

UDC 81'373.231:165.194(043.3)



CLOSE APPositionAL CONSTRUCTIONS WITH PROPER NAMES

Yevgeniya Bielitska

PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor,
German Philology Department
Horlivka Institute of Foreign Languages
SHEI “Donbas State Pedagogical University”
Bakmut, Ukraine

ORCID ID 0000-0002-3221-9846

belitskay@yahoo.com

Abstract. The article discusses a number of restrictive (close) appositive constructions, compares them with complex proper names in the English language and some Slavic languages. The phenomenon of apposition has attracted considerable attention within linguistic research. Various approaches have been taken towards the definition of the phenomenon. The author emphasizes that grammar oriented approach to properhood can bring more relevant results to the understanding of proper names. The purpose of the article is to consider linguistic account that could correlate with the proper names analysis. Theoretical background of the paper is based on the tenets of Construction Grammar with its treatment of language as a collection of “form and function pairings”. Special attention is paid to the existence of taxonomic and inheritance links between appositions and complex names. It is argued that close appositions and complex names can be derived from the same underlying schema. It is shown that appositives are to be defined through the phenomenon of quotation which is treated broadly covering not only exact words but extralinguistic matters – events. Thus, it is explained that certain types of close apposition involve quotation of naming and calling events. The analysis of the appositional constructions as a constructicon, where the taxonomic and inheritance links are taken into prime attention, the study of the so-called traditional appositional types along with complex names provide a better understanding of the linguistic phenomenon. Specific network architecture of mind (mythological thinking) proves an efficient background for considering a network architecture of appositives with the proper names as their part. As a result grammatical status of proper names appears more obviously connected with the events of naming and calling and their further linguistic behavior – with the quotation of these events.

Key words: close apposition; construction grammar; constructicon; taxonomic and inheritance links; proper names; citation.

Problem setting in general. The phenomenon of apposition has attracted considerable attention within linguistic research. Various approaches have been taken towards the definition of the phenomenon, and, as a consequence, different opinions have emerged when deciding what is or is not an apposition. In the studies on apposition that have been carried out the following questions are asked: What kind of structures can be considered appositions? What kind of grammatical relation (coordination, subordination or something unique) is there between the elements in apposition? Yet another question sounds important – what role does apposition play in

constructing grammar of proper names? Linguists have proposed quite a number of answers to these questions although there is still room for debate. In this article I will discuss some properties of apposition as “a crucial criterion for 'properhood'” (Langendonck, 2007, p.125). This – grammar oriented – approach to properhood can bring more relevant results to the understanding of proper names.

The latest papers and publications on the problem. Apposition comprises a number of binominal expressions which behave in a more or less unified manner both formally and functionally. Formally the apposition construction is a phenomenon where two equivalent expressions are adjacent to each other, although there are cases of non-adjacent appositional constructions, as in:

(1) *The Artist Formerly Known As Prince*

(<https://www.biography.com/musician/prince>)

Grammatical relation in apposition is different from typical complementation or modification, which is why there is no unity of thought among scholars as to it. For example, G. O. Curme and E. Haugan affirm that there is a relation of subordination in the appositional structure. Otto Jespersen and Ch. F. Hockett consider apposition a kind of coordination. Ch. F. Hockett asserts that both elements of the apposition construction may be head and attribute. In other words, the first element can identify the second and vice a versa. R. Quirk et al. consider that apposition has similarities with both coordination and subordination (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svavik, 1985).

Research, conducted previously, distinguishes two types of appositive constructions: so-called loose, or non-restrictive (2) and close, or restrictive (3) (Acuña Fariña, Forsgren, Martínez, Meyer, Neveu, Van Langendonck, 2016):

(2) *The singer, Paul Robeson* entered the hall.

(3) *The singer Paul Robeson* entered the hall.

Though almost everyone mentions both close and loose apposition nowadays, loose apposition construction is usually taken as apposition proper. In the common view, the two types of apposition are not considered two variants of one construction, but rather two different constructions with a different structure and meaning. In this paper I will adhere to this point of view and consider just close apposition constructions.

One of the key features of close apposition is the presence of a non-class noun (Haugen, 1953). Two class-nouns cannot form appositive construction: *the weapon sword; the vehicle wagon*.

E. Keizer (2005) mentions such specific features of close apposition as:

– intonation contour (secondary-primary stress pattern, one tone unit);

- form of the elements (belonging of both the elements to the same word-class, existence of the proper noun as part of the construction);
- headedness and syntactic omissibility (modifier-head type, each of the appositives can be separately omitted without affecting the acceptability of the sentence);
- reference and semantic omissibility (two parts refer to the same entity, after omitting either of the two parts there is no difference in extralinguistic reference);
- positions of elements (two parts are arbitrarily reversible).

Meyer's approach to apposition is prototypical and gradient (Meyer, 1992). Thus we can speak about prototypical appositive and peripheral appositive constructions, which might merge with complementation, modification or coordination. The prototypical appositive has two juxtaposed and referentially related items, syntactically promoting end-weight relations, with the second item adding new information to the first. Appositives are structurally independent: items can be alternately deleted and reversed without changing the meaning of the construction. Almost half of the nominal appositives in Meyer's corpus contain proper nouns but that these appositives occur almost exclusively in writing rather than speech. Thus we can say appositions are mode-of-speech sensitive. Besides, single appositives are twenty times more frequent than multiple ones, juxtaposed appositives are ten times as frequent as unjuxtaposed. Finally, the scholar mentions there are few appositives in fiction and conversation, whereas journalistic and learned writing are similar in having many; intimates share fewer appositives while speaking in comparison with disparates. The findings mentioned still need further linguistic account which could correlate with the proper names analysis, which actually constitutes **the purpose of the article**.

Theoretical background of the paper is based on the tenets of Construction Grammar with its treatment of language as a collection of "form and function pairings". The "function" side covers what is understood in "traditional grammar" as meaning (content), thus extends over both semantics and pragmatics. Rules of syntactic combination are thought of as directly associable with interpretive and use conditions. Units bigger than words are also considered possible semantic building blocks of syntax. Besides that, Construction Grammar postulates that form is semantically motivated.

Constructions are formed in real occurrences in actual usage forming "templates" – regularities which emerge in representation and anchor in the actual experience of language users with certain linguistic stimuli. Therefore, occurrence frequency is considered a formative component of the system, leading to

“entrenchment”. Every construction encodes all the information (phonological, morphological, semantic-pragmatic, etc.) which occurs when it’s used.

Constructions can be purely contentful (lexemes) or schematic (syntactic templates). Idioms and prefabricated units (“prefabs”) take middle position. Construction grammar takes prime interest in the internal compositionality of constructions.

Constructions form a “constructicon” – networks, where the nodes are related to each other via taxonomic and inheritance links. The latter are found between a parent and a daughter construction whereas the former have shared features. These links are motivated, so formally similar constructions are also often semantically similar. Considered as such, construction cannot be completely alike since they perform specific functions in actual use. As a result functional specificity of each construction can be distinguished in order to explain their existence in the language. In the paper I’ll be interested in the motivational links between different types of appositions with less interest in the functional side.

Linguistic tradition distinguishes four basic types of close apposition:

- (4) *The singer Robeson: det + N + Np*
- (5) *Robeson the singer: Np + det + N*
- (6) *Singer Robeson: N + Np*
- (7) *My friend Robeson: Pro_{poss} + N + Np* (Acuña-Fariña, 2016).

With the key feature of at least one non-class noun within the construction we believe complex names can also be considered within appositive constructions. Thus such forms as:

- (8) *Luise Alice Elizabeth Mary*
- (9) (sp.) *José Luis Rodrigues Zapatero* (the example is taken from (Vincze, Orsolya; & Alonso Ramos, Margarita, 2014).
- (10) (cz.) *Klára Nováková-Malá* (the example is taken from <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pdt2.0/>) and alike are also considered.

Constructions activate other constructions at the syntactic level if the usage has stored enough shared links. Being real, constructions function in actual oral (gestural) and writing occurrences of communication, which are in effect, non-homogeneous spaces since communication face-to-face is considered a primary mode and writing is its extension. Due to the space limitations we will not dwell on this issue and take it as a postulate.

Discrimination between the language of action (where articulation does not play an important role) and articulated language is also taken into consideration. The first covers a specific type of face-to-face communication – event of calling, which can be

observed not only between people, but people and animals. A good example here is the name of the dog *Mumu* from the self-titled story by I. Turgenev. From this perspective what becomes important is how the meaning can be identified throughout these modes of language. In other words, instead of treating the meaning of, say, proper name *Peter*, one might ask about the essence of transitional medium which secures our understanding of:

- (11) I name him *Peter* (articulated language, naming event);
- (12) *Peter*, come to me! (language of action, calling event);
- (13) I asked *Peter* to come (articulated language, ? event).

This suggests that writing is a picture of speaking, which brings us to a different, more complex *Peter* (13) in comparison with *Peter* (11) or (12). *Peter* (13) is communicated to the unknown addressee and, thus, must provide more information about the object to be depictable to guarantee general understanding of the utterance.

Taken differently, it raises the question of variegation of forms which could pertain to the speaking and writing discourses. A written sign has to have some specificity in the absence of the receiver. It is time-neutral (“does not exhaust itself in the moment of its inscription” (Derrida, 1988, p. 8), which results in the possibility of understanding, say, the word *sky* for the third user of the 15th century and nowadays. Finally, the written sign is usually used with no reference to the exact writer (that is anonymously) which doesn’t mean it never had the one.

What’s more, (11) and (12) are to be treated as performatives unlike (13) – a constative. Performatives do not have their referent outside of themselves, they do not describe anything that exists outside of language and prior to it, have ritualistic/ceremonial character, and cannot be treated in terms of truth-conditions – just felicitousness. What they do is produce or transform a situation, they effect (Searle, 1989). Finally, performatives presuppose the conscious presence of speakers or receivers participating in their accomplishment.

So we can hypothesize the prevalence of constative position for at least some types of appositives, which is in effect proven in Meyer’s study (1992).

It is also important that a network architecture for grammar is related to the network structure of the mind/brain. Therefore linguistic links are to be treated as “activation” paths, which are stored via repetition in usage.

Here we follow the thought by Y. Lotman and B. Uspenskyi (1992) who affirm the existence of the proper name (mythological) language which exists independently and is included in the logical language. The language of proper names positions things in the same row as equation, where we can find isomorphic relations between the described world and the description system. So when we say *Ivan is a man*, we form

metalinguistic logical structure between *Ivan* and *the man* whereas in construction *Ivan the Man* the second item does not have any idea of “humanity”. Here we equate two things irrespective of their genus-species correlation. Likewise *Ivan Hercules* is to be interpreted as an integral whole with both *Ivan* and *Hercules* having the same functional (“traditional” semantic) value.

The world represented through the mythological consciousness is composed of objects which are peer-to-peer (without any logical hierarchy), indivisible into features (each object is treated as an integral whole), single (the idea of the multiplicity of objects, which implies their inclusion in some common sets, is not seen here).

So instead of hierarchy of logic metalinguistic categories there is a hierarchy of the objects in the myth, where into disintegration into parts corresponds to disintegration into logical features. The mechanism of mythical disintegration is crucially different from logics since it does not characterize the whole, but is equated with it. So we cannot speak about the concept of a class (a set of some objects), it’s an (though absurd from a logical viewpoint) equation of many objects as a whole.

The mythological world has a specific understanding of space: it is not represented as a continuum of features, but as a collection of individual objects bearing their own names. In the intervals between them, the space is interrupted, as it were, therefore, it does not have, from our point of view, a fundamental feature of continuity. The mythological space can thus model non-spatial (“traditional” semantic, etc.) relations.

It’s important to mention that the mythological consciousness is untranslatable into another description, it is closed in itself — and, therefore, is comprehensible only from the inside, and not from the outside. Linguistically it leads to untranslatability of proper names.

A. Losev (1982) affirms that the syntactic structure corresponding the mythological thinking is incorporation with stringing as the basic method of thought organization,.

Every myth is a logical analogue of the incorporated sentence, where we can observe an equation of a thing and its properties. Incorporated thinking treats a thing and its own properties outside the relations genus and species, the part and the whole. Such thinking does not yield metaphor but the idea of universal shapeshifting. So when we say “*Zeus turns into a bull*” – we mean interconvertibility. The result is the construction *Zeus the bull*.

In the paper I will consider appositional constructions of the above mentioned type and the one, formally equivalent to it – *the bull Zeus*. The third one which will be analysed is the construction *Bull Zeus* with zero article. The key proper name under

analysis is *Paul Robeson*, although some other names will be discussed. The material is taken from both oral and written discourse mainly in the English language with some insertions from Czech, Ukrainian and Russian.

Presentation of basic research material. Actual occurrences give us a lot of variegations of *det + N + Np*, *Np + det + N*, *N + Np* appositives :

(14) Fifty six years ago, on 9 May 1958, *the singer Paul Robeson* gave a famous comeback concert at Carnegie Hall in New York.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-27291682>

(15) *The American singer, actor and civil rights activist Paul Robeson* was one of the first black performers to achieve world renown.

<https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/blue-plaques/paul-robeson/>

(16) The Festival is named for its inspiration, *the actor-singer-activist-humanitarian Paul Robeson* (1898-1976).

<https://www.discoverlosangeles.com/event/2019/08/23/paul-robeson-theatre-festival-opening-night>

(17) In this world premiere, Nicholas Wright chooses to make many ironic and sometimes lame comparisons with that triangular relationship via a semi-factual depiction of *the great black singer/actor/activist Paul Robeson* and his love affair with his leading lady Uta Hagen, married to actor/director Jose Ferrer.

<https://www.gscene.com/arts/theatre/review-8-hotels-minerva-theatre-chichester/>

(18) Explore the story of how a concert by *singer Paul Robeson* tested the political possibilities of the new transatlantic telephone cable.

<https://www.sciencemuseum.org.uk/objects-and-stories/robeson-sings-first-transatlantic-telephone-cable>

(19) A distinguished cultural anthropologist in her own right, Eslanda Goode Robeson (1896-1965) is remembered also as the wife and long-time business manager of *singer/actor Paul Robeson*

(20) *Renowned African American singer Paul Robeson* and his family lived in London during the Spanish Civil War.

<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/579733/grandpa-stops-a-war-by-susan-robeson/9781609808822/>

(21) Remembering the Overlooked Life of Eslanda Robeson, Wife of *Civil Rights Legend Paul Robeson*.

<https://portside.org/2013-02-12/remembering-overlooked-life-eslanda-robeson-wife-civil-rights-legend-paul-robeson>

(22) Studs presents a tribute *to singer, actor, athlete, author and civil rights crusader Paul B. Robeson*.

<https://studsterkel.wfmt.com/programs/studs-presents-tribute-singer-actor-athlete-author-and-civil-rights-crusader-paul-b>

(23) *Famed singer-actor-activist-athlete-scholar Paul Robeson* grew up in Somerville and graduated from Rutgers University.

<https://eu.northjersey.com/story/entertainment/2019/04/08/paul-roberson-being-feted-rutgers-100-years-after-his-graduation/3058229002/>

Despite differences at the level of extension (which can be a separate object of linguistic research) all the occurrences represent the three types suggested for the analysis:

det + N + Np,

Np + det + N,

N + Np.

If to consider the first two they surely have taxonomic and inheritance relations (Acuña-Fariña, 2016). Taxonomic links are obvious since both constructions share the same elements: *the, singer, Robeson*. However, there is still confusion of thought whether the inheritance links can connect *the singer Robeson* and *Robeson the singer* as having parent-daughter relations.

The empirical claim is there are structural and functional differences between the constructions. This can be seen from the fact that the non-proper name element in *Robeson the singer* covers a wider scope of lexical semantic groups as the non-proper name element in comparison with *the singer Robeson* which is lexically specified as belonging to the sphere of occupation. Thus we can say: *Robeson the whiner, Robeson the meddler* but not vice a versa.

In:

(24) *Paul Robeson – The Giant*, in a Nutshell

<https://www.miltoncommunityconcerts.com/paul-roberson-the-giant-in-a-nutshell>, – the second element obtains a temporal characterization of a person which can become its pet name or a title: *Edward the Confessor, Ben the Miller*. Such type of name-creation is typical not only of English but of Slavic languages where pet names can transform into surnames: (ukr.) *Іван Шульга (Ivan Southpaw)*, (rus.) *Петр Мельник (Peter Miller)*. The crucial point, however, is that the internal structure of such constructions is in line with the parameter of the incorporated thinking. In particular, they are seen as iconic signs (of the type “individual – group”) which is a default qualification of incorporation in the non-mythological world.

In all cases reviewed so far, construction *Np + det + N* is connected with the naming event. Close connection with the naming event is proven by the limitation of such constructions to the types of elements possible – people and animals (*Robeson the singer, Polly the bird*), which in its turn has an immediate correlation with the event of calling, unlike *the singer Robeson* which can cover all sorts of things, both animate and inanimate.

The internal structure of the construction analysed correlates with the complex name of the type *Paul Robeson*. Both types form an iconic relations of the type: *individual – group*, both answer the criterion of ommittability:

- (25) a. *Paul* entered the hall
b. *Robeson* entered the hall
c. *Paul is Robeson*
d. *Robeson is Paul*.
- (26) a. *William* entered the hall
b. *The Conqueror* entered the hall
c. *William is the Conqueror*
d. *The Conqueror is William*.

In both (25) and (26) each of the appositives can be separately omitted without affecting the acceptability of the resultant sentence, each fulfils the same syntactic function and there is no difference between the sentences in extralinguistic reference (Quirk et al., 1985) which can testify to the strong taxonomic links between the constructions.

However, there are cases when the non-proper name element does not lose its discourse connection and thus cannot be treated within a naming event. It occurs in cases of role-oppositions:

(27) While well known as a political activist and actor, *Paul Robeson the singer* also had a commanding presence, achieved through the quality of his baritone and the feeling he brought to the songs he chose to sing.

<https://folkways.si.edu/paul-robeson/the-collectors/african-american-music-folk-celtic/album/smithsonian>

(28) (cz) *Máme Zemana předsedu a Zemana ministra* (We have *Zeman* the chairman and *Zeman* the minister) (Retrieved from <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pdt2.0/>).

In these cases it looks like the non-proper element obtains predicative meaning which can be explicated through *as: Paul Robeson as the singer* which is impossible in (24). This suggests the construction *Paul Robeson the singer* with predication has more shared links with *the singer Pole Robeson*.

Construction *singer Robeson* unlike *the singer Robeson* does not answer the ommitability test. We cannot put it:

- (29) a. **Singer* entered the hall
b. **Singer* is *Robeson*.
c. **Robeson* is *singer*.

This construction has a structural resemblance to the (8) where such transformations are also impossible:

- (30) a. **Luise /Alice /Elizabeth/ Mary* entered the hall.
b. **Luise* is *Alice*
c. **Alice* is *Luise*.

Both parts of the appositional constructions $N + Np$ regain their default lexical status outside it, which can be illustrated with the example:

One document repeated the allegation, which *the Prince* has always denied, that *Andrew* had sex with a 17 year old girl (<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7346077/Prince-Andrew-joined-fellow-royals-church-Balmoral-day-Jeffrey-Epsteins-suicide.html>).

Here the appositive *Prince Andrew* is disintegrated into two separate elements which secure their default status as a common name and a proper name respectively. What's more, such linguistic behavior can testify to the existence of the specific stimulus that forms the template in question. It is viewed in this paper as another case of incorporation. A trivial consequence is that *Singer Robeson* and non-predicated *Robeson the singer* share similar internal structure.

The construction *the singer Robeson* which exists in a non-performative discourse is better to be treated through the phenomenon of citation. Such type of apposition is in effect an attributive modified direct speech (Vries de, 2008). Citational treatment of close apposition solves the problems of multilingual usage of names, it serves the context which keeps the content of the name. Citation comes in many different forms in both spoken and written language. Quotations are treated as (quasi-)linguistic demonstrations of something that can be an earlier utterance or an event, or even a certain idea (Vries de, 2008). Quotations are compositional-semantically and syntactically opaque; they relate to form rather than content. They demonstrate not only **what** someone said (or wrote), but also **how** he or she said (wrote) it.

So in *the singer Robeson* the common noun is used referentially whereas the proper name can be used both referentially and autonomously. In the latter case the proper name is introduced. As E. Keizer (2005) noted such constructions are systematically sensitive to the introductory uses.

Names as quotations are usually not surrounded by quotation marks, however sometimes mentioning character of names is put forward with the help of the syntactic marks:

(31) Anthony Scaramucci, who was quickly terminated ... now seems to do nothing but television as the all time expert on “*President Trump*” (Tweet by Donald J. Trump. 11.08.2019)

If the name is complex it can have a quotation as a demonstration as its constituent:

(32) *John 'Jack' Schlossberg* takes a stroll in New York City with his mother Caroline Kennedy on the anniversary of his uncle JFK Jr’s tragic plane crash death (<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7255459/John-Jack-Schlossberg-spotted-New-York-City-mother-Caroline-Kennedy.html>).

We can hypothesize that the form of proper name in a close apposition – a quotation – approximates the form of a previous event (naming or calling) or utterance. As de Vries truly affirms “If we were interested in the content we would use common noun” (Vries de, 2008, p. 51). The quotation itself is not referential, but the complex noun phrase containing the quote is.

The way of connection with the previous naming event may be straightforward – through the antonymous use of the name, as in:

Those who recognize *the name Paul Robeson* recall *the American actor and singer* known for his deep baritone voice and rendition of “Ol’ Man River (<https://ufcw324.org/paul-robeson-and-the-peekskill-riots/>).

Another case shows the quotation of the calling event:

Grandpa Paul was a world-famous actor and singer with a deep and rumbling voice, a man of peace and principle who worried about the safety of children and families living in countries at war (<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/579733/grandpa-stops-a-war-by-susan-robeson/9781609808822/>).

Here the form *Grandpa Paul* is an explicit form of addressing restricted to the author of the utterance, not the reader. The natural generalization is that one cannot look at the appositional constructions in isolation and conclude it has a specific form-function type. In all cases studied the difference in the internal structure of the appositional constructions covary with their function in a systematic way.

The conclusions and the perspectives of further research. The analysis of the appositional constructions as a construction, where the taxonomic and inheritance links are taken into prime attention, the study of the so-called traditional appositional types along with complex names provide a better understanding of the linguistic

phenomenon. Specific network architecture of mind (mythological thinking) proves an efficient background for considering a network architecture of appositives with the proper names as their part. As a result grammatical status of proper names appears more obviously connected with the events of naming and calling and their further linguistic behavior – with the quotation of these events.

REFERENCES

1. Acuña-Fariña, J. C. (2016). The Grammars of Close Apposition. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 44(1), 61–83.
2. Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited Inc* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
3. Haugen, E. (1953). On resolving the close apposition. *American Speech*, 28(3), 165–170.
4. Keizer, E. (2005). The discourse function of close appositions. *Neophilologus*, 89(3), 447–467.
5. Langendonck, W. van (2007). *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Losev, A. F. (1982). About proportional functions of the ancient lexical structures. *Znak. Simvol. Mif: Trudy po jazykoznaniju*, (pp.246–279). Moscow, the Russian Federation: Izd-vo Moskovskogo un-ta.
7. Lotman, Ju. M., & Uspekyy, B. (1992). Myth – name – culture. *Izbrannyye stati v trekh tomakh*. (Vol.1, pp. 59–76). Tallin, Estonia: Aleksandra.
8. Meyer, Ch.F. (1992). *Apposition in Contemporary English*. Cambridge, the UK: Cambridge University Press.
9. The Prague Dependency Treebank 2.0. (2006). Retrieved from <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pdt2.0/>
10. Searle, J. R. (1989). How Performatives Work. *Linguistics and Philosophy*. 12 (5), 535–558.
11. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
12. Vincze, Orsolya; & Alonso Ramos, Margarita (2014). A proposal for a multilevel linguistic representation of Spanish personal names. *Dependency Linguistics: Recent advances in linguistic theory using dependency structures*. K. Gerdes, E. Hajičová, L. Wanner (Ed), (pp.119–140). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
13. Vries de, M. (2008). The representation of language within language: a syntactic-pragmatic typology of direct speech. *Studia Linguistica*, 62 (1), 39–77.

КОНСТРУКЦІЇ НЕВІДОКРЕМЛЕНОЇ АППОЗИЦІЇ З ВЛАСНИМИ НАЗВАМИ

Євгенія Беліцька

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

кафедри германської філології

Горлівський інститут іноземних мов

ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»

м. Бахмут Донецької області, Україна

ORCID ID 0000-0002-3221-9846

belitskay@yahoo.com

Анотація. У статті аналізується низка конструкцій невідокремленої аппозиції з власними назвами у складі. Конструкції порівнюються зі складними власними назвами на прикладі англійської та низки слов'янських мов. Особливу увагу приділено наявності таксономічних та наслідкових зв'язків між аппозитивами та складними назвами. У статті доводиться, що невідокремлена аппозиція та складні власні назви можуть походити від тотожної спільної схеми. Продемонстровано, що аппозитиви мають визначатися за допомогою феномену цитації, що трактується широко, від конкретних слів до екстралінгвістичних сутностей – подій. Таким чином, у статті пояснено, що деякі типи невідокремленої аппозиції передбачають цитацію до подій іменування і призову.

Ключові слова: невідокремлена аппозиція, граматика конструкцій, констрактивон, таксономічні та наслідкові зв'язки, власні назви, цитація.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Acuña-Fariña, J. C. (2016). The Grammars of Close Apposition. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 44(1), 61–83.
2. Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited Inc* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
3. Haugen, E. (1953). On resolving the close apposition. *American Speech*, 28(3), 165–170.
4. Keizer, E. (2005). The discourse function of close appositions. *Neophilologus*, 89(3), 447–467.
5. Langendonck, W. van (2007). *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Лосев А. Ф. (1982). О пропозициональных функциях древнейших лексических структур. *Знак. Символ. Миф: Труды по языкознанию*. (с.246-279). Москва, Российская Федерация: Изд-во Московского ун-та.
7. Лотман, Ю. М., Успенский Б.А. (1992) Миф – имя – культура. *Избранные статьи в трех томах*. (Т.1, с. 59–76). Таллин, Эстония: Александра.
8. Meyer, Ch.F. (1992). *Apposition in Contemporary English*. Cambridge, the UK: Cambridge University Press.
9. The Prague Dependency Treebank 2.0. (2006). Retrieved from <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pdt2.0/>
10. Searle, J. R. (1989). How Performatives Work. *Linguistics and Philosophy*. 12 (5), 535–558.
11. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
12. Vincze, Orsolya; & Alonso Ramos, Margarita (2014). A proposal for a multilevel linguistic representation of Spanish personal names. *Dependency Linguistics: Recent advances in linguistic theory using dependency structures*. K. Gerdes, E. Hajičová, L. Wanner (Ed), (pp.119–140). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
13. Vries de, M. (2008). The representation of language within language: a syntactic-pragmatic typology of direct speech. *Studia Linguistica*, 62 (1), 39–77.

Матеріали надійшли до редакції 04.08.2019 р.