MINISTRY OF THE HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

On the rights of manuscript
UDK 42

RUZIEVA NIGORA ZOXIDJONOVNA

NOMINAL PHRASES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Specialty: 5A 120102
Linguistics (The English language)

DISSERTATION PAPER

Dissertation for Master's Degree

Supervisor
Ph.D. F.Sh. Ruzikulov

Samarkand – 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

At the present moment of globalized world, knowing and learning languages have become the crucial issue of communication for different purposes. Knowing a foreign language can open many doors of opportunities for people of business, commerce, science, and any other trade in general.

To this respect the attention of the Head of our Republic to the multi-sided development and education of growing up children seems to be just up-to-date. In many of his works, Islam Karimov pointed out that knowing foreign languages creates wide possibilities for the young generation to contribute to the development of our society in integration with the world [1,2; 2,10; 3, 12;].

Adoption of the Presidential Resolution from December 10, 2012, was also one step forward in this direction [3, 12;].

In this dissertation we studied Nominal phrases from different aspects, and made certain conclusion upon their theory, structure, and functions.

Although traditional grammars often treat word classes apart from their roles in larger structures, it is really not possible to do so. For one thing, we cannot study a word's functions without viewing it in a larger setting. For another, a single word may constitute a phrase. For instance, a noun phrase may contain just a noun—its head. Likewise, a verb phrase may contain just a verb. Phrases, then, are units of one or more words. They are the lowest syntactic unit.

It is important for us to know about phrases and to be able to distinguish them from words and clauses. This knowledge is essential in at least the two following situations. Journeyman writers often produce fragments, that is, parts of sentences punctuated as if they were sentences. These fragments are rarely just random strings of words; rather, they are typically internally grammatical. They are in fact phrases. Fragments are objected to because they are not the type of expression that more experienced writers would use in the context. They are often a reflection of linguistic patterns used in speech and indicate that the writer has not yet mastered the stylistic differences between the spoken and written modes. Languages differ in the orders they impose on sequences of words. For

example, in English (and many other languages), adjectives typically precede the nouns they modify, whereas in Spanish (and many other languages), adjectives typically follow the nouns they modify. Language learners must learn the orders expected in the target language. Their teachers must know the ordering possibilities and be able to articulate them in ways their students can learn from.

As we examine phrases, then, we study how words relate to each other in the smallest of the larger linguistic structures. There are five major phrase types in English:

1. Adverb Phrase (AdvP)
2. Prepositional Phrase (PP)
3. Adjective Phrase (AP)
4. Noun Phrase (NP)
5. Verb Phrase (VP)

The aim of our dissertation work is to study the Noun Phrase generally, and specifically the Noun + Noun type.

To achieve this aim we have chosen to fulfill the following **tasks**:

- To study the Category of Noun in the English language;
- to research the theory of phrases;
- to study different types of noun phrases;
- to analyze the members of pre- and post modification parts of Noun + Noun phrases;
- to study the structure of the NPs;
- to summarize different definitions of noun phrases;
- to study the function and patterns of noun phrases as well as the modifiers inside them;
- to identify stylistic peculiarities of using Noun+Noun phrases;

The actuality of the research is justified by the fact that the type of constructions studied during the research conduction have faced some lack of attention by local linguists; and those who did study them, paid attention to one

side of the problems. In our research, we studied this type of construction profoundly and from many aspects including syntax, lexicology, stress, and etc. the novelty also lies in the fact that we studied more deeply the Noun + Noun type of nominal constructions, and their difference from the similar compound nouns.

The subject and object of the research are nominal phrases, their types, and specifically the Noun+Noun construction. Semantic, stylistic, comparative typological and statistic **methods of inquiry** were used in the work.

The scientific novelty of the research work is vivid in the complex investigation of the semantic-stylistic, functional features of the above mentioned type of lexical units, as the nominal phrases though investigated widely by Russian linguists, in local literature they faced some lack of attention.

The practical significance of the research lies in the possibility of using the rich material of the research during the classes of Grammar, Comparative Typology of the English and Russian (Or Uzbek) languages, during the lessons of practical English, lectures and seminars on Country Study, Stylistics, Literature of English speaking countries and etc.

When we discuss the Noun Phrase, first, we will examine their basic functional patterns; then how those functions are realized by structural possibilities; and, where appropriate, we will explore some of the complexities associated with each type of phrase. Whenever such complexities lead us to topics considered in another chapter, we will provide a brief commentary and defer fuller treatment to a later time.

The dissertation work consists of Introduction, Main Part consisting of three chapters, Conclusion, and the list of the Literature we relied on while researching the issue. At the end of each chapter we give the general summary.

The English language is, it seems a boundless source of investigation. As with many other fields of scientific study, new discoveries simply lead to new

questions, and hence open up further avenues of research. The phenomenon under investigation in this dissertation has been present in the English language for centuries and has been a major source of word formation, along with borrowing and derivation. However, during the 20th century a sudden and very significant increase in the use of these devices was noted [29, 43-66;]. However, this only constitutes a superficial explanation of a linguistic phenomenon which merits a far more detailed and analytical assessment. As we will see in this dissertation, there is only a small available literature here, and most extant research deals only in a relatively superficial way with the topic. Indeed, some studies have looked at N+N structures as part of a wider investigation [82, 25-26; 29, 43-66;], while others have addressed very specific issues [137, 41-45;]; other studies take earlier approaches [92], while others have contributed to the literature with small, although valuable, articles [136, 69-83;]

We will also study those nouns which function as premodifiers in noun phrase structure and which, in combination with the head noun they modify, are referred from hereafter as N+N structures or N+N sequences [134]. Their function as premodifiers is far from being prototypical, since nouns usually function as heads of noun phrases, whereas premodifying position is prototypically filled with adjectives. However, the present research will show that their frequency of use in contemporary English is high. In order to do so, N+N sequences are studied from three different perspectives: their status, their evolution, and their use. In terms of their status, the structures are considered here as syntactic constructs [77, 135-151;], in contrast to others, who have considered them to be morphological compounds [92, 137, 25]. As for their evolution, some may become part of the lexicon through a gradual process of lexicalization, acquiring properties of a morphological, semantic or orthographic nature.

Finally, from the point of view of their use, it will be shown that several different variables are in operation.

CHAPTER I. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH NOUNS

The word "noun" come from the Latin “nomen” meaning "name." Word classes like nouns were first described by Sanskrit grammarian Panini and ancient Greeks like Dionysius Thorax, and defined in terms of their morphological properties. For example, in Ancient Greece, nouns can be inflected for grammatical case, such as dative or accusative. Verbs, on the other hand, can be inflected for tenses, such as past, present or future, while nouns cannot. Aristotle also had a notion of onomata (nouns) and rhemata (verbs) which, however, does not exactly correspond our notions of verbs and nouns. In her dissertation, Vinokurova has a more detailed discussion of the historical origin of the notion of a noun.

Expressions of natural language will have properties at different levels. They have formal properties, like what kinds of morphological prefixes or suffixes they can take, and what kinds of other expressions they can combine with, but they also have semantic properties, i.e. properties pertaining to their meaning. The definition of nouns on the top of this page is thus a formal definition. That definition is uncontroversial, and has the advantage that it allows us to effectively distinguish nouns from non-nouns. However, it has the disadvantage that it does not apply to nouns in all languages. For example in Russian, there are no definite articles, so one cannot define nouns by means of those. There are also several attempts of defining nouns in terms of their semantic properties. Many of these are controversial, but some are discussed below.

In traditional school grammars, one often encounters the definition of nouns that they are all and only those expressions that refer to a person, place, thing, event, substance, quality, or idea, etc. This is a semantic definition. It has been criticized by contemporary linguists as being quite uninformative. Part of the problem is that the definition makes use of relatively general nouns ("thing," "phenomenon," "event") to define what nouns are. The existence of such general nouns shows us that nouns are organized in taxonomic hierarchies. But other

kinds of expressions are also organized in hierarchies. For example all of the verbs "stroll," "saunter," "stride," and "tread" are more specific words than the more general "walk." The latter is more specific than the verb "move." But it is unlikely that such hierarchies can be used to define nouns and verbs. Furthermore, an influential theory has it that verbs like "kill" or "die" refer to events, and so they fall under the definition. Similarly, adjectives like "yellow" or "difficult" might be thought to refer to qualities, and adverbs like "outside" or "upstairs" seem to refer to places. Worse still, a trip into the woods can be referred to by the verbs "stroll" or "walk." But verbs, adjectives and adverbs are not nouns, and nouns aren't verbs. So the definition is not particularly helpful in distinguishing nouns from other parts of speech.

Another semantic definition of nouns is that they are prototypically referential. That definition is also not very helpful in distinguishing actual nouns from verbs. But it may still correctly identify a core property of noun hood. For example, we will tend to use nouns like "fool" and "car" when we wish to refer to fools and cars, respectively. The notion that this is prototypical reflects the fact that such nouns can be used, even though nothing with the corresponding property is referred to:

John is no fool.

If I had a car, I'd go to Marrakech.

The first sentence above doesn't refer to any fools, nor does the second one refer to any particular car.

In most cases in treating English nouns we shall keep to the conception of scientists that we refer to post-structural tendency It's because they combine the ideas of traditional and structural grammarians. The noun is classified into a separate word- group because:

1 .they all have the same lexical - grammatical meaning:

Substance / thing

2. According to their form - they've two grammatical categories:

Number and case

3. they all have typical stem-building elements :

- er, - ist, - ship, - ment, -hood ....

4. typical combinability with other words:

most often left-hand combinability.

5. function - the most characteristic feature of nouns is - they can be observed in all syntactic functions but predicate.

From the grammatical point of view most important is the division of nouns into countables and un-countables with regard to the category of number and into declinables and indeclinables with regard to the category of case. So after describing grammatical categories of English nouns we will try to classify them from different points of view.

1.1 Main Features of English Nouns.

1.1.1 The Category of Case

The category of case of nouns is the system of opossums (such as girl—girl's in English, дом — дома — дому — дом — домом — (о) доме in Russian) showing the relations of the noun to other words in speech. Case relations reflect the relations of the substances the nouns name to other substances, actions, states, etc. in the world of reality. In the sentence ‘I took John's hat by mistake’ the case of the noun ‘John's’ shows its relation to the noun hat, which is some reflection of the relations between John and his hat in reality.

Case is one of those categories which show the close connection:

(a) between language and speech,

(b) between morphology and syntax.

(a) A case opposeme is, like any other opposeme, a unit of the language system, but the essential difference between the members of a case opposeme is in their combinability in speech. This is particularly clear in a language like Russian with a developed case system. Compare, for instance, the combinability of the nominative case and that of the oblique cases. See also the difference in

the combinability of each oblique case: одобрять поступок, .не одобрять поступка, удивляться поступку, восхищаться поступком, etc.

We can see here that the difference between the cases is not so much a matter of meaning as a matter of combinability. It can be said that поступок — поступка — поступку, etc. are united paradigmatically in the Russian language on the basis of their syntagmatic differences in speech. Similarly, the members of the case opposeme John — John's are united paradigmatically on the basis of their syntagmatic differences.

Naturally, both members of an English noun case opposeme have the features of English nouns, including their combinability. Thus, they may be preceded by an article, an adjective, a numeral, a pronoun, etc.

a student	a student's ...
the student...	the student's ...
a good student ...	a good student's ...
his brother ...	his brother's ...
the two brothers ...	the two brothers' ...

Yet, the common case grammemes are used in a variety of combinations where the possessive case grammemes do not, as a rule, occur. In the following examples, for instance, John's or boys' can hardly be substituted for John or boys: John saw the boys, The boys were seen by John, It was owing to the boys that ..., The boys and he ..., etc.

(b) Though case is a morphological category it has a distinct syntactical significance. The common case grammemes fulfill a number of syntactical functions not typical of possessive case grammemes, among them the functions of subject and object. The possessive case noun is for the most part employed as an attribute.

All case opposemes are identical in content: they contain two particular meanings, of 'common' case and 'possessive' case, united by the general meaning of the category, that of 'case'. There is not much variety in the form of case opposemes either, which distinguishes English from Russian.

An English noun lexeme may contain two case opposemes at most (man —man's, men —men's). Some lexemes have but one opposeme (England — England's, cattle — cattle's). Many lexemes have no case opposemes at all (book, news, foliage),

In the opposeme dog — dog's, men — men's, the 'common' case is not marked, i.e. dog and men have zero morphemes of 'common case'. The 'possessive' case is marked by the suffix -'s /-s, -z, -iz/. In the opposeme dogs — dogs.' the difference between the opposites is marked only in writing. Otherwise the two opposites do not differ in form. So with regard to each other they are-not marked.

Thus, -'s is the only positive case morpheme of English nouns. It would be no exaggeration to say that the whole category' depends on this morpheme.

As already mentioned, with regard to the category of case English nouns fall under two lexico-grammatical subclasses: declinable, having case opposites, and indeclinable, having no case opposites.

The subclass of declinable is comparatively limited, including mostly nouns denoting living beings, also time and distance [6, 31—32;].

Indeclinable like book, iron, care have, as a norm, only the potential (or oblique, or lexico-grammatical) meaning of the common case. But it is sometimes actualized when a case opposite of these words is formed in speech, as in ‘The book's philosophy is old-fashioned’. (The Tribune, Canada).

As usual, variants of one lexeme may belong to different subclasses. Youth meaning 'the state of being young' belongs to the indeclinables. Its variant youth meaning 'a young man' has a case opposite (The youth's candid smile disarmed her. Black belongs to the declinables.

Since both cases and prepositions show 'relations of substances', some linguists speak of analytical cases in Modern English. To the student is said to be an analytical dative case (equivalent, for instance, to the Russian студенту), of the student is understood as an analytical genitive case (equivalent to

студента), by the student as an analytical instrumental case (Eg. студентом), etc.

The theory of analytical cases seems to be unconvincing for a number of reasons.

1. In order to treat the combinations of the student, to the student, by the student as analytical words (like shall come or has come) we must regard of, to, with as grammatical word-morphemes [5, 14;]. But then they are to be devoid of lexical meaning, which they are not. Like most words a preposition is usually polysemantic and each meaning is singled out in speech, in a sentence or a word-combination. Eg. to speak of the student, the speech of the student, news of the student, it was kind of the student, what became of the student, etc.

In each case of shows one of its lexical meanings. Therefore it cannot be regarded as a grammatical word-morpheme and the combination of the student cannot be treated as an analytical word.

2. A grammatical category, as known, is represented in opposemes comprising a definite number of members. Combinations with different prepositions are too numerous to be interpreted as opposemes representing the category of case [7, 181-183;]. The number of cases in English becomes practically unlimited.

3. Analytical words usually form opposemes with synthetic ones [5, 31-32;] (comes — came — will come). With prepositional constructions it is different. They are often synonymous with synthetic words.

E. g. the son of my friend == my friend's son; the wall of the garden == the. garden wall.

On the other hand, prepositional constructions can be used side by side with synthetic cases, as in that doll of Mary's, a friend of John's. If we accepted the theory of analytical cases, we should see in of John's a double-case word, which would be some rarity in English, there being •'no double-tense words nor double-aspect words and the like [4, 9;].

4. There is much subjectivity in the choice of prepositions supposed to form analytical cases [4, 9;]. Grammarians usually point out those prepositions whose meanings approximate to the meanings of some cases in other languages or in Old English. But the analogy with other languages or with an older stage of the same language does not prove the existence of a given category in a modern language.

Therefore we think it unjustified to speak of units like to the student, of the student, etc. as of analytical cases. They are combinations of nouns in the common case with prepositions.

The morpheme -'s, on which the category of case of English nouns depends, differs in some respects from other grammatical morphemes of the English language and from the case morphemes of other languages.

As emphasized by B. A. Ilyish, -'s is no longer a case inflexion in the classical sense of the word. Unlike such classical inflexions, -'s may be attached

a) to adverbs (of substantial origin), as in yesterday's events,

b) to word-groups, as in Mary and John's apartment, our professor of literature's unexpected departure,

c) even to whole clauses, as in the well-worn example the man I saw yesterday's son.

B. A. Ilyish comes to-the conclusion that the -'s morpheme gradually develops into a "form-word", a kind of particle serving to convey the meaning of belonging, possession.

G. N. Vorontsova does not recognize –‘s as a case morpheme at all [7, 181-183;]. The reasons she puts forward to substantiate her point of view are as follows:

1) The use of -'s is optional (her brother's, of her brother).

2) It is used with a limited group of nouns outside which it occurs very seldom.

3) -'s is used both in the singular and in the plural (child's, children's), which is not incident- to case morphemes (Eg. мальчик-а, мальчик-ов).

4) It occurs in very few plurals, only those with the irregular formation of the plural member (oxen's but cows').

5) -'s does not make an inseparable part of the structure of the word. It may be placed at some distance from the head-noun of an attributive group.

"Been reading that fellow what's his name's attacks in the 'Sunday Times'?" (Bennett).

Proceeding from these facts G. N. Vorontsova treats -'s as a 'postposition', a 'purely syntactical form-word resembling a preposition', used as a sign of syntactical dependence.

In keeping with this interpretation of the -'s morpheme the author denies the existence of cases in Modern English.

At present, however, this extreme point of view can hardly be accepted [4, 9;]. The following arguments tend to show that -'s does function as a case morpheme.

1. The -'s morpheme is mostly attached to individual nouns e, not noun groups. According to our statistics this is observed in 96 percent of examples with this morpheme. Instances like: ‘The man I saw yesterday's son are very rare and may be interpreted in more ways than one’. As already mentioned, the demarcation line between words and combinations of words is very vague in English. A word-combination can easily be made to function as one word.

Eg. a hats-cleaned-by-electricity-while-you-wait establishment, the eighty-year-olds.

In the last example the plural morpheme -s is in fact attached to an adjective word-combination, turning it into a noun. It can be maintained that the same morpheme –‘s likewise substantivizes the group of words to which it is attached, and we get something like the man-1-saw-yesterday's son.

2. Its general meaning — "the relation of a noun to another word" — is a typical case meaning.

3. The fact that -'s occurs, as a rule, with a more or less limited group of words bears testimony to its not being a "preposition-like form word". The

use of the preposition is determined, chiefly, by the meaning of the preposition itself and not by the meaning of the noun it introduces (Eg. on the table, in the table, under the table, over the table etc.)

4. The fact that the possessive case is expressed in oxen — oxen's by -'s and in cows — cows' by zero cannot serve as an argument against the existence of cases in English nouns because -'s and zero are here forms of the same morpheme

a) Their meanings are identical.

b) Their distribution is complementary.

5. As a minor argument against the view that -'s is "a preposition-like word", it is pointed out [4, 9;] that -'s differs phonetically from all English prepositions in not having a vowel, a circumstance limiting its independence.

Yet, it cannot be denied that the peculiarities of the -'s morpheme are such as to admit no doubt of its being essentially different from the case morphemes of other languages. It is evident that the case system of Modern English is undergoing serious changes.

1.1.2. The Category of Number of English Nouns.

The category of number of English nouns is the system of opposemes (such as girl — girls, foot — feet, etc.) showing whether the noun stands for one object or more than one, in other words, whether its grammatical meaning is 'oneness' or 'more-than-oneness' of objects.

The connection of the category with the world of material reality, though indirect, is quite transparent. Its meanings reflect the existence of individual objects and groups of objects in the material world.

All number opposemes are identical in content: they contain two particular meanings of 'singular' and 'plural' united by the general meaning of the category, that of 'number'. But there is a considerable variety of form in number opposemes, though it is not so great as in the Russian language.

An English noun lexeme can contain two number opposemes at most (toy — boys, boy's — boys'). Many lexemes have but one opposeme (table — tables) and many others have no opposemes at all (ink, news).

In the opposeme boy — boys 'singularity' is expressed by a zero morpheme and 'plurality' is marked by the positive morpheme /-z/, in spelling -.s. In other words, the 'singular' member of the opposeme is not marked, and the 'plural' member is marked.

In the opposeme boy's — boys' both members have positive morphemes –‘s, -s’, but these morphemes can be distinguished only in writing. In the spoken language their forms do not differ, so with regard to each other they are unmarked. They can be distinguished only by their combinability (Eg. a boy's head, boys' heads).

In a few noun lexemes of foreign origin both members of a number opposeme are marked, e.g. symposium — symposia, genus — genera, phenomenon—phenomena, etc. But in the process of assimilation this peculiarity of foreign nouns gets gradually lost, and instead of medium — media a new opposeme develops, medium — mediums; instead of formula — formulae, the usual form now is formula — formulas. In this process, as we see, the foreign grammatical morphemes are neglected as such. The ‘plural’ morpheme is dropped altogether. The 'singular' morpheme becomes part of the stem. Finally, the regular -s ending is added to form the 'plural' opposite. As a result the 'singular' becomes unmarked, as typical of English, and the 'plural' gets its usual mark, the suffix -s.

Since the 'singular' member of a number opposeme is not marked, the form of the opposeme is, as a rule, determined by the form of the 'plural' morpheme, which, in its turn, depends upon the stem of the lexeme.

In the overwhelming majority of cases the form of the 'plural' morpheme is /-s/, /-z/, or /-z/, in spelling -(e)s, e. g, books, boys, matches.

With the stem ox- the form of the 'plural' morpheme is -en /-n/.

In the opposeme man—men the form of the 'plural' morpheme is the vowel change /→ > e/. In woman — women ii is /u > i/, in foot — feet it is /u — i:/, etc.

In child — children the form of the 'plural' morpheme is complicated. It consists of the vowel change /ai > i/ and the suffix -ren.

In sheep — sheep the 'plural' is not marked, thus coinciding in form with the 'singular'. They can be distinguished only by their combinability: ‘one sheep’, ‘five sheep’, ‘a sheep was ...’, ‘sheep were ...’, ‘this sheep’, ‘these sheep’. The 'plural' coincides in form with the 'singular' also in ‘deer, fish, carp, perch, trout, cod, salmon’, etc.[80, 201;].

All the “plural” forms enumerated here are forms of the same morpheme. This can be proved, as we know, by the identity of the “plural” meaning, and the complementary distribution of these forms, i.e. the fact that different forms are used with different stems.

As already mentioned [5, 14;], with regard to the category of number English nouns fall into two subclasses: countables and uncountable. The former have number opposites, the latter have not. Uncountable nouns are again subdivided into those having no plural opposites and those having no singular opposites.

Nouns like milk, geometry, self-possession having no plural opposites are usually called by a Latin name — “singularia tantum”. Nouns like outskirts, clothes, goods having no singular opposites are known as “pluralia tantum”.

As a matter of fact, those nouns which have no number opposites are outside the grammatical category of number. But on the analogy of the bulk of English nouns they acquire oblique (or lexico-grammatical) meanings of number. Therefore singularia tantum are often treated as singulars and pluralia tantum as plurals.

This is justified both by their forms and by their combinability.

Eg. This (table, book, milk, love) is...

These (tables, books, clothes, goods) are...

When combinability and form contradict each other, combinability is decisive, which accounts for the fact that ‘police’ or ‘cattle’ are regarded as plurals, and ‘measles’, ‘mathematics as singulars.

The lexico-grammatical meaning of a class (or of a subclass) of words is, as we know, an abstraction from the lexical meanings of the words of the class, and depends to a certain extent on those lexical meanings. Therefore singularia tantum usually include nouns of certain lexical meanings. They are mostly material, abstract and collective nouns, such as sugar, gold, butter, brilliance, constancy, selfishness, humanity, soldiery, peasantry.

Yet it is not every material, abstract or collective noun that belongs to the group of singularia tantum (e. g. a plastic, a feeling, a crowd) and, what is more important, not in all of its meanings does a noun belong to this group.

As we have already seen [5, 49;], variants of the same lexeme may belong to different subclasses of a part of speech. In most of their meanings the words joy and sorrow as abstract nouns are singularia tantum.

E.g. He has been a good friend both in joy and in sorrow. (Hornby).

But when concrete manifestations are meant, these nouns are countables and have plural opposites, e. g. the joys and sorrows of life.

Likewise, the words copper, tin, hair as material nouns are usually singularia tantum, but when they denote concrete objects, they become countables and get plural opposites: a copper — coppers, a tin — tins, a hair — hairs.

Similarly, when the nouns wine, steel, salt denote some sort or variety of the substance, they become countables.

E. g. an expensive wine — expensive wines.

All such cases are not a peculiarity of the English language alone. They are found in other languages as well. Eg. дерево — деревья and дерево is a material noun, платье — платья as a collective noun.

‘Joy’ and ‘a joy’, ‘beauty’ and ‘a beauty’, ‘copper’ and ‘a copper’, ‘hair’ and ‘a hair’ and many other pairs of this kind are not homonyms, as suggested by some grammarians [8, 35;] , but variants of lexemes related by internal conversion.

If all such cases were regarded as homonyms, the number of homonyms in the English language would be practically limitless. If only some of them were treated as homonyms that would give rise to uncontrolled subjectivity.

The group of pluralia tantum is mostly composed of nouns denoting objects consisting of two or more parts, complex phenomena or ceremonies, e. g. tongs, pincers, trousers, nuptials, obsequies. Here also belong some nouns with a distinct collective or material meaning, e.g. clothes, eaves, sweets.

Since in these words the -s suffix does not function as a grammatical morpheme, it gets lexicalized and develops into an inseparable part of the stem [8,36;]. This, probably, underlies the fact that such nouns as mathematics, optics, linguistics, mumps, measles are treated as singularia tantum.

Nouns like police, militia, cattle, poultry are pluralia tantum, judging by their combinability, though not by form [80,208;].

People in the meaning of “народ” are a countable noun. In the meaning of “люди” it belongs to the pluralia tantum. Family in the sense of "a group of people who are related" is a countable noun. In the meaning of "individual members of this group" it belongs to the pluralia tantum. Thus, the lexeme family has two variants:

	Sing.	PL
1)	family	families
2)	—	family

Eg. Almost every family in the village has sent a man to the army. (Hornby).

Those were the oldest families in Jorkshire. (Black).

Her family were of a delicate constitution. (Bronte).

Similar variants are observed in the lexemes committee, government, board, crew, etc.

Colour in the meaning "red, green, blue, etc." is a countable noun. In the meaning "appearance of reality or truth" (e. g. His torn clothes gave colour to his story that lie had been attacked by robbers. A. Hornby.) it has no plural opposite and belongs to the singularia tantum. Colours in the sense of "materials used by painters and artists" has no singular opposite and belongs to the pluralia tantum.

Thus, the lexeme has three variants:

	Sing.	Pl.
1)	colour	colours
2)	colour	—
3)	—	colours.

When grammarians write that the lexical meanings of some plurals differ from those of their singular opposites [9, 30;], they simply compare different variants of a lexeme.

Sometimes variants of a lexeme may belong to the same lexico-grammatical subclass and yet have different forms of number opposemes.

Eg. brother (son of same parents) — brothers

brother (fellow member) — brethren

fish — fish (e.g. I caught five fish yesterday.)

fish — fishes ('different species', e. g. ocean fishes).

A collective noun is a word that designates a group of objects or beings regarded as a whole, such as "flock", "team", or "corporation". Although many languages treat collective nouns as singular, in others they may be interpreted as plural. In British English, phrases such as the committee are meeting are common (the so-called agreement in sense "in meaning", that is, with the meaning of a noun, rather than with its form). The use of this type of construction varies with dialect and level of formality.

All languages are able to specify the quantity of referents. They may do so by lexical means with words such as English a few, some, one, two, five hundred. However, not every language has a grammatical category of number. Grammatical number is expressed by morphological and/or syntactic means.

That is, it is indicated by certain grammatical elements, such as through affixes or number words. Grammatical number may be thought of as the indication of semantic number through grammar.

Languages that express quantity only by lexical means lack a grammatical category of number. For instance, in Khmer, neither nouns nor verbs carry any grammatical information concerning number: such information can only be conveyed by lexical items such as khlah “some”, “pii-bey” “a few”, and so on.

Most languages of the world have formal means to express differences of number. The most widespread distinction, as found in English and many other languages, involves a simple two-way number contrast between singular and plural (car / cars; child / children, etc.). Other more elaborate systems of number are described below.

1.2 Structural Semantic Characteristics of English Nouns

1.2.1 Morphological Characteristics of Nouns

Due to the following morphological characteristics nouns can be classified in following ways:

1. Nouns that can be counted have two numbers: singular and plural (e. g. singular: a girl, plural: girls).

2. Nouns denoting living beings (and some nouns denoting lifeless things) have two case forms: the common case and the genitive case.

3. It is doubtful whether the grammatical category of gender exists in Modern English for it is hardly ever expressed by means of grammatical forms.

There is practically only one gender-forming suffix in Modern English, the suffix -es, expressing feminine gender. It is not widely used.

heir —heir-ess

poet — poet-ess

actor — actr-ess

waiter — waitr-ess

host - host-ess

lion — lion-ess

tiger — tigr-ess

Gender, i.e. the distinction of nouns into masculine, feminine and neuter, may be expressed lexically by means of different words or word-compounds:

father —mother	man—woman
boy —girl	gentleman —lady
husband — wife	cock-sparrow — hen-sparrow
boyfriend —girlfriend	man-servant — maid-servant

Very often personal or possessive pronouns indicate the gender the noun.

1.2.2 Syntactical Characteristics of Nouns

Due the syntactical characteristics nouns can be classified in following ways:

The chief syntactical functions of the noun in the sentence are those of the subject and the object. But it may also be used as an attribute or a predicative.

The sun was rising in all his splendid beauty. (Dickens) (subject)

Troy and Yates followed the tourists. (Heym) (object)

He (Bosinney) was an architect ... (Galsworthy) (predicative)

Mary brought in the fruit on a tray and with it a glass bowl, and a blue dish... (Mansfield) (attribute; the noun glass is used in the common case)

The hero and heroine, of course, just arrived from his father's yacht. (Mansfield) (attribute; the noun father is used in the genitive case)

A noun preceded by a preposition (a prepositional phrase) may be used as attribute, prepositional indirect object, and adverbial modifier.

To the left were clean panes of glass. (Ch. Bronte) (attribute)

Bicket did not answer, his throat felt too dry. He had heard of the police. (Galsworthy) (object) She went into the drawing-room and lighted the fire. (Mansfield) (Adverbial modifier).

"Stop everything, Laura!" cried Jose in astonishment. (Mansfield) (Adverbial modifier).

The noun is generally associated with the article. Because of the comparative scarcity of morphological distinctions in English in some cases only articles show that the word is a noun.

A noun can be modified by an adjective, a pronoun, by another noun or by verbal.

1.2.3 Characteristics of nouns due the way of their composition

According to their morphological composition we distinguish simple, derivative and compound nouns.

1. Simple nouns are nouns which have neither prefixes no suffixes. They are indecomposable: chair, table, room, map, fish, work.

2. Derivative nouns are nouns which have derivative elements (prefixes or suffixes or both): reader, sailor, blackness, childhood, misconduct, inexperience.

Productive noun-forming suffixes are:

-er: reader, teacher, worker

-ist: communist, telegraphist, dramatist

-ess: heiress, hostess, actress

-ness: carelessness, madness, blackness

-ism: socialism, nationalism, imperialism

Unproductive suffixes are:

-hood: childhood, manhood

-dom: freedom

-ship: friendship, relationship

-meat: development

-ance: importance

-ence: dependence

-ty: cruelty

-ity: generosity

3. Compound nouns are nouns built from two or more stems. Compound nouns often have one stress. The meaning of a compound often differs from the meanings of its elements.

The main types of compound nouns are as follows:

(a) noun-stem+noun-stem: apple tree, snowball;

(b) adjective-stem+noun-stem: blackbird, bluebell;

(c) verb-stem+noun-stem: pickpocket; the stem of a gerund or of a participle may be the first component of a compound noun:

Dining-room, reading-hall, dancing-girl.

1.2.4 Semantical Characteristics of Nouns

Nouns fall under two classes: (A) proper nouns; (B) common nouns.

a) Proper nouns are individual, names given to separate persons or things. As regards their meaning proper nouns may be personal names (Mary, Peter, Shakespeare), geographical names (Moscow, London, the Caucasus), the names of the months and of the days of the week (February, Monday), names of ships, hotels, clubs, etc.

A large number of nouns now proper were originally common nouns (Brown, Smith, Mason).

Proper nouns may change their meaning and become common nouns:

"George went over to the table and took a sandwich and a glass of champagne. (Aldington)

b) Common nouns are names that can be applied to any individual of ad ass of .persons or things (e.g. man, dog, book), collections of similar individuals or things regarded as a single unit (e. g. peasantry, family), materials (e. g. snow, iron, cotton) or abstract notions (e.g. kindness, development).

Thus there are different groups of common nouns: class nouns, collective nouns, nouns of material and abstract nouns.

1. Class nouns denote persons or things belonging to a class. They are countables and have two. numbers: singular and plural. They are generally used with an article.

"Well, sir," said Mrs. Parker, "I wasn't in the shop above a great deal." (Mansfield)

He goes to the part of the town where the shops are. (Lessing)

2. Collective nouns denote a number or collection of similar individuals or things as a single unit.

Collective nouns fall under the following groups:

(a) nouns used only in the singular and denoting-a number of things collected together and regarded as a single object: foliage, machinery.

It was not restful, that green foliage. (London)

Machinery new to the industry in Australia was introduced for preparing land. (Agricultural Gazette)

(b) nouns which are singular in form though plural in meaning:

police, poultry, cattle, people, gentry They are usually called nouns of multitude. When the subject of the sentence is a noun of multitude the verb used as predicate is in the plural:

I had no idea the police were so devilishly prudent. (Shaw)

Unless cattle are in good condition in calving, milk production will never reach a high level. (Agricultural Gazette)

The weather was warm and the people were sitting at their doors. (Dickens)

(c) nouns that may be both singular and plural: family, crowd, fleet, nation. We can think of a number of crowds, fleets or different nations as well as of a single crowd, fleet, etc.

A small crowd is lined up to see the guests arrive. (Shaw)

Accordingly they were soon afoot, and walking in the direction of the scene of action, towards which crowds of people were already pouring from a variety of quarters. (Dickens)

3. Nouns of material denote material: iron, gold, paper, tea, water. They are uncountables and are generally used without any article.

There was a scent of honey from the lime-trees in flower. (Galsworthy)

There was coffee still in the urn. (Wells)

Nouns of material are used in the plural to denote different sorts of a given material.

... that his senior counted upon him in this enterprise, and had consigned a quantity of select wines to him... (Thackeray)

Nouns of material may turn into class nouns (thus becoming countables) when they come to express an individual object of definite shape.

Compare:

- To the left were clean panes of glass. (Ch. Bronte)

"He came in here," said the waiter looking at the light through the tumbler, "ordered a glass of this ale." (Dickens)

But the person in the glass made a face at her, and Miss Moss went out. (Mansfield).

4. Abstract nouns denote some quality, state, action or idea: kindness, sadness, fight. They are usually uncountable, though some of them may be countable.

Therefore when the youngsters saw that mother looked neither frightened nor offended, they gathered new courage. (Dodge)

Accustomed to John Reed's abuse — I never had an idea of plying it. (Ch. Bronte)

It's these people with fixed ideas. (Galsworthy)

Abstract nouns may change their meaning and become class nouns. This change is marked by the use of the article and of the plural number:

beauty	a beauty	beauties
sight	a sight	sights

He was responsive to beauty and here was cause to respond. (London)

She was a beauty. (Dickens)

... but she isn't one of those horrid regular beauties. (Aldington)

1.3 English Nouns in Speech.

1.3.1 Noun Grammemes in Speech

An English noun lexeme may contain four words at most (boy, boys, boy's, boys'). Each of these words, as we know, represents not only the lexeme,

but a certain grammeme as well. The grammeme represented by the word boy, for instance, includes all the English words having the two actual grammatical meanings of 'common case' and 'singular number' (girl, teacher, mile, etc.). The word book does not belong to this grammeme because it has only one actual grammatical meaning, that of 'singular number'. The meaning of 'common case' is only potential or oblique. So book represents another noun grammeme. The word England represents a different grammeme with the actual grammatical meaning of 'common case' (Eg. England's) and the oblique grammatical meaning of “singular number”.

If we assume that each grammatical meaning can be actual and oblique, there are four grammatical meanings of 'number', and they can be combined with four 'case' meanings each, to constitute 16 grammemes. In reality, however, the 'possessive case' meaning cannot be oblique in English, i.e. there are no words with the form and combinability of a 'possessive case' member of a case opposeme that have no 'common case' opposites. Nouns like St. Paul's, the baker's, denoting places, have certainly no opposites with the same lexical meaning and the 'common case' form, but their distribution resembles rather the distribution of 'common case' nouns (Eg. at the baker's, from the baker's and at the shop, from the shop). If, however, we regard them as constituting a separate grammeme with the oblique meanings of 'singular number' and “possessive case”, we may speak of 13 noun grammemes in English. In the table1 (appendix) they are represented by one word each.

The frequency of the occurrence of different grammemes in speech is different. We have analyzed several texts containing a total of 6,000 nouns and counted the occurrence of each grammeme.

When analyzing an opposeme of any category, we regard the grammatical meanings of its members as elementary, indivisible and unchangeable, determined only by the contrast with the opposite meanings. But in speech words are contrasted with other words not paradigmatically, in opposemes, but

syntagmatically, in word-combinations. Depending on these combinations, grammatical meanings may vary considerably.

We must also take into consideration that single grammatical meanings may occur in speech only in case a word has but one such meaning. Otherwise all the grammatical meanings of a word go in a bunch characteristic of the grammeme to which the word belongs. So if we want to see the different shades a given grammatical meaning may acquire in speech, we are to analyze in a text the words of different grammemes containing that meaning. If, for instance, the variation of the 'singular' meaning is to be investigated we are to study the grammemes represented by the words boy, boy's, England, England's, book, milk, St. Paul's. We shall call them 'singular' grammemes for short.

The representatives of "singular" grammemes constitute the bulk of nouns found in an English text (more than 70 per cent of the total number). Following is a brief summary of what a 'singular' noun may denote in speech.

1. One object. The plane struck a seagull. (Daily Worker).

2. A unique object. Shakespeare's name will live forever. (Ib.).

3. A whole class of objects. The English gentleman is dead. (Walpole).

In this sense 'singularity' gets very close to 'plurality'. So close indeed, that sometimes 'singular' and 'plural' nouns are actually interchangeable.

Eg. The polar bear lives in the North.

Polar bears live in the North.

Here as elsewhere extremes meet.

4. A "singular" collective noun stands for a group of beings or things viewed as an integrated whole, e. g. peasantry, humanity, mankind.

5. A 'singular' abstract or material noun may show some abstract concept or substance which is not associated with any idea of singularity.

I have accepted with tolerance the established conventions of syntax. (Vallins).

Nouns representing 'plural' grammemes may denote:

1. Two or more homogeneous objects.

Molly was very proud to be able to decide such questions. (Steinbeck).

2. A whole class of objects.

The Hindus and the Muslims liked and trusted him. (Maugham).

Foreigners on the whole were very dangerous people. (Ib).

3. A number of objects similar, though not identical (the plural of approximation).

A woman in her late thirties.

4. Individual objects.

His trousers looked shabby.

5. A mass of some substance.

A lion does not live on leavings. (Maxwell).

6. Boundless extension or repetition. The usage is aimed at producing a stylistic effect.

The snows of the Polar Region. The waters of the Danube.

Nouns representing “common case” grammemes express a wide range of meanings, the exhaustive examination of which is hardly feasible. Here are some of them.

1. A doer of an action or the carrier of some property.

The young worker challenged the Prime Minister to go and meet Britain's jobless young people. (Daily Worker).

2. A recipient of some action.

He wanted to employ the axioims of arithmetic. (Whittaker).

3. The person (or thing) for whom something is done.

He gave M a r y по time to change her mind. (Daily Worker).

4. An instrument. When so used, the 'common case' noun is mostly associated with a preposition,

e. g. to cut with a knife.

5. Circumstances of different events. When so used, the 'common case' noun is mostly introduced by a preposition.

Time: Every Saturday night she bought a joint of meat. (Coppard).

Place: I arrived at P a r k Lane. (Wilde).

Manner: Everything went off without a hitch. (Hornby), etc.

6. A property or characteristic of some substance.

The house committee was ready to act. (Daily Worker).

7. A person or thing as an object of comparison.

That monster of a dog.

As we have seen, “possessive case” nouns occur a great deal less frequently than their opposites. Some linguists regard the possessive case as a disappearing case [32, 36;]. Others speak of "the spreading of the 's-genitive at the expense of the of-genitive".

The range of meaning of the possessive case is incomparably narrower than that of the common case. Yet linguists point out a number of meanings a 'possessive case' noun may express in speech [7, 40;].

a) possession, belonging (Peter's bicycle)

b) personal or social relations (Peter's wife)

c) authorship (Peter's poem)

d) origin or source (the sun's rays)

e) kind or species (ladies' hats)

f) the relation of the whole to its part (Peter's hand)

g) subjective relations (Peter's arrival)

h) objective relations (Peter's being sent)

i) characteristic (her mother's care), (rather rare)

j) measure (a night's reflection; a mile's distance).

Sometimes the relations of a 'possessive case' noun are ambiguous. The relation in her daughter's loss may be interpreted either as subjective or as objective. This can be accounted for by the fact that her daughter's loss may be regarded as a transformation (or a transform) of two different sentences.

Her daughter lost == daughter’s loss

Her daughter was lost == daughter’s loss

In other words, having no voice distinctions, the noun loss may correspond to both the active and the passive voice of the verb.

Since both “possessive case” and “common case" nouns may have right-hand connections with other nouns, it is interesting to see the difference between the two combinations in speech. This is what W. N. Francis writes on the subject. "Nouns make up a considerable number (as many as 25 per sent) of the single-word modifiers of nouns

Possessive	Noun-adjunct
child's play	child psychology
a dog's life	the dog days
a day's work	the day shift'
my father's house	a father image
that woman's doctor	that woman doctor

The last pair illustrates vividly the difference in meaning there may be between these two structures of modification. The formal difference between them may be described as follows: a construction with of may be substituted for the possessive construction, and the determiner (if there is one) will then go with the modifying noun; on the other hand, some other kind of construction must be substituted for the noun-adjunct, and the determiner goes with the head noun. In the following illustrations the symbol means "transforms into".

My father's house >	house of my father
that father image >	that image like (a) father
that woman's doctor >	doctor of that woman
that woman doctor >	that doctor who is a woman.

As we see, the relations expressed by a 'possessive case' noun can usually be rendered by its 'common case' opposite preceded by of (the so-called 'of-phrase'). The “possessive case” noun and the corresponding of-phrase are synonymous, but to a certain extent only.

Unlike the possessive case, the o/-phrase is freely used with all nouns irrespective of their lexical meanings. Its range of meaning is much wider than

that of the possessive case. Thus, besides the 'possessive case' relations already mentioned it may show the relations of appraisal (a man of strong will), of material (a table of oak), of composition (a group of children), etc.

The of-phrase is believed to sound more formal than the possessive case. In formal style it is more common than the possessive.

E. g. Head of a girl (in a picture or sculpture exhibition programme), not a girl's head.

In the Russian language a noun in the genitive case may be adnominal and adverbial, i.e. it can be attached to a noun and to a verb.

E.g. дом отца, боюсь грозы.

The possessive case is practically adnominal, as in Tom's departure.

In sentences like The idea is George's, where George's is not followed by a noun, it is sometimes called the 'independent possessive'. But in reality it is not independent, as it refers to some noun, usually mentioned previously (the word idea in the sentence above). Therefore such possessives are called “anaphorical”. But this term would be misapplied in cases like George's was a brilliant idea, where the noun idea follows the possessive.

Seeing that there is exact parallelism with the use of the so-called absolute possessive pronouns (The idea is mine. Mine was a brilliant idea), we shall call such possessives absolute.

In Modern English there exists a peculiar construction which is a combination of the possessive case and the of-phrase. The construction makes it possible to place an article, a demonstrative pronoun, etc. before the modified noun. Eg. John's friend and a (the, that) friend of John's. The possessive case in the construction is absolute. Eg. a (the, that) friend of yours.

The construction usually has a portative meaning. A friend of Mary's — one of Mary's friends. It may also be used for stylistic purposes mostly with ironic coloring. That long nose of John's.

In cases like I dined at my aunt's or a garden party at Brown's the possessive case is really independent. It does not refer to any other noun, and

does not correspond to an absolute possessive pronoun. The meaning of the independent possessive is that of locality. It denotes the house, shop, cathedral, place of business, etc. of the person denoted by the noun. E. g. the baker's, draper's, watchmaker's, etc., also St. Paul's .

1.3.2 The use of Articles with Nouns in Some Set Expessions

a) The use of indefinite article with nouns in some set expressions [8, 36;].

1. in a hurry — второпях

Things done in a hurry are done badly.

2. to have a mind to do some thing (a great mind, a good mind) — иметь желание что-либо сделать, быть склонным что-либо сделать

I have a great mind to have a serious talk with her.

3. to fly into a passion — прийти в бешенство

If you contradict him, he will fly into a passion.

4. to get in a fury (in a rage) — прийти и ярость

If you contradict him, he will get in a fury (in a rage).

5. to take a fancy to (chiefly with names of living beings) — проникнуться симпатией, по чувствовать расположение

I wonder why she took a fancy to the little girl.

6. in a low (loud) voice — тихо (громко)

Don't speak in a low voice.

7. a great many (with countables) — много

I have spoken to him a great many times.

8. a great deal (with uncountables) — много

We can't skate to-day, there is a great deal of snow on the ice.

9. it is a pity —жаль

It is a pity you did not go to the concert last night

10. it is a shame — стыдно

It is a shame not to know these elementary things.

11. it is a pleasure — приятно

It is a pleasure to read beautiful poetry.

12. as a result —в результате

As a result of the inhabitants' strenuous efforts the damaged city

13. to have a good time — хорошо провести время

Last night we went to an evening party and had a very good time.

14. to be at a loss —быть в недоумении

She was at a loss what to say.

15. at a glance — сразу, с первого взгляда

She saw at a glance that something had happened.

b) The use of definite article with nouns in some set expressions.

1. it is out of the question —об этом не может быть и речи

'Will you go to the theatre tonight?" "It's out of the question. I have lots of things to do."

2. to take the trouble to do something — потрудиться

You had a difficult text to translate and you did not take the trouble to consult the dictionary.

3. in the original — в оригинале

You know English well enough to read Dickens in the original.

4. to play the piano (the violin, the harp) — играть на рояле (скрипке, арфе)

She plays the piano very well.

5. to keep the house — сидеть дома

She has a cold and will have to keep the house for a couple of days.

6. to keep the bed — соблюдать постельный режим

She has a bad cold and will have to keep the bed for a couple of days.

7. on the whole — в целом

On the whole Tom is a pleasant fellow, but sometimes he has whims.

8. the other day (refers to the past) — па днях

I met him the other day.

9. on the one hand…on the other hand — с одной стороны...с другой стороны

On the one hand he certainly excites suspicion, but on the other hand we have not enough evidence against him. (Oppenhe'un)

10. to tell (to speak) the truth — говорить правду; to tell the truth — no правде говоря

He always speaks (tells) the truth. To tell the truth, I don't like the girl.

11. to be on the safe side —для верности

I am almost sure of the pronunciation of this name, but to be on the safe side let us consult the pronouncing dictionary.

c) Nouns in some set expressions use without an article.

1. out of doors — на дворе, на улице, вне дома

The children spent most of the time out of doors.

2. to take to heart — принимать близко к сердцу

Don't take things too much to heart.

3. to take offence — обижаться

If he had heard your remark, he would have taken offence.

4. to"1 give (to get, to asft) per mission— дать (получить, просить) разрешение

I asked permission to keep the book a little longer.

5. to lose heart —терять мужество, приходить в уныние

He found the subject very difficult at first, but he did not lose heart.

6. at present — в настоящее время

You may go home, we don't want you at present.

7. from morning till night—с утра до вечера

He worked in his litte garden from morning till night.

8. from head to foot —с головы до ног

She was dressed in furs from liead to foot.

9. from beginning to end — с начала до конца

The whole story is a lie from beginning to end.

10. at first sight — с первого взгляда

He fell in love with her- at first sight.

11. by chance — случайно

They met quite by chance.

12. by mistake — по ошибке

I have brought the wrong book by mistake.

13. for hours —часами

He could read for hours.

14. for ages —целую вечность

I have not seen you for ages.

15. by land, by air, by sea — сушей, по воздуху, морем

I like travelling by sea.

16. to go to sea — стать моряком

My sister wants to be a doctor, and my brother wants to go to sea.

17. on deck — на палубе

We spent hours on deck.

18. to keep house —вести хозяйство

Her sister keeps house for her.

19. at sunrise —на рассвете

We left the town at sunrise.

20. at sunset — на закате

We arrived at the village at sunset.

21. at work —за работой

Whenever I come, he is always at work.

22. at peace — в мире

We want to be at peace with all countries.

Summary and conclusion of Chapter 1

In this chapter we have analyzed the existing theory about the English Noun, the views of some linguists on this issue, and found out that The word "noun" comes from the Latin “nomen” meaning "name." Word classes like nouns were first described by Sanskrit grammarian Panini and ancient Greeks like Dionysius Thorax, and defined in terms of their morphological properties.

For example, in Ancient Greece, nouns can be inflected for grammatical case, such as dative or accusative. Verbs, on the other hand, can be inflected for tenses, such as past, present or future, while nouns cannot. Aristotle also had a notion of onomata (nouns) and rhemata (verbs) which, however, does not exactly correspond our notions of verbs and nouns.

The noun is classified into a separate word- group because:

1 .they all have the same lexical - grammatical meaning :

substance / thing

2.according to their form - they've two grammatical categories:

number and case

3.they all have typical stem-building elements :

- er, - ist, - ship, - ment, -hood ....

4.typical combinability with other words:

most often left-hand combinability.

5.function - the most characteristic feature of nouns is - they can be observed in all syntactic functions but predicate.

Nouns have two categories: the category of Case, and the category of Number.

According to their morphological composition we distinguish simple, derivative and compound nouns.

1. Simple nouns are nouns which have neither prefixes no suffixes. They are indecomposable: chair, table, room, map, fish, work.

2. Derivative nouns are nouns which have derivative elements (prefixes or suffixes or both): reader, sailor, blackness, childhood, misconduct, inexperience.

Productive noun-forming suffixes are:

-er: reader, teacher, worker

-ist: communist, telegraphist, dramatist

-ess: heiress, hostess, actress

-ness: carelessness, madness, blackness

-ism: socialism, nationalism, imperialism

Unproductive suffixes are:

-hood: childhood, manhood

-dom: freedom

-ship: friendship, relationship

-meat: development

-ance: importance

-ence: dependence

-ty: cruelty

-ity: generosity

3. Compound nouns are nouns built from two or more stems. Compound nouns often have one stress. The meaning of a compound often differs from the meanings of its elements.

The main types of compound nouns are as follows:

(a) noun-stem+noun-stem: apple tree, snowball;

(b) adjective-stem+noun-stem: blackbird, bluebell;

(c) verb-stem+noun-stem: pickpocket; the stem of a gerund or of a participle may be the first component of a compound noun:

dining-room, reading-hall, dancing-girl.

CHAPTER 2. GENERAL THEORY OF NOUN PHRASES

Traditionally “phrase” is defined as “a group of words that does not contain a verb and its subject and is used as a single part of speech.” This definition entails three characteristics: (1) it specifies that only a group of words can constitute a phrase, implying that a single word cannot; (2) it distinguishes phrases from clauses; and (3) it requires that the groups of words believed to be a phrase constitute a single grammatical unit.

A word and a phrase may play identical grammatical roles in a clause, as (1) and (2) demonstrate:

(1) Most of the members of the genus avis fly.

(2) Birds fly.

Most of the members of the genus avis is the subject of (1) and birds is the subject of (2), showing that single words and phrases can function identically in clauses. There are two inferences that we can draw from this fact: (a) a subject can consist of either a single noun or a noun phrase, or (b) subjects are phrases, and so whatever functions as a subject must be a phrase. If we assume (a), then whenever we define subject (and any other grammatical function, such as predicate, direct object, indirect object, etc.), we must always specify that it can be expressed as a word or as a phrase. Linguists would say that this formulation is more complex than it needs to be because it fails to articulate a more general pattern. The broader generalization is that these grammatical relations are always expressed as phrases and phrases can consist of either a single word or a unified group of words. Below, we will show how and when words can be phrases.

Second, single words and phrases may be replaced by identical proforms. We can replace the subjects of both (1) and (2) with They:

(1) a. They fly.

(2) a. They fly.

Again, there are two inferences we can draw: (a) pronouns can replace either a noun or a noun phrase, or (b) pronouns replace phrases. Again, (b) is

more general, but it does require us to specify when words can function as phrases.

A single word may be a phrase when it is the head of that phrase. The head of a phrase is the phrase's central element; any other words (or phrases) in the phrase orient to it, either by modifying it or complementing it. The head determines the phrase's grammatical category: if the head is a noun, the phrase is a noun phrase; if the head is a verb, the phrase is a verb phrase, and so on. The head can also determine the internal grammar of the phrase: if the head is a noun, then it may be modified by an article; if the head is a transitive verb, it must be complemented by a direct object. Heads also determine such things as the number of their phrases: if the head of an NP is singular, then the NP is singular; if the head is plural, then the NP is plural. Crucially, the head of a phrase may occur alone in the phrase, that is, without modification or complementation.

Let's look a little closer at what expressions may be replaced by pronouns. Specifically, let's test the claim made in many textbooks that pronouns can replace nouns or noun phrases. Consider (3):

(3) Fooster hates the cabbage. **NP** **Det** **N**

the cabbage

If we replace the NP the cabbage in (3) with the pronoun it we get the perfectly grammatical (3a): Delahunt and Garvey

3) a. Foster hates it. NP Pron it

However, given the typical textbook definition of pronoun as a word that can replace either nouns or noun phrases, we should be able to replace just the noun cabbage in (3) with it. However, when we do so, we create the wildly ungrammatical (3b):

(3) b. *Foster hates the it.

So, why is (3a) fine but (3b) is not? To create (3a) we replaced the entire phrase the cabbage, but for (3b) we replaced only a part of the phrase. It appears that when we pronominalize we must replace an entire phrase with a pronoun,

not just a random piece of it. It follows that if we can successfully replace an expression with a pronoun, then that expression must be a complete phrase. To check this, consider what happens when we replace cabbage in (3c) with a pronoun; we get the grammatical (3d):

(3) c. Foster hates cabbage. NP(3) d. Foster hates it.

N cabbage

So cabbage is just a noun in (3) and therefore cannot be replaced by a pronoun; but in (3c) it is both a noun and a noun phrase (as the diagram shows), and so can be pronominal zed, proved by the fact that (3d) is grammatical.

Let's add just one more test to the two tests for phrase hood we've already used (capable of functioning as a grammatical relation and capable of being replaced by a pronoun): if an expression can be moved from one part of a sentence to another without any internal reorganization, then that expression is a phrase. We can use our cabbage sentences for this test too.

We can successfully move the cabbage in (3) to the left of the subject, giving us:

(3) e. The cabbage, Foster hates.

But when we try to move just the N cabbage, the result is ungrammatical, just as when we tried to pronominalize cabbage in (3):

(3) f. Cabbage, Foster hates the.

Analogously, when we move cabbage in (3c) in which cabbage occurs alone, the result is also grammatical:

(3) g. Cabbage, Foster hates.

So, we've applied three tests—ability to function as a grammatical relation, pronominalization, and movement—and all three have yielded the same results: a phrase may consist of a unified group of words, or of a single word as long as that word is the phrase's head.

There is an important methodological precept here: the more arguments you can marshal in favor of your analysis and definitions, the more confidence

you can place in them. Our new, improved definition of "phrase": a phrase is a grammatical unit, intermediate between a word and a clause, which may consist of just one word (its head) or its head and expressions (including other phrases) that modify or complement it (see below). This definition retains the traditional distinctions between word and phrase and between phrase and clause. It adds the requirement that phrases have heads and allows a phrase to consist of just its head.

In considering word classes, we examined the most important ones first. In this chapter, we will present the three less complex types first— adverb, prepositional, and adjective. The reason for this seemingly backwards approach is that the two major phrase types—noun phrases and verb phrases—often include the minor types as subparts. But first we must make a brief detour to discuss the important distinction between modification and complementation.

The head of a phrase may be modified or complemented by other words, phrases, or sentences within the phrase. We begin with complementation as it is perhaps the more easily understood. When one element in an expression creates the grammatical expectation that another expression will also occur, the expected element complements the expecting element. For example, transitive verbs create the expectation of an object, as in Sheila fractured (her ankle); intransitive verbs create the expectation of two objects, as in Sally gave (her) (a shot of morphine); certain other verbs create the expectation of two complements, though one or both need not be an NP, as in She put (her first aid kit) (away/in the truck). Generally, although verbs (in English) require a subject, subjects are not usually said to complement the verb.

Verbs are the primary complement-requiring elements in language, but other parts of speech may require complements too. Prepositions typically require an NP complement—on may be complemented by a phrase denoting notions such as location or time, as in on (the pavement), on (your mark), on (time). Certain nouns may be complemented by clauses, as in the belief (that diseases are caused by evil spirits).

Modification occurs in a construction in which an expression is accompanied by an element not grammatically required by it. For example, because nouns do not typically require adjectives, *eager* modifies *fans* in *eager fans*. Verbs and adjectives do not typically require that they be accompanied by adverbials, so violently modifies swore in swore violently, and disappointingly modifies slow in disappointingly slow.

Modification may be restrictive or non-restrictive. When one word restrictively modifies another, the modifier restricts the potential reference of the modified. For example, in the phrase long books the adjective long restrictively modifies the noun books. If the word books were to occur alone, then it could potentially refer to any and all types of books. The modifier restricts the reference of the phrase to just those books that are long. Nouns may have many modifiers, as in tall, black, neutered, male, domestic, shorthaired cat. Here we have six modifiers, each restricting the potential reference of the word cat. The result of piling up these modifiers is that the actual referent of the phrase must satisfy all of them—it must be a cat that is tall, black, neutered, male, domestic, and short-haired. Each modifier acts like a criterion that the ultimate referent(s) of the phrase must satisfy.

There are two main classes of modifying words in English—adjectives and adverbs. Adjectives modify nouns and adverbs modify pretty much everything else—verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, and sentences. They modify these in much the same way as adjectives modify nouns—by adding criteria that must be met. For example, in ran quickly, quickly modifies ran and therefore requires that whoever ran didn't run in any old way, but did it quickly. Other examples include expressions like take regularly, needs help immediately. Likewise, intensely in intensely bright requires that the brightness be intense (Eg. specially packaged, medically appropriate). Irritatingly in irritatingly slowly requires that whatever is going on must not only be going on slowly, but so slowly as to be irritating to someone (Eg. extremely cleverly).

Unfortunately in "Unfortunately, he didn't make it back" requires not only that he didn't make it back, but also that (the speaker feels that) it is unfortunate that he didn't (Eg. Sadly, she's no longer with us, hopefully, it won't happen again).

Nouns may be restrictively modified by clauses, called relative, adjective, or defining clauses, bolded in the man who knew too much. Notice that there is no comma between the noun man and the beginning of the restrictive relative clause. Sentences may be restrictively modified by adverbial clauses, bolded in though he liked her a lot, he was afraid to ask her for a date. Here a comma is preferred, especially if the adverbial clause is relatively long.

Notice that none of the modifiers are required or implied by the words, phrases, or sentences they modify. These words, phrases, and sentences would be grammatically complete without the modifiers—though of course adding or removing modifiers affects the meaning and potential referents of the modified elements.

Non-restrictive modifiers, or appositives, add information that is not essential for the identification of the referent of the phrase so modified. In written English, appositives are set off by commas—*The President of the US, who is in his 7th year in office, has only one more year to serve.* In cases like this, the writer assumes that the reader will know who *the President of the US* is and so does not need the appositive information to identify him.

Nonetheless, the writer adds the information that the President is in his 7th year in office as a sort of secondary predicate in addition to the primary one, namely, that he has only one more year to serve. In spoken English, appositives are set off from the remainder of the sentence by brief pauses (hence the commas) and a drop in pitch. From a writer's or speaker's point of view, it is essential to decide whether the audience does or does not need the modifier to identify the referent of the phrase.

2.1. The Preposition+ Noun Phrase (PNp)

The following are typical prepositional phrases:

(11) a. on the waterfront

b. of human bondage

c. beyond the blue horizon

d. from the halls of Montezuma

e. with malice toward none

From a functional point of view, PNPs are very simple: they consist of a head preposition and an object or complement, which is typically an NP. We can represent this as:

(12) Head + Object

From a structural point of view, each of the NPPs in (11) consists of a preposition followed by a noun phrase, and we can represent their basic structure as:

(13) PP P NP

This phrase structure tree is generated by the following PSR:

(14) PP P NP

We read this PSR as: a PP consists of a P followed by an NP. Noun phrases are discussed in more detail later in this chapter. All you need to know now is the list of single- and multi-word prepositions presented in the chapter on Minor Parts of Speech. Prepositional phrases are relatively uniform constructions: spot a preposition and the NP that immediately follows it, and you can be fairly certain that you have identified a PP. However, you should recall that some apparent prepositions are actually particles and that others may be subordinating adverbial conjunctions.

It may seem odd to treat a preposition as the head of a phrase, because traditional grammar may have persuaded us to regard the preposition as insignificant. In fact, prepositions express meanings that encompass the entire range of key semantic relations in a sentence. Another sign of the importance of prepositional phrases is their ability to appear in so many structures—within noun phrases, verb phrases, and adjective phrases.

The second part of the PNP is a noun phrase that functions as its complement or object. This terminology also suggests the central role of the preposition within its phrase. Just as verbs may govern direct and indirect object NPs, prepositions govern object NPs.

Prepositions are often simply characterized as linking words, and this is an accurate characterization as far as it goes. However, we'd like to have a more complete concept of how they work. Typically prepositions have meanings and these meanings connect their objects to other parts of the sentences in which they occur. For example, in (16), to indicates that its object NP represents the recipient of the money:

(16) Tony donated $10,000 to the hospital.

In (17), for indicates that the cardiac laboratory is to be the beneficiary of the money:

(17) The money was for the cardiac laboratory.

Notions such as recipient and beneficiary are called semantic roles, about which we will have much more to say in our chapter on Basic Clause Patterns.

2.2.The Noun Phrase (Np)

We begin our discussion of noun phrases (NP) with NPs that consist of just a single word and discuss their functional and then their formal properties. Then we will move on to various types of multi-word NPs.

Simple NPs: single word phrases

The left-hand column in Table 3 lists categories of single words that may constitute an NP, and which must consequently be its head; the italicized expressions in the right-hand column in Table 3 are examples of single-word NPs belonging to the corresponding category.

category of head word example

Noun, count Wombats are playful.

Noun, non-count Cabbage is nutritious.

Subject and object personal pronouns They saw her.

Genitive personal pronoun Mine are chartreuse.

Indefinite pronoun/quantifier None were found.

Wh-word/pronoun Who placed the call?

All of the word categories in the right-hand column are noun-like, so in order to abbreviate and to simplify matters, let's refer to them all as nominals. Every NP, like every other phrase, must have a head, and any nominal can be the head of an NP.

From a structural point of view, we can represent the possibilities in Table 2 in the following simplified tree structure:

(23) a. NP

This tree is generated by the PSR:

(23) b. NP ——> Nominal

We can read this as saying that an NP consists of any kind of nominal.

More complex NPs

There are two very general functional formulas for NPs. We give these two because it would be confusing to combine them into a single formula.

(24) a. (Premodifier) + HEAD + (Post modifier)

b. (Complement) + HEAD + (Complement)

Formula (24a) states that a noun phrase must contain a head word (which, of course, must be a nominal) but need not contain anything else. If the NP has more elements than the head, it may contain one or more premodifiers (modifiers that precede the head) and/or one or more post modifiers (modifiers that follow the head). This formula thus abbreviates several possibilities:

(25) a. Head

b. Premodifier(s) + head

c. Head + postmodifier(s)

d. Premodifiers(s) + head + postmodifiers(s)

Formula (24b) states that a noun phrase must contain a head, which may be preceded or followed by a complement. It also abbreviates several possibilities:

(26) a. Head

b. Complement + Head

c. Head + Complement

d. Complement + Head + Complement

We will deal with these possibilities in sequence.

More complex NPs: single-word premodifier + head

The part of speech of the premodifiers is given in the left-hand column.

form of premodifier	example
Article	*The wombats* escaped.
Adjective Phrase	Strong wind
Demonstrative pronoun	*That vase* is valuable.
Genitive NP	*Sheila's serve* is powerful.
Genitive pronoun	*Her serve* is powerful.
Noun	*Metal plates* shielded the instruments.
Indefinite pronoun/quantifier	*Some survivors* remained.
Wh-word	*Which lobster* do you want?
Numeral	*Seven boxes* fell.
Ordinal	*Second thoughts* assailed us.
Quantifier	*Several vats* of beer.
Negative	*No accidents* were reported.

The range of premodifiers of noun heads is large, including nearly all the parts of speech. The most frequently used modifiers are the articles, which we briefly discussed in our chapter on Minor Parts of Speech. Here we will elaborate on that discussion.

We noted that one major use of an article is to indicate whether the NP in which it occurs is definite or not: if the NP is definite, then the speaker/writer assumes that the hearer/reader can identify the referent of the NP; and if the NP is indefinite, then the speaker/writer assumes that the hearer/reader cannot identify its referent.

Yet another meaning associated with NPs is that of preferentiality. A referring NP may be either definite or indefinite but it denotes a particular entity

or set of entities: the bold NP in The/A man sat down refers to some particular man.

The opposite of a referring NP is an attributive or non-referring one. An attributive NP provides a description but does not refer to any particular individual(s). Anyone or anything that fits the description will do. Attributive NPs can often be paraphrased by whoever . . ., whatever . . ., or any . . ., as in

The man who /whoever steals my purse steals nothing.

(27) a. I saw the elephants at the zoo. (Referential and definite)

b. The next caller will win a vacation to Miami. (Attributive and definite = whoever is the next caller)

c. I want an elephant. Its name is Big Bob. (Referential and indefinite)

d. I want an elephant. Any pink one will be fine. (Attributive and indefinite.)

Finally, NPs can have a generic or non-generic reference. Generic reference designates an entire class (i.e., category, set) of entities. A non-generic reference designates a particular member or members of a class.

(28) a. Cats are skilled predators. (generic, indefinite)

b. A cat is a skilled predator. (generic, indefinite)

c. A cat is asleep on the table. (non-generic and indefinite)

d. The cat is asleep. (non-generic and definite)

e. The cat is a skilled predator. (ambiguous: generic or nongeneric and definite)

The only somewhat difficult case in Table 4 is the noun modifier, that is, the case where a noun modifies a head noun, as in metal plates. Remember that metal is not an adjective for formal reasons—e.g., it cannot be compared or intensified: metaler, more metal, very metal. Noun modifiers appear frequently when one speaks of a material out of which something is made, but the semantic range of such constructions is extensive:

(29) a. government spying

b. state law

c. pie chart

d. desert safari

e. Sunday newspaper

f. stone wall

g. plastic cups

h. cardboard boxes

More complex NPs: head + prepositional phrase

Most of the simple premodifiers above contain one word. The least complex post modifier—and by far the most common—is the prepositional phrase (PP). Remember that NPPs consist of a preposition and a noun phrase. So this simple postmodification will have the structure: N + PP. (31a-f) are examples, each with the structure:

Phrases (30) NP N PP N

Concerns about the future

(31) a. songs about rebellion

b. clocks on the wall

c. walks with my mother

d. arguments about abortion

e. reasons for my hesitation

f. sources of concern

A problem that arises with expressions in which a N is followed by a PP is whether the N and PP actually combine to form a noun phrase, as in the examples in (31), or whether they are simply a non-unified sequence of N followed by PP, as in *Put the book on the shelf*. In this expression, the N book is not combined with the PP *on the shelf* into an NP. It is important to have ways of identifying which kind of expression we are dealing with.

Remember that we said that one test for phrase hood is the possibility of being replaced by a single word. In the case of NPs these words would be pronouns. So, if a sequence of words can be replaced by a pronoun, then it is very likely an NP. For instance, you could replace all of the expressions in (31)

by some form of the word they. Let us see whether we can substitute nouns by pronouns (32):

(32) a. Woody admired the picture on the wall.

b. Woody put the picture on the wall.

Applying this Test to the picture on the wall in (32a) we get (33a):

(33) a. Woody admired it.

This is grammatical, so in (32a) the picture on the wall is a unified NP. When we apply the Pro-Sub Test to the same sequence of words in (32b) we get (33b):

(33) b. Woody put it.

This is ungrammatical, showing us that the picture on the wall in (32b) is not a unified NP. If we now apply the Pro-Sub Test to the picture in (32b) we get:

(34) Woody put it on the wall.

This is grammatical, showing us that the 'picture' in (32b) is separate from 'on the wall'. These patterns of grammaticality lead to the conclusion that (32a) contains an NP made up of a head with a PP post modifier and that (32b) contains the simpler NP the picture followed by a separate PP on the wall.

We can represent these by the following tree structure diagrams:

(32)a'. **NP** **(32)b'.** **VP**

Art **N** **PP** **V** **NP** **PP**

the picture on the wall put the picture on the wall

Given that subjects are generally NPs, if an expression can be turned into a passive subject then it is an NP. We can apply this test to (32a,b):

(32) a. Woody admired the picture on the wall.

c. The picture on the wall was admired by Woody.

Because (32c) is grammatical the sequence the picture on the wall must be an NP in (32a).

(32) b. Woody put the picture on the wall.

d. The picture on the wall was put by Woody.

Because (32d) is ungrammatical, the sequence the picture on the wall cannot be an NP in (32b).

Use the passive test to show that the italicized phrases in the following sentences are NPs:

a. Grammatical tests prove grammatical categorizations.

b. Teenagers mow lawns.

c. Obsessive-compulsives write grammar books.

d. The military developed the internet.

e. The teachers forced the unfortunate students to read grammar books.

There is also a paraphrase test for a noun head + PP. If you can insert the words which is/was or that is/was between the noun head and the PP, the construction is probably of the head + post modifier type. We call this the Whiz-test. (Which comes from which; iz comes from the pronunciation of is). Applying this test to (32a) and (32b) we end up with the paraphrases (32e,f), respectively.

(32) e. Woody admired the picture which was on the wall.

f. Woody put the picture which was on the wall.

That (32e) is grammatical indicates that on the wall is a post modifier of picture in (32a) and thus that the picture on the wall is a phrase in that sentence; the ungrammaticality of (32f) indicates that on the wall is not a post modifier of picture in (32b) and thus that the picture on the wall is not a phrase in that sentence.

Thus we can conclude that the picture on the wall in (32a) is a unified NP containing a head noun and a following PP. In contrast, in (32b), the picture on the wall is not a unified NP.

Our tests demonstrate aspects of the process of grammatical reasoning—the use of tests, the need for several tests, consideration of multiple hypotheses, and the role of grammaticality judgments. A further dividend is that the tests we

have just described will apply to just about any type of NP, not just those involving PP post modifiers.

More complex NPs: multiple premodifiers

Our examples so far have dealt only with single word premodifiers, but premodifiers can be multiplied, as (35) shows.

(35) a. the two culprits (article + numeral)

b. those metal plates (demonstrative + noun)

c. several other candidates (quantifier + indefinite)

d. one such oddity (numeral + indefinite)

e. a second chance (article + ordinal)

2.3. More complex NPs: phrasal premodifiers

Multiple one-word premodifiers cause little trouble for students. But phrasal pronominal modifiers are more complicated. Table 5 presents some major types. (We deal with verbal phrases in our chapter on Multi-Clause Sentences.)

form of premodifier	example
Genitive NP (GenNP)	This friend's hobby is knitting.
Adjective phrase (AP)	Very old memories return easily.
Verbal phrase (VblP)	Carelessly organized meetings annoy everyone.

Phrasal premodifiers can be expanded, adding greater complexity to the structure. Moreover, genitive NPs and APs readily combine with other structures to create heavily premodified NPs:

(36) a. My friend's hobby is interesting.

(GenNP my friend's modifies hobby; genitive pronoun (GenNP) my modifies friend.)

b. All my friend's hobbies are interesting.

(GenNP my friend's modifies hobbies; my modifies friend; all modifies my friend's hobbies)

c. All my friends' very old plates (three premodifiers: quantifier all; Gen NP with genitive premodifier my friends'; AP with intensifier very old)

d. Those very old counterfeiting plates belonged to Capone.

(three premodifiers: demonstrative those; AP with intensifier very old; verbal phrase counterfeiting)

Genitive NPs raise two further issues of complexity. First, they are closely related to postmodifiers that use a prepositional phrase headed by of. Compare the following.

(37) a. my friend's hobbies

b. the hobbies of my friend

c. my friend's house

d. the house of my friend

e. the house of the friend that I met in Palo Alto

f. the birth of a daughter

g. a daughter's birth

h. my daughter's birth

i. the home of the brave

j. the braves' home [Note: (37i) and (37j) have different meanings.]

k. a cup of soup/coffee/tea

l. a soup's/coffee's/tea's cup

m. a wedge of cheese

n. a cheese's wedge

o. a pat of butter

p. a butter's pat

q. a ream of paper

r. a paper's ream

s. a fistful of dollars

t. a dollar's fistful

These examples indicate that the choice of premodifier genitive vs. of-genitive depends on various factors:

a. The length of the GenNP: the longer the GenNP, the more likely we are to use an of-genitive, e.g., (37e).

b.Whether the entity represented by the genitive is animate or not; if it is, we are more likely to use the premodifier genitive; Eg. the cat's fur vs. ?the wheel's rim).

c.If the GenNP is a pronoun, we strongly prefer the premodifier genitive; Eg. her car vs. *the car of her, Sophie's Choice vs. ? A Choice of Sophie('s).

d.Note the meaning difference between her photographs and photographs of her. The first can have many meanings, e.g., photographs she owns/took/ordered/designed/etc. The second means photographs in which she is pictured.

e. An NP containing a premodifier genitive is definite, but a post-modifier genitive allows indefinite determiners to modify the head noun; compare the definite NP Oscar's friend with the indefinite NP a friend of Oscar's.

While native speakers are not likely to have trouble with such complexities, non-native students may encounter serious difficulties with this construction.

The second complexity is that genitive NPs themselves contain a NP. When one structure contains another structure, we say that the second structure is embedded in the first. The NP Harry's wife's painting contains a genitive NP within a genitive NP. In other words, Harry's is embedded within Harry's wife's, which in turn is embedded in Harry's wife's paintings.

This structure is represented in (38):

(38) NP-1

Premodifier-A Head-A (GenNP) NP-2 's Premodifier-B Head-B (GenNP) NP-3's Head N

Harry 's wife 's paintings

Embedding allows one function (or form) to contain other functions (or forms). An understanding of embedding is critical to analysis of grammatical structures with any significant degree of complexity. Let's illustrate this fact with diagram (38). NP-l (Harry's wife's paintings) consists of a premodifier of

the form GenNP (Harry's wife's) and a head noun (paintings). The GenNP in turn consists of a full NP (NP-2), along with the genitive inflection's. In other words, the form NP-2 is contained in the form NP-l. NP-2 contains a premodifier (Harry's) and a head noun (wife). Finally, premodifier-B contains a single noun head (Harry), the 's, and no premodifiers.

Under NP-3, we could have chosen a premodifier with a possessive pronoun and a noun modifier to give us my uncle Harry's wife's paintings. We could even have selected another GenNP under NP-3, in which case we might have gotten Harry's cousin's wife's paintings. In fact, we could (in principle) go on to infinity, producing ever longer and more genealogically bizarre structures:

Harry's aunt's cousin's son's granddaughter's niece's sister's step-child's friend's paintings.

Embedding enables language to be infinite in the number and length of the sentences it can create. Fortunately, speakers tend to use these possibilities sparingly, though occasionally writers such as Dylan Thomas, Henry James, and William Faulkner toy with them. As you progress through this book, you will see the pervasiveness of embedding.

Before we leave premodifiers of Ns we must address one final matter, namely the order of premodifiers. There are many proposals in the grammatical and linguistic literature, many of remarkable complexity. The following, adapted from Frawley (1992: 482-3) is a partial list:

Det > quantity > value > physical property > age > color > Head

The five good long old brown tables

Other languages allow different orders, so your non-native English speaking students may come up with utterances that violate the order rules, such as the following from a Korean student:

the weakness of the each student

2.4. Complex NPs

As complicated as possessives are, we easily recognize the infrequency of expressions such as Harry's uncle's cousin's sister's paintings. Much more

common—and much more complex—are the various sorts of phrases and clauses that follow head nouns. We have already examined the prepositional phrase, probably the simplest post modifier. Yet even this innocent construction raises the specter of mind-boggling expansions. Like possessive NPs, prepositional phrases contain noun phrases, which can contain prepositional phrases, which can contain other NPs which can contain a PP . . . all the way to the linguistic loony bin. In case you have doubts, consider the NP in (39):

(39) The book in the drawer of the desk in the office of the leader of the rebellion against the oppression of readers of tales of adventures on far planets of the galaxy . . .

Complexity is due also to the potential for various sorts of post modifiers, each more structurally intricate than the premodifiers. We treat these structures more fully in other chapters. For the present, we will introduce the major types of post modifiers and comment briefly on them.

Post modifier type example

Adjective phrase (AP) (Anyone fond of kumquats) should buy this cookbook.

Appositive NP (AppNP) (His nominee, an infamous scoundrel) is unlikely to be elected.

Relative clause (RC) (The contestant who guesses the title) will win a trip to Tahiti.

Appositive relative (AppRC) (G.W. Bush, who is the 43rd President of the US,) is only 60.

Verbal phrase (VblP) (The contestant guessing the title) will win a vacation in Tahiti.

(The person seated at the president’s right) is her bodyguard.

(The player to watch) is Jhon.

We have seen adjective phrases (APs) that function as premodifiers. Such constructions tend to be brief—one or two words if the adjective is not coordinated. However, some adjectives can, like nouns, appear with their own

post modifiers. (In the example in Table 6, of kumquats is a PP that complements fond; since that PP contains an NP, expansions like that in (39) are possible.) APs with complements or post modifiers almost always occur in the post modifier position of noun phrases. Post modifying APs also tend to allow the Whiz-test: Anyone who is fond of kumquats.

If the head of the NP is an indefinite pronoun such as someone, something, anything, nothing, then any attributive AP will occur after it:

(40) a. I heard something strange.

b. I haven't heard anything new.

c. I see nothing unusual.

Appositive noun phrases (AppNPs) and Appositive Relative Clauses (AppRCs) occur as "parenthetical asides" after their head noun. They are usually blocked off in writing by surrounding commas (dashes are also possible). In speech, they are surrounded by perceptible pause and often a fall in voice pitch, akin to the aside spoken by a stage actor. The appositive NP has the same referent as the rest of the NP. Thus in Table 6 his nominee and an infamous scoundrel designate the same individual. Since appositives can be expanded just like any other NP, they allow for infinite embedding. Sentence (41) suggests the possibilities.

(41) His nominee, an infamous scoundrel with principles learned from years of service in one of the most corrupt political machines ever devised by the devious minds that have blemished history, is unlikely to be elected.

Appositives provide extra information that is generally viewed as not being required for the identification of the referent of the NP. Some handbooks say that they can be omitted without changing the meaning of the sentence they occur in. This is quite misleading. The meaning of the sentence certainly changes, though what the affected NP refers to may not.

Verbal phrases (VblPs), which will be dealt with further in our chapter on Multi-clause Sentences, are like adjective phrases: short VblPs precede noun heads; longer VblPs, which may possess their own range of objects,

complements, and modifiers, follow the head noun within a noun phrase. In general, short modifiers tend to precede head nouns and longer ones tend to follow them.

Complements in NPs

Complements in NPs typically follow the head N, though some may occur before it, giving us the formula:

(42) (Complement) + H + (Complement)

The complements before the head may be either nouns or, more rarely, adjectives:

(43) a. a fiction writer Eg. someone who writes fiction.

b. an economics professor Eg. someone who professes economics.

c. a technical writer Eg. someone who writes technical manuals/ materials.

d. a financial adviser Eg. someone who advises on financial matters.

e. an ecological expert. [78, 439;]

When the complement follows the head N it must be either a PP or a clause:

(44) a. the trip to Disneyland (PP)

b. the claim that the war is justified (that-clause)

c. the question whether we've won (embedded/indirect question)

d. the question 'Are we there yet?' (quoted question)

e. the request to withdraw (to-infinitival clause)

Noun complement clauses are also discussed in our chapter on Multiclause Sentences.

Complex NPs: Coordination

Perhaps on the principle that too much of a good thing is impossible, languages allow us to repeat NPs indefinitely. Coordinated NPs are joined by a coordinating conjunction, such as and or or, as in (46):

(46) My sister and/or her best friend will deliver the letter.

Such structures are relatively simple to deal with—except for one problem.

Consider the ambiguous sentence (47):

(47) Old men and women will be served first.

Who will be served first? Old men and all women? Old men and old women? The answer seems to depend on whether the premodifying adjective old applies to men only or to the conjunction of men and women. To differentiate these possibilities, we must allow not only full NPs to coordinate but also heads of NPs. We represent the ambiguity diagrammatically in (48).

(48)a. **NP** **AP** **NP** **N** **Conj** **N** **A**

Old men and women

(48)b. **NP** **NP** **Conj** **NP** **AP**

Old men and women

Diagram (48a) represents the situation in which old modifies the NP men and women; (48b) represents the situation in which old modifies only men.

Summary and concluding remarks on Chapter II

As we saw, Noun Phrases are those phrases where the nuclear element is presented by a noun. Noun phrases can be single complement, and multi complement phrases. Noun phrases may vary according to the type of the complement, i.e. the words the noun is modified within the phrase, and according to the position of the modifiers.

The modifiers can be other nouns, prepositions, adjectives, numerals, and pronouns. Within a multi complement noun phrase the modifiers may modify only one element or more than one element at the same time.

CHAPTER 3. NOUN PHRASE STRUCTURE

In this chapter a brief account of the structure of the noun phrase (NP) is offered. The main goal of the current dissertation is the analysis of nouns which are embedded as modifiers in those larger units called noun phrases. In order to understand how a noun may act as a modifier in a noun phrase, attention must be paid to the processes which make this possible.

Nouns prototypically function as heads of noun phrases, but the object of study here is their role as modifiers. In order to appreciate the differences between these two functions that nouns can perform, an initial analysis of noun phrases is therefore useful.

Each section below is devoted to one specific aspect of the noun phrase. Due to limitations of space and time, I will focus on the definition, function and patterns of noun phrases as well as the modifiers inside them, and will pay special attention to premodification.

Accordingly, Section 2.1 deals with the definition and structural patterns of noun phrases, as well as to the role that noun phrases play as means for style. The phenomenon of premodification, where nouns also play an important role, is then discussed in Section 2.2; issues such as the order of premodifiers, their component parts and their possible combinations are also examined. Section 2.3 is then devoted to the role of premodification as opposed to post modification; there is a reference to previous works [120; 30,43-66] that have made a quantitative analysis of the use of premodifiers. Those earlier works will place nominal modifiers vis-à-vis the rest of modifying devices. I will also analyze aspects such as the lack of explicitness and context information as well as the pragmatic function of premodification.

3.1 Definition, function and structural patterns of noun phrases

The following subsections offer an account of the different approaches that grammars have made to noun phrases. It should be borne in mind, whilst discussing these different approaches, that the present study of the noun phrase is based on the idea that constituents in an NP are built up of a continuous and

recursive sequence of items, and that they may be studied from the point of view of their form and function.

3.1. Definition of noun phrases

The concept of phrase has been defined in a variety of ways over time. [8,15;] defined it as a combination of words put together in order to form a sense unit.

Similarly, [50, 177;] distinguishes "syntactic groups" as a combination of words which are part of a sentence. On the other hand, Hockett (1958: 152-154) refers to composite forms which are hierarchically organized. As an illustration, the old dog in the old dog lay in the corner is a composite form as well as lay in the corner. Both of them are part of a construction type, that is, a group of constructions which are similar in some specified way, since both constructions involve the modification of one immediate constituent by the other.

Thus, in the old dog, old is a descriptive adjective which functions as the second immediate constituent, whereas the noun dog is the first immediate constituent. Hackett also adds that the composite form yields a constitute, which also belongs to the class of singular nouns.

What is thus implied is that the form-class of the composite form is identified with one of its immediate constituents; this is why the old dog is a singular noun phrase just as dog is. These constructions are called endocentric. However, it seems that, at the time when Hackett was writing, the boundary between syntax and morphology was somewhat unstable, Hackett himself including constructions such as the old dog and blackbird within the label "endocentric constructions". Despite this, what constitutes a major advancement in the study of the noun phrase is that he refers to the concepts of head and attribute when observing that "the constituent whose privileges of occurrence are matched with those of the constitute is the head or centre; the other constituent is the attribute." (1958: 184). One way or another, this notion of end centrism has survived to the present day.

More recently, [12, 10-14;] refer again to the idea of the noun phrase as a headed phrase in which the head is the only obligatory constituent. They also use categories and functions to describe sentence units. The general idea is that the component parts of syntactic groups can be divided into lower units until the moment at which indivisible units are reached. Within the context of Generative Grammar, X-bar theory [80, 85] views all phrases as the product of syntactic rules which are context-free, and makes use of lexical categories such as N, V, A, P (noun, verb, adjective, and preposition) as the starting point of projection paths. These categories are assigned bars and often prime symbols also (X', X'', etc.), leading to a three-level structure. Thus for nouns, the noun phrase would be equivalent to N'' (N-double-bar), N''' or possibly N''''. It allows any constituent in the X-bar hierarchy to contain another constituent of a lower or even higher level. Example (1) may serve as an illustration of this.

(1) a broadcast of the new show

(2) This is an N'' which contains an N' which contains a P'' (of the new show) and an N'' (the new show) within it.

(3) Other approaches to the noun phrase have been made within the framework of Functional Grammar, which focuses on the communicative function of language. With Functional Grammar a new pragmatic perspective is added to the study of language. It seeks to find an explanation for phenomena according to their function in language use. Functional Grammar describes the English clause as a combination of three different structures deriving from distinct functional components, namely:

(4) (i) Ideational. Clause as representation → transitivity.

(5) (ii) Interpersonal. Clause as exchange → mood.

(iii) Textual. Clause as message → theme.

The group structure is also a combination of these three components. Group is a term which [70, 63] uses instead of phrase, arguing that "a group is in some respects equivalent to a word complex – that is, a combination of words

built up on the basis of a particular logical relation." The differences between group and phrase are mainly that "whereas a group is an expansion of a word, a phrase is a contraction of a clause." [70, 56;]. Halliday recognizes the existence and relevance of noun phrases, which he calls nominal groups. He emphasizes the value of groups (or phrases in the terminology employed here) since they provide very important aspects of meaning. Were it not for phrases, the lack of an intermediate level between clause or sentence and word would entail an enormous loss of insight. That is, describing a sentence as a construction of words is rather like describing a house as a construction of bricks, without recognizing the walls and the rooms as intermediate structural units (ibid.).

Cognitive Grammar offers a different approach to the study of noun phrases. In principle, it starts from the same premise as do the generativists when it conceives of language as knowledge in the mind. However, it differs in its conception of grammatical organization and of the specific proposals concerning semantic structure [90, 13;]. In fact, Langacker regards grammar as non-generative and non-constructive, not an algorithmic device giving a well-defined class of expressions as output, and contends that there is no such a thing as a form without meaning. Since meaning drives grammatical encoding, judgments about the grammaticality of some structures are not categorical but simply a matter of gradience. Grammatical structures do not constitute an autonomous formal system but, rather, are symbolic. Thus, lexicon, morphology and syntax belong to a continuum of symbolic units.

This notion of grammar gives a new perspective to the definition and use of noun phrases, both in terms of the categories of which they are comprised as well as the functions of each of their component parts. Thus, Langacker points out that categories such as nouns may be defined in notional, rather than grammatical, terms. As far as functions are concerned, the consideration of the determiner as the head of the noun phrase will be explained later in this chapter.

Traditionally, there is a distinction between the lexical category noun and the syntactic category noun phrase. As Taylor [136,343;] points out, "noun

phrases, or nominal, may exhibit considerable internal complexity. In terms of their conceptual organization noun phrases have four components:

(i) Specification. A given noun is a type that may be specified by using an adjective modifying it (e.g. red apple still designates an apple but it is more specific).

(ii) Instantiation. The relation between the type and its instances (i.e., those which are candidates to be selected by the noun phrase). While the noun designates a type, a noun phrase designates an instance of the type.

(iii) Quantification. Refers to the quantity of the designated instances.

(iv) Grounding. The speaker locates the designated instance from the perspective of the speech event (e.g. whether it is definite or indefinite)".

These four aspects stand in relation to one another. Thus, specification is internal to instantiation, and quantification is internal to grounding. Dependents define specification, determiners specify grounding, while quantifiers specify quantification. Noun phrase components regarding their conceptual organization Grounding enables the speech-act participants to establish mental contact with the designated entity. A speaker, by using a grounded nominal like the apples, is referring to the designated instance. The referent of a grounded nominal is not an object from the external world but an entity in a mental space. Grounding is intimately related to headedness, for which, as Taylor points out, phonological autonomy and semantic contentfulness are not actually relevant. Since a grounded nominal designates an instance (those apples and not any others) and not the type (apples), the profile of this composition is inherited from the determiner and not from the noun. This is the reason why the determiner is considered to be NP

The four red apples the head of the noun phrase. The noun is therefore the complement of the determiner, since "it fills in the conceptual material that is only schematically present in the semantic structure of the determiner." [136,350;].

Despite the obvious differences, the above approaches all share the belief that noun phrases are part of a syntactic group and are themselves made of component parts, although, admittedly, componentiality is made less use of in favor of a symbolic approach in Cognitive Grammar. Apart from constituency, other aspects, such as the function and the category of their constituents, must also be considered.

A detailed and model-free analysis of NPs is offered by Raumolin-Brunberg [120, 64;] when she refers to the concepts of constituency, dependency and linear order as the relations affecting the NP structure. As far as constituency is concerned, part-whole relations are established and the NP is therefore understood as a hierarchical structure. When it comes to dependency, part-part relations are established, since the existence of one item depends on the existence of another. Consequently, dependency provides information about how the elements are subordinated to each other. Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) also makes reference to the prevailing indecision among scholars as to an established terminology to describe the relation of dependency; terms such as subordination and embedding exist, as well as dependency itself, although these are far from identical in denotation. The final relation affecting NPs referred to by Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) is that of linear order, which is the position that the constituents can take in relation to neighbouring items. With this relation we may establish, for example, what the order of premodifiers is in connection with the head noun they modify.

In summary, the noun phrase may be defined in terms of its constituent parts (head and dependents) and their dependency (modifiers depend on the head) and order relations (modifiers may precede or succeed the head).

3.1.1 Noun phrases and nominals

The syntactic function of noun phrases is another defining property which helps to clarify their status and role. Thus, Payne and Huddleston [108, 326;] state: “NPs are prototypically capable, when placed in an appropriate case-form, of functioning as a complement in clause structure, i.e., as subject (The doctor

arrived), object (We need a doctor), or predicative complement (Kim is a doctor).” From this definition, it can be inferred that the syntactic function of noun phrases is restricted to the above mentioned functions. However, noun phrases can also function as complements in prepositional phrases (The bread is in the kitchen). In connection to this, Payne and Huddleston [108, 329;] distinguish another category, one which is intermediate between the noun phrase and the noun. This is the nominal, which fills another syntactic function, that of nominal modifiers. Example (2) may serve to explain this term.

(2) The red apple

In (2), the definite article is the determiner of red apple. This expression is not a single word, hence it is not a noun, but it is not an NP either, since it cannot function as a subject, object, PP complement, etc. (e.g. *Red apple is in the basket, or *Give me red apple). Hence, the expression is a nominal, which is head of the noun phrase, but can also function as pre-head dependent, as in (3).

(3) Those market price fluctuations

Market price is thus a nominal, it is neither a noun nor can it be an NP (e.g. *Market price is rising). It modifies the head of the NP fluctuations as a nominal modifier. The nominal also serves to discriminate internal from external dependents in NP structure, which is a distinction to be discussed in the next subsection. Biber et al. 29, 97;] also include the term nominal in their grammar, but the specific function of nominal in Payne and Huddleston (2002) as an intermediate category becomes more explicit when they assert: “Note that the term noun phrase, or NP, is frequently used more widely for any unit which appears in the positions characteristic of noun-headed structures (including clauses). If needed, noun phrases in this broad sense may be singled out as nominals.”

As has previously been seen, an NP is formed by a noun to which some dependents may be added. Those component parts offer a wide range of possible combinations in noun phrases, which gives rise to different structural patterns. A preliminary distinction can be made between simple vs. complex noun

phrases (e.g. the dog vs. the lovely hairy black dog with a red collar standing at the door of the house).

The head of the NP is defined by De Mönnink [52, 20;] as the "dominant member of the NP." This is rejected by generativists and also by Cognitive Grammar, where it is alleged that the determiner is the most prominent member which establishes the relationship between the type and its. However, from a less symbolic point of view, and if we restrict ourselves to the parameters of syntactic constituency, the rest of the NP components are placed around the head to specify the meaning and function of that head. The head may be filled by a noun (e.g. the dog) or by a nominal (e.g. the black dog). As a consequence, there are two kinds of head: an ultimate head (dog) and an immediate head (black dog). Other fillers of NP head are pronouns, numerals, or adjectives such as poor in the poor.

The construction of an NP is always recursive since a number of dependents can be added to the head element. Some dependents may precede the head and others may follow it. From a grammatical point of view, the determiner is the most important dependent in the NP, owing to the fact that this dependent is obligatory in many instances (e.g. the dog is barking outside in the garden vs. *dog is barking outside in the garden). This position is usually filled by a determiner proper (e.g. this dog) but might also be filled by a genitive noun phrase (e.g. the dog's bed). Furthermore, a more detailed analysis of this position reveals that predetermines can also appear here (e.g. both these books), as well as central determiners (e.g. both these books) and post determiners (e.g. the many books you have). On the same lines, Payne and Huddleston (2002) refer to the position of the predetermine by making another distinction between internal and external dependents; the definition of each, they argue, depends on the place they take in relation to the nominal

1. Thus, among the external dependents there are predetermines (e.g. both my skirts, such a wonderful day) and peripheral modifiers (e.g. the cat alone).

As far as internal dependents are concerned, they are placed within the nominal constituent and therefore they follow the determiner and other external dependents. Payne and Huddleston [108, 439;] make a distinction between internal dependents that depend on their position in the NP (as preceding or following the head noun) and those that depend on their function (as complements or modifiers). When defining those dependents, the differences among them and their features are not clear enough: "The pre-head dependents are modifiers, while complements are seen in the finance minister, our legal advisor, and the like. Of the post-head dependents, of Paris is a complement and the rest modifiers.". However, no definition exists which may help to discern the differences among dependents. Payne and Huddleston shed some further light on the issue when they put forward criteria for distinguishing complements from modifiers, pointing out similarities between the two in terms of sentence structure:

Complements must be licensed by the head noun (e.g. an injury of the wrist vs.*an injury to the wrist). The choices between the types of items that appear as complements depend on the head noun.

Scope of anaphora. The pronominal one precedes any internal dependents. An input which is a complement (e.g. You must take the bus to the station and not the one to the hospital, where to the station and to the hospital are complements vs. This bus is not the same as the one to the hospital, where to the hospital is a modifier).

Correlation with syntactic category. Adjectives are typically modifiers in noun phrase structure; however, there are exceptions, such as in the case of rural policeman (e.g. *The policeman is rural).

Positional mobility. The position of complements tends to be more restrictive than that of modifiers; this is especially the case of pre-head complements, which must be positioned adjacent to the head noun (e.g. a polite rural policeman).

The complement of Paris that Payne and Huddleston [108, 331;] allude to belongs to the NP The photos of Paris which his father had taken. By “the rest” they refer to the modifiers in bold type in the following NPs: A house as big as I have ever seen, The nightlife in Paris, The proposal which he made.

(v) Complements express semantic arguments of the head noun. This is especially

so when the noun is a semantic predicate denoting some property, relation, process or action and the complement represents an involved entity like the bearer of a property or a term in the relation (e.g. the softness of your skin).

(vi) Semantic roles of complements depend on the head noun. This is especially the case of complements headed by the preposition of, for example in the decease

of his father, where his father is agent, or in the election of his father, where his father is patient.

(vii) Semantic selection restrictions in noun phrases involve complements (e.g. the

reading of the poem vs. *the reading of the desk). Payne and Huddleston’s (2002) overview on NP structure is, despite some gaps, relatively comprehensive. Quirk et al. (1985), on the other hand, restrict those dependents to modifiers, and make a distinction regarding their position within the noun phrase (whether they precede or follow the head noun). Nevertheless, they differentiate among the following various kinds of modification: restrictive (e.g. my younger sister), non-restrictive (e.g. my lovely dog). Restrictive modifiers are those dependents that can create a subclass of the class denoted by the head of the NP, whereas non-restrictive or descriptive modifiers are those which describe the referent of the NP in terms of a particular quality it possesses [52, 23;]. Also, a further distinction between temporary and permanent modifiers can be made. Premodifiers tend to be permanent (the lovely girl) whereas post modifers may be temporary. Thus, temporary modifiers cannot usually be placed in premodifying position (e.g. the ready man). The categories which are

employed as modifiers are mainly adjectives, which are placed in premodifying position, but nominals are also common categories filling this position. Participles ending in –ing and –ed may also function as premodifiers. On the other hand, the post modifier position may be held by relative clauses, -ing and –ed clauses, to infinitive clauses, prepositional phrases and noun phrases in apposition.

As pointed out above, the head noun in an NP is traditionally the element around

which all the dependents are placed, and one can usually recognize a prototypical NP structure in which the order of each of its elements can be observed. De Mönnink [52,19;] divides a prototypical NP into the following constituent elements: limiter, determiner, premodifier, head and post modifier. The limiter is not the same as Payne and Huddleston's external dependent, neither is it the predetermine in Quirk et al.'s account.

The differences with this analysis have to do with the fact that De Mönnink includes a new analysis of the determiner position which is fulfilled by a determiner phrase. Thus, the predetermine, central determiner and post determiner that Quirk et al. (1985) resorted to are here part of the determiner phrase and thus the limiter is another kind of dependent. It is similar to the determiner phrase premodifier because it precedes other determiners and it is realized by an adverb phrase (e.g. only my books). However, a limiter cannot co-occur with a determiner phrase premodifier. The differences lie in the fact that the determiner phrase premodifier can obviously occur only if the determiner phrase slot is also realized.

Furthermore, the stress will fall on the following item (e.g. around twó days). On the other hand, the limiter is not dependent on the realization of the determiner phrase slot and receives the stress, since it restricts the reference of the NP (e.g. just your friend).

The second element (DET) is the determinative, whose occurrence depends largely on the head noun of the NP. The premodifier (PREM) is the

following dependent. As previously noted, this function is mainly filled by adjectives, adjective phrases, and nouns, but also by –ed and –ing participles, genitives, adverbs and other phrases. Premodifiers can co-occur, and the order in which they appear as a sequence is not entirely free. As De Mönnink [52, 21;] observes, the ordering is dependent on the syntactic and semantic class membership of the items concerned the general rule is to place the more objective and undisputable qualifications closer to the noun, and the more subjective, opinion like ones farther away."

This implies that descriptive adjectives precede classifying ones, whereas nouns will appear after the other premodifiers. Quirk further sub classify premodifiers from the furthest to the closest to the head noun as follows:

(1) General (small, big)

(2) Age (old, young)

(3) Colour (black, red)

(4) Participle (disturbing, closed)

(5) Provenance (Spanish, English)

(6) Noun (air, Paris)

(7) Denominal (personal, human)

In spite of this possible ordering of premodifiers in noun phrase structure, it should be pointed out that premodifiers may exhibit a certain weakness in their constraints.

The head (HEAD) is the following element, and indeed the most important one, since all the other items in the NP depend on it. Post modifiers (POM) follow the head and can prototypically be filled by prepositional phrases and clauses, but also by adjective phrases and noun phrases.

This is the prototypical structural pattern that noun phrases may exhibit. Yet there are other possible combinations that NPs can display which deviate from this prototypical ordering. Thus, De Mönnink puts forward a comprehensive classification of noun phrases depending on the kind of mobility that they present. It can be summarized as follows:

Type A. NP with a deferred modifier → the modifier (AP, ADVP, NP) follows the head (e.g. the breakfast this morning).

Type B. Noun phrase with a floating deferred modifier → a clause or a phrase is outside the NP boundaries (e.g. the news were suddenly spread that he was coming back soon).

Type C. Noun phrase with a fronted modifier → a clause precedes the head (e.g. the insert coin icon).

Type D. Noun phrase with a discontinuous modifier → the constituents of an adjective phrase do not occur adjacent to each other (e.g. She seems to be quite a different person from the one I used to know).

Type E. Noun phrase with a deferred determiner → part of the determiner follows the NP head (e.g. The problem does not affect us all).

Type F. Noun phrase with floating deferred determiner → the determiner occurs outside the NP boundaries (e.g. They are both playing tennis).

Type G. Noun phrase with a discontinuous determiner (e.g. My friends both went to the party).

Type H. Noun phrase with a deferred limiter → the limiter occurs after the NP head (e.g. He asked for nothing at all).

A floating constituent, as defined by De Mönnink [52,25;], is seen in those instances in which a constituent occurs in a position outside the boundaries of its mother constituent.

If an NP has one or more floating constituents, it is called discontinuous, as stated by De Mönnink [52, 25;].

Type I. Noun phrase with a floating deferred emphasizer → the emphasizer occurs outside NP boundaries (e.g. She already knew that he was himself outside the city).

One of the features which may define noun phrases is that of their static nature, as opposed to the dynamism of verbs. The addition of nominal premodifiers to the head of a noun phrase helps to increase this static character, which itself has some consequences in terms of the goals with which language

users may employ them. According to Varantola, owing to their static character, noun phrases with nominal premodification provide the statements they represent with a universalistic or normative vision, which generates a standardisation of the terminology that scientists employ.

Du Bois (1981) points out that the reasons why nominal premodification in scientific English noun phrases is a recursive phenomenon are not only of a stylistic nature but are also related to the assumptions of the writer as to what concerns shared information. Thus, prenominal position is usually occupied by shared information between the sender and receiver of a message, whereas new information is placed in postnominal position (the endfocus principle). In order to explain this, she resorts to the concept of "communicative dynamism" whereby shared information includes less communicative dynamism than new information [70, 26;].

Therefore, the later elements of a sentence are most communicative, that is, they bear the greatest message load. In spite of the fact that this phenomenon takes place at sentence level, she adds: "(…) the dynamic build up which is conceded to occur in units such as sentences can be seen to occur in their components, Halliday refers to the concepts of theme and rheme into which a sentence is organized, and also to notions of given and new information, which often coincide with the theme and rheme, respectively.

This awareness of the fact that there is shared knowledge causes a reduction in explicitness, itself characteristic of nominal premodification, since there is no need to repeat what is already known by the interlocutors. Similarly, Quirk et al. (1985: 243) explain that this reduction in explicitness is related to the linguistic and situational context in which a given NP occurs. Thus, there is information of which interlocutors have been aware in previous linguistic interchanges; and there is also the context of the situation in which the sentence is uttered, which helps to fill informative slots in the most efficient way with the least number of linguistic elements.

The function of noun phrases as means for style is also perceived in journalistic language. Complex noun phrases are mainly used in newspaper headlines. Examples (4a) and (4b) may serve as illustrations.

(4a) Brown's chief fundraiser embroiled in sleaze row

(4b) Call centre worker wins race case over accent

Both examples are taken from The Times Online newspaper. As can be seen, there is just one verb acting as a link between two different complex noun phrases on which all the information load falls. Such headlines are clear examples of the compressed style of complex noun phrases that can be exploited in journalese. Thus, complex NPs replace potential, more explicit and longer utterances like those with postmodifying relative clauses. Furthermore, the nominal style allows for an impersonal tone that can be used to establish distance between the writer and the news itself, creating the impression that the information presented is objective.

3.2 Premodification in NPs

Premodifiers are optional elements in the noun phrase, given that their presence or absence does not affect the grammaticality of its structure. However, premodifiers provide the noun phrase with important features, since they identify, classify and define the head noun. Indeed, premodifiers have the potential to be present in all kinds of linguistic interchanges and situations. Furthermore, they contribute to the saving of space.

In addition, and going back to Varantola's [137,75;] statement introduced at the beginning of Section 2.1.4, premodifiers are seen as permanent, as opposed to postmodifiers, which are more dynamic and variable. Nouns and adjectives, which tend to be stative, are the prototypical categories that fill the premodifier position. Thus, premodifiers tend to describe permanent features of the noun they modify. In the following subsections attention will be paid to the role of the different component parts of premodification, as well as to their order of appearance and the possible combinations that may be found in premodifying position.

As noted, premodifying position is usually and prototypically filled by adjectives (a sad scene), but also by participles (the stolen book/ the rising sun) and nouns (a car crash). In addition, there are other less frequent types of premodifying items, such as genitives (this airplane's crew), phrases (a round-the-corner shop), and sentences (the I don't know how many people). As has been previously noted, nouns and adjectives as premodifiers provide the noun phrase with a static character since they themselves are static. Nevertheless, this tendency towards some sort of permanence is also observed in the case of participles. Thus, (5) a working man is not a man who is working at a given time but a man who works habitually.

The premodifier position in noun phrases may be filled by one or more of the above mentioned items, since premodification is a recursive phenomenon. There is much variation across genres in the forms and quantity of premodifiers used; thus, for example, complex premodifying forms tend to be more present in scientific language than in a spontaneous conversation. There is theoretically no limit to the number of items which may appear in premodifying position; however, it is unusual to find more than four, since too much complexity in NP modification will imply a processing overload, leading to a loss of meaning and content.

As we know, the sequence into which these modifying items may appear is not entirely free, since there is an order that depends on a number of factors, such as the intended meaning and the type of premodifier.

In the noun phrase structure, two different ordering constraints can be found. Rigid ordering constraints imply that their violation must give rise to an ungrammatical structure.

For example, changing the order of the indefinite article and noun in (6a), below, for example, gives rise to an ungrammatical NP in (6b).

(6a) an apple

(6b) *apple an

Labile ordering constraints, on the other hand, imply that a change of order will not give rise to an ungrammatical structure; such constraints simply give the preferred order in the default case. Thus, departures from this order will often be of questionable acceptability but may be justified by considerations of scope and information packaging [108, 452;] Thus, in examples (7a) and (7b),

(7a) I want to wear a long red dress

(7b) I want to wear a red long dress

(7b) is an illustration of labile order. The prototypical order of modifiers in (7a) has been changed, but no ungrammatical expression has been created as a result. This second example serves to emphasize the kind of long dress the speaker wants to wear (which is red and not of any other color). Thus, the sentence could be expanded as in (7c).

(7c) I want to wear a red long dress and none of the other long dresses I have got in my wardrobe As already noted, there is a general rule whereby the more objective and unquestionable modifiers are placed closer to the head of the NP, whereas the more subjective ones are placed further away. This implies that nouns are closer to the head noun, while adjectives (especially descriptive ones) will precede those modifying nouns.

(8) A touching private poetry reading

In this NP, the descriptive adjective touching precedes the classifying adjective private, which itself precedes the modifying noun poetry; both are premodifiers of the head noun reading.

Thus, positions closer to the head noun are filled by descriptive modifiers, which are "more NP My first significant international Linguistics conference integral to the identification, classification, or description of the head noun referent." [28, 599;]. Along the same lines, Quirk [118, 22] distinguish four different premodification zones: precentral, central, postcentral, and prehead position. Non-gradable adjectives are situated in precentral position, gradable adjectives are placed in central position, whereas participles and colour adjectives are left in postcentral position. In prehead position are the least

adjectival and most nominal modifiers (adjectives denoting nationality, style, provenance; denominal adjectives and nouns). Figure II illustrates this classification.

When items of the same group co-occur there is a tendency for those modifiers which denote place and time to take precedence (e.g. National biological laboratory). Likewise, when there are two premodifying nouns (e.g. A plastic milk bottle), Quirk point out that the second premodifier corresponds to the object of the verb in a potential underlying sentence (e.g. The bottle contains milk), whilst the first premodifying noun is related to material, means, instrument, space or any comparable adverbial relation (material in the example above). However, this is not always the case, as many examples in the present corpora have shown. Thus, in the case of example (9), (9) cable television regulation bill (FROWN A01 L6) there is no possibility of saying that the *bill contains a regulation; rather, the bill regulates the cable television, which implies that the second premodifier becomes the verb of the potential sentence and the first premodifier becomes the direct object.

Multiple premodification also implies that premodifying items may be coordinated. There are examples of coordinated premodifiers.

(10a) She was an absent and forgetful person

(10b) He gave me some honey and jam jars

In both examples, there are two coordinated premodifiers which belong to the same category: two adjectives in the case of (10a) and two nouns in the case of (10b). Quirk note that there is no possibility for a coordination of premodifiers from different categories, such as a noun and an adjective.

(11) the local and waterboard authorities

However, many examples can be found of coordinated premodifiers which belong to different categories.

For an explanation of the reference of this extract see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1.

(12a) Hydraulic and fuel lines (FLOB J77 L206-207)

(12b) Parochial or district situation (FLOB G53 L107-108)

In these, the first constituent of the coordination is an adjective and the second is a noun, both of which premodify the noun heads lines and situation. We may thus wonder to what extent example (11) is ungrammatical, since real examples of this kind are found. Likewise, Rosenbach [125, 545;] makes reference to these sorts of coordinations as examples of nouns which have adjectival properties, such as personal and family tragedy. She stresses the fact that if both noun and adjective are coordinated it is because they belong to the same category.

However, this does not seem a very compelling argument, and indeed she ultimately recognizes that great difficulty exists in explaining this phenomenon whereby both items seem to share the same function but not the same category. Clearly this matter deserves more reflection, since the answers provided so far are not satisfactory

9. It may be analyzed from other points of view, such as the gradience between adjectives and nouns and the progressive acquisition of adjectival characteristics by nouns in their function as modifiers. Likewise, there are cases in which the coordination is placed in head position.

(13) Body fluids and chemicals (LOB J16 L66-67)

The fact that an adjective and a noun are considered to be of the same category just because they are coordinated does not seem to be very convincing. However, such cases are manifest examples of the fact that nouns in premodifying position are taking some properties which traditionally belong to the adjective. This could be an explanation for the grammaticality of the coordination between nouns and adjectives in premodifying position in which a single noun premodifies the coordinated head nouns fluids and chemicals. This kind of construction may yield some sort of ambiguity, since one may wonder whether the single modifier is referring to one or both of the coordinated head nouns.

Complexity in the case of premodification can also be appreciated in (14) and (15).

(14) some red brick farm houses

In (14) a head noun is modified by two different nouns *brick and farm*. However, the complexity of these premodifiers is evident, since there is an adjective (red) which is itself modifying brick. This means that premodifiers can be themselves individually and internally modified by other items. In relation to this, Payne and Huddleston (2002: 446-447) distinguish between stacked modification and submodification. In stacked modification, the items modify the head successively rather than simultaneously.

(15) red linen skirts

That is, in (15) the modifier *linen* modifies the head of the noun phrase *skirts*, and the whole composition is modified by *red*. The evidence for such a structure is justified with coordination and anaphora tests.

(15a) red linen skirts and dresses

(15b) red linen skirts and cotton dresses

(15c) red linen skirts and blue cotton dresses these skirts

(15d) I prefer the red linen skirts to these these red linen skirts

Examples (15a-c) provide different coordinations of the same noun phrase which do not affect the whole composition red linen skirts. Example (15d) shows that any of the three heads can be the antecedent of an anaphoric expression (skirts, linen skirts, or red linen skirts).

In the case of submodification, the modifier can itself be internally modified by another modifier, as in example (14), in which red is internally modifying brick, which is at the same time modifying the head of the noun phrase houses (some [[red brick] [farm houses]]).

3.3. Noun+ Noun consructions

3.3.1. Earlier analyses of N+N structures

The modification of nouns by nouns has been the object of study by various scholars during the 20th century. In what follows, I provide a brief overview of

the different approaches that have been taken, especially of those dating from the last quarter of the 20th century.

As previously mentioned, nominal modifiers have been of interest since Byington [38, 69;] condemned the use of these complex constructions because of their ambiguity. N+N structures were subsequently discussed by scholars such as Bloomfield (1984), and Marchand (1969). However, it is in the 1970s that monographs on the topic start to appear. Li (1971) views structures of this kind as compounds which have the function of subcategorizing the referents of nouns (e.g. sugar bowl, rice bowl). They also provide names (e.g. Liberty Bell) and serve as a means for telegraphic speech (e.g. cradle song). These structures are seen to be generated through productive rules, and are formed by two constituents. There is a condition within the compound which limits the semantic relations of the constituents and these determine which nouns can appear in the construction. Li (1971) also considers that there are some exceptions to this process, as in the case of those structures created for telegraphic speech at a given moment, which are thus not part of a productivity process. This idea is refuted by Downing [55, 816;], who points out that "(…) any existing compound, telegraphic or not, may serve as the model for the analogical formation of any number of novel compounds."

From a Transformational Grammar perspective, Levi (1978) provides a thorough analysis of the syntax and semantics of what she calls complex nominals. Her main hypothesis is based on the idea that complex nominals are generated from earlier underlying sentence structures. They may be created by deletion of the predicate (e.g. drugs death → death caused by drugs) or by nominalization (e.g. city regulations). For deletion, Levi (1978) built up a set of predicates (cause, have, make, use, be, for, in, from, about), which she referred to as RDP (Recoverably Deletable Predicates). These predicates are deleted in the process of the transformation from an underlying sentence into a surface structure. For example, the complex nominal disease germ derives from the underlying structure a germ causes a disease. This rule of deletion has access to

the semantic content, which makes it possible to identify the (omitted) RDP. As can be seen, the RDPs are extremely basic, which implies that, from a semantic point of view, it is easy to establish a potential underlying structure for any given N+N structure.

As noted in 3.1.4.1, above, Levi (1978) argues that the main function of complex nominals is the communication of information in a compacted way. Also, complex nominals are naming devices, a characteristic which clearly moves N+N structures further away from syntax and brings them close to (or even within) the field of morphology. In spite of this, she still distinguishes a modifier and a head inside each complex nominal, which implies that their structure is still that of a syntactic construct. They seem to be highly productive as a system, owing to their compacted structure. In addition, their formation is produced with a reduced loss of semantic content, since all the elements of the underlying sentence may be present in the new structure (e.g. senatorial industrial investigations → senators investigate industry), or the elided elements may be easily recovered (as in the case of drugs death). For the purposes of the current review, the most interesting contribution in Levi's (1978) work is perhaps the idea that complex nominals undergo a process of semantic specialization. She establishes a continuum of derivational transparency: + transparent + opaque mountain village flea market honeymoon.

Whereas the most transparent complex nominals are derivable through regular syntactic processes, the meaning of the most opaque complex nominals cannot be easily inferred; hence they will eventually warrant their own dictionary entries.

Bauer [23,54;] establishes three features to distinguish a compound: morphological, phonological and semantic, when asserting that The compound, it is claimed, shows a degree of phonological, morphological and semantic isolation." Those criteria, which will be discussed in Section 3.4.1, entail several problems, such as that of stress placement and its variability, already referred to in Section 3.1.2, above.

Warren (1978) established the semantic patterns of noun compounds. She considers these structures as indivisible semantic-syntactic units:

(i) in the middle of which no adjective can be inserted (e.g. *girl beautiful friend)

(ii) the first element cannot be inflected for number (e.g. *girls friend)

(iii) determiners preceding a structure of this kind refer to the second element but never to the first constituent (e.g. these girl friends)

Once again, N+N structures are placed within the field of morphology. Warren talks about a comment-topic semantic structure, in which the comment refers to what is said about the topic, whereas the latter refers to what is being talked about. The comment can have a classifying or an identifying function. Thus, she distinguishes six different types of semantic relations in N+N structures:

(i) A is something which constitutes B, or vice versa: paste wax.

(ii) A is something of which B is a part or feature or vice versa: board member.

(iii) A is the location or origin of B in time or space: sea food.

(iv) The comment indicates the purpose of B: pie tin.

(v) The comment indicates the activity or interest with which B is habitually

concerned: fire department.

(vi) A indicates something that B resembles: bullet head.

Within each semantic class there are further divisions and subdivisions. Each of these semantic classes admits prepositional paraphrasing (e.g. metal sheet → sheet of metal).

However, Warren [138, 49;] makes it clear that "prepositional paraphrasing will, however, not work whenever idiomatization of the meaning of the compound has occurred, since this is tied to the compound form." Thus, for example Sunday school and school on Sunday are not complete synonyms.

Bybee (1985) examines differences between lexical and syntactic compounds. While in the former the resulting unit is a complex structure whose meaning is not predictable from a summation of the meanings of its parts, in the latter the units combined also exist independently as words. The results of the compounding process are lexicalized and tend to gradually lose their semantic and phonological transparency [41, 106;].

The previous review reveals that in a first stage of the study of N+N structures, discussion was restricted to the consideration of these structures as morphological items, and the possible distinction between syntax and morphology was not a matter of great interest.

Meaning relations between N+N constituents were the object of attention, as well as their productivity as a word formation process. An interesting topic which begins to emerge during this stage in the research is the process of lexicalization that N+N structures may undergo.

The second stage in the study of N+N structures, it might be argued, takes place during the 1990s, when N+N structures begin to attract the interest of those working in textual genre studies and sociolinguistics. Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) conducts an in-depth analysis of the noun phrase in 16th century English and underlines the early existence of common nouns functioning as pre-head constituents within noun phrase structure. However, the range of modifying nouns by that time is very restricted. Basing her research on a corpus of texts by Sir Thomas More's writings, she found that all common nouns appearing in pre-head lots are simply titles denoting rank, social status or profession (e.g. king, master, doctor). A smaller proportion of nouns exists, these denoting family and household relations (e.g. daughter, servant, son). No other nouns appear modifying nouns. Furthermore, the head nouns are invariably human proper nouns.

Jucker (1992) introduces an interesting element into the study of nominal modification, taking a socioeconomic approach to account for N+N structures. He compares the different use of N+N structures in two kinds of newspapers,

tabloids and broadsheets, finding significant differences in the rate of nouns as modifiers as compared to other premodifying categories (adjectives, participles, genitives). The social implications are based on the idea that the higher educational profile of the readership of the up-market papers goes together with a higher proportion of adjectives in premodifying position. The resulting data also show more significant differences between premodifying categories according to newspaper section (i.e., sports, home news, foreign news, business, arts) than according to newspaper category (i.e., quality vs. down market). Thus, quality newspapers resort to nouns in prehead position less often than down-market papers; in fact, more than a third of all premodifiers in prehead position are adjectives, while the proportion in down-market papers is less than a fifth, which also implies that there is a much higher proportion of nouns than adjectives as premodifiers in down-market papers, as noted in Jucker (1992: 152).

Also, the arts and foreign news sections show a higher rate of adjectives than nouns as premodifiers; conversely, business, home news, and sports display a higher number of nouns in premodifier position, the last of which contains the highest proportion of all.

Varantola (1993) discusses the acceptability of N+N structures as devices used to

achieve compactness, which provides an explanation as to why nominal modifiers are so frequently used, as well discussing why there may be opposing opinions as to the acceptability of N+N structures in the language. She is aware of that the widespread use of these constructions is sometimes criticised, since they make for compactness at the expense of explicitness. However, arguments in favour of the use of nominal modifiers are concerned with their communicative function and whether they are understandable within a given context. Consider examples (28a) and (28b).

(28a) That child over there has a serious problem (…) The problem child has left school (28b) That child over there is causing the students some problems (…) *The

problem child has left school

Whereas in (28a) the use of the noun problem makes sense, in (28b) it does not, and the use of the adjective problematic would be more appropriate. According to Varantola (1993), this implies that the form of a given message must adapt to the content of that message (Eg.. also Wells 1960).

Varantola (1993) also makes reference to N+N structures as parts of a syntactic building block. According to this, N+N constructions appear in a context in which there is a contrast between the static nature of nominal constructions and the dynamic nature of verbal expressions (Eg.. Lehmann and Moravcsik, 2000: 732).

static dynamic noun adjective verb Figure IV Contrast between the static and dynamic nature of nouns and verbs During the 1990s, the putative second phase of research interest into N+N structures, the status of these structures itself becomes a source of debate. Bauer (1998) works from the assumption that the criteria used to discern whether an N+N structure is a compound or a noun phrase are not clear enough. The criteria against which he provides evidence are the following:

(i) Compounds are listed.

(ii) Compounds are written as a single word.

(iii) Compounds have fore-stress.

(iv) The first element in a compound is syntactically isolated.

(v) Compounds do not permit coordination.

(vi) The head of a phrase can be replaced by one.

The final stage in this review of the study of N+N constructions begins, arguably, with Biber and Clark's (2002) work on the spread of premodifiers in English, whose recent increase in use is manifest. The development of the mass

media and of information and communication technologies, such as the Internet, has had an essential role in that increase.

What was labelled the Global Village (McLuhan 1969) two generations ago has today acquired its fullest expression, and our current communicative realm undoubtedly favours theuse of short and direct linguistic devices to communicate effectively, amongst these N+N structures.

A rather different analysis is that of Benczes [26, 10;], who examines the semantics of metaphorical and metonymical N+N combinations (e.g. sandwich generation, snail mail) from a cognitive linguistic perspective, claiming that, once an N+N structure has been coined, it is already a compound word, whether or not it subsequently becomes established in the lexicon. Her main hypothesis is that the differences between endocentric N+N compounds such as apple tree and exocentric N+N compounds (which she refers to mainly as creative compounds11) such as hammerhead do not depend on more or less transparency of meaning but on creativity. These latter compounds, then, are created by means of "(…) a more imaginative, associative and creative word formation process, based on conceptual metaphor or metonymy". Such compounds are not semantically transparent and can be analysed by means of "metaphor, metonymy, blending, profile determinacy and schema theory" (ibid.) within a cognitive linguistic framework.

Rosenbach (2005) examines the spread of N+N constructions from the second half of the 17th century to 1990. She aims to demonstrate, through a corpus analysis, that the Late Modern English period plays an essential role in the increase of these constructions. Using the British English news sections of the ARCHER corpus, she asks whether N+N structures have become more frequent per se, not just because nouns in general have become more common in English

A comparison was made between the frequency of all nouns and of N+N structures in the relevant sections of the corpus, taking time intervals of fifty

years, from the second half of the 17th century to the second half of the 20th century.

We wonder whether she is referring to the increase in vocabulary items to name new things. Other works such as Potter [116, 101;] have pointed out that the growing orientation to information in our society is reflected in an increasing nominal style.

Finally, the work of Giegerich (2004) and Plag (2006) on the variability of stress assignment in N+N structures also falls within this period in the study of such structures.

These two studies were discussed in Section 3.1.2, above.

To summarise, various studies of N+N structures indicate that the question of nominal modification or compounding is still a matter of debate. Additionally, there seems to be no current solution to questions such as stress variability and the overlap with other structures like genitives or post modifiers. Different approaches have shown that N+N structures are a phenomenon in constant development.

As we know, the construction of a noun phrase is recursive, that is, we may add new items to its head which help to specify and characterize the extra linguistic referent that the NP is alluding to. The head noun allows the insertion of items to both its left and right sides with pre and post dependents, whether they are internal or external [108, 439-447;]. The premodifier position can be filled by different categories, such as adjectives (e.g. a red car), participles (e.g. the missing documents) or nouns (e.g. a gold watch). Adjectives are the prototypical category fulfilling this position [83, 30,43-66;] adjectives are classified depending on the properties they lend the noun which they modify. Their place and order within the noun phrase has been a frequent subject of study [21, 52, 48;].

In spite of the status of adjectives as the prototypical premodifying category, there is evidence of the increasing use of nouns as premodifiers. Biber et al. (1999) observed that, within premodification, nouns are nearly as frequent

as attributive adjectives in the Longman Spoken and Written English (LSWE) Corpus, a compilation of about 40 million words distributed into four different genres, namely conversation, fiction, news and academic prose; this tendency was especially notable in news and academic prose. Within postmodification, prepositional phrases are the most frequently used dependents, which means that non-clausal modification shows a clear supremacy in Present Day English. Furthermore, the work by Biber and Clark (2002) on the spread of nouns as premodifiers in the Present Day English noun phrase is just another example of this tendency and the interest it has raised among scholars (Eg.. Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1). Hence, it will be of interest to consider why nominal premodifiers are now on the rise, and which specific functional reasons there might be for this.

3.3.2. Nouns as modifiers

A noun may be defined as the category which characteristically occupies the head position in an NP. It usually inflects for number and it may be accompanied by various dependents, such as determinatives, adjective phrases and relative clauses. Such a definition clearly allows for the possibility that nouns may adopt new functions, since the function of the head is seen as characteristic but not the only possible one. Nouns as dependents accompany the head of the noun phrase, providing it with those specific qualities that are singular to the given entity.

They specify and characterize the head noun, and by providing additional information become essential ingredients in the process of exchanging information within a given communicative process.

Modifiers can also be nominals (understood as a category intermediate between the noun phrase and the noun, owing to the fact that they themselves can contain their own pre-head dependents (19a). However, they cannot usually take dependents to their right side (19b).

(19a) a [white rubber] hanger

(19b) *a [white rubber of high quality] hanger

Nonetheless, there are exceptions, and such is the case of institutional proper names [108,444;]. Where the premodifying noun Institute is itself modified by a postmodifying prepositional phrase of Development.

Nouns as dependents can be of two kinds: complements or adjuncts. As complements, they and the head noun are part of an unbreakable combination (e.g. a linguistics student). As adjuncts, they freely combine with the head noun (e.g. an Oxford student). We might recall from the previous chapter that Payne and Huddleston [108,439-443;] make a rather sharp distinction between these two types of noun dependents. However, when dealing with nouns as complements, it is sometimes difficult to discern whether they are part of a syntactic phrase or, rather, whether they combine with another noun to form a morphological compound [23, 31, 31-48; 63, 43-62].

The former distinction is intimately related to the order of premodifying nouns within noun phrase structure. Thus, the Principle of Head Proximity [121, 264;] captures the idea that in a subordinate domain the preferred position of the head constituent is as close as possible to the head of the super ordinate domain. This implies that, given an NP as a super ordinate domain, the head constituent of a subordinate domain (that is, a modifier) is as close as possible to the head of the NP. In relation to this, there are differences among categories, thus nouns are closer to the head noun than attributive adjectives. The abovementioned distinction between complements and adjuncts may serve to explain why there is such a fixed order of occurrence. Complements are mainly realized by nouns or nominals, as in a linguistics student; adjuncts, on the other hand, are mainly realised by attributive adjectives, such as white in a white skirt. As has already been noted, the relationship between a complement and the head noun is tighter than in the case of adjuncts, a further reason why those complements are closer to the head noun than adjuncts such as adjectives (e.g. a smart linguistics student). However, there are exceptions to this, and adjectives which are complements can be found [108, 439;], as with criminal in criminal lawyer, or nouns which are adjuncts, as with London in London Psychiatric Hospital, in

which there is a modifying noun followed by a modifying adjective. Another classification which resembles Payne and Huddleston's is the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers [139, 59-60;]. Nouns as modifiers are usually restrictive, since they combine with their heads to form units with a specific reference (e.g. flower seller), whereas adjectives as modifiers tend to be nonrestrictive, since they simply provide the head of the noun phrase with additional information about the referent (e.g. an amusing joke). As restrictive modifiers, nouns can be defining or classifying, in this latter case narrowing the denotational class of the head noun to a subset denoted by that head (e.g. telephone box, since this is not a kind of box but it refers to another kind of entity) [52]. As restrictive modifiers, nouns can also be identifying, when they restrict the reference of the head noun (e.g. winter clothes, restricting clothes to the ones that are usually worn in winter). However, there are occasions when nouns as modifiers are non-restrictive, such as an Oxford old residence, in which context makes it evident that Oxford neither identifies which particular residence is referred to, nor indicates a particular type of residence [139, 64;]. As noted in Warren, this distinction would explain the phonological, morphological and syntactic features of nouns as modifiers:

Warren refers here to the stress pattern characteristic of nouns when combining with other nouns. She also notes that modifying nouns are not inflected for plural even if they refer to plural referents, and goes on to identify the problem of ambiguity when nouns as modifiers co-occur with other nominal modifiers. These issues will be taken up in what follows.

Nominal modifiers, because of their restrictive function, tend to be part of a stress pattern involving stress reduction, lose their ability to be inflected and, when combined with another modifier, have no predictable scope of modification, so that this has to be indicated by position or coordinating conjunctions.

The syntactic vs. morphological nature of N+N structures is a question which will be dealt with in greater detail further in the following paragraphs.

However, it should be mentioned at this point that this issue has a bearing on the consideration of stress as a defining characteristic of each syntactic or morphological nominal construction. In fact, stress in N+N structures has often been used to argue against or in favour of the distinction between syntactic phrases and morphological units [61, 63;]. Marchand for instance, claims that stress may serve to distinguish syntactic phrases from compounds. He maintains that any substantive may be used to determine another substantive, by which is meant that the first is transposed from the position of head (determinatum) to that of modifier (determinant). This is a syntactic phenomenon which has nothing to do with word-formation and whose basic stress pattern is that of double stress (e.g. stone ´wall). On the other hand, there are fore-stressed combinations which show a lexical relation between a dependent and its head and which are part of a word-formation process (e.g. ´suitcase). Thus, for any N+N combination whose first constituent is transposed, the rule is that of syntactic double stress. Marchand [100, 23;] points out that a deviation from that rule must be accounted for by special semantic and/or grammatical reasons. Such a contrast can be seen in examples (21a) and (21b).

(21a) girl friend - syntactic phrase with double stress

(21b) girlfriend - morphological group with fore-stress

Additionally, the frequency of use of the same second element in N+N sequences (as ware in ironware, silverware, etc.) may also be a reason for the existence of fore-stress. Similarly, Liberman and Prince (1977: 257) point out that "[I]n any pair of sister nodes [AB]x , where X is a phrasal category, B is strong", which means that phrasal structures receive right-hand stress.

Olsen (2000a), on the other hand, considers that all N+N sequences are morphological compounds, and thus stress depends on two patterns of interpretation. So, left-hand stress provides an interpretation based on a compound internal inferred relation between the two constituents, whereas right-hand stress provides an interpretation based on a compound external modifier-like relation between the two constituents. The stress falls on the first

element if the second constituent is adverbial (e.g. drug dealer) or if it denotes a semantic relation which may be applied to the first element (e.g. pizza shop). Also, left-hand stress occurs in compounds "(…) where a relational notion is not overtly expressed by the head noun, but is inferable on the basis of the meaning of one of the constituents (…) The inferred relation is then used to combine the meanings of the two elements in the compound." [105, 55-69;]. This implies that there is a semantic relation between the constituents to which we can have access through the application of the cultural background of a given speech community. Hence, stock market is a compound because the two constituents are semantically related to each other through the semantic field of economics and business. In other words, Olsen relates the variability of stress placement on N+N structures to the semantic relation between their constituents. As a result, all N+N structures receive lefthand stress with the exception of:

(i) Copulative compounds (e.g. woman ´doctor).

(ii) When the first constituent is acting as either a locative or temporal modifier

(e.g. hotel ´room, August ´contest).

(iii) When the first constituent denotes the material out of which something is made (e.g. silk ´dress).

(iv) When a predicative relation is established (e.g. key ´word).

As can be appreciated, these structures are based on the compound external relations of coordination and modification (Olsen, 2000a: 62). However, despite differences of stress and interpretation, Olsen is of the opinion that these differences are not enough to be considered indicative of a change in structure.

Payne and Huddleston [108,451;] rely on the syntactic tests of coordination and modification to determine whether an N+N structure is a composite nominal (their term for syntactic constructions of this kind) or a compound noun. However, they also mention other, non-syntactic methods, including stress. Thus, the compound noun has stress on the first element, whereas the composite nominal has stress on the second (e.g. ´blackbird vs.

black´bird). However, they recognize the imperfect nature of such tests, given that there are cases of composite nominals with left-hand stress (e.g. ´biology teacher) and compounds with right hand stress (e.g. ice ´cream for many speakers). As a consequence, when there is no correlation of the syntactic criteria of coordination and modification and non-syntactic criteria such as stress, they favour the syntactic tests in the analysis of compounds and composite nominals.

Giegerich bases his account of variable stress patterns on what he calls a split site model, whereby N+N structures are generated on split sites: both in the syntax and in the lexicon. Thus, stress patterns are predicted for some N+N structures whereas there is a variable stress pattern for a distinct class of other structures. Accordingly, he distinguishes between (complement + head) structures which originate in the lexicon and are left-stressed (e.g. ´watch maker), and [attribute + head] structures which originate in the syntax and are right-stressed (e.g. steel ´bridge). Those constructions which, in spite of being fore-stressed, are [attribute + head] constructions (e.g. ´orange juice), then, can finally be explained as the result of a lexicalization process, where this process may have been accompanied by a gradual loss of syntactic characteristics that identify an N+N structure as a syntactic construct.

Plag [111,145-146;], though, has reviewed this assumption, and maintains that the variability of stress assignment in N+N structures depends on the combination of structural, semantic and analogical features. Thus, as far as structure is concerned, we recall that [complement + head] structures are left-stressed (e.g. ´truck driver), whereas [attribute + head] structures are end-stressed (e.g. wood ´bridge). However, Plag raises the following question: why are all forms not phrases, since they all have the same superficial structure?

Furthermore, if the stress pattern of N+N constructions were as Giegerich claimed, then all novel [attribute + head] structures should receive right-hand stress to begin with; this is not always the case, though, and attributive N+N structures with left hand stress can indeed be found (e.g. ´chocolate cake).

As a consequence, further opinions as to a convincing explanation of stress variability need to be taken into account. From a semantic point of view, meaning relations among the elements of a compound may explain why some are left-stressed and others are right-stressed.

Thus, all compounds are usually left-stressed but copulative compounds (e.g. scholar ´activist), those which express a temporal or locative meaning relationship (e.g. summer ´night, Eg. Olsen, mentioned above, or those with a causative meaning which is usually paraphrased as "made for" or "created by" (e.g. Shakespeare ´sonnet), are right-stressed. Plag [111,146-147;], however, is able to cite some exceptions, such as "man servant", "summer camp" or "day job".

Finally, analogy may also explain such stress variability, based on the fact that many N+N structures choose their stress pattern in analogy with combinations that have the same head, i.e., the rightward element:

(22a) street → ´Oxford Street > ´Main Street, ´Fourth Street

(22b) avenue → Fifth ´Avenue > Madison ´Avenue

The combinations with street as the second element here show leftward stress, whereas combinations with avenue as a second element show rightward stress. It follows, then, that [attribute + head] constructions show variable rightward and leftward stress. However, Plag considers that this variability cannot be explained in terms of lexicalization, as Giegerich has proposed, asserting that "what is considered the effect of lexicalization in some approaches [62, 56;] would emerge naturally in an analogical system, in which existing (i.e., lexicalized) compounds influence new (i.e., non - lexicalized) compounds to behave similarly.". As a result, both the type of semantic relation and analogy play an important role in the determination of the variability of stress assignment. As far as the status of N+N structures is concerned, Plag [112,144;] remains "agnostic with regard to the issue of whether NN constructions should be analyzed as compounds or phrases" and talks mainly about "NN constructs",

even though he believes that the majority of N+N structures he uses in his article would be regarded as compounds by most analysts.

In a more recent study, based on a corpus of spoken discourse (The Boston University Radio Speech Corpus), Plag and others have proposed a further hypothesis regarding the variability of stress patterns in compounds, in which the frequency of appearance of certain N+N constructs is taken into account: compounds with a relatively high frequency will show less variability than compounds with a relatively less frequency." [112,787;]. They present evidence that there is variability of stress patterns not only between types but also between tokens of the same type. As a consequence, it seems reasonable to suppose that variability in stress patterns is manifest in those N+N sequences which are less frequent; hence, when the token is low in frequency, there is a low representational strength, which implies that the stress pattern may be directed by the two constituent families to which N1 and N2 belong. Therefore, the constituent families suggest two competing stress patterns, and as a result the outcome will be unclear, giving way to variability. However, as Plag et al. (2008) themselves point out, this is merely a hypothesis, and requires further refinement.

3.3. Morphological properties of nouns as modifiers in NPs

As Warren reminds us, nominal modifiers, because of their restrictive function, tend to lose their ability to be inflected and thus usually appear in singular form (e.g. bookseller). There are even cases of nouns which usually have a plural inflection in their referential use (e.g. trousers) and lack the plural inflection when they modify another noun (e.g. trouser press).[139, 60;]. With this in mind, Adams [14, 59;] raises the possibility of considering the first elements in N+N structures as grammatically neutral rather than morphologically singular, arguing that on some occasions it is in fact the s genitive rather than the plural s that is lost (e.g. pigtail < pig's tail).

The lack of plural marking might also be a consequence of the reduced preferentiality of noun modifiers, a conclusion drawn by Koptjevskaja-Tamm

and Rosenbach on the basis of web-based analysis.[124, 125;]. They found that the dependent Bush in the Bush Administration was less likely to be referred to in the previous or subsequent context than in the case of a genitive like Bush's Administration. This implied that the modifying noun Bush was less salient, i.e., more backgrounded, than the genitive. However, as Quirk point out, the plural attributive construction (e.g. grants committee) is on the increase, particularly in British English, where it is more common than in American English . The use of these plural modifying nouns may also be due to a process of institutionalization. They are referred to by Quirk et al. (1985: 1334) as exclusive plurals: whereas the singular form is more generic and ambiguous, the plural form is not ambiguous and its interpretation is more accessible. They tend to occur with collective nouns and names of institutions as heads, and the stress tends to be on the premodifying plural, as in examples (23a) and (23b).

(23a) poetry books seller

(23b) book seller

In (23a) the modifying noun books is in plural form because it refers to a particular kind of books (more specific), whereas in (23b) the modifying noun is in the singular because it refers to books in general (more generic). Taylor (2000: 361) considers that plural forms, such as sports in the N+N structure sports administrator, are acceptable maybe because those plural nouns have been subject to semantic drift and have acquired a semantic connotation that is lacking in the singular form.

(24a) telecommunication → communication at distance

(24b) telecommunications → technology

The construction of an N+N structure with one or the other modifying noun will result in two different meanings, and thus the kind of specification will also be different. This can be seen as a consequence of something akin to Goldberg's (1995) Principle of the No Synonymy of Form [34, 64, 141]. Also mentioned in Chapter 2, which implies that the smallest change in the form of an item necessarily implies a change in its meaning. The use of singular or plural forms

for modifying nouns can also be a reason to avoid ambiguities (e.g. goods shop vs. good shop). In spite of this, Taylor reminds us that this is an area in which many confusing and idiosyncratic exceptions exist.

Another morphological issue regarding nouns as modifiers has to do with irregular plurals. N+N structures can be made from irregular plural forms (e.g. mice eater) but rarely from regular plural forms (e.g. books shop), since, as Pinker points out, irregular plurals are unusual and thus have to be stored in the mental dictionary as roots or stems (it is supposed that they are not to be generated by rule) and are attached to another noun in an N+N structure as independent stems [109, 146;]. On the contrary, regular plurals are not stems stored in the mental dictionary but, rather, are formed by a rule; they are words which are assembled with an inflectional plural whenever this is needed, independently of their union to another noun, to form a new structure (whether lexical or syntactic). Interestingly, in an experiment with children discussed by Pinker, children constructed N+N structures mice-eater and retreater from mice and rats. They used the irregular plural form of mice but never rats in its regular plural form, even though they had no evidence from adult speech that this is how languages function. Thus: children automatically distinguish between roots stored in the mental dictionary and inflected words created by a rule.".

3.4 The boundary between syntax and morphology in Noun+Noun Phrases

As we know, the status of nouns when filling a slot other than their prototypical one (i.e., head in noun phrase structure) has been a source of debate. The main assumption of the present investigation is that such nouns are syntactic constructs, which nevertheless become in many cases components of morphological constructions or complex words [108]. However, some scholars believe, on the contrary, that all N+N structures are generated in the lexicon and are thus compounds [93, 139;], while others claim that there is no evidence for a clear-cut difference between lexicon and syntax in the generation of N+N constructions [23, 56].

Furthermore, Liberman and Sproat (1992) find no evidence to suggest a lexical provenance for N+N structures, whereas others simply do not provide a concrete answer to the question [111]. Nonetheless, what remains indisputable is the fact that N+N constructions are on the rise, and as such the reasons why such a phenomenon is constantly increasing in Present Day English must be found.

Spencer draws attention to the status of words as anaphoric islands, which implies that words are supposed to be closed units, inaccessible to syntactic processes. [132, 312;].

However, he points out that there are cases in which parts of words seem to be actually manipulated by syntactic processes, and sometimes morphological processes such as word formation seem to have an influence on phrases which, clearly, have been formed by syntactic processes. Thus, in the same way as syntax concatenates words to form phrases, morphology concatenates morphemes to form words. This implies a dichotomy between syntax and morphology, but also allows us to think that there may be some inherent characteristics in N+N structures which correspond both to those of syntactic structures and morphological items.

In the event that N+N structures could be proved to be syntactic in nature, they should exhibit the characteristics of other syntactic combinations, such as modifier + head noun in noun phrases. Thus, they should follow the pattern of right-hand or end-stress, since stress in noun phrases falls on the head element (e.g. brick ´house). In terms of semantics, N+N structures should be fully transparent, as modifier + head combinations, since the meaning

The existence of anaphoric islands is part of the Lexicalist Hypothesis, developed as a reaction against Generative Semantics, an approach to semantics and syntax whereby syntactic rules have free access to the internal structure of words. According to this, syntactic rules can manipulate the internal structure of complex words. [85, 115, 88].

Also, N+N constructions ought to be fully productive, and hence allow the possibility of adding new modifying elements to the same head noun to form

new referring structures. Finally, from a semantic perspective they ought to display no internal argument structure, implying that both are arguments of an externally inferred predicate. Consider example (37).

(37) a brick house - the house is made of brick in the same way as in a large dog (= a dog that is large) the predicate is also externally inferred.

On the other hand, if N+N structures are to be considered lexical items, then they should share the characteristics inherent to morphologically complex nouns such as corkscrew. Owing to their idiosyncratic meaning, then, they must be subject to listing. They would also be expected to be left-headed, and their constituent parts would not allow modification or coordination independently. In addition, there would be no possibility of replacing one of the constituents by one or another anaphoric device (e.g. * a bus driver and a truck one) [98, 23, 108;].

Taking all this into account, there is clearly a difficulty here in deciding whether a

given N+N structure should be classified as a morphological item or a syntactic phrase. And in the event that we consider these structures to be compounds, we may also ask how some of them have syntactic properties. In the following section I will review the criteria which have traditionally been used for the definition and distinction of N+N structures as either morphological compounds or syntactic constructions.

3.4.1 Criteria for the definition of the status of N+N structures

As noted briefly in Section 3.2, above, puts forward three criteria for the identification of nominal compounds: “The compound, it is claimed, shows a degree of phonological, morphological and semantic isolation.” From a phonological point of view, compounds carry stress on the first element, while phrasal constructions have two different foci for stress, even though one tends to be stronger than the other. [24,54;]

However, as far as the stress criterion is concerned, some problems and inconsistencies exist, as discussed in Section 3.1.2. Giegerich observes the

dependence of stress assignment not only on the structure of N+N constructions themselves, but also on analogy and the semantic relation between the constituents of an N+N sequence. [61, 18, 111].

Giegerich distinguishes between two kinds of attribution, astrictive and associative:

(i) Astrictive attribution is prototypical of adjectives, both in attributive or predicative use. It establishes a direct meaning relationship between the modifier and the head which is being modified (e.g. beautiful picture → the picture is beautiful). It thus expresses a property of the head noun.

(ii) Associative attribution is a property of only some adjectives, when used as attributive modifiers. It establishes an indirect meaning relation between the modifier and the head which is being modified (e.g. beautiful dancer → the dancer is not beautiful but the activity of dancing which s/he performs is beautiful, thus s/he dances beautifully). Thus, it refers to an entity associated with the head noun.

This distinction can also be applied to nouns in attributive position. Thus:

(i) Nominal ascription: boy actor.

(ii) Nominal association: milk man.

Sometimes there are doublets, as in the case of woman doctor, which may be considered to be "a doctor for women" (hence, associative) or "a doctor who is a woman" (hence, astrictive).

Contextual information will help to solve the ambiguity. Adjectives with associative properties and nouns tend to be more lexical than phrasal, since their meaning is often more encrypted, obscure or opaque, that is, they have undergone a process of semantic lexicalization. However, not all lexical N+Ns have fore-stress (some of them show end-stress, which is typical of syntactic phrases). For this reason, Giegerich concludes that it is the distinction between associative and astrictive attribution that serves as a criterion to distinguish between compounds and phrases. Thus, it is not stress placement which defines and distinguishes phrases from compounds. Furthermore, the fact that lexical

N+N structures show end-stress indicates that stress is one of the characteristics within a gradual process of lexicalization and that, as a result, some N+N structures fall somewhere between lexicon and syntax. In other words, the lexicon-syntax divide, itself constructed with reference to three levels, namely syntax, semantics and phonology, shows in certain cases an overlap with the following potential divergences:

(i) Syntax-semantics mismatches: forms that are lexical on semantic grounds (i.e., they are semantically opaque) are not supposed to allow pro-one; however, cigarette end does in a cigar end and a cigarette one.

(ii) Syntax-phonology mismatches: forms that are fore-stressed should not allow

pro-one, however ´peanut oil and ´corn oil do in a peanut oil and a corn one.

(iii) Semantics-phonology mismatches: forms that are syntactic in semantic terms (i.e., they are semantically transparent) should not have fore-stress, however, corn oil does.

Since these mismatches occur, Giegerich concludes by pointing out that the boundaries between lexicon and syntax regarding N+N structures are in fact fuzzy and, as a result, some sequences of nouns may fall somewhere in between.

Additionally, the results obtained from native speakers in an experiment carried out as part of the present research show inconsistencies in stress assignment. Consequently, they do not provide a reliable answer to where stress falls. In some cases there seems to be no explanation at all for the different stress patterns (e.g. ´town house vs. country ´house, or ´rabbit warren vs. rabbit ´warren).

As regards morphological isolation, compounds are characterized by the unbreakable cohesion of their component parts, which implies that they are two lexemes acting as a single unit. The existence of morphological units of this kind implies a series of conditions when defining the concept of word, as proposed by Bauer (1998):

(i) Positional mobility. The word is placed within the sentence and moves as a

single unit.

(ii) Internal stability. The constituents of a word have a fixed order.

(iii) Uninterruptability. No external items can be freely added to a word.

It is expected that true morphological compound words, such as some N+N structures, will exhibit these conditions. Payne and Huddleston distinguish between what they call composite nominal from compound noun on the basis of two syntactic criteria, namely coordination and modification. These are two syntactic rules that cannot apply to morphological units, in accordance with the Lexical Integrity Principle, as proposed by Haspelmath syntactic rules relating to word order and constituency cannot apply to parts of words. [31, 73, 161;]. Coordination and modification, therefore, are useful as a means of testing whether a given N+N structure is either a composite nominal or a morphological compound. The following figure illustrates the different syntactic analyses of chain saw and afternoon coffee, assuming, provisionally, that the former is a genuine compound, and the latter a composite nominal.

For these two cases at least, the coordination and modification tests confirm the different structures of these N+N sequences.

1. An afternoon coffee	2. A chain saw
1.1. Various afternoon and evening coffees	2.1. Various chain and metal saws
1.2. Various afternoon teas and coffees	2.2. Various chain hammers and saws
1.3. Three afternoon and two evening coffees	2.3.Three chain and two metal saws
1.4. Three mid afternoon coffees	2.4. An iron chain saw
1.5. Three afternoon black coffees	2.5. A chain iron saw

However, Bauer notes as an exception the existence of potential modifiers which apply only to the first element of a morphological N+N sequence. [23,73-74;].

(38) High-energy physics

Furthermore, modification within syntactic N+N structures may present additional problems in cases in which there are complements which immediately precede the head.

(39a) A linguistics student where linguistics is a complement and thus no other modifying items can be inserted after it.

(39b) *A linguistics smart student

As regards coordination, Bauer has criticized this test, citing example (40). [23, 74;].

(40) * Bread and buttercups

Here there is an evident problem for coordination, because of the idiomatic reading of both elements in the compound buttercups ("small plant with bright yellow flowers"), "so there can be nothing in the same domain to co-ordinate with it." Thus, in the hypothetical case in which honey cup was a flower, the coordination honey and buttercups would probably be possible. The impossibility of coordinating a compound such as buttercup, in Bauer's view, has to do with the semantic idiomaticity of the compound, not with its nature as a compound.

Hence, the more idiomatic a construction is, the more difficult it is to coordinate it with other items. In other words, the impossibility of coordinating items such as *tooth and back ache and the possibility of coordinating others is not necessarily a consequence of there being two different constructions "one of which allows coordination and one of which does not; rather it can be seen to be the result of general constraints on coordination and varying degrees of lexicalization." [23,75;].

However, in connection with this, Payne and Huddleston (2002: 450) point out that the semantic relationship between the component parts is not enough to

account for their coordination independently, which again supports coordination as a criterion to distinguish compounds from syntactic phrases. [108, 450;].

(41) * The sunrise and set were amazing

Sunrise and sunset are semantically comparable but cannot be split by coordination, as (41) illustrates. The same is the case with examples such as toothache and backache, teardrop and raindrop, etc. Payne and Huddleston, then, support coordination as a test to distinguish between syntactic and morphological constructions. Furthermore, they add that abandoning such syntactic tests would imply that all N+N structures can either be only compounds or only syntactic phrases, which itself would lead to new problems. For example, if we consider that all N+N structures are syntactic objects, then there is no possible explanation for cases such as sunrise and sunset. Also, there would be a gap in the rules for forming compound nouns, in the sense that if there are so many compounds formed from adjectives (e.g. bittersweet, darkblue) and verbs (e.g. tape-record, blow-dry) why shouldn't there be a compound formation system based on nouns? On the other hand, if all N+N sequences are considered to be compounds, there seems to be a weakening of the boundaries between lexicon and syntax, since it would be difficult to explain why morphological units allow coordinations of Adjective + Noun (e.g. educational and integration projects), or elements with prepositional phrase complements (e.g. a Ministry of Defence official), whose appearance within a morphological item would be very difficult to explain.

Payne and Huddleston also refer to what they call non-syntactic criteria, such as orthography, meaning and productivity. As regards spelling, N+N sequences may have three syntactic realizations, namely as one orthographic word (e.g. lifestyle FROWN G01 L164), hyphenated (e.g. blood-stain FROWN G04 L74) or as two orthographic words (e.g. radio console FROWN G01 L11). The use of hyphenation, however, is not always consistent in English. In fact, there are examples of variant spellings in the corpora.

(42a) air raid (FLOB G06 L28)

(42b) air-raid (FLOB G06 L196)

As regards semantics, Faib considered it to be the most valuable criterion to define the status of compounds. In this respect, there exist differences in the degrees of specialization that an N+N sequence may acquire. Thus, in the case of clear syntactic N+N structures, their meaning is the result of the sum of the meanings of their component parts, that is, their meaning is characterized by its compositionality (e.g. drug addiction means "an addiction to drugs"). However, for morphological N+N sequences, their meaning cannot be inferred directly from the meanings of each of the constituents, since they have acquired a semantic specialization (e.g. streetcar does not mean "a car in the street" but "a wheeled vehicle which runs on rails and is propelled by electricity"). In general, it may be claimed that compounds have lost the transparency in meaning that is characteristic of syntactic phrases. [57, 148;].

This semantic change can be due either to a loss or an addition of meaning, in that an extra-feature of meaning can be either added to or excluded from each component part, entailing that the meaning of a given morphological N+N sequence will be unpredictable. [114, 73;].

(43a) A manuscript description (FLOB G50 L40) → "the description of a manuscript" vs. (43b) A house boy (FLOB G53 L77) → "a man or boy who cleans and does other jobs in someone else's house"

Example (43b) has specialized its meaning by adding special features related to the activity developed by a man or a boy in a house. In spite of this, it is often possible to interpret the constituent elements of a more or less semantically lexicalized N+N sequence separately [108, 450;].

Thus, for example, handbag still retains the meaning of one of its lexemes, i.e., bag, and both hand and bag can be analyzed separately as independent constituents. Furthermore, semantic specialization can be found in syntactic phrases too (e.g. desk job); conversely, compounds may have a transparent meaning (e.g. Toothache). In view of this, Stockwell and Minkova [133,13;] make a distinction between syntactic and lexical compounds, based on the

transparency of meaning of the constituents. While syntactic compounds are not listed in dictionaries (e.g. shoemaker), because their meaning can be directly inferred from the individual meanings of their constituent bases, lexical compounds are (e.g. icebox). This distinction is obviously problematic: the fact that dictionaries list some compounds does not imply that all of them are semantically opaque; many are listed simply because they are widely used or are familiar to speakers, yet are semantically transparent. Moreover, it is not unconceivable that N+N structures are included in dictionaries as a means of achieving a greater number of entries, with the aim of making the dictionary comprehensive. Furthermore, Di Sciullo and Williams (1988) argue that listeners is not a property of words per se. There are phrases, such as idioms, which actually show semantic specialization. In the same way, Booij [37,188;] points out that semantic idiosyncrasy is not valid as a criterion for the definition of compounds because " The fact that 'yellow fever" denotes a specific disease is a semantic idiosyncrasy that shows that this morpheme combination must be lexically stored. It is certainly a lexical unit, but not necessarily a word in the morphological sense" (emphasis added).

As regards productivity, the third non-syntactic criterion proposed by Payne and

Huddleston they also point to its gradient nature, once again implying that this is not a valid criterion for a binary distinction between compounds and phrases.

In view of the difficulties outlined here, Payne and Huddleston [108,450;] opt for giving preference to the criteria of coordination and modification in cases of divergent results.

Their response to critiques such as Bauer's (1998) is that "the existence of borderline cases does not provide a reason for abandoning a distinction that can be recognized in a great range of clear cases."

In sum, the traditional criteria for the identification of morphological items and their discrimination from syntactic structures do not yield consistent results.

Empirical work has also shown that there are exceptions to all criteria (i.e., stress, morphological isolation, orthography, semantics, listedness, and productivity). The only solution is to assume that the distinction between morphological compounds and free syntactic phrases is not binary but gradient. If this is a valid assumption, then we would be able to explain why some N+N structures satisfy some criteria but not others. This question is examined in detail in the next section.

3.4.2. The stress as distinction between NN phrases and NN compounds

Linguists continue to argue about the place in the grammar in which English noun-plus-noun constructions (henceforth 'NNs') are assembled. The traditional view – from Bloomfield (1933) via Lees (1963) and Marchand (1969) to, most recently, Payne and Huddleston (2002) – has been that some NNs, such as steel bridge, are phrases, originating in the syntax, while constructions such as watch-maker are compound words, produced – in terms of current understanding of the architecture of the grammar – in the lexicon by the derivational morphology. Levi (1978), Selkirk (1982) and Di Sciullo and Williams (1987), on the other hand, argue that all such constructions originate in the lexicon. Liberman and Sproat (1992) take the view that of the two examples given above, representing N1and N0 constructions respectively, the former must be generated in the syntax; but for the latter they find no evidence suggesting a different, i.e. lexical provenance. And Bauer (1998), finally, finds that the various criteria invoked by others to motivate a syntax-lexicon split for NNs fail to correlate with each other; and he concludes that there is therefore no evidence to support any assumption of different grammatical modules being involved in the generation of NNs.

The criterion invoked most frequently by those arguing for split sites has been stress. N N compounds are said to have fore-stress, NN phrases end-stress.

The most radical proponent of this position was probably Bloomfield [33,228;], who argued that ice cream, with a variable stress pattern, was a phrase for some speakers and a compound for others "… although there is no

denotative difference of meaning". Lees and Marchand also draw the category distinction along stress lines although the latter's very detailed analysis admits of other criteria for certain compound types [101, 20;]. But Lees' observations whereby Madison "Avenue, apple ""pie etc. vs. "Madison Street, "apple cake display a robust stress contrast without differing in any other aspect of behavior has served to discredit the stress criterion in much of the more recent work. The formal phonological literature has tended simply to note that certain compounds are haphazardly (and exceptionally) stressed like phrases – a position not very helpful to the morphosyntactic analysis of such constructions – and Schmerling (1971) finds stress in such constructions essentially unpredictable. [72, 21; 62, 257;].

This is then also the position held by Bauer [23, 89; 24, 70;].

Here we think in favor of the traditional position whereby NNs are generated on split sites: in the syntax as well as in the lexicon. I will do so by invoking in the first instance the stress criterion (although not in the same way as Bloomfield and Lees did); and I shall demonstrate that my version of that criterion correlates rather well with the other structural and behavioral characteristics associated with the syntax and the lexicon respectively. Viewed the other way round, the split-site model is capable of correctly predicting a firm stress pattern for some NNs and a variable one for a distinct class of others. And while not eliminating irregularity altogether, it will go some way towards identifying it, and towards explaining its existence.

Summary and concluding remarks on Chapter 3

The present chapter has provided an overview of earlier literature on the definition,

specification and function of N+N structures. It has been shown that nominal modifiers are characterized by their restrictive function, which has an effect on the order in which they appear in modifying position within the noun phrase. It has also referred to their morphological properties, such as the lack of inflectional endings. Reference to the problem of stress variability has also been

made. Several possible solutions to this problem have also been mentioned. In spite of these, the question of stress variability remains unsolved, and leads to many contrasting positions among scholars.

Empirical research has shown that N+N structures are on the rise nowadays, a development for which, provisionally, there seem to be three possible explanations:

(i) that they are compact packages of information;

(ii) that the information they provide is easily retrievable;

(iii) that interlocutors can easily predict the information conveyed by means of an

N+N sequence.

An overview of the previous literature on the topic has also been offered here,

especially of that published during the last three decades of the 20th century and in the present century. Three main stages were distinguished: a first stage, in which there is a clear interest in unraveling the semantic relations among the component parts of N+N structures; at this stage it is generally considered that all N+N sequences are compounds, and interest focuses on their productivity within a word formation process. In the second stage, there is increasing interest in seeing nominal sequences from the perspective of textual genre studies and sociolinguistics; their status as morphological items or syntactic devices is also a source of debate. Finally, the third stage has shown studies devoted to the question of the boundaries between syntax and morphology as well as to stress variability. Currently, scholars are aware of the fact that N+N sequences are in constant evolution, which complicates their analysis of this supposedly discrete phenomenon.

The fact that nominal sequences are simply juxtaposed items explains the difficulties that speakers may encounter when searching for the correct understanding of such combinations. Thus, the question of ambiguity in N+N

structures has also been discussed in the present chapter. As noted above, ambiguity here has been studied from three different perspectives:

(i) from the point of view of syntax, since longer N+N sequences need internal bracketing for their understanding;

(ii) from the point of view of semantics, since the meaning of the resulting combination of nouns can be ambiguous;

(iii) finally, from the point of view of the categorial structure of the first elements,

since the use of nouns in premodifying position can lead to the consideration that they undergo a process of conversion from nouns into adjectives.

Hence, the issue of gradience was carefully considered in the section on ambiguity, above.

However, this was not the only problem related to fuzzy boundaries that N+N structures display. A question which has been a continuous matter of study is that of the status of nominal sequences as syntactic structures or morphological items. In the present chapter this problem has been related to the questions of institutionalisation and lexicalisation and to the process of compounding within word formation. Lexicalisation has been seen as a gradient process that certain N+N structures undergo, and has been considered to be a combination of semantic, orthographic, phonological and morphological changes.

This chapter has also briefly reviewed the contrast of nouns as modifiers with other kinds of modification patterns within noun phrase structure. It has been shown that, on some occasions, nouns as modifiers entail the same meaning as other modification patterns, such as relative clauses or prepositional phrases. However, there are also some differences between them, and these are of pragmatic origin (such as their compact form and their character of permanence over time). Such differences allow speakers to make choices as to which construct to use according to the objectives of each communicative

situation. Also, as far as the contrast between adjectives and nouns is concerned, it has been explained that the choice between them (whenever there is one) depends most of the time on the semantic goals of the speaker.

And finally, it drew the N0/N1 distinction strictly along stress lines. They established that N1 constructions arise in the syntax and have end-stress. But then they failed to find evidence supporting the other half of the hypothesis, whereby N0 constructions, which they crucially (and wrongly) assumed uniformly to have fore-stress, systematically arise in the lexicon. The reason for this failure, as we can now see, was that N0 constructions with end-stress are not only possible but actually very common: these are the lexicalized attribute-head NNs that much of the foregoing discussion was about.

CONCLUSION

To conclude my dissertation work, I would like to tell that the definition of NPs has evolved through time, following the different theories that have appeared over the course of the 20th century, yet these different approaches all have in common the belief that noun phrases are part of a syntactic group and are themselves made up of component parts. However, componentiality is losing ground in favor of the ideas put forward by Cognitive Grammar through the proposal of a symbolic approach. The role of noun phrases as means for style is characterized by their static nature as compared to verbs, and by their compacted appearance, which is also related to contextual information and to the position of the information load; those concepts will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Reference has also been made above to their structural patterns, which allows for a consideration of the function of premodification and the role nouns play when filling premodifying position, which will also be the main topic of the following chapter. It has also been shown above that nouns as premodifiers not only fill the place which traditionally corresponds to adjectives but can also enter into coordination with them, implying that nouns in such position acquire adjectival characteristics in a process of gradience between categories.

Traditionally “phrase” is defined as “a group of words that does not contain a verb and its subject and is used as a single part of speech.” This definition entails three characteristics: (1) it specifies that only a group of words can constitute a phrase, implying that a single word cannot; (2) it distinguishes phrases from clauses; and (3) it requires that the groups of words believed to be a phrase constitute a single grammatical unit.

Modification occurs in a construction in which an expression is accompanied by an element not grammatically required by it. For example, because nouns do not typically require adjectives, *eager* modifies *fans* in *eager fans*. Verbs and adjectives do not typically require that they be accompanied by adverbials, so violently modifies swore in swore violently, and disappointingly modifies slow in disappointingly slow.

Modification may be restrictive or non-restrictive. When one word restrictively modifies another, the modifier restricts the potential reference of the modified. For example, in the phrase long books the adjective long restrictively modifies the noun books. If the word books were to occur alone, then it could potentially refer to any and all types of books. The modifier restricts the reference of the phrase to just those books that are long. Nouns may have many modifiers, as in tall, black, neutered, male, domestic, shorthaired cat. Here we have six modifiers, each restricting the potential reference of the word cat. The result of piling up these modifiers is that the actual referent of the phrase must satisfy all of them—it must be a cat that is tall, black, neutered, male, domestic, and short-haired. Each modifier acts like a criterion that the ultimate referent(s) of the phrase must satisfy.

There are two main classes of modifying words in English—adjectives and adverbs. Adjectives modify nouns and adverbs modify pretty much everything else—verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, and sentences. They modify these in much the same way as adjectives modify nouns—by adding criteria that must be met. For example, in ran quickly, quickly modifies ran and therefore requires that whoever ran didn't run in any old way, but did it quickly. Other examples include expressions like take regularly, needs help immediately. Likewise, intensely in intensely bright requires that the brightness be intense (Eg.. specially packaged, medically appropriate). Irritatingly in irritatingly slowly requires that whatever is going on must not only be going on slowly, but so slowly as to be irritating to someone (Eg.. extremely cleverly).

Ascriptive attribution is prototypical of adjectives, both in attributive or predicative use. It establishes a direct meaning relationship between the modifier and the head which is being modified (e.g. beautiful picture → the picture is beautiful). It thus expresses a property of the head noun.

(ii) Associative attribution is a property of only some adjectives, when used as attributive modifiers. It establishes an indirect meaning relation between the modifier and the head which is being modified (e.g. beautiful dancer the dancer

is not beautiful but the activity of dancing which s/he performs is beautiful, thus s/he dances beautifully). Thus, it refers to an entity associated with the head noun.

This distinction can also be applied to nouns in attributive position. Thus:

(i) Nominal ascription: boy actor.

(ii) Nominal association: milk man.

Sometimes there are doublets, as in the case of woman doctor, which may be considered to be "a doctor for women" (hence, associative) or "a doctor who is a woman" (hence, ascriptive).

Contextual information will help to solve the ambiguity. Adjectives with associative properties and nouns tend to be more lexical than phrasal, since their meaning is often more encrypted, obscure or opaque, that is, they have undergone a process of semantic lexicalisation. However, not all lexical N+Ns have fore-stress (some of them show end-stress, which is typical of syntactic phrases). For this reason, Giegerich concludes that it is the distinction between associative and ascriptive attribution that serves as a criterion to distinguish between compounds and phrases. Thus, it is not stress placement which defines and distinguishes phrases from compounds. Furthermore, the fact that lexical N+N structures show end-stress indicates that stress is one of the characteristics within a gradual process of lexicalisation and that, as a result, some N+N structures fall somewhere between lexicon and syntax. In other words, the lexicon-syntax divide, itself constructed with reference to three levels, namely syntax, semantics and phonology, shows in certain cases an overlap with the following potential divergences (Giegerich 2005b):

(i) Syntax-semantics mismatches forms that are lexical on semantic grounds (i.e., they are semantically opaque) are not supposed to allow pro-one; however, cigarette end does in a cigar end and a cigarette one.

(ii) Syntax-phonology mismatches forms that are fore-stressed should not allow

pro-one, however ´peanut oil and ´corn oil do in a peanut oil and a corn one.

(iii) Semantics-phonology mismatches forms that are syntactic in semantic terms (i.e., they are semantically transparent) should not have fore-stress, however, corn oil does.

Since these mismatches occur, Giegerich concludes by pointing out that the boundaries between lexicon and syntax regarding N+N structures are in fact fuzzy and, as a result, some sequences of nouns may fall somewhere in between.

Additionally, the results obtained from the research show inconsistencies in stress assignment. Consequently, they do not provide a reliable answer to where stress falls. In some cases there seems to be no explanation at all for the different stress patterns (e.g. ´town house vs. country ´house, or ´rabbit warren vs. rabbit ´warren).

As regards morphological isolation, compounds are characterised by the unbreakable cohesion of their component parts, which implies that they are two lexemes acting as a single unit. The existence of morphological units of this kind implies a series of conditions when defining the concept of word, as proposed by Bauer (1998):

(i) Positional mobility. The word is placed within the sentence and moves as a single unit.

(ii) Internal stability. The constituents of a word have a fixed order.

Uninterruptability. No external items can be freely added to a word.

End-stress in steel bridge, variable stress in orange squash and fore-stress in orange juice are probably due to different degrees or diachronic stages of lexicalization.

Lexicalization is the change from phrasal to lexical category status with concomitant loss of internal – morphological, phonological, semantic – structure. As Lipka notes, this change in status and indeed the whole process is strictly diachronic in nature, and driven by nonstructural criteria such as frequency of usage etc.

This means that it must be possible for a phrase – perhaps a frequently used one – to enter the lexicon unnoticed, as it were, without openly and immediately displaying any changes to its form or meaning. Recall that exactly this facility exists, in the present model of the behavior of NNs, for end-stressed phrasal NNs. They can become lexical and still have end-stress. However, recall from § 3.2 above that end-stress among nouns, while well-attested, is exceptional in Standard English, and that this is a declining class. It is plausible therefore to expect a phrase that has entered the lexicon, say ice "cream, in time – for some speakers perhaps faster than for others – to lose its exception feature and become "ice-cream.

This is not to say that every fore-stressed attribute-head NN must have individually undergone the diachronic process of lexicalization in order to get there. Given the existence of (listed) lexical NNs of that kind, originally through lexicalization, others can be coined via analogy.

A question which has been a continuous matter of study is that of the status of nominal sequences as syntactic structures or morphological items. In the present chapter this problem has been related to the questions of institutionalization and lexicalization and to the process of compounding within word formation. Lexicalization has been seen as a gradient process that certain N+N structures undergo, and has been considered to be a combination of semantic, orthographic, phonological and morphological changes.

We have also studied the contrast of nouns as modifiers with other kinds of modification patterns within noun phrase structure. It has been shown that, on some occasions, nouns as modifiers entail the same meaning as other modification patterns, such as relative clauses or prepositional phrases. However, there are also some differences between them, and these are of pragmatic origin (such as their compact form and their character of permanence over time). Such differences allow speakers to make choices as to which construct to use according to the objectives of each communicative situation. Also, as far as the contrast between adjectives and nouns is concerned, it has

been explained that the choice between them (whenever there is one) depends most of the time on the semantic goals of the speaker.

And finally, it drew the Noun+Noun Phrases and Noun+Noun compound words distinction strictly along stress lines. They established that N1 constructions arise in the syntax and have end-stress.

REFERENCE

1. И.А. Каримов. О мерах по дальнейшему совершенствованию системы изучения иностранных языков, Постановление Президента, Т.-2012, с. 2.
2. И.А. Каримов. За процветание Родины каждый из нас в ответе, Т. Узбекистан.- 2001, с. 10.
3. И.А. Каримов. Узбекистан по пути преодолений последствий мирового кризиса, модернизация страны и достижение уровня развитых стран. Т.-Узбекистан, 2010.- с. 12.
4. А. И. Смирницкий, Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1965.- с.9.
5. B.S. Khaimovich, B.I. Rogovskaya. A Course in English Grammar. 1966 p. 14.
6. M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya. English Grammar. M., 1953, p. 31—32.
7. Г. Н. Воронцова. Об именном форманте -'s в современном английском языке. («Иностранные языки в школе», 1948, № 3, 4); pp. 181 — 183.
8. Л. С. Бархударов, Д. А. Штелинг. Грамматика английского языка. М., 1960, p. 35.
9. В. Н. Жигадло, И. П. Иванова, Л. Л. Иофик, Теория грамматики английского языка, Москва, Просвещение.- 1975, с. 130.
10. Aarts, Bas. 2007. Syntactic Gradience: the Nature of Grammatical Indeterminacy. New York: Oxford University Press, 230-245.
11. Aarts, J. and Flor Aarts. 1988. English Syntactic Structures: Functions and Categories in Sentence Analysis. New York: Prentice Hall, 8-288.
12. Adams, Valerie. 1973. An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation. London: Longman, 146-158.
13. Adams, V. (2001). Complex words in English. Harlow etc.: Pearson/Longman, 220-240.

14. Algeo, John. 1991. Fifty Years among the New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms, 1941-1991. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 200-250.
15. Algeo, John. 2006. British or American English? A Handbook of Word and Grammar Patterns. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 180-200.
16. Allen, M. (1979). Morphological investigations. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, 200-258.
17. Aronoff, M. and Kristen Fudeman. 2005. What is Morphology? Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 200-250.
18. Aronoff, M. (1994). Blocking. In Asher, R. E. (ed.) Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Vol. 1. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 373-374.
19. Baayen, H. and Antoinette Renouf. 1996. "Chronicling The Times: productive lexical innovations in an English newspaper." Language 72: 69-96.
20. Bache, Carl. 1978. The Order of Premodifying Adjectives in Present Day English. Odense: Odense University Press, 188-200.
21. Barkema, Henk. 1997. "The grammatical freedom of lexicalised noun phrases." In Magnus Ljung (ed.) Corpus-based Studies in English. Papers from the 17th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 17). Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi, 49-68.
22. Bauer, Laurie. 1998. "When is a sequence of two nouns a compound in English?" English Language and Linguistics 2.1: 65-86.
23. Bauer, Laurie. 2000. "System vs. norm: coinage and institutionalization." In Booij, G., 180-200.
24. Bauer, L and Rodney Huddleston. 2002. "Lexical word-formation." In Huddleston, R. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds) The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1621-1722.

25. Benczes, Réka. 2006. Creative Compounding in English. The Semantics of Metaphorical and Metonymical Noun-Noun Combinations. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 148-200.
26. Biber, Douglas. 1988. Variation across Speech and Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 220.
27. Biber, D., Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman., 66-90.
28. Biber, D., Susan Conrad and Randi Reppen. 2001. Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 180-196.
29. Biber, D. and Victoria Clark. 2002. "Historical shifts in modification patterns with complex noun phrase structures." In Teresa Fanego et al. (eds) English Historical Syntax and Morphology. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 43-66.
30. Bisetto, A. and Sergio Scalise. 1999. "Compounding, morphology and/or syntax?" In L. Meren (ed.) Boundaries of Morphology and Syntax. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 31-48.
31. Blake, Norman F. 1990. An Introduction to the Language of Literature. London: MacMillan, 128.
32. Bloomfield, Leonard. 1984 [1933]. Language. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,
33. Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. Meaning and Form. London: Longman, 180-220.
34. Booij, Geert. 2007. The Grammar of Words. An Introduction to Linguistic Morphology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 200-240.
35. Bolinger, D. (1972). Accent is predictable (if you're a mind-reader). Language 48: 633-644.
36. Booij, G. (1985). Coordination reduction in complex words: a case for prosodic phonology. In van der Hulst, H. and N. Smith (eds.) Advances in nonlinear phonology. Dordrecht: Foris. 143-160.

37. Brinton, L. J. and Elizabeth Closs-Traugott. 2005. Lexicalization and Language Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Brown, G. and George Yule. 1983. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 220.
39. Burton-Roberts, N. (1997). Analyzing sentences. 2nd edn. London and New York: Longman, 144-148.
40. Bybee, Joan. 1985. Morphology: a Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 18-220.
41. Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (1992). Current morphology. London and New York: Routledge, 246.
42. Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (2002). An introduction to English morphology: words and their structure. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 230-245.
43. Carter, Ronald. 1997. Investigating English Discourse: Language, Literacy and Literature. London / New York: Routledge158.
44. Carstairs-McCarthy, Andrew. 1992. Current Morphology. London: Routledge, 128-200.
45. Costello, F. and Mark T. Keane. 1997. “Where do "soccer moms" come from? : cognitive constraints on noun-noun compounding in English.” At https://www.cs.tcd.ie/publications/tech-reports/reports.96/TCD-CS-96-18.pdf
46. Croft, William. 2001. Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 96-110.
47. Crystal, David. 2007 [2001]. English as a Global Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 44-66.
48. Crystal, D. and Derek Davy. 1973 [1969]. Investigating English Style. London: Longman, 244-266.
49. Curme, George. 1935. A Grammar of the English Language. Volume II: Parts of Speech and Accidence. Boston MA: D.C. Heath, 230-245.

50. De Haan, Pieter. 1989. Postmodifying Clauses in the English Noun Phrase. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
51. De Mönnink, Inge. 2000. On the Move: the Mobility of Constituents in the English Noun Phrase: a Multi-method Approach. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi. 79-90.
52. Denison, David. 2001. "Gradience and linguistic change." In Laurel J. Briton (ed.) Historical Linguistics 1999: Selected Papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9-13 August 1999. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 119-144.
53. Di Sciullo, A. M. and Edwin Williams. 1988. On the Definition of Word. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
54. Downing, Pamela. 1977. "On the creation and use of English compound nouns." Language 53: 810-842.
55. Du Bois, Betty Lou. 1981. "The construction of noun phrases in biomedical journal articles." In Høedt et al. (eds) Proceedings of the 3rd European Symposium on LSP: Pragmatics and LSP. Copenhagen: the LSP Centre, 49-67.
56. Faib, Klaus. 1981. "Compound, pseudo-compound, and syntactic group in English." In Kunsmannn, P. and Ortwin Kuhn (eds) Weltsprache Englisch in Forschung und Lehre. Berlin: Verlag, 132-150.
57. Ferguson, Charles A. 1983. "Sports announcer talk: syntactic aspects of register variation." Language in Society 12: 153-172.
58. Fraser, Bruce. 1970. "Idioms within a transformational grammar." Foundations of Language 6: 22-42.
59. Gagné, C. L. and Edward J. Shoben. 2002. "Priming relations in ambiguous noun-noun combinations." Memory and Cognition 30.4: 637-646.
60. Giegerich, Heinz J. 2004. "Compound or phrase? English noun-plus-noun constructions and the stress criterion." English Language and Linguistics 8.1: 1-24.

61. Giegerich, Heinz J. 2005a. “Associative adjectives in English and the lexicon-syntax Interface.” Journal of Linguistics 41: 571-591.
62. Giegerich, Heinz J. 2005b. “Lexicalism and modular overlap in English.” SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics 2.2: 43-62.
63. Givón, Talmy. 1985. “Function, structure and language acquisition.” In Dan I. Slobin (ed.) The Cross-linguistic Study of Language Acquisition, vol. 2. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1005-1028.
64. Givón, Talmy. 1989. Mind, Code and Context. Essays in Pragmatics. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc. 123-127.
65. Goldberg, Adele. 1995. Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 46-49.
66. Greenbaum, Sidney. 1991. “The development of the International Corpus of English.” In Aijmer, Karin and Bengt Altenberg (eds) English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik. London: Longman, 83-95.
67. Haiman, John. 1985. Iconicity in Syntax: Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24-26, 1983. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 224-234.
68. Haiman, John. 1994. “Ritualization and the development of language.” In William Pagliuca (ed.) Perspectives on Grammaticalization. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 109. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-28.
69. Halliday, Michael A.K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold, 20-45.
70. Halliday, Michael A.K. 1989. Spoken and Written Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 148-156.
71. Halliday, Michael A.K. 2006 [2001]. The Language of Science. London / New York: Continuum, 122-126.
72. Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. Understanding Morphology. London: Arnold.

73. Hirst, Graeme. 1987. Semantic Interpretation and the Resolution of Ambiguity. Studies in Natural Language Processing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 66-78.
74. Hockett, Charles F. 1958. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan, 25-45.
75. Hofland, K., Anne Lindebjerg and Jørn Thunestvedt (eds) 1999. ICAME COLLECTION of English Language Corpora. University of Bergen: The HIT Centre, 235.
76. Hopper, P. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1984. "The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar." Language 60: 703-753.
77. Huddleston, R. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 177-181.
78. Hundt, Marianne. 1997. "Has British English been catching up with American English over the past thirty years? In Magnus Ljung (ed.) Corpus-based Studies in English. Papers from the 17th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 17). Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi, 135-151.
79. Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. X Syntax: a Study of Phrase Structure. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 32-44.
80. Jespersen, Otto. 1976 [1914]. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. London: George Allen, 43-56.
81. Johansson, Stig. 1979. "American and British English grammar: an elicitation experiment." English Studies 60: 195-215.
82. Jucker, Andreas H. 1992. Social Stylistics: Syntactic Variation in British Newspapers. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 25-26
83. Kaplan, Robert B. 2001. "English – the accidental language of science?" In Ulrich Ammon (ed.) The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on other Languages and Language Communities. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 3-26.

84. Katamba, Francis. 1993. Morphology. London: MacMillan, 98-106
85. Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. American English: an Introduction. Canada: Broadview Press, 130-137.
86. Kruisinga, Etsko. 1932 [1909]. A Handbook of Present Day English. Groningen: Noordhoff.
87. Lakoff, George. 1971. "On generative semantics." In Steinberg, D. and Leon A. Jakobovits (eds) Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 232-296.
88. Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 18-44.
89. Langacker, Ronald W. 1990. Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.Leech, Geoffrey. 1974. Semantics. London: Penguin Books, 156-178.
90. Lees, Robert B. 1960. The Grammar of English Nominalizations. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 175-188.
91. Lehmann, Christian and Edith Moravcsik. 2000. "Noun." In Booij, G., Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds) Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation, vol. 1. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 732-757.
92. Levi, Judith N. 1978. The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals. New York: Academic Press, 29-33.
93. Levi, Judith N. 1983. "Complex nominals: new discoveries, new questions." In Hattori, S. and Kazuko Inoue (eds) Proceedings of the XIII International Congress of Linguistics (Tokyo 1982), 183-197.
94. Li, Charles N. 1971. Semantics and the Structure of Compounds in Chinese. Berkeley: University of California dissertation, 120-136.
95. Liberman, M. and Alan Prince. 1977. "On stress and linguistic rhythm." Linguistic Inquiry 8: 249-336.

96. Liberman, M. and Richard Sproat. 1992. “The stress and structure of modified noun phrases in English.” In Sag, I.A. and Anna Szabolcsi (eds) Lexical Matters. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 131-181.
97. Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. Deconstructing Morphology. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press. LPD = J.C. Wells (ed.) 2000. Longman Pronunciation Dictionary. London: Longman, 66-88.
98. Mair, Christian. 1997. “Parallel corpora: a real-time approach to the study of language change in progress.” In Magnus Ljung (ed.) Corpus-based Studies in English. Papers from the 17th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 17). Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi, 195-209.
99. Mair, Christian. 2002. “Three changing patterns of verb complementation in Late Modern English: a real-time study based on matching text corpora.” English Language and Linguistics 6: 105-131.
100. Marchand, Hans. 1969. The Categories and Types of PD English Word Formation: a Synchronic-diachronic Approach, 2nd edition. Munich: C.H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 34-56.
101. McLuhan, Marshall. 1969 [1962]. The Gutenberg Galaxy: the Making of Typographic Man. New York: New American Library.
102. Newmeyer, Frederick. 1974. “The regularity of idiom behaviour.” Lingua 34: 307-342.
103. OED = Simpson, John A. and Edmund S.C. Weiner (eds). 1989. The Oxford English Dictionary on CD-ROM. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
104. Olsen, Susan. 2000a. “Compounding and stress in English: A closer look at the boundary between morphology and syntax.” Linguistische Berichte 181: 55-69.
105. Olsen, Susan. 2000b. “Composition.” In Booij, G., Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds) Morphology. An International

Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation, vol. 1. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 897-916.

106. Pastor-Gómez, Iria. 2006. N+N Structures in Present Day English: Function and Development. MA Dissertation: University of Santiago de Compostela.

107. Payne, J. and Rodney Huddleston. 2002. "Nouns and noun phrases." In Huddleston, R. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds) The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323-523.

108. Pinker, Steven. 1994. The Language Instinct: the New Science of Language and Mind.London: Penguin Books, 48-60.

109. Plag, Ingo. 2003. Word Formation in English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 122-128.

110. Plag, Ingo. 2006. "The variability of compound stress in English: structural, semantic, and analogical factors." English Language and Linguistics 10.1: 143-172.

111. Plag, I., Gero Kunter, Sabine Lappe and Maria Braun. 2008. "The role of semantics, argument structure and lexicalization in compound stress assignment in English." Language. Journal of the Linguistic Society of America 84.4: 760-794.

112. Portero, Carmen. 2004. A Course in English Morphology. Córdoba: Servicio de Publicaciones, 28-45 p.p.

113. Portero, Carmen. 2007. "English 'NOUN+NOUN' sequences: their place in Functional Discourse Grammar." Web Papers in Functional Grammar (WPFG) 80: 1-23.

114. Postal, Paul. 1970. "On the surface verb remind." Linguistic Inquiry 1: 37-120.

115. Potter, Simeon. 1975. Changing English. London: Deutsch.

116. Preacher, Kristopher J. 2001. “Calculation for the chi-square test.” At: <http://people.ku.edu/preacher/chisq/chisq.htm> Date of access: June 2009.

117. Quirk, R., Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman, 120-132 p.p.

118. Radford, R. (1988). Transformational grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56 -68 p.p.

119. Raumolin-Brunberg, Helena. 1991. The Noun Phrase in Early Sixteenth-century English: a Study Based on Sir Thomas More’s Writings. Helsinki: Societé Neophilologique, 128 -133 p.p.

120. Rijkhoff, Jan. 2002. The Noun Phrase. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

121. Romaine, Suzanne. 1982. Socio-historical Linguistics. Its Status and Methodology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

122. Rosch, E., Carolyn Mervis, Wayne Gray, David Johnson and Penny Boyes-Braem. 1976. “Basic objects in natural categories.” Cognitive Psychology 8: 382-439.

123. Rosenbach, Anette. 2005. “On the track of noun+noun constructions in Modern English.” In Houswitscha, C., Gabriele Knappe and Anja Müller (eds) Papers from the Conference of the German Association of University Teachers of English. University of Bamberg, 18-21 September 2005. Verlag: Trier, 543-557.

124. Rosenbach, Anette. 2007. “Emerging variation: determiner genitives and noun modifiers in English.” English Language and Linguistics 11.1: 143-189.

125. Roeper, T. and M. Siegel (1978). A lexical transformation for verbal comp ounds. Linguistic Inquiry 9: 199-260.

126. Sauer, Hans. 2000. “Lexicalisation and demotivation.” In Booij, G., Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds) Morphology. An

International Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation, vol. 2. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1625-1636.

127. Saciuk, B. (1969). The stratal division of the lexicon. Papers in Linguistics 1: 464-532.

128. Schmerling, S. F. (1971). A stress mess. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 1: 52-66.

129. Schmerling, S. F. (1976). Aspects of English sentence stress. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

130. Selkirk, E. O. (1982). The syntax of words. Cambridge MA and London: MIT Press, 235

131. Spencer, Andrew. 2000. "Morphology and syntax." In Booij, G., Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds) Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation, vol.1. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 312-334.

132. Stockwell, R. and Donka Minkova. 2002. English Words: History and Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

133. Svartvik, Jan. 1992. "Corpus Linguistics comes of age." In Jan Svartvik (ed.) Directions in Corpus Linguistics. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82 Stockholm, 4-8 August 1991. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 7-13.

134. Taylor, John R. 2000 [1996]. Possessives in English. An Exploration in Cognitive Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

135. Taylor, John R. 2002. Cognitive Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Varantola, Krista. 1984. On Noun Phrase Structures in Engineering English. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.

136. Varantola, Krista. 1993. "Modification of nouns by nouns. Bad by definition?" in Andreas H. Jucker (ed.) The Noun Phrase in English. Its Structure and Variability. Anglistik and Englischunterricht 49. Heidelberg: Winter, 69-83.

137. Warren, Beatrice. 1978. Semantic Patterns of Noun-Noun Compounds. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Göthoburgensis. 41-45

138. Warren, Beatrice. 1993. “Nominal and adjectival modifiers of nouns.” In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.) The Noun Phrase in English. Its Structure and Variability. Anglistik und Englischunterricht 49. Heidelberg: Winter, 57-68.

139. Wells, Rulon. 1960. “Nominal and Verbal Style.” In Thomas Sebeok (ed.) Style in Language. New York: The MIT Press, 213-220.

140. Wierzbicka, Anna. 1988. The Semantics of Grammar. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

141. Williams, Edwin. 1981. “On the notions ‘lexically related’ and ‘head of a word’.” Linguistic Inquiry. 12.2: 245-274.

142. Zandvoort, Reinard W. 1975 [1962]. A Handbook of English Grammar. London: Longman.