PLAGIARISM RULES AWARENESS STATEMENT

Fraud and Plagiarism

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:

- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;
- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work.

The rules for plagiarism also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations.

The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.15) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism

entail. For its part, Utrecht University works to ensure that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.	
Name: Nelleke Jansen	
Student number: 4295730	
Date and signature: 28-06-2017	

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.

From *Landschap* to *Mindscape*:

A Diachronic Study of the English Morpheme -*Scape*

BA Thesis English Language and Culture
Utrecht University

Nelleke Jansen
4295730

Supervisor: dr. Marcelle Cole
Second Reader: dr. Nynke de Haas

June 2017

9424 words

Abstract

Recent academic discussions have focused on a special type of productive bound morpheme used in English word formation, generally referred to as final combining forms (e.g. Prćić, 2008) or 'splinters' (e.g. Callies, 2016). One of the morphemes discussed is -*scape*, which was derived from the Dutch loanword *landscape*. A full overview of the processes that have taken place in the development of -*scape* has hitherto never been given, and the properties of -*scape* have never been compared to the Dutch suffix -*schap*. Based on a corpus investigation, the present study explores in what ways the semantic and morphological properties of the Dutch suffix -*schap* have changed during the development into the English splinter -*scape*, and how these changes can be explained. A qualitative analysis of the data reveals that -*scape* is the result of different processes, including borrowing, blending, semantic broadening, and reanalysis. Whereas the involvement of language contact in the development of splinters has not been discussed in earlier studies, the present paper argues that the borrowing process was essential in the development of -*scape* as a splinter.

Keywords: English word formation, splinter, borrowing, Dutch loanword

Table of Contents

Introduction

Change is always taking place throughout the different domains of languages, and the lexicon forms no exception. New words are added to the English language all the time and the chances are that you will stumble upon a word you have not seen before nearly every day. The lexicon of a language can change through three basic mechanisms: borrowing, word formation and semantic change. Recent academic discussions have focused on a special type of morpheme used in English word formation, generally referred to as final combining forms (e.g. Prćić, 2008) or 'splinters' (e.g. Callies, 2016). Take for example the word *shopaholic*, which is a combination of *shop* and *-aholic*; the second morpheme *-aholic* originates in the word *alcoholic*, from which it was split off and has subsequently been used in the formation of new words. Another one of these special formatives is *-scape*. Words ending in *-scape* can be found anywhere, from descriptions of *seascapes* and *mountainscapes* in travel guides, and pieces of art titled *Geoscape* or *Interscape* (Gold, 2002), to names of software and games like *Inkscape* and *RuneScape*.

It is generally known that *-scape* was derived from the word *landscape*; the English word *landscape* was borrowed from Dutch *landschap* around 1600 (Landscape, 2017). To avoid confusion, Gold (2002) notes that "Modern English *landscape* does not descend from Old English *landscipe* 'region', found … in Genesis B, a ninth-century translation of an Old Saxon passage" (p. 94). The meaning of new words that have been formed with *-scape* sometimes retain a strong connection to *landscape*, such as *seascape*; others have a more abstract meaning, such as *mindscape*. Compared to the Dutch suffix *-schap* with which the word *landschap* is formed, the English morpheme *-scape* has a completely different meaning as well as different morphological properties. Whereas Dutch *-schap* is normally used in derivation to designate a certain condition or status and thus has a rather abstract meaning, English *-scape* is usually associated with a certain view or picture, and hence has a more

lexical meaning (-scape, 2017; -schap, 2016). It thus appears that all three of the different types of processes involved in lexical change play a role in the development of *-scape*: borrowing, word formation, and semantic change. This raises the question of how and when these processes of change took place in order to give the morpheme *-scape* the characteristics it has today.

When we look for the history of *-scape* in literature, a gap seems to appear. The origins of the Dutch suffix *-schap* and its properties in word formation have been well discussed (Van Rompaey, 2013). However, little has been written on the borrowing process of the word *landschap* into English; it is merely mentioned that it was introduced as a term in painting (e.g. Gold, 2002). When and how exactly *-scape* came to be used in the formation of new words has not been investigated either, whereas the word formation properties of *-scape* in Present-Day English have been broadly covered in academic discourse (Callies, 2016; Gold, 2002; Lehrer, 1998). Consequently, a full overview of the processes that have taken place in the development from Dutch suffix *-schap* via *landschap* to the English morpheme *-scape* has hitherto never been given. Moreover, the properties of *-scape* have never been compared to the Dutch suffix *-schap*. The aim of this study is therefore to trace the borrowing process and the morphological and semantic development of the formative *-scape* over time, and to compare its properties in word formation to those of the Dutch suffix *-schap*. This diachronic investigation involves a qualitative analysis of data from the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) as well as four corpora of the English language, together ranging from 1600 to 1950. The present study explores in what ways the semantic and morphological properties of the Dutch formative *-schap* have changed during the development into the English formative *-scape*, and how these changes can be explained.

The first chapter provides a theoretical framework on the processes of borrowing, blending and the development of splinters. The second chapter addresses the development and

characteristics of the Dutch suffix *-schap* as well as the history of the word *landschap*. In the third chapter, the proceedings and findings of the corpus study are discussed. First, an analysis is given of the borrowing of *landscape*; secondly, an overview is given of the appearance of neologisms formed using *-scape*, which includes an analysis of the semantic and morphological characteristics of the morpheme; and thirdly, the changes that have taken place are discussed and explained. In the fourth chapter, further developments of *-scape* after 1950 are examined. The final chapter summarises the processes that have taken place in the diachronic development of *-scape* and includes suggestions for further research.

1. Theoretical Framework

1.1 Lexical Borrowing

When languages come into contact, there are different ways in which they can influence each other. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) identify two major processes in contact-induced language change: borrowing and change through shift. Language shift takes place when a group of speakers of one language shift to speaking a different language, and thereby bring elements from their native language into their new language. Borrowing, on the other hand, is defined by Thomason and Kaufman as "the incorporation of foreign features into a group's native language by speakers of that language" (p. 37). In situations of borrowing, the speakers of the different languages maintain their own native language but take over features from the other language. According to Thomason and Kaufman, it is the sociohistorical context of the language contact that decides the type and extent of the change that takes place. Based on a large number of case studies, they provide a borrowing scale indicating the order in which features are generally borrowed, which shows the expected amount and type of borrowing for different contact intensities (p. 74). The scale starts with 'casual contact', which is characterised by lexical borrowing of content words. The first items that are borrowed are always words which are usually terms for concepts which do not have an equivalent in the borrowing language; thus "non-basic vocabulary will be borrowed before basic vocabulary" (p. 74). In 'slightly more intense contact', function words and minor grammatical structures can be borrowed as well. It is only in 'more intense contact' that "derivational affixes may be abstracted from borrowed words and added to the native vocabulary" (p. 74). The scale goes on to list the order in which more structural features are borrowed, finally arriving at the situation of 'very strong cultural pressure' which involves "[m]ajor structural features that cause significant typological disruption" (p. 75).

In a study of loanwords from Low Germanic varieties in the English lexicon, Malášková (2012) found 234 Dutch loanwords that were borrowed into English between the thirteenth and the twentieth century. Her results show a peak in the number of new Dutch loanwords around 1600. None of the loanwords are grammatical, and from the type of lexical loanwords it can be concluded that "the historic contact areas between English and Low Germanic people were mainly concentrated on the nautical, commercial and military domains" (p. 213). If we focus on the influence of Dutch on English, we can conclude that, using the terms of Thomason and Kaufman, the contact situation can best be characterised as 'casual contact', which mainly involves borrowing of non-basic vocabulary.

Winford (2005) provides a slightly different framework of contact-induced language change, which is based on Van Coetsem (1988), who identifies two types of change: borrowing and imposition, the latter of which roughly corresponds to change through shift as defined by Thomason and Kaufman. Rather than the sociohistorical context in which the change takes place, Winford is concerned with agentivity. Borrowing is the result of agentivity of the recipient language (RL), which means that features from the source language (SL) are transferred to the RL via the RL speaker; on the other hand, agentivity of the SL results in imposition. Winford discusses two processes that lead to these outcomes. In borrowing, the first process that takes place is imitation: the agent approximates an element from the SL. The borrowed item then often undergoes a process of adaptation: it is assimilated to the RL phonology, syntax and morphology. These are usually the processes that take place in lexical borrowing; this means that "lexical borrowing typically adds new lexical items to the RL without affecting its structure" (pp. 384-385).

Regarding the morphological treatment of loanwords, Thomason and Kaufman note that "[t]ypically, though not always, the borrowed words are treated as stems in the borrowing language – that is, they take the usual affixes for the appropriate stem-class", even though

these loanwords may in fact already include affixes from the original language (p. 37).

Loanwords are thus often adapted to the morphology of the borrowing language. However, this is not always the case. Millar (2015) discusses several ways in which languages deal with inflecting loanwords for number and case. In English, many borrowed nouns, especially those of Latin or Greek origin, retain their foreign plurals; for instance, word pairs like *cactus-cacti* or *phenomenon-phenomena* have Latin and Greek plural inflections rather than the English plural *-s* (p. 24). These words are thus not adapted to English morphology, which sometimes leads to confusion; some plurals, like *bacteria*, are used as singular forms, or the other way around. Other plurals, like those of the words *anorak* and *pizza*, are formed with the regular English plural *-s*; these words are thus treated as stems and adapted to English morphology.

1.2 Blending

Languages not only acquire new words through borrowing, but also through the formation of words. There are several different ways in which new words, also called neologisms, can be created. Some examples of such mechanisms are compounding, which is "combining two (or more) existing words into a new word", such as *girl* and *friend* in *girlfriend*; derivation, "the process of creating words by adding affixes … to existing words", for example by adding the suffix *-ity* to the adjective *civil* to create the noun *civility*; and clipping, "extracting a word from a longer word of the same meaning", such as *phone* from *telephone* (Millar, 2015, pp. 26-29). Another important word-formation mechanism is blending, which is relevant for the present study. Millar defines blending as a "combination of compounding and clipping […] in which pieces of existing words are combined to make a new word"; some examples are *smog* from *smoke* and *fog*, and *Oxbridge* from *Oxford* and *Cambridge* (p. 29). Cannon (1986) gives an extensive overview of the scholarship on word formation in general and blending in particular. Based on a variety of terms and definitions used in the scholarship on blending,

Cannon gives the following description of a blend: "a blend involves a telescoping of two or more SEPARATE forms into one, or, rarely, a superposition of one form upon another. It usually contains overlapping and preserves some of the meaning of at least one of the source words, though sometimes so much of the roots are lost that a blend is unanalysable" (p. 730). As for its taxonomic place, Cannon notes the potential overlap blending can have with the word formation processes of compounding and derivation in the application of some scholars' definitions. He distinguishes the process of blending from compounding based on the condition that at least one of the source words needs to be shortened, whereas in compounding the full source words are combined. The difference between blending and derivation is that in derivation, at least one of the morphemes is an affix or combining form, which is not the case in blending. Cannon classes blending as a form of shortening, along with other forms of shortening such as abbreviation.

Blends can be formed as slips of the tongue "caused by the rise of two or more words […] to one's consciousness at the same time" (p. 732); these blends are usually regarded as mistakes and are not accepted into the language. Perhaps less common, but more viable than slips are consciously created blends, which "can fill a void in the lexicon where two related words do not individually convey all the producer's semantic wishes" (p. 733). In a quantitative investigation into the structure of English blends, Gries (2004) analyses the relation between intentional blends and their source words in terms of structure. Looking at the contribution of each source word to the blend's graphemic or phonemic characteristics, he concludes that "the structure is governed by a desire to guarantee the recognizability of both source words" (p. 661). With regard to the similarity between the blend and its source words, he finds that "both intentional blends and speech-error blends exhibit a much higher degree of similarity to their source words than blends created randomly", which means that similarity to the source words is a decisive factor in the blend formation process (p. 662).

If a blend successfully combines two words to give them a new combined meaning, it has a chance of being taken over by other speakers or writers and eventually being accepted into the language. Many blends are short-lived and disappear before they enter the lexicon of the language; some, however, are used rather frequently, for example words like *motel* (from *motor* and *hotel*) and *brunch* (from *breakfast* and *lunch*) (Millar, 2015, p. 29). Cannon notes that successful blends like these can affect the language. As the meaning of a blend does not always exactly transmit the original meaning of the source words, its etymology may become obscure; as a result, "blending can help to give a new meaning to an old morpheme […] or can help to create a new morpheme" (p. 732). Cannon explains that people hearing or reading a blend may reinterpret a part of it as an affix, which "may be on the way toward becoming a new affix, which might become productive" (p. 734). Some examples he gives of such affixes in English are *-burger* and *-thon*; however, these morphemes are nowadays not usually referred to as affixes, as will be discussed in the following section.

1.3 Splinters in English Word Formation

Recent studies have looked at a special type of formative in the English language, generally referred to as final combining forms (Lehrer, 1998; Prćić, 2008) or 'splinters' (Callies, 2016; Lehrer, 1998); these formatives are productive bound morphemes that are thought to have arisen as the result of blending. For example, the blend *shopaholic* (from *shop* and *alcoholic*) has given rise to the new productive bound morpheme *-(a)holic*, which is subsequently used in other new words. The English language has three generally recognised types of bound morphemes: roots, affixes and combining forms. Lehrer (1998) explains a few differences between these different types. Combining forms are usually found in neoclassical compounds (compounds formed using Greek or Latin borrowings), such as both *tele-* and *-scope* in *telescope*. Combining forms differ from affixes in that they express highly lexical meaning,

whereas affixes have a more restricted meaning. The difference between combining forms and roots is that roots can combine with affixes, whereas combining forms can only combine with other combining forms or words. However, Lehrer argues that morphemes like *-holic* cannot correctly be classified as one of these three types of bound morphemes. In several earlier discussions, formatives like these are referred to as 'final combining forms' (e.g. Aldrich, 1966), which places them in the same category as combining forms in neoclassical compounds. Lehrer first refers to these formatives as 'combining forms' as well, but later applies the term 'splinters'. She distinguishes these morphemes from neoclassical combining forms because "splinters from blends retain a connection to their source words", which is not the case in neoclassical compounds (p. 16). Her study demonstrates that the source word of a splinter usually retains a superordinate status; for example, *-(a)thon* remains more closely bound to its source word *marathon* than to the neologism *bikathon* (p. 11).

Prćić (2008) offers a broader set of criteria than Lehrer for distinguishing final combining forms (FCFs) from suffixes (namely category membership, distinctive form and structure, cooccurrence restrictions, syntactic function, head-modifier relation, semantic meaning, morphosemantic patterning and productivity). I refer to Prćić for a further explanation of these criteria. Prćić also discusses bound morphemes like *-holic* and defines them as 'modern FCFs' as opposed to the 'classical FCFs', some of which "can be said to belong to the buffer-zone category of suffixized FCFs" based on their morphosemantic patterning and productivity (p. 16). Prćić thus decides on placing productive bound morphemes from blends under FCFs or in a grey area between FCFs and suffixes.

Callies (2016) endeavours to disentangle the variety in terminology applied to the formatives over time and eventually decides on the term 'splinter', which distinguishes these morphemes from combining forms most clearly. Before he applies this term, he investigates the origin of this type of formative. He argues that splinters arise through a sequence of

various processes. He admits that a process of blending may explain the first neologisms with endings like *-thon* and *-holic*, but it "cannot explain the large number of neologisms observed as it does not give rise to a productive pattern" (p. 6). He argues for a process of 'secretion', which means that a morpheme is extracted from its source word. The morphology of the source word is subject to a 're-segmentation', by which (part of) the semantic content of the source word is retained in the extracted morpheme. Millar (2015) discusses this process using the term 'reanalysis', which he describes as "interpreting a word as having a structure that is not historically valid and hence obtaining a new morpheme for use in coining other words" (p. 30). This simple process of morphological change is thus based on speakers' misconceptions about the structure of a word.

Callies' classification of bound morphemes distinguishes between affixes, roots, and combining forms based on the two criteria of combinability and lexical content. Based on three main characteristics, he argues that morphemes like *-thon* form a new type of bound morpheme. Firstly, these morphemes are highly productive in word formation and may lose their connection to their source words. Secondly, their combinatorial properties resemble those of combining forms, but differ from roots and affixes. Splinters can be combined with free morphemes (such as nouns), with combining forms, or with other splinters. Finally, in contrast to affixes and combining forms, which have inherent meanings, "splinters as originally non-morphemic elements are only interpreted as meaningful due to reanalysis of the structure of the original word", thereby taking over semantic content from the source word (p. 12). Callies also notes that using these morphemes in the formation of new words usually involves semantic change. From his discussion of the terminology in the literature, he concludes that the term 'splinter' "is preferable for these morphemes since it marks a new type of bound morpheme and, because of the metaphorical use of the word […] accounts for the fact that these new formatives are the result of secretion, i.e. morphological re-analysis"

(p. 11). Given that both Lehrer and Prćić are unclear in their application of the terminology, I adopt Callies' terms and definitions in my analysis of the morpheme *-scape*.

Callies also examines the word formation processes involving splinters. As mentioned earlier, he regards blending as "plausible for the initial stages" only (p. 14). As for the possible formation of new words based on analogy with a model word, he argues that splinters "have become meaningful and recognisable, giving rise to a regular, productive pattern in which reference to a model lexeme by analogy is no longer necessary" (pp. 14-15). Callies suggests that it is possible to classify word formation with splinters as compounding, based on three arguments: the combinatorial properties of splinters and neo-classical combining forms are very similar; in addition, the second element in a compound with a splinter (which is usually the splinter itself) semantically modifies the first element, just like in compounds; and finally, if the splinter is used productively in word formation it may eventually become a free morpheme. This last argument reflects a process of degrammaticalisation, and more specifically of 'debonding', which means that a bound morpheme becomes a free morpheme. This process is thus the reverse of grammaticalisation of morphologisation, in which a free word becomes a bound morpheme.

Callies notes that splinters may arise in other languages than English and that some English splinters have been borrowed into other languages. The splinter *-gate*, he observes, has been used in the largest number of languages, including German, Dutch, Polish, Greek and Arabian (p. 19). However, the possible involvement of language contact in the development of splinters is not discussed in the literature; the present paper will therefore comment on this process.

2. Historical Background of Dutch -*Schap* and *Landschap*

As the morpheme -*scape* entered English via the Dutch word *landschap*, the morphological

and semantic properties of this word need to be investigated. Dutch *landschap* was formed

from the noun *land* ('land') and the abstract suffix -*schap* (Lantscap, 2000); Dutch *land* and

English *land* are clearly cognates, and the Dutch suffix -*schap* is cognate with English -*ship*

(-ship, 2017). Van Rompaey (2013) gives a diachronic account of the development of the

Dutch suffix -*schap*. Like English -*ship*, this suffix originates in the Indo-European noun

*skap ('creation', 'creature'). This IE noun existed in similar forms in several old Germanic

languages; consider for example the Old English noun *gesceap* ('appearance'), which retained

this original meaning quite closely. The meaning of IE *skap became the subject of a process

called "desemantization" or "semantic attrition"; its meaning bleached to the more general

'kind', 'sort' (p. 89). A crucial stage in the development of the suffix was when the noun was

used in compounds. These compounds "fused when the syntagmatic combination became

entrenched in the mental lexicon" as a whole, which resulted in the loss of the syntactic

freedom of the morpheme (p. 90); what was first a noun and thus a free morpheme became a

bound morpheme. This process in which an independent word becomes a bound morpheme is

known as morphologisation. The morpheme in question not only lost its syntactic freedom,

but also its original meaning as "the abstract meaning (e.g. -*scap*/-*scip*, 'state') became

permanently coded in the emerging suffix" (p. 90). However, this transition from noun to

bound morpheme is rather fuzzy. Van Rompaey notes that in Middle Dutch, *scape* could be

used both with its original meaning of 'creature', 'kind' as a free morpheme and stand-alone

noun and as a suffix with a more abstract meaning in the compound *ridderscape*

('knightship') within a single sentence. She explains that "the co-occurrence of the

autonomous word and the suffix is probably due to divergent language processes in which one

path led to the emergence of the suffix and another to the Middle Dutch noun *schape*

('creature', 'kind')" (p. 90). This means that in Middle Dutch, in the independent use of the noun *schape* the original meaning and morphology was retained; the word thus only morphologised when it was used in a compound. Finally, the suffix that had emerged underwent some phonological changes; due to its semantic abstractness, which caused primary stress to be placed on the base of the word, final *-e* in *-scap(e)* was lost. Palatalization and unrounding caused the /a/ to develop into an /i/ in western dialects of Dutch; here, *-scip* remained in use until the original /a/ variant from central Dutch dialects took over in the seventeenth century (p. 91).

In the data from corpus research carried out by Van Rompaey, the first attestation of a compound with *schap* is Old Dutch *waterskap*, which can literally be translated as 'place where water is being created' (p. 110). Van Rompaey does not give a date, but according to the *Oudnederlands Woordenboek* (*Old Dutch Dictionary*) the word is first attested in 709 (Watarskap, 2009). The morpheme *schap* is first used as a suffix in the twelfth-century form *heithinskap*, in which *-skap* has a more abstract meaning; it indicates the status of 'being a heathen' rather than a kind of creation (p. 111). In Early Middle Dutch, the suffix is mainly used in derivations referring to specific professions, such as *coepmanscap* 'merchantship'. However, the suffix is also often used in words regarding social status or family relationship, such as *broederscap* 'brotherhood', "which may relate to the family relationship as well as to '(spiritual) solidarity'" (p. 111). From the thirteenth century, the suffix was used not only in combination with nominal bases, but also with adjectives or past participles, forming deadjectival quality nouns. Some examples are *ghemeenscap* 'fellowship' formed with the adjective *ghemeen* and *dronkenschap* 'being drunk' formed with the past participle *dronken*. Although the forming of deadjectival nouns ended in the sixteenth century, Van Rompaey suggests "that deadjectival *-schap* influenced the semantics of the denominal pattern, as even some denominal derivations came to refer to a quality instead of a rank or status" (p. 112).

However, new denominal derivations referring to professions kept emerging in the sixteenth and seventeenth century; some examples are *burgemeesterschap* 'mayoralty' and *colonelschap* 'colonelship'. In addition, in the late sixteenth century a new pattern of deverbal derivations emerged, many of which became act nouns, such as *zeggenschap* (derived from the infinitive *zeggen*, 'to say') which assumed the meaning 'the act of saying something'. However, due to competition with another suffix, "act nouns in *-schap* have known a very short productive period," resulting in the fast lexicalisation and semantic specialisation of many deverbal derivations, with *zeggenschap* now meaning 'the right to decide' the (p. 113). In the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, *-schap* remained productive mainly in derivations referring to professions. Van Rompaey notes that the meanings of some words became more concrete; she explains for example that "[l]ocative concretisations of derivations in *-schap* could refer to an area or an institute", with *graafschap* referring not to the status of a count (*graaf*) but rather to the county over which he rules (p. 114). Another example of a concretisation is *vriendschap* 'friendship', which could also denote 'a favour' in the sense of *een vriendschap doen* 'to do someone a favour'; however, this last meaning is no longer in use (p. 114). In some derivations, *-schap* has been reinterpreted by speakers of Northern dialects as part of a compound and could thus be extracted as a free lexical morpheme, meaning 'organisation' or 'institute'. For example, "*productschap* refers to an organisation of enterprises which process the same material or 'product'" (p. 115). Thus, the free morpheme that originated as an IE noun and in Dutch became a suffix via compounding has in some contexts regained its status as a free morpheme with a new meaning.

The suffix *-schap* was used in the derivation of *landschap* from the noun *land* 'land'. According to the *Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek* (*Early Middle Dutch Dictionary*), which is based on thirteenth-century records, the denominal derivation *lantscap* is first attested in 1240 (Lantscap, 2000). The word could mean 'land', 'realm', 'region', 'homeland',

or it could refer to the 'inhabitants of a land'[1]. The *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (*Middle Dutch Dictionary*), which roughly covers the period from 1250 to 1550, lists similar meanings (Lantscap, 1998). The *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (*Dictionary of the Dutch Language*, *WNT*), covering the language from 1500 to 1976, lists the original meanings of a land within certain borders (such as 'realm' or 'region') as archaic, and the meaning regarding the belonging to a certain land (as 'inhabitants of a land') as rare (Landschap, 1998). The third meaning that *landschap* has taken on is that of "an expanse of land that one can oversee in a single look, and which one has before one's eyes, possibly including villages or small towns" (Landschap, 1998). Over time, the meaning of *landschap* has thus slowly shifted from denoting a certain land or area to denoting a piece of land as it is viewed. This change in meaning resembles the concretisation of some other words ending in -*schap*, such as *graafschap* and *vriendschap* mentioned earlier. Rather than referring to a piece of land limited by certain political or natural borders, *landschap* came to refer to a piece of land as far as it is actually visible. The concretisation of *landschap* possibly went even further when it became used by artists as a technical term for drawings or paintings of the view of a land. The *WNT* does not list this as a separate meaning for *landschap*, but rather as a sub-meaning under the third meaning; the first attestation the *WNT* gives of *landschap* as denoting a picture of the view of a land is from 1604. The *WNT* also mentions some compounds with *landschap* in this sense, among which are *landschapsprent* 'landscape print' and *landschapschilder* 'landscape painter'; the *WNT* gives attestations of these compounds in 1657 and 1641, respectively. The word *landschap* as the view of a land is also used as the second part of various compounds such as *avondlandschap* 'evening landscape', *berglandschap* 'mountain landscape' and *winterlandschap* 'winter landscape' (Landschap, 1998).

---

[1] All translations from Dutch to English are my own.

The *Dikke van Dale* dictionary of Present-Day Dutch lists three meanings for *landschap*: firstly, it refers to a piece of land as it viewed; secondly, it is used in the figurative sense of 'stage' (for example in *het politieke landschap*, 'the political landscape'); and thirdly, *landschap* can denote "a painting that represents a landscape" (Landschap, 2016). The first and third meaning in the *Van Dale* correspond to what the *WNT* listed as the third and principle meaning of *landschap*, and its sub-meaning of a picture representing this view. The second meaning in the *Van Dale*, however, reflects the possibility in Present-Day Dutch of using *landschap* in a more abstract sense, to refer to a certain field of interest.

3. The Development of *-Scape* from 1600 to 1950

3.1 Data and Method

To be able to give a full overview of the development of *-scape*, the first uses of *landscape* in the English language were investigated, as well as the neologisms formed with the element *-scape* up until 1950. Neologisms formed using *-scape* after 1950 have already been widely discussed in the literature (e.g. Aldrich, 1966; Callies, 2016; Gold, 2002). In this study, two corpora were searched for attestations of *landscape*. The corpus used for attestations before 1700 was *Early English Books Online* (*EEBO*); this corpus contains books published in English around the world between 1473 and 1700 (ProQuest, 1998). For attestations of the word *landscape* after 1700 up to around 1800, the corpus *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (*ECCO*) was used (Gale, 2017). This corpus contains works printed in Britain during the eighteenth century. These corpora were searched for the word *landscape* and its variant spellings, in both singular and plural forms; conveniently, the corpora allow searches to include variant spellings. The spelling used in my search in *EEBO* was *landscape*, which automatically generated all possible variant spellings; *ECCO* was searched for *landschap*, *landscape*, *landskip*, *lantskap* and *landship*, which together generated nearly all the possible variant spellings given in the *OED*.

To investigate the use of *-scape* in neologisms, *EEBO* and *ECCO* were searched as well as two other corpora; for the period of 1800 to 1950, the databases that were searched are *Nineteenth Century UK Periodicals* (Shattock, 2008) and *The Times Digital Archive* (Gale, 2012). The former is a collection of British periodicals published in the nineteenth century; the latter contains issues of the British daily newspaper *The Times* from its first publication in 1785 up to 2011. Of course, the possibilities for neologisms in *-scape* are endless. To limit my search in the corpora I compiled a list of the earliest common neologisms with *-scape*, and looked for attestations of those words. This list is based on Gold (2002), who discusses

various neologisms given in the literature on *-scape* or found in his own research; the neologisms given in his article were compared to the *OED*, to determine which neologisms were formed between 1600 and 1950. Thirty-three of the neologisms mentioned by Gold were first attested before 1950 according to the *OED*; fifteen of these were selected for the present study. The following list of neologisms were investigated: *cityscape*, *dreamscape*, *inscape*, *lovescape*, *marinescape*, *mindscape*, *moonscape*, *nightscape*, *offscape*, *rockscape*, *roofscape*, *seascape*, *skyscape*, *snowscape*, and *streetscape*. The neologisms were searched in four different forms: ending in *-skip* and ending in *-scape*, and spelled with or without a hyphen. This gives, for example, the search terms *seaskip*, *sea-skip*, *seascape*, and *sea-scape*.

The following sections will provide a chronological overview of the words found in the corpora and other attestations given in the *OED*. In addition, a qualitative analysis of these words is given to shed light on the semantic and morphological properties of these forms. In the first section, the word *landscape* will be discussed and compared to the Dutch word *landschap*; the second section will focus on the English neologisms ending in *-scape*; and finally, the differences between Dutch *-schap* and English *-scape* will be explained.

3.2 Analysis

3.2.1 The Introduction of *Landscape* in the English Language

On the etymology of the word *landscape*, the *OED* notes that "[t]he word was introduced as a technical term of painters; the corrupt form in *-skip* was according to our quots. a few years earlier than the more correct form" (Landscape, 2017). The *OED* lists its first attestation of *landscape* in 1605, whereas *landskip* was attested a few years earlier in 1598. The search in *EEBO* yielded nine distinctive results, all of which contained attestations in the form *landskip*; no other spellings were found. The first attestation in this corpus is from 1647, in a handbook of drawing and painting. Among other things, the title page of this book advertises "directions

for birds, beasts, landskips, ships, and the like" (Jenner, 1647). All other occurrences of *landskip* are found between 1670 and 1698; in all of these instances, the word is used to refer to paintings or prints in catalogues of images or handbooks for artists or architects. This confirms that the term was introduced in the context of painting, and indicates that it remained in use solely as a technical term for at least a century after it was first borrowed.

If we look at the attestations in *ECCO*, we find various forms and spellings of the word, among which are *lantskip*, *landskip*, *landschap(e)* and *landscape*; all of these are found throughout the eighteenth century. Most them are used in a similar context as the attestations in *EEBO*, referring to landscape painting, although the word is also used in a few other contexts, for example in books on poetry and drama. In the context of poems, *landscape* often refers to natural scenes in reality rather than to images representing such scenes; this is already the case for poetry from the beginning of the eighteenth century. However, the use of the word *landscape* to refer to a natural scene still sometimes retains its connection to drawing or painting, for example in poetry by Dryden containing the line: "And draw the distant Landscape as they please" (qtd. in Bysshe, 1702, p. 146). In later books, the word is increasingly used free from its context of painting as simply referring to a view of land. It is also sometimes used with more abstract meanings, such as in a book of sermons by William Davy, who writes about a "moral Landskip" (1807, p. 416). However, throughout the eighteenth century, painting remains an important context in which the word *landscape* is used. These semantic developments of *landscape* found in the corpora correspond to the meanings given in the *OED*, as the *OED* lists the first attestations under the meaning of '[a] picture representing natural inland scenery' and later attestations starting around 1700 under the meaning of '[a] view or prospect of natural inland scenery' (Landscape, 2017).

Apart from the expected spelling variations, *ECCO* also gives five different attestations of the form *landship*, ending in the cognate of Dutch *-schap*. Interestingly, these

are all taken from foreign dictionaries, except for one attestation in a poem by John Dyer.

Most of the dictionaries, although not all of them, are compiled by native speakers of other

languages than English. The fact that a number of attestations in ending *-ship* is found

suggests that during the assimilation process of the loanword *landschap*, some speakers

adapted the word to English by translating the suffix *-schap* into its English cognate *-ship*.

The English cognate of the Dutch noun *land* is spelled the same, although it is pronounced

differently. The word *landship* could thus be analysed as a loan translation. However, this

word is used in fewer instances than the adapted loanword *landscape*, and does not survive in

Present-Day English.

If we compare the semantics of the English word *landscape* in these corpora to the

semantics of the Dutch original *landschap*, we can see some similarities; both *landschap* and

landscape can refer to either a view or prospect of land or to a picture of such a view. In the

Dutch word, the latter meaning was derived from the former, dominant meaning. However,

the word was borrowed into English as a technical term in painting, thus carrying the second

meaning. We later see that *landscape* is also used in a more general sense, referring to a real-

life view of scenery. In English, the dominant meaning of the original Dutch word was thus

derived from the pictorial semantics, to which it retained a connection long after the word was

first borrowed.

3.2.2 The First Uses of *-Scape* in English Word Formation

The first attestation given by the *OED* of the neologisms formed with *-scape* under scrutiny in

the present study is that of *offscape* in 1711 (Offscape, 2017). Correspondingly, *EEBO* has

yielded no results for the neologisms in the list. This suggests that *-scape* was not used in the

formation of neologisms before 1700, or hardly used. It is possible that some words were

already being formed with *-scape* before 1700, but these words did not survive long enough to

make it to the *OED*, like the words in our list. *ECCO*, on the other hand, yielded quite a few

results for the neologisms *offscape* and *seascape* and their variant forms. The first attestation

is that of *sea-skip* in 1726, and *offskip* is first attested in 1738; these words are increasingly

used throughout the eighteenth century. I also found one attestation of *rockscape* (in the form

rock-skip) from 1754, which is in fact from the same document as the first attestation of the

word given in the *OED*. The meanings of these words already deviate from the original

meaning of *landscape* in English, namely that of a certain kind of picture; however, a

semantic connection to painting often remains intact to some extent. An *offscape* or a

seascape is not necessarily a type of painting, but the words are rather used to refer to certain

elements within an image. For instance, in a description of a landscape painting by

Rembrandt, Daniel Daulby (1796) writes: "In the front of the canal, a fore-ground extends

from the right, to the middle of the piece. In the off-skip is a village, in which is a church with

a low tower steeple" (p. 147). This connection with painting is not always present, however;

the words can also refer to certain views in real-life or as described in, for example, poetry. In

his commentary on the epic poem *Orlando Furioso* by Ariosto, William Huggins (1757)

writes: "What an unexpected, astonishing opening of his final canto, by throwing before us

such an immense seascape, enrich'd with such a croud, such a variety of figures, described

with such amazing fire" (p. 79). Here, the *seascape* refers to a scene in the poem rather than

(part of) an actual picture.

Turning to our nineteenth-century corpus, we see only one attestation of *offscape*,

which seems to have almost died out; on the other hand, the word *seascape* starts to flourish,

especially from the 1870s onward. In addition, a few new words are introduced in the second

half of the nineteenth century; from the list in this study the words *streetscape*, *roofscape*,

skyscape, and *snowscape* are found. The successful word *seascape* is used either to refer to a

picture of the sea or to refer to an actual view of the sea; the neologism *seascape* has thus

acquired the same dual function in English as the word *landscape*. The first meaning of the

word is demonstrated by many descriptions of exhibitions, for example in the description of

works in McLean's Gallery given in the periodical *Fun*: "There are good examples in

landscape […] and a 'squally' seascape by Edwin Ellis" ("Picture shows", 1890, p. 138).

Furthermore, with the introduction of photography, *seascape* as a technical term for certain

paintings and drawings can now also be applied to photos. The second meaning of the word

(of a *seascape* as a real-life view) is nicely illustrated by the description of the island of Arran

as "a piece and factor of some of the grandest seascape and landscape in the world" ("The

angler in Arran", 1900, p. 252). In line with these functions of *seascape*, of the two

attestations of *snowscape* in this nineteenth-century corpus, one reflects the pictorial

semantics, whereas the other reflects the meaning of a view in reality. However, the word

skyscape is only used to refer to real-life views, as are the single attestations of *streetscape*

and *roofscape*. These words therefore seem to have been formed in analogy with *landscape*

and *seascape* as denoting real-life views, independent of their technical meaning in painting.

Finally, in the archive of *The Times*, all neologisms in the list are found except for

offscape, which had already fallen out of use in the nineteenth century. Although this corpus

spans the period from 1785 to 2011, only a few of the neologisms were attested before the

second half of the twentieth century. These words are *seascape*, *skyscape*, *snowscape*, and

streetscape, and the new words *nightscape* and *lovescape* (first attested in 1912 and 1936,

respectively). The words *seascape*, *skyscape*, *snowscape* and *streetscape* are all much more

widely used from first half of the twentieth century onwards than in the nineteenth century,

especially *seascape*, which has become firmly established in the English lexicon. Both

seascape and *snowscape* retain their two meanings and *streetscape* and *skyscape* are now also

incidentally applied to paintings as well as real-life views, for example in this description of a

painting from an exhibition of the East London Group: "If it is said that 'Bow Road,' by Miss

Grace Oscroft, slightly recalls Utrillo, it is not to suggest imitation, but to describe

conveniently a somewhat similar approach to 'streetscape'" ("East London Group", 1929, p. 10). The neologism *nightscape* is only attested once before 1950, namely in a 1912 description of the land around the river Wissey: "The country here is not unlike portions of East Prussia. In the dim darkness of night the nightscape is almost identical" ("Outpost attack at dawn", p. 7); in this case, *nightscape* denotes the land as it appears in hours of darkness. Curiously, the only attestations of *lovescape* before 1950 are those in which it is used as a name for a racing horse, from which we cannot derive any conclusions about the meaning of the word; only in 1989 the word is used to describe the setting of a film, which "could be a view of any other lovescape; homosexuality here is the norm" (Franks, 1989, p. 29); here, *lovescape* thus refers to the sexual norm in a film. The remaining words in the list are all attested after 1950; these words are *mindscape* (first attested in 1955), *inscape* (1960), *roofscape* (returning in 1960 after its single attestation in 1889), *cityscape* (1964), *moonscape* (1964), *marinescape* (1974), *dreamscape* (1978) and *rockscape* (which returns in 1986 after a gap of more than two hundred years). Just like the earlier attested neologisms, these words are all increasingly used the closer we come to the present day.

In summary, the semantics of the neologisms formed with -*scape* between 1700 and 1950 have generally developed from denoting (parts of) a certain kind of landscape painting to denoting views or settings in reality, while often retaining or later acquiring the use of the words as a technical term in the visual arts. In these neologisms, the morpheme -*scape* could therefore best be described as a view or prospect, which is further specified by the noun or prefix that forms the first part of the newly formed word; for example, a *seascape* is a view of the sea and a *streetscape* is the prospect of a street. However, in few of the new words, the whole meaning of *landscape* is retained in the element -*scape*. This is the case for the word *snowscape*, which is not simply a view of snow, but rather a view of land covered in snow; the same goes for *nightscape*, which is the prospect of land during the night-time. The

neologisms ending in -*scape* formed before 1950 can thus either denote a kind of view or a kind of landscape.

Having established the semantics of -*scape* in these neologisms, its morphological properties need to be determined. The attestations of neologisms ending in -*scape* throughout time demonstrate the development of -*scape* as a splinter, which can now be traced step by step. The first neologisms *offscape* and *seascape* can be characterised as blends of the prefix *off*- and the noun *sea* with the noun *landscape*; these blends were consciously created in the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century, the blend *seascape* became very successful and was accepted into the language. By then, the original abstract meaning of the Dutch suffix -*schap* had become obscure and -*scape* was reinterpreted as denoting a type of prospect or landscape; -*scape* consequently became a productive morpheme and was used in the formation of several new words, such as *skyscape* and *snowscape*. During the twentieth century, more and more words were formed with this morpheme, establishing -*scape* as a highly productive bound morpheme.

Using the terminology from Callies (2016), the morpheme -*scape* as part of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century neologisms can be analysed as a splinter, because its development corresponds to the development of splinters as outlined by Callies; the process starts with the blending of *landscape* with other words, for instance with *sea* in *seascape*, and later the splinter -*scape* is extracted from these words and used productively in the formation of numerous new words, as in *skyscape* and *nightscape*. In addition, the morphological and semantic properties of -*scape* are typical for splinters, for example regarding its combinatorial possibilities and the fact that its semantic content is derived from the meaning of the source word *landscape*. The fact that -*scape* retains some of the original meaning of 'view' from *landscape* also ties in with the characteristic of splinters that they retain a connection with their source word, as mentioned by Lehrer (1998).

3.3 Explaining Semantic and Morphological Changes

If we compare the splinter -*scape* to the Dutch morpheme from which it originates, we can see some major differences. Semantically, -*scape* has much more lexical content than Dutch -*schap*, as well as a different meaning. Whereas the Dutch morpheme -*schap* generally has an abstract meaning referring to a certain status or condition, the English morpheme -*scape* usually means something like 'prospect, view' or 'picture of a view'. Moreover, the meaning of the Dutch morpheme can eventually be traced back to the meaning of the IE noun **skap*, whereas the English morpheme derives its meaning entirely from the source word *landscape* from which it was extracted; it should be noted, however, that the English suffix -*ship* 'state, condition' or 'office, position' is cognate with the Dutch suffix -*schap* and shows a similar semantic and morphological development (-ship, 2017). Morphologically, -*scape* belongs to an entirely different class of bound morphemes than both -*schap* and -*ship*, because -*scape* has different combinatorial possibilities in word formation and functions as a productive splinter rather than an affix.

All the above raises the question why -*scape* has such different characteristics to -*schap*. The most important changes took place during the borrowing process, or perhaps earlier. It could be argued that even before the word was borrowed, the suffix -*schap* in *landschap* did not refer to a status or condition anymore, as according to the *WNT*, the most important meaning of *landschap* was "an expanse of land that one can oversee in a single look", under which the use of the word as a painting term is listed (Landschap, 1998). In this use of *landschap* as a stretch of land that can be viewed, -*schap* could be interpreted as a 'view, prospect'. However, it is doubtful whether this meaning of *landschap* had already replaced earlier meanings like 'region' in Dutch when the word was borrowed into English around 1600, because the *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (*Middle Dutch Dictionary*), which is based on texts up to 1550, does not list the meaning 'view' at all (Lantscap, 1998).

We can therefore not be sure whether *-schap* still had an abstract meaning in Dutch *landschap* at the time of borrowing. In any case, when the word was borrowed into English, the original meaning of the Dutch suffix *-schap* as 'status, condition' was not transferred because the word was borrowed as a technical painting term for a picture of a view of land. Consequently, English blends with *landscape* such as *seascape* denoted a picture or view as well. The change in meaning of *-schap* that took place either shortly before or during the borrowing process, together with the fact that the English language already had the abstract suffix *-ship*, provided the possibility for reanalysis of the morpheme *-scape* as referring to a view or a painting of a view.

It may be argued that the semantic and morphological reanalysis would never have taken place if the loan translation *landship* ending in the suffix *-ship* had been more widely used than *landscape*, because the etymology of *landship* would be more transparent to speakers of English. The reason is that the abstract suffix *-ship*, which is cognate with Dutch *-schap*, already existed in English and would therefore not likely have been reinterpreted as denoting a type of view, as is the case for the morpheme *-scape*, which did not yet exist in the English language. Speakers might rather have analysed *landship* as a derivation of *land* using the suffix *-ship*, which had taken on a more specialised meaning. The way in which a word is adapted to the recipient language during the borrowing process (as discussed by Winford, 2005) may thus have far-reaching consequences, like the development of a new morpheme.

4. Developments of *-Scape* after 1950

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, numerous new words ending in *-scape* are first attested after 1950. This increased productivity of *-scape* and similar morphemes is exactly what started the academic debate on splinters in the late twentieth century. Looking at the results from the corpus investigation, which mainly focused on the period before 1950, some later developments in attestations from *The Times Digital Archive* attract attention. First, the coining of the word *mindscape* points at a broader application of the splinter, as the mind is not usually regarded as something of which you can have a view or picture. A *mindscape* generally refers to a visualisation of an idea from the imagination. Similarly, the word *dreamscape* is used for images that seem to be taken from a dream rather than something that can be seen in real life. Second, words ending in *-scape* can now also refer to non-visual images, such as auditory images. The words *nightscape* and *dreamscape* are repeatedly used with reference to musical compositions, for example in this description of Ravel's *Mother Goose* suite: "This was an alternative dreamscape, with drifting images from flutes and clarinets, and with sumptuous yet limpid textures from the strings" (Griffiths, 1978, p. 11). These developments thus involve an increasing abstractness of the semantics of neologisms formed using *-scape*.

Another possible development is the degrammaticalisation of *-scape* towards the free lexeme *scape*. Although *scape* as a free lexeme was not included in the present study, Callies (2016) mentions that as well as some other splinters, *scape* can now be used as a noun meaning 'view, picture or scenery' (p. 15). Interestingly, this development is similar to the degrammaticalisation of the Dutch suffix *-schap* as a noun meaning 'organisation, institute', as described by Van Rompaey (2013). Both Dutch *-schap* and English *-scape* can thus be used as bound morpheme or as noun.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to investigate the ways in which the semantic and morphological characteristics of the Dutch suffix *-schap* have changed during the development into the English splinter *-scape*, and to explain these changes. The diachronic development of *-scape* can be summarised as follows. In the thirteenth century, the Dutch abstract suffix *-schap* was used in the formation of the Dutch word *landschap*. The word *landschap* had different meanings over time, and it acquired the function of technical term referring to landscape paintings somewhere around 1600. The word was quickly borrowed into English, carrying this meaning connected to drawing or painting; the assimilation process eventually led to the English word *landscape*. About a century later, *landscape* acquired a second meaning, derived from the first, namely that of a real-life prospect or view. Around the same time, the word was first used in the blends *offscape* and *seascape*, often in connection to painting. Consequently, the splinter *-scape* was extracted from the word *landscape* and its blends, and used in the formation of new words. The productivity of the splinter kept increasing throughout the following centuries, and the splinter could either mean 'prospect, view' or 'picture of a view', which is further specified by the word to which *-scape* is attached. In addition, since 1950 the splinter has been used in a more abstract sense in word formation, and it is also sometimes used independently as a free lexeme. All in all, the different processes involved in the semantic and morphological changes from Dutch *-schap* to English *-scape* (and *scape*) include borrowing, blending, semantic broadening, reanalysis, and degrammaticalisation.

Whereas the involvement of language contact in the development of splinters has not been discussed in earlier studies, this study demonstrates the importance of the borrowing process in the development of the splinter *-scape*. Firstly, splinters arise out of misconceptions about the etymology of words, which can be due to an incomplete or incorrect transfer of the meaning of loanwords. In this case, the specific meaning of *landschap* as a type of painting

that was transferred in the borrowing process obscured the original meaning of the affix *-schap*, which led to the semantic reanalysis of English *-scape* and thus to the development of the splinter. Secondly, different types of assimilation of a loanword to the borrowing language may lead to different degrees of influence on the language, as has been argued regarding the alternative assimilation of *landschap* as *landship*. As *-scape* is not the only splinter extracted from a loanword, it is possible that the borrowing process contributed to the development of other splinters as well, for example of the morpheme *-(a)thon* in words like *bikathon* (from the Greek loanword *marathon*). Future studies could consider the origin of other splinters, to further investigate the importance of borrowing and to establish which other processes of change might play a role in the development of this type of bound morpheme.

A limitation of the present study involves the list of neologisms ending in *-scape* that were searched in the corpora. Callies (2016) points out that splinters are used in "a high proportion of low-frequency words, most of them hapax legomena" (words that only occur once) (p. 3); he explains that these words are important in demonstrating the productivity of a splinter. However, the list of neologisms that were searched only contains words that have been used often enough to enter the *OED*; hapax legomena were not included in this study. In addition, the present paper did not consider the possible use of *scape* as a free lexeme. Future studies could investigate this recent degrammaticalisation of *-scape* and other splinters. Furthermore, this study did not discuss the use of *scape* as a verb in words such as *landscaping*, which can refer either to the depicting or the designing of a landscape, or in neologisms like *ladyscaping*, in which *scape* seems to mean 'to design, style' or 'to shape'. Future research could shed light on this development.

References

Aldrich, R. I. (1966). The development of "-scape". *American Speech, 41*, 155-157.

doi:10.2307/453137

Bysshe, E. (1702). *The art of English poetry.* London, England: R. Knaplock, E. Castle, and

B. Tooke. Retrieved from tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4smrx2

Callies, M. (2016). Of soundscapes, talkathons and shopaholics: On the status of a new type

of formative in English (and beyond). *STUF-Language Typology and Universals*, *69*,

495-516. doi:10.1515/stuf-2016-0021

Cannon, G. (1986). Blends in English word formation. *Linguistics*, *24*, 725-754.

doi:10.1515/ling.1986.24.4.725

Daulby, D. (1796). *A descriptive catalogue of the works of Rembrandt, and of his scholars,*

Bol, Livens, and Van Vliet. Liverpool, England: J. M'Creery. Retrieved from

tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4vwgL2

Davy, W. (1807). *A system of divinity, in a course of sermons, on the first institutions of*

religion; on the being and attributes of God; on some of the most important articles of

the Christian religion, in connection; and on the several virtues and vices of mankind.

Lustleigh, England: William Davy. Retrieved from

tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4rgzt5

East London Group. (1929, November 6). *The Times*. Retrieved from

tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4w4Se2

Franks, A. (1989, May 6). Aspects of love and freedom. *The Times*. Retrieved

from tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4vs8i5

Gale. (2012). *The Times Digital Archive, 1785-2011*. Available from

http://gdc.galegroup.com/gdc/artemis/home

Gale. (2017). *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Available from

    http://gdc.galegroup.com/gdc/artemis/home

Gold, D. L. (2002). English nouns and verbs ending in -*scape*. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios*

    Ingleses, *15*, 79-94. Retrieved from

    https://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5254/1/RAEI_15_05.pdf

Gries, S. T. (2004). Shouldn't it be breakfunch? A quantitative analysis of blend structure in

    English. *Linguistics, 42*, 639-668. doi:10.1515/ling.2004.021

Griffiths, P. (1978, November 9). BBC SO/Atherton/ Lutoslawski. *The Times*. Retrieved from

    tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4xL647

Huggins, W. (1757). *Annotations on the Orlando Furioso*. London, England: James

    Rivington, James Fletcher, and John Cook. Retrieved from

    tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4vx2c6

Jenner, T. (1647). *A book of drawing, limning, washing or colouring of mapps and prints. Or:*

    The young-mans time well spent. London, England: James and Joseph Moxon.

    Retrieved from http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/search

Landscape. (2017). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from

    http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/105515?rskey=WfNdU7&result=1

Landschap. (1998). In *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*. Retrieved from

    http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M036312&lemmodern=l

    andschap

Landschap. (2016). In *Dikke Van Dale*. Retrieved from http://vandale.nl/zoeken/dikke.do

Lantscap. (1998). In *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*. Retrieved from

    http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=MNW&id=24982&lemmodern=lan

    dschap

Lantscap. (2000). In *Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek*. Retrieved from

http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=VMNW&id=ID11976&lemmodern
=landschap

Lehrer, A. (1998). Scapes, holics, and thons: The semantics of English combining

forms. *American Speech*, *73*, 3-28. doi:10.2307/455924

Malášková, Z. (2012). Low Germanic loanwords in English borrowed in Europe. *Linguistica

Brunensia, 60*, 211-231. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/118234

Millar, R. M. (Ed.) (2015). *Trask's Historical Linguistics* (3rd ed.). London, England:

Routledge.

Offscape. (2017). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from

http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/130715?redirectedFrom=offscape#eid

Outpost attack at dawn. (1912, September 14). *The Times*. Retrieved from

tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4w4aF4

Picture shows. (1890, March 26). *Fun, 51,* 138. Retrieved from

tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4vwvG6

Prćić, T. (2008). Suffixes vs final combining forms in English: A lexicographic

perspective. *International Journal of Lexicography*, *21*(1), 1-22.

doi:10.1093/ijl/ecm038

ProQuest. (1998). *Early English Books Online*. Retrieved from

http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home

-scape. (2017). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from

http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/233395?rskey=7jcV08&result=9#eid

-schap. (2016). In *Dikke Van Dale*. Retrieved from http://vandale.nl/zoeken/dikke.do

Shattock, J. (Ed.) (2008). *Nineteenth Century UK Periodicals*. Available from

http://gdc.galegroup.com/gdc/artemis/home

-ship. (2017). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from

      http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/178229?rskey=kINf8o&result=6&isAdvanced=false#

      eid

The angler in Arran. (1900, August 25). *Racing Illustrated, 108*, 252-253. Retrieved

      from tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/4vWP85

Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1992). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic

      linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Van Rompaey, T. (2013). A diachronic account of Dutch *-nis*, *-heid*, *-dom* and *-schap*.

      Rivalry within the paradigm of abstract suffixes. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal-en

      Letterkunde*, *129*, 87-121. Retrieved from

      http://www.tntl.nl/index.php/tntl/article/view/286/272

Watarskap. (2009). In *Oudnederlands Woordenboek*. Retrieved from

      http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=ONW&id=ID386&lemmodern=wat

      erschap