ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ

Drofyak Nadiya
Lviv Ivan Franko National University

BINOMINAL SUBSTANTIVAL PHRASES IN MODERN ENGLISH

Summary. The article deals with the investigation of binominal substantival phrases known as close appositions. A special emphasis is laid on the morpho-syntactic, semantic and pragmatic peculiarities of these constructions. The issue of headedness within these structures, the hierarchy of components in particular, is touched upon. It is found out that the relative function of any linguistic elements can be determined by means of omissibility. On the background of this investigation it is pointed out that neither element within the construction is referential. Both elements can be used independently to refer to the same entity and the semantic relation between them is one of modification. So, the two elements in a close apposition can be reversed and the resulting constructions are acceptable from a syntactic and semantic point of view though their internal structure and communicative function may be diverse. Structural components such as determiners and adjectives which serve as modifiers of proper nouns are highlighted.

Keywords: binomial substantival phrases, hierarchy, reversibility, modifiers, subordination, apposition, semantic loading.

Дроф'як Н.І.
Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка

БІНАРНІ СУБСТАНТИВНІ ФРАЗИ В СУЧАСНІЙ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Анотація. Особливу групу синтаксичних конструкцій в англійській мові становлять субстантивні фрази, які є предметом нашого дослідження. Під бінарними субстантивними фразами маємо на увазі сполучення двох іменників з одним залежним компонентом, яким може бути будь-який детермінатив, як артикль, так і присвійний займенник. Такі синтаксичні сполучення часто називають прикладками, вказуючи на номінативну функцію та вираження єдиного складного поняття. Виходячи з того, що будь-яке сполучення слів не дає суму значень, а нові значення, є всі підстави розглядати поняття, що передається бінарним субстантивним сполученням, як співвідносне з тим поняттям, яке виражене ключовим словом, але більш конкретизоване. У статті досліджено особливості бінарних субстантивних фраз у сучасній англійській мові. Неабияка увага приділена морфо-синтаксичним, семантичним та прагматичним характеристикам цих конструкцій. Розглянуто питання ієрархічних відношень між компонентами цих структур, зокрема реверсності та відповідному впливу на семантичне навантаження. З'ясовано, що головний елемент у такій фразі можна визначити за допомогою дії опущення одного з них. На тлі цього дослідження встановлено, що жоден із складових компонентів конструкції не є визначальним. Обидва елементи можуть використовуватися незалежно для позначення однієї і тієї ж сутності, а смислове відношення між ними є модифікацією. Виділено структурні компоненти, особливо прикметники, які виступають модифікаторами власних іменників у бінарних субстантивних фразах. Аналіз службових слів у структурі бінарних субстантивних фраз показує, що детермінативи є їх повноцінними компонентами, котрі сполучаються з іменником для вираження кількісних, посесивних та класифікаційних відношень. Будучи основним критерієм утворення денотативних субстантивних фраз, вони виступають референтами ситуативної дійсності та кванторами її існування. Більше того, субстантивні бінарні фрази сприяють збільшенню інформаційного навантаження будь-якого тексту за допомогою компонентів-модифікаторів, які не тільки номінують відповідне явище, але й максимально описують його.

Ключові слова: бінарні субстантивні фрази, ієрархія, реверсність, модифікатори, субординація, прикладка, семантичне навантаження.

Introduction. Substantival phrases constitute a great part of word combinations in English. They function as grammatical sets of words with a noun as a key component (nucleus) made by way of the determination of certain lexico-grammatical categories of words or syntactic structures. Substantival phrases have a certain function within a context, bearing the main communicative loading.

The insight into the latest research. Substantival phrases in science history gained different interpretation. Nowadays domestic academic grammar defines word combination as a syntactic construction, formed by combination of two or more notional words on the basis of subordinate or coordinative connection and proper semantic-syntactic relations. The peculiarity of foreign studies on word combination is the absence of established terminology to denote this syntactic unit. Those linguists who support the idea of the nominative structure of a phrase think that they are based on the expression of one complex meaning. That idea was presented by Smirnitskiy [3]. Another group of linguists say that phrases convey one but broken meaning. Taking into account the fact that any combination of words doesn't present a sum of meanings but new ones, there are all reasons to consider the meanings conveyed by phrases synonymous with the key word but more definite [1; 2]. Among the supporters of the nominativeness of the phrase there are some discripencies in terms of the

role of the phrase components in making up a complex notion. Levytskyi says that words making the combinations with each other don't lose the possibility to express a meaning, though they transform into a single (complex) notion [2]. As far as the dependent components only clarify the notion expressed by the nucleus they lose their independent denotative meaning as a part of a phrase and as a result they lose the ability to express an independent meaning.

The blanks in the issues discussed. The most frequently used substantival phrases are also known in linguistics as binominal expressions or close appositions. The more general category of appositions, which has been the subject of an extensive amount of research, has proved quite difficult to define and, in the course of the debate, has come to include so many different constructions that it is difficult to perceive these constructions as constituting one category. So, **the main aim** of the investigation is to compare and capture under one label constructions which have a great number of features (morpho-syntactic, semantic or pragmatic) in common. This work will be restricted to a small type of substantival phrases – a subset which is generally referred to as close or restrictive appositions and which consist of a number of binominal constructions which, formally as well as functionally, behave in the same manner.

The main layout. In order for a structure to function as a close apposition, it is generally agreed that its two elements must belong to the same major form class, i.e. the class of nouns. This class includes common nouns (countable or mass) as well as proper nouns. Quirk uses syntactic class to distinguish between what they call close and weak apposition: in close appositions the two elements are of the same syntactic class, in weak appositions they are not [7]. In their case, however, the syntactic class of the elements is not so much the N as the NP. What this shows is that although there is overall consensus on the fact that the two elements somehow have to belong to the same class, the exact form or status of this class depends on the analysis given to such structures (e.g. as consisting of two nouns or two NPs). In the examples provided below we demonstrate that there are, in fact, important syntactic, semantic and pragmatic differences even among these constructions, and that, although it may be justified to capture them all under the general heading of close apposition we are really dealing with a number of subtypes:

a.	The director Tony Hall	Type 1a: *det 4*	- N +	NP
b.	the word landmark	Type 1b: *det 4*	- N +	N
c.	my friend Tim Ferron	Type 2a: *poss*	+ N	+ NP
d.	my friend the minister	Type 2b: *poss*	+ N	+ det + N
e.	Tim Ferron the actor	Type 3: *N_P +*	det -	N
f.	Director Tony Hall	Type 4: *N + NP*		

A similar situation arises when the two elements are further characterized as countable, mass

or proper nouns. From the examples given so far it becomes clear that one of the characteristics of close appositions is that they contain a proper noun or a noun with a similar force, namely a word or expression representing a thing as an individual not as a member of a class: *the platform two, the train five, the verb stay*. Keizer adds that, instead of a proper noun, a mass or substance noun can also be used, the distinguishing feature between the two elements of a close apposition being that the second element usually occurs without an article in other contexts, while the first element must have an article in other contexts. Thus the following examples *the opera Butterfly, the group PAIN , the insulin seroglycerin* are acceptable as appositions, since the names *Butterfly* and *PAIN(abbr.),* and the substance noun *seroglycerin* are normally not preceded by a definite article [5].

However, there are exceptions. They refer to those constructions containing the names of ships, rivers etc., which, although functioning as proper nouns, require a definite article in other contexts. Of course, one could claim that the definite article here is part of the proper noun; in that case, however, one would expect the article also to turn up in appositional constructions, which, as shown in the examples, is not the case:

– "The position of *the World War Two battleship Missouri* has not been disclosed…"

– "He said there were no plans to stop submarines operating off the west coast of Scotland where *the fishing boat Antares* went down near the Isle of Arran yesterday morning."

Some linguists also discuss constructions with a possessive pronoun *(his friend John),* which they analyze in the same way as constructions with the definite article. Similarly, Quirk mentions the possibility of a possessive or demonstrative determiner, as in *your brother George* and *that famous critic Paul Jones* [7].

When we look at the corpus, we find that examples with a possessive determiner are more frequent:

– "Well that's like *your friend Ruth* who lives with someone…"

– "An early chance for us to hear from *our guest tonight Duncan MacKenzie*"

– "And this might well be the plan for Indurain today to put away *his teammate Jean François Bernard" ("The week, Apr. 2018)*

Occasionally examples with a demonstrative can be found. In addition, the use of a genitive construction turns out to be quite common. Here some examples are provided:

– "We had a lecture by *that guy Rene Weis over there…*"

– "*This child Claire* has no idea what a spirit is!"

– "A lot of pressure on *that lad Lyons*…" *("The week, Apr. 2018).*

If we accept that the descriptive element of a close apposition may contain other definite determiners apart from the definite article, the next question which arises is whether it is justified to require that the determiner in close appositions be definite. In other words, why not also include in the category such constructions which contain an indefinite article and which seem similar to their definite counterparts in all other respects:

– "*I* have *a friend John* who deals with Linguistics."
– "… which were currents at *a frequency omega* modulated at *a modulation frequency*." *("The week, Apr. 2018).*

Naturally, it is possible to reserve the term close apposition for definite constructions only, or even to those with a definite article. However, apart from the fact that an important generalization seems to be missed, such an approach would leave a very similar group of indefinite constructions unaccounted for.

Another controversial point is revealing the main element in close apposition (the issue of headedness). Keizer disagrees with Lee's point that the second element is restrictive and is necessary to limit, or restrict, or define the meaning of the first [6]. According to Bradford, the opposite is obviously true. As a test, he proposes replacement by zero (or omissibility), arguing that the relative function of any two linguistic elements can be determined by omitting each one of them in turn and seeing which one of them can stand alone [4].

In such constructions as *the poet Kippling* it is not possible for the proper noun to be replaced by zero, as the element *the poet* cannot be used in the same context, e.g. to start a conversation by talking about a poet the hearer may be assumed never to have heard of. If, on the other hand, we omit *the poet,* we have 'a perfectly satisfactory sentence'. Keizer concludes that rather than the first noun, it must be the second noun which functions as the head of the construction, as 'in every case "the thing we are talking about" is not the larger class named first, but the individual named last, and the class is added to identify the individual [5].

Keizer's account, however, raises more questions than it answers. First of all, a further specification is needed of what is meant by a 'perfectly satisfactory sentence'. From a syntactic point of view, omission of either element leads to an acceptable result. Semantically, too, the resulting construction seems to be 'perfectly satisfactory', no matter which element is omitted. Nevertheless, Keizer is right in recognizing that omission of the first element may lead to a difference in understanding the whole entity. What Keizer has in mind, therefore, is pragmatic acceptability of the resulting construction.

Secondly, there is the question of what exactly is meant by identification. As it was pointed out, a construction like *the poet Kippling* can be used to start a discourse, even if the hearer cannot be assumed to know the poet in question. This is, indeed, a special form of identification, one which treats a proper noun as describing a particular person, while at the same time requiring further identification by means of a preceding modifier. This particular form of identification, which indeed characterizes this type of apposition is called descriptively identifying.

In fact, Keizer's use of the replacement-by-zero test to determine headedness within close appositions fails to prove his point because he does not specify the level at which the resulting sentences are to be judged as acceptable. Quirk is more precise in this respect, claiming that on a syntactic level the apposition (N2) is not subordinated to the subject (N1) since it is structurally independent and can itself function as the subject of the sentence.

Being predominantly concerned with non- restrictive appositions, he does not, however, answer the question of what determines headedness in close appositions (i.e. what, apart from word order, determines which element is the 'subject' and which the 'apposition') [7].

In most accounts of close apposition the two parts of the construction are taken to refer to one and the same entity. So, according to these accounts, on a semantic level either part can be left out. On the other hand, claims that close appositions do not contain two referential parts, since, in his view, it is a 'logical impossibility' for two coreferential constituents to form a higher NP, especially where this higher NP is supposed to be coreferential with both these elements. He uses the examples in to show that two truly referential elements cannot form one constituent. According to Keizer, these constructions are unacceptable 'precisely because their immediate constructions have identical implications of reference' [7].

Additional implication is also added by the presence of an adjective within the close apposition. Usually they serve as modifiers of proper nouns in different environments. A brief consultation of the corpus shows that all kinds of adjectives can be used in this position. Here are some examples:
– "Steve Cram, in the famous yellow vest has gone in behind *the early leader Mark Kirk* here in this heat of the fifteen…"
– "*The former American president Ronald Reagan* and his wife Nancy were ready to offer advice on retirement".
– "And the deficiency seems to be greatest at the top - in *the Irish Prime Minister Charles James Haughey himself*…"
– "*The most influential writer on the English constitution Walter Bagehot* warned that daylight should not be let in on the magic of the monarchy if its prestige is to be preserved. ("The Sunday Times", Aug., 2018).

In these examples, the adjective can only be interpreted as modifying the first noun; without this noun, the construction will be semantically anomalous. Leaving out the first noun presents an acceptable construction, but only if the adjective preceding this noun is reinterpreted as a noun. In other examples the adjective may be regarded as modifying either the first noun or the proper noun (although the latter is certainly not always the most frequent option). In other words, it is perfectly acceptable for an adjective in this position to modify the first noun rather than the proper noun.

All of the existing treatments of close appositions include the claim that the two elements in a close apposition can be reversed. The resulting constructions are acceptable from a syntactic and semantic point of view but this does not mean that they must have the same internal structure or communicative function.

Conclusions. Thus we can present a specific characterization of close appositions. Each of the types of close apposition has the following properties:
Formal properties:
– they contain two nominal elements;
– these elements form one intonation unit;
– there is no linking element between the components;

– one element is a proper noun or uniquely defining element, the other one a countable noun.

Semantic criteria:

– neither element within the construction is referential; both elements can, however, be used independently to refer to the same entity;

– the semantic relation between the two elements is one of modification.

Taking into account this characterization there is the assumption that it is only the apposition as a whole that is referential, with each of the elements fulfilling a predicative function. As a result, the definite article (the determiner) in constructions of the type $det + N + N_p$ will be seen as having scope not only over the first element, but over both elements. An important consequence of this assumption is that the tests of semantic and syntactic omissibility and reversibility become irrelevant. The absence or presence of an element, as well as the order in which they appear, may have important pragmatic implications. The further research should be based on the issue of diverse determiners, which influence greatly the semantic loading of such phrases.

References:

1. Kveselevych D.I. (1983). Integratsija slovosochetanija v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke [The integration of word combination in modern English]. Kyjiv : Vyshcha shkola. (in Russian)
2. Levytslyj A.E. (1998). Funktsyonalnyje podkhody k klacifikatsiji jedinits sovremennovo anglijskavo jazyka [Functional approaches to the classification of elements of modern English]. Kijev : Kievskij gosudarstvennyj lingvisticheskij universitet. (in Russian)
3. Smirnitskij A.I. (2007). Sintaksis anglijskoho jazyka [Syntax of English]. Moskva. (in Russian)
4. Bradford T. (2002). The Elements of Figurative Language. London : Prentice Hall.
5. Keizer E. (2007). The English Noun Phrase. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
6. Leech G.A. (1994). Communicative Grammar of English. London : Longman.
7. Quirk R.A. (1990). Student's Grammar of the English Language. London : Longman.
8. London: Language (2006). Phrasal or Lexical constructions. London : Language.
9. Radford A. (1996). Transformation Grammar. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Список літератури:

1. Квеселевич Д.И. Интеграция словосочетания в современном английском языке. Київ : Вища школа, 1983. С. 15–17.
2. Левицкий А.Е. Функциональные подходы к классификации единиц современного английского языка. Киев : Киевский государственный лингвистический университет, 1998. 362 с.
3. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка : учебник для студ. фил. спец. пед. вузов / за ред. В.А. Виноградова. Москва, 2007. 286 с.
4. Bradford T. Stull. The Elements of Figurative Language. London : Prentice Hall, 2002. 273 p.
5. Keizer E. The English Noun Phrase. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007. 400 p.
6. Leech G.A Communicative Grammar of English. London : Longman, 1994. 423 p.
7. Quirk R.A Student's Grammar of the English Language. London : Longman, 1990. 490 p.
8. Phrasal or Lexical constructions? London : Language, 2006. Vol. 82, Number 4, Dec. P. 850–883.
9. Radford A. Transformation Grammar. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1996. 625 p.

ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ