martyrs* for physical pain. (160/70)

(6) Another grey-sky Brit *wrist-slitter* on an Essex council estate. Yeah, we know what you are thinking about *Fish Tank*. But the film you probably missed this year is the film you cannot afford to. (163/139)

Finally, when a film is a combination of genres, or if it tries to somehow redefine one, instead of clumsy and long appositional compounds (such as *western-action-drama*) it is more
convenient to use compounds such as *genre-bender*, *genre-blender*, and *genre-mangler* (example (7) below) and explain in the textual context what genres are mixed in the film. *Genre-setter* denotes a film that sets a template for a new type of film or genre not recognized before (example (8)). A fitting example of a genre-setter is *Jaws*, which is often said to have created the “summer blockbuster” when it wreaked havoc at the summer box office in the US in 1975. Ever since, summer has been the most prominent time in the US to release the biggest films.

(7) Best, though, was Philip Ridley’s flawed but sad, scary, vicious and often-gorgeous *Heartless*, an ambitious, ideas-stuffed hoodie-horror *genre-mangler* and weeping emotional wound of a film. (160/36)

(8) Recalling rock-hard French [gangster film] *genre-setters* such as *Rififi*, *Mesrine* balances an ensemble sprawl with a fierce one-man focus. (163/140)

Exocentric, appositional, and copulative compounds turned out to be rare. A compound such as *double-platter* ‘DVD/Blu-ray edition that includes two discs’ can be counted as an exocentric compound, but it is difficult to find other candidates for the category. Copulative type of compounding did not occur at all, while only a handful of examples of the appositional type occurred. However, compounds such as *horror-comedy*, *writer-director*, or *actor-producer* have certainly been in use for a long time, even if they are not listed in dictionaries. This is probably due to the fact that the possible combinations are practically endless: Robert Rodriguez, for instance, is well-known for performing various duties in the making of some of his films, but this does not mean that a compound such as *writer-director-producer-editor-cinematographer* should be recorded in dictionaries.

Some of the words gathered were far from easy to categorize. Take, for instance, *golden baldie/statuette* ‘Academy Award’ or *silver spinner* ‘Blu-ray disc’. In theory, these qualify as endocentric compounds – *golden baldie* (example (9) below) is, after all, a kind of baldie,
while silver spinner is a kind of spinner. At this point, a passing reference to Adams’ classification (1982) helps: the “resemblance” and “composition” types of nominal compound seem fitting for categorizing these compounds. But how about Oscar-bait ‘a film that is likely to attract Academy Award nominations’, or greenlight suit ‘a person in a high position who can decide which films are made and which are not’ (example (10)), or torture porn ‘a (horror) film where torture is the main attraction for the audience’ (for a detailed discussion of the 16 examples representing this pattern, see 4.9.3)?

(9) Next, in 2006, came The Departed, the collaboration that would finally – Jesus, finally – land Scorsese his Oscar and in truth should have garnered DiCaprio a golden baldie, too. (159/69)

(10) Not bad for a film that was made for $11m, starred a bunch of horrible latex puppets and was originally dismissed as a bit of a joke by the greenlight suits at studio Warner Bros. (161/137)

Two examples occurred of an interesting type of compounding for which no explanation in the source materials or the dictionaries consulted was given. When the noun head follows a proper noun, the compound has the meaning ‘a fan or follower of X’ similar to that of the noun-deriving type of the suffix -ian (for a brief reference, see 4.9.1). It could be argued that such formations are playful analogies to the established type with head which is used in relation to people who are addicted to different types of drugs: acid head, smack head, and pothead are frequently used compounds. The lexemes, as illustrated below, could thus be interpreted as referring to somewhat more serious groups of people (both occurred in the plural), so that the definition would be something like ‘a devoted fan or follower of X’, with possibly an additional element of obsession, or perhaps even addiction, involved:

(11) …this is the Coen-film, you know, for fans. … all Coenheads will blog about the mysterious shtetl-based (bygone Eastern European Jewish village) prologue with the same reverence afforded to The Dude’s rug. (161/49)
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(12) **Depp-heads** might defend *Public Enemies*, but Johnny’s Dillinger was more dandy than desperate man… (167/159)

4.2.2 Other Types of Compounding in *Total Film*

Seven examples of compounding occurred where hyphens were used to join a string of words. When a film is not considered worthy of a cinema distribution, the compound *straight-to-disc* can be used to describe it. This compound is new, but it is in fact a modified version of the word that was in use before the arrival of DVD: *straight-to-video*. Elsewhere, *cops-n-robbers (film)* is a self-explaining compound, while *swords-and-sandals (epic)* refers to films such as *Spartacus* or *Gladiator* that take place in the past, in a place where the climate is very hot and dry and the landscape dominated by sand. Naturally, a swords-and-sandals epic must feature sword-fighting, while it is presupposed that people in such circumstances wore sandals (see the examples below). The compound has already become subject for suffixation (see 4.1.3).

(13) Russ and Ridley’s **swords-and-sandals** epic *Gladiator* turns Blu on a two-discer that just keeps on giving. (160/141)

(14) [Mickey Rourke] is following up action man roles in *The Expendables* and *Passion Play* with a turn as the creepy-looking demon-hunting King Hyperion in the new 3D **swords and sandals** epic from *The Fall*’s Tarsem Singh. (169/20)

*Shoot-‘em-up* ‘a fast-moving story or film, esp. a Western, of which gun-play is a dominant feature’ (*OED* s.v.) was originally used to describe films only, but it is now connected with violent video games as well. Four compounds occurred in *TF* whose formation is based on the model of this word: *hack-‘em-up* and *beat-‘em-up* (example (15) below) refer to films where the fighting is done without guns, or without any kinds of weapon – especially martial arts films; in a *gore-‘em-up* (example (16)) violence leads to a great amount of blood-shedding, and the genre in question is likely to be horror; *smash-‘em-up*
refers to loud films where large objects are destroyed (in this case, the film in question was *Transformers 2*).

(15) Narratively, *Ong-Bak: The Beginning* has nothing to do with the explosive 2003 Thai **beat-'em-up** that introduced the world to martial-arts superman Tony Jaa. (160/52)

(16) Fur flies with fresh clarity in this Blu-ray’d re-release of John Landis’ gigglesome **gore-'em-up** [*An American Werewolf in London*]. (160/141)

Ten examples were gathered of compounds where the formation seems to be motivated by phonological factors. Each of the words gathered were motivated by rhyming – no ablaut-motivated compounds were used. In addition, each example adheres to the modifier–head structure of compounds. In spite of Adams’ claim that modifier–head structures such as *dream team* should not qualify as examples of phonologically motivated compounds (2001, 127-8), I decided to discuss them here. As a result, some words included in here were counted in the group of endocentric compounds as well, and mentioned in 4.2.1 above.

Examples of long-established words based on rhyming include *creature feature* ‘a film … featuring fantastical or monstrous creatures’ (*OED* s.v. *creature*, sense C2) and *chick-flick* ‘a film predominantly based around female characters’ (*OED* s.v. *chick* n.1, compounds); these compound occurred frequently in *TF* as well. New lexemes where the two elements of a compound rhyme are *yack-track* ‘audio commentary’, *killer thriller*, and *serial-killer thriller*; assonance is involved in *chat-track* and *jabber-track* ‘audio commentary’. Combinations with the word *Brit* as the modifier were common: *Brit-grit* ‘a British style of drama characterized by gritty realism’ and *Brit-hit* are motivated by rhyme, while *Brit-grit-flick* and *Brit-flick* are based on assonance. These compounds were commonly used when a film fitting the description was being discussed:
(17) Supremely efficient in its storytelling, it’s also acutely atmospheric and suspenseful – perhaps mild compared to the shock-and-gore of Hollywood serial-killer thrillers, but not without its gut-punching moments. (165/50)

(18) Reformed Essex geezer Chris (Daniel Mays) returns home to find best mate Shifty … dealing crack. Yet another Brit-grit thriller? Not exactly… (159/139)

Long-established examples of film-related neo-classical compounds are not easy to come up with. One example is psychodrama ‘a play, film, novel, etc., in which psychological elements are the main interest’ (OED s.v., sense 2); biopic and bio-drama are further candidates, but they may as well be considered clipping compounds (bio can be treated both as a combining form and as a clipped form of the adjective biographical). 16 new, film-related neo-classical compounds came up in the 13 issues of TF examined.

Audio commentary is one of the numerous words used to describe the bonus feature on a DVD or Blu-ray, but audio could also be treated as an adjective in this compound (see 4.2.1). As mentioned earlier, noir occurred as the head in many compounds. Three such examples can be classified as neo-classical compounds: Euro-noir ‘a noir taking place in Europe’, meta-noir ‘a film that is conscious of its being a noir’, and neo-noir ‘a new, modern kind of noir’:

(19) After Pedro Almodovar’s Volver brought him back to maternal melodrama, this tragi-romantic meta-noir [Broken Embraces] executes an about-swerve to the Spanish auteur’s last-but-one, Bad Education. (158/50)

(20) Taking a cold, cruel plunge into its sociopath’s world, Winterbottoms’s latest genre swerve [The Killer Inside Me] is an accomplished neo-noir. (168/54)

The combining form bio occurred in bio-doc ‘biographical documentary’ and bio-thriller, which suggests that it can be used with whichever genre, as long as there is a suitable biographical story to base a film on (bio-western and bio-horror, for instance, are possible formations). The final combining form -(a)thon, ‘denoting something long in terms of time and endurance…’ (CD s.v.) came up in two combinations: horror-athon and explode-a-thon.
(example (21)) are good examples of how word-formation often helps writers who need to find a way to express something unusual, but do not have a word for it in the lexicon of their language. In a situation of this kind, nonce formations are likely to arise:

(21) Laughably, this [film is] pitched closer to reality – a notion that is shot down the second a katana-flashing ninja bungee-jumps onto the field of battle. Still, for a modern **explode-a-thon** the plot’s passably coherent… (159/63)

Two further “combining forms” should be mentioned here. In some combinations, **apoco-** ‘related to or taking place in a post-apocalyptic setting’ and the humorous **geri-** ‘related to old people’ are used in compounds, as in **apoco-western**, **apoco-actioner**, **geri-action**, and **geri-actioner** (see the illustrations below). These elements are not recognized either as combining forms, prefixes, or potential stems in any of the material I examined. However, the elements do originate in a classical language – both **apocalyptic** and **geriatric** are Greek in origin – and are used in a way that resembles the use of combining forms. In addition, with **apoco-** the argument is further supported by the fact that it includes the linking element **-o-** (not present in **apocalyptic**) that is commonly found in neo-classical compounds:

(22) We want to know if she witnessed any of the acting goliath’s behind-the-scenes ticks or tricks while shooting **apoco-movie** The Book Of Eli. (164/85)

(23) Old dudes in action movies: it’s what the kids are into these days (The Expendables, The Taking Of Pelham 123, anything with Steven Seagal…). Next up in the **geri-action** genre comes Armoured, boasting a cast of senior studs including Jean Reno, Matt Dillon, and Laurence Fishburne. (160/37)

During the past year or so, the compound element **geri-** has been useful, as it has become almost fashionable to revive (the careers of) old actors, especially action stars who were popular perhaps in the 1970s or the 1980s. Currently, the prototype for a geri-actioner is the recent, Sylvester Stallone-directed The Expendables. However, it was Quentin Tarantino who systematically started giving forgotten stars second chances to work with fresh material –
actors resurrected by him include John Travolta in *Pulp Fiction*, Pam Grier in *Jackie Brown*, and David Carradine in *Kill Bill*.

4.3 Conversion, Partial Conversion, and Syntactic Processes in *Total Film*: An Overview

Conversion turned out to be a rare source of new film-related vocabulary in the 13 issues of *TF* examined. Six clear examples of conversion were gathered and six words were categorized as examples of syntactic processes, while only one example of partial conversion occurred. Even if the number of examples of true conversion is small, they are worth discussing here, as most of them were used regularly; also, examples of syntactic processes represent an interesting method of creating new expressions. In the following, the findings are discussed.

As regards true conversion, many examples of the noun to verb type gathered turned out to be long-established: the film-related nouns *score*, *script*, *soundtrack*, and *voiceover* all have their respective converted verbs, listed in the dictionaries consulted: *to score*, *to script*, *to soundtrack*, and *to voiceover*. Each verb has the general meaning ‘to provide/write/perform X for a film’.

There were two occasions when the title of a film or the name of a writer was used as a verb. Such a verb is interesting because in a certain context it is semantically highly restricted, but without the context there are many possible senses. According to Clark and Clark, a verb converted from a proper noun “has as many senses as there are facts that speakers and listeners could mutually know about” the person or object denoted by the original proper noun (1979, 784). In any case, the reader must know enough about this person or object in order to understand what the meaning of the derived verb is. Here are the two examples that came up:
(1) By turns thrilling, funny, confounding and certifiable, *Thirst* is also extravagantly overlong – could nobody have *Kill Billed* it in two? – but this much invention crammed into 90 minutes would likely melt brains. (160/47)

(2) [Jonathan Nolan] was Christian Bale’s go-to guy when the *Terminator Salvation* script turned up a stinker. Cynics would say he didn’t exactly *Mamet* it, but then again the original draft was by *Catwoman* and *T3* men Brancato and Ferris. (160/66)

In other contexts, these verbs could have many different senses. Here, however, the textual context helps the reader familiar with films to decode the meaning, so that the number of different possible senses is narrowed down to one. Quentin Tarantino’s *Kill Bill* was released in two parts owing to the four-hour duration of the entire film – such duration is considered disastrous in financial terms. Thus, the meaning of the verb here is ‘to release in two parts in order not to take a financial risk caused by the long duration of the film’. Based on this, it can be said that the last film in the *Harry Potter* series is also *Kill Billed*. The verb *Mamet*, on the other hand, refers to David Mamet, who is famous for his skilful rewrites of screenplays for big-budget films. Thus, the sense of the verb here is ‘to improve a flawed screenplay by rewriting it’.

As discussed elsewhere in this thesis, Blu-ray is currently overtaking DVD and gaining the position of the standard format for watching films at home. In the course of the publication of the 13 issues examined, the share of Blu-ray in the reviews section grew significantly. This means that articles related to Blu-ray are now much commoner, which provides an ideal channel for the coinage of new vocabulary. As was the case earlier with DVD, one of the selling points of the new format is re-releasing old films with improved picture and sound quality. Words such as *transfer* and *upgrade* are commonly used both as nouns and as verbs, but the brand name itself has also become subject to conversion: *to Blu-ray* now means ‘to upgrade a film into a Blu-ray edition’. Only one instance of the verb came up (example (3) below), but it has been further used in subsequent issues, and in a recent film
advertisement, one-third of the page was occupied by the imperative “Blu-ray me”. It is likely that this word will gain more ground in future. Note, in the following example, that the word has obtained a past participle form:

(3) Fur flies with fresh clarity in this **Blu-ray’d** re-release of John Landis’ gigglesome gore-’em-up. (160/141)

The noun *cameo* ‘a small character part that stands out from the other minor parts’ (*OED* s.v., sense 2) was relatively frequently used as a verb. Based on the diversity of the forms the verb occurred in (*cameos, cameo’d, cameoed, cameoing*), it is surprising that this item of vocabulary qualifies as new. The following examples illustrate the different forms of the verb:

(4) The casting offers pleasures, too: Bill Murray **cameos**, Gael García Bernal struts, John Hurt talks bohemian and Tilda Swinton bigs up Orson Welles’ *The Lady From Shanghai*. (162/62)

(5) Which wrestling legend **cameo’d** as himself in monster sequel *Gremlins 2: The New Batch*? (169/152)

(6) Where once there was Drew Barrymore **cameoing**, now we have Elizabeth Berkeley. Enough said. (157/139)

Some examples of conversion that came up are interesting in the sense that the words they are derived from are also recent coinages through another method of word-formation. This is the case with the verb *mo-cap*, derived from the noun *mo-cap*, which is itself a clipping compound based on *motion capture* (for the explanation of this word, see 4.2.1). In each of the seven instances that occurred, the verb was used in the passive (see (7) below). The noun *nom*, on the other hand, was first clipped from *nomination* (see 4.3.1), and quite soon became subject to conversion. In most of the examples of this verb it is part of a passive construction (*nommed*), and in fact every time preceded by *Oscar* (example (8)). This is
hardly surprising, as Oscar is the most prestigious award in the film industry – films might as well be *BAFTA-nommed* or something else, but such combinations did not occur in the 13 issues examined. *Nom* seems to be a somewhat restricted word: when we think about the Golden Globes, for instance, the converted verb is not as suitable: *nominated for a Golden Globe* has a much more natural feel to it than *Golden Globe-nommed*. The preference for the passive, on the other hand, can be explained by the nature of the action itself: nominations are *given* once a year, and the point of view is rarely one that discusses a person or an entity nominating, giving out nominations to, or indeed *nomming*, films or people in the industry. It should also be noted that in some instances the word form *nommed* was an adjective (“an *Oscar-nommed film*”).

(7) What’s truly remarkable is how everything meshes with utter believability: the stomping CG Ents, a *mo-capped* Gollum, stampeding Oliphants and a New Zealand backdrop that seems too magical to actually exist. (163/64)

(8) Lasseter had been busy, too. His witty short *Luxo Jr* … was the first massive step forward for Pixar, becoming the first 3D computer-animated movie to be *Oscar-nommed*. (169/91)

A common type of syntactic process is the proper noun to common noun type where the name of an artist or an author is used to denote an individual piece of their work. Linguist and political activist Noam Chomsky can serve as an example: when a new book by Chomsky is published, one may go to a book store and ask, “Where can I find the new *Chomsky*?” In *TF*, this strategy was used once, in reference to a hypothetical new film by Paul Thomas Anderson, one of the most acclaimed directors in the 21st century:

(9) Here’s a tip Charlie: when all you do is parodies (two *Hot Shots*, two *Scary Movies*), it’s gonna be hard to be considered [to be cast in] the next *PT Anderson*. (161/111)
A type similar to the one above sees a proper noun becoming a common noun in a phrase beginning with *to do a: to do a Gervais* (example (10) below) and *to do a Paul Greengrass* (example (11)) were used in connection with a British person, or somebody working outside Hollywood, expected to “move on” and make their breakthrough in Hollywood – Ricky Gervais (actor/director) and Paul Greengrass (director) are well-known individuals who have succeeded in doing that recently. The phrase *to do a Shyamalan* (example (12)) is based on director M Night Shyamalan, who began his career as a filmmaker with two successful thrillers but has since failed in his attempts to repeat the success. Thankfully, each of these examples is accompanied by a clarifying textual context, so that the reader knows what the words mean:

(10) It’s time for [Larry David] to ‘do a Gervais’ and make Hollywood a more interesting place. (160/72)

(11) The next 12 months will determine whether [Edgar Wright] can *do a Paul Greengrass* and move from Brit TV to being offered US movies. (160/88)

(12) And while Kelly might think he’s channelling a sinister suburban psychodrama in the pulsing vein of David Lynch’s *Lost Highway*, he’s actually doing a Shyamalan – another born filmmaker and storyteller who should be focusing on refining his filmmaking and storytelling instead of wasting energy trying to reverse-engineer an earlier hit. (167/136)

The only example of partial conversion that occurred in *TF* was in fact frequently used: the transitive verb *greenlight* ‘to allow a proposed film project to move into production’ is based on the compound *green light*, used figuratively in *(to give) a green light* ‘(to give) permission to proceed on a course of action’ (*OED* s.v. *green adj*, sense 1i). The verb, commonly used in the passive, is an example of partial conversion because the stress has shifted from the second component to the first. The three examples below illustrate the gradual conversion of the word from a nominal compound to a verb:
(13) The current plan is to mould a self-contained trilogy, but since the original was ahead of its time for merchandise and spin-off potential, Disney will want to get the cash cows mooing… Our guess: Christmas box-office money shower, greenlight in Feb 2011, film in 2012. (169/106)

(14) After a few false starts … Bale went supernova with Batman Begins, using his newfound celebrity status to greenlight passion projects like Harsh Times and Rescue Dawn. (158/130)

(15) You can’t keep a good vampire down. Every few years they’ll just rise again… These days, it seems the quickest way to get something green lit is to add a few fangs. (161/12)

A closer examination of the use of greenlight revealed that when the verb is used in the active voice, it can have another meaning in addition to ‘to give a green light to’: as seen in example (14), the verb can also mean ‘to help a project get the green light’.

4.4 Clipping in Total Film: An Overview

Clipping is a remarkably commonly used method of word-formation in TF: altogether 124 instances of new film-related clippings were gathered. The distribution according to the subcategories is as follows: 48 back-clippings, one fore-clipping, no instances of back and fore clipping, and 75 clipping compounds.

The number of clipped names gathered was a not insignificant 43. It could be argued that names are not relevant when new film-related vocabulary is examined, especially as they are not listed in general dictionaries. However, I consider them worth discussing from the point of view of word-formation: the clipping of names is well represented in the literature on word-formation. Still, as names do not have the possibility to receive dictionary entries, it should be stated that the number of new clippings gathered from the corpus that may some day become established is reduced to 81, which is still a large figure but one that is far behind those of affixation and compounding, with 120 and 129 new film-related lexemes respectively.
There seem to be only a few specifically film-related clippings that have become so well-established that they are not considered clippings anymore, *movie* from *moving picture* probably being the most widely known of such words. In addition, people who are familiar with films and entertainment need not necessarily think about the original words in order to understand clipping compounds such as *biopic* (*biographical picture*), *sitcom* (*situation comedy*), or *romcom* (*romantic comedy*). What remains in all of these words, crucially, is their connection to their longer versions, and the identical meaning they share.

The findings support Adams’ claim that words that are clipped consist of two or more syllables: none of the clippings gathered were based on a monosyllabic word. Marchand’s claim that clipped verbs and adjectives are rare is also corroborated by the findings: clipped adjectives appeared only in clipping compounds, while not a single clipped verb occurred.

4.4.1 Back-Clipping in *Total Film*

48 new film-related words were gathered that are a result of back-clipping, including 21 back-clipped names and 17 formations with a diminutive suffix. This means that only ten new film-related examples of back-clipping occurred which were not personal names. By far the most frequently occurring ones of these new lexemes were *adap* from *adaptation* that occurred 118 times and *nom* from *nomination* with 24 occurrences (see the examples below). *Nom* was also frequently used as a verb (*to nom*, *to be nommed*), but this word is discussed in more detail in 4.3 as there are grounds for stating that the verb is a result of noun to verb conversion.

(1) “Ahhh, that was my favourite shoot. A lovely crew to work with,” remembers Reston of this anarchic Alan Moore *adap*. (166/37)

(2) …he’s here because in 2010’s brave new world of 10 Best Picture Oscar *noms*, his exceptional *Funny People* has got a shout. (160/66)
Doc from documentary is an established clipping (used more frequently in TF than its longer version) whose meaning has changed slightly with the recent development of film entertainment in our homes. With the introduction of DVD and later Blu-ray (the name of which was fairly quickly clipped into Blu), it became possible to include extra materials on the discs, something that was seldom done with VHS tapes (these extra materials are almost without exception referred to as extras, or supps from supplementary materials when Blu-ray special features are discussed). One kind of “doc” often offered is the Making Of documentary (or the Making Of doc, or, even more shortly put, the Making Of) that tells about the production of the film. There is a tendency in TF to prefer the clipped word when the documentary in question is relatively short and part of the disc’s extras; however, even when referring to actual, feature-length documentaries, the clipping seems to dominate:

(3) The sole extra, an hour-long doc interviewing 617 Squadron survivors, shows Anderson was bang on target as he reveals that flying at 60ft was “bloody frightening… and very dangerous.” (169/134)

(4) Good Hair covers the racial politics you’d expect from Rock’s stand-up material … but this fast-moving doc also riffs on men vs. women, globe-spanning economic injustices and several other fascinating hair-strands. (169/56)

Silent from silent film and short from short film are long-established examples of the type of shortening that is found problematic by Adams and Marchand (see 2.4.1), as they are shortenings that look like adjective to noun conversions. However, the omitted material (film) can be regarded as specific in meaning, and even though the noun is not there, it can always be added. Therefore, there are grounds for saying that the words above are clippings. Similar words that are established include feature from feature film and horror from horror film (here the retained word is not an adjective in the compound, but does serve as an adjectival). Film-related examples not listed in the dictionaries consulted are the Region 1 from the Region 1
edition (of a DVD), visuals from visual aspects or visual effects, and sci-fi from sci-fi film, as illustrated in the following examples:

(5) Extras AWOL – go for the Region 1 instead. (167/141) [in a DVD review]

(6) One sub-plot even offers a coy romance, while the ruminative voiceover and stark, shimmering visuals suggest dream and parable – lessons can be learned from this strange community cocooned in the mists of time and memory. (161/54)

(7) Kant, Buddhism, kung-fu, Baudrillard, comic books… You need a PhD in pop culture just to follow the Wachowski’s sci-fi. (169/69)

Altogether 21 back-clipped names (not including names where a diminutive suffix has been added) occurred in TF, most of which came up only once in the 13 issues examined. 17 out of the 21 names gathered were back-clipped given names, and most of them do end in a consonant, supporting the claim made by Plag (2003, 118); examples of the findings include Kev from Kevin, Morph from Morpheus, and Jen from Jennifer. The only clipped name ending in a vowel indeed ended in a diphthong instead of a single vowel (Leo from Leonardo), which is one of the tendencies observed in Plag’s study (ibid.).

Back-clipped surnames turned out to be an interesting category, as two of the four names gathered were accompanied by the definite article (Hitch from Hitchcock, Trav from Travolta, the Stath from Statham, the Hath from Hathaway). The addition of the definite article is not mentioned in the works I consulted, but it seems to be a convenient way of signifying familiarity towards the person denoted:

(8) She’s a Hair and Make-up Designer who’s friendly with Alan Rickman’s codpiece, makes lesbian vampires sexy and runs her fingers through The Stath’s hair for a living. (157/40)

(9) The Hath is great at many things, but extrovert inebriation isn’t one of them. (169/162)
Another way of expressing familiarity or positive attitude that came up relatively often (17 lexemes) is the addition of a diminutive suffix to an (often) clipped name; the suffixes -ie, -y, -o, and -s were mentioned earlier, and examples of each were gathered. Surprisingly, most of the clipped names with a suffix attached to them were male names – only one clipped woman’s name came up; two were based on the surname of the person denoted. The findings include: Angie from Angelina, Arnie from Arnold, Wolvie from Wolverine; Dusty from Dustin, Gerry from Gerard, Olly from Oliver; Gibbo from Gibson, Rolo from Roland; Bats from Batman, Favs from Favreau, and (the) Pads from Paddy (notice that the names of film characters can undergo clipping as well). When these forms are used, it is usually clear for the intended reader who is being referred to. To help those who are unfamiliar with the subject matter, some material usually reveals the person denoted: often the full names are mentioned elsewhere in the text, or the accompanying pictures provide the aid needed.

4.4.2 Fore-Clipping in Total Film

Toon/toon from cartoon could serve as a perfect example of an established film-related fore-clipping. However, there is a degree of disagreement upon whether such words qualify as clippings where it is the lightly stressed first syllable that has been removed. A commonly known genre of shadowy crime films known as film noir, however, has a fore-clipped form noir that can be considered an established example of this type (example (10); see also 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 for a discussion of noir as an element in compounds).

Only one example of an unmistakable fore-clipping that is new and film-related occurred in the corpus: the ‘Berg refers to Steven Spielberg, and the clipping is used in a film review alongside half a dozen references where the surname is left untouched (example (11)). It seems that the function of the clipping is simply to bring variation to the text, but the fact that the word berg is commonly associated with a large mountain may suggest that the
clipping is employed because the referent is one of the most successful, or one of the “biggest”, film directors of all time:

(10) It’s not long into Werner Herzog’s lunatic noir about an irredeemably corrupt, nasty, granny-terrorising nutjob with a badge (Nicolas Cage) that you’ll be grinning ear to ear. (167/47)

(11) The ‘Berg is on his game, too. The eyes are literally the mirror of the soul in his vision of 2054, a startlingly plausible world of glitchy, consumerist technology that feels ever more like the day after tomorrow… (168/152)

4.4.3 Back and Fore Clipping in Total Film

Not a single new, film-related word occurred in the corpus that is the result of back and fore clipping. This is not surprising, as this type of clipping is considered rare.

4.4.4 Clipping Compounds in Total Film

Alongside back-clipping, clipping compound was the most productive type of clipping in TF. However, the figure can be considered slightly misleading: out of the 75 words gathered, as many as 38 were variations of one productive pattern where the latter part of the clipped compound is com from comedy (see 4.9.2 for an in-depth discussion on this pattern).

All clipping compounds gathered were nouns. Out of the 37 lexemes that do not involve the word com as the second element, noun–noun compounds were the most common type (22 words, including four names), while 15 adjective–noun combinations occurred; no verb–noun combinations were found. Only back-clipped and full words were used as parts of the compounds, meaning that all lexemes gathered from the corpus where the second element has been fore-clipped were categorized as blends (see 4.5). Clipping only the second element was the most common way to form clipping compounds (19 examples), but many examples
occurred where only the first element (14) or both elements (6) have been clipped. In the following, a brief overview of the findings is given.

Some clipping compounds gathered are formed using individual clipped elements that either are listed in dictionaries or that were mentioned above with back-clippings – it is the resulting combination that is new. Such compounds include docu-portrait (documentary portrait, similar to docu-drama); lit-pic, lit-flick ((12) below), lit-biopic (lit from literature); studio exec, exec producer (exec from executive); teen pic, studio pic (pic from picture); bio-doc (biographical documentary), mock-doc ((13) below), shock-mock-doc; and the rather odd bonus supps from *?bonus supplementary materials.

(12) Here, she puts her own spin on the lit flick in Ang Lee’s breezy take on Jane Austen’s novel of sisterhood, marriage and inheritance. (160/161)

(13) How many of those die-hards will make it to the end of this plotless shock-mock-doc? Some might regard doing so as a bizarre badge of honour. (169/56)

Mo-cap (motion-capture) is an example of a clipping compound whose both parts have been clipped, and whose meaning is unlikely to be understood by people who are not familiar with the technology used (example (14) below; see also 4.2.1 for the definition of the term). Other examples where both elements have been clipped include lit-pic (literature picture) and the following combinations where the shortening has changed the first element only orthographically, not phonologically: slo(w)-mo (slow-motion), hi(gh)-def (high-definition), and lo(w)-fi (low-fidelity). The different written forms of the first elements in the latter three examples are used interchangeably.

(14) But Andy Serkis’ incredibly expressive performance still utterly convinces nearly a decade later. His return to the mo-cap suit is still what The Hobbit will rely on to bring Gollum back to life. (166/147)
A problematic pattern is illustrated by the following three examples where the first element, originally sci-fi, has been shortened into sci-: sci-caper, sci-fable, sci-fantasy. The first example is clearly a clipping compound, but in the latter two, the presence of the /f/ sound indicates that we may also be dealing with blends.

Four names occurred in the corpus that can be classified as clipping compounds. Each such compound is a combination of a back-clipped given name and a back-clipped surname. 

Li-Lo refers to Lindsay Lohan, while Scar Jo is a shortening of Scarlett Johansson. J-Ro, meaning Julia Roberts, is definitely a clipping compound, but it can also be considered to be an analogical formation based on another celebrity whose full name has been clipped: the singer Jennifer Lopez is commonly known as J-Lo. The most frequently occurring clipped full name was that of Robert Pattinson, a young heartthrob who is currently causing mass hysteria among teenage girls (see also section 4.9.3). He is now commonly referred to (at least among teenagers and TF readers) as R-Patt or, more frequently, with a variant form of the suffix -s added, as R-Pat(t)z (how the word should be pronounced remains a mystery to me):

(15) …giving R-Pattz a run for his money by romancing Kristen Stewart in Adventureland, Jesse Eisenberg has also found time to slip into Michael Cera’s shoes as Hollywood’s go-to awkward yet witty teen. (167/80)

(16) But so long as the camera’s in focus whenever R-Patz is on, no one’s going to care, are they? (162/72)

4.5 Blending in Total Film: An Overview

Blends turned out to be a relatively rarely used method of word-formation in TF: altogether ten examples came up, out of which three were personal names referring to a pair of lovers. In five cases, the first word has been back-clipped while the second one has remained intact; three blends came up where the first element is retained in its full form while the second one
is fore-clipped; in addition, two blends were formed by back-clipping the first component and fore-clipping the second one (this means that all new lexemes where both elements were back-clipped were categorized as clipping compounds, see 4.4.4). In all but three of the ten blends gathered the two elements overlap in pronunciation. In the following, all findings are discussed and illustrated.

Established examples of blends used in film journalism include \textit{dramedy} from \textit{drama} + \textit{comedy} and \textit{blaxploitation} from \textit{black} + \textit{exploitation} ‘the commercial exploitation of Black characters or subjects, esp in cinema or television’ \cite{CD s.v.}. These kinds of terms are useful when film genres are discussed, as it is not uncommon for a film to feature elements of more than one genre. In both of these formations, the two elements overlap, and the resulting blends have the same number of syllables as their second elements. This type of blending employed to describe genres more specifically, however, seems rare: only two new examples of this kind that came up in \textit{TF}: \textit{splatire} from \textit{splatter} + \textit{satire} and \textit{tweepie} from \textit{tween} + \textit{weepie}:

(1) From an allegorical premise, Blomkamp fuses \textit{Starship Troopers}-ish ‘splatire’ with body horror, \textit{Enemy Mine}-ish buddy-movie business and a thrilling, speaker-stretching wallop of \textit{Robocop}-ish hardware porn. (164/134)

(2) While trying to film this month’s \textit{tweepie} \textit{Remember Me}, [Robert Pattinson] was chased by rabid fans … and ‘enjoyed’ a girl hanging off him like a pendant during a stroll from trailer to set. (166/20)

The most commonly occurring new blend in \textit{TF} is \textit{bromance} from \textit{bro(ther)} + \textit{romance}. The context of use for this blend has become rather predictable, as it was mostly used in texts related to a certain type of film. Example (3) below can be regarded as a kind of definition for the blend, while the blend itself is seen in example (4). The blend can almost be claimed to have become a term for a new film genre: in recent years, a new generation of comedic talent, led by producer-director Judd Apatow, has made a breakthrough. In many of the films made by them, the story is built around a close, non-sexual relationship between two or more male
characters. The bonding between the men is never of a romantic kind; often the viewer may feel that the characters have had a long history together and seem like brothers, or at least “bros”. The point that the compound brother romance seems to have never occurred further proves that this word is indeed a blend. A similar example is gorno from gore + porno, (example (5)) which is synonymous to the commonly used torture porn, in both terms the element referring to pornography being metaphorical (see 4.9.3); however, I do not have a recollection of the compound gore porno being used in TF.

(3) [The Hangover] is a male wish-fulfilment that uses the recent Judd Apatow-propelled line in romcoms for guys to into a slightly more reconstructed take on blokey solidarity. (162/158)

(4) Proving that 2009 wasn’t the only year for bromances (I Love You, Man, The Hangover, Role Models, the forthcoming Humpday), Simon Pegg and Nick Frost head to the States for their first film together without Edgar Wright… (160/86)

(5) Ti West’s shocker favours old-school tropes – plot, character, suggestion and suspense – over gorno extravagance. (166/68)

Animation was found as either the first or second part of three blends. Two of the blends (animajesty from animation + majesty and paranoia-mation from paranoia + animation, see (6) and (7) below) only occurred once, apparently coined to serve the immediate need of the writer. The adjective–noun blend Japanimation from Japanese + animation (example (8)), however, is clearly gaining ground, reflecting the ever-increasing popularity that Japanese animated films enjoy in the West. The need for such a term, however, can be questioned, as a long-established term for Japanese animation (anime) already exists. Thus, it seems unlikely that Japanimation will become significantly more widely used than it is already; however, it is a useful term for bringing variation to a text.

(6) Fleeing from witch-wielded paper birds, he twists and writhes, dips and swoops, alive with pain and plumage fluid with fluttering ani-majesty. (159/118)
(7) Charles Freck’s got innumerable itches he can’t scratch in Richard Linklater’s rotoscoped paranoia-mation. (159/117)

(8) This month’s The Princess And The Frog sees Disney go back to the drawing board. Hayao Miyazaki has never left it. In fact, his latest 2D marvel sets a record for the Japanimation godhead’s oeuvre: it uses roughly 170,000 separate cels, none of them computer-generated. (164/43)

Sometimes, when two well known celebrities find love, the press may create a blend based on their (given) names. The entity that is Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie has become Brangelina; another similar blend that came up in the corpus is Robsten, combining Robert Pattinson and Kristen Stewart, the stars of the phenomenally successful Twilight films. For one reason or another, it is the name of the man that comes first in these blends:

(9) To women’s magazines, she remains the ultimate cover star. Post-Brangelina, they have imbued her with martyrdom and layers you suspect may not be there. (161/130)

(10) And what makes it all the more tantalising is the thought that real-life are-they-aren’t-they co-stars ‘Robsten’ may be doing this for real… squeal! (166/18)

In the contents page of one of the TF issues a joke on blends such as these is made: an introduction to a feature titled “Power Couples” says “Brangelina were busy. So here’s Paulennifer…” (160/3). In this case the motivation for using blends is clearly the lack of space. However, this example is illuminating from the point of view of word-formation, being the only one where a blend combining two proper names is accompanied by a verb. Based on the verb form, such a blend should be treated as a plural form.

4.6 Abbreviation in Total Film: An Overview
Looking back in time, it can be seen that abbreviations are not especially common among film-related vocabulary. Some examples that are (or have been) frequently used include VHS ‘video home system’ (practically disappeared by now) and DVD ‘digital versatile disc’
(probably on its way out as well). *HD-DVD* ‘high definition DVD’ appeared for a period of time during the latter part of the previous decade, but the abbreviation has already become obsolete. In addition to names for video formats, the names for a number of film production companies are abbreviations, including *MGM* ‘Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer’ and *RKO* ‘Radio-Keith-Orpheum’. Abbreviations are also used in naming members of a film-making crew: the director of photography is referred to as *DoP*, while assistant directors are known as *ADs*. When it comes to genre names, science fiction has been abbreviated into *SF*. Even if the word is hardly restricted to film vocabulary, *science fiction* in an interesting word because it has been subjected to more than one process of word-formation (see 4.1.3, 4.4.1, and 4.4.4) in the course of time.

Plag has an argument based on which we can assume that abbreviations can be expected to occur in an informal magazine that focuses on a specific topic. He says that there is a social meaning implied in the use of abbreviations: “within certain groups of speakers, the use of an abbreviation can be taken as a marker of social identity: speaker and listener(s), but not outsiders, know what the speaker is talking about” (2003, 128-9). Based on this, it can be predicted that abbreviations will occur in *TF* in contexts where the reader should indeed be somewhat of an “insider” in order to understand what or who is being referred to.

Altogether 19 new film-related abbreviations were gathered from the corpus. All of the words gathered are initialisms, or what Marchand calls letter-words, that is, words that are composed of the initial letters of multi-word sequences. In addition, in each abbreviation the initial letters are pronounced individually. No syllable-words, acronyms, nor words that have acquired pronunciation-spellings occurred. 15 out of the total of 19 words are abbreviations of full names of actors or directors, while the remaining four are related to new home video technology. Out of the 19 words, eight came up only once, whereas most other lexemes were
used on a relatively regular basis. No abbreviations were gathered with dots between the individual letters. In the following, the findings are briefly analyzed and illustrated.

The introduction of modern high definition video technology to our homes has involved a great deal of new technical vocabulary, some of which is in the form of abbreviations. In spite of this, the number of new abbreviated words found in TF’s Blu-ray reviews is small, perhaps to the advantage of readers that may still be unfamiliar with the new format. One such word is PiP ‘picture in picture’, or PiP-track, which refers to the possibility of watching a film while simultaneously receiving other information on the screen via smaller windows.

It was mentioned in section 4.4.1 that the trade name Blu-ray was relatively quickly back-clipped into Blu. The official abbreviation of is actually BD (from ‘Blu-ray disc’), which rather surprisingly occurred only three times in the corpus. The related term high definition itself is also often abbreviated into HD, occurring 35 times in the issues examined (example (1) below). Interestingly, with the arrival of high definition in its current form (OED has a quotation of the word from 1943, but at the time the concept was certainly much less developed than it is today), the term standard definition and its abbreviation SD have begun to be used. These terms commonly come up in Blu-ray reviews where the new release of a film is compared with the DVD edition: when purchasing a Blu-ray, one expects the picture and sound quality to be superior to those provided on the cheaper DVD edition, released either years before or simultaneously with the Blu-ray edition. In addition, there are expectations related to the supplementary materials offered. Sometimes, the distributors simply offer the same extras on a Blu-ray disc as have already been offered with the DVD editions. Therefore, SD is frequently accompanied by the word carry-over(s) (example (2)).

(1) Previously-seen supps and modest HD picture-boosting make for an inessential upgrade of Petersen’s workmanlike reboot. (167/148)
(2) A full-bodied 40-minute doc and a lively FX-team talk-track spearhead solid **SD carry-overs**; all-new enticements include a booklet and [a] comic. (166/150)

All the instances of **SD** occurred in the last four issues examined, which may be due to the fact that Blu-ray is finally starting to overtake DVD in terms of sales and becoming the standard format, at least in Britain. The rise of Blu-ray can also be seen in the space devoted to each format in the issues: the first issue examined (Issue 157) had less than one page reserved for news related to Blu-ray, whereas only a year later, in issue 169, as many as six pages were devoted to Blu-ray, while many of the remaining pages featured reviews of recent films that came out in both formats simultaneously. It remains to be seen if the words **standard definition** and **SD** become part of the lexicon or simply disappear: when the manufacturing of DVDs ends, these terms are no longer needed that much. However, it is likely that a new format will be developed with “even higher definition”, possibly resulting in the high definition provided by Blu-ray becoming mere “standard definition”.

Out of the 15 proper names gathered, all but two were male names. This is similar to the trend of given names that are clipped and then given pet suffixes (as discussed in 4.4.1). Actors and directors were equally referred to by using initialisms. In general, individual initialisms composed of three letters had a tendency to occur more frequently than those composed of only two letters. The reason for this is simple: when a string of three letters is encountered, it is easier for the reader to come up with the full name of the person denoted, as the possibilities are more limited. Examples of three-letter initialisms that came up more than once include **RDJ** from Robert Downey Jr. (9 instances), **PTA** from Paul Thomas Anderson (7), **GDT** from Guillermo del Toro (2), and **SJP** from Sarah Jessica Parker (2).

(3) This **Holmes** refuses to take itself seriously. Brilliant, because it allows **RDJ** and Ritchie to let rip with their non-traditionalist revamp. (164/50)
(4) Sure, it’s taken him ten years, but Cameron has achieved no less than a rebirth of cinema. Jackson, Spielberg, Fincher, PTA, del Toro… over to you. (164/47)

Six out of the nine initialisms consisting of two letters only occurred once; the reason for this may be the fact that using them can be argued to be done at the expense of the clarity of the text. The three two-word names that occurred in their abbreviated form more than once are well-known directors: JC from James Cameron (6 instances, all of which came up in an issue that contained a “James Cameron Special”), QT from Quentin Tarantino (6), and RR from Robert Rodriguez (2).

(5) But if the historical liberties outrage or offend, just keep telling yourself: it’s only a movie-movie. One that’s big, brash and unpredictable, enriched by QT’s love of actors, love of language, and love of cinema… (158/43)

(6) Can Robert Rodriguez do for Predator what James Cameron did for Alien? RR will write and produce, Vacancy’s Nimród Antal will direct. (160/76)

A closer examination of the textual context surrounding these abbreviations revealed that they are seldom used alone: in almost all cases the abbreviation was accompanied by other references to the person denoted (either the full name or the surname), or by a picture. Abbreviations were often used in a headline or an ingress right below it, or in other contexts where the use of an abbreviation could be explained by lack of space. In four cases, however, an initialism came up unaccompanied by any kind of explicit hint. These names are PTA, RDJ, GDT, and QT – for a reader familiar with today’s film world, recognizing these names should not turn out to be a problem. However, an occasional reader may feel put off by the use of such “in-group” vocabulary.
4.7 Analogical Formation in *Total Film*: An Overview

In this thesis, Bauer’s classification (1983, 96) is followed when deciding upon whether a new word is regarded as an example of analogical formation rather than, for instance, a blend. The lexeme should be clearly based on a commonly used model word, and/or there should be a phonetic resemblance upon which the formation is based. In addition, words were included that can be argued to contain a “pseudo morpheme” that has seemingly become analyzable (Marchand 1969, 2). The search yielded 15 examples of more or less genuine analogy, and an overview of the findings is given below. I begin by referring to new lexemes that are discussed elsewhere in this thesis, as in certain cases it was challenging to decide whether or not a productive pattern should be considered an example of analogy and included here. The purpose is to yet again illustrate that categorizing new vocabulary in English according to the method of word-formation involved is not always straightforward.

As stated in section 4.2.2, the pattern based on *shoot-‘em-up* (*hack-‘em-up, gore-‘em-up*) was categorized as an example of compounding, even though it might as well be regarded as one of analogy: there is a clear model word that has become widely used in film vocabulary, the formations resemble the model word phonologically, and Plag’s model of proportional relations (2003, 37) can be applied (see below). The pattern of compounding with the word *porn* as the head (see 4.9.3) could also be argued to qualify as an example of analogy: the model word *torture porn* was frequently used for some years, after which a number of variations began to emerge. However, the condition of phonetic resemblance cannot be applied to the pattern, but Plag’s model still applies:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & a : b :: c : d \\
\text{b. } & \text{shoot : shoot-‘em-up :: hack : hack-‘em-up} \\
\text{c. } & \text{torture : torture porn :: holiday :: holiday porn}
\end{align*}
\]
Another problematic issue concerning classification is deciding whether a certain coinage is an example of analogy or a blend. In section 2.7, the different interpretations of cheeseburger and other “burgers” were referred to; in addition, the “genuine” analogical formation ambisextrous, referred to by Bauer (1983, 96), is given a different etymology in OED (s.v.), where it is stated that the word is a blend of ambidextrous and sex. In the following discussion, it could be argued that nearly all of the examples categorized as analogical formations could also be analyzed as blends.

The following discussion on the corpus findings begins with a brief reference to the words gathered from TF that are not very likely to result in productive series, and that were therefore interpreted as the clearest instances of genuine analogy. Most of the lexemes listed below occurred only once, however, and they seem like nonce formations that will not find their way into dictionaries. These examples are followed by the introduction of the new items of vocabulary that were associated with a productive pattern; such lexemes are also interesting because they tend to blur the borderline between analogy and word-formation rules (Plag 2003, 37-8).

Independent cinema’s answer to Hollywood can be Indie-wood, even though no such place physically exists where most independent films are produced. Adults who have for a long time been fans of Disney films were referred to as Mouseketeers in, the formation being based on a phonological resemblance with musketeer and the fact that Disney is commonly associated with Mickey Mouse. A formation came up twice where the first element in Blu-ray was replaced by the combining form nu-, which is here related to the sense ‘forming the names of types of popular (esp. dance) music which revive earlier styles, typically incorporating more modern elements’ (OED s.v. nu-comb. form, sense 2): nu-ray was used to emphasize that the format has brought home video technology to a new era. Below, the abovementioned words are illustrated:
(1) Gradually, **Indiewood** domination blunted Miramax’s fabled edge and the backlash began even though the awards multiplied. Anodyne crowd-pleasers replaced taboo-busting gambles. (159/160)

(2) Disney’s attempt at an instant animated classic will impress the kids, but leave older **Mouseketeers** wistful for former glories. (164/48)

(3) Fittingly, an excellent **nu-ray** extra takes note of sound’s importance in the movie’s mix of naturalism and impressionistic headspaces. (161/163)

Fans of the recent *Twilight* films were frequently referred to as **Twi-hards** (example (4) below), the formation of which is based on a phonetic resemblance with **die-hard** that can be used to denote followers of people or sports teams (*a die-hard fan*); the possible role of the classic film *Die Hard* in this formation should perhaps also be taken into account. As seen in example (5), a film that features a great number of cameos (‘a small character part that stands out from the other minor parts’ (*OED* s.v., sense 2)) was described by using the “adjective” **cameo-tastic**, based on **fantastic**. Finally, it has happened several times in the history of film that Disney have produced a film based on a well-loved (children’s) story – such a treatment received by a story was referred to as a **Walt-over** (example (6)), the formation being based on either **walkover** (phonological resemblance) or **makeover** (semantic resemblance).

(4) R-Pattz mania shows no signs of abating. Summit Entertainment have rushed the third episode in the *Twilight* saga through production to capitalize on their licence to print money at the expense of rabid ‘**Twi-hards**’.

(5) [The film will be] **cameo-tastic**, including appearances from Bruce Willis, Steve Austin and **the Governator** [see the discussion below], aka Arnie. (168/26)

(6) [This version of *Robin Hood* is a] cutely anthropomorphic **Walt-over** … Packed with charm and laughs despite being built on a modest budget. (168/40)

Analogy is sometimes employed to create nicknames for people. Arnold Schwarzenegger is a former film star who moved into politics and was elected governor of California in 2003. In *TF*, he is frequently referred to by using nicknames such as **Arnie** and
even *The Big Oak*, probably owing to his surname being so difficult to spell and pronounce by English speakers. The name of his most iconic character – the titular/eponymous cyborg from the future in the first three *Terminator* films – became a model word soon after he received his post as the governor, resulting in a new nickname analogous to the name of the film franchise: *the Governator* (example (5) above). It is a humorous way to refer to the popular man, and clearly the coinage is not based on the non-existent verb *governate*.

As regards analogy resulting in a productive pattern, some new lexemes based on the noun *blockbuster* ‘an expensively produced and commercially successful film, novel, etc’ *(CD s.v.)* occurred in *TF*: *mockbuster* ‘a direct-to-video film that piggybacks on a big release’ (defined in *TF* 162/109), *schlockbuster* ‘an expensive film based on a simple plot’, and *budget-buster* ‘an extraordinarily expensive film’ (see (7) below) are all different kinds of blockbuster. The first two formations are based on a phonetic resemblance with the model word, while the third might also be regarded as an example of a synthetic compound (see 2.2.2) but was nevertheless considered more suitable to be included in here. Two further examples occurred where the component *-buster* is preceded by a proper noun: the formation *Bay-buster* is based on Michael Bay, who is the director of some of the most explosive action films in the past years (including the *Transformers* and *Bad Boys* films), while *Bruck-buster* (example (8)) is based on Jerry Bruckheimer, the most influential and commercially successful action film producer in Hollywood today (in fact, most films directed by Bay are produced by him). In addition, a noun formed to describe Bay’s films occurred: *Bayhem* (example (9)) is based on *mayhem*, and it is another example of genuine analogy. Interestingly, *Bayhem* is one of the few lexemes gathered from the corpus that occurred inside quotation marks.

(7) *The Postman*: Post-apocalyptic *budget-buster* so tedious that footage of an actual postie doing his rounds would’ve entertained more. (163/142)
(8) But after two Bruck-busters, it must have been a relief to do something a little more cerebral, like Redford’s The Conspirators? (165/79)

(9) For all its loud, supersized ‘Bayhem’, Revenge Of The Fallen has a plot so opaque it’s like trying to decipher hieroglyphics using the Oxford English dictionary. But it’s a toy tie-in movie, you cry – it’s about fun. Well… (162/146)

Another potential example of analogy that has become productive is the pattern based on sequel. In the 21st century, Hollywood has more than ever so become characterized by the lack of fresh ideas: especially nowadays, old ideas, films, and characters are recycled again and again in order to make a relatively easy profit. As a result, a number of different kinds of sequels (as well as remakes, see 4.9.4) are produced: the events in a prequel (which is listed in dictionaries, and which in OED (s.v.) is said to be a blend of pre- and sequel) take place before those in the original film(s), while a threequel (also recorded in OED) and a fourquel are the installments whose narrative should chronologically follow that of the sequel (see the examples below). In the paper I wrote on this topic earlier, there was even a reference to an inbetween-quel, referring to a film that takes place between the events in two trilogies published earlier. Perhaps excluding the last example, these words hardly need an explanation these days, as they are used frequently and are quite transparent semantically.

(10) Subtitled Revelations, this threequel to the Ashton Kutcher clunker surprises: it’s not bad. (159/139)

(11) Tokyo Drift director Justin Lin’s fourquel never captures that visceral va-va-voom again until right at the end… (159/139)

The absence of fourquel in dictionaries can be accounted for by stating that fourth parts in film series are simply not that common: in the 13 issues of TF examined, the words prequel and threequel occurred eleven and ten times, respectively, while only two instances of fourquel were gathered. In theory, however, this pattern is “infinitely” productive: even if a
series of films does not typically become very long, there will always be exceptions. For instance, the horror franchise *Saw* has recently reached its seventh part, and even though it is sub-titled “the final chapter”, it is not unlikely that commercial success will bring an *eightquel*, a *ninequel*, and perhaps even a *tenquel* to cinemas in the near future. Similar to the different kinds of “burger” discussed above, this pattern is also far from straightforward to categorize: for instance, should *fourquel* be categorized as a blend of *four* and *sequel*, or does it contain the “pseudo morpheme” *-quel*, an unmeaningful sound group that has become analyzable and productive in English (Marchand 1969, 2, 213)? Are these words examples of analogy, or could word-formation rules be applied?

4.8 Semantic Shift in *Total Film*: An Overview

Semantic shift was a relatively common category of both long-established and new film-related vocabulary in the 13 issues of *TF* examined. In most cases, the motivation behind using the words seems to be related to the effects of synonymy (as discussed in section 1.5.3), so that by using the words more colour is added to the texts and space is saved by the use of such economic, descriptive words. One aspect that makes this category interesting is that the majority of the neosemanticisms were used frequently, which indicates that they have become part and parcel of film-related vocabulary in *TF*. The findings can thus be said to be more satisfactory than some others introduced in this thesis, in that they do not only illustrate a source of new vocabulary, but also represent potential new dictionary entries, whereas many other findings were rare and thus more likely to end up forgotten.

In this thesis, the inclusion of a word in the category of new film-related examples of semantic shift is based on the following conditions, following partly the points made by Ullmann (1962) and Cruse (2000), as referred to in 3.8, and partly conditions that I have formulated myself. Note that phases (4) and (5) in Cruse’s pattern (2000, 214) do not apply
when specialization of meaning is concerned: the original sense is unaffected because the new sense is adopted only in the terminology of a limited group. The conditions are as follows:

1. Word W has an established literal sense, S1, but is used in TF primarily in a new sense, S2, which is film-related and somehow based on S1.
2. It seems as if S2 has “caught on” and is freely used by the writers of TF.
3. No definition matching S2 (that is, with the film (or similar) context specified) is listed in the dictionaries consulted.

Seven nouns and four verbs matching these conditions were categorized as new film-related examples of semantic shift. In addition, a more significant group of words that can be claimed to have undergone semantic shift is discussed in section 4.9.4: 17 nouns and eight verbs related to the remaking of an existing film occurred. Most of the words begin with the prefix re-, and I decided to present them in a section of their own, as it can also be argued that they should be discussed in section 4.1.1, alongside prefixation.

Some of the words gathered are listed in either OED or CD in their film-related senses. The definition of commentary ‘a description accompanying a cinema film or other exhibition, etc’ (OED s.v., sense 3c) may not yet include the audio element (on a DVD) that commentaries are associated with today, but the definitions of the following words are more accurate: the noun helmer ‘a person who directs a film, television programme, etc’ (OED s.v.), and the verbs helm ‘to direct (a film, television programme, etc)’ (OED s.v. helm v.) and wrap ‘to finish filming or recording’ (OED s.v., sense 8). In the latter three examples, the relation between the original and the new sense is metaphorical; this can also be argued to be the case with the long-established noun nod ‘in the entertainment industry: (a nomination for) an award’ (OED s.v. nod n., sense 1d), although the metaphorical relationship between a nod and a nomination is not entirely transparent. Furthermore, the OED definition seems imperfect, as in TF the word was never used to denote the award itself: it occurred 25 times, always in the
sense ‘a nomination for an award’, as illustrated in example (1) below. It is reasonable to suggest that the parentheses be removed from the above OED definition:

(1) Laden with gongs and noms (including four nods at this year’s Emmy’s), *Entourage* has fans in high places – namely Barack Obama… (159/153)

Related semantically to *nod, gong* (example (1) above and (2) below) is a word frequently used to denote an award, especially the prestigious Academy Award. It can be argued that this is a new sense of the noun, as the definition closest to ‘award’ that was found in the dictionaries consulted was ‘medal’ (*CD* s.v.), which is somewhat different. However, a medal is also something that is made of metal and given out in order to reward an achievement. Thus, it seems reasonable to state that the sense ‘award’ is an extension of the sense ‘medal’, based on physical resemblance; however, the use of the noun also reminds one of the beating of a gong, which can be associated with moments of victory.

(2) That *American Beauty* beat *Magnolia* for all three Best gongs tells you everything you ever need to know about the Academy Awards. (165/146)

Many of the nouns categorized as new film-related examples of semantic shift are listed in dictionaries with similar senses. The crucial reason for including them in my inventory is that films (or television, often closely connected to films in dictionary definitions) are not referred to in dictionaries for any of the senses. For instance, *gig* ‘an engagement, esp of a band or pop group for one performance only’ (*CD* s.v., sense 3) is almost exclusively limited to bands performing music; in addition, the duration of a gig is rather short, something that is over by the end of the night. When adopted in the film context, *gig* still refers to a single engagement, but now it is one of an individual, usually a director or an actor. Moreover, the engagement can last as long as several months, as the production of a film tends to take a long
time. In example (4) below the gig actually covers the making of one or more seasons of a television series.

(3) The former wild child is eyeing *The Wizard Of Oz* spin-off *Surrender Dorothy* as her sophomore directing *gig*, with the sort-of-sequel focussing on Dorothy’s great, great granddaughter. (169/23)

(4) When director Stephen Hopkins offered him a *gig* in a real-time TV experiment, he saddled up but expected little. “At best,” Sutherland said, “I thought I could get a year or two of work.” (168/136)

The noun *scribe* has an old-fashioned feel to it, and the dictionary sense closest to the one found in *TF* is somewhat general: ‘used (more or less playfully) for: One who writes or is in the habit of writing; an author; the writer (of a letter, etc.)’ (*OED s.v. scribe n.1, sense 7a*). *Scribe* with the specific meaning ‘screenwriter’ occurred 24 times in the issues examined, so it is surprising that this sense is not listed in *OED*. A similar example is *thespian*: the senses given in dictionaries suggest that the word is connected with drama (as in the theatre) and not film actors. In addition, the initial letter of the word in dictionaries is capitalized. In *TF*, the noun was never capitalized, and it was used in an interesting way: I expected that it would only refer to serious actors or actors who are considered to be at the top of their game. However, *thespian* (as well as the clipped version of the word, *thesp*) was used for denoting both great actors and actors in general. Also, when a derivative based on the noun was used (*thesp|ing, thesp|y*), it was not always serious acting that was being referred to – the words were used in a sort of humorous sense (see the examples below). This supports the definition given in *OED* (s.v. *Thespian*), according to which the use of the word can be facetious.

(5) Steve Carell might be Hollywood’s greatest current tragic-comic *thespian*… (166/57)

(6) Starring *Memories of Murder* super-*thesp* Song Kang-ho as a priest who’s born again as a vampire, it’s a blood-black comedy full of twisted laughs… (160/19)
(7) Fear not though [Megan] Fox hounds, [Jennifer's Body]'s not all serious thesping, there’s still plenty of the sex stuff too. (160/112)

One verb with the sense ‘to write a screenplay’ came up in TF but was not listed in the dictionaries in that sense. Ink ‘to daub, cover, blacken or colour with ink’ (CD s.v. ink v.) occurred four times alongside other verbs such as pen or scribble, being used to replace the generic write or a long, clumsy phrase referring to the writing of the screenplay (the latter two verbs, however, were not included in my inventory, as their dictionary definitions cover a wide range of different kinds of writing):

(8) Named after a song by Hole, the second film inked by Juno scribe Diablo Cody gives Fox her tastiest role yet. (158/14)

(9) If you liked HBO’s sex-and-violence-filled Rome you’ll be pleased to hear that creator Bruno Heller has penned a script for a movie sequel. (167/153)

Finally, two verbs were frequently used that refer to the winning or receiving of a nomination, an award, or a role (or any other kind of “gig”). Of the two, land ‘to capture; to secure’ (CD s.v. land v.) is semantically more diverse, as it was evenly used in connection with awards and award nominations as well as roles in films. The verb bag ‘to seize, secure or steal; to claim or reserve for oneself’ (CD s.v. bag v.) was used more frequently, but its usage seems to be more restricted: it was used only once in connection with a nomination, while 19 instances were connected to an award and nine to a kind of gig. In the majority of the occurrences, both verbs were used transitively, but when the winning of an award was referred to, ditransitive use was also common: a film can land or bag its director or star an award, and a role can bag an award for the actor. Below, the usage of the two verbs is illustrated:

(10) Three years ago, freshly minted from the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, she landed a pair of career-launching roles… (165/81)
(11) The fact that this Sundance-launched despair-fest is certain to land a Best Picture Oscar nod – maybe even the big prize itself – is testament to Precious’ staggering, stirring potency. (164/45)

(12) …en route to landing [Woody Allen] two Oscars … [Annie Hall] set the template to which his subsequent work has adhered. (167/160)

(13) Grimes cropped up in Band of Brothers, has a regular voiceover gig on American Dad and has now bagged the role of Will Scarlet [in Robin Hood]. (157/37)

(14) Bagging Fukunaga the Best Director prize at Sundance, Sin Nombre sees young gang-member El Casper … on the run from his own vengeful gang. (158/30)

4.9 Closer Examination of Selected Groups of Vocabulary Found in Total Film

For this section, I have handpicked for a more detailed discussion four groups of film-related vocabulary gathered from TF that I considered worthy of sections of their own. Each of the groups represents patterns that are very productive. The groups are as follows:

(1) Suffixation with the denominal suffixes -esque and -ian

(2) Clipping compounds with com (‘comedy’) as the head

(3) Compounds with the noun porn as the head

(4) Semantic shift related to remaking a film

This section offers more than an overview of these groups of words, in contrast to what has been done with many other patterns in sections 4.1–4.8. The findings are discussed more thoroughly: not only is more attention paid to the semantics of the words, but issues such as context and orthography are also taken into account. Some of the following sections do not repeat earlier theoretical observations, the emphasis being instead on analysis and illustrations.
4.9.1 Suffixation with the Denominal Suffixes -esque and -ian

In section 4.1 it was stated that by far the most frequently used suffix in TF was -er. I decided to present the second and third most productive suffixes in a section of their own, in order to have an opportunity to delve deeper into their nature without overburdening section 4.1. The following two sub-sections discuss the denominal suffixes -esque (24 new film-related lexemes) and -ian (16), which resemble one another in meaning. In 4.9.1.1 these suffixes are briefly introduced, and in 4.9.1.2 the findings are discussed and illustrated.

4.9.1.1 The Suffixes -esque and -ian

According to Bauer, the suffix -esque can be added to either common nouns (picturesque) or proper nouns (Junoesque) to form adjectives. He goes on to state, however, that nowadays adding the suffix to a common noun base seems to be a somewhat limited process, and that when the suffix is added to a proper noun base, the noun in question tends to be a surname (1983, 266-7). Plag states that the suffix -ian is also typically attached to proper nouns. One key difference between -ian and -esque is observed by Marchand, who states that derivatives ending in -ian can be either adjectives or nouns, whereas the use of -esque is limited to forming adjectives (1969, 246).

The definitions of -esque vary slightly: Jespersen’s definition is ‘in the manner or style of X’ (1942, 326), while Marchand elaborates with ‘having the (artistic, bizarre, picturesque) style of the person in the base’ (1969, 286). Adams compares -esque (as well as -ian) with a group of native suffixes (-like, -ly, -ish, -y, -ed, and -ful) and provides a rather general definition: they can mean ‘like X’ or ‘having X’. (2001, 36-7).

The sense of -ian most people are familiar with is seen in derivatives such as Scandinavian ‘a person from Scandinavia’. However, in this study we are not interested in this sense, as lexemes related to geographical locations can hardly be considered very central
when film-related vocabulary is discussed. The meaning that we are interested in is roughly similar to that of -esque, namely ‘(one) pretending to or characterized by material or spiritual descent from –’ (Marchand 1969, 246). Plag adds to this the nominal sense ‘being the follower or supporter of X’ and illustrates it with Chomskian and Smithsonian (2003, 90).

In relation to orthography, Jespersen observes that if the base word ends in a vowel, this vowel should be dropped (Casanov(a)esque) unless there are semantic reasons for not doing so (Garboesque) (1942, 326). According to Bauer, there is a tendency for the base word to have more than one syllable (1983, 267). These issues were not commented on in relation to the suffix -ian in any of the background sources, but in the next section -ian is examined from these points of view.

4.9.1.2 Suffixation with -esque and -ian in Total Film

24 new film-related words with the suffix -esque were gathered from the 13 issues of TF examined, while the number of new lexemes in -ian occurring in the corpus was 16. In the following, the findings are discussed and illustrated.

In each new example in -esque, the suffix was attached to a proper noun, supporting Bauer’s claim that the suffix is no longer that productively attached to common noun bases. In addition, the findings partly support his further statement that the proper noun base tends to be a surname (1983, 266-7): out of the total of 24 examples, 13 were based on a surname (Jim Jarmusch ‡ Jarmusch-esque). Exceptions were found, however, as four words were based on a full name (John Carpenter-esque) and one on a given name only (Roman Polanski ‡ Romanesque); other lexemes include those based on the name of a character (Gollum-esque), on the name of a film (Avatar-esque), and on the name of a film studio (Pixaresque). In general, directors’ names were the dominant group of base words (12 words), but names of actors (5) and film characters (5) were rather common as well. The suffix -ian, on the other
hand, is somewhat more predictable than -esque when it comes to the kinds of base word the suffixes are attached to: of the 16 derivatives gathered, 14 were based on a director’s name, and in 15 cases the name used as a base word was a surname. Here are some examples:

(1) Put a **John Carpenter-esque** hero (grizzled DJ Stephen McHattie) in a George A Romero-type scenario (a zombie infestation …) with a Cronenberghian conceit (the infection is aurally transmitted) and what have you got? (160/52)

(2) [Roman Polanski’s] *The Ghost* is a perfectly passable political suspenser with enough **Romanesque** flair to satiate admirers. (166/60)

(3) The *Corpse Bride* fantasist and the *Wanted* maestro are producing this post-apocalyptic CG ‘toon fantasy, which looks anything but **Pixaresque**. And that, for once, is a compliment. (158/74)

(4) White Rabbit emerges from bushes making odd hand gestures – very **Lynchian**, very eerie. (165/20)

As it was not very illuminating to try and force the different senses of the new findings under the definitions provided by Jespersen and Marchand (see above), I decided to divide them into more specific sense groups, and came up with four categories that can be applied for the derivatives in -esque and -ian gathered. The majority of the lexemes gathered with both suffixes could be included in a relatively general category, not unlike those referred to above. The sense ‘in a style typical of (films by) X’ is present in the following four examples, where the adjective is derived from a director’s name:

(5) Catherine Deneuve and Mathieu Amalric trade bittersweet blows as unloving matriarch and charismatic black sheep respectively, while the **Altmanesque** whirl of stories keeps you intrigued… (158/147)

(6) The premise is simple … but it’s all about the meticulously controlled, **Fincher-esque** visuals and the outrageous ultraviolence. (160/70)

(7) Soderbergh’s camera has a **Godardian** obsession with her guarded face that, along with the fiddly non-linear narrative, is about as ‘experimental’ as it gets. (166/140)
(8) Moon is tense … dodging potential clichés in favour of emotive, intelligent revelations. It’d be wrong to say “twists”, because Nathan Parker’s script drip-feeds Hitchcockian suspense instead of delivering fast-forgotten shocks. (157/58)

The above sense, in a slightly modified form, can also be applied to some formations that are based on the names of actors or even film characters; in the two examples below, the sense of the derivatives in -esque is ‘in a style typical to actor/character X’. Notably, no examples of derivatives in -ian representing this sense occurred in the corpus, suggesting that -esque can be used more diversely than its counterpart.

(9) Murphy steps into Jerry Lewis’ shoes and Rick Baker’s latex body suits for a flatulence-filled comeback vehicle that cannily exploits the actor’s gift for Sellers-esque multi-character antics. (164/151)

(10) Ford’s violence is strong, perhaps unwatchably, but doesn’t dominate the film. That job goes to Affleck’s mumbling whisper, narrating with Patrick Bateman-esque unreliability. (168/54)

Findings related to the other three senses that I came up with for these suffixes were marginal in comparison to the one illustrated above. Below, these three types are listed and illustrated with some added context:

(a) ‘as seen in film/television series X’:

Avatar-esque process [related to mind teleporting] (167/102)
Robocop-esque exo-suit (159/53)
Whovian mix of the ordinary and the extraordinary (166/153)

(b) ‘physically resembling X’:

Gollum-esque patient hideously disfigured by a mystery assailant (165/47)
Hugh Grant-esque newcomer … doing his stammering best (166/66)
Withnail-esque Simon Farnaby (166/139)

(c) ‘resembling a specific characteristic or event related to X’

Cameron-esque can-do style (162/10)
Travolta-esque comeback (161/96)
Wellesian moment, [a] silver flash of Icarus-esque glory (159/130)
Some derivatives in *-esque* came up in all these three senses, while *-ian* did not come up in sense (b) at all. However, one example of *-ian* forming a nominal derivative in the sense ‘the follower or supporter of X’ came up in the corpus:

(11) *Volver* scooped a Cannes gong for best female ensemble, but committed *Almodóvarians* might argue that the Cannes clamour came late for him and for *Cruz*. (158/136)

Based on these findings, it can be stated that with *-esque*, a wider variety of meanings can be communicated than by using the nearly synonymous *-ian*, even if *-esque* is limited to forming adjectives. Neither of the suffixes was used in a negative sense, which is not surprising as it usually takes some sort of a maestro to have one’s name qualified as the base word for one of these suffixes. Sometimes, however, a derivative was used in a negative context to point out flaws in the film under discussion, in connection with the superior filmmaker it brings to mind:

(12) [This] off-kilter *Jarmusch-esque* meander [is] pretentious and too in love with its own quirkiness, but a decent supporting cast and the weird, chilly frontier vibe make it curiously watchable. (162/152)

As regards orthography, three words were gathered where the base word preceding the suffix *-esque* ends in a vowel. In none of them is anything dropped from the end of the base. This is probably due to the fact that in each instance the vowel in question affects the pronunciation of the word, and dropping it would result in a derivative that is pronounced in an odd manner. The derivatives are *Capra-esque*, *Travolta-esque*, and *Romero-esque*. Another interesting finding is that in the majority of the derivatives in *-esque* gathered there is a hyphen between the two components – I do not recollect seeing a single hyphenated example of this type of derivative in the background sources consulted for this study.
In the 16 derivatives ending in -ian nothing is ever dropped, but there is one interesting finding that is not mentioned in the works on word-formation consulted, probably owing to the rarity of the type. In both examples where the base word of -ian ends in a vowel, the consonant v is added before the suffix -ian (cf the formation of Peruvian). The addition is called for, as the pronunciation of the derivatives would not be natural without the added consonant. The derivatives in the following examples are based on the television series Dr Who and the Hong Kong director John Woo, respectively:

(13) The result is a very Whovian mix of the ordinary and the extraordinary. (166/153)

(14) Lau/Mak’s inspiration was Face/Off, but they ditch those Woo-vian bullet ballets for the psychological subterfuge of a stylish urban-existential thriller. (157/92)

In terms of the number of syllables in the base word, it was discovered that -esque was never added to a monosyllabic word: 14 derivatives had a two-syllable base (Kaufman-esque), eight were attached to a three-syllable word (Travolta-esque), and in two words the base consisted of four syllables (Patrick Bateman-esque). The suffix -ian turned out to be more flexible when it comes to the number of syllables in the possible base words: mono- and bisyllabic bases came up five and six times respectively (Lynchian, Kubrickian), while altogether five examples were gathered where the base consists of either three or four syllables (Cronenbergian, Almodóvarian).

Bauer has examined the distribution of this group of suffixes that are roughly similar in meaning and commonly attached to personal names (-esque, -ian, and the ones quoted above in 4.9.1.1). According to his findings, -ian is by far the commonest of these suffixes, being used in 60 percent of the instances found in the data he examined, while -esque resulted in a low figure of 15.4% (1983, 268). These figures are surprising, as in TF roughly three words ending in -esque were gathered for every two derivatives ending in -ian.
4.9.2 Clipping Compounds with com (‘comedy’) as the Head

The “model words” for the pattern of clipping compounds introduced in this section are most likely to be romcom (from romantic comedy) and sitcom (from situation comedy). The two words appeared, respectively, 75 and 34 times in the 13 issues of TF examined, and it was only seldom that their longer versions were used. The latter element in the compounds is interesting in the sense that in spite of its productivity in combinations, com never seems to be used on its own – the only position where it can occur is as the head of a clipping compound.

In this section, the clipping compounds gathered are discussed through examining the left-hand elements modifying com, the focus being on the following issues: the part of speech, the form, and the meaning of the modifier; whether or not the modifier is a clipped word as well; and any phonological effects that the formations may have been based upon.

Altogether 38 new clipping compounds with com as the head were gathered. In 28 cases the modifier was clearly a noun (bloke-com), while in six cases it was interpreted to be an adjective (tragic-com). The remaining six examples were more challenging to analyze: how to decide, for instance, whether binge in binge-com is a noun or a verb, or whether politi in politi-com is a clipping of politics, politician, or political? Regardless of the part of speech, the word in the modifying position was mostly used to describe either one or more of the following: the setting of the film (vacation-com, flight-com); what kind of theme the film addresses (politi-com, sex-com); who the protagonists of the film are (gangster-com, spy-com, stoner-com, fem-com ‘female/feminine comedy’); or the kind of genre or intended audience (kiddie-com ‘a comedy about/for children’ sports-com). Here are some examples:

1. Todd Phillips’ lauded binge-com [The Hangover] intoxicates less on disc… (162/158)

2. In those 18 months, Hall squeezed in two telly dramas … three films (Frost/Nixon, Dorian Gray, Nicole Holofcener’s New York-set fem-com Please Give), awards-season tub-thumping for Vicky Cristina Barcelona and… (159/86)
In six cases, the modifier preceding com consisted of more than a single word. In addition to dysfunctional character-com and suicide-bomber-com, which inform us who the protagonists are, there are examples where a new element has been added to an existing clipping compound. Rom-zom-com is an extension of both romcom and zom-com, and the word stands for ‘a romantic zombie comedy’, while buddy zom-com ‘a buddy comedy with zombies’ does the same to buddy-com and zom-com. It is tempting to state that formations such as these are clearly nonce formations (perhaps even stunts) coined to serve an immediate purpose. However, it is not easy to predict which terms persist: zom-com, as far-fetched as it may seem, occurred no less than five times in the corpus. If we add to this the two extensions mentioned above, the number of occurrences is a not-inconsiderable seven. The word was probably coined around 2004 when the British hit Shaun of the Dead (whose tagline says: “A romantic comedy. With Zombies.”) was released; in the subsequent years, zombie comedies have started to become increasingly popular. It looks as if a new sub-genre of both horror and comedy has arrived – and with the genre arrived a new term to describe it:

(4) The Shaun of the Dead boys screened an exclusive trailer of their zom-com at 2003’s FrightFest. (159/123)

(5) ‘I’ve been watching you since I’ve been masturbating!’ shares Tallahassee, with the sort of infectious enthusiasm typical of a rom-zom-com. Is it better than Braindead or Shaun? Nope. But make no mistake, Zombieland rules. (161/66)

When it comes to the composition of the left-hand element, 32 examples have a single-word modifier, most of them consisting of one or two syllables. The only two words where the first element has three syllables are politi-com ‘a political comedy, a comedy about politics/politicians’ and vacation-com ‘a comedy taking place during a vacation’. In ten cases
the modifier is a two-syllable word, meaning that in the majority of the lexemes, *com* is modified by a single-syllable word. Such words can be claimed to be structurally closer to the two model words (*romcom, sitcom*), and it can also be stated that they are pronounced with more ease than their slightly longer counterparts. Below, the three types are illustrated:

(6) More giggles [are] promised in **vacation-com** *Couples Retreat* … featuring tons of funny and/or sexy people… (160/60)

(7) She told us last issue that she hoped she wouldn’t be the catastrophic Jar Jar Binks of this saucy **horror-com** – and Megan Fox can rest easy. Yes, she’s vapid, unrealistic and she sucks (literally), but that’s the aim of the game. (161/51)

(8) Hartnett was a chiselled heartthrob destined for Pitt-style superstardom. But as soon as he clashed with [Harrison Ford] in this **cop-com**, Josh’s career melted into a miasma of flops… (164/31)

The brevity and the relative ease of pronunciation are reasons for the preference to have a single-syllable word as the modifier. Furthermore, in eleven cases out of the total 20 with a monosyllabic modifier, there is an identifiable phonological motivation present in addition to the shortness of the word; different types of sound motivation were also identified in some of the modifiers consisting of more than one syllable. *Zom-com* and *bomb-com* ‘a comedy involving bombs’ are motivated by rhyme and consonance (the final sound is the same); there is alliteration (initial consonant sound is repeated) in *cop-com, kiddie-com*, and *vacation com*; assonance (the two elements have the same vowel sound) is involved in *cop-com, mob-com*, and *mock-com*, and formations such as *crim-com* and *fem-com* are motivated by consonance.

In 12 out of the 38 clipping compounds gathered it is not only the latter element *com* that has been clipped, but the modifier has been clipped as well. In the case of *Brit-com, frat-com*, and *indie-com* the clipped word in the modifying position is listed in dictionaries and is also used independently, but in most cases the modifier has been clipped to serve the purpose of being combined with *com*. The long-established *romcom* and *sitcom* are good examples of
this: *rom* and *sit* can hardly be used independently to replace their longer versions. New lexemes where both elements of the formation are clippings that cannot be used independently include *zom-com*, *crim-com* ‘a comedy about criminals’, and *preg-com* ‘a comedy revolving around pregnancy’:

(9) And as for similarities to another Irish **crim-com**, no one minds. “People will say it’s another *In Bruges,*” admits Fitzgibbon. “If they do, we’ll go, ‘Yeah, great…’.”

(165/26)

(10) Here’s hoping Jennifer Lopez has one of her own after the underwhelming performance of her single-mum **preg-com** [*The Back-Up Plan*]. (169/69)

4.9.3 Compounds with the Noun *porn* as the Head

In its literal sense, the noun *porn* is a shortened version of the longer word *pornography* with an identical meaning. However, the sense of the word has been expanded metaphorically – here is the definition given in *OED* (s.v. *porn* n.2, sense 2):

*fig.* As the second element in compounds: denoting written or visual material that emphasizes the sensuous or sensational aspects of a non-sexual subject, appealing to its audience in a manner likened to the titillating effect of pornography.

The examples quoted alongside the definition include *horror-porn*, *gastro-porn*, *weather porn*, and *war porn*. A particularly useful and illuminating quotation provided by *OED* is that from *Locus* (May, 1991): “Practically anything that can be obsessed about turns up as hyphenated pornography: food-porn, disaster-porn.” Based on this information, it can be stated that practically any type of film that features a great deal of something whose effect can be described as “titillating”, or something that can be “obsessed about”, can be referred to by using a compound with *porn* as the head.
Having read *TF* for years before starting to gather vocabulary for the purposes of this study, I feel rather confident in stating that the first compound word widely used in the magazine with *porn* as its head was *torture porn*. The term began to be used when the horror film *Hostel*, directed by Eli Roth, was released in 2005. The plot of the film is simple: a group of arrogant male backpackers travel to a city in Slovakia, where they end up as victims for a corporation providing a curious service for wealthy people looking for new sensations. The service allows customers to torture and murder people in whichever ways they desire. The film was R-rated and disapproved of in many countries owing to the gruesome scenes featured in it. The term *torture porn* was coined to describe the film and the various copy-cats produced in the years following *Hostel*’s success; in fact, torture porn can now be said to be a horror sub-genre; serious filmmakers often associated with the term include Michael Hakene and Takashi Miike. The quotations below shed further light into the meaning of the term:

1. As its preppy serial killers torment both a middle-class family and us, Haneke demands: why are you watching this? The only logical answer to that question is to eject the disc. It’s *torture porn* given a moral compass – unwatchable but unmissable. (161/157)

2. Love him, loathe him or be completely indifferent to his *torture porn*, it’s fair to say that not all leapt for joy when Roth was cast as Sgt Donowitz… (158/86)

3. What makes Haneke’s ultraviolence fascinating is that while it soaks every frame, you rarely see it – and it cuts you far deeper than any Hollywood *torture-porn* horror. (160/34)

In the 13 issues of *TF* examined, *torture porn* occurred 17 times. It can be considered to be the “model word” for the relatively large group of similar words: in addition to *torture porn*, no less than 16 different terms with *porn* as the head were gathered. Even though each of the words only came up once, the number of different findings suggests that this pattern is definitely gaining ground. Below, the lexemes are discussed from the point of view of
orthography (how the words are formed) and semantics (use in a positive or negative sense; the kinds of words that serve as the modifier).

A compound that is used in an attributive position is commonly hyphenated (the lights on a Christmas tree but Christmas-tree lights (McArthur 1992, s.v. hyphen)), and this is mostly the case with the porn compounds as well. When the lexemes were hyphenated, they often modified the following noun, as in auto-porn epic, food-porn shots, poverty-porn undertones, and torture-porn style. However, examples were also found where a hyphenated compound did not serve as an attribute (examples (4) and (5) below). In general, it can be stated that there is no clear-cut method of predicting whether a compound with porn is hyphenated or written as two separate orthographical words.

(4) Sadly, the good bits are buried under merciless gross-out gags and humiliation-porn. (167/54)

(5) …the remaining 400-or-so minutes [of extras] are filled with: people walking to the edge of cliffs and pointing at stuff, doors being thrown open into chambers … New Zealand vista-porn and seasoned British actors gazing into the distance, talking politics while their American counterparts talk food. (159/159)

Deciding whether the compounds were used in a positive or negative sense was a challenge – eventually, most of them were interpreted as being neutral in tone. Four examples were identified where the tone accompanying the compound can be said to be negative, while in three instances something more positive was being communicated. The words that occurred in a negative sense were mostly connected with flawed films that the filmmakers had perhaps attempted to save by over-emphasizing some aspects. This is the case with humiliation-porn (see (4) above) and food-and-property porn (example (6)) as well as with example (7) below. Positive connotations were less straightforward to analyze – sometimes it is simply a good thing when there is an excess of something; see the quotations with gross-out porn, hardware porn, and holiday-porn below.
(6) …no one’s going to need a map to navigate the glossy contours of Nancy Meyers’ latest made-to-measure romcom. Light laughs. Low-level emotional tension. Lashings of food-and-property porn. It’s… calculated. (163/47)

(7) While Lopez looks photoshoot-stunning throughout (even when in labour), she’s hard to relate to, indulges in too much comic gurning and is ultimately acted off the screen by a disabled dog on wheels. Best enjoyed as property, shoe and hairdo porn. (168/64)

(8) It’s a hilariously bloodstained, semen-soaked tour de force during which Green … kills the gross-out genre dead. This is gross-out porn. This is Green’s Antichrist. (161/175)

(9) From an allegorical premise, Blomkamp fuses Starship Troopers-ish ‘splatire’ with body horror, Enemy Mine-ish buddy-movie business and a thrilling, speaker-stretching wallop of Robocop-ish hardware porn. (164/134)

(10) Aniston has more chemistry with her selection of kooky scarves than she does with [Eckhart]. Saving graces? The holiday-porn shots of Seattle and John Carrol Lynch, playing a grieving father with genuine, understated feeling. (161/66)

The modifiers of porn were analyzed and categorized; hopefully, this will shed some light into how exactly porn can be used to coin compounds denoting visual material in films and elsewhere. It was deduced that often these compounds are used to describe films that purposefully make the viewer want to consume. Films are an ideal vehicle for explicit product placement, but sometimes the advertising is done in a less obvious manner. A good example is cigarettes: throughout the history of cinema, famous stars have been smoking on-screen, and filmmakers have often been accused of encouraging smoking, especially among the young audience. Thus, it is not surprising that out of the 17 different porn compounds, as many as nine described a type of film that is likely to make the viewer want to consume in whichever form of consumption the film represents. Only one of the words, auto-porn, can be categorized as appealing mainly to male viewers, whereas frock porn, hairdo porn, and shoe porn are more likely to appeal to females. Food porn, property porn, and holiday porn denote films whose subject matter can be said to be equally tempting to both sexes.
Another aspect associated with the compounds gathered is human senses or feelings. The sense of taste is titillated by *food porn*, while *vista porn* is aimed at the sense of sight – they are likely to make the viewer willing to go to a restaurant or book a trip to a beautiful place. More commonly, compounds with *porn* denote films depicting issues or events that make the viewer respond with a negative reaction. Such material is nevertheless found enjoyable because the events are happening to fictional characters or, in the case of documentaries, to strangers. Such words include *torture porn, surgery porn* (both associated with horror), *poverty porn*, and *disaster porn* (showing natural disasters), all of which depict events the viewer may enjoy watching but would rather not be part of. Finally, *Pattinson porn* is an example of a formation that is connected with positive feelings: Robert Pattinson is nowadays regarded as a heartthrob, especially among the younger female audience; thus, a film where he plays the central character is likely to make the target audience feel titillated.

4.9.4 Examples of Semantic Shift Related to the Process of Remaking a Film

I have had enough. I have been a loyal follower since Issue one, but for at least a year the pleasure of reading your magazine has been spoiled somewhat and now it’s time for an ultimatum. The next issue to contain the word ‘reboot’ will be the last one I buy.

(A reader’s letter, TF 170/9)

This section discusses a source of film vocabulary that reflects a current phenomenon that is especially common in Hollywood: remakes. Remakes can be roughly divided into two types. The first type has always existed, as new adaptations of classic stories are made decade after decade (*Robin Hood, Alice in Wonderland, Shakespeare, Jane Austen*). The other type is causing a great deal of controversy among the film-loving public: old classics are being remade at an alarming rate, failures including *Psycho* and *The Planet of the Apes*. In recent years it has become almost a rule that successful non-English language films, especially
horror films, are remade in Hollywood as quickly as possible – the Spanish horror \( REC \) and the Swedish vampire drama \textit{Let the Right One In} are recent examples. Often remakes are deemed unnecessary, and indeed most of them are inferior to the original films. Thus, remaking a classic is often seen as something close to sacrilege, and the existence of remakes is constantly questioned – why remake something that has already been done well by someone else? The probable reason why remakes are made is actually quite simple: a remake means easy profits in a time when originality seems ever harder to come by. The following example – \textit{TF}'s short “definition” of \textit{J-horror} (‘Japanese horror’) – is short but illuminating:

(1) \textit{J-horror: Ringu} was the ringleader. It was no gore, utterly terrifying, ruined by \textit{remakes}. (163/101)

The large number of remakes produced has resulted in an ample terminology referring to them. Most of the terms begin with the prefix \textit{re-} and are listed in dictionaries, albeit still in a general sense in no way specified as being related to films. In this section, the prefix \textit{re-} is briefly introduced, after which an overview of the findings (17 nouns and 8 verbs) is given.

Marchand offers some useful insights into the usage of the prefix \textit{re-}. He points out that it is primarily used with verbs in the sense ‘to ~ anew, again’, the connection between the original action and the new attempt being that the “result of the action is … understood to be imperfect or unattained, and \textit{re-} then denotes repetition with a view to changing or improving the previous inadequate results”. He points out that although there is commonly a change for the better implied (\textit{re-education}), this may not always be the case (\textit{resettle}) (1969, 188-9). Marchand goes on to state that \textit{re-} is also found with deverbal nouns (\textit{recount, rehash, remake}) (ibid., 190); in the following, the emphasis is on the nouns with the suffix \textit{re-}, but it should be noted that most of the nouns were derived from the corresponding verbs.
As expected, *remake* was the most common term used in *TF*, occurring 144 times in the corpus. The noun, as well as the corresponding verb, can be used basically whenever a film is made whose story has already been told on film. The term itself seems to be rather neutral in tone, as it does not necessarily imply negative or positive attitudes.

The second most common noun was *reboot* (52 instances), a term which was originally restricted to computers, but the corresponding verb of which has since been given the metaphorically extended sense ‘to start (a process etc.) afresh or with renewed vigour; to restart’ (*OED* s.v. *reboot* v., sense 2). In a film context, the meaning of the noun has also been metaphorically extended: when a film franchise has in some way become unsuccessful, it can be *rebooted*, the resulting (first) film being a *reboot*. A reboot is much less likely to raise negative opinions than a *remake* (unless we think about the term itself!), as it is based on a series of films that is perhaps expected to continue, and as the expectations tend to be initially low, cinemagoers remembering only the disappointment caused by the latest, inferior instalment(s) in the series. Recent, successful examples of rebooting include the revival of the *Batman* and the *James Bond* franchises, both of which have once again become critically acclaimed in addition to being commercially successful. The following illustration explains everything that needs to be known to understand why films are *rebooted* (even though the word itself is not included in it):

(2) Abrams and his collaborators have done for *Star Trek* what Russell T Davies did for *Dr Who*: rescue a well-known but increasingly niche brand from the margins, making it younger, fresher, sexier – and most importantly, relevant again. (163/74)

The nouns introduced in the following were much rarer, but considered relevant as well: as with *remake* and *reboot*, verbs corresponding to these nouns were also used.

*Redux* looks like another formation with the suffix *re*-; but in fact is not analyzable like that in English, even though the element of doing something again is strongly present in the
meaning of the word. According to OED (s.v., sense 1), the word is a postmodifying adjective with the meaning ‘brought back, restored; experienced or considered for the second time; revisited’. It is probable that the term started to gain ground in film journalism in 2001, when Apocalypse Now. Redux was released. Remarkably, the word was used both as a noun and a verb in TF, even though in the OED definition the two parts of speech are not listed. Probably owing to its resemblance to the other words discussed in this section, redux as a noun appeared as many as 12 times in the corpus. It was commonly used in a way similar to remake and reboot, or to denote a film that recreates events or themes seen in older films:

(3) Just when you thought last year’s Prom Night was the worst of the new wave of ‘80s slasher reduxes, director Nelson McCormick goes and outdoes himself. (162/70)

(4) That’s ‘G’ for guinea pig, and ‘Force’ as in what it’ll take for most parents to sit and watch a rodent redux of Mission: Impossible. (162/145)

(5) His Day After Tomorrow froze stiff after passing through the eye of the ice-storm. Here, the director won’t rest until he’s reduxed every disaster movie ever made. (166/149)

The noun re-imagining (based on reimagine ‘to reinterpret (an event, a work of art, etc.) imaginatively’ (OED s.v.)) implies some kind of a change, not necessarily for the better, but to a style that is perhaps very different from that of the original work. The findings support this: even though some examples were gathered where the new film was not expected to be particularly different from its predecessors, there was a clear tendency to use the word for films that would be somehow very different. The examples below illustrate this:

(6) Dragon Fire [is] a re-imagining of Herman Melville’s whale obsession story Moby Dick, set in a fantasy world where people hunt dragons for their special powers. (166/32)

(7) The Frat Pack do it their way, re-imagining [Robin Hood] in a depression-era gangster romp… (168/40)
*Revamp* is a noun whose meaning is connected with improvement: *CD* (s.v. *revamp v.*) defines the underlying verb as follows: ‘to renovate, revise, give new appearance to’. However, the examples that came up in *TF* provide material for a mixed analysis, the word sometimes communicating a variation of attitudes towards the film that is talked about (examples (8) and (9) below). This observation leads me to conclude that *revamp*, or the corresponding verb, can be said to be quite close to *remake* in meaning, perhaps applied in different contexts to avoid repetition. I decided to include more context to the latter example below, as it offers an illuminating view on why the phenomenon of remaking old films may also be a positive thing and not always sacrilegious.

(8) It’s a needless remake of a brilliant Swedish film. But there’s a chance this *revamp* won’t bite… (169/18)

(9) So we got to thinking: if all the great horror films out there really must be *revamped*, why not plump for some obscure gems? *These* are the movies that are ripe for reinterpreting. For starters, few people will be annoyed that sacred cows have been slaughtered, for few people have seen the originals. And then there’s the added bonus that marquee releases for the remakes will steer viewers towards the glorious first efforts. It might even win them a Special Edition DVD or a debut on Blu-ray. (160/68-9)

The noun *retool* and the corresponding verb *to retool* seem to underline the fact that the source material is somehow modified to suit a new audience; it seems that no special attributes are associated with these words. The examples of their usage occurred in contexts where either a television series had been adapted into a film (e.g. *Mission: Impossible*), or where a classic film, made perhaps decades ago, had been remade (*Predator*). This word seems to be used in a positive sense, but only until too many things start to become *retooled*:

(10) The producer/writer of *Predators* and his crew tell us how to avoid pitfalls in their super-cool *retool* of the ‘80s cult hit, which saw Schwarzenegger and a group of commandos being stalked deep in the jungle. (169/74)
(11) Horror movies have been remade, recycled, reimagined, re-bloody-everything since the 1910s, but Hollywood is particularly obsessed at the moment, **retooling** heritage titles faster than Jason (old or new) can off fornicating teens. (160/68)

Lastly, **reinvention** was used when an old film, or a series of films, whose characters are known by most people, had been remade as a new kind of film (for instance, as one with more action to suit the needs of the target audience in the 21st century). The word was used for Ridley Scott’s new *Robin Hood* film as well as the recent *Sherlock Holmes* film directed by Guy Ritchie – here, the term **reboot** might just as well have been applied, and in fact it was in other issues used to refer to both films. The first illustration below hints at the role of marketing in bringing these words to the context of films: when there is a need to justify the remaking of a classic film and using the term **remake** is not considered desirable, new terms are employed:

(12) First there were remakes. Then there were ‘reimaginings’. Now comes the **‘reinvention’**. (167/144)

(13) Robin Hood’s righteous arrow has been flying for over a century and now Ridley Scott’s **reinvented** him again. We’ve handily perused 39 previous versions … to bring you the pick of the bunch… (168/40)

In addition to the nouns and the verbs introduced above, a number of somewhat rarer words occurred in the corpus that could be added to this discussion, but the inclusion of which would stretch this section into unnecessary length. These words include **re-do, refit, rehash, rejig, remix, retread, rework, and update**; this rather large group of words could serve as a good ground for further research.
5. Discussion

In the following two sections, the findings presented in chapter 4 are considered from two points of view. In 5.1, chronological observations are made, based on vocabulary gathered from the first issue of TF (published in 1997) and on some items of vocabulary gathered from International Dictionary of Broadcasting and Film (IDFB, published in 2000). Furthermore, references are made to some of the lexemes that were presented in my Bachelor’s Thesis but that did not occur in the corpus used for the present study. The comparisons made in 5.2 are based on the data gathered from one 2010 issue of Empire, another British film magazine.

By carrying out the abovementioned comparisons, this chapter will shed light on two issues. Firstly, the chronological observations inform us about the ways in which the lexicon may undergo changes: words that were in use some years ago may have, for one reason or another, either become obsolete by 2010 or have experienced a shift in their meaning or in their written form. Secondly, the comparison with another film magazine helps us gain a general view of how some of the new film-related lexemes that occurred in TF are used in other publications as well. In addition, neologisms occurring in Empire that did not come up in TF are commented on.

5.1 Chronological observations

A few interesting findings were made by examining the first issue of TF. To begin with, some words were inside quotation marks, implying that the words in question were considered novel at the time; such a choice on the words in question would perhaps seem strange today. For instance, Making Of, a common feature on DVDs and Blu-rays, was in 1997 limited to the contents of film-related books, as it was not very practical to include extra material on VHS tapes. Thus, the term was not commonly used, and readers probably were not very familiar with it (example (1) below). In addition, in the only reference to prequel gathered, the
word was inside quotation marks, indicating that the phenomenon denoted by it was new as well in 1997. Example (2) hints that the formation may have its origins in American English, and that at the time, the upcoming Star Wars prequels were perhaps among the first major productions representing this type of sequel. At some point in time, the quotation marks have been dropped owing to the term becoming more commonly used: nowadays, even lexemes like threequel and fourquel need not be used inside quotation marks.

(1) By no means your typical behind-the-scenes “Making Of” effort, this guide to the musical has pretensions to coffee-table grandeur… (1/106)

(2) The new movies will be “prequels” – if you don’t speak American, that’s episodes 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed 9-part SW epic – and thus will set before the original Star Wars: A New Hope. (1/10)

It was stated in section 4.9.4 that remakes have recently become increasingly common in Hollywood. However, two nouns (remake, rehash) and two verbs (to revamp, to rework) came up in the 1997 issue as well, with a surprisingly large total number of 14 occurrences. Fittingly, it is commented in the issue that “remakes remain a popular choice for ever-nervous Hollywood execs” (1/45). As discussed before, this phenomenon is by no means new in the world of cinema. However, it can be argued that the nature of remaking has changed during this short period of time. Indeed, many of the examples gathered referred to 1997 films that were remakes of very old films. Some of the films discussed were based on material dating as far back as the 1950s or even the 1930s (see the examples below), whereas today it is not uncommon that a remake is produced within only one or two years from the premiere of the original. In several cases, the rights for remaking a film have been purchased even before the premiere, especially if the original is a promising non-English-language film.

(3) Few have heard of its precursor, but Ransom is a remake of a 1956 movie written by Bond scribe Richard Maibaum and starring Glenn Ford… (1/25)
(4) A remake of the 1954 Billy Wilder original which starred Humphrey Bogart and Audrey Hepburn, Pollack’s version of *Sabrina* feels suitably old-fashioned. (1/104)

(5) Brad Pitt is down to play Death in Universal’s *Meet Joe Black*. … [Martin Brest] directs this loose remake of 1934’s *Death Takes A Holiday*. (1/46)

Another film-related lexeme that has changed slightly is *cameo*, which seldom occurred as part of compounds in the corpus. However, in more than half of the occurrences in the 1997 issue, *cameo* was part of combinations such as “cameo appearance” or “cameo role” (examples (6) and (7) below). Nowadays, the word has become well-established, and it is safe to use it in its clipped form without risking that some readers might not understand its meaning. Notably, *cameo* was already used as a verb in the first issue of *TF* (example (8)), even though *OED* still does not list the word as having a verb form (see also 4.3).

(6) It has murder, sex, violence, revenge, dusty crania, a bit of “to be or not…” and a *cameo appearance* by Ken Dodd. (1/19)

(7) The flick’s got a budget of $60 million, and a number of big names are mooted – director Stephen Hopkins is hoping to provide *cameo roles* for many of the original TV crew… (1/48)

(8) …it’s no surprise that Hollywood wanted Woo after this. The director even *cameos* as… Mr Woo, a nightclub barman (1/79)

Technological developments are reflected in the way the abbreviation *CGI* ‘computer-generated imaging’ was used in the 1997 issue. These days, the term hardly needs to be explained in a film magazine, as most breathtaking scenes in films are made cost-effectively and safely by using computers. However, in the first issue of *TF*, the abbreviation seldom occurred without an accompanying explanation, unless the term had already been explained earlier in the same text. Phrases such as “computer-percolated lava”, “computer-created Godzilla”, and “computer-generated sequences” occurred nearly as commonly as the abbreviation. The technology was clearly in a stage of rapid development at the time and still
considered novel, whereas today’s audiences take computer effects for granted. To underline the state-of-the-artness of the phenomenon, words such as *realistic* sometimes preceded the abbreviation. Another interesting point is that the abbreviation is in fact commonly used in a “wrong” way, similar to expressions such as *ATM machine* and *PIN number* where the element denoted by the third letter is repeated. Similarly, the phrase *CGI lava* (example (10) below) in its “correct” form would be *CG lava* ‘computer-generated lava’.

(9) Using the latest in computer-generated imaging (*CGI*), ILM has redesigned and reshot all the space sequences, replacing the X-Wing and TIE Fighter models with *eye-jolting* computer-spawned versions… (1/8-9)

(10) These days there’s no need to release thousands of gallons of orange-dyed porridge down a street, because *realistic CGI lava* can be added later. (1/37)

Further observations from the 1997 issue that are related to the corpus findings include an example of partial conversion (a film by John Woo was called *a Woo*), a *porn* compound with a genitive ‘’s attached to the modifier (pyromaniac’s *porn*), and the suffix -*esque* being added to names of films (*Blade Runneresque*, *Rockyesque*). Finally, in the 1997 issue there was a tiny corner titled “What’s new on laser disc?” which referred to a format that was still at the time considered special and advanced, but that eventually was made obsolete by DVD.

*IDFB* was found to be useful in some ways, but frustrating in others. For instance, the dictionary lists some genre names, but the number of different terms offered eventually turned out to be a disappointing five: *docudrama*, *historical film*, *musical film*, *period film*, and *slasher* were the only genre names offered, when the number could (and should) easily have been at least twenty. In addition, the dictionary is heavily production-oriented, meaning that most lexemes listed in it were not very useful from the point of view of the present study. Nevertheless, material for some interesting observations was found.
The useful aspects of the dictionary offer insights into the semantics and the written forms of certain lexemes. Some words are given definitions in IDFB that are somewhat surprising from the point of view of film journalism. A useful example once again, the compound noun *cameo appearance* is defined as expected, but curiously its shortened form *cameo* is associated with a lighting technique (s.v.). Similarly, the phrase *direct to disc* is defined as ‘direct recording’ (s.v.), whereas in film journalism the compound is used to refer to a film that is released directly on DVD or Blu-ray without the preceding release in cinemas. Another interesting term is *extra*, which traditionally refers to ‘a person engaged by the studio to perform minor parts or to be part of a crowd in a film or show’ (IDFB s.v.). These days, *extra* more commonly refers to a special feature on a DVD or Blu-ray, being a back-clipped form of *extra feature*.

The capitalized noun *Multiplex* occurred both in IDFB and the first issue of TF, but nowadays the noun is no longer capitalized. The word refers to cinema complexes where there are several screens in the same building; the reason why it is no longer capitalized is probably that in the 21st century, multiplexes have become the standard: individual small cinemas are dying out, unable to compete with the multiplexes run by powerful corporations.

Even though the number of new film-related lexemes introduced in my Bachelor’s Thesis was relatively small, some of them are noteworthy, being examples of words that never gained enough ground so as to become more widely used. Section 4.2 in this thesis introduced six compounds denoting ‘audio commentary’ on a DVD. The different compounds occurred frequently and were used in order to avoid repetition in the texts. In the 2008 issues examined, the compound *gab-track* occurred as well; it seems now to be an example of a nonce formation, one that at some point became considered unsuitable for further use, and was thus replaced by other candidates. The same can be said for the two rather informal words meaning ‘screenwriter’, namely *hack* and *scribbler*: they were used in 2008 but did not
occur in the corpus the present study is based on. Finally, the clipping *ep* ‘episode’ occurred frequently in 2008 but has since disappeared from the pages of *TF*, perhaps owing to the word being slightly too short and not transparent enough.

5.2 Comparison with *Empire*

*Empire* was selected as the object of comparison owing to the fact that it is the only film magazine in the UK that sells more copies than *TF*; in addition, the style of the magazine can also be said to be somewhat on the informal side. Thus, it was deduced that the magazine would be another ample source of film-related neologisms suitable for the present purposes. Below, some observations and comparisons are presented.

Satisfyingly, a large number of new lexemes that were gathered from *TF* also occurred in the pages of *Empire*. This indicates that many of the lexemes that commonly occurred in the corpus are indeed more widely used in the film press and not only in *TF*. Based on this observation, it can be claimed that some of the words should perhaps be included in new dictionary editions.

Some items often used as the head of compounds in *TF* were also used in *Empire*. For instance, *noir* and *flick* came up in combinations such as *detective noir, neo-noir, buddy flick*, and *teen flick*. In addition, the hyphenated nominal phrase *sword-and-sandal* (which is mostly used in an attributive position, see example (11)) also came up, further supporting the theory that this term is indeed gaining ground in spite of the fact that it is possibly considered odd by readers at first encounter. As regards the several different compound terms used in *TF* as near-synonyms of *audio commentary*, *Empire* provides a surprise: the word *commentary track* (one occurrence) and its shortened form *commentary* (11 occurrences) were only once replaced by another term, namely *talk-track*. This is in stark contrast to the variation that was commonly found in the DVD and Blu-ray reviews in *TF*. 
(11) Scott and Crowe are aiming to repeat the $450 million worldwide haul they pulled off with their sword-and-sandal rejuvenator [Gladiator] ten years ago.  
(Empire p. 77)

Some back-clippings frequently used in TF occurred in Empire as well, including *adap* from *adaptation*, *doc* from *documentary*, and *exec* from *executive*. Several clipped personal names also occurred in the issue examined: *Nic* from *Nicolas* and *Kev* from *Kevin* represent the most straightforward type of back-clipping, *Arnie* from *Arnold* and *Orly* from *Orlando* (example (12)) include a diminutive suffix, while *The Stath* from *Statham* and the rather curious *The Shat* from *Shatner* ((13) below) are examples of the “new” type, where familiarity towards the person denoted is indicated by combining a back-clipped name with the definite article (see 4.3.1). The only example of fore-clipping in TF also came up in the issue of Empire examined: ‘Berg was used to refer to Steven Spielberg, albeit without the definite article that was present in the example found in TF. Clipping compounds were also common, including new yet familiar words such as *high-def* from *high definition*, *lo-fi* from *low fidelity*, and the popular name *R-Pattz* from *Robert Pattinson*.

(12) …the new *Pirates* does arguably what the last two should have: landlocks Keira and *Orly* and instead follows Jack over a new horizon. (Empire p. 93)

(13) Well, it’s fair to say that Brosnan isn’t immune to any irony gathered over recent years. And like *The Shat* [referred to earlier in the text] he is able to laugh about it. (Empire p. 109)

The suffixes *-esque* and *-ian* were used with directors’ names in a way similar to that discussed in 4.9.1. The phrases gathered from Empire include “Altmanesque trick of interweaving multiple storylines”, “Edgar Wright-esque comedy”, and “Stonian parental conflict” (based on Stone). As was the case in TF, in more than half of the examples in *-esque* gathered there was a hyphen between the two elements.
Film-related words used in *Empire* that are the result of semantic shift were also similar to those gathered from *TF*. In addition to some of the established examples such as the verbs *to lens* and *to pen* and the noun *helmer*, some neosemanticisms that were introduced in 4.8 also occurred, including *gig* and *gong*. In addition, the tsunami of different types of *remake* produced nowadays and the resulting need for a variety of terms used to refer to them has not been overlooked by the writers of *Empire*. The nouns *remake*, *reboot*, *reimagining*, and even *redux*, which is not listed as a noun in *OED*, had a total number of 10 occurrences in the issue examined.

To conclude this section, references are made to some interesting lexemes and other points that came up in the issue of *Empire* examined. In *TF* there was one occurrence where the noun *fest* served as the head in a compound, namely *sob-fest* ‘a film that makes the viewer cry excessively’. Owing to the lack of any further examples, this type was not discussed in section 4.2. However, the pattern is definitely worth a look, as two further examples occurred in *Empire*: *gigglefest* and *nostalgia-fest* came up in the context of films that *could have provided*, respectively, plenty of laughs and nostalgia, but that were something else instead. The same applies to the use of *sob-fest*, and whether this is a coincidence is worth examining (see the illustrations below). Note that the component *fest* here should not be mistaken for the back-clipped form of *festival*. Instead, the lexeme is directly based on German *Fest* ‘with qualifying word … denoting a festival or special occasion,’ examples given including *gabfest* and *talk fest*, both referring to long events were people talk (*OED s.v. fest*).

(14) It should be a whipcrack, burst-half-the-bloodvessels-in-your-face **gigglefest**. And yet watching these talented comedians … is just tragic. (*Empire* p. 60)

(15) Rather than an easy **nostalgia-fest** filled with flared trousers, Gervais and Merchant have captured a warm, funny, and engaging coming-of-age drama… (*Empire* p. 48)
Lest you assume *Up* is one long **sob-fest**, we should hasten to add that once that gut-punching salvo is over the movie settles into a more traditional groove…

Interestingly, the only example that occurred inside quotation marks in *Empire* was the noun ‘*making of*’. In *TF*, quotation marks were never used with the term, even though in both of the occurrences in the first issue this was the case. *Empire*’s choice to use them, however, is likely due to the fact that the individual words of the term are never capitalized in the magazine, whereas in *TF* they were in the majority of the occurrences capitalized. Thus, when the initial letters are not capitalized, some kind of a strategy needs to be employed to make the term easily distinguishable from its textual context. *Empire* has adopted the single quotation marks, and the reason is clear – consider the following two examples:

(17) Blu-ray buyers also get a picture-in-picture feature and exclusive ‘**making of**’. *(Empire* p. 138)

(18) Over three hours of goodies include … fascinating ‘**making of**’ retrospectives, a trip to the annual fan fest at the original locations (Peakies!), the Falling music video and more.

Finally, perhaps the most notable difference between *TF* and *Empire* turned out to be the latter’s avoidance of using the suffix -**er**. The suffix occurred in no less than 61 new film-related derivatives in *TF* as well as in numerous synthetic compounds where the latter element also ends in -**er**. The comparison with *Empire* may suggest that the writers of *TF* are perhaps somewhat overenthusiastic as regards experimenting with the suffix. However, they nevertheless do it in a manner that brings variety and a sense of informality to their texts, and ensure that the use of the suffix does not affect the legibility of the magazine.
6. Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, the results of the study are summarized. There are grounds for stating that the study has reached its goals, as all of the research questions presented in 1.2 are here given a satisfactory answer.

As regards the different sources of new vocabulary in present-day English, chapter 2 introduced eight techniques that cover the vast majority of the coinage of all new lexemes that enter the English language. The eight sources are affixation, compounding, conversion (including partial conversion and syntactic processes), clipping, blending, abbreviation, analogical formation, and semantic shift. As it has been stated earlier, some rarer methods were excluded from the discussion: providing an introduction of them would not have increased the value of this study, as no examples to illustrate them occurred in the corpus.

New lexemes representing all of the aforementioned eight sources of vocabulary were gathered from TF. As shown in Table 1 (see chapter 4), the three most common sources of new film-related lexemes in TF were very close to one another in their respective figures. When combined, compounding, clipping, and affixation constituted no less than 80.1 % of the total findings. If statistics from earlier studies on neologisms are considered, the frequency of compounding and affixation does not surprise. For instance, in Bauer’s data affixation and compounding were by far the most common sources of new words between 1880 and 1982, formations based on the two methods making up more than 80 % of the total number (1994, 38). In the three independent sets of statistics shown by Algeo, compounding and affixation comprise 68.3 %, 63.9 %, and 54.3 % of the total sources of new lexemes (1991, 14).

Based on these varying figures, it can be deduced that it is not possible to present figures that would apply to all sets of new English vocabulary: the proportions of individual sources are bound to vary according to time and the field in which the words are coined. In this study, this instability is seen in the surprisingly large number of lexemes that were the
result of clipping. 124 new examples of clipping (26.6 % of the total findings) is a significant figure for a method whose percentages do not rise anywhere near 10 % in the statistics referred to above. There are two points of view from which we can consider this anomaly. Firstly, of the 124 examples of clipping gathered, 43 are personal names, which are usually not listed in dictionaries, and which therefore would not be qualified as new lexemes in most studies. However, even when personal names are not included in the statistics, the share of clipping is still a not-inconsiderable 20 % of the total number. Secondly, the number of clipping compounds was 75, and no less than 38 of them were examples of the productive type where the clipped word \textit{com} is the head. Thus, after going through these two “filters” and for the moment disregarding the two types (personal names and words with \textit{com}), the figure for clipping looks more like those presented in earlier statistics. Based on this, it can be stated that the statistics related to new vocabulary coined in a certain professional or other field may be heavily affected by only one or two productive patterns that may constitute a great deal of the total number of findings.

Following the three most frequent sources from a distance, semantic shift was another surprisingly common source of new film-related lexemes, comprising 7.7 % of the total findings. Semantic shift was followed by abbreviation (4.1 %), analogical formation (3.2 %), the different types related to and including conversion (2.8 %), and, finally, blending (2.1 %). Interestingly, all the personal names included in the inventory are from three sources: the different types of clipping (70.5 %) constitute the great majority of these findings, but abbreviation (24.6 %) and blending (4.9 %) play their part as well. Incidentally, these three sources are all methods of word-formation where one or more existing lexeme is shortened in order to create a new one.

The central and most interesting new film-related lexemes included in the final inventory were introduced in chapter 4; many lexemes were accompanied by examples of use
in context alongside definitions or explanations in the running text. There are definitely grounds for claiming that the new lexemes introduced in this thesis cover a wide variety of issues related to the world of cinema in the 21st century. They reflect, among other things, different variations of genres and sub-genres, technological innovations and developments, as well as names for well-known people currently working in the industry. Having read the empirical part of this thesis, the reader is not only familiar with some established film-related lexemes based on the eight different sources of new vocabulary discussed, but also with the kinds of new vocabulary frequently used in *TF* and possibly in other film publications as well.

For the most part, the creation of the new lexemes gathered from the corpus followed the theories and guidelines of word-formation and semantics presented in the background sources. However, some illuminating new observations were made in relation to nearly every source of new vocabulary discussed in this thesis. In the following, some examples that are considered especially noteworthy are reviewed.

As regards affixation, *er* turned out to be by far the most commonly used affix, and its diversity in forming new lexemes was discussed in section 4.1.3. Some interesting findings were also made concerning two more rarely used affixes: the prefix *sub-*-, denoting the sense ‘below the standards set by X’ when attached before a proper noun base, was not discussed in any of the background sources consulted for this study. The suffix *-ism*, on the other hand, was attached to names of actors and directors, and there is a possibility that the sense of the suffix used in *TF* is a minor extension, or a combination, of the senses usually given in dictionaries and literature on word-formation.

The suffixes *-esque* and *-ian* were also used frequently, many of their characteristics being discussed in 4.9.1. The following orthographical observations were made related to the two suffixes: firstly, in the case of derivatives in *-esque*, there was frequently a hyphen between the two elements (*Jarmusch-esque*), even though the source materials strongly imply
the opposite; secondly, in two examples of the derivatives in -ian, the consonant v was added in front of the suffix when the base word preceding it ended in a vowel (Whovian, Woo-vian).

Compounding is a source that provided a wealth of new lexemes. Perhaps the most interesting category was the porn compounds (discussed in 4.9.3), a pattern which has seemingly begun to gain more ground after the successful introduction and the subsequent popularity of the term torture porn in TF. The compounds Coenhead and Depp-head were particularly interesting as well, as the component head in the two compounds seems to be used in a new way, albeit one similar to that in such drug-related words as pothead and acid head that definitely carry negative connotations. Furthermore, in the discussion related to neo-classical compounds, two “fake” initial combining forms were introduced: apoco- from apopalyptic and the quite humorous geri- from geriatric represent ways to refer to some of the new types of sub-genres that are more commonly produced these days.

The number of examples of true conversion gathered from the corpus was small, but one is reminded of the effectiveness and convenience of the method by the short time it took for the trade name Blu-ray to become converted into the verb to Blu-ray ‘to produce a Blu-ray edition of a film’. In addition, some nouns that have become subject to clipping earlier were found to have been subsequently converted into verbs: the original nouns motion-capture and nomination were first clipped into mo-cap and nom, after which they have become used as verbs (to mo-cap, to nom).

As stated earlier, clipping was a very productive source of new lexemes, partly owing to the great number of compounds with com as the head. Also, about one third of the examples of clipping gathered were personal names denoting actors and directors, including back-clippings, one fore-clipping, clipping compounds, and back-clippings where a diminutive suffix has been added to the clipped name. A particularly interesting, potentially new way of marking familiarity towards the object denoted was to add the definite article in front of a
back-clipped name, as was the case with *the Hath, the Stath*, and *the Pads*, the latter example also including the non-plural, diminutive suffix *-s*.

Another relatively rarely used source of new film-related vocabulary, blending was the source for the now common *bromance*, a term denoting the new sub-genre of romantic comedy. As regards personal names, example of blending occurred where the first names of celebrity couples have been combined to form a personal name denoting the couple: the occurrence of *Paulennifer* was clearly aimed as a stunt, but *Brangelina* occurred as many as five times, while the more recent *Robsten* denotes a couple so famous among young film audiences that, should their relationship last, the blend will definitely become more widely used.

Abbreviation was not a very productive category, especially as the majority of the lexemes gathered were formed by combining people’s initials. However, one notable observation was made related to the abbreviated names: most of them were based on male names. The same phenomenon was seen among the different types of personal names that are the result of clipping; also, when we consider the abovementioned blending of the names of couples, we can see that the given name of the man always comes first. These tendencies are definitely something worth looking into – certainly the reason cannot simply be that the film industry is so male-dominated?

The abbreviations not based on anyone’s name were interesting in that they represent new vocabulary that has arrived alongside a new format of home video entertainment: *BD, PiP, HD, and SD* are all new lexemes related to Blu-ray. *HD* and its longer version *high-definition* are interesting words because the high-definition denoted by them is nowadays something completely different from what it was several years ago when the related technology was not as advanced as it is today. Inevitably, what is considered “advanced” HD today will certainly not be that in ten years’ time.
In relation to analogical formation, nothing particularly striking was discovered. One-off formations representing true analogy occurred relatively commonly, while some earlier analogies seem to have led to productive patterns. These include the different words ending in -buster (*Bay-buster, schlockbuster*), those having the productive “pseudo morpheme” -quel (*prequel, fourquel*), and the different words based on *documentary* (*mockumentary, frockumentary*).

Semantic shift turned out to be especially useful when it comes to the terminology used in referring to the remaking of existing films. The phenomenon has “always” existed, but there are grounds for stating that in the 21st century it has evolved to a new level, as practically no film seems to be sacred enough anymore to avoid becoming subject to remaking. Of the several terms gathered, *remake* and *reboot* were by was the most frequently used, but *redux* was perhaps the most interesting one: being defined in *OED* (s.v.) as an adjective (and not recorded at all in *CD*), the word was used in *TF* as anything but: in all the 14 examples gathered, *redux* was used either as a noun or a verb.

It can be argued that it is not possible to come up with new genres these days. Genres are in a sense like colours, in that the number of different main categories is fixed, but the possibilities of combining them to create hybrids and different shades are virtually endless. This becomes clear when we examine the lexemes denoting established genres or new kinds of subgenres in more detail. The lexemes that most likely have the chance to become established include *torture porn* (a kind of horror film), *zom-com* (a kind of horror-comedy), and *bromance* (a kind of romantic comedy aimed at male audiences). When it comes to further examples, the suffix -er proved to be particularly productive. Existing genres have been given alternative terms, such as the well-established *actioner* and the new formations *suspenser, sci-fier, shocker, and chiller*. Some other frequently used terms denoting a certain genre include *chuckler* and *laffer* for comedies, as well as *screamer, shrieker, scarer, spooker,*
and the aforementioned shocker for horror films. Clearly, this wealth of new terminology has arisen owing to a demand, most likely one prompted by a desire to be able to discuss various films in a long reviews section without appearing repetitive. In other words, the role of synonymy or near-synonymy in the construction of style is demonstrated by the existence of these different terms.

Finally, another lexicological feature typical to film journalism seems to be that sometimes several formations are coined on the basis of only one original word. An illuminating example is science fiction: established formations based on the compound include the clipping compound sci-fi and the abbreviation SF; new lexemes include a sci-fi ‘a sci-fi film’ which is an example of back-clipping, the derivative sci-fier, as well as formations such as sci-caper, sci-fable, and sci-fantasy. Motion-capture, a term referring to relatively new technology, has already been clipped to mo-cap, which has been further converted into the verb to mo-cap. Blu-ray and its official abbreviation BD have seen further formations as well, including the clipping Blu, the converted verb to Blu-ray, and even the derivative to Blu-rayify. Even the name of one of the most worshipped actors today has become subject to inventive word-formation: based on Robert Pattinson, new personal names such as R-Pattz, Rob, and Robsten have been formed, not to mention the compound Pattinson porn.

From the point of view of yours truly, a film enthusiast, the study that is now drawing to its conclusion has been a pleasant journey. It has helped me (not to mention the reader) to better understand the workings of English, especially how the language changes and how new vocabulary comes to being in it. In addition, a large number of new film-related lexemes were introduced, and by discussing, explaining, and sometimes even defining them, many details were learnt that help us better understand the world of cinema as it functions today. However, as it is clear by now, that world is changing constantly, requiring the language used to describe it to change as well. Therefore, it is possible that part of the information presented in
the empirical part of this thesis will no longer be relevant after some years have passed. Thus, if a future student of lexicology should come across this thesis and be of the opinion that the subject should be updated, perhaps with better resources, *the green light* is definitely given: *reboot* this study, make it fresh, perhaps even sexy if possible – but most importantly, make it relevant again. As long as you do not unashamedly make it into a long catalogue of *neologism porn*, you have my blessing.
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Appendix: Word Index

Below, all new film-related lexemes gathered from the corpus are listed. The lexemes are categorized following the categorization and order seen in chapter 4, with the exception that the four productive patterns selected for a discussion in 4.9 are placed under the corresponding method of word-formation. This means that the new lexemes discussed in 4.9.1 are found under “suffixation”, while the words introduced in 4.9.2, 4.9.3, and 4.9.4 are found under “clipping”, “compounding”, and “semantic shift”, respectively. The two sub-sections in 4.2 are not separated because, as seen in the discussion, some words qualified in more than one category, while some words were left undefined. In connection with clipping, blending, and abbreviation, the longer version of or the name denoted by the lexeme is given in parentheses after each entry. In the case of analogical formation, the established word interpreted as being the “model word” is given in parentheses. The neologisms in each category are listed in alphabetical order, and brackets are used to enclose optional elements when more than one spelling of a lexeme occurred.

4.1 Affixation

4.1.1 Prefixation

coscribe, non-sequel, pre-Kane, sub-Chaplin, sub-Fincher

4.1.3 Suffixation

-er

arthouser, Avatar Day-er, behind-the-scener, big-budgeter, big-hitter, bruiser, cat-and-mouser, charmer, chiller, chuckler, clunker, coming-of-ager, costumer, crimer, double-dipper, double-discer, downer, four-discer, frat packer, FrightFest-er, gang-banger, gripper, hoofer, ensemble, kitchen-sinker, laffer, low-budgeter, multi-strander, opener, plodder, puzzler, revenger, road-tripper, scarer, schlocker, sci-fier, scrapper, screamer, shocker, shooter, shrieker, sizzler, slow-burner, sniveler, snoozer, spooker, Star Trekker, stop-motioner, stunner, Sundancer, suspenser, swooner, sword-and-sandal-er, talking-header, thought-provoker, three-discer, tooner, Twilighter, twister, two-discer, WTF-er

-esque

-ian

Almodóvarian (adj.), Almodóvarian (n.), Apatowian, Cronenbergian, Eisensteinian, Godardian, Herzogian, Hess-ian, Hitchcockian, Kubrickian, Loachian, Lynchian, Solonzian, Wellesian, Whovian, Woo-\-vian

Others

-ery: ’toonery; -ie: baldie, Star Warsie; -ify: Blu-rayify; -ing: remaking, scene-stealing, thesping; -ism: Guy Ritchie-ism, Lee-ism, Shatnerism, Spike-ism; -ite: Cameron-ite, Leonite, Potterite

4.2 Compounding

Endocentric compounds, group I: various types

acid noir, Avatar Day, bonus material, bromantic comedy, buddy comedy, buddy flick, carny noir, event cinema, event film/movie, commentary track, fact flick, faux-documentary, fear flick, flickhouse, gangster noir, headfuck, high-school noir, issue drama/movie, kitchen sink noir, money shot, mood-piece, motion-capture, noir thriller, period actioner, revenge noir, road flick, rogue-cop noir, romantic black comedy, scare flick, scene-thief, set-piece cinema, spandex cinema, sob-fest, spectacle cinema, standard definition, talk track, tech-noir, teen flick, women’s lib flick

Endocentric compounds, group II: synthetic compounds


Endocentric compounds, group III: phonological motivation involved in the formation

Brit-grit, Brit-grit-flick, Brit-hit, chat-track, jabber-track, kid flick, killer thriller, serial killer-thriller, slick flick, yack-track

Neo-classical compounds

Hyphenated nominal phrases

beat-‘em-up, cops-n-robbers, gore-‘em-up, hack-‘em-up, smash-‘em-up, straight-to-disc, swords-and-sandals

Others/not categorized

Coenhead, Depp-head, double-platter, golden baldie, golden statuette, greenlight suit, Oscar-bait, silver spinner

Porn compounds

auto-porn, disaster porno, food-porn, food-and-property porn, flock porn, gross-out porn, hairdo porn, hardware porn, holiday-porn, humiliation porn, Pattinson porn, poverty-porn, property porn, shoe porn, surgery-porn, torture(-)porn, vista-porn

4.3 Conversion

Genuine conversion

to Blu-ray, to cameo, to Kill Bill, to Mamet, to mo-cap, to nom

Partial conversion

to greenlight

Syntactic processes

a PT Anderson, to do a Gervais, to do a Paul Greengrass, to do a Shyamalan, to do a Yasmine Bleeth, to Goldfinger

4.4 Clipping

4.4.1 Back-clipping

Personal names

Alf (Alfred), Aud (Audrey), Cam (Cameron), Em (Emma), Fav (Favreau), Gem (Gemma), Hitch (Hitchcock), Jen (Jennifer), Kev (Kevin), Leo (Leonardo), Morph (Morpheus), Nat (Natalie), Nic (Nicolas), Rob (Robert), Russ (Russell), Sam (Samuel), Tel (Terrence Malick), the Hath (Hathaway), the Stath (Statham), Trav (Travolta), Wes (Wesley)
Personal names with diminutive suffixes

Angie (Angelina), Arnie (Arnold), Bats (Batman), Brucie (Bruce), Dusty (Dustin), Favs (Favreau), Gerry (Gerard), Gibbo (Gibson), Jimbo (James), Marty (Martin), Olly (Oliver), (the) Pads (Paddy), Rolo (Roland), Sodey (Soderbergh), Stevie (Steve), Wolfie (the Wolfman), Wolvie (Wolverine)

Other words

adap (adaptation), Blu (Blu-ray), doc/doco (documentary), nom (nomination), protag (protagonist), supps (supplementary materials), the Region 1 (the Region 1 edition), sci-fi (sci-fi film), visuals (visual effects), visuals (visual aspects)

4.4.2 Fore-clipping

the ‘Berg (Spielberg)

4.4.4 Clipping Compounds

Noun–noun combinations

bonus supps (*bonus supplementary materials), docu-portrait (documentary-portrait), frat-comedian (frat pack comedian), lit-biopic (literature biopic), lit-flick (literature flick), lit pic (literature picture), mo-cap (motion-capture), muso-doc (muso documentary), prod house (production house), sci-caper (sci-fi caper), sci-fable (sci-fi fable), sci-fantasy (sci-fi fantasy), stop-mo (stop-motion), studio exec (studio executive), tech-noir (technology noir), teen pic (teen picture), studio pic (studio picture), Twi-world (Twilight world)

Personal names

J-Ro (Julia Roberts), Li-Lo (Lindsay Lohan), R-Patt(z) (Robert Pattinson), Scar Jo (Scarlet Johansson)

Adjective–noun combinations

alt-ending (alternative ending), bio-doc (biographical documentary), faux-doc (faux-documentary), J-horror (Japanese horror), exec producer (executive producer), fast-mo (fast-motion), mock-doc (mock documentary), hi(gh)-def (high-definition), high-res (high-resolution), lo(w)-fi (low-fidelity), mega-def (mega definition), shock-mock-doc (shock-mock documentary), slo(w)-mo (slow-motion), standard-def (standard definition), shaky-cam (shaky camera)
Clipping compounds with com


4.5 Blending

Personal names combined

Brangelina (Brad + Angelina), Paulennifer (Paul + Jennifer), Robsten (Robert + Kristen)

Other words

animajesty (animated + majesty), bromance (bro(ther) + romance), gorno (gore + porno), Japanimation (Japanese + animation), paranoia-mation (paranoia + animation), splatire (splatter + satire), tweeplee (tween + weepie)

4.6 Abbreviation

Personal names

AA (Andrea Arnold), BBT (Billy Bob Thornton), CC (Charlie Chaplin), GDT (Guillermo del Toro), JC (James Cameron), JT (John Travolta), PG (Paul Greengrass), PJ (Peter Jackson), PTA (Paul Thomas Anderson), QT (Quentin Tarantino), RDJ (Robert Downey Jr), RR (Robert Rodriguez), RR (Ryan Reynolds), SJP (Sarah Jessica Parker), TC (Tom Cruise)

Other words

BD (Blu-ray disc), HD (high definition), PiP (picture-in-picture), SD (standard definition)

4.7 Analogical formation

Bay-buster (blockbuster), Bayhem (mayhem), Bruck(-)buster (blockbuster), budget-buster (blockbuster), cameo-tastic (fantastic), fourquel (sequel), frockumentary (documentary), the Governator (the Terminator), Indiewood (Hollywood), mockbuster (blockbuster), Mouseketeer (musketeer), nu-ray (Blu-ray), schlockbuster (blockbuster), Twi-hard (die-hard or Die Hard), Walt-over (makeover or walkover)
4.8 Semantic shift

Nouns

*bow, gig, gong, platter, reboot, re(-)do, redux, refit, rehash, re(-)imagining, reinvention, rejig, remake, remix, re(-)tool, retramp, re(-)tread, revamp, rework, reworking, scribe, thespian, thesp, update*

Verbs

*to bag, to ink, to land, to reboot, to redux, to re-imagine, to reinvent, to remake, to re(-)tool, to revamp, to revisit, to take a bow*