

---

## Entrenchment and productivity predicting potential for creativity: a corpus-based approach on creative adjective intensifiers.

---

**Birgit Kohn**

*Universität Osnabrück*

[birgit.kohn@uni-osnabrueck.de](mailto:birgit.kohn@uni-osnabrueck.de)

Linguistic creativity is defined by deviations from norms (Sampson 2016; Goldberg 2019), which I assume to be determined by entrenchment (Hilpert & Diessel 2017) and conventionalisation (Schmid 2020). My corpus-based approach to linguistic creativity assumes no binary distinction between norm-deviating and norm-abiding expressions but proposes a scale ranging from the least creative uses that show a high degrees of entrenchment and productivity, to highly creative uses, which are not entrenched and rely less on productivity. The majority of creative expressions fall somewhere along this scale.

I approximate degree of creativity with entrenchment and productivity (Barðdal 2008; Baayen 2009), relying on frequency and co-occurrences above chance level. The assumption is that creative expressions are characterised by lower frequencies, less attracted co-occurrences and rely less on productive patterns.

The focus of this study lies on ADJ intensification in the enTenTen15 corpus. Creative ADJ intensifiers often make use of taboo expressions coerced into the ADV-slot, such as ‘damn crazy’, ‘bad-ass crazy’ or ‘bat-shit crazy’. These patterns can be used more or less productively: the bat(-)shit-ADJ-construction is entrenched with ‘crazy’, but it can be extended to other adjectives as in ‘batshit original’. Examples such as ‘the crazy-ass idea’ suggest that with increasing productivity, constructions like the bad(-)ass-construction give rise to new constructions. This study eventually aims for a systematic and more comprehensive rather than just exemplar-based overview of the creative potential of different adjective intensifiers.

**References:** • Baayen, H. (2009) Corpus linguistics in morphology: Morphological productivity. In A. Lüdeling & M. Kytö (eds.), *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*, 899–919. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. • Barðdal, J. (2008) Productivity: Evidence from Case and Argument Structure in Icelandic. John Benjamins. • Goldberg, A. (2019) *Explain Me This: Creativity, Competition, and the Partial Productivity of Constructions*. Princeton UP. • Hilpert, M. & H. Diessel (2017) Entrenchment in construction grammar. In H.-J. Schmid (ed.), *Entrenchment and the psychology of language learning: How we reorganize and adapt linguistic knowledge.*, 57–74. Washington: American Psychological Association. • Sampson, G. (2016) Two Ideas of Creativity. In M. Hinton (ed.), *Evidence, Experiment and Argument in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*. Peter Lang. • Schmid, H.-J. (2020) *The Dynamics of the Linguistic System: Usage, Conventionalization, and Entrenchment*. Oxford UP.