

KATARZYNA KASPRZYK  
University of Silesia  
Katowice

## ON APPPOSITION IN POLISH

This paper aims at sketching a theoretical framework permitting a more satisfactory approach to the controversial notion of loose, or nonrestrictive, apposition in Polish. The solutions which it proposes have been arrived at on the basis of the corpus from the Polish edition of *Newsweek* magazine.<sup>1</sup> The appositive constructions have been characterized by the criteria for apposition usually assumed in the previous studies on apposition.

### 1. Introduction

While there appears to be little agreement as to how apposition should be defined and whether a number of different constructions are or are not appositive, grammarians do not usually question the appositive status of such a construction as:

*Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano, trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy, wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.* (23:92)<sup>2</sup>

In the opinion of some grammarians, such as Fries (1952:187) and Francis (1958:301) the construction is made of two juxtaposed NPs which are coreferential.

Other linguists such as Hockett (1955), Sopher (1971) and Burton-Roberts (1975) state that the two constituents are noncoordinated, therefore each constituent can independently perform the same function and express the same meaning. Sopher (1971:401) shows why apposition as a grammatical category is different from coordination and subordination. By adopting his words the role played by the second unit in apposition *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy* can be analysed:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Newsweek Polska* 23/2005, 25/2005, 26/2005, 27/2005, 29/2005, 31/2005, 32/2005, 47/2005, 48/2005, 49/2005

<sup>2</sup> The first number refers to a volume, the second number refers to the page of a volume reference.

On a syntactical level, [the second unit] is not coordinate since there is no coordinating conjunction, nor can there be, for then *Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano* and *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy* would constitute a double subject requiring a plural verb. It is not subordinate since it is structurally independent and can itself function as the subject of the sentence. The two noun groups, *Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano* and *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy*, are therefore syntactically equivalent: either may function as the subject of the verb *wygląda*.

On a notional level, [the second unit] is not coordinate, since *Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano* and *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy* have a single referent (they refer to one and the same person). It is not subordinate, since *Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano* and *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy* are interchangeable and we may, without change of meaning, rewrite the sentence:

*Trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy, Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano, wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

*Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano* and *trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy* are therefore notionally equivalent, that is, of equal rank.

Similarly, Quirk *et al.* (1985:1302) indicate three distinguishing characteristics of elements in apposition. These three statements set up a test of the identical function of the noun phrases in apposition:

- a) each appositive can be individually omitted and the resultant sentences are acceptable,
- b) each appositive fulfils the same syntactic function in the resultant sentences,
- c) there is no difference between the original sentence and either of the resultant sentences in extralinguistic reference, the reference of the resultant sentences is the same, they are coreferential.

Apposition fulfilling these three conditions is termed by Quirk *et al.* (1985:1302) "full apposition". On the contrary, apposition not fulfilling these three conditions is termed "partial apposition".

Further on, Meyer (1992:10) argues that apposition is a gradable grammatical relation in the sense that "some appositions are fully appositional" while "other appositions behave in a manner that places them on a gradient between apposition and other grammatical relations". He proposes a similar set of criteria to determine the amount of interdependency between units in apposition and distinguishes, respectively, "central" and "peripheral apposition" (p. 41).

The construction that initiated our discussion is an example of full or central apposition. The units of the apposition are coreferential and therefore semantically identical. Additionally, the units are syntactically interdependent, satisfying all of the syntactic criteria for apposition proposed by Quirk *et al.*

*Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano, trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy, wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

*Trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

*Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

*Trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy, Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano, wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

As can be seen, the characterization of apposition as grammatical relation is based on the notions of syntactic and semantic equivalence.

In addition to these approaches, it is assumed by Norwood (1954:269) that in spoken language “the appositive is indicated by an intonation pause. In writing, these pauses are signaled ordinarily by a comma, a dash, or a colon”, therefore the presence of pauses or commas in writing is essential to apposition. Pisarkowa (1984:137) emphasizes that the characteristic feature of the units in apposition is their formal independence, namely ‘meta’ relation between the units. The independence can also be signaled by writing in italics, using quotation marks or expressions such as *pod tytułem, tak zwany, to jest*.

Alongside these features mentioned, for Sopher (1971:412) “a crucial criterion for apposition is the presence, actual or potential, of an apposition marker”. Similarly, Burton-Roberts (1975:414) admits as appositions only those constructions that can be linked by a marker of apposition. It is possible to insert a marker if apposition such as *czyli, mianowicie, to znaczy*, etc, into the illustrative construction:

*Argentyńczyk Raul Lozano, czyli trener polskiej reprezentacji siatkarzy, wygląda na boisku jak Napoleon na polu bitwy.*

Moreover, in Polish, the language with nominal case inflection, various Polish authors, such as Jodłowski (1976:86), Topolińska (1984:343), Labocha (1996), also the authors of *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej* (1968:4) and *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* (1999:51), observe that the two noun phrases in apposition as in the illustrative example agree both in number and in case.

However, the example discussed in this section is simplistic and intended to be illustrative only. All the linguistic characteristics of the units in apposition in the example are not applicable to a number of other constructions, since the problem with the notion of apposition is that the strategy of relating all the features to other similar constructions is not so easy. To uncover the characteristics that actually define apposition in Polish, we need to analyse a much larger number of examples taken from *Newsweek Polska* magazine.

## 2. Syntactic characteristics of apposition

### 2.1. The syntactic form of units in apposition

According to one of the frequently cited grammatical criteria for apposition, the elements in apposition should be capable of having the same syntactic function with

respect to the same other elements in the sentence. Most definitions limit the concept of apposition to nouns, i.e., two nouns joined by their referring to the same thing with no preposition or conjunction joining them. Both Fries (1952:187) and Francis (1958:301) restrict the notion of apposition to coreferential noun phrases, conversely, other linguists expand the category of apposition considering other constructions appositional.

Some grammarians claim that appositives and their antecedents may be defined beyond this narrow scope, in that appositives can comprise other parts of speech beyond nouns and pronouns. Following Quirk *et al.* (1985) and Meyer (1992) who provide a theoretically sound description of the important syntactic form and function of apposition, appositive constructions in Polish have been analysed.

Elements in apposition belonging to the same syntactic class are described by Quirk *et al.* (1985:1303) as "strict apposition". On the other hand, elements in apposition from different syntactic classes are termed as "weak apposition".

*Niedawny outsider, Borowski, poszedł nieco do przodu, kiedy spróbował programowej kampanii.* (23:12) (strict apposition: two noun phrases)

*Komórki nerwowe przesyłają sobie e-maile w postaci neuroprzekaźników – substancji chemicznych sprawiających organizm w stan zwiększonej gotowości.* (27:56) (weak apposition: the noun phrase and the clause)

Following Quirk *et al.* (1985) and Meyer (1992) among the nominal apposition we can differentiate:

- a proper noun followed or preceded by a noun phrase:  
*Ale nie zmieniono mu tożsamości; w papierach wciąż jest Jarosławem Sokołowskim, gangsterem mafii pruszkowskiej.* (23:17)  
*Najważniejszą z nich jest Arena w Weronie, doskonale zachowany starożytny amfiteatr, który stanowi naturalną i atrakcyjną scenę dla operowych przedstawień.* (27:86)
- common nouns:  
*Po owoc ich pracy – surowe opium – zgłaszają się pośrednicy, którzy oddadzą półprodukt do laboratorium.* (32:40)
- one unit consists of a common noun preceded by a cardinal number or a quantifier:  
*Na Florydzie, gdzie w marcu zabójcy pedofile zgwałcili i zamordowali dwie dziewczynki – 9-letnią Jessicę Lunsford i 13-letnią Sarę Lunde – za wykorzystanie seksualne dziecka grozi dożywocie.* (27:20)
- one or both noun phrases can be such phrases as a number, a measurement, a date or an abbreviation:  
*Mimo niewielkiej liczby mieszkańców – 293 tysiące – Islandia od ponad 10 lat pracuje nad pozbyciem się wizerunku wyspy dorszy i wikingów.* (27:34)  
*Kierunek polskiej filantropii stypendialnej wytycza Polsko-Amerykańska fundacja Wolności (PAFW).* (23:30)

- the first unit can be a pronoun followed by a noun phrase:  
*I przyznaje, że on, twardy facet, kawał kozaka, boi się.* (23:17)
- a noun phrase in apposition with a subordinate clause:  
*Fakt, że żyć i osiągać szczęście można na wiele sposobów, stał się dla nas kulturową oczywistością.* (23:105)
- an interrogative sentence in apposition with a noun phrase:  
*Nic dziwnego, że macherzy od kampanii politycznych zadają kandydatom sakramentalne pytanie: jaki szkielet w szafie chowasz?* (23:23)

And among the non-nominal apposition we can distinguish:

- adjective phrases:  
*Jeśli w trzygwiazdkowej restauracji w karcie jest kawior, to tylko najlepszy, astrachański.* (23:57)
- adverb phrases:  
*Właściwie – dobrze. Doskonale.* (29:98)
- predicative phrases:  
*NIK zakwestionowała potem to zlecenie – wytknęła naruszenia interesów skarbu państwa i tajemnicy państwowej.* (23:11)
- verb phrases:  
*Przetrwał, wytrwał, od czterech lat jest pastorem.* (23:87)
- prepositional phrases:  
*Ale na świecie – w Wielkiej Brytanii, USA czy Izraelu – działają tysiące funduszy venture capital specjalizujących się w finansowaniu wynalazczości.* (27:37)
- declarative sentences/clauses:  
*Organizowali ewangelizację uliczną – rozdawali ulotki, namawiali do przyścia do kościoła.* (23:85)
- interrogative sentences:  
*Ale czy to znaczy, że mogli zamienić się rolami? Czy tak jak w filmie Kieślowskiego, “Przypadek” mógł sprawić, że Cimoszewicz znalazłby się w demokratycznej opozycji, a Kaczyński w kręgu komunistycznej władzy?* (32:17)
- appositions have different forms but identical functions (weak apposition):  
*Zaczynali skromnie, w 30 osób – licząc szefostwo, animatorów i ekipę techniczną.* (27:78) (prepositional phrase in apposition with adjective phrase functioning as adverbials)

Units in apposition containing markers of apposition.

As it has already been observed the units in apposition can contain markers/indicators of apposition. Appositive conjuncts relate the clause or the noun to the preceding text therefore, similarly to the other functional classes of conjuncts, they “explicitly mark logical relations between clauses, and as such they are important in discourse with highly informational focus” (Biber, 1988:239). Quirk *et al.* (1985:1307)

provide a list of common indicators of apposition which convey certain semantic relationships between appositives. In Polish such a list is given by Klemensiewicz (1963:81) and he mentions the following markers of apposition: *czyli, mianowicie, to jest, to znaczy, inaczej, innymi słowy, słowem, czyli inaczej, to jest innymi słowy, a mianowicie*.

*Że nie radzi sobie z **potrzebnymi inwestycjami** – jak kolejny most przez Wisłę.* (23:24)

Markers of apposition can be optional and obligatory. Meyer (1992:26) considers markers introduced into appositions for pragmatic reasons to be optional, however, markers introduced for syntactic and semantic reasons are regarded as obligatory. Meyer (p. 27) observes that the most common obligatory markers join appositives in which the second unit is included in the first, and as far as Polish language is concerned, they include such markers as: *taki jak, jak, wliczając, włączając, szczególnie, zwłaszcza, głównie, przede wszystkim*.

*Początkowo **jego wina, przede wszystkim Neill Pinot Noir**, nie zyskiwały rewelacyjnych ocen, ale z roku na rok się poprawiają.* (27:42)

The omission of an obligatory marker leads to ungrammatical constructions, such as:

*\*Początkowo **jego wina, Neill Pinot Noir**, nie zyskiwały rewelacyjnych ocen, ale z roku na rok się poprawiają.*

The table below lists the syntactic form of units in apposition and the number of appositions found in three successive issues of *Newsweek Polska* magazine. As the table demonstrates, the vast majority of the examples found in the press is mainly associated with noun phrases.

The syntactic form of units in apposition	<i>Newsweek</i> 47/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 48/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 49/2005
Nominal apposition	80%	82%	83%
Non-nominal apposition	20%	18%	17%
Appositions containing markers of apposition	17%	16,5%	17,5

## 2.2. The syntactic function of units in apposition

With regard to the syntactic function of appositions, the following can be distinguished:

- subject:  
*Niedawny **outsider, Borowski**, poszedł nieco do przodu, kiedy spróbował programowej kampanii.* (23:12)

- subject complement:  
*Ale nie zmieniono mu tożsamości; w papierach wciąż jest Jarosławem Sokolowskim, gangsterem mafii pruszkowskiej.* (23:17)
- direct object:  
*Na Florydzie, gdzie w marcu zabójcy pedofile zgwałcili i zamordowali dwie dziewczynki – 9-letnią Jessicę Lunsford i 13-letnią Sarę Lunde – za wykorzystanie seksualne dziecka grozi dożywocie.* (27:20)
- indirect object:  
*To autorskie przedsięwzięcie Arte dei Suonatori, zespołu prowadzonego przez dwoje skrzypków, Ewę i Arkadiusza Golińskich.* (27:83)
- adverbial:  
*Zaczynali skromnie, w 30 osób – licząc szefostwo, animatorów i ekipę techniczną.* (27:78)
- verb:  
*Przetrwiał, wytrwał, od czterech lat jest pastorem.* (23:87)

Additionally, in Polish, the verb accommodates to the noun phrase both in number and in gender. In Quirk *et al.*'s words (1985:1304) when the apposed units appear in subject position in the sentence "the first appositive determines concord". Quirk *et al.*'s point receives confirmation in Polish in which there is a fully developed gender inflection. If the members of apposition have different genders, it is ordinary the first of them which controls agreement with the verb in a sentence.

*Jedyny przejaw "buntu" – graffiti wewnątrz szkoły – także był kontrolowany: uczniowie wykonali je za zgodą dyrekcji.* (27:27)

However, Kallas (1993:66) observes that the first appositive determines concord only if the second unit is enclosed in paired commas.

Moreover, it has been observed in the introduction to the article noun phrases in apposition agree in case and number but there are cases where one of the units in apposition is not marked for case:

*W latach 90, zasłynęli "MdM-em" (TVP), talk show, gdzie słowne popisy gospodarzy były atrakcyjniejsze od historii opowiadanych przez zaproszonych gości.* (27:71)

### 3. Semantic characteristics of apposition

#### 3.1. The semantic relations between units in apposition

Traditionally the relation of apposition is described as a relation consisting of two coreferential units and Hockett's fourth requirement for apposition (1955:101) that "the IC's must refer to the same entity" appears to tally with most definitions of apposition provided by different linguists. For example, Quirk *et al.* (1985:1301)

claim: "for linguistic units to be appositives, i.e. in apposition, they must normally be identical in reference" or else "the reference of one must be included in the reference of the other". Matthews (1981:225) also points out that "two noun phrases would not stand in apposition unless their referents were to be understood as identical". Jodłowski (1976), Kallas (1980), Podracki (1989), Labocha (1996) also consider this criterion as significant. However, adhering only to this criterion is not satisfactory.

Accordingly, Meyer (1992) expands the number of semantic relations between units in apposition, arguing that not all constructions regarded as apposition are coreferential. Following Lyons (1977) he claims that the units in appositions are related by the referential relations such as coreference, part/whole reference and cataphoric reference, and nonreferential relations such as synonymy, attribution and hyponymy.

#### Coreference

According to Meyer (1992:60) "the units are strictly coreferential because there is a close connection between the meaning of the units and the referents in the external world that they refer to". Similarly, for Leech (1981:156) two units in apposition are coreferential if they "refer to the same piece of reality" or in Matthew's words (1981:225) they "refer to the same individual, described in two different ways", as in the following example:

*Według Yao Tandonga, dyrektora chińskiego Instytutu Badań Płaskowyzu Tybetańskiego, lodowce na tym obszarze zmalały o 7 procent przez ostatnie czterdzieści lat, a tempo ich topnienia wciąż rośnie. (23:79)*

#### Part/whole reference

In the part/whole relation the reference of the second unit of the apposition is included within the reference of the first unit, (Lyons, 1977:311). It is defined by Lyons (p. 312) "as a relation which holds between the separate or separable components of a thing and the whole thing of which they are components". The first unit is more general than the second unit and an obligatory marker of apposition is necessary to mark unambiguously the part/whole relation between the units such as *taki jak, jak, wliczając, włączając, między innymi (m.in.), szczególnie, zwłaszcza, głównie*:

*Przez Bangladesz przeszła zaś największa od piętnastu lat powódź, woda roznosiła po kraju bakterie wywołujące śmiertelne choroby, takie jak biegunka i cholera. (23:79)*

The removal of the marker of apposition results in the change in meaning and hence the units can be regarded as coreferential or it can lead to an ungrammatical sentence:

*\*Przez Bangladesz przeszła zaś największa od piętnastu lat powódź, woda roznosiła po kraju bakterie wywołujące śmiertelne choroby, biegunka i cholera.*



### Cataphoric reference

Cataphoric reference is between units that are not coreferential. The first unit is a definite noun phrase and the second unit is a clause or sentence, hence has no referring value. The initial unit refers cataphorically to the second unit (1992:64). Here is an example:

*Trener przygotował igrzysko żołnierski regulamin, którego nie powstydzilby się nawet Bonaparte. Zawodnicy nie mogą rozmawiać przez telefony komórkowe, nie mogą jeździć na mecze własnymi samochodami, ale wyłącznie z drużyną w autokarze. Nie mogą podjadać w fast foodach, a do obiadów używać gęstych sosów. Mają jeść zdrowo i lekko. Nie wolno palić przed i po treningu, przed i po meczu, w szatni, w hotelu – czyli praktycznie nigdzie i nigdy.* (23:92)

### Relation of synonymy

According to Cruse (1986: 268) “absolute” synonymy between the units in apposition is if the units have identical meanings and hence their meanings in any contexts would be identical. The synonymous units in apposition can be noun phrases, adjective phrases, verb phrases and adverb phrases. Cruse (p. 267) maintains that one of the words in this type of synonymy serves “as an explanation, or clarification, of the meaning of another word”.

*Michael Braungart, mój współpracownik, wymyślił termin upcycling – odzysk na lepsze.* (25:74)

### Relation of attribution

One of the units has an “ascriptive, descriptive or classificatory role” in relation to the other unit of apposition (Burton-Roberts, 1975:395). The second unit, which is a noun phrase containing an attributive indefinite noun phrase, attributes a particular characteristic to the first unit (Meyer, 1992:69):

*Nate, pogodny i nigdy nie tracący równowagi naukowiec, ubrany w szorty khaki i płócienny kapelusz, braki w wykształceniu nadrabia niebywałą wyobraźnią.* (26:79)

### Relation of hyponymy

Lyons (1977:294) defines hyponymy as “a paradigmatic relation of sense which rests upon the encapsulation in the hyponym of some syntagmatic modification of the sense of the superordinate lexeme”. Similarly, Leech (1981:92) characterizes it as a relation of “meaning inclusion”. In hyponymous apposition the meaning of the second unit is included within the more general meaning of the first unit, in other words, the more specific second unit of apposition contains a word whose meaning would be included within the meaning of the more general first unit.

*Biopaliwa można zatem dodawać do tradycyjnych paliw (benzyn czy oleju napędowego) i rozprowadzać poprzez sieć normalnych stacji paliw.* (32:45)

However, the distinction between hyponymy and part/whole relation should be noticed (Lyons, 1977). Consequently, the relation of hyponymy between nouns can be illustrated by the following formula:

'X is a kind of Y',

while the part-whole relation by:

'X is a part of Y'.

### 3.2. The semantic classes of apposition and their communicative functions in press genre

The semantic classes are largely based upon the semantic classes in Quirk *et al.* (1985:1308). The following semantic relationships between the elements in apposition are distinguished:

- 1) equivalence
  - appellation
  - identification
  - designation
  - reformulation
- 2) attribution
- 3) inclusion
  - exemplification
  - particularization

As it has already been illustrated, semantically, units in apposition are related by various kinds of equivalence. However, thematically, they are characterized by various degrees of non-equivalence: "the second unit of an apposition is not equivalent to the first unit but rather either wholly or partially provides new information about the first unit" (Meyer, 1992:92). According to Halliday (1994:225) apposition can link units paratactically and is elaborating in function, it means that "one clause elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it. The secondary clause does not introduce a new element into the picture but rather provides a further characterization of one that is already there, restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding a descriptive attribute or comment".

Following the classification proposed in Quirk *et al.* examples of appositive constructions in Polish have been examined.

#### Appellation

It is regarded as naming relation in which both appositive noun phrases are definite and the second is a proper noun or a common noun phrase. The second appositive is more specific than the first and there is "a one-to-one correspondence between the references of the two appositives" (1985:1309), as in the following example:

*Główny ekonomista towarzystwa ubezpieczeniowego Allianz, Michael Heise, uważa, że jeśli to się powiedzie to i niemieckie firmy staną się bardziej konkurencyjne, to inne kraje nie będą miały wyjścia, jak tylko pójść w ich ślady. (25:39)*

### Identification

The first appositive is an indefinite noun phrase and the second is more specific, therefore the indicator *namely* (*mianowicie*) is possible. “The second appositive identifies what is referred to in the first appositive” and “there is no longer a one-to-one correspondence”, as there is with appellation (1985:1309). Here is an example:

*Podobno pojawiać się w niej mają **znane postaci amerykańskiej lewicy – profesor Noam Chomsky i reżyser Michael Moore, autor filmu “Fahrenheit 9/11”, wyśmiewającego Busha.*** (25:43)

### Designation

Both appositives are definite noun phrases. The second is less specific than the first, the opposite of appellation and identification, and hence the indicator *namely* (*mianowicie*) cannot be used (1985:1310).

*Mariusz Łapiński, były minister zdrowia i bohater afery lekowej, bawi się w porucznika Colombo.* (23:4)

### Reformulation

It is “a rewording in the second (defining) appositive of the lexical content of the first (defined) appositive” (1985:1311). As a result of the combination of elaboration with parataxis Halliday (1994:226) distinguishes a similar type of relationship named “exposition”. “Here the secondary clause restates the thesis of the primary clause in different words, to present it from another point of view, or perhaps just to reinforce the message”. According to Quirk *et al.* (1985:1311) reformulation can be based on linguistic knowledge or on factual knowledge, or convey a more precise information.

*To dużo, choć przesadzony był strach państw zachodnich przed **delokalizacją, czyli przenoszeniem fabryk na Wschód.*** (32:50)

### Exemplification

The second appositive exemplifies the reference of the more general term in the first appositive or in Halliday’s words (1994:226) “the secondary clause develops the thesis of the primary clause by becoming more specific about it, often citing an actual example”.

*Tego typu rozwiązania funkcjonują w większości krajów europejskich – np. w Szwecji i w Anglii.* (23:88)

Here the explicit conjunctives are: *na przykład* (*np.*), *jak na przykład*, *wliczając*, *włączając*, *w tym*, *taki jak*. If there is no indicator ambiguity between exemplification and identification may occur.

*Postanowili zacząć działać – efektem jego starań stały się **kolejne wielkie przedsięwzięcia charytatywne: Band Aid, USA for Africa, Live Aid, Farm Aid, Conspiracy of Hope.*** (26:104)

### Particularization

It is the marked form of exemplification or in other words inclusion (1985:1316.) The explicit indicator of particularization has to be present: *szczególnie, zwłaszcza, głównie, przede wszystkim.*

*Wielu naukowców, szukając przyczyn rosnącej agresywności, wskazuje na szkodliwy wpływ mediów, zwłaszcza telewizji i gier komputerowych. (27:56)*

The following table illustrates which semantic classes of apposition are prevalent in the press genre.

The semantic classes of apposition	<i>Newsweek</i> 47/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 48/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 49/2005
appellation	3,5%	3,5%	2%
identification	25%	34%	37%
designation	19%	13,5%	13%
reformulation	24%	19%	15%
attribution	19%	18%	18%
exemplification	8,5%	10%	12%
particularization	2%	1%	2,5%

## 4. The linear and hierarchical structure of apposition

As far as the linear structure is concerned, the vast majority of appositive constructions have been exemplified with merely two appositives, termed by Meyer (1992:37) "single apposition", that is, the initial unit is apposed to single second unit. However, there may be more than two units in apposition and Meyer (ibid.) names such instances "double, triple or multiple apposition".

The following examples illustrate double apposition, that is, the initial unit is apposed to two subsequent units.

*Jak szacuje prof. Józef Baniak, socjolog religii z Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, autor pracy "Wierność powołaniu a kryzys tożsamości kapłańskiej", większość – ok. 80 proc. – rezygnowała z kapłaństwa z powodu kobiety. (23:84)*

*Niegdyś kwitnąca metropolia, dzisiaj stolica AIDS i przestępczości. Kaliningrad świętuje 750-lecie istnienia. (27:46)*

Hierarchically, Meyer (1992:39) claims that "apposition is typically a binary relationship: the second unit of the apposition is in apposition with the first unit that immediately precedes it". Apposition involving more than two units is termed by

Koktova (1985:64) “the structured apposition” and following Koktova, the first example can be schematically illustrated like this:

[ a ( b c ) ].

Such a subclass of the structured apposition is called “a backward recursion”. In the scheme *a* stands for *prof. Józef Baniak*, *b*, for *socjolog religii z Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu*, *c*, for *autor pracy “Wierność powołaniu a kryzys tożsamości kapłańskiej”*.

The second example involves “a forward recursion” and can be schematically illustrated like this:

[ ( a b ) c ].

In the scheme, *a* stands for *niegdyś kwitnąca metropolia*, *b*, for *dzisiaj stolica AIDS i przestępczości*, and *c*, for *Kaliningrad*.

In the next example the coordinated noun phrases are together appositional to the initial unit *Oskar Lafontaine*.

*Liderem WASG jest Oskar Lafontaine, znakomity mówca, były minister finansów w rządzie Gerharda Schroedera i dawny szef SPD.* (27:44)

Moreover, as far as coordinated noun phrases in apposition are concerned, they can be both semantically and structurally paralleled, as in the example:

*Trudno zrozumieć Kaczyńskich, nie wiedząc, że ich ojciec i matka – inżynier i polonistka z warszawskiego Żoliborza – mimo bardzo młodego wieku brali udział w Powstaniu Warszawskim.* (32:18)

The units functioning as a single appositive need not be coordinated by *i*, but the relationship of coordination may not be marked overtly and the second appositive can be an asyndetic series of juxtaposed units, for example:

*Kupowali je peerełowscy krezusi: Telpot, Diora, Kasprzak.* (27:37)

As the table demonstrates, double apposition is uncommon among appositive constructions present in three successive issues of *Newsweek Polska* magazine.

	<i>Newsweek</i> 47/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 48/2005	<i>Newsweek</i> 49/2005
Double apposition	2,5%	3,5%	2,8%

In triple apposition the initial unit is apposed to three subsequent units, for example:

*Znam kilkaset podobnych przypadków – mówi dr Karin Jackel, publicystka, autorka książek o wychowaniu, działaczka walcząca o prawa rodzicielskie.* (25:80)

Multiple apposition is illustrated in the following example:

*Jest nim jednak Stefan Chwin – twórca powieści takich jak “Hanemann” i “Esther”, które weszły już do kanonu współczesnej literatury, subtelny eseista,*

*intelektualista, profesor, laureat najbardziej prestiżowych nagród literackich.*  
(25:98)

The following example involves more complex hierarchy of appositional relationships.

*Wiść o katastrofie obiegła świat z szybkością błyskawicy, bo jej ofiarą padł John Walton – syn i jeden z pięciu spadkobierców Samuela Waltona, twórcy Wal-Martu, największej sieci handlowej świata.* (27:30)

The first unit *John Walton* is in apposition with the second unit *syn i jeden z pięciu spadkobierców Samuela Waltona*, while one element from the second appositive, namely *Samuela Waltona* is apposed to the third unit *twórcy Wal-Martu*, additionally *Wal-Martu* is apposed to *największej sieci handlowej świata*. All that follows the first appositive *John Walton* does not constitute the second appositive but each of the apposed units identifies what is referred to in the preceded unit.

Additionally, according to most definitions the notion apposition refers to constructions where one unit is placed alongside of another, or in other words, units are juxtaposed. However, it is argued, that appositive elements are not necessarily juxtaposed, but that one may be separated from the other not merely by a mark of punctuation but by entire phrases or clauses. Norwood (1954:270) considers the idea that the appositive is placed alongside as misleading. The appositive is “loosely connected with the word or word group with which it is in apposition (...) is frequently a parenthetic expression and could be signaled by ‘and I might add that’...”. Similarly, Meyer in the discussion of Matthews (1981:233), who understands apposition as “a type of juxtaposition”, finds it unsatisfactory to restrict apposition to two juxtaposed noun phrases and provides different reasons why units in apposition are not juxtaposed. In written corpora “a number of units were unjuxtaposed for reasons of end-focus and end-weight” and “because of syntactic constraints on the placement of words in a sentence or clause” (1992:39).

The vast majority of appositions in *Newsweek* contain units that are juxtaposed but there are a few instances of units in apposition which are unjuxtaposed, for example:

*Najbardziej uderzającym przykładem sukcesu jest Tanzania, która również nie ma złóż ropy. Ten nigdy nie targany wojną kraj na wschodzie Afryki powoli popadł w biedę po odzyskaniu niepodległości w 1961r., głównie z powodu złej polityki gospodarczej i stagnacji politycznej.* (27:51)

## 5. Summary and conclusions

In this paper I have tried to redefine the concept of loose, or nonrestrictive, apposition in Polish. I discussed the features usually invoked by different linguists as significant for apposition, and different approaches to apposition. In the light of such extremely different views, it can be assumed that the concept of apposition is too

complex to be analysed in terms of any single aspect. Accordingly, following Norwood's words (1984:267) apposition can be considered as "a lively and flexible construction, capable of twisting around to add, in numerous variations, information or emphasis".

Considering all the examples provided in the paper, it can be concluded that both semantic and formal features decide on the integration of the units in apposition (Topolińska, 1984:339).

Appositive constructions occur so frequently in the press genre because they are useful grammatical constructions for providing new or additional information about individuals. For this reason, most of the appositions occurred are in the classes of identification, designation, attribution and reformulation because of the communicative need of the press genre to name individuals and attribute characteristics to them. The vast majority of appositive constructions are concentrated around proper nouns because as Biber (1988:104) claims "nouns are primary bearers of referential meaning in a text, and a high frequency of nouns thus indicates great density of information".

## References

- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (1996). Are apposition markers discourse makers? *Journal of Linguistics* 32, 325–347.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Burton-Roberts, N. (1997). *Analysing sentences*. London: Longman.
- Burton-Roberts, N. (1993). 'Apposition'. In: N. Asher (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (vol.1). Pergamon Oxford. 184–187.
- Burton-Roberts, N. (1975). Nominal apposition. *Foundations of Language* 13, 391–419.
- Bühler, K. (2004). *Teoria języka*. Kraków: TAiWPN Universitas.
- Cruse, D.A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Francis, W.N. (1958). *The structure of American English*. New York: Ronald.
- Fries, C.C. (1952). *The structure of English*. New York: Harcourt.
- Goląb, Z., Heinz, A., Polański, K. (1968). *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Grzegorzczkowska, R. (1998). *Wykłady z polskiej składni*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Hockett, Ch. (1958). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Hockett, Ch. (1955). Attribution and apposition. *American Speech* 30, 99–102.
- Kallas, K. (1993). *Składnia współczesnych polskich konstrukcji współrzędnych*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Kallas, K. (1980). *Grupy apozycyjne we współczesnym języku polskim*. Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Kallas, K. (1978). Struktura syntaktyczna polskich konstrukcji apozycyjnych. *Slavia Orientalis XXVII*, z. 3, s. 345–350.

- Klemensiewicz, Z. (1963). *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Koktova, E. (1985). Apposition as a pragmatic phenomenon in a functional description. *UEA Papers in Linguistics*: 39–79.
- Labocha, J. (1996). *Gramatyka polska: składnia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwa "Księgarni Akademickiej", Nr 33.
- Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics*. New York: Penguin.
- Jodłowski, S. (1976). *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P.H. (1981). *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, C. (1992). *Apposition in contemporary English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moroz, A., Wiśniewski, M. (2004). *Studia z gramatyki i semantyki języka polskiego*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Nagórko, A. (2003). *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Norwood, J. (1954). The loose appositive in present-day English. *American Speech* 29, 267–271.
- Podracki, J. (1989). *Dydaktyka składni polskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Polański, K. (1999). *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R. and Greenbaum, S. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Saloni, Z., Świdziński, M. (2001). *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Sopher, H. (1971). Apposition. *English Studies* 52, 401–412.
- Strutyński, J. (1999). *Gramatyka polska*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Tomasz Strutyński.
- Świdziński, M. (1990). Przecinek jako jednostka składniowa. *Poradnik Językowy* z. 8, 578–588.
- Topolińska, Z. (1984). Składnia grupy imiennej w: *Składnia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Urbańczyk, S. (1978). *Encyklopedia wiedzy o języku polskim*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- de Vries, Mark. (2000). Appositive Relative Clauses. <http://odur.let.rug.nl/~dvries/pdf/2000-apposition-lin.pdf>