Anton Getsov^ ©
Sylvia Velikova^ ©

Metalanguage issues in the analysis of the appositional construction

)   St Cyril and St Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo
2 T. Turnovsky St., 5003 Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria
E-mail: anton_getsov@abv.bg
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-4384-664X

2) St Cyril and St Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo
2 T. Turnovsky St., 5003 Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria
E-mail: sylvia.velikova@gmail.com
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-1301-2903

Abstract. The way metalanguage is used in research directly influences the accurate representation of scientific thought in the description, theorisation and analysis of the phenomena under study. Therefore, language as a means through which scientific concepts are illuminated is worth some serious attention. This article examines the use of key terminology in research publications in the field of syntax which deal with the linguistic status, the specific features, and the typology and realisations of the appositive construction. The main focus of analysis is on the inconsistent use of terms such as *apposition*, *appositive*, *appositivity*, *appositional*, and their derivatives and word combinations of a terminological nature. The arbitrary mixing and replacement of these key terms often result in significant problems regarding the meanings conveyed in the texts in which they are used and their interpretation. The study also provides a systematic review of fundamental terms and discusses some debatable solutions to their use in linguistic studies in Bulgarian, English, German, and Russian.
Keywords: Metalanguage; Terminology; Apposition; Appositive; Appositional relation; Appositional construction

Introduction

Metalanguage as the language used to describe, analyse and talk about language has a crucial role in linguistics. It is a unique means of communication which is entirely different from the (object or natural) language it describes (Lyons, 1977: 11), "the property by virtue of which a language may be used to refer to itself (in whole or in part)" that may be referred to as "reflexivity" (Lyons, 1995: 7). The interaction between object language and metalanguage may operate within a single language or across languages. For instance, two languages can be in "an object-language-metalanguage relation" if linguistic phenomena of one language are discussed in the other language, such as the description of German grammar in English (Bussmann, 2006: 823). In linguistic research, it is of critical importance for scholars to communicate through the mediation of a "common metalanguage", no matter if their scholarly communication takes place in one linguistic context (e.g. in their own language) or across a variety of

languages (when they produce or translate their work). The main function of metalanguage, then, is two-fold. Firstly, scholars' metalanguage serves as an indicator of their theoretical and methodological orientations. That is why, if they fail to use it in a precise and consistent way, the theoretretical underpinnings of their work will be perceived as contradictory and confusing. Secondly, metalanguage has a mediating function as a tool for communicating explicit and unambiguous meanings and ideas in the academic dialogue between linguists investigating specific language phenomena.

Although there is not a one-to-one correspondence between terminology and metalanguage, terminology (considered to be the lexical aspect of metalanguage or technical lexis) is a salient factor that makes a metalinguistic code as precise and clear as possible. It is not surprising, therefore, that interest in terminological units has emanated in the interdisciplinary study of terms examining their functions simultaneously as "language units (linguistics), cognitive elements (logic and ontology, i.e. part of cognitive science) and vehicles of communication (communication theory)" (Cabre, 1999: 25). Like all researchers, linguists are bound to use terminology as part of the common metalanguage of linguistic science. In this process, they either adopt already existing terminology, which has been conventionalised, or develop their own set of terms. It is of utmost importance, in both cases, terms to be explained unambiguously and used consistently. In his research on appositional constructions, for instance, Schindler (1990) proposes his own idiosyncratic terminology. He has justified his choice with a deliberate attempt to distance his theory from existing terms and theoretical positions of other scholars in the field, and to make it possible for his claims to be tested against them (cf. Stevens, 1992: 182).

In Academia, however, there has always been the problem of terminological variability. A recurring phenomenon in scientific studies (either by the same author or by different scholars), and in linguistics, in particu-

lar, is the proliferation and arbitrary use of different terms denoting the same concept or the use of the same term with different meanings. This variability often makes the metalanguage of linguistic literature obscure and controversial - a challenge researchers have to deal with when investigating language phenomena. Lyons (1977: xi), for example, points out that there is a terminological confusion worth addressing due to the plethora of terms and meanings in the literature of semantics and semiotics:

One of the biggest problems that I have had in writing this section of the book has been terminological. It is frequently the case in the literature of semantics and semiotics that the same terms are employed in quite different senses by different authors or that there are several alternatives for what is essentially the same phenomenon. All I can say is that I have been as careful as possible in selecting between alternative terms or alternative interpretations of the same terms and, within the limits of my own knowledge of the field, in drawing the reader's attention to certain terminological pitfalls.

In the field of syntax, a fundamental problem with research studies on the *appositional construction* is the disparate interpretation of key terms (of Latin or English origin) such as: *apposition* or *appositio*, *appositive* (as a noun or an adjective), *appositional*, and their derivative words and phrases of terminological nature: *appositivity*, *appositional/appositive member, appositional/appositive function, appositional/appositive link, appositional/appositive relation, appositive pair, appositional/appositive construction, a construction of an appositional/appositive type, appositional/appositive phrase, appositional/appositive unit, appositional/appositive structure*, etc. These terminological units have been in steady circulation in studies on syntax published in English and in other languages. It should also be noted that *appositional* and *appositive* are used interchangeably as adjectives in linguistic literature. In this paper we have adopted the attribute *appositional*, while the term *appositional construction* is used to

.

Research result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 7 (1). 2021.

. . 7, 1 2021.

51

refer to a type of binary grammatical structure. As in traditional accounts, one of the elements is the *independent unit (the head, the anchor);* the other element is the *dependent unit (the appositive).*

The choice of terms which make a precise demarcation of the differences between the concepts they denote has not always been sufficiently motivated and based on established scientific practice from a conceptual and/or practical standpoint. This results in metalanguage complexity and ambiguity, and affects the optimal theoretical conceptualisation and the methodological approaches to the study of this linguistic unit that has still been poorly investigated. Terminological designations also pose problems in the translation of texts from a language in which certain terms have an unequivocal and well-established meaning and use to a language in which they do not have even near equivalents. The uncritical acceptance of terms with a meaning which often appear to be quite different from the original idea of the text and the author's intention, and their mechanical adoption leads to even greater difficulties and creates conditions for involuntary and undesirable distortion or replacement of opinions, hypotheses, and ideas.

The grammatical term *apposition* (Bulgarian /prilozhenie/, a /apozitsia/;* English *apposition;* French *apposition;* German *Apposition;* Russian /prilozhenie/, /appoziciya/)* comes from the Latin word *appositus* meaning " 1. Situated near or opposite to, juxtaposed, adjacent ", which is a derivative of *appono, apponere, apposui* "to place near or opposite (to), set alongside" (OLD, 1968: 153). The term can also be traced back to *appositum,* meaning "1. An adjective, epithet" (OLD, 1968: 153).

The grammatical term *apposition* was used as early as 1799 by the French linguist Antoine Isaac Silvestre de Sacy in his book *Principles de grammaire generate (Principles of General Grammar).* In his work, he distinguishes the attribute as an independent part of the sentence and uses the term *apposition* to

designate it. According to the author, *the attribute* as a syntactic category includes three subcategories - *the grammatical attribute, the appositive and the relative clause* (Silvestre de Sacy, 1822: 213-231).

Orlov, in his research published in the second half of the twentieth century, used the term *appozitivnost'* (*appositivity*) to name the linking mechanism between the components of an appositional construction and interprets it as a genetic, meaning-oriented (and not syntactic) feature. Orlov also explored the etymology of the word *appositio* and its related words. According to him, the Latin word *appositio* means "adding, supplementing"; *apposita* means a "near concept"; *appositum* as a grammatical term means an "adjective", and as a rhetorical term - "an appositive, attribute, epithet"; *appositus* in its basic meaning refers to "standing near or next to", and in its figurative sense, "coming into contact, close" (Orlov, 1960: 29).

Purpose, materials and methods of research

Even a cursory review of publications in which key terms are used differently by different authors (and sometimes by the same author) will reveal the heterogeneous and sometimes mutually exclusive meanings with which the terms have been loaded. The purpose of this study is to present, analyse and summarise some of the inaccuracies and inconsistencies identified in what can be deemed authoritative scholarly research investigating *appositional constructions*. The present investigation expands the analysis beyond a single language, although it restricts its focus to publications in Bulgarian, English, German, and Russian. The sources under review include "terminology collections" or "resources" (Wright and Budin, 1997: 325-326), such as dictionaries and grammar books, as well as dissertations, academic books, and articles. The paper first addresses some definitional issues in discussions on the appositional construction. It then attempts at delimiting the metalanguage of research on this grammatical construction by focusing on a set of foundational terms that are most fre-

quently used by researchers in the field; namely, *apposition, appositive, appositional construction, appositive relation.* Finally, a number of conclusions pertaining to the meta-language and terminology in the study of ap-positional constructions are outlined.

Critical analysis of the definitional variability in the description of the apposi-tional construction

In academic discourse, it is not consid-ered good practice to use different terms to make reference to the same concept; especial-ly, when it is done without any justification and with no special purpose. In research on Bulgarian syntax, the term *apozitsia* has a sporadic and ambivalent use. An eloquent il-lustration of the *status quo* is Konstantin Po-pov's definition proposed in a significant study on the issue: "The *appositive* (*prilozhenieto*) as a syntactic concept and as a term most often means *an attribute* in the broad sense of the word, a nominalised form of an attribute or a detached part of the sen-tence" (Popov, 1978: 207). In his examination on the differences between constructions with detached appositives and constructions with non-detached appositives, Getsov (2019b) provides a critical review of theories dis-cussed in linguistic literature published in Russian, English, and German. In his study, Getsov also analyses the terminological issues related to the syntactic category *detachment (obosobyavane)* (Getsov, 2019b: 217-255). *Detachment* is a rhythmic-intonational separa-tion of a secondary part of the sentence (i.e. a dependent part), which aims to emphasise the distinct communicative significance of that part (BES, 1998: 340). The terms *obosoble-nie, obosoblennaya gruppa* and *obosoblennye vtorostepennye chleny*, introduced only in 1914 by the founder of the theory of detached parts Aleksandr Peshkovsky (Peshkovsky, 2001: 412 - 436), alternate the terms *sobstvennoe prilozhenie* and *prida-tochnoe/predikativnoe prilozhenie* (Shahma-tov, 2001: 280-282, 39-40); *prilozhenie neo-bosoblennoe* and *prilozhenie obosoblennoe* (Ahmanova, 2004); *prilozhenie-atribut* and *obosoblennoe prilozhenie* (Rudnev, 1963:

121-122; 153); *neraschlenennyj appozitivnyj oborot, predstavlyaemyj appozitivnym slovosochetaniem (cel'nyj appozitivnyj obo-rot)* and *raschlenennyj appozitivnyj oborot (appozitivnyj oborot s obosoblennym prilozheniem)* (Kochetkova, 2005: 8), etc. In Bulgarian linguistic literature the terms *obosobeno prilozhenie* and *neobosobeno prilozhenie* have also been widely adopted (Andreychin, 1942: 478-479). In English lin-guistic studies the following distinctions have been made: *restrictive apposition* and *non-resrtictive apposition* (Quirk et al., 1985: 1302-1304); *close apposition* and *loose ap-position* (Curme, 1947: 129-131) or *non-detached apposition* and *detached apposition* (Kobrina et al., 2008), while in German syn-tactic literature the most frequently employed terms are *enge Apposition* (*Appositive Ne-benkerne)* and *lockere Apposition* (Grammat-ik, 2009: 280-294).

In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, one of the most popular and authoritative grammars of the English language, the appositional construction is ex-amined in detail. Quirk et al. (1985) define the so-called *apposition* using both syntactic and semantic criteria, which have also been applied earlier by Sopher (1971). Quirk et al. primarily use the term *apposition* to mean *a relation* between the components of an appo-sitional construction. Occasionally, however, they mean rather the construction itself, while with the term *appositive* the authors consist-ently designate either each of the components, or only the dependent one (Quirk et al., 1985: 1300-1321). Practically, it seems that Quirk et al. (1985) use the same term *(apposition)* to refer to different concepts and this can be jus-tified by terminological polysemy, which is a symptomatic (and rather discrediting) factor for terminological systems as a whole, but it can also hinder the adequate and timely inter-pretation of a specific text.

In his doctoral dissertation, Heringa (2011) proposes the idea that a prototype ap-positional construction is only the one in which the dependent unit is separated by comma intonation ("loose apposition"). He

.   . . 7,   1 2021.

Research result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 7 (1). 2021.   53

refers to a "restrictive example" (1a) and an "appositive variant" (2b) in his comments on examples of the type:

(1) *a. M^y brother Peter is still at college.*

b. My brother, Peter, is still at college.

(Heringa 2011: 3)

Furthermore, the components that Quirk et al. (1985: 1300-1321) refer to as *appositives* (the two components of an appositional construction), Heringa designates as *anchor* (anchor, base) and *apposition* (Heringa 2011: 3).

Curme (1931), similar to the authors of *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, uses the term *appositive* to refer not only to the dependent, but also to each of the two components of an appositional construction; while for the entire construction, he uses the terms, *appositional construction* or *apposition (close, loose)* (Curme, 1931: 88-92, 1947: 129-131).

Other authors of seminal texts also use the same term (mainly *apposition*) when referring to different concepts. For example, in the popular *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (1997: 97), the term *apposition* is defined both as:

1 a: grammatical construction in which two usually adjacent nouns having the same referent stand in the same syntactical relation to the rest of a sentence (such as *the poet* and *Burns* in "a biography of the poet Burns ")

b: the relation of one of such a pair of nouns or noun equivalents to the other.

The proposal of the authors of the dictionary, as reflected in the second part (b) of the definition, differs from the widespread practice adopted in English-language research literature, where the relation between the components of an appositional construction is designated with the terminological phrase *in apposition.*

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics (Matthews, 2003) further complicates the issue. There are marked differences between Matthews' (2003) definition of *apposition* and the explanations of the term in the publications mentioned above. Matthews proposes that the term *apposition* should refer syntactically to the relation between juxtaposed elements of the same kind, and that are in juxtaposition. What is more, the author distinguishes *apposition* from *modification* or from *attribution* in that there is no tendency any element (of the two in an appositional construction) to qualify the other. The term *appositional,* according to Matthews (2003: 197-198) means:

1) Standing in a relation of *apposition: e.g., the *first president* and *George Washington* are appositional noun phrases in the *first president, George Washington*;

2) Having a role like that of an element in apposition.

The first part of the definition (1) provides an interpretation of the term *apposition* which does not open any significant disagreement: many other (mostly English-speaking) linguists use the term precisely to refer to the category of *syntactic relation*. In this respect, in Bulgarian syntax, there is a dominating theory that syntactic relations constitute the grammatical meaning, while syntactic links constitute the grammatical form (the syntactic expression of meaning). For example, the *syntactic relation of subordination*, as the most general semantic one, subsumes such relations, at a lower level of abstraction, as *attributive*, *adverbial,* and *objective.* Each of these is realised through different *syntactic links - agreement, prepositional linking*, *apposition*, and *government.*

However, the second meaning of the term (2) gives rise to reasonable reservations. In (1), Mathews (2003) clearly indicates that the term *appositional noun phrases* designates the two components of an appositional construction. This can be considered common practice. On the other hand, sense (2) in the dictionary entry reveals that the term *apposition* seems to be interpreted ambivalently - both as a syntactic relation and as a syntactic construction, cf. "Having a role like that of <u>an element in apposition</u>" (underline ours). A likely reason for the observed ambiguity in

the description of the term *apposition* in Mathews' work (2003) might be the standard requirements regarding the length of diction-ary entries and the need to confine to a partic-ular word-count limit.

Similarly, Crystal (2008), in defining the term *apposition*, uses three related terms without a clear indication of the commonali-ties and differences in their meanings: e.g. *apposition* vs *appositive* and *apposition* vs *appositional.* In his *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, the author explains that *appo-sition* is a traditional term used in some mod-els of grammatical description to refer to a sequence of components (members) that are constituents of the same grammatical level and having the same or close reference. He provides the following example:

(3)   *John Smith, the butcher, came in.* (Crystal 2008: 31)

Crystal's example, see (3) above, con-tains two noun phrases that have the same reference and perform the same syntactic function; i.e. omitting one or the other com-ponent does not violate the acceptability and the correctness of the sentence. According to Crystal, —[T]hey are therefore said to be in apposition or in an appositive or appositional relationship" (Crystal, 2008: 31). There are three key terms in this explanation, and they are frequently used in linguistic studies on the appositive construction to denote different grammatical categories: 1) each of the com-ponents of the appositional construction, tak-en separately (*appositive*), 2) the sequence of these components (*in apposition*), and 3) the syntactic relation between them (*apposi-tive/appositional relationship; (in) apposi-tion).* Therefore, in his Dictionary, Crystal (2008) could have expanded on their specific meanings.

Some contemporary researchers delib-erately change their metalanguage within the same text. For example, Schindler (1990), in the introduction of his dissertation, states that he has adopted Raabe's terminology. Raabe interprets the term *apposition* as the whole syntactic construction, while the term *apposi-tiv* is reserved for the dependent component of

the same construction. However, in his text, Schindler (1990) also mentions that *apposi-tion* (*die Apposition),* or what he calls later in his study *die Zusatz*, is seen as a syntactic re-lation between the two units. At the same time, in his efforts to improve Raabe's "unu-sual" metalanguage, he maintains that the term *appositional construction* (*eine Apposi-tionskonstruktion*) should be used to designate the construction that contains a head (*Bezugs-element - eine Basis)* and a unit that refers to the head *(eine "Apposition").* What is more, in one of the diagrams in his text (1.2.), the term *apposition* is used to denote the whole appositional construction, and the term *appos-itiv* refers only to the dependent element in it; while in another diagram (1.3.) the two terms have been used synonymously to refer only to one component of the appositional construc-tion. In fact, to explain this inconsistency, the author makes it clear that he has adopted mainly Raabe's language in his work and notes that when he claims that "7 is an appos-itive of *X*, it is equivalent to claiming that *Y* is an apposition of *X—* (Schindler, 1990: 2). However, the terminological intricacy and the partially compromised unambiguous use of the terms raise some doubts regarding the general approach adopted by the linguist.

Ahmanova's (2004) position, who de-fines the term *prilozhenie (appositive)* as a paratactic positioning of two grammatically equivalent nouns for the expression of a spe-cial kind of attributive link, is also open to serious consideration. She also distinguishes between: a) *prilozhenie neobosoblennoe* (an appositive that is not marked out prosodically and with any punctuation), e.g.:

(4)   (Ahmanova, 2004)

b) *prilozhenie obosoblennoe* (an apposi-tive that is marked out prosodically and with the presence of punctuation), e.g.:

(5)   *,*   *,*
                              . (Ahmanova, 2004)

c) *prilozhenie predikativnoe (predica-tive apposition)* that is in an attributive-predicative relation with respect to its ante-

cedent, i.e. an appositive that is separated by comma intonation, having a similar meaning to secondary predicate, e.g.:

(6)   *,*

,

. (Ahmanova, 2004)

(7)   *,   -*

. (Ahmanova, 2004)

There is also   term, similar to Ahmanova's *predicative apposition,* that is to be found in the *Grammar of the English Language* by G. Curme (1931). In Chapter III, entitled *The Predicate*, the American Germanist uses the term *Predicate Appositive* (Curme, 1931: 30-32) consistently and in a motivated way, but in the context of other grammatical relations.

Clearly, these examples are manifestations of a metalinguistic issue arising from the designation of the same constructions (in terms of syntax) with different terms.

Problems of a metalinguistic nature occur even within one language. However, when scientific texts have to be translated, these problems are exacerbated and often multiplied. For example, Mishina (2007: 46-47) attempted at bringing clarity and uniformity in the translation and rendering of scientific texts on appositional constructions from English into Russian. She rightly observes that terminological metalanguage makes the analysis of the theoretical database extremely complicated. Namely, the Russian term *prilozhenie* along with its English equivalent *appositive* are used either as equivalents or as alternatives each of which suggesting the existence of some distinctive features. Thus, as Mishina notes, in "foreign" literature, when the term *appositive* is employed, the main emphasis is on apposition as a process, while the linguistic units as elements of the appositive construction do not receive due attention. In Russian linguistics, on the contrary, it is the linguistic units that come to the fore. Mishina's (2007) observations, in fact, clearly articulate important issues involved in the translation of academic research from one language to another in general.

Even based on the assumption that - with a great deal of doubt - the term *prilozhenie,* used in publications on syntax in Russian, is the equivalent of the English term *appositive,* Mishina's comment that "as a far as the term *appositive* is concerned, the main emphasis is on apposition as a process..." (2007: 46-47) reveals her ambivalent attitude and her inevitable uncertainties (not just hers, unfortunately) reflecting the challenges in drawing a line between the meanings of terms *appositive* and *apposition.*

A critical review of authoritative sources in English and German strongly indicates that currently the contrast is rather between the term *apposition* (designating the whole appositional construction or only one of its components) and *in apposition* (denoting the relation between the components in this construction). In Russian-language research in the field of syntax, the terms *appoziciya* and *appozitiv* are sporadic and peripheral in their use, in contrast to the derivatives *appozitivnyj (appositional), appozitivnaya svyaz' (appositional link), appozitivnoe otnoshenie* (*appositional relation)* that are used very often. The most likely reason for this tendency is that *prilozhenie* does not allow derivation of compound terms. Therefore, Mishina's (2007) observation - that in Russian syntax the focus of attention is on the structural units and that in English syntax apposition has predominantly been studied as a process - seems to be correct but it needs to be further refined. It is certainly the case that in English publications on syntax, as well as in German and Russian literature, appositional constructions have increasingly been made the subject of in-depth and focused studies. There has been a strong tendency, since the last decades of the twentieth century, the issues related to the syntactic relation between the components of appositional constructions to be examined peripherally. On the contrary linguistic research has primarily been concerned with their morphological and semantic characteristics. The reason for this sustained interest in the morphological and semantic characteristics of the elements of appositional

constructions can be explained by the fact that the relation between them is a function of their semantic and morphological features.

An issue that should probably be the focus of a separate study is the way some researchers refer to ideas of authors writing both in the researchers' language and in another language. For instance, Kornilov (2012: 96-97), in his PhD dissertation, quotes Potebnya and the reader is left with the impression that Potebnya uses the terms *appozitivnye chleny (appositional members)* and *appoziciya (apposition)* to mean *prilozhenie (appositive):*

"   (   ),

          .   .   ,

                    -            .   (_)

(   ) '   ,

                                                            -

                                    '"   (

2012: 96-97).

In fact, in his original text, Potebnya systematically uses only the term *prilozhenie*, and only once (in a footnote) its Latin equivalent *appositio* (Potebnya, 1958: 110, 122).

Likewise, Mishina (2007: 38) makes references to original texts in her dissertation. For example, she notes that Quirk et al. (1985) distinguish between *detached appositives* and *non-detached appositives* and claims that the authors of *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* use the terms *restrictive appositive (ogranichitel'nyi appozitiv)* and *non-restrictive appositive (neogranichitel'nyi appozitiv)* (in fact, the terms that Quirk et al. (1985: 1303) use are *restrictive apposition* and *nonrestrictive apposition*)

In her work, Mishina also somewhat loosely cites Close's proposal. In his grammar, the linguist does not actually use the terms *non-detached apposition* and *detached apposition* (Mishina, 2007: 38), but what he refers to is *restrictive apposition* and *non-restrictive apposition* (Close, 1975: 22, 44). Mishina's claim that in Russian linguistics Viktor Vinogradov has introduced the terms *sobstvennoe prilozhenie* (non-detached appos-

itive) and *pridatochnoe/predikativnoe prilozhenie* (detached appositive) also raises some doubts. Her reference to Vinogradov can actually be traced back to an earlier work, *Sintaksis russkogo yazyka (Syntax of the Russian Language),* written by Academician Aleksey Shahmatov (Shahmatov, 2001: 280) (Mishina, 2007: 38-39). Shahmatov employs the term *sobstvennoe prilozhenie (prototype appositive)* to refer to all non-detached appositives, but also some detached appositives in pre-position and post-position (Shahmatov 2001: 280; 281-282; 284); with the term *pridatochnoe prilozhenie* (subordinate appositive) he denotes detached appositives in pre-position (Shahmatov, 2001: 280; 281); he adopts the term *predikativnoe prilozhenie* (predicative appositive) to designate some detached appositives in post-position (Shahmatov, 2001: 39-40).

There are linguists, however, who accurately and consistently draw a dividing line between terms that are used to refer to identical concepts, and between concepts that are designated by the same term. For example, more than a century ago, Kimball (2010) interpreted the terms *appositive* and *apposition* as referring to two different phenomena. According to her, the term *appositive* refers to a noun or noun phrase that functions as a modifier of a noun or pronoun. In the same definition, Kimball (2010: 87) notes: "[w]hen the base word of an appositive is a noun, it is called a noun in apposition". Therefore, she clearly distinguishes between the meaning of the two terms - the first (*an appositive*) refers to the structural unit, while the second (*in apposition)* refers to the syntactic relation.

Wykoff and Shaw (1952) also precisely delineate between the concepts designated by different terms. They define the term *appositive* as follows: "Appositive. A substantive added to another substantive to identify or explain it. The appositive signifies the same thing and is said to be in apposition" (Wykoff and Shaw 1952: 117). This is how Wykoff and Shaw avoid the ambiguous use of terms (and concepts). Namely, they designate a particular concept (a component of an apposi-

tional construction) with a specific term - *appositive,* and refer to the syntactic relation between the components of the appositional construction through another term - *in apposition.*

Seright (1966: 109) presents the correlation *appositive - in apposition* in a similar way:

A final definition for the appositive, then, is that it is ANY structure in ANY function which, in addition to modifying or renaming an antecedent, will also SUBSTITUTE for that antecedent. It may, of course, be restrictive or nonrestrictive, and it will always show a three-fold semantic, intonational and graphic correlation.

Similarly, Trask (1996) provides the same definition of the term in one of the most popular English-language dictionaries of linguistic terms. The linguist has consistently referred to the dependent component in an appositional construction as an *appositive*, but he concludes that "An appositive is said to be in apposition to the preceding NP" (Trask, 1996: 19). Therefore, with the term *appositive,* Trask (1996) denotes one of the components of an appositional construction; i.e. a structural unit, while with the term *in apposition,* he indicates the relation between the two components of the construction.

Findings and discussion. A review of the meanings of key terms used in the description of the appositional construction

The analysis of various studies in the field of syntax in different languages identified the following foundational terms of their metalanguage: *apposition, appositive, appositional construction, appositive relation.* These terms, however, have been employed with more than one meaning. Some authors adopt the same term to refer to different concepts; in other cases, the same authors, as a result of minor or major transformations of their views, have changed the meaning of the terms they use.

Apposition

In syntactic studies on the grammatical status, distinctive features, typology and use of the appositional construction, the term *apposition* is used to denote:

1)   A noun, a substantive part or a noun phrase that refers to another noun by defining it and giving another name to the entity already designated with the first noun. Some of the authors who use the term with this meaning are Tesniere (1969: 163-166), Ilish (1971: 231), Helbig and Buscha (1996: 606-609), Hannay and Keizer (2005: 163-164), Gallmann (Grammatik 2009: 980-994), Osenova (2009: 162-163), Heringa (2011: 1). It is important to note that this meaning of the term can be considered as the most widely used, as the basic one, and in a sense - the representative one. In this context, the discrepancies regarding the scope of the term are tied to the authors' differing interpretations of the status of the dependent component of the appositional construction.

Some authors - Jespersen (1943: 93-95), Seright (1966: 107-109), Close (1975: 43-44), Raabe (1979: 226; 329), Quirk et al. (1985: 1303-1306), Nehoroshkova (1989: 1-16), Meyer (1992: 10-34),—Acuna-Farina (1996: 168), Taylor (2002: 236), Kobrina et al. (2008) - claim that the dependent component can be expressed by a subordinate clause, predicative phrase, and infinitive construction.

Raabe clearly does not accept the view that enge Apposition (so-called non-detached/close appositive) is an appositional construction, but at the same time convincingly defends his thesis that examples of the type of (8), (9), and (10) are typical appositives (Raabe, 1979: 226, 329):

(8) *Der Wal - das sagt auch Pia - mufi geschutzt werden.* (Raabe, 1979)

(9)   *Er kommt, er kommt morgen.* (Raabe, 1979)

(10)   *Er will nur eines: Erfolg haben.* (Raabe, 1979)

His approach, aimed at restricting the lower limit of the syntactic category of the appositional construction and at the "opening" of its upper limit, is debatable. Its uncritical adoption also brings undesirable risks. Meyer refers to the components of the appositive construction as units, most frequently as a first and a second unit, while with the term

apposition he denotes either the whole construction or the type of the relation between its components (Meyer, 1992).

Other authors assert that the dependent component of the appositional construction can be realised even with an adverb, adjective or a verb. These scholars include Poutsma (1904: 183), Hook and Mathews (1956), Potebnya (1958: 185-191), Rudnev (1963: 154-155), Seright (1966: 108), Severyanova (1978), Quirk and Greenbaum (1991), Acuna-Farina (1996: 168), O'Connor (2008), Kornilov (2012: 119-120).

Some researchers - in the context of Russian, English and German linguistics - use the term *apposition* to denote only an appositional construction in which the dependent component is separated by comma intonation: Potebnya (1958: 109-110) (Potebnya sporadically uses the Latin term *appositio* as a dictionary synonym of the term *prilozhenie*; similarly, both terms are consistently employed by many Russian-speaking authors), Jespersen (1969), Brinkmann (1971), Barhudarov (2008), Weinrich (1993: 361-364), Engel (1996: 806-811), Zifonun (Grammatik 1997: 1648, 1661 f., 2036, 2038 ff., 2043), Puleha (1999: 20), among others. Some Bulgarian linguists take the same view as these authors: e.g. Iliev who uses the terms *podlozhna dobavka (apozitsia)* (Iliev, 1888: 6), Kostov (1939: 207) who employs the term *apozitsia,* Teodorov-Balan (1940: 34, 431-432) who along with the term *prilog* uses its Latin correspondence *appositio*, and Popov (1942: 183) who employs only the term *prilozhenie*. There has been no consensus yet on the distinction between the prototype appositional construction from those syntactic structures that are usually neglected or considered similar or peripheral phenomena to the appositional construction - e.g. *weak apposition* and *partial apposition* (Quirk et al., 1985: 1302-1303); *enge, gebundene Apposition* (Grammatik, 1997: 2043), *Appositive Nebenkerne* (Grammatik, 2009: 988-993); *peripheral apposition* (Meyer 1992: 41) or the group of constructions that are similar to ap-

position: *appositionsverdachtige Konstruktion* (Schindler, 1990: 1).

2) A syntactic unit (construction), consisting of two nouns (noun phrases), having the same reference, in which one of the nouns (noun phrases) functions as an independent component, while the other one is a dependent component. This interpretation is to be seen most clearly in Quirk et al. (1985: 1300-1319), Koktova (1986: 6), Meyer (1992), Acuna-Farina (1999: 59-91, 2009: 453-481), Kaizer (2007: 22-60), Mouratova (2018: 240-246).

3) The type of relation between the two components of an appositional construction (e.g. Quirk et al., 1985: 1300-1319). This meaning of the term *apposition* is typical mostly in studies written in English where the prepositional phrase *in apposition* is consistently used. There are a number of different perspectives that linguists espouse as regards the nature of the above-mentioned relation.

a) According to Jespersen (1969: 123), Hockett (1955: 99-102), Close (1975: 22), Allerton (1979: 127-129), Brown and Miller (1982: 258), Sturm (1986: 245), Lekant (1977: 50, 2006: 298) among others, the relation between the components of the appositional construction is firstly syntactic. Secondly it should be considered as a type of co-ordination, i.e. the term *apposition* denotes the relation of coordination between the components of the appositional construction. Some of the researchers, such as Mathesius (1967: 505), Fries (1952: 187), Francis (1958: 301), Roberts (1962: 219), Bogacki (1973: 19), Taboada (1978: 315-340) go even further. They use this term to refer to the juxtaposition of co-referent nominal groups. The proponents of the view that there is a coordinating relation between the elements of the appositional construction almost incessantly maintain that the syntactic equivalence of the components does not lead to their semantic equivalence or to an equivalent communicative function.

Prominent proponents of this school of thought in the context of Soviet linguistics, though not using the term *apposition,* are

Peshkovsky (2001: 57-59, 141), Beskrovnyy (1940: 39-40), and Ahmanova (2004). Later, some Soviet and Russian linguists "resuscitate", the once-weird, Peschovsky's idea, by refining and enriching it, even terminologically. Zaharenko (1998), who uses the term *appozitivnaya svyaz' (appositional link)* instead of *appozitivnoe otnoshenie (appositional relation)*, considers the appositional link as a special type of link, signifying syntactic equality between the linked components, but it does not necessarily imply equality between their semantic status and their communicative roles (Zaharenko, 1998: 12, 24). Kobrina et al. (1998), using the term *appositive relation,* point out that it is similar to coordination syntactically since the head word and the appositive, though not having an equal communicative status, are constituents at the same sentence level.

b) Some other linguists, for example, Poutsma (1904: 183), Curme (1947: 129-131), Hadlich (1973: 234), argue that the relation between the components of the appositional construction is subordination; therefore, the term *apposition* refers to the subordinative relation between the head and the dependent component. However, there are some pertinent questions that arise in this case. One of them is of how the independent component and the dependent component in the construction can be identified. Other questions concern their morphological and semantic characteristics. Some authors adopt the view that the relation in an appositional construction is derivative and/or approaches the attributive relation (see, Kornilov (2012: 12-14) for a bibliographic reference to the theories which support this idea). Other authors, for example, Doron (1994: 53-65), Zifonun et al. (Grammatik, 1997: 2035, 2040), argue that it has a predicative nature. The third strand of researchers, such as Potts (2005, cited in Heringa 2011: 8) and Orlov (1960) view the relation not as a syntactic but as a semantic one. However, no matter if the relation is defined as attributive, predicative, or is not even considered syntactical, it is denoted with the same term - *apposition* (with the exception of

Orlov who uses the term *appozitivnost' (appositivity)*).

Some of the linguists who published their studies in Russian in the second half of the twentieth century use the term *apposition* to refer not to a subordinative relation but to a subordinative link (Kornilov (2012: 106-107) comments briefly on this terminological alternation). Maloshnaya (1975), for instance, distinguishes the syntactic link *apposition*, which is a type of coordination, from the syntactic link *imennoe primykanie (nominalparataxis).* According to her, in a particular type of noun phrases, as seen in (11 a-e) and (12 a-c) the components are linked through *imennoe primykanie* (nominal parataxis); that is why they are not appositional:

(11) a. " ", (Maloshnaya, 1975: 44)

b. " " (Maloshnaya, 1975: 44)

c. " " (Maloshnaya, 1975: 44)

d. " " Maloshnaya (1975: 44)

e. (Maloshnaya, 1975: 44)

(12) a. - (Maloshnaya, 1975: 48)

b. - (Maloshnaya, 1975: 48)

c. - (Maloshnaya, 1975: 48)

In contrast, the construction consisting of a first and a last name, as in (13 a-b), is appositional (Maloshnaya, 1975: 34, 44, 48):

(13) a. Maloshnaya (1975: 34)

b. Maloshnaya (1975: 34)

This idea has been interpreted in different ways in Russian linguistics, but the most established view is that in the appositional construction representing a personal name (i.e. a complex of first name, father's name and family name) the family name functions as the head /anchor, while the first name and the father's name - as a detached appositive, e.g.:

(14)   ,   ,   -
                  ^   . (Gvozdev
1968:120)

(15)   ,   -
. (Malahov, 2009: 48)

(16)   ,   -
                    . (Malahov, 2009: 82)

In German linguistics, some authors have taken an interesting position. For example, G. Helbig and J. Buscha (1996), who, describing the variants of the construction with non-detached appositive *(enge/ gebundene Apposition),* claim: "(1) First names. The head word is the last name or the middle name. The appositive precedes the head word. The head word and the appositive have zero article: *Heinrich Mann, Johann Sebastian* (Helbig and Buscha, 1996: 607). P. Gallmann (Grammatik, 2009: 990) interprets the first name in personal names, e.g. *Rainer Maria Rilke*, as an additional appositive nucleus (*Appositive Nebenkerne*). Sowinski (1991: 126) and Jung (1973: 84) define it as a non-detached appositive (*enge Apposition*), and Griesbach (1972: 94) considers the first name as an appositive in pre-position (*vorangestellte Apposition).* Krifka (1983: 113), who examines the constructions with a non-detached appositive within the categorical-grammatical paradigm, also considers that the constructions of a baptismal name (Taufname) and surname are appositive, e.g.:

(17) a. *Henry Jonston* (Krifka, 1983)

b. *Nakaso Toshio* (Krifka, 1983)

c. *PiaMuler* (Krifka, 1983)

In these constructions, the surname (Operator/Funktor/Specificator) specifies the first name (Operand/Argument/Spezifikat) (Krifka, 1983: 28 f., 113 f.). Engel (1996) does not agree with his colleagues Germanists, because in his view the appositive cannot be in a pre-position and non-detached, e.g.:

(18)   *(der) Schornsteinfeger Pfeiffer* (Engel 1996: 806)

In other words, he does not recognize the construction called *enge Apposition* as apposition. Engel claims that in constructions of this type there is an attribute in pre-position (*vorangestellte Attribut)* and defines them as

Nomen varians, respectively as *Nomen invarians* (Engel, 1996: 610). In his view, the appositive is always in post-position and detached, e.g.:

(19)   *Herr Pfeiffer, der Schornsteinfeger* (Engel, 1996: 806).

Therefore, an appositive, according to him, can only be the so-called loose appositive (*lockere/freie/ nachgetragene Apposition*) (Engel, 1996: 806).

Burton-Roberts (1994) also defines apposition as an extremely loose and atypical syntactic relation (his use of the term *syntactic relation* corresponds to the meaning of a *syntactic link* in this text) in which the second element is added as a parenthesis to the first, and sometimes functions as its metalinguistic interpretation or comment (Burton-Roberts, 1994: 184).

c)   A large number of linguists - both of the past and the present - persistently and convincingly support the view of the unique character of the relation between the components of appositional constructions. This practically means that it is considered as a third type of grammatical relation, different from coordination and subordination. Sopher (1971), for example, observes that the relation between the elements in apposition is not coordination because they are coreferential, nor subordination because they are functionally equivalent (Sopher, 1971: 401-412). However, there is some hesitation in his interpretation of this relation, since he uses the terms *head group* and *appositional group.* This suggests that, although implicit, there may be a subordinate relation. Other authors are consistent and explicit. Delorme and Dougherty (1972: 2-29), Bitea (1977), Koktova (1986: 1-34), Taylor (2002: 235) use the term *apposition* to name this controversial type of relation that has nothing to do either with coordination or subordination.

Schindler (1990: 47) builds the theoretical framework of his dissertation by using key ideas from Hackel. He proposes that "in terms of appositional constructions we have to start from a relation of variable conditionality" (Hackel, 1968: 88, cited in Schindler, 1990:

48). Schindler (1990) also takes into account Eisenberg's ideas (1986: 243):

The formulation *'X* is an appositive to *Y* 'means that *X* is appositive and *Y* is the head to which *X* is related. If the head and the appositive cannot be distinguished, then this mode of expression does not apply and must be replaced by *'X* is the appositive of *Y* and *Y* is the appositive of *X'*. (This is a common case.)

Analysing the appositive through the lens of the so-called "Schaukelsyntagmatik" (syntagmatics of the cradle), referred to as "confusion" of the construction (die „Kopflosigkeit" der Konstruktion), respectively "double-head" construction (die „Doppelk6pfigkeit"), Schindler (1990) with no reservations accepts Lehmann's (1983: 339-341) and Raabe's (1979: 226) views of the nature of the relation in appositional constructions. He concludes that there are three types of syntactic relations: *subordination* - (dependence) between the units of the relation; *coordination* - no dependence between the units of the relation; and *adordination* - a relation between independent units, which however are not equal. According to Schindler, the grammatical relation between the components of the appositional construction is of the third type - *adordinative* (Schindler, 1990: 47-50). The term, which he uses to designate this relation, however, is *apposition.*

Mayer's point of view is as much original as it is ambivalent. In the opening pages of his book, he analyses *apposition* as a grammatical relation, placing it on the same plane with other grammatical relations - *coordination, complementation, modification,* and *parataxis* (Meyer, 1992: 5-6). Later in his work, Meyer elaborates on his proposal that apposition cannot be described as a conventional grammatical relation (such as coordination and modification). According to him, it could be interpreted as *an undifferentiated relation*, as proposed by Matthews (1981: 224), that is, as a relation of different gradable levels. Therefore, it is not possible to propose just one constituent structure for all types of appositional constructions. If, instead, apposi-

tion is considered as an undifferentiated relation or as a relation of different (gradable) levels, it is possible to distinguish constructions that are most appositional *(central appositions)* and constructions that are less appositional to varying degrees *(peripheral appositions).* Therefore, the validation of a specific constituent structure of the appositional construction depends on the degree to which its units are structurally dependent on each other (Meyer, 1992: 41).

Similar ideas, but expressed through the use of other terms, typical of the Russian-speaking studies, have been introduced and developed in Soviet and Russian linguistics by Muhin (Muhin, 1974: 240-246), Uhanov (Uhanov, 1974:   336-342), Severyanova (1978), Kochetkova (2005), Starodumova (2005:   22-26), Priyatkina (2007:   22). It should be noted, however, that the weak arguments, the serious contradictions and the mutually exclusive proposals strongly prevail over the consensual analyses and viable solutions. The hesitations, contradictions and inconsistencies in the presented concepts have also been critically analysed by Getsov (2019a: 104-106).

In Russian linguistics, Lomov (2007) provides the most exhaustive theory on the relation between the components of the appositional construction. In his account, he distinguishes this relation from coordination and subordination. The similarities between his views and Sopher's ideas are evident. However, it should be admitted that Lomov refines it and makes it more precise and develops it further. In *Slovar'-spravochnik po sintaksisu sovremennogo russkogo yazyka (Dictionary-reference book on the syntax of the modern Russian language)*, Lomov proposes that the specific referential nature of the elements is the main reason for this differentiation that is so difficult to analyse and conceptualise. According to Lomov (2007), the link (what he refers to is a *link*, not a *relation*) is not that of coordination because only words that have different referents are linked through coordination. It is not one of subordination either, because the equal status of the components of

the appositional construction (which formally do not dependent on each other) is determined by the reference of the two noun phrases to the same referent (Lomov, 2007: 18). Indicative, however, is the fact that the specific syntactic link, that Lomov (2007) analyses, does not receive both a name and a sound theoretical grounding.

d)   The review of syntactic studies on the referentially identical components of the "bi-substantive constructions", reveals yet another meaning of the term *apposition*. It refers to a grammatical relation that has a syncretic character, i.e. combining features both of coordination and subordination. Almost a hundred years ago, the German linguist John Ries (1928) proposes that appositional constructions *(Anfugegruppen,* as part of the *Halbenge Gruppen),* which exhibit signs both of parataxis and of hypotaxis, are a peculiar transitional zone between the coordinate word groups (*Lockere Gruppen*) and the subordinate word groups (*enge Gruppen*) (Ries, 1928). More recently, Burton-Roberts offers his well-argued idea that apposition and coordination are derivatives of the same deep structure (Burton-Roberts, 1975: 406), and his viewpoint has been adopted by many scholars. A central point in Burton-Roberts's account, for instance, is that in cases often referred to as "loose apposition" by other scholars the relation between the first and the second element in the construction is very loose and "not a genuine *syntactic* relation at all". However, there are other cases of constructions (of the so-called "Close Apposition") in which the relation is definitely a syntactic one (Burton-Roberts, 1994: 184). Even a cursory comparison between the theoretical perspectives of Quirk et al. (1985: 1301), Matthews (1981: 220), and Meyer (1992), as well as of Burton-Roberts's (1994) substantially revised account reveals a number of differences and discrepancies. In general, however, it is beyond any doubt that the term *apposition* has begun to be interpreted in a new way.

In the former USSR, research efforts on the issue had long been the focus of attention. In the theories that have been popular within the Soviet and Russian linguistics, the term *apposition* has not been used to designate the relation between the components of the appositional construction, but the idea that it combines features typical both of coordination and subordination, and that it is worth examining the ideal focal point between these two relations is undoubtedly a current issue. This idea - more implicitly or more clearly - is to be found in Tsyganenko (1954: 1-16), Shatuh (1954   13), Krotevich (1956: 9), Itskovich (1963   3-10), Atayan (1968), Mihnevich (1968   106-112), Kaminina (1970:   25), Vatseba (1973: 159-160), Kornilov (2012: 70, 82, 84-85, 140), among others.

4)   The increasingly attractive idea, which emerged in the 1970s and 1980s of the 20th century, of the non-grammatical (non-syntactic) nature of the relation between the components of the appositional construction requires a special attention. Practically, the elimination of coordination and subordination as possible variations in the definition of the construction determines the search for other vantage points. This interest is understandable and reflects the creation of innovative, extraordinary, even extreme opinions, sharing the idea that if the relation between the components of appositional constructions is neither coordination nor subordination, it is not syntagmatic (syntactical) at all. This theory has most accurately been put forward by Peterson (1999: 229-250). It has also been adopted by Zemb (1968: 296), Burton-Roberts (1975, 1994), Longree (1987: 199). In essence, according to this theory, the analysed relation is not subject to the study of grammar, and, in particular, syntax. In other words, in this strand of research, the term *apposition* is used to denote the unique type of non-syntactic relation. In the Bulgarian syntactic literature Popov (1978) has presented such insights. Instead of using the terms *apposition* and *appositive relation*, he refers to this link as *sui generis;* i.e. "unique, special, one of its kind" (Popov, 1978: 212). Unfortunately, the famous Bulgarian linguist does not go further to reach more viable formulations.

Hannay and Keizer use the same term and argue that apposition is a specific case of holophrastic expression, i.e. an independent discourse unit having its own proposition (Hannay and Keizer, 2005: 163-164). This means that they regard it as a purely pragmatic phenomenon.

5)   In linguistics, there are also extreme, not very popular, views on the meaning that is attached to the term *apposition.* For Sinclair (1972: 252), for example, this term is non-functional because it refers to too many concepts, phenomena and categories in grammar.

Appositive

The term *appositive* has been used to denote:

1) Each of the components of the appositional construction as, for example, has been employed by Quirk at al. (1985: 1302).

2) The dependent component of the appositional construction, which is contrasted to the independent one, referred to as *main word, head noun (unit), anchor.* In a similar way, it has been employed in Curme (1947: 129-131), Watt (1964: 463), Seright (1966: 107-109), Weinrich (1993: 361-364), Zaharenko (1998: 16-21), Acuna-Farina (1999: 59-91), Bussmann (2006: 78), Katanova (2007: 68-74), Muratova (2018: 240-246).

3) The whole appositional construction. With this meaning, for example, Hockett (1955: 99-102) uses the term in his widely-cited study.

4) A type of clause expansion, namely - reduplication, where the doubled components have the same referent, e.g. Brazil (1995: 121).

Appositional construction

The term *appositional construction* has predominantly been used to refer to:

1) A syntactic unit containing an independent (*anchor*) and a dependent (*apposition*) component. This is how the term has been consistently and systematically employed in Heringa's doctoral dissertation (Heringa, 2011).

2)   Non-predicative constructions in which the dependent element is expressed by a word or a phrase, and predicative construc-

tions in which the dependent element is expressed by a subordinate clause (see, for example, Mishina 2007: 17).

Appositive relation

The term *appositive relation* has most frequently been used to denote:

1) A type of relation of subordination in which the second component does not only give a second name to the referent already named by the first component, but also defines, explains, and characterises the first component; see, for example, Shahmatov (2001: 279) and Krotevich (1956: 9).

2) An entirely pragmatic, semantic or intonational phenomenon that is not part of syntax. In linguistic studies where the term is used with this meaning - Koktova (1986: 1-34), Burton-Roberts (1994), Peterson (1999: 247), Heringa (2011: 7) - there is an unjustified replacement and mixing (quite often implicitly) of the use of the two terms *apposition* and *appositive relation,* which actually denote the same concept, namely an *appositional relation.*

3) A syntactic relation which is different both from subordination and coordination; see, for instance, Muratova's paper (2018: 240-246).

4) A specific type of syntactic link which serves to denote syntactic equivalence between the units in the appositional construction. However, it does not imply equality on a semantic level or in terms of their function; see, for example, Zaharenko's dissertation (1998: 16-21).

Conclusion

This examination on the use of key terms in syntactic studies on the grammatical status, typology and use of the appositional construction yielded a number of conclusions.

1) In a large body of the reviewed publications, the terms *apposition*, *appositive*, *appositional construction*, *appositive relation* and their derivative words and phrases with terminological usage are well-argued and used accurately and consistently.

2) In some research studies on the issue, each of the terms has been employed to denote more than one concept or the authors re-

fer to the same concept with several terms. Both cases are instances of imprecise and unacceptable use.

3) The likely reason for the (deliberate or not) mixing, intertwining, duplication and replacement of terms (and their meanings) is the very nature of the appositional construction, which is difficult to study because of the ambivalent semantic-grammatical potential of their two units. The fact that a noun or a nominal group simultaneously identifies and characterises another name or a nominal group (without a grammatically expressed link between them) becomes a serious prerequisite for the challenges in the analysis of apposition.

4) The mixing of terms and terminological meanings have a direct influence on the presentation and comprehension of the theoretical statements and the ideas conveyed by the authors. The so-called *apposition* is inherently enigmatic phenomenon, which is difficult to interpret and describe. If, in addition, the metalinguistic tools used to describe it fail to facilitate the production and reception of a scientific text, then the ideas and the theoretical underpinnings of a study in most cases cannot be adequately interpreted.

5) Researchers have the freedom and responsibility to select the methods, approaches, and means to deliver their ideas as authors. A large part of this choice is determined by the adopted terminological system and the way it is used. It is in the interest of the author, as well as in the interest of the reader, that the message is unequivocal, consistent, and well-argued. It may be acceptable for an author to use the term *apposition* to denote the whole appositional construction, and another author to use it to designate the relation between its units (by all means, the adopted terminology should be clearly defined and justified). It may also be acceptable that in Russian linguistic publications, for example, the term *apposition* has been translated as *prilozhenie*. However, it is unacceptable when the same author uses different terminological designations to refer to the same concept (for instance, the use of the terms *apposition* and

appositive to refer to the dependent unit of the appositional construction). It is also undesirable when the same author refers to different concepts with the same term in the same text (for example, by employing the term *apposition* to designate both the whole appositional construction and its dependent unit).

6) Despite their immanent conventionality and their nature as metalinguistic textual units, terms are unique, stable, precise and systematic designations that should not be misused, but have to be employed accurately and with caution. Undoubtedly, polysemy in terminological systems has become more and more tangible in recent years, and the uniqueness of meaning of terms has been perceived as a tendency rather than as a mandatory characteristic. However, in the study of such an ambivalent and complicated semantic and grammatical phenomenon as the appositional construction, the use of terminological units should be more carefully considered, refined, and motivated. This holds true for scholars working within the conceptual realm of one language, and even more so for researchers or translators engaged with the transfer of knowledge in the conceptual system of another linguistic culture. The idiosyncratic character of each linguistic tradition often presupposes conflicts between the source and the target language conceptual domains and respectively between their terminological systems. However, no matter whether it comes to text creation or translation into another language, a thorough examination of the conceptual and terminological foundations of research on appositional constructions within each linguistic tradition can help resolve metalinguistic confusion and theoretical pitfalls. Thus, the present study argues for the need of consistent and transparent "common metalanguage" through the critical study of terminological use and variability in linguistic research across diverse languages. The findings discussed in the article, we believe, can serve as a point of departure towards the development of a transparent terminological foundation of research agendas that have as their goal to describe and analyse both the idiosyn-

. . 7, 1 2021.
Research result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 7 (1). 2021.

65

cratic and universal characteristics of the appositional construction as a grammatical unit.

References

Acuna-Farina, J.C. (1996). *The Puzzle of Apposition. On so-called Appositive Structures in English,* Universidade de Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacions e Intercambio Cient^fico. *(In English)*

Acuna-Farina, J.C. (1999). On apposition, *English Language and Linguistics,* 3.1, 59-81. *(In English)*

Acuna-Farina, J.C. (2009). Aspects of the grammar of close apposition and the structure of the noun phrase, *English Language and Linguistics,* 13.3, 453-481. *(In English)*

Ahmanova, O.S. (2004). *Slovar' lingyisticheskih terminov* [Dictionary of linguistic terms], Editorial URSS, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Allerton, D.J. (1979). *Essentials of Grammatical Theory,* Routledge, London. *(In English)*

Andreychin, L. (1942). *Osnovna balgarska gramatika,* Hemus, Sofia. *(In Bulgarian)*

Atayan, E.R. (1968). *Predmet i osnovnye ponyatiya struktural'nogo sintaksisa* [The subject and basic concepts of structural syntax], Izd-vo MITK, Erevan. *(In Russian)*

Barhudarov, L.S. (2008). *Struktura prostogo predlozheniya sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka* [The structure of a simple sentence in modern English], LKI, Moscow, Russia, available at: https://classes.ru/grammar/ 116.Barhudarov/html/unnamed_64.html (Accessed 15 November 2020). *(In Russian)*

BES (1998). *Yazykoznanie. Bol'shoj e'nciklopedicheskij slovar'* [Linguistics. The Great Encyclopaedia Dictionary], Bolyshaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Beskrovnyy, A.E. (1940). *Konspekt lekcij po sintaksisu russkogo yazyka* [Lecture notes on Russian syntax], Krasnodarskaya tipografiya, Krasnodar, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Bitea, I.N. (1977). An attempt at defining apposition in modern English, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique,* 453-477. *(In English)*

Bogacki, B.K. (1973). *Types de constructions appositrves en francais,* Akademia Nauk, Komitet J^zykoznawstwa 73, Wroclaw, Poland. *(In French)*

Brazil, D. (1995). *A Grammar of Speech,* Oxford University Press, London, UK. *(In English)*

Brinkmann, H. (1971). *Die deutsche Sprache: Gestalt und Leistung,* Schwann, Dusseldorf. *(In German)*

Brown, E.K. and Miller J.E. (1982). *Syntax: Generative Grammar.* Hutchinson, London. *(In English)*

Burton-Roberts, N. (1975). Nominal apposition, *Foundations of Language,* 13, 391-419. *(In English)*

Burton-Roberts, N. (1993). Apposition, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, in R. E. Asher & J. M. Y. Simpson (Eds.), vol. 1, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 184-187. *(In English)*

Bussmann, H. (2006). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics,* Taylor & Francis, London. *(In English)*

Cabre, M.T.C. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications,* in Sager J.C. (Ed.), John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. *(In English)*

Close, A.R. (1975). *A Reference Grammar for the Students of English,* Longman, London. *(In English)*

Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics,* Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK. *(In English)*

Curme, G.O. (1931). *A Grammar of the English Language. Syntax,* North-Western University, USA, available at: https://arrow.latrobe.edu.au/store/3/4/5/9/ 1/public/ B12849467.pdf (Accessed 15 November 2020). *(In English)*

Curme, G.O. (1947). *English Grammar,* Barnes & Noble, New York. *(In English)*

Delorme, E. and Dougherty, R.C. (1972). Appositive NP constructions: *we, the men; we men; I, a man;* etc, *Foundations of Language,* 8 (1), 2-29. *(In English)*

Doron, E. (1994). The discourse function of appositives, *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics and of the workshop on discourse,* Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 53-65. *(In English)*

Eisenberg, P. (1986). *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik,* Metzler, Stuttgart. *(In German)*

Engel, U. (1996). *Deutsche Grammatik,* Groos, Heidelberg, Germany. *(In German)*

Francis, W.N. (1958). *The Structure of American English,* Ronald, New York. *(In English)*

Fries, Ch.C. (1952). *The Structure of English: An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences*, Harcourt, Brace & World, New York. *(In English)*

Getsov, A. (2019a). Kontseptsii za gramaticheskoto otnoshenie v apozitivnite konstruktsii, *Proglas, 1* (XXVIII), 103-110, available at: http://journals.uni-vt.bg/proglas/bul/vol28/iss1/12 (Accessed 6 August 2020). (*In Bulgarian*)

Getsov, A. (2019b). Neobosobena apozitsia vs. obosobena apozitsia, *Godishnik na Fakulteta po humanitarni nauki*, XXX A, UI Episkop Konstantin Preslavski, Shumen, 217-255. *(In Bulgarian*)

Grammatik (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache.* Hrsg. von G. Zifonun, L. Hoffmann, B. Strecker. Bd. 3, de Gruyter, Berlin; New York. *(In German)*

Grammatik (2009). *Die Grammatik: Unentbehrlich fur richtiges Deutsch: Band 4,* Dudenverlag, Manheim, Wien, Zurich. *(In German)*

Griesbach, H. and Schulz, D. (1972). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache,* Max Hueber Verlag, Munich, Germany. *(In German)*

Gvozdev, A.N. (1968). *Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj yazyk* [Modern Russian literary language], Prosveshtenie, Moscow, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Hackel, W. (1968). Personen igennamen als kasus neutrale Apposition, *Sprachpflege,* 6, 113. (In *German)*

Hadlich, R.L. (1973). *Gramatica transformativa del espanol,* Gredos, Madrid, Spain. *(In Spanish*)

Hannay, M., Keizer, E. (2005). A discourse treatment of English non-restrictive nominal appositions in functional discourse grammar, in Mackenzie J. L., Gomez-Gonzalez, M. A. (Eds.), *Studies in Functional Discourse Grammar*, Peter Lang, Bern, 159-194. *(In English)*

Helbig, G., Buscha, J. (1996). *Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch fur den Auslanderunterricht,* Langenscheidt, Leipzig, Berlin, Munchen, Germany. *(In German)*

Heringa, H. (2011). *Appositional constructions,* Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, University of Groningen. Utrecht, The Netherlands, available at: https://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/2449766/

Thesis_appositional_constructi_1.pdf (Accessed 15 November 2020). *(In English)*

Hockett, Ch.F. (1955). Attribution and apposition, *American Speech.* 30, 99-102. *(In English)*

Hook, J.N., Mathews, E.G. (1956). *Modern American Grammar and Usage,* Ronald Press Co., New York, USA. *(In English)*

Iliev, At. (1888). *Sintaksis na balgarskia ezik*, Hr. G. Danov, Plovdiv, Bulgaria. (*In Bulgarian*)

Ilyish, B.A. (1971). *Stroj sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka: uchebnik po kursu teoreticheskoj grammatiki* [The structure of the modern English language. Textbook on the course of theoretical grammar], Prosveshtenie, Leningrad, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Itskovich, V.A. (1963). About the types of connection of words in a sentence, *Russkiy yazyk v natsionalynom shkole,* (1), 3-10. *(In Russian)*

Jespersen, O. (1969). *Analytic Syntax,* Holt, Rinehart and Winston New York, USA. *(In English)*

Jespersen, . (1943). *Essentials of English Grammar,* George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. *(In English)*

Jung, W. (1973). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache,* Verlag VEB. Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, Germany. *(In German)*

Kaminina, A.A. (1970). *O podchinitel'nyh svyazyah slov* v *prostom predlozhenii* [On the subordinate relation of words in a simple sentence], Izd-vo MGU, Moscow, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Katanova, E.N. (2007). Appozitivnaya konstrukciya kak sredstvo vyrazheniya samoidentificiruyushhego suzhdeniya [Appositive construction as a means of expressing a self-identifying judgement], *Proceedings of Voronezh State University,* Lingvistika i mezhkulyturnaya kommunikatsiya, (2), 68-74. *(In Russian)*

Keizer, E. (2007). *The English Noun Phrase. The Nature of Linguistic Categorization,* Cambridge University Press, New York, USA. *(In English)*

Kimball, L.G. (2010). *English Grammar,* Forgotten Books AG. *(In English)*

Kobrina, N.A. et al. (2008). *Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka. Morfologiya. Sintaksis* [Grammar of the English Language. Morphology. Syntax], Izdatelystvo Soyuz, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Kochetkova, T.I. (2005). *Word compounding as a means of nomination and predication in contemporary Russian,* Abstract of Ph.D. dissertation, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Koktova, E. (1986). Apposition as a pragmatic phenomenon in a functional description, *Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg (Trier),* Series A, 158, Duisburg, 1-34. *(In English)*

Kornilov, N.V. (2012). *Nereshennye voprosy teorii appozitivnyh sochetanij* [Unresolved issues in the theory of appositive combinations], Izdatel'stvo Vladimirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, Vladimir, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Kostov, N. (1939). *Balgarska gramatika,* Knigoizdatelstvo Kazanlashka dolina, Sofia, Bulgaria. (*In Bulgarian*)

Krifka, M. (1983). Zur semantischen und pragmatischen Motivation syntaktischer Regularitaten: Eine Studie zur Wortstellung und Wortstellungsveranderung im Swahili, *Studien zur theoretischen Linguistik,* Wilhelm Fink, Munchen, Germany. *(In German)*

Krotevich, E.V. (1956). Syntactic relationships between word combinations and sentence members, *Voprosy russkogo yazykoznaniya,* (2), 3-18. *(In Russian)*

Lehmann, C. (1983). *Rektion und syntaktische Relationen*, Inst. f. Sprachwiss. d. Univ., Koln, Germany, 339-378. *(In German)*

Lekant, P.A. (1977). *Izuchenie struktury predlozheniya i slovosochetaniya* v *kurse sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [Studying the structure of sentences and collocations in modern Russian], MOPI, imeni N. K. Krupskoy, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Lekant, P.A. (2006). Appositive Word-Combinations, in Kasatkin, L. L., Klobukov, E. V., Lekant, P. A (Eds.), *A short guide to the modern Russian language,* Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, Russia, 297-298. *(In Russian)*

Lomov, A.M. (2007). *Slovar'-spravochnik po sintaksisu sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [Dictionary of Modern Russian Syntax], AST: Vostok - Zapad, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Longree, D. (1987). Les complements du nom en Latin classique: syntaxe, semantique et pragmatique, *Cahiers de l' Institut de Linguistique de Louvain,* (13), 163-230. *(In French)*

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics: Volume 1.* Cmbridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. *(In English)*

Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. *(In English)*

Malakhov, A.S. (2009). *Types of grammatical connection in appositive combinations*, Ph.D. Thesis, Vladimirskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet, Vladimir, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Maloshnaya, T.N. (1975). *Substantivnye slovosochetaniya* v *slavyanskih yazykah* [Substantive word combinations in Slavic languages], Nauka, Moscow, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Matezius, V. (1967). Language and style, *Prazhskiy lingvisticheskiy kruzhok. Sbornik statey,* Progress, 444-523. *(In Russian)*

Matthews, P.H. (1981). *Syntax.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. *(In English)*

Matthews, P.H. (2003). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. *(In English)*

Matthews, P.H. (2007). *Syntactic relations: A Critical survey.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. *(In English)*

Merriam-Webster (1997). *Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary,* Springfield, Mass., Merriam-Webster, U.S.A. *(In English)*

Meyer, Ch.F. (1992). *Apposition in Contemporary English*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; N. Y. *(In English)*

Mihnevich, A.E. (1968). Some issues in the study of syntactic (subjunctive) relationships of words in the works of Soviet and Czechoslovak linguists, *Voprosy yazykoznaniya,* (5), 106-112. *(In Russian)*

Mishina, Yu.E. (2007). *The apposition in English: structure, semantics, prosody,* Ph.D. Thesis, SGPU, Samara, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Mukhin, A.M. (1974). Appositive connection in sentence structure (in Russian), in Beloshapkova V. A., Tolstoj N. I. (eds.), *Issledovaniya po slavyanskoj filologii* [Study of Slavic philology], Izd-vo MGU, Moscow, USSR, 240-246. *(In Russian)*

Muratova, S.V. (2018). On the status of appositional structures in modern German, *Bulletin of Kemerovo State University,* (4), 240-246. *(In Russian)*

Nehoroshkova, L.P. (1989). *Spatial and temporal appositive constructions in modern English*, Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, Moscow. *(In Russian)*

O'Connor, K.M. (2008). *Aspects de la syntaxe et de I'interpretation de I'apposition a an-*

tecedent nominal, Ph.D. Thesis, Universite Charles de Gaulle, Lille. *(In French)*

OLD (1968). *Oxford Latin Dictonary* by P.G.W, Glare, Oxford University Press/Clarendon Press, London. *(In English)*

Orlov, K.P. (1960). The grammatical nature of the apposition in modern literary Russian, *Filologicheskie nauki,* (4), 29-37. *(In Russian)*

Osenova, P. (2009). *Imennite frazi* v *balgarskia ezik,* ETO, Sofia, Bulgaria. *(In Bulgarian)*

Peshkovsky, A.M. (2001). *Russkij sintaksis v nauchnom osveshhenii* [Russian syntax in scientific coverage], Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Peterson, P. (1999). On the boundaries of syntax, in P. Collins & D. Lee (eds.), *The Clause in English. In Honour of Rodney Huddleston,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 229-250. *(In English)*

Popov, D. (1942). *Balgarska gramatika,* Knigoizdatelstvo Hristo G. Danov, Sofia, Bulgaria. (*In Bulgarian*)

Popov, K. (1978). Strukturni, semantichni i funktsionalni osobenosti na apozitsiyata (prilozhenieto) v balgarskia i sarboharvatskia ezik, *Slavyanska filologia,* XV, Sofia, Bulgaria. (*In Bulgarian*)

Potebnya, A.A. (1958). *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike* [From notes on Russian grammar], Uchpedgiz, Moscow, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA. *(In English)*

Poutsma, H. (1904). *Grammar of Late Modern English, Part I,* Noordhoff, Groningen, Netherlands. *(In English)*

Priyatkina, A.F. (2007). O vzaimnom otnoshenie vidov sintaksicheskoj svyazi [On the mutual relation of the types of syntactic connection], in Priyatkina, A. F., Starodumova E. A. (eds.), *Russkij sintaksis* v *grammaticheskom aspekte (sintaksicheskie svyazi i konstrukcii)* [Russian syntax from a grammatical perspective (syntactic relations and constructions)], Izd-vo Dalynevostochnogo universiteta, Vladivostok, Russia, 18-27. *(In Russian)*

Puleha, I.R., (1999). *Apposition in modern English,* Ph.D. Thesis, St. Petersburg, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. (1991). *A University Grammar of English,* Longman: Harlow (Ess.). *(In English)*

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvic, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language,* Longman, London/New York. *(In English)*

Raabe, H. (1979). Apposition, Untersuchungen zu Begriff und Struktur, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tubingen, Germany. *(In German)*

Ries, J. (1928). *Zur Wortgruppenlehre: mit Proben aus einer ausfuhrlichen Wortgruppenlehre der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart,* Taussig & Taussig, Prag.

Roberts, P. (1962). *English Sentences,* Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, USA. *(In English)*

Rudnev, A.G. (1959). *Obosoblennye chleny predlozheniya* v *istorii russkogo yazyka* [Individuating members of a sentence in the history of the Russian language], Uch. zapiski LGPI im. A.I. Gertsena, 174. *(In Russian)*

Rudnev, A.G. (1963). *Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [Syntax of the modern Russian language], Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Schindler, W. (1990). *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik appositionsverdachtiger Einheiten im Deutschen,* Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tubingen, Germany. *(In German)*

Seright, O.D. (1966). On defining the appositive*, College Composition and Communication,* (17), 2, 107-109. *(In English)*

Severyanova, V.A. (1978). *Apposition in modern English*, Abstract of Ph.D. dissertation, Leningrad, USSR. *(In Russian)*

Shahmatov, A.A. (2001). *Sintaksis russkogo yazyka* [Syntax of the Russian language], Uchpedgiz, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Shatuh, M.G. (1954). The *apposition* and its role in the contemporary Russian language, Abstract of Ph.D. dissertation, Lyvov. *(In Russian)*

Silvestre de Sacy, A.I. (1822). *Principes de grammaire generale: mis a la portee des enfans, et propres a servir d'introduction a I'etude de toutes les langues,* Chez Delance et Lesureur, Paris, France. *(In French)*

Sinclair, J.McH. (1972). *A Course in Spoken English: Grammar,* Oxford University Press, London, UK. *(In English)*

Sopher, H. (1971). Apposition, *English Studies.* (52), 401-412. *(In English)*

Sowinski, B. (1991). Deutsche Stilistik. Beobachtungen zur Sprachverwendung und Spra-

Research result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 7 (1). 2021.

69

chgestaltung im Deutschen, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, Berlin, Germany. *(In German)*

Starodumova, E.A. (2005). *Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [Syntax of the modern Russian language], Izdatelystvo Dalynevostochnogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, Vladivostok, Russia, available at: http://window.edu.ru/resource/025/41025/files/dvgu146.pdf (Accessed 15 November 2020). *(In Russian)*

Stevens, C.M. (1993). Untersuchungen zur Grammatik appositionsverdachtiger Einheiten im Deutchen. Wolfgang Schindler, *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 4 (2), 181-188. *(In German)*

Sturm, A.N. (1986). *Primaire syntactische structuren in het Nederlands.* Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nijmegen, Leiden. *(In Dutch)*

Taboada, M. (1978). Relaciones sintacticas en el interior de la frase nominal: la aposicion. Verba, *Anuario Galego de Filol^^ia,* (5), 315-340. (In *Spanish)*

Taylor, J.R. (2002). *Cognitive grammar,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. *(In English)*

Teodorov-Balan, Al. (1940). *Nova balgarska gramatika* [new Bulgarian grammar], Knigoizdatelstvo T. F. Chipev, Sofia, Bulgaria. (*In Bulgarian*)

Tesniere, L. (1969). *Les Elements de syntaxe structural,* Klincksieck, Paris, France. *(In French*)

Trask, R.L. (1996). *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics,* Routledge, London, New York. *(In English)*

Tsiganenko, G.P. (1954). *Apposition in contemporary Russian,* Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, Harykov. *(In Russian)*

Uhanov, G.P. (1974). Explanatory conjunction in its relation to composition and subordination, in Beloshapkova V. A., Tolstoj N. I. (eds.), *Issledovaniya po slavyanskoj filologii* [Study of Slavic philology], Izd-vo MGU, Moscow, USSR, 336-342. *(In Russian)*

Vatseba, R.V. (1973). On the question of the appositive connection, in Migirin V. N. (ed.), *Problemy teorii chlenov predlozheniya* [Problems in the theory of sentence members], Izd-vo Shtinitsa, Kishinyov, 154-160. *(In Russian)*

Watt, W.W. (1964). *An American Rhetoric,* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, USA. *(In English)*

Weinrich, H. (1993). *Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache,* Duden-Verlag, Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zurich, Germany. *(In German)*

Wright, S.E., Budin, G., (Eds.) (1997). *Handbook of Terminology Management: Basic Aspects of Terminology Management*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Netherlands. *(In English)*

Wykoff, G.S., Shaw, H. (1952). *The Harper Handbook of College Composition,* Harper & Brothers, New York, USA. *(In English)*

Zemb, J.M. (1968). *Les structures logiques de la proposition allemande,* OCDL, Paris, France. *(In French)*

Zakharenko, E.K. (1998). *Structural and semantic types of appositives and their functioning in modern English*, Abstract of Ph.D. thesis, MGLU, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Anton Veselinov Getsov, Lecturer, PhD, Full Professor, Faculty of Modern Languages, St Cyril and St Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo.

Sylvia Atanasova Velikova, Lecturer, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Modern Languages, St Cyril and St Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo.