LITERARY TEXT FROM THE LINGUOPOETIC PERSPECTIVE

ХУДОЖНІЙ ТЕКСТ В АСПЕКТІ ЛІНГВОПОЕТИКИ

Maryna BIELOVA
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University (Ukraine)
University of Birmingham (United Kingdom)
orcid.org/0000-0002-13069395

STYLISTIC NEOLOGISMS IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE CHICK LIT: MORPHOSEMANTIC ASPECT

Метою статті є виявлення основних словотворчих процесів, що беруть участь у формуванні стилістичних неологізмів, та інтерпретація їхніх значень. Поставлену мету досягнуто в результаті послідовного вирішення таких *завдань*: виявлення зразків стилістичних неологізмів у корпусі англомовних романів жанру чік-літ; виокремлення морфологічних операцій, які залучаються для формування стилістичних неологізмів в англомовних романах жанру чік-літ; визначення того, як створення стилістичних неологізмів виходить за межі конвенційної морфології; опису комунікативного призначення стилістичних неологізмів в англомовних романах жанру чік-літ і витлумачення їхньої семантики.

Стилістичні неологізми розглядаються в роботі як нові слова, експресивне навантаження яких є результатом трансгресії конвенційної деривaційної морфології. Неологічність цих утворень діагностується за низкою критеріїв, включаючи відсутність їхньої кодифікації в словниках, невключення або фрагментарне функціювання цих формацій у корпусах, їхню семантичну непрозорість і формальну девіантність. Прийнято вважати, що неологізми, які порушують морфологічні умовності словотвору, є стилістично утилітарними; вони характеризуються наявністю як соціального, так і експресивного значення. Іншими словами, стилістичні неологізми постають, з одного боку, як засоби створення гумору, грайливості та смішності (експресивне значення), а з іншого, служать інструментами для побудови та підтримки стосунків, створення ідентичності, переконання тощо (соціальне значення).

Методологічною основою дослідження слугував комплекс підходів: цілеспрямована вибірка (для демонстрації специфіки морфологічних моделей, що використовуються для формування стилістичних неологізмів, їхнього смислоутворення та інтерпретації); дефінітивний і компонентний аналіз (для встановлення основних значень компонентів нових лексичних одиниць); типологічний метод (для класифікації основних методів словотворення, які використовуються для формування стилістичних неологізмів в англомовній чік-літ); функціональний метод (для з'ясування прагматичного потенціалу стилістичних неологізмів в англомовній чік-літ). Типологічний опис у цій статті залучає деривaційний підхід, що приписує поняття продуктивності словотворення рівню граматичної компетенції, яка враховує потенціал слова. Деривaційні моделі, використані для створення нових слів, були описані як такі, що включають адитивні та метаморфічні процеси. Типологічний опис стилістичних неологізмів в англомовній чік-літ було контекстуалізовано в цьому дослідженні у межах формального підходу в деривaційній морфології. Згідно з цим підходом, словоформа вважається результатом застосування правил, які змінюють словоформу або основу з метою створення нової.

Важливим результатом цього дослідження є визнання того, що способи утворення стилістичних неологізмів в англомовній чік-літ є переважно стандартизованими. Вони включають афіксацію, словоскладання, усічення та конверсію, причому суфіксація домінує в цьому списку. Незважаючи на дотримання усталених процесів словотворення, формування стилістичних неологізмів в англомовній чік-літ відбувається з порушенням морфологічних конвенцій. Унікальним процесом, який використовується при створенні стилістичних неологізмів, є спосіб словотвору, зворотній словоскладанню, коли наявне складне слово розкладається на окремі сегменти, які функціонують самостійно.

Ключові слова: стилістичні неологізми, чік-літ, морфологія, правила словотворення, недотримання правил словотвору.

Introduction

Studies on neologisms in literary texts have seen a steady growth in the last several decades. Two genres of literary texts have been considered as the most suitable settings to invent new words – science fiction [Cheyne, 2008; Aksoy, Söylemez, 2023] and children's literature [Munat, 2007; Poix, 2018]. In these genres, where fantasy and nonsense are prominent, neologisms are genre-defining elements. A review of the literature devoted to the study of neology in literary texts bears witness that scholars are mainly interested in the ludic/humorous potential of neologisms [Gulyás, 2021; Trolé, 2021; Bordet, Brisset, 2021], the pragmatic application of context and world knowledge to the creation and interpretation of neologisms [Allan, 2016], typologies of neologisms [Munat, 2007; Poix, 2018]. Neologisms are classified by applying different lexicological patterns. For instance, in her study of neologisms in children's literature, Munat [2007] analyzes new words according to metamorphology (comprising punning, linguistic games, and nonce formation), premorphology (children's inventions prior to development of morphological grammar), and paramorphology (including echo-words, blends, back formation, and onomastic creations) [Dressler, 1994]. Poix [2018], in turn, favors another line of analysis and studies neologisms in children's literature in accordance with Tournier's [2007] internal and external matrices. The external matrix employs borrowing linguistic material from other languages, whereas the internal is split into morphosemantic, semantic and morphological neology. The overwhelming majority of studies devoted to neologisms in literary texts highlight the problem of searching for perfect equivalence in source and target texts [Salich, 2020; Schuler, 2006; Aksoy, Söylemez, 2023].

This paper continues a line of analyses of neologisms in literary texts focusing on chick lit (also known as 'cappuccino fiction' [Montoro, 2012]), which emerged as a popular genre of fiction in the latter part of the 20th century. Although earlier branded as 'residual discourse' by Williams [1977], chick lit has regained its prominence as a cultural construct addressing a gap in how women were represented in popular culture (see [Harzewski, 2011; Missler, 2019]).

As pointed out by Lipka [2007], the emergence of stylistic neologisms depends strongly on the specific register under investigation (with its key features being field, tenor, and mode) and/or text-type (each of which has a range of linguistic characteristics). Chick lit is a highly layered genre and includes multiple forms of literary, popular, and media discourse. My choice of data for this research is limited to literary texts, wherein messages are shared verbally. In chick lit literary texts, the narratives are predominantly first-person, dialogue-driven stories. It is in this unmediated mode that the characters interact and manage relationships. In terms of tenor, chick lit serves to represent attitudes towards romantic bonds, friendships, family ties, and colleagues' relationships. Its lighthearted tone with strong ties to confessional and social satire [Harzewski, 2011, p. 16] tends to be adopted through impressionistic, colloquial, more journalistic narration [Harzewski, 2011, p. 130] and "often parodic and intricate bricolage of diverse popular and literary terms" [Ibid., p. 13]. With regard to field, the main function of chick lit is the social observation, representation and reinforcement of a modern average female life. It emplots a "single girl in the city" wrestling with the temptations of consumer culture. It tends to chronicle the heroine's fortunes on the marriage front and evaluates contemporary courtship behavior, dress, and social motives [Harzewski, 2011; Missler, 2019]. With regard to text-types (in accordance with the binary distinction of texts on the ground of seriousness – non-seriousness [Lipka, 2002]), chick lit literary texts are described as accessible, witty, humorous, ironic, and playful [Harzewski, 2011; Missler, 2019]. Many of the above described register and text-type features are likely to foster stylistic neologicity in this genre of literature. The overwhelming presence of stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit suggests that lexical innovation is crucial for the expressivity of this genre of literary discourse.

As documented in this paper and discussed below, chick lit encourages the emergence of stylistic neologisms whose expressive power stems from morphological transgression. To classify stylistic neologisms in chick lit, I adopt a morphosemantic approach. This method allows for the development of a comprehensive typology of neologisms. Their invention makes use of morphological operations by deliberately breaching conventions of productivity – abstract patterns or templates describable in a rule format [Mattiello, 2017, p. 9]. Deviant morphology is performance oriented and is set off from core morphology [Štekauer, Valera, Körtvélyessy, 2012,

pp. 229–233], which forms part of implicit language knowledge and competence. The backbone of the creation of stylistic neologisms is analogy [Miller, 2014] – the re-creative process [Munat, 2016, p. 96] whereby a new word is coined within an existing model in a motivated but unpredictable (non-rule governed) way [Mattiello 2017, p. 9] (i.e. transgressing the model). New words, artfully manufactured by manipulating morphological rules, contain elements of form-based creativity.

The database for this study comprises 100 tokens of stylistic neologisms (mono- and polymorphemic) identified in a corpus of chick lit novels written between the years 1996–2021. The occurrences were all retrieved manually by carefully reading the literary works by H. Fielding [Fielding, 1996, 1999], S. Kinsella [Kinsella, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2018, 2021], L. Weisberger [Weisberger, 2003, 2005], and Ch. Lauren [Lauren, 2020] – the most prominent authors of the genre. A certain number of these coinages are onomastic derivatives. I will omit from consideration those onomastic derivatives whose inputs are proper names of fictional characters that cannot convey their meaning in a wide variety of different contexts, where both the creator of the output and its specific referent may be absent (see [Keane, Costello, 1996]).

This study lays the groundwork for presenting a comprehensive overview of expressive neology in English-language chick lit (henceforth ELCL) and sees deviant morphological processes as operating within an inherency model [Carter, 2004], which explains formal properties of language. Further research is scheduled to look into the sociocultural model [Carter, 1999] of creative morphology in performance and the cognitive model [Carter, 1999] that will focus on metaphor and metonymy – conceptual phenomena that stand behind morphological inventiveness serving as language-external motivations for stylistic neologisms.

This paper is structured as follows. This section (1) serves as an introduction. Section 2 outlines the theoretical background of the research revealing the idea of stylistic neologisms and focusing on morphological operations in English. Section 3 presents the methodology of the study and its data including the diagnostic criteria for identifying newly manufactured words as stylistically charged. Section 4 discusses the typology of stylistic neologisms in ELCL based on the morphological operations well-established in English. Section 5 serves as the conclusion.

Theoretical Background

At the outset of my study, a short remark on the notion of '***neology***' is in order. Neology constitutes a natural, dynamic, and multifaceted part of all living human languages, whether as a reflection or for facilitation of linguistic communication [Klosa-Kückelhaus, Kernerman, 2021]. To be precise, a ***neologism*** is a linguistic unit coined to define new concepts and not previously recorded in a given language [Zatsnyi et al., 2013], which implies that novelty is its main feature. The process of identifying a word as new rests on several ***diagnostic criteria***. Regarding the temporal factor, it considers the moment a word emerged: a neologism is a recently created word. In terms of frequency of use, a unit that is used less often will be seen as more novel since speakers are not accustomed to it. As to the lexicographic parameter, a new word is the one that is not codified, i.e. not included in dictionaries. Linguistic features, such as predictability and transparency, may also influence the perception of neologicity: if a word exhibits semantic opacity, is a non-productive form, or deviates from word-formation rules, the speaker will find it more difficult to comprehend and will identify it as new. Considering the cognitive aspect is also crucial: specifically, if a word names a novel concept and the mental representation of the referent is not fully developed, the word can be classified as neological. Last but not the least, discursive and contextual factors have to be taken into account: the newer the word, the more relevant information context and co-text provide to figure out the meaning of a linguistic unit and reduce ambiguity [Selivanova, 2006; Schmid, 2008; Dziubina, 2017].

The morphosemantic analysis of neologisms, the crux of this study, entails an examination of word-formation processes employed for the manufacture of new coinages with their semantic interpretation. Derivational patterns utilized for the production of new lexical items are listed in this study as those involving additive and metamorphic processes. Additive processes produce signifiers consisting in adding some predefined segmental or suprasegmental material to the base, whereas metamorphic processes coin signifiers consisting in making a change to the base itself [Beck, 2017, p. 325]. Transgression from word-formation rules may take three forms:

pattern-bending, when the formation of a new word follows a well-established pattern, yet violates one or more of its constraint(s); pattern-extension, when a coinage is manufactured with a well-established pattern revealing its extension; pattern-creation, in case a word is produced via a newly created pattern (see [Lensch, 2022]).

In chick lit literary texts, the innovative act is always intentional ("it is hard to conceive that an author would coin a word impulsively without much planning and consideration" [Poix, 2018, p. 2]) and goes beyond rule-governed and patterned forms. By deliberately opting to violate language restrictions, writers position their characters as those seeking attention when striving to be "socially successful with their speech" [Haspelmath 1999, p. 1056] – build and maintain relationships, construct identities and the world around them, mitigate and persuade [Littlemore, 2022]. As such, the notion of stylistic neology inherently possesses a social dimension.

According to Lyons [1977, pp. 50–51], social meaning is one of three aspects of meaning encoded by a language utterance. The other two are descriptive and expressive meanings. Descriptive meaning conveys factual content that can be explicitly asserted or denied and is, in most cases, amenable to objective verification. Expressive information co-varies with the characteristics of the speaker: creating innovations by transgressing the established possibilities of language resources may stand out as means of conveying humor, playfulness and ludicity [Körtvélyessy et al., 2021]. Social and expressive meanings are closely intertwined and often difficult to disentangle. This interrelation is taken into account in the analysis of the meaning of stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit.

This study continues a line of theoretical and empirical research into stylistic neologisms in literary texts by answering the following *research questions*:

1. What are the morphological operations employed to manufacture stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit?

2. How does the creation of stylistic neologisms straddle the boundaries of core morphology (i.e. does it override the core morphology constraints, extend the existing patterns, or offer new ones)?

3. What communicative purposes do stylistic neologisms serve in ELCL and how their semantics can be interpreted?

4. What is the source stylistic neologisms (is it the author or members of the speech community)?

Data and Methodology

Corpus

Twelve English-language chick lit novels [Fielding, 1996, 1999; Kinsella, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2018, 2021; Lauren, 2020; Weisberger, 2003, 2005] were selected for this study. After defining the textual corpus, a manual extraction of stylistic neologisms was carried out. This was done in accordance with lexicographic, temporal, and frequency of use criteria.

My point of departure was proving the non-existence of a coinage in the storage of already codified lexemes. In order to confirm that the occurrence is indeed non-attested, I searched Longman Dictionary of Contemporary Dictionary [Wesley, 1987], Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary [Lee, Bradbery, 2020], Cambridge Dictionary of English [Walter, 2005], Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English [Mish, 2025], and Macmillan Dictionary of English [Rundell, Fox, 2002]. These were chosen, because they are reference dictionaries of British and American English including lexemes that were subject to the effects of morphological standardization and written features, spelling in particular. The coinages retrieved from ELCL were also considered eligible for this study, if they are on the way to become part of the language system appearing in dictionaries of unconventional English (the Urban Dictionary [Peckham, 2024], Your Dictionary [Love, 2024], and Word Sense Dictionary [Moosbach, 2024]) compiled to register the most recent words that are absent in standardized dictionaries.

In order to record the moment of appearance of a word, I consulted Google Books Ngram Viewer (GBNV) [Orwant, Brockman, 2025], which charts the emergence of linguistic units since 1500. I also considered corpus data to assess the novelty of a word. If the sampled words were either absent from corpora or occurred extremely infrequently in isolated contexts, i.e. func-

tioned in a limited number of contexts, they were also classified as novel lexical items. The corpora employed for the verification of the novelty of words included the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) [Davies, 2025a] and the British National Corpus [Davies, 2025b], which are extensive (1.1 billion and 100+ million words, respectively) and balanced corpora offering insight into English variation, as well as Bank of English 2012 [Breslin, McKeown, 2012], selected for its recency and broad coverage.

A sample of 30 neologisms was discussed in detail in this paper. They are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Creative neologisms in English-language chick lit

Creative coinage	Morphological pattern	Observance in corpora				Appearance in dictionaries of unconventional English			Formal deviancy	Explicit markedness
		BNC	COCA	Bank	Google Ngram Viewer	YD	UD	WSD		
mentionitis	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
boutique-y	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
anti-invitation	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
Prada-y	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
clippy	well-established[1]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
housekeeperly	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
Ricky Lake-ism	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
Big Brother-esque	well-established	0	0	0	+[2]	-	-	-	+	+
relaxed-ish	well-established	0	0	2	+	-	-	-	+	+
googlable	well-established	0	0	1	+[3]	-	-	-	+	-
hump-ist	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
pramaholic	well-established	0	0	0	0[4]	-	-	-	+	-
unhoneymooner	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
detrance	well-established[5]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
sub-Leonardo DiCaprio	well-established[6]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
un-Runway-esque	well-established[7]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
braincyclopedia	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
achey-painy	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
pashmaster	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
pashmarried	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
pash-hurts	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
bigger and wiggier	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
hip and hop	non-existent	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
'witchy'	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+
un	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
semitarian	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-

End of table 1

Creative coinage	Morphological pattern	Observance in corpora				Appearance in dictionaries of unconventional English			Formal deviancy	Explicit markedness
		BNC	COCA Bank	Google Ngram	Viewer	YD	UD	WSD		
business meeting	well-established	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
umm, ahh	well-established[8]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-
sheet	well-established[9]	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	-

[1] extends $[X + -y]_{Adj,}$ where X_N $_V$

[2] since 1986

[3] since 2003

[4] since 1987

[5] extends $[de- + X]_{V,}$ where X_V $_N$

[6] extends $[sub- + X]_{N,}$ where X_N $_{Prop N}$

[7] extends $[un- + X + -able]_{Adj,}$ where -able   -esque

[8] extends the nomenclature of conversion sources (+ interjection)

[9] extends the N to V conversion subpattern (form/shape to action performed)

Methodology

This research examines stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit and their morphosemantic properties, and is based on the following tenets:

1. New words are created by the same principles and rules that govern the form (constituency and constituent order) of existing words [Miller, 2014, p. 17].

2. Those neologisms that belong to the norms of the community (i.e. are created in accordance with core morphology) and are generally known to most members of that community become codified/institutionalized [Hohenhaus, 2005]. Lexical listing is necessary to capture blocking and account for the inheritance by derivatives of idiosyncrasies in form and meaning [Aronoff, 1988, p. 787].

3. The creation of stylistic neologisms is implemented through foregrounding, which can be achieved via either deviation/parallelism, or via defamiliarization. According to deviation theory, features of creativity lie in the degree to which language departs or deviates from expected patterns of language, thereby defamiliarizing the reader [Carter, 2004, p. 59]. I thus employ deviancy through constraint violation approach and exmaine how stylistic neologisms transgress one or more constraints of recognized word-formation processes (semantic, phonological, cognitive, etc.).

4. Morphologically creative neologisms are analogous to codified words of a given form, meaning, or both, although they "straddle the boundaries of morphology" [Los et al., 2012, p. 134]. They thus can be classified in accordance with the well-recognized morphological patterns that underlie them. Hence, the typological description in this article takes a derivational approach. This approach applies the concept of word-formation productivity to the level of grammatical word-formation competence, which accounts for potential words [Dressler, Ladányi, 2000]. Derivational patterns utilized for the production of new words were listed as those involving additive and metamorphic processes [Beck, 2017, p. 325]. The typological description of stylistic neologisms in ELCL was contextualized in this study on Item-and-Process approach [Hocket, 1954; Anderson, 1992; Aronoff 1994] falling under lexeme-based morphology which sees a word form as a result of an operation – word-formation rule (henceforth WFR). Word forms, from this

approach, result through application of rules to alter a stem in order to produce a new word. This approach is relevant here because new words artfully manufactured in ELCL, the crux of this study, tend to be rule-related, hence, up to the point where a distinction from "governed by productive rules" becomes problematic and "the difference between creativity and productivity is a cline" [Hohenhaus, 2007, p. 16].

5. Stylistic neologisms are coined in performance and are pragmatically utilic (witty, humorous, ironic, impertinent, offensive, etc.) [Mattiello 2008, p. 60]. By intentionally manipulating morphological conventions, speakers meet their specific needs in specific situations [Killie, 2022; Lensch, 2022] – to reveal feelings of intimacy or distance, express emotion and empathy, convey humor and playfulness, project a persona and sense of identity, achieve rhetorical effects, and more [Munat 2007, p. 4].

6. New words coined with the violation of core morphology can be explicitly marked in a number of ways. They can be:

a) explained by meta-discursive comments – the definition of the new word in the immediate co-text:

(1) *"It's **Mentionitis**," Jude was saying. –"What's that?" said Magda. – "Oh, you know, when someone's name keeps coming up all the time when it's not strictly relevant: "Rebecca says this" or "Rebecca's got a car like that"* [Fielding, 1999];

b) spelt alternatively using a non-alphabetic orthographic sign (e.g., hyphen):

(2) *Kelly's company is new, but easily one of the best – **boutique-y**, very impressive client list, and a great place to meet all sorts of wildly shallow and self-involved people and get the hell out of that hole in which you've recently sequested yourself* [Weisberger, 2005];

c) presented in the text in a different font (e.g., in italics):

(3) *"Not invited? You're kidding!" She grabs the laptop out of my hand and scans it intently. 'Wait. You are invited." "That's not really invited, though, is it? I wasn't on the list. Krista's "allowing" me to come to the party. It's different. In fact, this entire email is pretty much an **anti-invitation*** [originally in italics]" [Kinsella, 2021, p. 45].

Discussion and Major Findings

This section aims to define and account for the diversity of stylistic neologisms in ELCL. It does so by classifying originally coined new words based on similarities and differences in their formal structure. It draws on a taxonomy of morphological processes by signifier type [de Saussure, 1960] that have been typically categorized into additive and metamorphic processes (see [Beck 2017, pp. 325–326]). The typology is compiled on the basis of 100 tokens from ELCL with 27 illustrative instances presented in this section.

Typology of stylistic Neologisms in English-Language Chick Lit

The data derived from the corpus of ELCL novels indicates that morphological processes preferred for the artful production of new words include both additive (segmental (affixation and compounding)) and metamorphic (apophony and conversion) ones.

Stylistic neologisms produced by additive processes

Additive signifiers are discrete morphological signifiers that consist of predefined segmental and non-segmental material added to a base [Beck 2017, p. 326]. In ELCL, words produced creatively by additive processes include affixed derivatives and compounds. I will now focus on them in turn.

Affixed derivatives

I start the classification of stylistic neologisms in ELCL with affixed derivatives produced by concatenation – the process of adding identifiable, potentially listable and meaningful signifiers

(suffixes and prefixes) to bases (see [Beck 2017, pp. 340–341]) – as they are the most numerous occurrences in the dataset. They include suffixed, prefixed and co-fixated derivatives.

Suffixed derivatives

Suffixed derivatives are morphological alterations employing derivational suffixes. The English language makes extensive use of suffixation (see [Mithun, 2003; Velupillai, 2012; Dryer, 2013]). A possible explanation for this is provided by Borowsky [2010, p. 368] who observes that "normal lexical retrieval is 'left to right', so that in right affixation (i.e. suffixation) the listener will relatively quickly recognize the […] word in question, and speech flow will be more likely" (quoted in [Storch, 2017, p. 292]). This might also explain why this group of stylistic neologisms in ELCL is the most frequent.

As my data suggest, the most productive word formation pattern in this group (based on a quantitative approach) is **X + -y**, which produces adjectives. In this respect, ELCL creativity seems to resemble other types of discourses as the suffix -y, as is claimed by Carter [2004, p. 98], is highly productive and is becoming an established process by which new words can be produced. We can witness the pattern in the following example:

(4) *With a surge of excitement, I hurry towards the Barkers Center. I won't go mad, I promise myself. Just one little treat to see me through. I've already got my cardigan – so not clothes … and I bought some new kitten heels the other day – so not that … although there are some nice **Prada-y** type shoes in Hobbs … Hmmm. I am not sure* [Kinsella, 2000, p. 71].

In the English language, the pattern X + -y is attested to produce adjectives from noun bases. The example of X + y derivative listed above is thus coined in accordance with the pattern that is already in existence, yet it reveals formal eccentricity due to the violation of phonological constraint. The suffix -*y* preferably selects mono- and bisyllabic noun bases ending in a consonant or the silent -*e* (cf. the institutionalized forms *wintry, curly, horsy* (LDOCE)), hence, *Prada-y* in (4) stands out as deviant. The coinage economically expresses a complex idea about women's shoes being stylish, luxurious, exclusive, and sophisticated. It is a striking example of how formal expressivity serves to represent issues salient to young women of postfeminist era, in particular, the importance accorded to women's consumption in popular culture, their ability to select the current commodities to attain a lifestyle inspired by celebrity culture. The deviant *Prada-y* involving the name of a luxury fashion brand as its input represents the protagonist's identity as a shopaholic, whose ardent desire to own fashion brands brings her consistency, confidence, sense of accomplishment, and happiness boost. It can be referred to as a linguistic structure belonging to a version of a social (shopaholics') dialect – a linguistic variety generated by the social group to assert its uniqueness. *Prada-y* in (4) stands out as a case of overlexicalization, defined as the introduction of a completely novel lexical item to express meaning understandable within the given community. In the excerpt (4), by describing shoes as *Prada-y*, the protagonist seems to be talking herself into buying yet another superfluous pair as a way to feel good. *Prada-y* in (4) is unattested and does not appear in dictionaries of unconventional English or in corpora, which means it was purposefully coined by the author to fulfil the above described needs.

My database contains another particularly noteworthy derivative featuring -*y* attachment:

(5) *"I am very pleased to see you, Bridget", he said, taking my arm. "Your mother has the entire Northamptonshire constabulary poised to comb the county with toothbrushes for your dismembered remains. Come and demonstrate your presence so I can start enjoying myself. How's the be-wheeled suitcase?" "Big beyond all sense. How are the ear-hair clippers?" "Oh, marvelously – you know – **clippy**"* [Fielding, 1996].

In (5), *clippy*, exclusively exile as 'able to clip', does not look odd on the surface, yet, contextually it reveals an irregularity in that the attested derivative *clippy* is a noun meaning 'a Microsoft paperclip' [Peckham, 2024]. The fact that *knives* are *knifey* and *clippers* are *clippy* is so obvious that there is no need to prove or explain it. As such, the language system avoids codifying the qualitative adjectives of the kind. Moreover, the contextual meaning of *clippy* in (5)

('able to clip') leads to the conclusion that the new coinage is a deverbial adjective. This means that the formation of *clippy* in (5) extends the well-established pattern $[X + -y]_{Adj}$, where X is a noun.

In (5), it is not the descriptive meaning of *clippy* that is utilic, but its social and expressive meanings.

The conversation above occurs between Bridget, the main heroine of [Fielding, 1996], and her father. In it, Father asks the daughter what she thinks about the suitcase Bridget got as the New Year gift from her mother. Practicing the 'this-is-the-worst-present-ever-but-I-love-my-mom-so-I'll-pretend-I-like-it' response, Bridget praises its size. Mr. Jones responds in a humorous way describing his New Year gift he received from his wife (ear-hair clippers) as having the only virtue that he can possibly think of – that they are 'clippy'. The word indicates quality of the object; its formation extends the word formation pattern $[X_N + -y]_{Adj}$ making the verb *clip* available for complex word production. The main purpose of the utterance is to show that he cannot think of anything positive to say about the present, but does not want to offend his wife. By using this word, he is also able to convey a degree of solidarity with his daughter who has also been given a present with few discernable qualities other than its immediate usefulness.

The underlying effect of *clippy* is one of linguistic playfulness. The author's playful intention is perceived by the reader and humor is achieved once the deviant form is identified and unraveled (see [Poix, 2021]). In case of $[X_V + -y]_{Adj}$ surface form *clippy*, it fits into metalinguistic humor which lies in the playful mismatch between what is expected of the input $clip_V$ at the level of word grammar and what is done with it in actual speech (see [Manon, 2021]). The wordplay of *clippy* [*clippers*] does more than merely focus on content. The meaning of *clippy* represents Mr. Jones's attitude towards his wife (he cannot get rid of the useless clippers as they were given to him by his spouse) and reinforces the 'husband-wife' relationship, whilst revealing chinks in the relationship.

One more highly productive word formation pattern involved in the production of stylistic neologisms in ELCL is **X + -ly**, which forms adjectives:

(6) *Trish and Eddie are both staring at me, agog. Maybe I should add some **housekeeperly** detail* [Kinsella, 2005, p. 78].

Housekeeperly in (6) is coined in accordance with the X + -ly pattern, which is productive in English and manufactures adjectives from noun bases to designate culturally universal "cradle traits" [B. Aginsky, E. Aginsky, 1948]. Cultural universals – elements, patterns, traits, or institutions common to all known human cultures – reflect "the psychic unity of mankind" [Ibid.]. They impose tendencies in the linguistic marking (with language being a cultural universal itself) uncovering universal regularities in color terminology [Berlin, Kay, 1969], temporality [Whorf, 1956], cause and effect [Fausey et al., 2010] to name a few. The prevalence of traditional (anti) values (such as friendship, bravery, and deity) impacts word-formation patterns, making the *-ly* adjectives *saintly, cowardly* [Wesley, 1987] acceptable while *housekeeperly* appears anomalous.

The main heroine in [Kinsella, 2005], Samantha, is a high-powered London lawyer. Just when she is about to achieve everything she has ever wanted Samantha makes a mistake and, unable to face its consequences, runs away. Mistaken for another woman, she ends up in a new job as a family housekeeper; however, she has no idea how to do housework. The author of [Kinsella, 2005] consciously coins the new *housekeeperly* (unattested in dictionaries and corpora) for her heroine to demonstrate her imagined inclusion in the housekeepers' in-group, as well as to cultivate her new employer's approval.

Another pattern that is worth mentioning as productive with creative coinage in ELCL is **X + -ism**, where X is a proper noun. The outputs of the pattern are onomastic derivatives – innovative nominal suffixed forms that are based on proper names:

(7) *"Becky?" says my father gravely, and both Mum and I swivel to face him. "Are you in some kind of trouble we should know about? Only tell us if you want to", he adds hastily. "And I want you to know – we're there for you". That's another bloody **Ricki Lake-ism**, too. My parents should really get out more* [Kinsella 2000, p. 224].

Ricki Lake, the input for *Ricki Lake-ism* in (7) is the name of a real-life person – an American television host and actress as well as the name of the TV show that she hosted. As Lieber and Scalise [2007, p. 9] remark, "it seems possible to attach *-ism* to names, for example, *Shelly Lieber-ism* does not sound all that bad or even *Lieber and Scalise-ism* if it were known, for example, that we were in the habit of working together". It is publicly known that Ricki Lake show's topicality was on dealing with personal subjects and revealing its guests' secrets, which suggests that the meaning transmitted by *Ricki Lake-ism* in (7) is 'interfering in private matters'. Nevertheless, the coinage is formally deviant and violates the 'No Phrase' constraint.

The noun *Ricki Lake-ism* is not listed in any of the English dictionaries and does not appear in corpora, indicating that the word was consciously manufactured by the author of [Kinsella, 2000]. The intent, presumably, was to veil Kinsella's [2000] heroine's attitude to her parents' interference in her private matters, in order to maintain positive relationships that establish clear personal boundaries.

The pattern **X + -esque**, where X is a proper noun, is also prolifically used in ELCL. Consider an example from [Weisberger, 2003]:

(8) *I didn't know how to explain this world that may have been only two hours away geographically but was really in a different solar system. They all nodded and smiled and asked questions, pretending to be interested, but I knew it was all too foreign, too absolutely strange, sounding and different to make any sense to people who – like me until a few weeks earlier – had never even heard the name Miranda Priestley. It didn't make much sense to me yet, either: it seemed overly dramatic at times and more than a little **Big Brother-esque**, but it was exciting. And cool. It was definitely, undeniably a supercool place to call work. Right?* [Weisberger, 2003, p. 77].

The pattern $[X_{PROP N} + -esque]_{Adj}$ coins derivatives meaning 'resembling or suggesting the style of'. The English etymological dictionary [Harper, 2024] lists only five entries of *-esque* adjectives including *Hamingwayesque*, *Japanesque*, *Junoesque*, *Kiplingesque*, *Romanesque*; The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English [Wesley, 1987] adds the sixth entry – *Kafkaesque*. There seem to be no semantic or phonological constraints for the formation of *-esque* derivatives: their bases are semantically diverse and include names of famous writers, philosophers, goddesses, nationalities, historic periods; they end on both consonant and vowel sounds. However, *Big Brother-esque* violates the 'No Phrase' constraint with its input being a phrase. This, along with the metadiscursive markedness (hyphenation) of *Big Brother-esque* witnesses its formal deviancy. The newly coined derivative seems to convey a holophrastic idea. *Big Brother* is a television reality show made in the UK, where contestants take part in a challenge to see who will last the longest in the Big Brother house. Thus, *Big Brother-esque* implies a complex idea of 'being challenging, competitive, and desirable', which is difficult to express with an already existing, codified lexeme. As such, *Big Brother-esque* is a witty form serving the function of language economy and emphasizes the heroine's sense of self and identity.

The extract (9) illustrates the formation of *relaxed-ish* in accordance with **X + - ish** pattern, where X is an adjective:

(9) *Panic shoots through me, but somehow I summon a relaxed smile. **Relaxed-ish** maybe* [Kinsella, 2021, p. 37].

Unattested and unavailable in both dictionaries of unconventional English and corpora, *relaxed-ish* is a hyphenated new word derived with the suffix *-ish* indicating a degree of a quality. It is formally deviant as the inflexion *-ed* hinders derivation with right hand elements. It is premeditatedly coined by the author of [Kinsella, 2021] to serve as an expressive and emotive indication of the heroine's intensity.

The following example (10) illustrates the functioning of the new word *googlable* produced with **X + -able** pattern:

(10) *As I finish my shower and get dressed, something else is bugging me, which is Genevieve. I can't stop googling her, which I know is a mistake, but she is so **googlable**. She's always doing something adorable on Instagram or announcing some new piece of Harriet's house merchandize on her YouTube channel* [Kinsella 2018, p. 168].

Dictionaries of unconventional English give account of *googlable* as 'able to be found through an Internet search engine, especially Google'. The word was also extracted from corpora that observes 1 instance of its usage in [Breslin, McKeown, 2012]. *Google* is not listed for attracting *-able* in reference dictionaries, presumably due to the 'Synonymy Blocking' effect – "the nonoccurrence of one form due to the simple existence of another," a synonymous one [Aronoff, 1976, p. 43]. The motivation behind the coinage is the dominance of prototype leading to the promotion of a certain search engine (Google) to designate the class as a whole (see [Miller, 2014]). The formation of the coinage does not bend any other WFR constraint(s), yet it is additionally metadiscursively marked in the printed version of [Kinsella, 2018] by a different font (italics).

Among the least productive suffixes (with just one example attested in my database) is the suffix *-ist* employed in the pattern ***X + -ist*** that forms adjectives:

(11) *"And Eric is such a sweet loving guy. It's not his fault his back was damaged when he was a baby. And he's achieved so much. He's awe-inspiring." – Now I am hot with shame. Maybe my husband does have a hump. I shouldn't be **hump-ist*** [Kinsella, 2008, p. 70].

This fragment contains a stylistic neologism – the adjective *hump-ist* derived from the noun input *hump* by adding the suffix *-ist*. It is uncodified in the reference dictionaries of the English-language, yet appears as a noun in [Peckham, 2024], which attributes its authorship to Brian Teal, a singer, and specifies its usage as a generic insult. The corpora do not observe the usage of the coinage.

In (11), the production of *hump-ist* is in the flow with [N +-ist]$_{Adj}$ pattern relaying the categorical meaning of the quality related to treating people unfair because of something. The English lexicon has a number of explicit phonological realizations of the mapping with the surface forms of [N + -ist]$_{Adj}$ derivatives wherein the input slot is restricted by the general constraint that comes from the interaction with extralinguistic factors. For instance, *sexist*, 'making unfair differences between men and women' [Harper, 2024], came into existence in 1965 with the rise of feminist consciousness and reinforcement of women's liberation movement, largely based in the USA. *Racist*, 'being discriminatory towards a person or people on the basis of their race' [Ibid.], appeared in the context of fascist theories and *ageist* 'being discriminatory on grounds of age' [Ibid.] was manufactured by the gerontologist Dr. Robert N. Butler. Their acceptability is guided not by grammatical (competence-oriented principles), but rather by performance-oriented conditions connected with our world knowledge [Gaeta, 2015, p. 864]. The surface form *hump-ist* is thus an outright violation of the cognitive constraint that results in the appearance of the original coinage to cover an immediate communicative need – to emphasize the necessity to be empathic towards other people's physical conditions. Its creativity is combined with cultural reference to the words 'of prejudiced attitudes' emphasizing the high degree of the producer's cultural competence (see [Carter, 2004, p. 100]).

Another least productive suffix in stylistic neologisms formation is *-aholic* in nouns. The following (12) is a fitting example of such a derivative (12):

*"Hey, Bex". Suze comes over, pushing the twins with one hand and the state-of-the-art buggy with the other. "Do you think I need a new pram?" – "Er…" I look at the twins. "Isn't that double buggy quite new?" – "Yes, but I mean, this one's really maneuverable. It would be really practical!" I think I should get it. I mean, you can't have too many prams, can you?" There's a kind of lust in her eyes. Since when did Suze become such a **pramaholic**?"* [Kinsella, 2007, p. 106].

This example shows the unattested word manufactured by adding the suffix - *aholic* to the noun *pram*, which shares the generalized meaning with listed *-aholic* lexemes – 'someone

who cannot stop doing something or using something' (cf: *shopaholic* – 'someone who cannot stop shopping', *chocaholic* – 'someone who cannot stop consuming chocolate' [Wesley, 1987]). The word falls under the category of neologisms in accordance with non-attestation diagnostic feature due to the lack of generic labeling for its future use. The attested *shopaholic* covers all possible products one might be willing to purchase. Therefore, labelling one's desire to buy prams only is an effort too superfluous to be undertaken. Yet, the newly coined word realizes an effect of women's' solidarity in their ardent desire to purchase new things.

Prefixed derivatives

Prefixed derivatives are words formed by the attachment of a bound morpheme (prefix) before a free or yet another bound morpheme.

One of the patterns for the creation of stylistic neologisms in ELCL involved in this group is **un- + X**. It, for instance, underlies the creation of the word

(13) *unhoneymooners* [Lauren, 2020].

In nouns, the prefix *un-* is used to show lack of something (like in *unemployment* [Wesley, 1987]). As for [un- + X_N]$_N$ derivatives they are formed on bases that denote something one can possess/experience, as such *unhoneymooner* is formally deviant.

Another formation pattern employed to create stylistic neologisms in ELCL makes use of the prefix *de-*:

(14) *Shazzer suddenly **detranced*** [Fielding, 1999].

The prefix *de-* is of Latin origin – from the Latin negative prefix *dis-*, in which it implies reversal, – and thus is used to form verbs that have a sense of undoing the action. The process of base selection for derivatives with *de-* delimits their inputs to action verbs. This principle is not at work with the formation of *detrance* in (14) as its input is a noun. In other words, the manufacture of *detrance* extends the pattern [de- +X_N]$_N$ by employing a verb as a base to produce another verb. Unattested in reference dictionaries and dictionaries of unconventional English, unidentified in corpora, *detrance* is deliberately manufactured by the author of [Fielding, 1999] to foreground the female heroine's emotion.

One more prefix that is at work with stylistic neologisms in ELCL, is *sub-*:

(15) *Ended up walking along with Rebecca's nephew: **sub-Leonardo DiCaprio** lookalike hunted-looking in the Oxfam overcoat, whom everyone referred to as "Johnny's boy"* [Fielding, 1999].

Sub-Leonardo DiCaprio that appears in (15) is unattested and not found in corpora. It is author-produced to demonstrate how assessing a male's physical attractiveness is typical of women in their strive to select a potential mate and build relationships. *Sub-* is a common prefix in English word-formation transmitting the meaning of 'a lower position', 'somewhat or nearly' and 'secondary action'. Contextually, *sub-Leonardo DiCaprio* contains an idea of 'being somewhat, or nearly like Leonardo DiCaprio' (good-looking but not handsome enough compared to the actor). The set of bases for *sub-* outputs with the idea of something imperfect includes adjectives only (cf. *subnormal* [Wesley, 1987**])** and as such proper names are excluded from the rule.

Co-fixated derivatives

Another interesting aspect of this work is stylistic neologisms manufactured by co-fixation – the application to a base of two (or more) affixes that, taken together, constitute a single, non-decomposable, linguistic sign [Hagège, 1986, p. 26]. The case of co-fixation involved in the production of stylistic derivatives in ELCL is circumfixation – a process whereby a word is derived by means of the simultaneous attachment to a single base of a prefix and a suffix neither of which is used for other purposes elsewhere in grammar [Beck, 2017, p. 335].

This type can be illustrated by the following extracts:

(16) *Sadly there wasn't much: just a few boxes of bed linen and pillows, another of photo albums and assorted desk supplies (even though I lacked a desk), some makeup and toiletries, and a whole bunch of garment bags filled with* **un-Runway-esque** *clothes* [Weisberger, 2003, p. 196].

(17) *"…Have you been to the Masai Mara, Rebecca? "Er … no. I've never actually been to –" "… Have you been to Turkey?" "No, not there either", I say, feeling rather inadequate. God, how* **under-travelled** *I am…*[Kinsella, 2002, p. 43].

Circumfixation is a common affixation process in English with productive frames being il- + X + -ity, im- + X + -ity, in- + X + -ity, dis - + X + -al, dis- + X + -ion, dis- + X + -ment, dis- + X + -ation, be- + X + -ment, in- + X + -ness, un- + X + -ness, im- + X + -ion, im- + X + -ment, through which nouns are formed from nouns and adjectives; un- + X + -able, im- + X + -able, under- + X + - ed that form adjectives from verbs; in- + X + -ly, un- + X + -ly forming adverbs from adjectives and nouns [Chidi-Omwuta, Ojinuka, 2018].

The combinatorial endeavor that resulted in *un-Runway-esque* in (16) fits in neither of the above-listed frames. The two segments of *un-Runway-esque* derive an adjective from the proper noun *Runway* (the name of a fashion magazine) in two stages: coining the adjective *Runway-esque* and subsequently producing its negative. The newly coined word conveys a holophrastic meaning of 'being opposite to designer, chick, elegant, up-to-date', which is virtually impossible to be labelled with a lexicalized sign.

Andrea Sachs, the protagonist in [Weisberger, 2003], is a newly graduated journalist who lands a job as an assistant to Miranda Pristley, the executive of the Runway fashion magazine. Andrea is being lured into the world of fashion, where *Runway-esque* is 'designer, chic, elegant, up-to-date' and *un-Runway-esque* is the opposite. For fashion-illiterate Andrea, the new *un-Runway-esque* becomes a way for her to assert her identity in this alien world of high fashion.

A composite application of the discontinuous morpheme *under-…-ed* to a verb base is a valid pattern in English morphology (cf.: *undercooked* [Wesley, 1987]). The circumfixation in *under-travelled* in (17) could be assumed to derive in two stages: the first stage involving the attachment of the suffix *-ed* to the verb *travel* and the second stage employing the application of the prefix *under-* to the newly coined adjective *travelled*. The first stage, however, is problematic as the adjective *travelled* is ill-formed: in *travelled* the suffix *-ed* can be inflectional only and produce the past tense and past participle of the regular verb.

Stylistic neologisms produced by compounding

Compounding, as a word-formation process, combines two or more free standing forms into a single lexeme creating a word-level unit (see [Ralli, 2013, p. 10]. Compounding is represented by compounds proper (wherein the components are amalgamated in their full form and/or contractions) and blends (wherein the components linked are either clipped or partially overlap).

Compounds proper

The compoundhood of these formations may be specified on phonological, morphological, and syntactic grounds [Bauer, 2017]. Phonologically, compounds usually behave like single words [Finkbeiner, Schücker, 2019, pp. 9–10] and are spelt as one word with or without a hyphen (such as *horse-trade* or *egghead*) or as two separate words (such as *body language* and *free trade*) [Altakhainek, 2016. pp. 61–62]. Morphologically, compounds are marked as word-like units, with the head carrying the inflection in accordance with the compound's role in a matrix sentence [Bauer, 2009, p. 346]. Syntactically, compounds are inseparable and impenetrable; as such, they can be modified only as a whole [Lieber, Štekauer, 2009, pp. 11–12].

Compounds are not homogeneous in structure. They include:

1) neutral compounds wherein the merge is realized by the mere juxtaposition of two affixless stems (*shop-window*, *tallboy*), affixed stem(s) (*latecomer*, *golden-haired*) and contracted stem(s) (*V-day*, *H-bag*). These have been classified into subordinate, attributive, and coordinate compounds, all of which can be endocentric or exocentric [Scalise, Bisetto, 2009]. Coordinate compounds (those whose constituents are of equal status) include two subtypes:

a) dvandvas, whose constituents belong to the same lexical-syntactic category [Miller, 2014] (e.g., *cat-dog, grey-blue, passive-aggressive*);

b) tautological compounds [Benszes, 2014], which include two related types: compounds where the left-hand member is a hyponym of the right-hand member (e.g., *oak tree, tuna fish*) and compounds, which are based on the pairings of two synonymous words (e.g., *pathway, subject matter, hustle-bustle*) (see [Bauer, 2008]);

2) morphological compounds represented by words, in which two compounding word stems are combined by a linking vowel or consonant (e.g., *Anglo-Saxon, handiwork*);

3) synthetic compounds that have a deverbal constituent whose verb takes a nominal complement (e.g., *peace-maker, truck driver, mice-eater*) [Sproat, 1985];

4) syntactic compounds [Salus, 2011] – words formed from segments of speech, preserving in their structure numerous traces of syntagmatic relations typical of speech: articles, prepositions, and adverbs (e.g., *lily-of-the-valley, good-for-nothing, sit-at-home*);

5) phrasal compounds – complex words that combine a lexical head and a phrasal non-head [Günter et al., 2020] (e.g., *chicken and egg situation* [Trips, 2014, p. 44f] quoted in [Günter et al., 2020])

Some scholars (e.g., [Lieber, 2005, p. 377; Szymanch, 2005, p. 433; Meibauer, 2007]) single out entire sentences as compound constituents (e.g., *I have the that-I-am-being-called-upon-every-five-minutes headache*), with Miller [1993, p. 94], Bauer and Renauf [2001], and Moyna [2011, p. 36] analyzing them as sentential NP modifiers analogous to relative clauses or adjectives (quoted in [Miller, 2014]).

The following may shed light on the role of compounding in the manufacture of stylistic neologisms in ELCL:

(18) *Eventually, I make my way into the living room. "What are your plans today?" I'm still in my pajamas but feeling much more human. – "You are looking at it." He closes the book, resting it on his chest. The image is immediately filed in my* **braincyclopedia** *as an Ethan Posture, and subcategorized as Surprisingly Hot. "But preferably at the pool with an alcoholic beverage in my hand"* [Lauren, 2020, p. 159].

In this passage, the noun *braincyclopedia* stands out as an artful coinage. It is a noun-noun endocentric compound merging affixless stems – *brain* and *cyclopedia*. The construction refers to an invented area of the protagonist's brain where she stores the sorted images of the man she loves and surfaces the social function of expressive neology – to serve as the indicator of a close relationship. There can be a diversity of semantic relationships between components of such compounds, as well as between the individual elements and the compound as a whole. Yet, however diverse the semantics of endocentric noun-noun combinations may be, the formation of those occurrences that find their way to the English-language community lexicon is based on productive patterns leading to the creation of outputs that are hyponyms of their head elements (e.g., a *greenhouse* is a kind of house). *Braincyclopedia* is not a kind of cyclopedia and thus can be viewed as an exceptional case that does not follow a normal and productive compound-forming pattern.

Witness another example:

(19) *The baby suddenly kicks me hard inside and I wince. Everything's so … **achey-painy**. Me. Luke. The whole horrible situation* [Kinsella, 2007, p. 283].

The compound *achey-painy* in (19) is composed of two tautological derivational stems, which are synonymous units (see [Benczes, 2014]). Tautological compounding is not rare in English and is still productive with new words as is evidenced by the Rice University Neologisms Database (see [Benszes, 2014]) and as such this instance (19) is in the flow with the current trend in English word-formation serving as an emphatic device in order to express strong emotion (see [Ulmann, 1977, p. 153]. The tautological compound *achey-painy*, however, is unlisted and is not observed in corpora, which proves it is a neologism manufactured by the author to reach the intended goal described. Its right-hand component is formally deviant as the adjective derivative on the noun base *pain* is formed with the suffix *-ful* (*painful*).

Blends

Blends, as a word-formation process, are compounds consisting of two source words – one complete word and a fragment (part of a morpheme), like *wintertainment < winter + enter*[*tainment*], or two fragments, like *brunch < br*[*eakfast*] + [*l*]*unch* (see [Lehrer, 2007]). Most blends are a fusion of constituents either overlapping at segments that are phonologically or graphically identical (e.g., *motel < mot*or + *hot*el) or retaining their form as a result of overlap (*stoption < stop + option*). It is common to form blends for combinations (e.g., an animal breed: *zorse < zebra + horse*) or products of two objects or phenomena (e.g., *shress < shirt + dress*). A blend's constituents share paradigmatic relations as they combine elements of the same semantic category. As such, the coinages are semantically constrained, bringing together the inputs with correlated meanings.

Blends' outputs in English, as a rule, are constrained phonologically:

1) a blend is the same length as the longest of its constituent;

2) the ordering of the constituents follows a certain pattern: shorter and more frequent constituents come first;

3) the position of the switch point (where one blended word is cut off and switched to another) is typically fixed at the syllable boundary or at the onset.

Blends exhibit several additional properties that set them apart from compounds. Particularly, compounds develop a special meaning – for instance, in a N + Adj compound the noun provides a point of comparison with respect to the property expressed by the adjective or the noun can function as a mere intensifier, in which case it bears the main stress of the word. Meaning specializations of this sort presuppose the emergence of a compounding subpattern, which is the basis from which the variation grows. No such pattern can emerge with blends: each blend is, by nature, unique [Fradin, 2015]. In addition, the property of category assignment is stable and well-defined for compounds (for instance, in endocentric N + N compounds, the compound inherits its category from its head – the right-hand component); in N + N blends, by contrast, there is a conflict between the semantic and the morphological head. Moreover, the inputs of blends can be rather vague, especially when the two forms overlap phonologically, and the class of the inputs, as well as their phonological complexity and syllable structure, is arbitrary. As such, blends' emergent patterns rarely appear; yet there are some instances when splinters are reused once a blend is created (e.g., *Japlish, Czechlish, Yidlish* for code-switching styles based on Japanese, Czech, or Yiddish plus English, created by analogy with *Spanglish < Spanish + English*). All this has led some scholars to assume that blending is extrasystemic in its own right (see [Marchand, 1969]).

To exemplify the formation of stylistic neologisms as blends in ELCL, I will provide a fragment from Fielding [1996] that contains a chain of occasional coinages:

(20) *"Pashminas," I slurred on my Chardonnay. – "That's it!" said Tom excitedly. "It's fin-de-millennium pashminaism. Shazzer is Simon's "pashmina" because she wants to shag him most so he diminishes her and Simon is Shazzer's* **pashmaster**.*" – At this Sharon bursts into tears, which took 20 minutes to sort out with another bottle of Chardonnay and packet of fags until we could come up with a list of further definitions, as follows: A friend who you really fancy who's actually gay ("Me, me, me", Tom said).* **Pashmarried**: *a friend who you used to go out with and is married with children who likes having you around as memory of old love but makes you feel like mad barren pod-womb imagining vicar in love with self … "What about* **pash-hurts**?*" said Shaz sulkily. "Friends who turn your own private emotional disaster into a sociological study at the expense of your feelings"* [Fielding, 1999].

In this fragment, one can observe two blends wherein the constituents overlap at segments that are phonologically and graphically identical (*pashmaster < pash**m**ina + **m**aster* and *pashmarried < pash**m**ina + **m**arried*). Although the newly coined words obey the structural and phonological constraints of blending, they certainly violate the semantic constraint as their constituents are unrelated. The blended *pash-hurts* violates a number of constraints: firstly, blends are never hyphenated; secondly, *pashminas* and *hurts* have no semantic correlation; lastly, phonologically, the constituents have no switch point. All three words are meta-discursively marked by their definitions in the immediate co-text and do not seem to reuse an already existing pattern.

Uncodified in dictionaries and unattested in corpora, *pashmaster, pashmarried* and *pash-hurts* in (20) are intentionally created by the author to cover an immediate communicative need. By metaphorically extending the registered meaning of *pashmina*, characters in [Fielding, 1996] artfully coin new blends with the splinter 'pash' to label different aspects of their catastrophic love relationships, which is the cementing bond of their friendship.

Decompound forms

In the database of stylistic neologisms extracted from the ELCL corpus, I observe an interesting case of 'decompounding', which is a non-productive word-formation process in English:

(21) *Sir David Allbright is chairman of the board. He's total bigwig, even* **bigger and wiggier** *than Simon* [Kinsella 2008, p. 89].

The fragment (21) features the attested noun – the solid idiomatic compound *bigwig*, which is the product of one-off instance of word-formation (see [Beck 2017, p. 327]) conveying the meaning of 'an important person' [Wesley, 1987; Mish, 2025], 'a great man, person of consequence' [Harper, 2024]. The compound is a combination of big_{Adj} + wig_N, dating to the 18th century in reference to the imposing wigs formerly worn by men of rank or authority [Harper, 2024]. The present-day sense of the word is idiomatic and figurative: it is a metaphtonymy whose meaning is derived from the ground – the relationship between the wig as a mark of a well-bred man, a status symbol for people flaunting their wealth (see [Jung, Kim, 2005]) and a high-flyer. In accordance with the idea of idiomaticity, whose central characteristics are opacity and inseparability of compound words expressed in the unity of their structural, phonetic, and graphic integrity, decomposing *bigwig* into two comparative adjectives (additionally breaking the rules of conversion by trancategorizing the noun *wig* into an adjective). Formally, this is a clear deviation from English morphological rules, as there are no established decompounding patterns. Functionally, the phenomenon is interesting in that it is aimed to construct social relationships and identities.

Another highly individual case, which is interesting from both a formal and functional point of view, is *hipped and hopped* in

(22): *By the next evening, my heart has* **hipped and hopped** *all over the place. I am getting ready for supper, staring at myself in the tiny cracked mirror in my room (everything here is old and picturesque), unable to think about anything except: what are my chances?* [Kinsella, 2021, p. 46].

Hip hop_N, which pairs the *hip* – meaning 'trendy' or 'fashionable' with the leaping movement *hop*, is a type of popular dance and popular culture. In the case of *hipped and hopped* in (22), the compound was converted into a verb; its components were further separated into two verbs. The pattern is unattested, i.e. *hipped and hopped* is a neologism; functionally, the newly coined form serves as a metacommunicative strategy to emphasize the protagonist's emotion-focused coping.

Stylistic neologisms produced by metamorphic processes

In metamorphic processes, the meaning is expressed through some change or alteration on the base itself [Beck, 2017, p. 341]. Signifiers of the metamorphic type are divided into three groups – reduplication, apophonies and conversion [Beck, 2017, p. 341] with apophonies and conversion being productive with stylistic neologisms in ELCL.

Apaphonic forms

Apophony presupposes modification of the base in some way, either by making changes to one or more of its segments (segmental apophony), or altering its tonal or accentual patterns (suprasegmental apophonies) [Beck, 2017, p. 344]. The formation of stylistic neologisms in ELCL, as my database suggests, is presented by segmental apophony, namely subtraction.

Subtracted forms

Subtraction, or clipping/truncation, is a morphological process that removes part of the base [Beck, 2017, p. 347]. New (clipped) words created by shortening lexemes retain the same meaning and still are members of the same word class [Bauer, 1993, p. 233]. The reductive process comes in four basic varieties:

- back-clipping (or apocopation), when the back half of a word is deleted (e.g., *memo* < ***memo****randum*);

- fore-clipping (or apheresis), when the initial part of a word is cut off (e.g., *bike* < *motor-****bike***);

- mid-clipping (or syncope) – the retention of the middle part of the word (e.g., *fridge* < *re-****frige****rator*);

- median clipping, in which the middle of the word is dropped (e.g., *smog* < ***smo****ke fo****g***) [Jamet, 2009].

Truncation is highly variable, and "there is no way to predict how much of a word will be clipped off […], nor even which end of the word will be clipped off" [Bauer, 1994, p. 40]. The phonological material that is clipped off and deleted may be part of a syllable (e.g., *shroom*), an entire syllable (e.g., *sis*), or several syllables (e.g., *gator, fridge*). The clipped form may consist of one syllable (e.g., *sis*) or more syllables (e.g., *gator*). It may end in a consonant (e.g., *sis*) or a vowel (e.g., *bro*). The same word may be clipped in different ways (e.g., *bro vs bruv*). Clippings mostly instantiate nouns (e.g., *sis*), but also other word classes, including adjectives (e.g., *legit*) [Hilpert, Saavedra, Rains, 2021].

Lappe [2007, p. 168] views the clipping process as the product of two interacting types of constraints, namely faithfulness constraints, which bias speakers against outcomes that differ strongly from their sources, and phonological markedness constraints, which bias speakers against phonologically unusual outcomes. Faithfulness constraints (cf. [McCarthy, 2011, p. 13]) include the tendency to preserve the stressed syllable of the source word in the outcome ('*doctor* > *doc*). Markedness constraints include the tendency for shortening to result in monosyllabic words, since these represent the unmarked case in English (quoted in [Hilpert, Saavedra, Rains, 2021]).

The following are excerpts containing authentic formations found in ELCL:

(23) *They ride around on a tandem and wear matching jumpers knitted by their old nanny and have this stupid family language which no-one else can understand. Like they call sandwiches* ***'witchies'*** [Kinsella 2000, p. 83].

In this fragment, we witness the original *witchies,* which is the subtracted noun *sandwiches*. This is a case of fore-clipping, wherein the initial part of the base undergoes structural changes. The clipped output meets the word-production phonological constraint (it is phonologically well-formed) and the formal (structural) criterion (it is a two-syllable form that does not differ much from the output). Nevertheless, the new word is exclusively exile, is meta-discursively marked by single inverted commas as well as by referring to its input. The clipped word fulfills a provisional function: it is coined to satisfy the immediate communicative need – to indicate the actors' solidarity, which is proved by the co-text.

Here is another example:

(24) *"Is he a bad sort, then?" says the midwife." You should listen to your friend," she adds to me. "She sounds like she knows what she's talking about." "Friends can always tell the wrong* ***'uns,'*** *agrees the woman in the pink dressing gown. "He's not the wrong* ***'un!'*** *I retort indignantly. "Suze, please! Calm down! Go with the nurse! Get some drugs!"* [Kinsella, 2002, p. 91].

The bold parts of the fragment (24) are the apocopation *un*. As Bauer [1993, p. 233] states, the formalization of phonological realizations of clipping is impossible. However, phonology works hand in hand with semantics, morphology, and syntax to generate new words and we can apply the semantic constraint here and claim that words cannot be shortened to a bound morpheme. This is affirmed by [Hilpert et al., 2021] who claim that a clipping should correspond to

a morpheme that is present in the source word and can function as an independent word. The meaning of the emerged new formation *un* is highly context-dependent and out of context can denote anything 'negative, lacking or opposite' [Wesley, 1987]. However, the word sense disambiguation can be approached contextually: the co-text stimulates the deciphering of the meaning transmitted by *un* to identify it as a 'mismatch'. As such, *un* is morphologically ill-formed and highly context-dependent. It is unattested as a free morpheme, unavailable in this status in corpora and, as such, is a stylistic neologism.

As is witnessed by my database, clipping in ELCL also enters into further morphological derivation – prefixation:

(25) *"I eat tofu sometimes." – "You don't", I gape at him. "Tofu". – "I don't. I tried it and, you know, it's OK. It's protein. It's fine. I think I could be … **semitarian**, maybe? Half vegetarian? It's a thing", he adds a little defiantly* [Kinsella, 2021, p. 365].

For *semitarian* in (25), the noun *vegetarian* was shortened to *tarian* and further prefixated with *semi-*. The coinage is unattested and unwitnessed in corpora. It is pragmatically utilic to emphasize the speaker's status (a meat lover trying to limit the consumption of meat for the sake of his beloved woman – a vegetarian) and thus helps to maintain relationships.

Conversed forms

Conversion, the "noiseless machinery" of vocabulary enrichments [Marsta, 2013, p. 3], is a metamorphic operation that results in no phonological change in the base, but alters its grammatical properties [Beck, 2017, p. 351]. Conversion patterns are classified in accordance with the type of grammatical property affected [Mel'čuk, 2006, pp. 304-306] into:
- categorical conversion that involves a change in part of speech;
- rectional conversion involving a change in the government of agreement pattern of a word (e.g., a change in grammatical gender);
- paradigmatic conversion entailing a change in the paradigmatic properties of a word (e.g., the inflectional category of plurality) [Beck, 2017, p. 351].

Categorical conversion is typical for English, and my database shows that new coinages received through conversion in ELCL are the instances of this type.

Categorical conversion

Categorical conversion is a very productive method of extending the English lexicon. The input categories involved in conversion in English are nouns, verbs and adjectives [Booij, 2005, p. 57] with major directions of conversion, recognized in [Quirk et al., 1985], including:
- noun to verb (e.g., *a father – to father*);
- verb to noun (e.g., *to talk – a talk*);
- adjective to verb (e.g., *dry – to dry*);
- adjective to noun (e.g., *comic – a comic*).

These patterns are employed in the production of original coinages in ELCL, as illustrated in the following extract:

(26) *I altered my path to pass his table, at which he immersed himself deep in conversation with trollop, glancing up as I walked past and giving me a firm, confident smile as if to say "business meeting". I gave him a look which said, "Don't you **business meeting** me", and strutted on* [Fielding, 1996].

The syntactical position in which *business meeting* functions in (26) signifies that it is a verb produced by conversion from the compound noun [Meriam Webster's, 1995] wherein *meeting* is the head word premodified by the noun *business*. Conversion of nouns to verbs in English is conventional [Booij 2005, p. 67], yet the coined verb *business meeting* is defective in its ability to form a tense paradigm (*business meetinging* and *business meetinged* are hard to imagine). With this in mind, we can label *business meeting*$_v$ a stylistic neologism.

Hohenhaus [2007, pp. 28–29], borrowing the term from Brekle [1976], labels cases like *business meeting* in (26) "delocutive conversion" – speech act-bound formations not dependent

on an actual verbatim citation of a particular locution. The delocutive mechanism of citing some linguistic material by converting that material into a verb (like with *business meeting* in (26)) is exploited in communicative situations of conflict, where a speaker rejects the form of something said to him/her [Hohenhaus, 2007, p. 29] and typically appears in the frame '*don't (you) _____ me!*' [Hohenhaus, 1996, p. 328 ff].

In (26), *"Don't you **business meeting** me"* serves as a metacommunicative comment to imply a threat of physical confrontation between the main heroine [Fielding, 1996] and her friend's husband, whom she met at a restaurant with another woman, and he pretended it was a business meeting. Stylistic neologisation in this case is an expressive process used by for the protagonist to maintain a close relationship with her friend and confront the cheater.

As observed by Hohenhaus [2007, p. 29], interjections can also undergo delocutive conversion, which we can witness in chick lit:

(27) *And now Suze **is umming and ahhing** over about six family tiaras while I take sips of champagne* [Kinsella, 2002, p. 41].

The formations *umm* and *ahh* in (27) are recognized in context as verbs by their inflectional endings, as both are followed by the aspectual (continuous) ending *-ing*. The bases in the conversion pairs $umm_{INTERJ} - umm_V$ and $ahh_{INTERJ} - ahh_V$ belong to a closed part of speech, extending the well-established pattern of conversion. In (27), the author engages in the creative activity to metacommunicatively emphasize the emotional state of the heroine – that one of admiration and excitement.

Another case of pattern extending can be witnessed in

(28): *"If I can get in to speak to him, it'll be fine. But I know I'll be fobbed off. They have no time for me any more." I sigh and reach for the car door. It's totally **sheeting** it down, but I can't sit here all night* [Kinsella, 2008, p. 389].

In (28), *sheet* functions as a verb, recognized by its inflectional ending *-ing*, converted from the noun. The direction of this conversion type is guided by the semantics of the conversion pair, with the templates for N-to-V conversion cases being as follows (see [Booij, 2005, p. 58]):
- instrument   action performed by the instrument (e.g., *a hammer – to hammer*);
- performer   action performed (e.g., *a father – to father*);
 - object acquired   action of acquiring the object (e.g., *fish – to fish*);
- location   action performed at the location (e.g., *a garage – to garage*);
- time span   action performed within the time span (e.g., *winter – to winter*).

Thus, the noun *sheet* fits none of the templates, making the product of conversion formally deviant and extending the nomenclature of N-to-V conversion subpatterns. The effect realized in (28) by $sheet_V$ is the one of pathetic fallacy, in which the heroine's emotions (sadness and despair) are attributed to the aspects of rainy weather.

Conclusions
In English-language chick lit, where normative changes are challenged to the advantage of accessibility, wittiness, humor, and playfulness, it is standard practice to manufacture stylistic neologisms – individual (system external) lexemes deployed by the writer to create a unique, thrilling, and interesting literary experience. The elusiveness of these creations, which is the result of their non-codification, still allows them to follow the existing morphological processes of word-formation (core morphology). By manually collecting a body of such words with a view to provide a quantifiable account of their typical characteristics in ELCL, I have concluded that they are typologically marked and involve bending our systemic knowledge of English core morphology.

In contrast to science fiction and children's literature, where the formation of neologisms may follow a wide range of meta-, pre-, and paramorphological patterns, the processes involved in the creation of stylistic neologisms in ELCL mainly involve paramorphology and are substantially conventional with respect to core morphological operations: typologically, these coinages make

use of affixation, compounding, clipping, and conversion. Although in line with well-established lexicogenetic operations, artfully coined new words in ELCL are immune to derivational constrains – phonological (*Prada-y*), semantic (*sheet*), syntactic (*Ricki Lake-ism*), cognitive (*humpist*), allow for alternative inputs (*umming and ahhing*), can be derived from inflected forms (*relaxed-ish*), and readily override blocking effects, in particular synonymy blocking (*pramaholic*) (an observation that aligns with Miller [2014] and Giegerich [2001]); numerous formations are based on deviant lexical bases (*achey-painy*). One atypical process involved in the manufacture of stylistic neologisms in ELCL is decompounding, wherein a compound word is broken apart with the segments of the whole functioning separately (*bigger and wiggier, hip and hop*). Morphosemantically, creatively produced new words in ELCL are open class coinages (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs), which serve descriptive, evaluative, and emphatic functions.

The violation of core derivational morphology stipulates the expressive effect of neologisms. A significant majority of stylistic neologisms in ELCL are created by the author (77%), rather than the language community. This suggests that the author's use of word-formation rules at the level of langue represents individual performance as solutions serving the specific needs of fiction. Authors tend to draw on a wide range of word-formation rules offered by the system, rarely extending the limits of the grammar or offering new morphological patterns (the portion of new coinages in ELCL manufactured in accordance with pattern extension hardly extends 16%). This supports Carter's [2004, p. 38] argument that creativity must not deviate too far from established norms and the creator of artful forms must respect (though not necessarily conform to) the norms, the canons or the received views of the language community.

The variety of mechanisms that English offers for the formation of stylistic neologisms, which have been presented in this paper, as well as the numerous corresponding examples add to the existing literature on neology and open new horizons to discussing artful lexicogenesis from different angles.

References

Aginsky, B., Aginsky, E. (1948). The importance of language universals. *Word*, 4 (3), 168-172.

Aksoy, Ö., Söylemez, A.S. (2023). Translation of neologisms in science fiction: The textual reality or unreality of the target text. *Istanbul Universits Journal of Translation Studies,* 18, 107-122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26650/iujts.2023.1255932

Allan, K. (2016). Pragmatics in language change and lexical creativity. *Springer Plus,* 5, 342. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-1836-y

Altakhainek, A. (2016). What is a compound? The main criteria for compoundhood. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics*, 4 (1), 58-86. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/exell-2017-0007

Anderson, S.R. (1992). Where's morphology? *Linguistic Inquiry*, 13, 571-612.

Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Aronoff, M. (1988). Review of Di Sciullo and Williams (1987). *Language,* 64, 766-770.

Aronoff, M. (1994). *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Cases*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bauer, L. (1993). Review of Becker 1990. In G. Booij, J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1992* (pp. 264-268). Dortrecht: Kluwer.

Bauer, L. (1994). *Watching English Change: An Introduction to the Study of Linguistic Change in Standard Englishes in the Twentieth Century*. London; New York: Longman.

Bauer, L. (2008). Dvandva. *Word Structure*, 1, 1-20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3366/E1750124508000044

Bauer, L. (2009). Typology of compounds. In R. Lieber, P. Štekauer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding* (pp. 343-356)*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bauer, L. (2017). *Compounds and Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235679

Bauer, L., Renouf, A. (2001). A corpus-based study of compounding in English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 29, 101-123. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/00754240122005251

Beck, D. (2017). The typology of morphological processes. Form and function. In A.Y. Aikhenvaid, R.M.W. Dixon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology* (pp. 325-360). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316135716.011

Benczes, R. (2014). Repetitions, which are not repetitions: The non-redundant nature of tautological compounds. *English Language and Linguistics*, 18 (3), 431-447. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000112

Berlin, B., Kay, P. (1969). *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evaluation*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Booij, G. (2005). Compounding and deviation: Evidence for construction morphology. In W.U. Dressler, D. Kastovsky, O.E. Pfeiffer, F. Rainer (Eds.), *Demarcation Problems in Morphology* (pp. 109-132). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bordet, L., Brisset, F. (2021). Introduction. *Lexis*, 17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.5585

Borowski, T. (2010). Language disguise in OT: Reversing and truncating. *Indigenous Language and Social Identity: Papers in Honour of Michael Walsh*, 626, 367-385.

Brekle, H. (1976). "Delokutive Verben: Ein Sprechakttheoretisch fundierter Wortbildungstyp". In K. Braunmüller, W. Kürschner (Eds.), *Grammatik. Akten des 10. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Tübingen 1975* (Vol. 2, S. 69-76). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Breslin, G., McKeown, C. (Eds.). (2012). *BOE – Bank of English 2012*. Retrieved from http://collinslanguage.com/content-solutions/wordbanks

Carter, R. (1999). Common language: Corpus, creativity and cognition. *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics*, 8 (3), 195-216. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709900800301

Carter, R. (2004). *Language and Creativity. The Art of Common Talk*. London: Routledge.

Cheyne, R. (2008). Created languages in science fiction. *Science Fiction Studies*, 35 (3), 386-403. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/sfs.35.3.0386

Chidi-Onwuta, G., Ojunwka, N. (2018). A case for circumfixation in English. *Journal of Arts / Humanities*, 1 (1), 1-12.

Davies, M. (Ed.). (2025). *COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English*. Retrieved from https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

Davies, M. (Ed.). (2025b). *BNC – British National Corpus*. Retrieved from https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/

de Saussure, F. (1960). *Course in General Linguistics*. London: Peter Owen Limited.

Dressler, W.U. (1994). Word-formation: Poetic license. In R.E. Ashor (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (Vol. IX, pp. 5022-5029). Oxford: Elsevier Pergamon.

Dressler, W.U., Ladányi, M. (2000). Productivity in word formation: A morphological approach. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 47 (1/4), 103-144. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014010530824

Dryer, M.S. (2013). Prefixing vs. suffixing in inflectional morphology. In M.S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591

Dziubina, O. (2017). *Problematyka vyznachennia termina "neolohizm" (na materiali anhliiskoi movy)* [The problem of denoting the term "neologisms"]. *Philological Discourse*, 6, 221-228 (in Ukrainian).

Fausey, C.M., Long, B., Inamori, A., Borodinsky, B. (2010). Constructing agency: The role of language. *Frontiers in Cultural Psychology*, 1, 1352-1354.

Fielding, H. (1996). *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Retrieved from https://ru.scribd.com/doc/285510965/Bridget-Jones-Diary

Fielding, H. (1999). *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason*. Retrieved from https://fb2.top/bridget-jones-the-edge-of-reason-145704/read/part-3

Finkbeiner, R., Schnücker, B. (2019). Compounds and multi-word expressions in the languages. In B. Schnücker (Ed.), *Complex Units: Compounds and Multi-Word Expression* (pp. 1-44). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110632446-001

Fradin, B. (2015). Blending. In P.O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen (Eds.), *Word Formation. An International HandBook of the Languages of Europe* (Vol. 1, pp. 386-413). Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110246254-023

Gaeta, L. (2015). Restrictions in word-formation. In P.O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen (Eds.), *Word Formation. An International HandBook of the Languages of Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 859-875). Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110246278-004

Giegerich, H.J. (2001). Synonymy blocking and the elsewhere condition: Lexical morphology and the speaker. *Transactions of the Philological Society,* 99, 65-98. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.00074

Gulyás, A. (2014). Lexical creativity and humor in translation: On Rabelais' linguistic genius and the difficulties in translating his works. Lexis, 17, 1-23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.5143

Günter, Ch., Kotowski, K., Plag, P. (2020). Phrasal compounds can have adjectival heads: Evidence from English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24 (1), 75-96. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674318000229

Hagège, C. (1986). *La Langue Palau, Une Curiosité Typologique*. Munich: Gink.

Harper, D. (Ed.). (2024). *Online Etymological Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.etymonline.com/

Harzewski, S. (2011). *Chick-Lit and Postfeminism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia.

Haspelmath, M. (1999). Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics*, 37 (364), 1043-1068. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/ling.37.6.1043

Hilpert, M., Saavedra, D.C., Rains, J. (2021). A multivariate approach to English clippings. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 6 (1), 104. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5771

Hocket, Ch. (1954). Two models of grammatical description. *Word*, 10, 201-234.

Hohenhaus, P. (1996). *Ad-hoc Wortbildung – Terminologie, Typologie und Theorie kreativer Wortbildung im Englischen.* Frankfurt/M., Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien: Peter Lang.

Hohenhaus, P. (2005). Lexicalization and institutionalization. In P. Štekauer, R. Lieber (Eds.), *Handbook of Word Formation* (pp. 353-373). Dorchester: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3596-9_15

Hohenhaus, P. (2007). How to do (even more) things with nonce words (other than naming). In J. Munat (Ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts* (pp. 15-38). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.08hoh

Jamet, D. (2009). A morphonological approach to clipping in English. *Lexis*, 1, 1-18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.884

Jung, H-J., Kim, S-N. (2005). Wig usages investigation which symbolizes the socio-economic status (Egypt ~ 17 C.). *Journal of Fashion Business*, 9 (6), 56-70.

Keane, M.T., Costello, F. (1996). *Where Do "Soccer Moms" Come from? Cognitive Constraints on N-N Compounding in English*. Dublin, Trinity College Dublin Publ.

Killie, K. (2022). Extravagance, productivity, and the development of -ingly adverbs. In M. Eitelmann, D. Haumann (Eds.), *Extravagant Morphology: Studies in Rule-Bending, Pattern-Extending and Theory-Challenging Morphology* (pp. 51-72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kinsella, S. (2002). *Shopaholic Ties the Knot*. London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2005). *The Undomestic Goddess*. London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2007). *Shopaholic and Baby*. London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2008). *Remember Me?* London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2018). *Surprise Me*. London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2021). *The Party Crasher*. London: Transworld publishers.

Kinsella, S. 2000. *The Secret Dream of a Shopaholic*. London: Black Swan.

Klosa-Kückelhaus, A., Kernerman, I. (2021). Converging Lexicography and Neology. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 34 (3), 277-281. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecab018

Körtvélyessy, L., Štekauer, P., Kačmár, P. (2021). On the role of creativity in the formation of new complex words. *Linguistics*, 59 (4), 1017-1055. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0003

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

Lauren, Ch. (2020). *The Unhoneymooners*. New York: Gallery Books.

Lee, D., Bradbery, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/

Lehrer, A. (2007). Blendalicious. In J. Munat (Ed.), *Lexical Creativity and Context* (pp. 115-133). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.16leh

Lensch, A. (2022). Diggers-out, leaf clearer-uppers and stayer-onner-for-nowers. On creativity and extravagance in English -er nominalisations. In M. Eitelmann, D. Haumann (Eds.), *Extravagant Morphology: Studies in Rule-Bending, Pattern-Extending and Theory-Challenging Morphology* (pp. 73-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.223.04len

Lieber, R. (2005). English word-formation processes: Observations, issues, and thoughts on future research. In P. Štekauer, R.R. Lieber (Eds.), *Handbook of Word Formation* (pp. 375-427). Dorchester: Springer.

Lieber, R., Scalise, S. (2007). The lexical integrity hypothesis in a new theoretical universe. In G. Booij, L. Ducceschi, B. Fardin, E. Guevara, A. Ralli, S. Scalise (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting* (pp. 1-24). Universita` degli Studi di Bologna, Bologna.

Lieber, R., Štekauer, P. (Eds.). (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lipka, L. (2007). Lexical creativity, textuality and problems of metalanguage. In J. Munat (Ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts* (pp. 3-12). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.06lip

Lipka, L. (2002). *English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics and Word-Formation*. Berlin: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Littlemore, J. (2022). On the creative use of metonymy. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 20 (1), 104-129. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.00103.lit

Los, B., Blom, C., Booij, G., Elenbaas, M., van Kemenade, A. (2012). *Morphosyntactic Change: A Comparative Study of Particles and Prefixes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Love, H. (Ed.). (2024). *Your Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.yourdictionary.com/

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manon, Ph. (2021). Incongruous names: The humorous coinages and use of proper names. *Lexis* 17, 1-26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.5204

Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day Word-Formation*. München: C.H. Beck, Marle, Jaap van.

Marsta, S. (2013). *Conversion in English: A Cognitive Semantic Approach*. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Mattiello, E. (2008). *An Introduction to English Slang: A Description of Its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology*. Milan: Polimetrica.

Mattiello, E. (2017). *Analogy in Word-Formation. A Study of English Neologisms and Occasionalisms*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110551419

McCarthy, J. (2011). *Doing Optimality Theory: Applying Theory to Data*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Meibauer, J. (2007). How marginal are phrasal compounds? Generalized insertion, expressivity, and I/Q-interaction. *Morphology*, 17, 233-259. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-008-9118-1

Mel'čuk, I.A. (2006). *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199864

Miller, G.D. (1993). *Complex Verb Formation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.95

Miller, G.D. (2014). *English Lexicogenesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mish, F.C. (Ed.). (2025). *Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/.

Missler, H. (2019). *The Cultural Politics of Chick Lit. Popular Fiction, Postfeminism and Representation*. London: Routledge.

Mithun, M. (2003). Why prefixes? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 50, 155-185. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1556/aling.50.2003.1-2.9

Montoro, R. (2012). *Chick lit: The Stylistics of Cappuccino Fiction*. London: Bloomsbury.

Moosbach, D. (2024). *WordSense Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.wordsense.eu/

Moyna, M.I. (2011). *Compound Words in Spanish: Theory and History*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.316

Munat, J. (2007). *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58

Munat, J. (2016). Lexical Creativity. In R.H. Jones (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Creativity* (pp. 32-106). Oxfordshire & New York: Routledge.

Orwant, J., Brockman, W. (Eds.). (2025). *(GBNV) – Google Books Ngram Viewer*. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/ngrams/

Peckham, A. (Ed.). (2024). *Urban Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.urbandictionary.com/

Poix, C. (2018). Neology in children's literature: A typology of occasionalisms. *Lexis*, 12, 1-24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.2111

Poix, C. (2021). Deviance in children's literature as a Form of Creativity with a humorous effect. *Lexis*, 17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.5253

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Ralli, A. (2013). *Compounding in Modern Greek*. London: Springer Spenser and Business Media.

Rundell, M., Fox, G. (Eds.) (2002). *Macmillan Dictionary of English*. Retrieved from https://www.macmillandictionary.com/

Salich, H. (2020). Authorial neologisms in translation: Is the translator a smuggler? *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem,* 26 (47), 59-78. DOI: https://doi.org/10.12797/MOaP.26.2020.47.03

Salus, P.H. (2011). Syntactic compounds in modern English. *English Studies*, 45 (6), 462-465. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.1964.9709599

Scalise, S., Bisetto, A. (2009). The classification of compounds. In R. Lieber, P. Štekauer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding* (pp. 34-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmid, H-J. (2008). New Words in Mind: Concept-formation and entrenchment of neologisms. *Anglia*, 126, 1-36. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/angl.2008.002

Schuler, A. (2006). Neologismen als Übersetzungsproblem. *Lebende Sprache,* 51 (2), 62-66. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/LES.2006.62

Selivanova, O. (2006). *Suchasna linhvistyka: terminolohichna entsyklopediia* [Present-day Linguistics: Terminological Encyclopedia]. Poltava, Dovkillia Publ. (in Ukrainian).

Sproat, R.W. (1985). *On Deriving the Lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Štekauer, P., Valera S., Körtvélyessy, L. (2012). *Word-Formation in the World's Languages: A Typological Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Storch, A. (2017). Typology of secret languages and linguistic taboos. In A.Y. Aikhenvaid, R.M.W. Dixon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology* (pp. 287-322). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Szymanek, B. (2005). The latest trends in English word-formation. In P. Štekauer, R.R. Lieber (Eds.), *Handbook of Word Formation* (pp. 429-448). Dorchester: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3596-9_17

Tournier, J. (2007). *Introduction Descriptive à la Lexicogénétique de L'anglais Contemporain*. Genève: Slatkine Erudition.

Trips, C. (2014). How to account for the expressive nature of phrasal compounds in a conceptual-semantic framework. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 11 (1), 33-61.

Trolé, E. (2021). How to (mis)use language: Humor, creativity and lexical creation in Rikki Ducornet's *The Stain, the Fountains of Neptune and Phosphor in Dreamland. Lexis,* 17, 1-21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.5483

Ulmann, S. (1977). *Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.* Oxford, Basil, Blackwell: Oxford University Press.

Velupillai, V. (2012). *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/z.176

Walter, E. (2005). *Cambridge Dictionary of English*. Retrieved from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

Weisberger, L. (2003). *The Devil Wears Prada*. New York: Anchor.

Weisberger, L. (2005). *Everyone Worth Knowing*. Retrieved from https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Everyone_Worth_Knowing/wAoF693o-fEC?hl=ru&gbpv=1&dq=everyone+worth+knowing&printsec=frontcover

Wesley, A. (Ed.). (1987). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Retrieved from https://www.ldoceonline.com/

Whorf, B.L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writing*. Cambridge: Technical Press of MIT.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zatsnyi, Yu., Yenikieieva, S., Klymenko, O. (2013). *Osnovy neolohii ta problemy perekladu neolohizmiv* [The Basics of Neology and the Problem of Neologisms Translation]. Zaporizhzhia, ZNU Publ. (in Ukrainian).

STYLISTIC NEOLOGISMS IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE CHICK LIT: MORPHOSEMANTIC ASPECT

Maryna A. Bielova, H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University (Ukraine); University of Birmingham (United Kingdom)
email: m.bielova@bham.ac.uk

Key words: *stylistic neologisms, chick lit, morphology, word-formation rules, rule bending.*

The aim of this article is to reveal major word-formation processes involved in the formation of stylistic neologisms and decipher their meanings. The overall objectives to achieve the established goal were as follows: to identify samples of stylistic neologisms in a corpus of English-language chick lit; to single out the morphological operations employed to manufacture stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit; to identify how the creation of stylistic neologisms straddle the boundaries of core morphology; to describe the communicative purposes of stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit and interpret their semantics.

Stylistic neologisms are viewed as new words, whose expressive power is the result of morphological transgression. The neologicity of these creations is diagnosed against a range of criteria including their concodification in dictionaries, inobservance or overall infrequency in corpora, semantic opacity, and formal deviancy. It is agreed upon that neologisms that transgress morphological conventions of word-formation are stylistically utilic combining social and expressive meanings. As such, they stand out as means of conveying humor, playfulness, and creativity, as well as serve as tools to build and maintain relationships, construct identities and the world around them, mitigate and persuade.

The methodological basis of the research was a complex of the following *methods*: purposeful sampling (to demonstrate the specificity of morphological patterns employed for stylistic neologisms formation, their meaning making, and meaning interpretation); definitive and component analysis (to establish the basic meanings of the new lexical units components); typological method (to classify major word-formation methods utilized for the production of stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit); functional method (to clarify the pragmatic potential of stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit). The typological description in this article takes a derivational approach that assigns the concept of word-formation productivity to the level of grammatical word-formation competence, which accounts for potential words. Derivational patterns utilized for the production of new words were listed as those involving additive and metamorphic processes. The typological description of stylistic neologisms in ELCL was contextualized in this study on Item-and-Process approach falling under lexeme-based morphology which sees a word form as a result of word formation rule.

An important *outcome* of this research is the recognition that the methods used to create stylistic neologisms in English-language chick lit align with standard conventions regarding fundamental morphological conventions. They include affixation, compounding, clipping, and conversion, with suffixation dominating the list. Although adhering to these established word-formation processes, creatively crafted neologisms in English-language chick lit are not restricted by derivational constraints. A unique process utilized in the creation of stylistic neologisms is decompounding, when a compound word is dissected, and its individual segments operate independently.