

Univerzita Karlova

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

Diplomová práce

**Comparative Analysis of Neologisms in Selected Works of Terry Pratchett
and George R. R. Martin**

Komparativní analýza neologismů ve vybraných dílech Terryho Pratchetta a
George R. R. Martina

Bc. Tereza Dragounová

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Klára Lancová, Ph.D.

Studijní program: Učitelství pro střední školy

Studijní obor: N AJ-M

Praha 2018

Děkuji vedoucí své práce, PhDr. Kláře Lancové, Ph.D., za čas, který věnovala mé práci a také za všechny její hodiny lingvistiky, kterých jsem se v rámci studia mohla zúčastnit.

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto práci vypracovala samostatně, všechny použité
prameny uvedla v citacích a že práce nebyla použita k získání jiného
vysokoškolského titulu.

V Praze, dne 3. července 2018

.....
Tereza Dragounová

Abstract:

The thesis presents a comparison of the neologisms found in selected works of two fantasy series, namely those from the books *Last Continent* and *Jingo* (both by Terry Pratchett, they belong to the *Discworld* series) and *A Game of Thrones* (by George R. R. Martin, an installment of the *A Song of Ice and Fire* series). The neologisms gathered from the three books are firstly dealt with separately and subcategorized according to the word-formation processes that were employed in their creation. Subsequently, the data from respective categories in each series are compared with attention paid equally to possible disparities on one hand as well as to significant similarities on the other hand. An attempt at interpreting thus obtained results has been made, mostly with respect to the subgenres of the books and the roles they might have played in the creation of the acquired neologisms.

The comparison reveals both differences and similarities, some of them quite striking. The word-formation processes that demonstrate the most intriguing results are compounding and miscellaneous processes, which are utilized to vastly different degrees in each of the series. The other processes display mostly similarity of use or just slight differences.

Key words: word-formation process, neologism, comparison

Abstrakt:

Práce se věnuje porovnání neologismů z vybraných děl dvou fantasy sérií, konkrétně z knih *Last Continent (Poslední kontinent)* a *Jingo (Hrr na ně!)*, které obě patří do knižní série *Discworld (Úžasná Zeměplocha)* od Terryho Pratchetta, a z knihy *A Game of Thrones (Hra o trůny)*, která je dílem ze série *A Song of Ice and Fire (Píseň ledu a ohně)* od George R. R. Martina. Neologismy shromážděné z těchto tří knih jsou nejprve podrobeny individuálnímu zkoumání a jsou rozřazeny do odpovídajících kategorií podle toho, jaký slovtvorný proces byl využit při jejich tvorbě. Následně jsou údaje z odpovídajících si kategorií porovnány a pozornost při jejich srovnání je věnována stejnou měrou jak potenciálním rozdílům, tak i signifikantním podobnostem. Dalším krokem byl pokus o interpretaci takto získaných výsledků s důrazem na příčiny těchto závěrů, především na ty, které by mohly plynout z rodílnosti podžánrů obou knih.

Srovnání ukázalo jak rozdíly, tak podobnosti a některé z nich byly velice výrazné. Slovtvornými procesy, které poskytly nejzajímavější výsledky, byla kompozita a marginální slovtvorné procesy, jež byly v obou sériích použity ve značně jiných měřácích. Ostatní procesy byly použity většinou podobně nebo vykazovaly pouze nepatrné rozdíly.

Klíčová slova: slovtvorba, neologismus, srovnání

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	8
2 Theoretical part.....	10
2.1 Word-formation processes.....	12
2.1.1 Compounding.....	12
2.1.2 Derivation.....	16
2.1.3 Miscellaneous processes.....	17
2.1.4 Borrowing.....	19
2.1.5 Shift of meaning.....	19
3 Methodology.....	21
4 Analysis.....	25
4.1 Overview.....	25
4.2 Compounding.....	26
4.2.1 Compounding in GoT.....	26
4.2.2 Compounding in LC and J.....	29
4.2.3 Comparison.....	32
4.3 Derivation.....	34
4.3.1 Derivation in GoT.....	34
4.3.2 Derivation in LC and J.....	35
4.3.3 Comparison.....	37
4.4 Miscellaneous processes.....	38
4.4.1 Miscellaneous processes in GoT.....	39
4.4.2 Miscellaneous processes in LC and J.....	40
4.4.3 Comparison.....	46
4.5 Borrowing.....	47
4.5.1 Borrowing in GoT.....	47
4.5.2 Borrowing in LC and J.....	48
4.5.3 Comparison.....	49
4.6 Shift of meaning.....	50
4.6.1 Shift of meaning in GoT.....	50
4.6.2 Shift of meaning in LC and J.....	52
4.6.3 Comparison.....	53
5 Conclusion.....	54

List of tables

Table 1: A complete overview of word-formation processes represented in both series	25
Table 2: Compounds in GoT	26
Table 3: Compounds in LC and J	29
Table 4: Comparison of compounds in GoT and LC and J	32
Table 5: Derivation in GoT	33
Table 6: Derivation in J	34
Table 7: Derivation in LC	36
Table 8: Comparison of derivational processes in GoT and LC and J	38
Table 9: Miscellaneous processes in GoT	40
Table 10: Comparison of miscellaneous processes in GoT and LC and J	47
Table 11: Borrowing in GoT	48
Table 12: Borrowing in J	49
Table 13: Borrowing in LC	49
Table 14: Shift of meaning in GoT	52
Table 15: Shift of meaning in J	53
Table 16: Shift of meaning in LC	54

Abbreviations

Abbreviations for the three selected books are commonly used throughout the thesis for convenience.

GoT *A Game of Thrones*

J *Jingo*

LC *The Last Continent*

1 Introduction

This thesis aims to compare the neologisms encountered in three selected works of literature, specifically those in two books belonging to *the Discworld* series by Terry Pratchett and then the first installment of *A Song of Ice and Fire* by George R. R. Martin, *A Game of Thrones*.

The differences and similarities of the two book series are such that they provide ideal material for a potentially interesting comparison. Apart from the fact that the chosen works are equally rife with examples of neologisms, they belong to the same general literary genre. Both series fall under the label of fantasy but they may be further subclassified as the subcategories of comic fantasy and high fantasy respectively. Both series gave rise to the creation of detailed fictional worlds with a vast history and a myriad of characters. The time period of their publishing largely coincides but not the place of origin as the first one is British and the latter American. A more in-depth discussion of some aspects of the works will be given below, where perceived as relevant to the topic.

As already stated, only three selected instalments of the two series will be taken into consideration. They have supplied plentiful material for the analysis in question, therefore an acquirement of additional data was deemed unnecessary and way beyond the scope of this thesis. *The Last Continent* and *Jingo* were singled out as representatives of *the Discworld* series, the main reason being that they are personal favorites of the writer of this thesis when it comes to books that are ostensibly playful with their language. Since *A Game of Thrones*, the first part of *A Song of Ice and Fire*, is substantially longer than any book of *the Discworld* series it was concluded that this one would suffice. Unlike the books of *the Discworld* series, which can mostly be read in no particular order, each book in *A Song of Ice and Fire* series takes off where the previous one ended, so it only made sense to choose the first one, where most of the neologisms are introduced.

The main objective of the thesis can, in a nutshell, be stated as “finding out whether when two people do the same, it indeed is the same“. Some probable sources of differences are anticipated. The subgenre might prove to be an intriguing and decisive element, the assumption here being that the comic fantasy genre would lead to linguistically more varied and colorful neologisms. Additional merit of the thesis might be an observation of what processes were utilized the most, whether the frequency and productivity of their use correspond with their status of either central or peripheral processes.

What follows the Introduction are four parts that constitute the main body of this work. The first part is a note on the methods employed in data collection and analysis. The second part is devoted to the matter of word-formation processes in English and it provides the theoretical foundation for the subsequent analysis. The third part is where the amassed neologisms are

subjected to the analysis. The fourth part is a conclusion. An appendix with all the gathered neologisms organized into tables is attached.

2 Theoretical part

The theoretical part provides a short discussion on the nature of neologisms and how new words come into existence in a language. The bulk of the theoretical part is devoted to a detailed description of word-formation processes found in English.

A neologism is simply put “a word newly introduced into a language“ (Brown et. al 306). There are several means of achieving that. A very common one involves the combination of existing material to form new words. Depending on the type of material combined that is whether bound or free lexemes are added, these are furthermore distinguished as examples of **derivation** and **compounding** respectively. Another means of constructing new words can be achieved by subtracting some material from existing forms. Various types of processes involving **shortening** can thus be defined, for example blending, acronyms or back-formation. Moreover, new words can be obtained by **borrowing** and possibly modifying words from another language. Another option is to **manufacture** a new word completely independently from any other already existing word in a language. Furthermore, new words can be obtained through a **shift of meaning** of existing words. Compounding and derivation traditionally form the foundation for the creation of new words in English. These two central types of processes are then complemented by various other peripheral cases of word-formation. The status of borrowing and the shift of meaning among word-formation processes is questionable, e.g. Huddleston et al. (1631) dismiss them in their discussion of word-formation, reasoning that these processes, while they certainly enlarge the vocabulary, do not really yield newly formed words. Nevertheless, since this thesis is focused primarily on neologisms and not core word-formation per se, the practicality of having borrowing and a shift of meaning in the classification employed here was prioritized and they were included in the processes.

Various classification systems of word-formation processes can be found in literature and it is often the case that each one places emphasis on different aspects of a possible classification. Morphological, phonological, semantical or lexicological phenomena are all possible criteria for a classification. It follows that various systems can be constructed. Devising the classification employed here was somewhat a case of pick and choose, until a satisfactory and well-suited classification system was arrived at. A classification built around morphological, semantical and to some extent syntactical criteria proved to be the most beneficial one. The final classification employed here is summarized in the following figure and a thorough description is provided in the subsequent section of the thesis.

Figure 1

Word-formation processes

- 1 Compounding
 - 1.1 Subordinate
 - 1.1.1 Endocentric
 - 1.1.2 Exocentric
 - 1.2 Attributive
 - 1.2.1 Endocentric
 - 1.2.2 Exocentric
 - 1.3 Coordinate
 - 1.3.1 Endocentric
 - 1.3.2 Exocentric
 - 1.4 Dephrasal
- 2 Derivation
 - 2.1 Conversion
 - 2.2 Affixation
 - 2.2.1 Prefixes
 - 2.2.2 Infixes
 - 2.2.3 Suffixes
- 3 Miscellaneous processes
 - 3.1 Shortening
 - 3.1.1 Clipping
 - 3.1.2 Blending
 - 3.1.3 Abbreviations
 - 3.1.4 Back-formation
 - 3.2 Analogy
 - 3.3 Reduplication
 - 3.4 Independent word manufacture
- 4 Borrowing
- 5 Shift of meaning

2.1 Word-formation processes

This section presents the core of the theoretical background for the following analysis and is dedicated to a detailed description of word-formation processes.

2.1.1 Compounding

A very basic description of compounding is that it is a process where two words are combined to form a new word (Plag 170). More precision can be gained by defining a compound as a form that combines two or more potential stems (Laurie 28) or bases (Quirk et al. 1520); depending on the approach adopted when defining these two terms. This definition can be even further specified to exclude instances of forms such as *school-masterish* (Laurie 29). To exclude these cases, the definition of a compound may be stated as a lexeme containing two or more potential stems that has not subsequently been subjected to a derivational process (Laurie 29).

Compounds occur in three distinct orthographic forms: *a flower pot*, *a flower-pot* or *a flowerpot* (Quirk et al. 1569). The first version might prove rather troublesome for an analysis of a written text since it does not possess a clear demarcation to indicate a status of a compound which would distinguish it from a noun phrase, something that is easily done in speaking since the stress pattern differs (Gibson ??). Bearing in mind that the identification of a true compound is on a shaky ground in these instances, only those combinations the status of which as compounds is beyond a reasonable doubt were included, relying mostly on semantic indicators while making the decision.

The head of a compound

The concept of headedness needs to be introduced when discussing the structure of compounds. The head of the compound is the “more important element“ (Lieber et al., *Compounding* 348) in a couple of ways. If the elements of a compound are in a hyponym-hyperonym relationship then the hyponym is the head of the compound, eg. *flagpole* – it is a type of pole, not a type of flag, which makes the *pole* segment the head. Furthermore, we could just use *pole* in situations where *flagpole* would be useful and still convey the intended meaning. Conversely, using only *flag* would not be possible. In this sense *pole* is obligatory in the construction of *flagpole* (Lieber et al., *Compounding* 348). It also tends to be the case that there is a correlation between the world class of the head and the world class of the whole compound, therefore compound adjectives often have adjectival heads and similarly with other types (Lieber et al., *Compounding* 348). This concept of a head should not be confused with the grammatical head of a compound, which is, at least in English, the final part of the compound that is marked for number etc. (Bauer 30).

Semantic criteria

A frequently utilized method of classification of compounds is based around semantic criteria. A division can be made using the labels endocentric, exocentric, appositional and copulative (Laurie 30). An endocentric compound is one where the compound is a hyponym of the grammatical head (Laurie 30). To give an example: *steamboat* is a kind of boat. The second option, an endocentric compound, comprises of such instances where the compound is not a hyponym of the grammatical head (Laurie 30), making the meaning of the compound sometimes rather opaque, for example a *cut-throat*, which denotes a person. An appositional compound is a hyponym of all its elements, e.g. *writer-director*. The last option is a case of compound where it is unclear which of the elements is the grammatical head and the compound is not a hyponym of either of them, for instance *Austria-Hungary*.

Morphological criteria

Another option for a classification of compounds is to consider their morphological structure. The resulting word class is of main concern with further subdivision based on the word class of each of the elements that constitute the compound. This method presents some difficulties, the chief one being that given the amount of conversion in English it is sometimes debatable what word class a particular element belongs to (Bauer 202)., eg. in a compound like *rattlesnake* it is unclear whether *rattle* is a verb or a noun (Bauer 202).

Applying this method, compounds can be divided into a few basic categories presented in the figure below (adopter from Bauer):

Figure 2

Compounds classified according to morphological criteria

1. Compounds
 1. Compound nouns
 2. Compound verbs
 3. Compound adjectives
 4. Compound adverbs
 5. Other classes
 6. Neo-classical compounds

As was already mentioned, these categories can be analysed in more detail. To illustrate, the category of compound nouns can be subdivided into compounds that are made up of two nouns

(noun + noun pattern, eg. *beehive*), a verb and a noun (verb + noun pattern, eg. *Kill-joy*), two verbs (verb + verb pattern, eg. *make-believe*) and many others.

Semantic and syntactic criteria

An interesting proposal of classifying compounds was brought forth by Bisetto and Scalise (Lieber et. al., *Compounding* 44). They use a mixture of syntactic and semantic criteria. The first level of distinction is based solely on the syntactic criteria of subordination, coordination and attribution that exist among the compound elements (Lieber et. al., *Compounding* 45).

Subsequently, all the compounds distributed into these three categories are split between endocentric and exocentric compounds (in line with the aforementioned distinction based on the presence or absence of the head).

Figure 3

Compounds classified on the basis of syntactic and semantic criteria

- 1 Compounds
 - 1.1 Subordinate
 - 1.1.1 Endocentric (eg. *taxi driver*)
 - 1.1.2 Exocentric (eg. *pickpocket*)
 - 1.2 Coordinate
 - 1.2.1 Endocentric (eg. *bittersweet*)
 - 1.2.2 Exocentric (eg. *mother-child*)
 - 1.3 Attributive
 - 1.3.1 Endocentric (eg. *girlfriend*)
 - 1.3.2 Exocentric (eg. *loudmouth*)

Compounds are defined as subordinate if the two elements share a head-complement relation, or alternatively said if they display a strong “of relation“ (Lieber et. al., *Compounding* 45). This applies even to compounds where the head is missing, as in *pickpocket*. The head-complement relation is still determined by the presence of the verb. This class also includes most neoclassical compounds, eg. *hydrology* is the “science of water“.

Coordinate compounds are those that are made up of elements that are tied by the conjunction “and“ (Lieber et. al., *Compounding* 46). These compounds possess two semantic heads (or more, they can be recursive) with one of them being the grammatical head.

Attributive compounds comprise of a noun-head that can be modified by an adjective/noun/verb, such as *girlfriend*. This category also comprises of such cases as *punch in the*

stomach effect, the so-called phrasal compounds. This construction actually delivers the noun-head element that is attributed some characterization (*punch in the stomach effect = painful effect*).

Scalise and Bisetto later decided to add another layer to their classification to account for more distinctions in meaning in the subordinate and attributive classes. This finer diversification in its entirety was found needlessly minute and delicate for the objective of this thesis and abandoned. The reason for this decision is that their classification is to encompass other languages than English and the refined classification, for example, resulted in a subclass that is very obscure for English and no instances would be found in the data collected for this thesis.

However, some finer details were found useful and even necessary and applied, especially a more thorough discussion on the differentiation of some cases of subordinate and attributive compounds. The discussion is concerned with instances such as *mushroom soup* versus *mushroom cloud*. *Mushroom soup* would fall under the category of subordinate compounds, since it is a “soup made of mushrooms“ whereas *mushroom cloud* is not to be interpreted in its literal sense but it conveys a rather metaphorical meaning (Lieber et. al., *Compounding* 52), which is “being like a mushroom, regarding shape“.

Phrasal-like neologisms

The last issue that needs to be handled to have the classification of compounds complete is to have a closer look at compounds such as *I-never-wanted-to-come-here-in-the-first-place* look, which are created by the means of blending a whole phrase or sentence into one hyphenated word. Some of them would fall under the subcategory of attributive compounds as was already stated above, however, not all words of this type can be readily categorized on such terms as e.g. *punch in the stomach effect = painful effect* above. Another option was proposed by Huddleston (1966), compounds of this kind are treated separately and labelled dephrasal compounds, the reasoning behind it being that they do not display normal morphological process of compounding but a fusion of words within a syntactic structure into a single lexical base (Huddleston 1966). It is supported by the fact that these words allow for internal inflection, e.g. *holier-than-thou attitude*, which is usually not the case with traditional compounding process.

Conclusion

The classifying structure for compounds is by far the most challenging deed within the theoretical section of this thesis. Maybe stemming from the inherent nature of neologisms found in an innovative piece of literature, it is complicated to obtain a classification that would accommodate for all the various compounds gathered from the source material. Nevertheless, largely satisfactory system was achieved eventually. An adopted proposition from Scalise and Bisetto was deemed the

most suitable option with the addition of dephrasal compounds, thus resulting in the classification below:

Figure 3

Compounds – final classification

- 1 Compounds
 - 1.1 Subordinate
 - 1.1.1 Subordinate endocentric
 - 1.1.2 Subordinate exocentric
 - 1.2 Coordinate
 - 1.2.1 Coordinate endocentric
 - 1.2.2 Coordinate exocentric
 - 1.3 Attributive
 - 1.3.1 Attributive endocentric
 - 1.3.2 Attributive exocentric
 - 1.4 Dephrasal

The main merit of this system is perceived by the distinction between endocentric and exocentric compounds, which would be an interesting phenomenon to observe in the analysis.

2.1.2 Derivation

A very prolific means of creating new words in a language is through derivation. Together with compounding they form the two basic pillars of English word-formation.

Any discussion on derivation usually starts with a section dealing with the difference between derivation and inflection. While that matter is usually rather clear and the differences are neatly established, various sources often vastly differ on what specific word-formation processes fall within the definition of derivation.

One of the usual issues is whether to treat conversion separately or whether it is a branch of derivation, so-called zero derivation (Laurie 32). Another question linked to derivation is the matter of minor word-formation processes such as blending or reduplication. It turns out that the status of minor word-formation processes and the question of where they fit varies among various sources. While Laurie treats them separately from derivation (and derivation is therefore equalled with affixation, figure on page 34), Olsen (Lieber et. al., *Derivation* 26) lists back-formation, truncation and other processes as cases of derivation. Similarly Plag includes these processes under the heading of derivation and they are discussed in a chapter labelled “derivation without affixation“.

Other authors even treat some of these miscellaneous processes as cases of compounding, eg. blends are defined as “formations in which a compound is made by blending“ (Quirk et al. 1583).

It was considered best that processes which involve some loss of material be subsumed under a separate category of shortening.

Derivation

Derivation is a process whereby a bound morpheme (an affix) is added to a base (Lieber et al., *Derivation* 26, Plag 90). An essential distinction is usually drawn between class-maintaining and class-changing derivation (Bauer 31), where the derived words retain the original word class of their base in the former case and not so in the latter.

With respect to where affixes are attached to the base three kinds of affixes are distinguished with prefixes preceding the base, suffixes following the base and infixes being inserted in the middle. While prefixes and suffixes are prolific in English, the use of infixes is very limited. It is restricted to the use of expletives such as *kanga-bloody-roo* (Plag 127). However, these instances do not include bound morphemes that would qualify for infix status and thus they should not fall under the heading of derivation. While these arguments are sound it is concluded in Plag that however problematic the question of infixes might be they do form a subsection of completely regular processes and must therefore be a part of one’s linguistic competence (130).

Conversion

Conversion can be defined as the derivation of a new word without any overt marking (Plag 134), but which still changes the word class. A fitting label of zero derivation is also sometimes used (Bauer 32). Examples include *release* that is used both as a noun and as a verb (Quirk et al, 1558).

A subclass of partial conversion is sometimes distinguished, which encompasses instances of conversion achieved solely by a syntactic position (e.g. *mother* in *mother tongue*; *mother* being a denominal adjective) or by the placement of the definite article in deadjectival nouns (e.g. *the poor*) (Dušková 27). Especially the latter type of partial conversion is relevant for this thesis, as various examples were found in the source material.

2.1.3 Miscellaneous processes

Plentiful other word-formation processes that do not fit neatly into the aforementioned categories and are better treated with separately can be established. These include various types of shortening, analogy, reduplication and probably the most obscure group of independent word manufacture.

Shortening

Conversely to derivation, the processes of shortening are based upon the deletion of some elements. They can be subdivided into instances of clipping, blending, abbreviations and back-formation.

Clipping

Clipping refers to the process whereby a lexeme is shortened, while still retaining the same meaning and word class (Bauer 233), eg. *laboratory* for *lab*. Words that undergo the process of clipping predominantly lose some of their final elements, eg. *demonstration* – *demo*, but the deletion of some initial elements is also possible, eg. *telephone* – *phone* and even a combination of the two can occur, eg. *pyjamas* – *jams*. The original version and the clipped version often differ on the stylistic level (Bauer 233, Plag 147).

Blending

Blending has much in common with compounding, two lexemes are combined but simultaneously at least one of the elements is shortened (Lieber et. al., *Derivation* 46), eg. *friends* + *enemies* = *frenemies*.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations are in nature similar to blends as both these processes involve the deletion of some parts of the original words and a subsequent combination of the retained elements. Abbreviations are commonly formed by taking initial letters of multi-word sequences to create a new word (Plag 161), eg. *frequently asked questions* – *FAQ*. A finer distinction can be made between acronyms and initialisms (Plag 163) (alternatively also called alphabetisms (Quirk et al. 1581)). Acronyms are those abbreviations that are pronounced as a new word and not as a mere series of letter (Bauer 237). To illustrate, *NASA* (*National Aeronautics and Space Administration*) is an acronym whereas *FBI* (*Federal Bureau of Investigation*) is an initialism.

Back-formation

Back-formation is a process that is basically the converse of affixation (Lieber et. al., *Derivation* 45). Instead of adding an affix to derive a new word, back-formation creates a new lexeme by the subtraction of a supposed affix from an apparently complex base (Lieber et. al., *Derivation* 45). Examples of back-formation include *bottle-feed* (Quirk et al. 1579).

Analogy

The process of analogy can be described as substituting one element of a base for another to achieve a more precise intended meaning, eg. the creation of *whitemail* from *blackmail* (Lieber et al., *Derivation* 45). These instances cannot be subsumed under the label of compounding because of their meaning restrictions, they work only in analogy with the original base.

Reduplication

Reduplications are words with two or more constituents that are either identical or only slightly different (Quirk et al. 1979). The motivation behind reduplication is to repeat some phonological segments which are present in the base lexeme (Lieber et al., *Derivation* 47). This process is especially productive in the sphere of child-parent talk (Quirk et al. 1979). Examples include *goody-goody* or *willy-nilly* (Lieber et al., *Derivation* 47).

Word manufacture

An extremely rare word-formation phenomenon is the process of creating a novel word without any pre-existing familiar forms, completely out of thin air. In itself an infrequent occurrence in everyday language but instances of this type are to be expected in a literary work where creativity is a priority.

2.1.4 Borrowing

Another means of obtaining a new word that needs to be taken into account is borrowing, a process heavily employed in reality but obviously not so in a literary work. Nevertheless, instances of this process marginally occurred in the source material. The origin for these words lies either in non-existent languages that were invented for the sake of the characters that come from vastly distinct cultures and were therefore granted their own fictitious languages (for example a tribal language). Some of these words were consequently borrowed and used as loan words by characters that otherwise use English as their default, universal language in the books. Furthermore, some existing languages also served as source language for loans, e.g. Latin.

2.1.5 Shift of meaning

Changes of meaning provide another way of expanding a vocabulary of a language. The original meaning of a word can be completely or partly replaced or, more frequently, all the meanings coexist side by side (Peprník 39). The meaning of a word can be **narrowed**, e.g. *hound* used to mean any kind of dog but then its meaning became more specialized and now it refers to a hunting dog (Peprník 41). Furthermore, the meanings of words can **widen**, e.g. *sir* used to only refer

to a member of nobility but the meaning expanded to include any person in a position of authority (Peprník 40). Another option is a process of **branching** which results in the word in question becoming polysemous (Peprník 43), e.g. the word *head* have accumulated quite a few meaning in addition to its original one, such as „life“ (*It cost him his head...*), a unit of measurement (*The horse won by a head...*) and various others. The last possibility is **transfer**, whereby the given word acquires a new meaning but in such a way that there is a degree of similarity between the original meaning and the new one (Peprník 44), e.g. *neck of the violin* (similar to *the neck of the body*).

3 Methodology

An integral part in the process of collecting neologisms was played by the online version of the Oxford English Dictionary, or the OED for short. All potential neologisms were run by the dictionary to determine whether they will be taken into account. Only those words that passed the criterion of not being listed in the dictionary were analysed, the complete list is given in the Appendix. A special case of “non-listedness” sometimes occurred with words such as *weed-encrusted* (J) or *fish-shaped* (LC). These precise words are not listed in the word stock but the dictionary mentions that “encrusted” and “shaped” are used to create compounds. Neologisms of this kind were included.

With this trite issue resolved, more intricate concerns come into play. As the study of language is more often than not a study of blurred boundaries and clear-cut defining lines are hard to be found, it was not unforeseen that a thesis on analysing word-formation processes applied in inventive and artistic ways in works of literature would bring a plethora of obstacles. The greatest challenge presented itself at the moment of data acquisition, which preceded the check with the OED. That is - what material should be considered for the analysis in the first place. Questions regarding proper nouns, idioms and others had to be settled. Indeed, the expectations of troublesome cases were fully met and exceeded.

It seemed advisable to thoroughly ponder what the aim of this thesis is and make decisions accordingly. The main objective is to explore what use both authors make of word-formation processes that the English language puts at their disposal. As this is also a work celebrating the innovatives and playfulness of the texts that are created as a result, it proved imperative to not let slip by any potentially enriching phenomena, a case in point being the aforementioned issue of proper nouns and idioms. A devastating majority of work on word-formation processes is focused on common nouns. That practise holds true for this thesis as well, nevertheless, a substantial portion of proper nouns was taken into account as well on the grounds of their having undergone a very obvious word-formation process (often utilizing common nouns in their creation). More details will be given on that further on.

These and similar issues had to be tackled and settled right on the onset, decisions and compromises have been made and a satisfactory key for the targeting and selection of neologisms for this thesis has been devised. These will be now laid out in detail.

Unproblematic cases first

A large portion of the potential material posed no problem regarding the question of usability, comprising of neologisms that display clear instances of word-formation processes. To

name some: *kingswood* (GoT), *gift-giver* (GoT), *the black* (GoT), *arakh* (GoT), *apehood* (LC), *lifetimer* (LC), *shouting-at-subordinates* (LC), *sea-bottom* (J), *mistership* (J) or *anti-Klatchian* (J). These form the core of the amassed data.

The question of proper nouns

A very essential question to solve was the one of proper nouns. The names of places, characters, events and various additional entities in a literary work is quite unsurprisingly a prolific source of newly found words. Many of these would arguably be of little value to this work, for example names that display no obvious origin and might have been created completely randomly or their creation just cannot be analysed, as they display no obvious connection to other existing linguistic units in the language, for instance *Klatch* (J) or *Dorne* (GoT).

Then there are proper names that do have, linguistically speaking, apparent and intriguing origin, that could be analysed but that would go well beyond the scope of this thesis and is a topic for an analysis in itself. One example is the name of *Lord Vetinari* (J), which is a pun built on the word “veterinary“ and the real-life family of the Medici. This level of obfuscation behind the creation of names ruled out most of them, since the processes employed to make them are far from those of typical word-formation and their study would be perhaps more suited for a work concerned with onomastics and of a limited value here.

However, there were some viable candidates for this thesis among the gathered proper nouns, words that showed a clear usage of the word-formation processes outlined in the theoretical part and could therefore be of merit to this work. A fit example is *Lannisport* (GoT), a blend of *Lannister* and *port* and thus a suitable material for this thesis. On the contrary, the proper name of the *Lannister* family itself would not be subjected to analysis, even though the name origin is by some believed to be inspired by the real-life family of Lancaster (again, this exceeds the scope of this work).

What is even more obviously well suited for this thesis are instances of proper names that were constructed using exclusively common nouns, these include for example *Riverrun* (GoT), (*Verity*) *Pushpram* (J), *Heartsbane* (GoT), *the Dragonpit* (GoT), (*Quorin*) *Halfhand* (GoT), *Rincewind* (LC) and many more. It was deemed desirable to incorporate these as well. Whatever joy the act of including these might have brought to the author of this thesis, it was somewhat dulled by the resulting necessity to further discuss what proper nouns specifically are to be added in the list of neologisms.

The problems that have thus arisen and especially the decision-making process behind their selection might be well illustrated using the names of the direwolves found in GoT. Four of the wolves are named *Nymeria*, *Shaggydog*, *Grey Wind* and *Summer*. *Nymeria* is immediately excluded

from a possible analysis. On the contrary, *Shaggydog* is definitely a case that would be suitable. The fact that the compound is written as one orthographic unit also adds to the readiness of recognizing and accepting it as a newly formed compound. *Grey Wind* has a worse position as a possible candidate on the account of the compound being written as two separate units. *Summer* may be labelled as a case conversion, shifting the word from the class of common nouns to proper nouns.

It was concluded that only instances as *Shaggydog* will be considered (alternatively, also hyphenated cases). One of the reasons is the most clear status of a newly formed compound word it displays, relying heavily on orthographic criteria. Furthermore, the exclusion of examples such as *Grey Wind* or *Summer* is motivated by possible complications that the admittance of these words would bring, which could easily lead to the preposterous notion of the necessity to also include instances such as *Peach Pie Street* (LC) or *the Trident* (GoT).

Even with this discussion undergone, some problematic cases remain to be touched upon. There is the matter of titles and nicknames, for example *The Sword of the Morning* (GoT, a person), *the Mountain that Rides* (GoT, also a person), *Protector of the Realm* (GoT), *the Hide Park Flasher* (J), *Snowy Slopes* (J, a person with a serious case of dandruff), *The Lecturer in Recent Runes* (LC) or *Egregious Professor of Cruel and Unusual Geography* (LC) etc. All established titles and such will be included, they are analogous to some similar entries found in a dictionary (e.g. *Master of Coin* from GoT compared to *Master of Work* found in the OED). These actually rather belong to the category of common nouns as the object they point to is changeable but it was considered prudent to mention and discuss these cases.

The issue of nicknames and similar cases is rather more complex. Some of them are easily dismissed as unbecoming for this work, e.g. *Old Nan* (GoT) or *Sidney Slopes* (J). Some, on the other hand, are single and compact units with a meaning of their own and similarly to idiomatic expressions the individual words often add up to a semantically distinct entity, sometimes even underivable from the individual components themselves, opaque to their fullest (e.g. the already mentioned *The Sword of the Morning*, which does not denote an object but a person). Those were deemed convenient for the analysis. The essential ground for distinction in this case was the presence or absence of the actual name of the person (or object) in point. Secondly, the rule of orthographic evidence for the recognizability of a compound was applied.

The last side of this issue are words derived from proper nouns that themselves are not included, e.g. *Klatchian* (J) or *Braavosian* (GoT) (neither *Klatch* or *Braavos* made it to the list of neologisms analysed here). Words derived from these were nevertheless taken into account as they have undergone a derivational process.

The question of phrases, idiomatic expressions and so forth

Another issue revolves around linguistic units that extend beyond the basic concept of a word as it is most commonly perceived. Both authors use some novel yet for the books set expressions that encapsule unique meanings and could therefore be considered proper lexemes and analysed alongside neologisms in this work. Most of these are analogous to existing idiomatic expressions or reflect them to some extent. Since these instances provide some of the most playful and enthralling cases of language innovation they were promptly included during the collection of data. Some examples include *unclean son of the dog of the female persuasion* (J), *at the drop of a turban* (J), *meat and mead* (GoT), *blood of my blood* (GoT), *waking the dragon* (GoT), *what in the seven hells* (GoT), *NULLUS ANXIETAS* (LC) or *if the Prophet Ossory won't go to the mountain, the mountain must go to the Prophet Ossory* (LC). These marginal instances were subcategorized together with either other compounds or placed in the category of analogy.

The question of non-standard variants

A large number of words occurring in the books that could be labelled as neologisms for not being listed in the OED are those that display some variation of spelling or slight (occasionally heavy) changes made to existing words. The motivation is predominantly to invoke a social or regional language variation. Examples include words with missing letters such as *m'lord* (GoT), *p'ple* (LC); words with spelling alterations *sez* (LC, instead of *says*), *dem* (J, instead of *them*), *hyou* (J, instead of *you*). All of these were included in the analysis, even though the categorization of some of the seriously badly misspelled ones turned out to be a treat. The majority of those with a distorted spelling were placed into the category of analogy, which seemed the most befitting option as they were actually created as analogous versions to the already existing words.

The question of "mundane" neologisms

A special subcategory of neologisms are, for the want of a more fitting term, somewhat ineptly named mundane neologisms. A very specific section of the gathered neologisms follow a pattern of word-formation so uninteresting that the situation dictated they be metaphorically put into this tedious category. These are words such as *half-human* (GoT), *half-alive* (GoT), *bowl-shaped* (GoT), *half-rotten* (LC), *fish-shaped* (LC), *galactic-sized* (J), *thimble-sized* (GoT). Compounds containing segments such as *half*, *shaped* or *sized* and some more were prolific in all the three works. The OED shows awareness of their being common components in compounds as it lists, among all the various entries, this feature with the note of used "in combination". However, as the compounds themselves are not to be found in the OED, they are nevertheless classified as neologisms. Admittedly, their analysis is rather dull, yet they play an integral role, as for example

the ratio of this type of compounds to the rest of them, the rest supposedly being more intriguing, could be an excellent factor for a comparison of the inventiveness of all the works.

Mixed processes

A few of the amassed neologisms have undergone multiple word-formation processes during their creation. For example *rag'ead* (J), a clipped version of the word *raghead*, which is a neologism in itself, formed by the means of compounding. Those were placed according to the word-formation process that was applied as the final one.

4 Analysis

This section provides the actual analysis of the amassed material. It comprises of several parts, a short introductory overview for all three of the books and then subsequent five chapters, each devoted to the processes of compounding, derivation, miscellaneous processes, borrowing and shift of meaning. A complete list of the gathered neologisms is given in the Appendix, some of the shorter tables were inserted directly in the analytical part.

4.1 Overview

An impressive total of 876 neologisms has been gathered and subjected to analysis, detailed numbers are provided in the following table. Although admittedly both the series are abundant in neologisms, it is easily observed that *The Discworld* series is noticeably more prolific in their creation. In spite of the fact that two books were selected from *The Discworld* series to be measured against *A Game of Thrones*, a decision based on the fact that the two are substantially shorter, the sum of neologisms compiled from each of the individual books almost matches the sum of neologisms found in GoT. (A note: GoT is slightly over 800 pages in length while LC and J are both slightly over 400, all the three books are almost identical in format and have similar fonts; all of these facts contributed to their having been deemed comparable.).

Each book exhibited instances of all the five major categories, the lowest number of tokens being 3 examples of borrowing in J and the highest being 272 examples of compounds in GoT. Generally speaking, compounding was employed heavily in all three of the analysed books, the majority of neologisms was formed utilizing this process. Conversely, borrowing and shift of meaning were indisputably the most marginalized processes.

Looking at the representation of individual subcategories in both the series, it can be easily observed that there is a striking discrepancy among the ratios of some of the categories in GoT contrasted to those in J and LC. Whereas an overwhelming majority (88.3%) of all the neologisms found in GoT are compounds, instances of compounds in J and LC do not account for even a half of the neologisms gathered (they do not surpass 45%). Alongside the staggering majority being

represented by compounds in GoT, the remaining subclasses are represented fairly evenly. On the other hand, the subclasses of compounding and miscellaneous processes in J and LC are both equally prominent and combined they account for almost 85% of all the neologisms gathered from these two books. Both borrowing and shift of meaning played a peripheral role in J and LC, while derivational processes were more productive. It is noteworthy that the sums of subclasses in J and LC, considered individually, are comparable.

Table 1

A complete overview of word-formation processes represented in both series and their ratios for each book

Subcategory of neologisms	Jingo	The Last Continent	Jingo + The Last Continent	A Game of Thrones
Compounds	126 (42.7%)	122 (44.7%)	248 (43.7%)	272 (88.3%)
Derivation	30 (10.2%)	24 (8.8%)	54 (9.5%)	10 (3.2%)
Miscellaneous	124 (42%)	114 (41.8%)	238 (41.9%)	12 (3.9%)
Borrowing	3 (1%)	4 (1.5%)	7 (1.2%)	7 (2.3%)
Meaning shift	12 (4.1%)	9 (3.3%)	21 (3.7%)	7 (2.3%)
Total	295	273	568	308

4.2 Compounding

Compounds constitute the bulk of neologisms analyzed in this thesis as almost five hundred of them have been collected and subjected to study. Compounding was a dominantly used word-formation process in both series, rivalled only by miscellaneous processes in LC and J and completely unrivalled by any of the others in GoT. All the subcategories of compounds have been located, in varying degrees.

Since both series contain hundreds of compounds the complete lists are not included here but only in the Appendix.

4.2.1 Compounding in GoT

Neologisms created utilizing compounding constitute a devastating majority of neologisms in GoT (88,3%). In total, 272 neologisms have been collected and the detailed data is presented in the following table (only 271 neologisms were analysable using the given criteria, the remaining case will be treated separately later on).

Table 2

Compounds in GoT

	Endocentric	Exocentric	Total
Subordinate	82	30	112 (41.3%)
Coordinate	13	3	16 (5.9%)
Attributive	113	23	136 (50.6%)
Dephrasal	-	-	7 (2.6%)
Total	208 (76.8%)	56 (20.7%)	271 (vertical sum)

The data can be viewed from two standpoints, one can either focus on the nature of the tie between the compound elements or on the factor of endocentricity versus exocentricity. Regarding the latter, the results are not surprising, an overwhelming majority of the compounds are endocentric and an approximately fifth of them are exocentric. Turning now to the classification based on syntactic links between the components, the first readily made observation is that very few compounds are of the dephrasal type. The second least frequent type is that of coordination (5.9%). The remaining two options are both abundant, nevertheless attributive links are slightly more common (50.6% is the highest ratio).

The subcategories will be now discussed individually, accompanied by examples.

Subordinate endocentric compounds

They constitute the second most numerous group of compounds in GoT with 82 tokens. A lot of the compounds are titles such as *King in the North*, *master of coin*, *Lord of the Seven Kingdoms*, *the Kingsguard* or *Knight of the Gate*. Generally, quite a number of subordinate endocentric compounds refer to people (which is understandable since the notion of “of relation“ can be realized through the concept of “an agent of something“), e.g. *horselord*, *gift-giver*, *shadowbinder*, *spellsinger*, *dragonlord*, *bloodmage*, *herbwoman* and many more. Apart from these, many other types of compounds are present, some adjectives e.g. *castle-bred*, *spell-forged*, likewise nouns not denoting people e.g. *summerwine*, *dragonbone* or *godswood*.

Subordinate exocentric compounds

These are noticeably more rare than their endocentric counterparts (more than two times less their amount) but still rather frequent with 30 tokens and they constitute the most prolific subgroup of the exocentric compounds. Similarly to endocentric ones they often describe characters' titles, e.g. *the Sword of the Morning*, *the King's Spider*, *the Hand of the King*, *Lord of Ham* or *moon of my life*. Since dragons play a crucial role in the story of GoT and exocentric compounds are concerned with symbolic meaning, it is no surprise that a lot of them contain the word *dragon* as one of the components, drawing on various imageries and metaphors of dragons, e.g. *the blood of the dragon*

(referring to people from a house that has a dragon for their sigil), *Dragonstone*, *dragonspawn* (again, referring to people), *the Dragonpit* or *waking the dragon*. A vast majority of them refers to people, nevertheless there are some instances of compounds denoting object, e.g. *stone tent* (a house), *honeyfinger* (food), *ghost-light* or *tree egg* (fruit).

Coordinate endocentric compounds

One of the least common type of compounds to be found in the series, it is surpassed in its sparsity only by its exocentric type of counterparts. There were 13 instances in total. Most of them are colors such as *grey-green*, *green-and-yellow* or *grey-black*. Other examples include *moon-and-falcon*, *slash-and-parry* or *oak-and-bronze*. An interesting compound is *grumkins and snarks* (mythical creatures), which is used to mock someone who is acting childish and believes in nonsense, as in (1).

- (1) [...] watching for **grumkins and snarks** and all the other monsters your wet nurse warned you about. (GoT 125)

Coordinate exocentric compounds

By far the rarest subcategory provided three instances in GoT. The first one is *monsters-and-maidens*, a children's role playing game, the second one is *sun-and-stars*, which is a form of address that one of the characters uses for his wife, and the last one is *hand-and-a-half*, a kind of a sword.

Attributive endocentric compounds

These provide, quite unsurprisingly, the most numerous subgroup of compounds with 113 tokens. There are a few areas that are extremely common for these kind of compounds. Firstly, types of plants are commonplace, truly a myriad of these has been gathered, e.g. *sweet lemon*, *fireplum*, *milkgrass*, *smokeberry*, *sourleaf*, *fire pepper*, *firewine* or *winter rose*. Secondly, types of animals are also not unusual such as *direwolf*, *shadowcat*, *snow bear* or *iron worm*. Thirdly, titles also occurred richly in this category, e.g. *Sworn brother*, *black brother*, *Boy King*, *First Ranger* or *Bran-the-Broken*. Another particularly prevalent subgroup is made up of colors (with their hue specified), e.g. *silver-blond*, *soot-dark*, *beet-red*, *forest-green* or *silver-grey*. Additionally, compounds containing the word *half* are widespread, e.g. *half-human*, *half-bored* or *half-blind*.

Apart from the types of compounds already discussed, there are numerous others that do not conform to any bountiful subgroup such as those for colors or plants. Examples will be just listed individually with short comments. There are some adverbs, e.g. *fresh-baked* or *sad-eyed*, some more

nouns, e.g. *vulgar Valyrian* or *the common tongue* (both language variants), *sky cell*, *broadhead* or *the grey plague* (really individual cases). The variability really does not exhaust itself.

Finally, probably the most interesting case is that of the word *greenseer*. The intrigue stems from the fact that a *greenseer* is a person whose attributes and abilities are still a case of mystery to a large extent, they dispone with some unique powers which are somehow connected to trees but as the matter has not been cleared up in the series so far, it is an unresolved issue.

Attributive exocentric compounds

These neologisms form a rather small group of 23 instances, which is nevertheless a relatively high number for exocentric examples. No practicable key for their subgrouping is applicable so some examples will simply be listed here: *hired knife* (an assassin), *red hand* (a tribal role), *poison kiss* (a plant), *the Young Dragon* (a person's title), *the White Bull* (a person's nickname), *Longclaw* (a sword), *Shaggydog* (a direwolf) or *Highgarden* (a castle).

Dephrasal compounds

Dephrasal compounds form with mere seven tokens a marginal subgroup. They denote people, as in *The-King-beyond-the-Wall* or *the Mountain that Rides* (a particularly bulky knight), and other phenomena likewise, e.g. *in-the-way*, *hide-the-treasure* or *come-into-my-castle*.

Finally, one unique case needs to be addressed separately. It is impossible to conclude whether the word *weirwood* belongs to subordinate or attributive group because its origin is unclear and a point of mystery in the series, expected by all to be revealed in the future books.

4.2.2 Compounding in LC and J

Compounding in LC and J represents an immensely productive process, more than two hundred tokens have been gathered which makes compounding the most prolific process (even though miscellaneous processes come close) and accounts for 43.7% of all the neologisms in LC and J. The complete data are summarized in the following table.

Table 3
Compounds in LC and J

	Endocentric	Exocentric	Total
Subordinate	79	12	91 (36.7%)
Coordinate	4	0	4 (1.6%)
Attributive	81	10	91 (36.7%)
Dephrasal	-	-	62 (25%)
Total	164 (88.2%)	22 (11.9%)	248 (vertical sum)

Considering first the endocentric versus exocentric distinction, it can be easily concluded that endocentric compounds form a devastating majority with 88.2% ratio. The factor of syntactic links among the compound elements does not provide such radical distinctions. Coordinate compounds are clearly in the minority with sole four tokens but all the other subcategories are common with the two most prolific ones (subordinate and attributive) being equal.

All the subcategories will be now discussed more closely.

Subordinate endocentric compounds

This group comprises of 79 instances, making it the (second) most productive subclass (almost matching attributive endocentric compounds). Some of the compounds can be organized into discernible groups sharing some features. Firstly, titles of people were often created, e.g. *Doctor of Sweet Fanny Adams* (J), *Protector of the King's Piece* (J), *Egremious Professor of Cruel and Unusual Geography* (LC), *Keeper of the Other Jacket* (LC), or *the Lecturer in Creative Uncertainty* (LC). Secondly, a large number of compounds followed the structure of "the doing of something", e.g. *nose-tapping* in J ("the tapping of the nose"). Plentiful other compounds of this kind have been found, e.g. *camel-eating* (J), *banana-bending* (LC), *boat-building* (LC), *ant-stamping* (LC), *string-weaving* (J). Thirdly, compounds describing an agent of some action are frequent, e.g. *outside-designer* (LC), *thief-taker* (J), *camel-driver* (J), *empire-builder* (J), *saddle-maker* (LC) and even a compound containing an inanimate agent has been found: *lifetimer* (LC). Additionally, many other disparate instances have been gathered, e.g. *frog pills* (LC), *dragonhouse* (J), *fish-god* (J) and various adjectives such as *nicotine-laden* (LC), *dwarf-sized* (J) and others. In conclusion, it is a very colorful category.

Subordinate exocentric compounds

A substantially less prolific category than its endocentric counterpart with more than six times less the number of tokens, it nevertheless provided some interesting compounds for analysis. There are two very poetic compounds used when discussing the philosophy of life: *the Stove of Life* (J) and *the Trousers of Time* (J). Moreover, three derogatory addresses for people mocking their headwear have been found: *towelhead* (J), *dishcloth-head* (J) and *Tinhead* (LC). An interesting example is *the camel of the sea* (J, meaning a *boat*). The rest of them refer to people, e.g. *the Archancellor's Keys* (LC, a position), *Ramkin* (J, kin of rams, metaphorically speaking) or *Vetinari's terrier* (J, a person's nickname).

Coordinate endocentric compounds

An extremely scarce subcategory of these compounds amounted to meagre four tokens and all can be thus provided here with details where considered useful. They are *Ankh-Morpork* (J, a name of a city comprising of these two parts, each in itself describes one part of the city that joined in the past), *waifs and strays* (J, a phrase used to describe a group of people), *banana-and-sushi* (LC) and *sage-and-onion* (LC).

Coordinate exocentric compounds

Since no compounds of this kind have been found, this is a trivial discussion.

Attributive endocentric compounds

They form the most prolific subcategory with a total of 81 instances (closely followed by subordinate endocentric compounds). As is often the case, they can be organized into several recurring types, firstly, titles and nicknames like *Senior Wrangler* (LC), *the Head Bledlow* (LC), *A Grade II Mutterer* (J) or *71-hour Ahmed* (J). Secondly, there are some animal species, e.g. *swamp dragon* (J), *Curious Squid* (J), *battle camel* (J) or *thunder lizard* (LC). An especially extensive group is formed by compounds containing the words *look*, *shape*, *sound* and other. They all follow a structure best described as “having an ‘attribute’ look/shape/sound etc.” Examples include *tough-looking* (J), *forgotten-looking* (J), *dry-looking* (LC), *funny-shaped* (J), *sunny-sounding* (J), *pastry-faced* (J), *fish-shaped* (LC) or *shovel-nosed* (LC). Apart from these two distinct types, other individual examples include *honest-crime* (J), *most-favoured-nation* (J), *temporal gland* (LC), *nicotine tree* (LC), *invisible writings* (LC), *big-fella* (LC) or *milky-blue* (J).

Attributive exocentric compounds

They constitute a rather small group of compounds with only 10 tokens (endocentric ones are roughly eight times more frequent). They refer almost exclusively to people, with one exception of *Fourecks* (LC). Examples include either proper names of characters such as *Littlebottom* (J), *Smallplank* (J), nicknames such as *Stoneface* (J), *Blue-Eyes* (J), *the Pointy-Heads* (LC), *Fair Go* (LC) or titles, e.g. *Two-chairs* (LC).

Dephrasal

The last subclass of dephrasal compounds is abundant in tokens and variety of use, it amounts to a quarter of all the compounds. They are mostly used to modify nouns, e.g. *shouting-at-subordinates* expression (LC), *closing-the-argument* voice (LC), *make-out-of-clay-and-smite'em* brigade (LC), *I'll-kill-you-if-you-ever-mention-this* expression (J), *The Going-Under-The-Water-*

Safely device (J), *Make-Things-Bigger* device (J), constable *Smite-The-Unbeliever-With-Cunning-Arguments* (J), constable *Visit-The-Ungodly-With-Explanatory-Pamphlets* (J) and more. However, there are some that function as noun phrases in their own right, e.g. *elephant-under-construction* (LC), *Seeing-Things-Pipe-You-Can-Breathe-Down* (J), old „nickname“ *ancient-wizard-who-died-fifty-years-ago-who-ponder-wouldn't-possibly-be-able-to-remember* (LC). Finally, there is a very specialized subclass of idioms that mimic Australian English, which is notoriously known for having a lot of colorful ones, e.g. *snagged as a wombat's tonker* (LC), *gonging like a possum's armpit* (LC), *as busy as one-armed carpenter in Smacharoo* (LC), *faster 'n an eel in a snakepit* (LC) and many others.

4.2.3 Comparison

A category of compounds has provided a lot of insight into the utilization of neologisms in both series. Divergencies as well as shared features occur in abundance and they will be presented promptly.

One shared feature is that compounding is the prevalent word-formation process in both series, however, the status of compounding in relation to other processes in each series differs drastically. While compounding in LC and J is almost equalled by miscellaneous processes (43.7% versus 41.9% respectively), compounding in GoT represents a devastating majority (with 88.3%), in comparison to other processes. The number of neologisms created using compounding does not display a significant discrepancy, 248 in LC and J and 272 in GoT.

A table with all the amassed data from both series has been devised to enable a more detailed comparison.

Table 4

Comparison of compounding in GoT and LC and J

	GoT			LC and J		
	Endocentric	Exocentric	Total	Endocentric	Exocentric	Total
Subordinate	82	30	112 (41.3%)	79	12	91 (36.7%)
Coordinate	13	3	16 (5.9%)	4	0	4 (1.6%)
Attributive	113	23	136 (50.6%)	81	10	91 (36.7%)
Dephrasal	-	-	7 (2.6%)	-	-	62 (25%)
Total	208 (76.8%)	56 (20.7%)	271 (vert.)	164 (88.2%)	22 (11.9%)	248 (vert.)

Looking first at the ratios between endocentric and exocentric compounds, it can be concluded that they differ slightly. Sure, endocentric compounds are dominant in either series, but the percentage is notably higher in LC and J with 88.2% compared to 76.8% in GoT.

Another interesting observation can be made if the seven individual subgroups (sub-ed, sub-ex, co-ed, co-ex, at-ed, at-ex and dep) are lined up according to the frequencies of their tokens. From the highest to the lowest in GoT it is: at-ed, sub-ed, sub-ex, at-ex, co-ed, **dep**, co-ex. Now from the highest to the lowest in LC and J: at-ed, sub-ed, **dep**, sub-ex, at-ex, co-ed, co-ex. As can be seen, if the category of dephrasal compounds was taken out, they would become exactly the same. In conclusion, the category of dephrasal compounds is where the most prominent difference lies, dephrasal compounds are scarce in GoT but substantially common in LC and J. Apart from the distinctive role of dephrasal compounds in each series, there are some minor digressions among the rest of the processes. While the number of subordinate and attributive compounds in LC and J is the same, attributive compounds surpass subordinate ones in GoT approximately by 10%. Furthermore, coordinate compounds are noticeably more common in GoT (LC and J does not even have a single representative of coordinate exocentric compound).

The areas of use in all the seven subclasses can be compared as well. The employment of subordinate endocentric compounds is remarkably similar, the formed neologisms are mostly titles or words denoting some agency, e.g. *shadowbinder* (GoT), *gift-giver* (GoT), *empire-builder* (J) or *outside-designer* (LC). The only obvious disparity is that LC and J contain a myriad of compounds of the “doing of something“ structure, e.g. *banana-bending* (LC) or *nose-tapping* (J), which are nowhere near as numerous in GoT. Subordinate exocentric compounds offer more disparity between the two series. They often denote people’s titles or nicknames in GoT (similar to their endocentric counterparts) and a lot of them are also somewhat symbolically linked to dragons. Those in LC and J display almost no common features to be grouped around. Coordinate compounds contain rather disparate kinds of compounds in both series, the only pattern to be observed is that they are often colors in GoT. Attributive endocentric compounds display some decidedly dissimilar areas of employment. The most notable groups of neologisms of this kind in GoT are plants, colors and compounds containing the word *half* as its modifier, whereas the most frequent area of use in LC and J is to construct words such as *dry-looking* (LC), *funny-shaped* (J) or *sunny-sounding* (J). However, some uses are also similar, both series use these type of compounds to denote animals and people’s titles to a large extent. Attributive exocentric compounds do not display any noticeable patterns or disparities suitable for comparison. Lastly, the essential role of dephrasals has already been discussed and it stands to reason that since they are used marginally in GoT and heavily in LC and J they will fulfil vastly different roles.

4.3 Derivation

Derivation was not especially prominent in either of the series, being the third most prolific word-formation process in J and LC and the fourth in GoT. Infixation was not utilized in either of the books, but all the other options were employed.

4.3.1 Derivation in GoT

In total, 10 instances of derivation have been located in GoT which accounts for 3.2% of all the neologisms found in the book.

Table 5

Derivation in GoT

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	the Others	conversion	8
2	the Unsullied	conversion	35
3	the black	conversion	203
4	wildling	suffix	1
5	Valyrian	suffix	14
6	Braavosian	suffix	31
7	Dornishmen	suffix	34
8	Crannogman	suffix	44
9	wagonman	suffix	183
10	sweetling	suffix	473

Conversion was employed for three of the neologisms (30%), suffixation for seven (70%) and prefixation was not used at all.

Perusing over the instances of conversion, it can be observed that they are all instances of partial conversion, being created using the tool of the definite article to mark their status. The first two refer to a class of people, while the last one is a metaphorically motivated word used to indicate that someone serves as a member of the Night's Watch, who are traditionally clad exclusively in black. It is often used in a collocation with the word *take*, to stand for "enter the service of the Night's Watch", as in (2) and (3).

(2) He may decide that you have convinced me to take **the black**. (GoT 203)

(3) It seems the boy aspires to take **the black**. (GoT 66)

Cases of suffixation were substantially more frequent. Three different suffixes were used: *-ling*, *-man* and *-ian*. Most of the neologisms are nouns with the exception of *Valyrian* and *Braavosian*, which are adjectives.

4.3.2 Derivation in LC and J

Instances of derivation amounted to 54 in J and LC. Both books were especially rich in cases of suffixation, while also containing some examples of prefixation and conversion. Together they represent 9.5% of the neologisms collected from J and LC.

Table 6

Derivation in J

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	saddlery	suffix	246
2	Omnian	suffix	41
3	Ankhian	suffix	28
4	Klatchian	suffix	10
5	chickies	suffix	21
6	noseful	suffix	269
7	Genuan	suffix	71
8	trollish	suffix	132
9	Elharibian	suffix	160
10	mediuming	suffix	162
11	Vimesness	suffix	182
12	mistership	suffix	32
13	Morkporian	suffix	212
14	Offlerian	suffix	252
15	Murmurian	suffix	252
16	Rimward	suffix	294
17	Tsortean	suffix	351
18	vitalist	suffix	389
19	Leveller	suffix	23
20	oasisies	suffix	192
21	Hershebian	suffix	30
22	non-war	prefix	19
23	anti-klatchian	prefix	34
24	multi-vital	prefix	49
25	dis-organizer	prefix	149
26	non-sailor	prefix	211
27	out-weaponed	prefix	254
28	de-barnacle	prefix	259
29	mid-anger	prefix	404
30	Pseudopolis	prefix	29

Table 7

Derivation in LC

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	the Wet	conversion	107
2	forwards	conversion	211
3	the From of running	conversion	319
4	apehood	suffix	16

5	technomancy	suffix	29
6	Agatean	suffix	38
7	in-ness	suffix	44
8	out-ness	suffix	44
9	seagully	suffix	50
10	thaumadalite	suffix	66
11	godding	suffix	177
12	Ecksian	suffix	211
13	sniggerruity	suffix	215
14	crackable	suffix	254
15	Rimwards	suffix	350
16	salt-free	suffix	403
17	thaumostatic	suffix	92
18	Trunkie	suffix	349
19	gooey	suffix	101
20	clearerer	suffix	375
21	over-footed	prefix	383
22	omnicognizant	prefix	146
23	nano-demon	prefix	393
24	super-Rincewind	prefix	109

All subclasses of derivation are present, the most numerous one being suffixation with 38 instances (70.4%), followed by prefixation with 13 instances (24.1%) and conversion with 3 (5.6%).

Looking at conversion in more detail, there are cases of traditional conversion and of partial conversion likewise. Interestingly enough, there is an instance of a neologism being converted from a closed word class into a noun in *the From of running*, a rather rare phenomenon. Equally intriguing is the case of the word *forward* being converted into a noun in (4).

(4) Then he saw why they stopped. They'd run out of **forwards**. The ground fell away into a canyon [...] (LC 211).

Suffixation was employed abundantly, using various suffixes, to list some *-ful*, *-ish*, *-ian*, *-ness*, *-ing*, *-ist*, *-er*, *-ship* and more. They were mostly used to create nouns such as *apehood*, *mistership*, *Vimesness*, or *mediuming*. Similarly to conversion, some of the derived nouns were likewise formed from closed word classes, e.g. *in-ness* and *out-ness*. Aside from nouns, adjectives were also common, such as *trollish*, *Murmurian* or *Ecksian*. Furthermore, even some adverb occurred, such as *crackable* or *Rimwards*.

There were some interesting cases that deserve a detailed attention, one of them is the word *saddlery*, which might seem like an established English word meaning either the equipment for horses or the place where saddles are made, but its origin and meaning are different. It is rather derived from the words *saddle* and it refers to the area of one's buttocks.

(5) 'You took measurements?' --- 'Oh, yes, I-' --- 'What, of my... **saddlery** regions?'
(J 246)

Another intriguing example is the word *clearerer*, which displays the recursive usage of the suffix -er, which forms comparative adjectives. It is used by an inebriated character in (6).

(6) [...] no matter how much I dnirk. Helps me think **clearerer**. (LC 375)

The last example that needs to be pointed out is the word *oasisies*, which stems from a character's ignorance of *oases* being the correct plural form of the word *oasis*, therefore actually creating a new word while trying to apply derivation.

As for prefixes, there are various examples such as *anti-klatchian*, *non-war* or *super-Rincewind*. There are three words that reside on the thin line between prefixation and neo-classical compounds: *omnicognizant*, *nano-demon* and *Pseudopolis*. The word *Pseudopolis*, combining two words of Greek origin, is an exceptionally creative way of devising a name for a city, given the fact that *polis* is a word referring to a city state and *Pseudopolis* means something along the lines of "a fake/not really a city", resulting in both of them conveying the notion of "being a city, but..."

Another spectacular neologism is the denominal verb *de-barnacle*, which represents the very rare phenomenon of a class-changing prefix, meaning "getting a ship rid of barnacles".

4.3.3 Comparison

The series differ significantly in their use of this word-formation process. The first divergence is simply the number of derived neologisms found in each of them. While the process was rather marginal in GoT, only 3.6% of neologisms were created through derivation, the situation was quite different in J and LC with 9.3%, a figure almost three times higher.

Furthermore, the subclasses of derivation supply another striking difference, while J and LC contain 13 cases of prefixation it is completely absent in GoT. Nevertheless, there is one feature shared by both series. Suffixation is not only clearly the dominant subclass of derivation in both of them but the percentage of suffixes in both series is almost identical as well (70% in GoT and 70.4% in LC and J). A complete overview is given in the form of a table that summarizes the data and also provides the ratio of subclasses of derivation in each series.

Table 8

Comparison of derivational processes in GoT and LC and J

A subcategory of derivation	GoT	LC and J
Conversion	3 (30%)	3 (5.6%)
Prefixation	0	13 (24.1%)
Infixation	0	0
Suffixation	7 (70%)	38 (70.4%)
Total	10	54

Additional noteworthy factor in establishing a difference between the two series is the degree of employment of proper nouns as bases for the derived words. More than a half (four out of seven) of the suffixed words in GoT are created from the names of places that were devised for the book, such as *Valyrian* or *Dornishmen*, whereas only approximately a third of the suffixed words in J and LC are of this kind. One interpretation might suggest a possible higher level of creativity in J and LC, as deriving denominal adjectives from place names or the combination of place names with *-man* (in GoT) could be perceived as not as innovative as the instances encountered in J and LC. Another factor supporting the argument for less innovation in GoT is the fact that only three distinct prefixes were used, in a sharp contrast to J and LC, which display around twenty of them.

To sum up, J and LC utilize the option of derivation more frequently and they display a far greater variability in its use.

4.4 Miscellaneous processes

Miscellaneous processes account for vastly different ratios of neologisms gathered from both series. In total, 12 (3.9%) instances were found in GoT and 238 (41.9%) in LC and J. Surprisingly enough, all the subcategories (clipping, blending, abbreviations, back-formation, analogy, reduplication and independent word manufacture) have at least one representative. It was hoped for but thought unlikely for some of them.

It needs to be mentioned that this portion of neologisms is the most heterogenous one and it was often challenging to categorize the words that eventually found its place among others from this category. The delineation between blending and compounding is sometimes arduous to establish. Furthermore, the category of analogy posed several problems, also stemming from a blurred line between some cases. However, perhaps needless to say, all these intricacies often go hand in hand with some of the most captivating cases of neologisms analysed in this thesis.

One more issue regarding analogy needs to be discussed. This category yielded a very powerful tool for organizing. The class of analogies was mainly established with compound-like creations in mind, such that require a contextual background for the interpretation of the word. Nevertheless, there is a large number of words that are not of the compound structure but they are

still produced using an analogy to some existing English word. Various distorted words form the most prominent part, e.g. *dere* (J, based on the word *there*) or *hloins* (LC, based on the word *loins*). These words can likewise only be interpreted when the link to the original word is discovered. Moreover, neologisms like these do not really belong to any other category. To conclude, it was deemed suitable that they be subsumed under analogies.

Since the table containing the neologisms from GoT comprises of mere 12 examples it was included in its entirety here, whereas, quite understandably, the tables for J and LC, which span across several pages, are provided in the Appendix.

4.4.1 Miscellaneous processes in GoT

This subcategory forms a very marginal portion of all the neologisms in GoT. There are 6 instances of shortening (4 clipping and 2 blending) accompanied by 2 examples of reduplication and 4 examples of analogy. Abbreviations, back-formation or independent word manufacture are not present.

Table 9

Miscellaneous processes in GoT

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	m'lord	clip	4
2	m'lady	clip	134
3	s'posed	clip	132
4	's (<i>is</i>)	clip	180
5	Lannisport (<i>Lannister + port</i>)	blend	183
6	Karhold (<i>Karstark + hold</i>)	blend	568
7	blood of my blood	reduplication	105
8	meat and mead	reduplication	196
9	what in the seven hells	analogy	17
10	ast (<i>ask</i>)	analogy	150
11	the black goat of the Tully flock	analogy	364
12	sting-me-not	analogy	709

Instances of clipping are all used to achieve one goal, to produce an illusion of social stratification. Characters with lower social standing and education use these words instead of the full forms.

Both examples of blending are proper nouns created using names of family houses and common words.

There are two neologisms created by reduplication, both of them idioms. *Blood of my blood* serves to refer to a member of someone's family, especially among the tribe of the Dothraki people.

Meat and mead is an idiom meaning “what someone experiences commonly and it natural to them, what they are used to“ as can be seen in (7).

(7) He had no taste for these intrigues, but he was beginning to realize that they were **meat and mead** to a man like Littlefinger. (GoT 196)

The remaining four cases are analogies. Probably the least interesting one is the word *ast* (mimicing *ask*), likewise used to mark social standing of a character. A great example of analogy is the word *sting-me-not*, a name of a flower modelled using the pattern of *forget-me-not*. Another delightful example was constructed using the idiom *black sheep* in its making: *the black goat of the Tully flock*. The character who this refers to is also alternatively called *Blackfish*, the *fish* part arising from the fact that he comes from a house that has a fish for a sigil. The last example of analogy is *what in the seven hells* (and its alternative modifications), which is used as a blasphemous phrase (the addition of *seven* is a result of the faith in the book being polytheistic and worshiping seven gods).

4.4.2 Miscellaneous processes in LC and J

Miscellaneous processes in LC and J were abundant, actually rivaling the number of neologisms created through compounding. In total, 238 instances were gathered amounting to 41.9% of all the neologisms in J and LC.

Every single subclass of miscellaneous processes is represented, albeit in small numbers. The numbers of individual instances are as follows: 39 clippings, 33 blends, 1 abbreviation, 2 back-formations, 11 reduplications, 133 analogies and 19 independent word manufactures. Each will be now discussed in turn.

Clipping

Almost all the examples of clippings are there to evoke a social or regional language variation. The clippings are mostly words with missing letters that have been replaced by an apostrophe, largely in the middle of words, e.g. *lit'rally* (J). Few of the words are so distorted that it would be impossible to derive their meaning without context, such as *c'p'r* (J, meaning *copper*) or *r't* (J, meaning *right*). A few of the clipped words have undergone, apart from the act of letter deletion, a process of a slight letter modification, e.g. *lisnin* (LC) or *tomorra* (LC).

As was already mentioned, one reason to use these types of clippings is to signal a lower social standing or education in some characters, e.g. *lit'rally* (J), *n'thin* (J), or *orrible* (J). Furthermore, they can be implemented to elicit a regional variation, especially in J with respect to

the natives of the Fourecks continent, such as *competitively* (LC), *morno* (LC), *stalag* (LC), *so'thing* (LC) and more.

The least numerous neologisms are the words the creation of which was not intended to establish or complement any language variation, but simply to provide a shorter alternative. A good example is the word *Runes* (LC), which is a clipped form of the title *the Lecturer in Recent Runes*. Another one is the word *Rinso* (LC), being a shorter and slightly adjusted version of the word *Rincewind*.

Blending

Examples of blending are present in roughly the same amount as those of clipping, however, the reasons for their use are far more varied. Looking at their forms, a few patterns of creation can be observed, some are also supplemented with apostrophes, e.g. *bug'roff* (LC, meaning *bugger off*) or *y'see* (J, meaning *you see*); some do not contain an apostrophe, e.g. *geroof* (J, meaning *get off*) or *wzt* (LC, meaning *what is it*); hyphenated in *L-space* (LC, meaning *Library space*) and apart from a few exceptions they display some spelling changes.

As has already been touched upon, the areas of their implementation is fairly varied. They share some with clippings, namely social and regional variations, such as *m'lord* (J) or *b'g'r'off* (J, meaning *bugger off*). Another use is to provide a sufficiently blurred speech for a drunk character, as in *barrardifferentshap* (LC, meaning *bar are different shape*) or *wzt* (LC, meaning *what is it*). Immensely original blends were created to cover another need, the talk of budgies in LC. One of the characters runs into a flock of extremely talkative birds and they utter the following and similar creations: *wh'spr'boyden* (LC, meaning *who is a pretty boy then*), *h'yc'mbik* (LC, meaning *hey come back*), *g'd'gr'f* (LC, meaning *good grief*). Another interesting blend that is worth singling out is *rag'ed* (J). It deserves attention since it is a fairly opaque word, being the blend of the words *rag* and *head*, it is a derogatory term for a person from Klatch (they traditionally wear turbans). Moreover, the word does not appear as a compound in the book, in its potential full form of *raghead*, but only as this blend. The last example to be discussed in detail is *L-space* (LC), denoting a specialized term for the concept of “library space“.

Abbreviation

A single abbreviation has been located while searching the books and that is *UU* (LC), which stands for *Unseen University*.

Back-formation

Examples of back-formation are also extremely sparse, only two are to be encountered in both books. The first one is *iconograph* (J), which is an apparatus used for taking photographs (for want of a better explanation, they are pictures drawn quickly by a gnome that lives inside the device). The neologism was created via the subtraction of “a suffix“ from *iconography*, but gives the impression that the contrary is true. The second example is *thaum* (LC), the basic unit of magic of the Discworld, which was subtracted from *thaumaturgy*.

Reduplication

This process was with its 11 tokens noticeably more commonplace. As expected, the majority of the reduplications serve as interjections, e.g. *gloing-gloing* (J), *wib wib wib* (J), *whum-whum* (J) or *ribbit ribbit* (LC). Nevertheless, there are three that function as nouns: *Never-Never* (LC, a place), *Mothers and Mothers* (LC, a child’s game) and *EcksEcksEcksEcks* (LC, a continent). Particularly the last one mentioned is of a heightened interest since the continent of *EcksEcksEcksEcks* is either referred to in this manner, or alternatively, as to *Fourecks* (to be found in compounds). The name is based on the notion that the continent is an unexplored place of mystery, which are regularly marked using the letter *x*.

Analogy

Analogy is with its 133 examples by far the most prolific subcategory of miscellaneous word-formation processes, but that result has to be approached with caution, which will be explained further on. What is unquestionable is the fact that this subcategory is remarkably diverse. A large number of the neologisms in this category are idioms, which is one of the reasons for such a variety.

An attempt has been made to sort the neologisms into some conceptually similar groups, which will be discussed shortly. Some of the most intriguing cases are to be treated last and addressed individually.

Typical analogies

Some of the neologisms, a minority, represent perfect examples of traditional analogies which do not fit into any other subgroup, for instance *insteadofashave* (J, analogous to *aftershave*), *hunchgroin* (J, analogous to *hunchback*) or *souphole* (LC, analogous to *waterhole*).

Social stratification

It is no surprise that analogies, as well as clipping and blends, are used to create a social stratification.

Four distinct types of analogies that signal a specific social standing or affiliation to a specific group of people have been devised. Firstly, words that mark a troll dialect, signalled by the replacement of some letters which is an indication that they do not pronounce these phonemes: /ð/ or /θ/, examples include *dere* (J, meaning *there* or *their*), *dese* (J, meaning *these*), *fink* (J, meaning *think*), *dat* (J, meaning *that*). Secondly, words that are uttered by a crocodile bartender in LC who has trouble pronouncing some sounds, most notably fricatives, for example *poiffible* (LC, meaning *possible*), *thif* (LC, meaning *this*), *loft* (LC, meaning *lost*) and many others. Thirdly, words signalling a cultural affiliation, since the character uttering these words is a foreigner and he adds a kind of a breathy onset to his words. All of these are marked by a “prefix“ *h-*, e.g. *hyou*, *hloins*, *hcome*, *hexperienced* (all LC, meaning *you*, *loins*, *come* and *experienced*). Finally, there are words that are misspelled or otherwise distorted in various ways, which indicates ignorance of the speaker, e.g. *forane* (J, meaning *foreign*), *statchoos* (J, meaning *statues*), *natchure* (J, meaning *nature*), *brung* (J, meaning *brought*), *continuiuinium* (LC, meaning *continuum*), *hinjis* (LC, meaning *hinges*) and many others. Some of them are rather humorous, for example *in-you-endoes* (J, meaning *innuendos*).

Combined with borrowing

Some neologisms in this category work partially with borrowing from latin, nevertheless, they fit better in here since the knowledge of the original is crucial for the deciphering of the analogous one. Firstly, it is *fatal femmies* (J) a butchered version of *femme fatal*, resulting from a character’s attempt to use the correct phrase. Secondly, *droit de mortis* (LC), an alteration to phrases such as *droit de suite* or *droit de seigneur*. It refers to a practise of “the acceleration of a wizard through the ranks of wizardry by killing off more serior wizards“ (LC 34). Thirdly, there are several parallels to the famous saying *veni, vidi, vici*. These are *veni, vermini, vomui* (interpreted by the speaker in the book as *I came, I got ratted, I threw up*); *visi, veneri, vamoosi* (again, interpreted as *I visited, I caught an embarrassing disease, I ran away*) and *veni, vici... Vetinari* (all J). The first two are suggested as possible replacements to the established version of *veni, vidi, vici* by one of the characters. The last one is uttered by Lord Vetinari in a moment of his triumph.

Idioms

Bountiful idioms analogous to those that are in everyday use have been gathered. There is either a slight change in the idiom, an extra word is usually inserted or exchanged, or one is

modelled anew but following the pattern of an existing idiom very closely. The first category includes examples such as *a celestial penny seemed to drop* (LC), it is *all Klatchian to me* (J, instead of *Greek*), *be back on your knuckles* (LC, instead of feet, since the speaker is addressing an orangutan), *does a camel shit in the desert* (J, instead of *a bear in the woods*), *at the drop of a turban* (J instead of *a hat*), *count on the fingers of a blind butcher's hand* (J) or *Johnny Klatchian* (J, instead of *Johnny foreigner*). Some examples that would rather fall into the latter category include colorful derogatory addresses inspired by *a son of a bitch*, such as *an unclean son of a dog of the female persuasion*, *second cousin of a jackal*, *Evil Brother-in-Law of a Jackal* or *nodding acquaintance of a dog* (all J).

Other

This subcategory comprises of neologisms that were so creative that they do not fit neatly into any of the other subcategories and they definitely deserve a special treatment here. Firstly, the word *WUM* (J), which was created based on the word MUM, as explained by a character giving details about his tattooing experience in (8).

(8) 'It was gonna be "Mum" but I passed out and Needle Ned didn't notice I was upside down.' (J 250).

Secondly, the phrase *loitering within tent* is used together with the phrase that gave rise to it to describe offences of people standing in tents (9).

(9) [...] going equipped to commit a crime, obstruction, threatening behaviour, loitering with intent, **loitering within tent**, hah, travelling for the purposes [...] (J 368)

Thirdly, there is *loweroglyph* (J). It stems, as is quite often the case, from a character's ignorance. He is attempting to describe what hieroglyphs are, while not having the slightest idea, and ends up guessing a type of mollusc (at that moment the characters are in a submarine on its way through a flooded cave and other characters are peering out of the windows, trying to find hieroglyphs on the walls on the cave). Another character promptly catches onto his explanation and makes a generalization about other types of mollusc as opposed to those mollusc being "here" (10).

(10) 'That's what hieroglyphs are, is it? So, if we go any deeper, they'll be **loweroglyphs?**' (J 251)

Another highly intriguing neologism is the word *substitious* (J). It was formed as a contrary concept to *superstitious* utilizing the prefix *sub-*. However, since the part of *substitious* that is left after the deletion of *sub-* is not a legitimate base, it cannot be classified as a case of affixation.

The word *Al-tronomy* (J) is also worthy of detailed attention. Two characters in the book are discussing what inventions were made by Klatchians and one of them makes the generalization that they invented all the words starting with *al-* and he names alcohol and algebra. Their subsequent conversation is concluded thus (11).

(11) [...] well, they *say* the Klatchians invented astronomy-'

'**Al-tronomy**, 'said Nobby helpfully.

'No, no... no, Nobby, I reckon they'd discovered esses by then [...] (J 42)

And finally, the word *octarine* (LC), the eighth color of the spectrum, clearly deriving inspiration from color names such as *ultramarine*, *tangerine* or *aquamarine* and simultaneously utilizing the *octa-* prefix meaning "eight". Similarly to *substitious*, it was not classified as a case of affixation because *octa-* is not added to an existing base.

It almost does not even require a close observation to arrive at the conclusion that the miscellaneous processes in LC and J are tremendously varied and they provide some of the most captivating neologisms in this thesis.

Independent word manufacture

Neologisms belonging to this category are mostly interjections but not exclusively. A sum of 19 completely independently formed words has been arrived, which grants this subcategory a second place in the number of neologisms created within the framework of miscellaneous processes.

As was already stated, most of the neologisms are interjections such as *aagraaah* (J), *shwup* (J), *whUUMMMM* (LC), *too-ra-la* (LC) and many others.

Nevertheless, there are two rare instances of neologisms that are not interjections. Firstly, it is the word *slood* (LC). *Slood* is a mysterious substance that can be discovered by intelligent beings during their development, or as the author describes it "much easier to discover than fire, and only slightly harder to discover than water" (LC 10). Secondly, there is *wol* (J), a Klatchian currency, the creation of which seems not to be inspired by any existing word in English, or its origin is rather opaque.

4.4.3 Comparison

There is a fundamental difference between the miscellaneous processes applied in GoT and those from LC and J, both in their frequency and the diversity of the neologisms created through them. A table is provided that demonstrates the findings neatly. It gives the total sums of instances analyzed together with the percentages that the subcategories represent among miscellaneous processes.

Table 10

Comparison of miscellaneous processes in GoT and LC and J

Subcategory of miscellaneous processes	GoT	LC and J
Clipping	4 (33.3%)	39 (16.4%)
Blending	2 (16.7%)	33 (13.9%)
Abbreviation	0	1 (0.4%)
Back-formation	0	2 (0.8%)
Reduplication	2 (16.7%)	11 (4.6%)
Analogy	4 (33.3%)	133 (55.9%)
Independent word manufacture	0	19 (8%)
Total	12	238

It is blatantly obvious that the use of miscellaneous processes is profoundly distinct in both series. They constitute an almost negligible portion of neologisms in GoT (mere 3.9%), whereas in LC and J they form an absolutely vital part. The results are so disparate that they are almost incomparable. GoT displays only four of the processes while LC and J contain an example of each of them.

Most frequently occurring processes in GoT are clipping and analogy with four tokens each but the processes of blending and reduplication have only a slightly lower number of instances so the difference might not be significant. On the contrary, the miscellaneous processes in LC and J are overwhelmingly dominated by analogies (more than a half). Clipping, blending and independent word manufacture are all common. Rarely employed processes are reduplication and particularly abbreviation and back-formation.

This category is where the distinctive motivations behind the use of word-formation processes in both series become glaringly apparent. LC and J really utilize the potential of miscellaneous processes to their fullest, which is evident from the sheer number of instances of their use and equally well from the fact that even the most obscure word-formation processes are employed. It is also this category where the objective to be an entertaining piece of literature becomes palpable.

LC and J gain a lot of their humor from language, notably from analogies. Furthermore, this factor also explains, why zero instances of independent word manufacture are to be found in GoT as

opposed to 19 in LC and J despite the fact that both series feature characters that frequently fight, fall, shout or otherwise, simply put, indulge in activities that produce sounds. The addition of interjections is humorous and colorful and enriches the light atmosphere in LC and J, but it would not sit well with the severe mood of GoT.

4.5 Borrowing

Borrowing was used extremely marginally across all three of the books. It was the least productive word-formation process in both series with 7 instances in J and LC (1.2%) and 7 instances in GoT (2.3%). Two basic types of borrowing can be distinguished, the first one being borrowing from an existing language (like Latin) and the second one being borrowing from a fictitious language that exists only within the realms of the books.

4.5.1 Borrowing in GoT

So few cases, only seven, of borrowing have been gathered that the whole table is provided here.

Table 11

Borrowing in GoT

	neologism	source language	page
1	khal	Dothraki	29
2	khalasar	Dothraki	32
3	dosh khaleen	Dothraki	100
4	arakh	Dothraki	102
5	khaleesi	Dothraki	105
6	khalakka	Dothraki	670
7	maegi	Dothraki	672

All the neologisms were borrowed from a fictitious language of the Dothraki people. They all represent words ordinarily used in the so-referred to “common tongue“ of the books (English, obviously). Their adoption was mostly motivated by the need to name new entities, which arose when people started to get into contact with the Dothraki tribe, e.g. *arakh* is a kind of sword that is used by Dothraki fighters, *khal* is the title of their leader with *khaleesi* being the title of the leader’s wife and so on.

It might be interesting to point out that a large number of the words are seemingly modelled from one base, *khal*, which is combined to derive other words using affixes of the fictitious language.

4.5.2 Borrowing in LC and J

Cases of borrowing were likewise sparse in LC and J. Both kinds of borrowing, as delineated in the introduction, were found.

Table 12

Borrowing in J

	neologism	source language	page
1	<i>offendi</i>	Klatchian	35
2	Doctorum Adamus cum Flabelo Dulci	latin	77
3	the D'reg	D'reg's original language	229

Table 13

Borrowing in LC

	neologism	source language	page
1	argo nautical unico	latin	149
2	nullus anxietas	latin	363
3	Terror Incognita	latin	58
4	Café de Feet	Spanish (?)	288

Firstly, words adopted from fictitious languages can be analysed in more detail. Two different languages served as the source for borrowing, one of them being Klatchian, which provided words such as *offendi* (a polite form of address, similar *sir*). The situation is rather complicated by the fact that at least some of the loan words were seemingly inspired by actual, existing words in English. Some background is needed first. Klatch is a country that was very obviously created as an analogy to the Arabic parts of the real world, for satirical purposes (deserts, minarets, harems, turbans, curry, proficiency in algebra and so forth are all present). Going back now to the word *offendi*, which is used as a polite address, an analogy can be drawn to the word *effendi*, which is used in Turkey as a title of courtesy. The author thus effectively created a word for a polite address that evokes the word “offend“. It is debatable whether a word such as this is not supposed to be categorized as an example of analogy, since it was very obviously inspired by an existing word in its creation. However, the origin of the word is rather obscure and, more importantly, it is not necessary to decode the meaning of the neologism, which is a crucial factor for the process of analogy. One can read the book and understand perfectly what *offendi* means without having the slightest idea that there is a possible analogy there to be discovered (thus not missing the meaning, only the joke).

The second example of a loan word taken from a fictitious language is *the D'reg*, taken from the name of a tribe, but also denoting “an enemy“ (in that language).

Turning now to neologisms borrowed from existing languages, a very obvious difference can be seen, they are all modelled as idioms or fixed phrases containing more than one word. The source language is predominantly Latin with the exception of *Café de Feet*, which is probably Spanish. It is reasonable to discuss each in slightly more detail.

Doctorum Adamus cum Flabelo Dulci is a secretly mocking honorary title given by a university meaning “Doctor of Sweet Fanny Adams“. *Argo nautical uniuo* is a type of plant which is in fact a functioning ship.

The interpretation of *nullus anxietas* should be preceded by some background again. The fictitious country (*Fourecks*) where this phrase is uttered and used was modelled as a parody of Australia, meaning that it is actually a reference to the phrase “no worries“. The question arose again whether this should be classified as a case of borrowing or analogy. The reasoning behind the decision to include it here was mainly the fact that the phrase seems understandable enough even without the knowledge of the real phrase it mimics.

The uniqueness of the phrase *Terror Incognita* is perhaps obvious now, knowing about the element of Australian parody. It is a lovely alteration on the phrase “terra incognita“ drawing heavily on the fact that Australia (and even more so its imitation *Fourecks*) is widely considered a country where almost anything from the present fauna and flora can kill its inhabitants.

The last one to be discussed in slightly more detail is *Café de Feet*, meaning practically the same as coffee-to-go.

4.5.3 Comparison

Even though the categories of borrowing are equally represented, considering numbers of tokens, the neologisms found in each series are quite different, especially the motivation and the means behind their creation.

One apparent difference is that all the loan words from GoT are borrowed from a non-existent language, while J and LC display instances of loan words from both fictitious and real languages.

Another distinguishing feature, perhaps even more striking one, is the effect that these words should bring to the books. It seems that the desired effect of the neologisms from GoT is to add a flavor of cultural diversity. On the contrary, the main motivation behind the employment of the neologisms in LC and J seems to be to entertain the reader.

The last distinction is that the neologisms in LC and J are more often than not set phrases, exactly the opposite situation to those in GoT.

4.6 Shift of meaning

It is perhaps desirable to preface the analysis of this section by a short discussion on the nature and position of this subcategory. It is indisputably the most obscure and debatable one among the five major categories present in the analytical part. The inclusion of this category was motivated by three major factors, or rather by three major types of words encountered in both series which would not fit into any of the other four. Firstly, it were words like *stag* (GoT) or *dragon* (GoT) that prompted the existence of this category. Both of these are instances of existing words applied to designate non-existent meanings (by the means of polysemy). Once it was apparent that those two words would inevitably lead to a creation of this category, it provided a solution for other troublesome cases, such as *Tradition* (LC). This word, and many similar ones, occupy an uncertain area that is made up of hybrid examples that somewhat changed their meaning, but not obviously enough to be impervious to objections to their being included in this analysis. These words with capitalized initial letters gain additional, modified meaning, as can be seen in (12).

(12) 'Yes, but we're all alone *together*,' said Ridcully urgently. 'There could be **Talk**.'
(J 92)

Clearly, the word in that sentence carries a meaning substantially different from a simple use of the word "talk". It adds extra layers to the specific nature of such talk and notably enriches its meaning. The essence of this enrichment is what was attempted to be captured and described by the inclusion of such words in this category. The status of neologism of these words is arguable, no doubt, but having already established a category that deals with metaphorical shifts in meaning used to create new words, it seemed that they actually fit in quite neatly.

The third type of words that prompted the establishment of this category were misused words, given a different meaning due to a character's ignorance.

4.6.1 Shift of meaning in GoT

Seven instances of shift of meaning have been found (2.3%), thus matching borrowing with equal seven and making these two the least productive processes in GoT. Two of the examples display shift through branching of meaning and the rest through transfer.

Table 14

Shift of meaning in GoT

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	the Doom	transfer	24

2	(the/my) Lion	transfer	51
3	the Imp	transfer	51
4	the Hound	transfer	89
5	the dragon	transfer	100
6	stag	branching	135
7	dragon	branching	175

The two instances of branching are both examples of made up currencies, a *stag* being a silver coin and a *dragon* a gold one. It is never explicitly revealed how they had gained the names, but there is a plausible explanation, especially in the case of *dragon*. It probably had been named after a once ruling family that has a dragon as its sigil (deriving from the fact that they used to keep live ones in the past, before their extinction). The situation is similar with *stag* as the recently appointed new king from a different house has a stag in his sigil.

A different situation is that of *the dragon*, which is often used in the collocation “wake the dragon“. It is used by one of the characters, also from the ruling family that has a dragon as its sigil, to describe a state of seething rage and posing a danger as a result, analogous to a typical behaviour and traits of a real dragon. Alternatively, the character refers to himself as *the dragon*, imagining himself to embody the traits of a dragon 13).

(13) You will not fail me tonight. If you do, it will go hard for you. You don’t want to wake **the dragon**, do you? (GoT 29)

(13) [...] I am the rightful Lord of the Seven Kingdoms. **The dragon** does not beg. (GoT 100)

The remaining instances represent nicknames and titles given to characters based on some of their qualities, background or patterns of behaviour. To give an example, *the Hound* is a nickname given to one of the characters. He is a knight serving the crown prince and he follows him everywhere (being his protector and generally at his disposal), the prince and other members of the royal family often literally ask him to hunt down people for them, he wears a helmet fashioned into the shape of a dog’s head and he even displays some character traits that might be associated with a hunting dog, such as being harsh and rough. The metaphorical meaning is sometimes even utilized by other characters, as in (14).

(14) “The prince will remember that, little lord [...] “I pray he does,” Tyrion Lannister replied. “If he forgets, **be a good dog** and remind him.“ (GoT 88)

4.6.2 Shift of meaning in LC and J

A total of 21 instances of shift of meaning have been collected from J and LC, gaining thus a position of a peripheral process. Most of them fall under the subcategory of transfer with a few instances of branching.

Table 15

Shift of meaning in J

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	troll	branching	63
2	the Thought	transfer	64
3	Us	transfer	199
4	Them	transfer	199
5	Me	transfer	199
6	Mine	transfer	211
7	Yours	transfer	211
8	Responsibilities	transfer	214
9	'Speaking'	transfer	16
10	the Boy	branching	115
11	the Diseased (meaning <i>the deceased</i>)	branching	113
12	faeces (meaning faces)	branching	44

Table 16

Shift of meaning in LC

	neologism	subcategory	page
1	Tradition	transfer	12
2	Talk	transfer	92
3	Everything	transfer	146
4	a Look	transfer	236
5	an Atmosphere	transfer	281
6	Fire	transfer	364
7	Mr Brain	transfer	166
8	Mr Mouth	transfer	166
9	Place	transfer	111

The first example of branching is the word *troll*, which aside from the creature, is also used to mean the language of trolls. The second examples is the word *the Boy*, which refers to an occupation position in a mansion, something along the lines of a house servant. It is true that the OED claims that the origin of the word *boy* can be traced back to Middle English (meaning a male servant), but since it is not listed as one of the meanings in the dictionary and the word in J is capitalized and accompanied by the definite article, thus supporting its status as a distinct word, it was included in the analysis.

Two similar cases of branching are the words *the Diseased* (used to mean *deceased*) and *faeces* (used to mean *faces*). They are both misused words, appearing because of the spelling troubles of some of the characters. Spelling alterations are common means of neologism acquisition in both J and LC and are categorized as analogies, but these two are specific in that the characters inadvertently used existing words (for humorous purposes), thus using them with a shifted meaning.

The remaining examples are words of rather disparate origins and types. Some of them are words that gained a significant meaning charge through capitalization and their usage, usually acquiring some metaphorical meanings, for example the word *Place* (15).

(15) [...] Ai know my **Place**. [...] 'I think it's very commendable of her. Her world is Below Stairs, after all.'(LC 111)

The first part of the example is uttered by a woman who is employed as a cleaning lady at a university when she is talking to her superiors (wizards who run the university). It is more than simply saying that she knows where her position regarding to wizards is, the increased significance of the word is signalled by the capitalization and context, especially the subsequent callback from *Below Stairs* (*Place* and *Below Stairs* actually complement each other and work together to get the whole meaning across to the reader). Another example is *Fire*, which refers to primeval fire, more specifically the event of its discovery by people.

Interesting cases that deserve a more detailed comment are *Mr Brain* and *Mr Mouth* (16).

(16) The Bursar looked at the soaking log and sought for words. Sometimes, when he really needed to, it was possible to get **Mr Brain** and **Mr Mouth** all lined up together. (LC 166).

They are great examples of metonymy, *Brain* standing for thinking and *Mouth* for talking.

4.6.3 Comparison

Both series are rather similar in some aspects. The ratio of neologisms created through shift of meaning is marginal in both of them. Moreover, they both display instances of transfer heavily and of branching minimally.

A slight difference can be drawn between the use of the words, while those in GoT are mostly nicknames and titles those in J and LC cannot be so easily subsumed under one heading as they are more varied.

5 Conclusion

The analysis of the two series has proved fruitful. Firstly, a great number of neologisms have been gathered and subjected to it and secondly, more importantly, some interesting results have been arrived at. Both significant similarities and disparities between the series have been found. In general, the books belonging to *the Discworld* series pose a more prolific source of neologisms.

Compounding is the most frequently used word-formation process in both series and the subcategories of compounds are approximately evenly represented, the only striking difference being the fact that dephrasal compounds play an essential role in LC and J whereas only a peripheral one in GoT. Furthermore, borrowing and meaning shift are equally marginal in both series. Derivation is slightly more utilized in LC and J and the affixes used are more varied.

The area that displays the most prominent differences is the category of miscellaneous processes. The ratios of neologisms belonging to this group in *Discworld* and GoT are staggeringly different. While a marginal category in GoT, it is extremely prolific in *Discworld*, almost equal to the most numerous group (compounds). One of the reasons that contributes to this dissimilarity is probably the subgenre of the *Discworld* series (a humorous fantasy), which leads to more linguistically versatile creations and this factor is especially prominent in the area of miscellaneous processes (e.g. parodies in analogy, interjections etc.).

In general, the *Discworld* series shows quite clearly more variation and linguistic richness when its own created lexis is considered.

Works cited

The books subjected to the study:

Martin, R. R. George. *The Game of Thrones*. New York: Bantam Books, 2011.

Pratchett, Terry. *Jingo*. London: Corgi Books, 1998.

Pratchett, Terry. *The Last Continent*. London: Corgi Books, 1999.

Other:

Bauer, Laurie. *English Word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Brown, Keith and Jim Miller. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Dušková, Libuše et al. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia, 2006.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Lieber, Rochelle and Pavol Štekauer. *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Ed. R. Lieber and P. Štekauer. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lieber, Rochelle and Pavol Štekauer. *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Ed. R. Lieber and P. Štekauer. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

OED Online. Oxford University Press, May 2018. 10 May 2018

<<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>>

Peprník, Jaroslav. *English Lexicology*. Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci, 2006.

Plag, Ingo. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Quirk, Randolph et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman, 1985.

Appendix

The complete tables of all the neologisms gathered for this thesis are provided there.