Bożena Cetnarowska https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8642-6827
University of Silesia

Expressive N+N combinations in Polish and the coordination/attribution cline[1]

Abstract

In this paper I will examine N+N juxtapositions in Polish, such as *kobieta anioł* (woman angel) 'an angel of a woman', *praca marzenie* (job dream) 'dream job', *dziecko geniusz* (child genius) 'prodigy child', and *kierowca cham* (driver lout) 'a lout of a driver'. I will demonstrate that they exhibit properties of expressive combinations, as discussed for English by Potts (2007) and for German by Meibauer (2013). It will be proposed that Polish expressive N+N juxtapositions under analysis fall into two groups. Juxtapositions belonging to the first group, e.g. *kierowca cham* 'a lout of a driver', behave like coordinate compound-like units. Juxtapositions which form the second group of expressive complexes, such as *kobieta anioł* 'an angel of a woman' and *praca marzenie* 'dream job', can be treated as attributive--appositive (ATAP) combinations (in Scalise and Bisetto's 2009 classification). The occurrence of a cline between coordinate and attributive multi-word units is postulated.

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule zbadano zestawienia składające się z rzeczowników pozostających w związku zgody w języku polskim, takie jak *kobieta anioł*, *praca marzenie*, *dziecko geniusz* oraz *kierowca cham*. Stwierdzono, że mają one cechy wyrażeń ekspresywnych, podobnie do wyrażeń w języku angielskim analizowanych przez Pottsa (2007) oraz złożeń w języku niemieckim badanych przez Meibauera (2013). Zaproponowano podział polskich zestawień ekspresywnych na dwa typy. Przedstawiono argumenty za traktowaniem zestawień pierwszego typu, np. *kierowca cham*, jako wyrażeń o strukturze współrzędnej (tj. składających się z elementów równorzędnych pod względem semantycznym). Wykazano, że zestawienia drugiego typu, np. *praca marzenie*, zachowują się jak połączenia rzeczownikowe o semantycznej strukturze nadrzędno-podrzędnej, tj. jako zestawienia atrybutywno-apozycyjne

---

[1] I am grateful to the two anonymous SPL reviewers for their insightful and useful comments. I would also like to thank the audiences of OLINCO 2018, the Word-Formation Theories III & Typology and Universals in Word-Formation IV Conference, LingBaW 2018 and SinFonIJA 11 for their feedback.

(por. Scalise i Bisetto 2009). W artykule postuluje się istnienie strefy pośredniej pomiędzy obiema grupami zestawień ekspresywnych w języku polskim.

Słowa kluczowe
leksyka ekspresywna, zestawienia rzeczownikowe, zestawienia o strukturze współrzędnej, zestawienia o strukturze podrzędno-nadrzędnej

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine N+N combinations in Polish, such as those in (1), which contain a negatively or positively loaded constituent, e.g. *idiota* 'idiot', *cham* 'lout', *oferma* 'wimp', *anioł* 'angel', *geniusz* 'genius' and *marzenie* 'dream'. In section 2, I will employ some of the diagnostics for the expressive meaning proposed by Potts (2007) and Meibauer (2013) in order to show that Polish juxtapositions under analysis are expressive multi-word units.

(1) a. *kierownik idiota* (manager idiot) 'an idiot of a manager'
     b. *kierowca cham* (driver lout) 'a lout of a driver'
     c. *projektant oferma* (designer wimp) 'a wimp of a designer'
     d. *żona anioł* (wife angel) 'an angel of a wife'
     e. *dom marzenie* (house dream) 'a dream of a house, a dream house'

The N+N combinations in (1) consist of fully inflected lexemes. They are regarded as noun phrases in apposition by Kallas (1980) and as syntactic N+N constructs by Willim (2001). Polish morphologists traditionally identify similar N+N combinations as a subgroup of composite expressions, namely as so-called "juxtapositions" (Pol. *zestawienia*), which are distinct from compounds proper (as assumed by Długosz-Kurczabowa and Dubisz 1999, Szymanek 2010, Nagórko 2010). Here, as in Cetnarowska (2019), I will treat them as phrasal lexemes, i.e. as compound-like multi-word units which have an internal syntactic structure yet function as lexical items (see Masini and Benigni 2012 on phrasal lexemes in Russian).

  The left-hand constituent of the phrasal lexemes in (1) is the morphological head (in the sense of the term used by Scalise and Fábregas 2010) since it determines the grammatical gender of the whole juxtaposition. This is shown in (2), where the demonstrative adjective agrees in gender and number with the morphological head of the juxtaposition.

(2) a. *to*   *dziecko*   *geniusz*
         this-SG.N.NOM   child-SG.N.NOM   genius-SG.M.NOM
         'this prodigy child'
     b. *tamte*   *wakacje*   *koszmar*
         those-PL.F.NOM   holiday-PL.F.NOM   nightmare-SG.M.NOM
         'those nightmarish holidays'

The identification of semantic heads of N+N combinations in (1-2) is a more controversial issue. It is linked to the problem where to place such juxtapositions in the typology of compounds (and compound-like units) proposed by Bisetto and Scalise (2005) and Scalise and Bisetto (2009). Should they be treated as coordinate or as ATAP (attributive-appositive) combinations? In order to answer this question, I will use the "IS A" Condition, regarded by Allen (1978) as a test for semantic heads, and examine the reversibility of Polish expressive combinations. Section 3 will examine Polish juxtapositions which can be treated as coordinate or coordinate-like combinations. Section 4 will be devoted to N+N juxtapositions which behave like ATAP compound-like units. I will show that there is a continuum between coordinate and ATAP combinations in Polish.

Let us add that, according to the current prescriptive orthographic rules in Polish (as discussed by Karpowicz 2009, see also https://sjp.pwn.pl/zasady), the distinction between coordinate and determinative (i.e. non-coordinate) juxtapositions should be reflected in spelling. Only coordinate juxtapositions can be hyphenated, e.g. *aktor-reżyser* 'actor-director'. However, as is shown by sentences culled from the NKJP corpus (Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego) and from NFJP corpus (Narodowy Fotokorpus Języka Polskiego) or by N+N expressions found on various websites, many speakers of Polish do not conform to such prescriptive regulations. Moreover, the same orthographic rules did not hold in the previous centuries, as is indicated by examples of N+N expressions occurring in the 19th or 20th century Polish literary texts, which are analysed by Damborský (1966) and Kallas (1980). Consequently, the spelling of expressive N+N combinations attested in the corpora will not be taken as the decisive piece of evidence for their status as coordinate or determinative juxtapositions.

2. Expressive meaning

Expressive constructions have both an expressive and descriptive content, as is postulated by Potts (2007: 168–169) on the basis of English sentences, such as the one in (3) below.

(3) *That bastard Kresge is famous.*
    Descriptive content: Kresge is famous.
    Expressive content: Kresge is a{bastard/bad in the speaker's opinion}.

Potts argues that the expressive content is independent of the descriptive content. It can be removed without affecting the descriptive content, e.g. *Kresge is famous*. The independence of the expressive meaning can also be illustrated for Polish N+N combinations, such as *teściowa-potwór* (mother_in_law monster)

'a monster of a mother-in-law' or *przemytnik oferma* (smuggler wimp) 'a wimp of a smuggler.'

(4) *Teściowa*   *potwór*   *psuje*   *mi*   *małżeństwo.*
    mother_in_law-SG.F.NOM monster-SG.M.NOM ruin-PRS.3SG me-DAT marriage-SG.N.ACC
    'The monster of (my) mother in law is ruining my marriage.'
    (https://www.rodzice.pl › ... › Tematy, których nie znalazłam w forum)
    Descriptive content: *Teściowa psuje mi małżeństwo*
                         '(My) mother-in-law is ruining my marriage.'
    Expressive content: *Teściowa jest potworem.*
                         '(My) mother-in-law is a monster (i.e. a terrible person).'

(5) *Przemytnik*   *oferma*   *nie znał*   *drogi.*
    smuggler-SG.M.NOM wimp-SG.F.NOM not know-PST.3SG.M way-SG.F.GEN
    'The wimp of a smuggler didn't know the way.'
    (www.fakt.pl › Wydarzenia › Polska)
    Descriptive content: *Przemytnik nie znał drogi.* 'The smuggler didn't know the way.'
    Expressive content: *Przemytnik jest ofermą.* 'The smuggler is a wimp.'

According to Potts (2007: 169), expressives "always tell us something about the situation itself," thus they cannot (normally) be used to report on past events. While the descriptive content of the sentence in (5) denotes a past event, the negative evaluation coincides with the utterance time.

Potts (2007) and Meibauer (2013) note that expressives by default convey the evaluation[2] from the perspective of the speaker (who is in a heightened state of emotion). However, the speaker may signal that another individual is chosen as the contextual judge, e.g. *Policjanci dziwili się, że przemytnik oferma nie znał drogi.* 'The police officers were surprised that that wimp of a smuggler didn't know the way.'

---

[2] Reviewer 2 observes that the relationship between the category of "expressive construction" and the category of "evaluative morphology" (Grandi and Körtvélyessy 2015) is worthy of further discussion. Juxtapositions analysed in this paper present subjective assessments of individuals and objects. However, they do not fall into the scope of evaluative morphology as defined by Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015), which subsumes the formation of diminutive, augmentative, pejorative, or ameliorative forms, and the expression of intensification or attenuation. Moreover, Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015: 13) assert that an evaluative construction must contain a lexical morpheme which is the expression of the standard value and an evaluative mark which expresses the shift in evaluation. The evaluative mark can be a suffix, a prefix, the reduplication of the lexical morpheme, a circumfix, and, less commonly, a compound element. While Meibauer (2013) investigates morphological compounds in German, such as *Reformscheiße* 'reform shit' and *Fußballgott* 'soccer god', Polish composite expressions analysed here are not compounds proper and they can be situated at the border between morphology and syntax, or morphology and phraseology.

Expressive utterances in German or English are often used as insults or as compliments (Meibauer 2013: 33). This is true of expressive N+N combinations in Polish.

(6) a. *Itaka – wakacje koszmar* 'Itaka – nightmare holidays'
        (https://www.wakacje.pl/forum/na-kazdy-temat/)

    b. *Słowem – dom marzenie*
        'In a nutshell – a dream house (lit. house dream).' (NKJP)

    c. *Tabloidy natychmiast wydały wyrok: matka potwór.*
        'The tabloids immediately reached a verdict: a monster of a mother (lit. mother monster).' (NKJP)

    d. *Dziecko geniusz! Ma 6 miesięcy i mówi!?*
        'A prodigy child (lit. child genius)! It is six months old and can talk!?'
        (https://www.fakt.pl › Wydarzenia › Świat)

Potts (2007) and Meibauer (2013) point out that the paraphrase of an expressive utterance by means of non-expressive terms does not satisfy the speaker. Moreover, evaluative phrases may differ in their degree of expressivity, depending on the expressive item used. This can be shown by Polish N+N combinations containing such negatively loaded words as *nieuk* 'ignorant, dunce', *głupek* 'nitwit', *kretyn* 'moron', or *idiota* 'idiot', e.g. *syn nieuk* (lit. son dunce) 'son who is a dunce', *sąsiad głupek* (lit. neighbour nitwit) 'a nitwit of a neighbour', *kierowca kretyn* (lit. driver moron) 'moron driver', and *kierownik idiota* (lit. manager idiot) 'an idiot of a manager'. The degree of expressivity may also depend on the construction employed. The "X not Y construction," as illustrated in (7), carries a higher emotional load than the N+N expressive combinations in (6).[3]

(7) a. *Koszmar, nie wakacje.* (lit. nightmare not holidays) 'It's a nightmare, not holidays.'
    b. *Marzenie, nie dom.* (lit. dream not house) 'It's a dream house.'
    c. *Potwór, nie matka!* (lit. monster not mother) 'It's a monster of a mother!'
    d. *Geniusz, nie dziecko!* (lit. genius not child) 'It's a child genius (i.e. a prodigy child)!'
    e. *Anioł nie człowiek* (lit. angel not man) 'It's an angel of a man!' (NKJP)

In the next section I will present the tripartite classification of compounds proposed by Bisetto and Scalise (2005) and focus on Polish expressive juxtapositions which come close to coordinate combinations.

---

[3] A similar opinion is formulated by Kallas (1980: 157), who compares the expressivity of the N+N combination *kobieta-iskra* (lit. woman spark) 'vivacious woman' and *iskra nie kobieta* (lit. spark not woman) 'vivacious woman'.

3. Coordinate (or coordinate-like) expressive combinations

Bisetto and Scalise (2005) divide compounds, and compound-like multi-word units, into three basic types: subordinate, attributive and coordinate compounds. Coordinate compounds consist of lexemes (or stems) which have an equal semantic status, e.g. English *actor-director* 'both an actor and a director' and Polish *półkotapczan* (lit. shelf sofa) 'wall bed'. Constituents of subordinate compounds exhibit the argument-predicate relationship, e.g. *cat-lover* 'lover of cats' or *book review* 'review of a book' in English, and *pracodawca* (lit. job giver) 'employer' in Polish. Attributive compounds consist of a head and a modifier which attributes a property to the head, e.g. *blackbird* in English and *czerwonokrzew* (lit. red shrub) 'the rooibos shrub (*Aspalathus linearis*)' in Polish.

It seems useful to apply Bisetto and Scalise's classification to expressive N+N combinations in Polish in order to see what semantic-structural relationship obtains between constituents of such juxtapositions. I will start by examining expressive juxtapositions which can be treated as coordinate N+N combinations, as they are very close to canonical coordinate juxtapositions in their behaviour.

Allen (1978) and Fabb (1998) use the so-called "IS A" Condition to identify the number and position of semantic heads in English compounds. When this condition is applied to N+N Polish juxtapositions, such as *dziecko geniusz* (lit. child genius) 'prodigy child', *żołnierz-oferma* 'a wimp of a soldier', *kierowca cham* (driver lout) 'a lout of a driver', *dentysta-sadysta* (dentist sadist) 'a sadist of a dentist', and *kierownik idiota* (manager idiot) 'an idiot of a manager', or to many other insulting combinations containing synonyms (or near-synonyms) of the lexeme *idiota* 'idiot', both constituents can be identified as semantic heads, as is shown below.

(8) a. *Dziecko geniusz jest dzieckiem.* 'A prodigy child is a child.'
     b. *Dziecko geniusz jest geniuszem.* 'A prodigy child (lit. child genius) is a genius.'

(9) a. *Żołnierz oferma jest żołnierzem.* 'A wimp of a soldier is a soldier.'
     b. *Żołnierz oferma jest ofermą.* 'A wimp of a soldier is a wimp.'

(10) a. *Kierowca cham jest kierowcą.* 'A lout of a driver is a driver.'
     b. *Kierowca cham jest chamem.* 'A lout of a driver is a lout.'

Arcodia et al. (2010: 189) argue that constituent order reversibility is an important cross-linguistic diagnostic for coordinate compounds. As shown by Renner and Fernández-Domínguez (2011) for English and Spanish, and by Arnaud and Renner (2014) for English and French, the reversibility may be potential. A given coordinate multi-word expression may be institutionalized in one

form while the other order of constituents may be less common but acceptable – unless there are semantic constraints which prohibit it, as demonstrated by the difference in the acceptability of *murder-suicide* and *suicide-murder. In the case of Polish expressive N+N combinations discussed in this section, the evaluative noun usually, though not exclusively, occurs as the right-hand constituent, as in (11) and (12) below. The expression *dentysta-sadysta* (lit. dentist sadist) 'a sadist of a dentist', as in (11a), has 14 attestations (in various case forms) in the full version of the NKJP corpus, whereas there are only 2 occurrences of *sadysta-dentysta* (lit. sadist dentist) 'a sadist of a dentist', as in (11b). As is shown in (11c), both constituents of such reversible N+N combinations are inflected for number (and case).

(11) a. *Ma próchnicę i dentysta-sadysta już na nią czeka!*
          'She has tooth decay and the sadist of a dentist (lit. dentist sadist) is already waiting for her!' (NKJP)
      b. *A jak dzieciak zamyka usta to mu sadysta-dentysta kolanem na klatę i zęba i tak będzie leczył.*
          'And when the child closes his or her mouth, the sadist of a dentist (lit. sadist dentist) (presses) his knee against the child's chest and he will treat (his/her) tooth in any case...' (NKJP)
      c. *Dentyści-sadyści: Ukryty ropień – opis, recenzje, zdjęcia, zwiastuny i terminy emisji w TV.*
          'Sadistic dentists (lit. dentists sadists): A hidden abscess – the description, reviews, photos, TV trailers and the times of broadcasting.'
          (https://www.teleman.pl/tv/Dentysci-Sadysci-Ukryty-Ropien-1778427)

(12) a. *Ogrodnik geniusz* (lit. gardener genius) 'a genius of a gardener.'
      b. *Autystyczny geniusz ogrodnik* (lit. autistic genius gardener) 'the autistic gardening genius.'
          (https://programtv.onet.pl/tv/autystyczny-geniusz-ogrodnik-52096)

Another feature of the N+N combinations in (8−12) which suggests their status as coordinate multi-word units is their semantic transparency. For instance, the N+N expression *dentysta-sadysta* (dentist sadist) 'a sadist of a dentist' denotes an intersection of a set of dentists and a set of sadists. Gavriilidou (2016: 99) observes that coordinate and subordinate N+N combinations in Greek are semantically transparent, in contrast to attributive combinations.

On the other hand, what brings the Polish expressive combinations in (8−12) closer to attributive juxtapositions is the possibility of replacing the expressive (right-hand) noun with a synonymous adjective, as in (13).[4]

---

[4] Reviewer 1 adds that the left-hand constituents of the expressive juxtapositions in (8−12) cannot be replaced by denominal relational adjectives (RAs), which suggests that they are semantically superordinate to the right-hand constituents, cf. unattested combinations *oferma żołnierska* (lit. milksop soldier.RA) 'milksoppy soldier' and *sadysta dentystyczny* (lit. sadist dentist.RA) 'sadistic dentist'.

(13) a. *ofermowaty żołnierz* 'milksoppy soldier',
   b. *chamski kierowca* 'loutish driver',
   c. *genialny ogrodnik* 'genius gardener',
   d. *sadystyczny dentysta* 'sadistic dentist'.

Moreover, the combinations in (8–12) do not meet the additional criterion for (English and Spanish) coordinate compounds postulated by Renner and Fernández-Domínguez (2011), who claim that coordinate compounds should be composed of co-hyponymous lexemes,[5] e.g. two (or more) names of professions (*actor-dancer*), names of places (*café bar*), artefacts (*fighter-bomber*), actions (*lend-lease*) and the like. Such a restriction was not adopted by Olsen (2001) in her analysis of English N+N copulative compounds, which roughly correspond to coordinate compounds in Bisetto and Scalise's classification.[6] Olsen (2001) regards English Profession+Property compounds, such as *poet- -drunkard* or *diplomat-playboy*, as well as Profession+Characteristic-Activity combinations, e.g. *singer-spy*, as copulative constructions, although their constituents are not co-hyponyms. Similarly, Damborský (1966) puts Polish N+N juxtapositions consisting of a name of a profession and a name of some property into the class of dvandvas, e.g. *szewc cudotwórca* (lit. shoemaker miracle_worker) 'shoemaker who can perform miracles'. He defines dvandvas as multi-word units whose constituents have a semantically equal status.

The requirement for constituent parts to denote semantically associated concepts is crucial for co-compounds, i.e. for multi-word units which express natural coordination, as proposed by Wälchli (2005). Co-compounds (i.e. dvandvas proper) denote superordinate units (in contrast to the combinations *poet-translator* and *poet-drunkard*, which have an intersective meaning). For instance, Greek co-compounds, e.g. *maxeropiruna* (lit. knives+forks) 'cutlery' and *meronixto* (lit. day+night) 'day-night', as discussed by Ralli (2013), call for additive, collective, synonymous or antonymous interpretations.

Consequently, I assume that the Polish N+N juxtapositions discussed in this section are either coordinate combinations or can be regarded as "coordinate-like" combinations (due to their reversibility, semantic transparency, intersectivity, and the results of the "IS A" test). Thus, I take a different position than, among others, Radimský (2015: 104), who regards intersective and reversible N+N compounds in Italian, such as *uomo peccatore* (man

---

[5] Renner and Fernández-Domínguez (2011) postulate such a constraint in agreement with Scalise and Bisetto (2009) and Lieber (2009). However, Reviewer 1 points out that both constituents of the combinations in (8–12) denote personal and animate nouns, thus the lexeme *osoba* 'person' could be regarded as their hypernym.

[6] Olsen (2001: 279) assumes that copulative compounds "encompass a coordinative relationship between the two constituents such that both concepts are attributed simultaneously to one individual: a 'poet-doctor' is someone who is both a 'poet' and a 'doctor'."

sinner) 'sinful man' and *bambino-soldato* (lit. child soldier) 'child soldier', as attributive.[7]

4. Attributive expressive combinations

In their 2009 article, Scalise and Bisetto rename the attributive category of compounds, postulated in Bisetto and Scalise's (2005) typology, as ATAP (attributive-appositive) class. Compounds in the attributive subgroup of ATAP combinations contain adjectival modifiers, as in *soft cheese* 'soft unripened cheese made of sweet milk and cream' in English or *ostrosłup* (lit. sharp pole) 'pyramid' in Polish. In the appositive subgroup of ATAP compounds the modifying element is a noun, which specifies some property of the head often in a metaphorical manner. For instance, very fast trains (especially in Japan) can be called *bullet trains* since they resemble bullets in their pointed shape and their speed. Hippies can be referred to by the ATAP compound *flower children* in English, or the ATAP juxtaposition *dzieci kwiaty* (lit. children flowers) in Polish, since hippies wore flowers as a symbol of peace and love.

 Scalise and Bisetto's use of the term "appositive" with reference to a subclass of determinative compounds (i.e. combinations consisting of a semantic head and a modifier) can give rise to some confusion. The term "appositional" is used by Szymanek (1989), Fabb (1998) and Haspelmath and Sims (2010), among others, to denote compounds with two semantic heads.[8]

 The disagreement between morphologists as to whether components of appositive (or appositional) compounds exhibit a (semantic) head-modifier configuration or whether they make an equally important semantic contribution to the meaning of the whole multi-word combinations may be due to the ambiguity concerning the term "apposition" in syntax. As observed by Acuña Fariña (1996: 56), the analysis of appositive syntactic constructions presents some degree of difficulty because of the "semblance of syntactic and semantic equivalence" between constituents of such constructions. This semblance of equivalence is

---

[7] Radimský (2015: 104) adopts Haspelmath's (2004) constraint on coordinate constructions: coordinate elements should be of the same semantic type. He also assumes that compounds with an intersective interpretation are headed. Consequently, he cannot treat *bambino-soldato* 'child soldier' and *uomo peccatore* 'sinful man' as coordinate combinations. However, he suggests that some modifiers in (his class of) Italian ATAP compounds can act as secondary semantic heads (see Radimský 2015: 180). Moreover, he puts symmetric compounds, such as *studente-lavoratore* 'working student' and *bar-pasticceria* 'bar-pastry shop', into the subgroup of [+coordinate-like] ATAP combinations (Radimský 2015: 125).

[8] Haspelmath and Sims (2010: 141) distinguish between "coordinative compounds", e.g. Korean *nonpath* (lit. ricefield+dry_field) 'farm' which have two semantic heads and denote multiple referents, and "appositional compounds", where both constituent parts have the same referent, e.g. English *student worker* and Spanish *poeta pintor* 'poet-painter'.

motivated by the possibility of omitting one of the constituent parts or by changing their word order (e.g. *the poet Burns*, *the poet*, *Burns the poet*).

Canonical ATAP compounds in English, or ATAP juxtapositions in Polish are not reversible.

(14) a. *snail mail, bullet train, soft cheese,*
b. **mail snail, *bullet train, *cheese soft,*
c. *kobieta guma* (lit. woman rubber) 'female contortionist', *dzieci kwiaty* (lit. children flowers) 'hippies',
d. **guma kobieta* (lit. rubber woman), **kwiaty dzieci* (lit. flower children).

The application of the "IS A" Condition indicates that only one constituent of the attributive-appositive combinations *bullet train* and *dzieci kwiaty* 'hippies' functions as the semantic head. The compound *bullet train* is a hyponym of *train*, and the juxtaposition *kobieta guma* 'female contortionist' is a hyponym of *kobieta* 'woman'.

(15) a. *A bullet train is a train.*
b. **A bullet train is a bullet.*

(16) a. *Kobieta guma jest kobietą.* 'A female contortionist is a woman.'
b. **Kobieta guma jest gumą.* ***'A female contortionist is rubber.'

I will demonstrate below that Polish expressive juxtapositions containing the constituent *anioł* 'angel', *koszmar* 'nightmare', *potwór* 'monster' and *marzenie* 'dream', such as those in (17), can be treated as ATAP juxtapositions, similarly to the N+N combination in (16).

(17) a. *1991 Ferrari F40: Prowadząc samochód-marzenie*
'1991 Ferrari F40: Driving a dream car (lit. car dream).'
(https://www.wykop.pl › #motoryzacja)

b. *pozwolę sobie opublikować swój utwór-potwór pod tytułem „Pytanie"*
'I will allow myself to publish my monstrous piece of writing (lit. piece_of_writing monster) entitled "A question".' (NKJP)

d. *Bywają biura-koszmary.*
'There are nightmarish offices (lit. offices nightmares).' (NFJP)

e. *Kobieta-anioł* (lit. woman angel) 'an angel of a woman'

f. *był to kac potwór*
'It was a monstrous hangover (lit. hangover monster).' (https://sjp.pwn.pl/korpus)

g. *W ogóle jej nie interesują inni kolesie. Dziewczyna-Skarb*
'She's not interested in other guys at all. A treasure of a girl (lit. girl treasure).' (NKJP)

The combinations in (17) are not reversible, which suggests that they are not coordinate combinations. The change in their word order diminishes the acceptability of such combinations. There are no attestations of *marzenie samochód*

(lit. dream car), *koszmar-biuro* (lit. nightmare office), *potwór-utwór* (lit. monster piece_of_writing), *potwór-kac* (lit. monster hangover) or *skarb-dziewczyna* in the NKJP or NFJP corpus.[9]

One can come across the combinations *anioł-kobieta* (lit. angel woman) or *anioł-księgowy* (lit. angel bookkeeper) in the two corpora and during Google searches. However, those N+N complexes do not have an expressive meaning. The juxtaposition *anioł-kobieta* refers to a female angel (and not to an ideal woman). *Anioł-księgowy* (lit. angel bookkeeper) denotes an angel who records human deeds. It differs in its interpretation from the (potential) expressive juxtaposition *księgowy-anioł* (lit. bookkeeper angel), which could refer to a bookkeeper who is a very good and gentle person, in addition to being a perfect bookeeper.

(18) a. *nie będzie aniołem-mężczyzną, ani aniołem-kobietą*
'will not be a male angel or a female angel (lit. angel woman)'
(https://prasa.wiara.pl › prasa.wiara.pl › Któż jak Bóg › Czy istnieją anielice?)

b. *Każdy czyn ludzki, zły czy dobry, jest rejestrowany przez specjalnego anioła--księgowego.*
'Each deed, whether right or wrong, is registered by a special angel-bookkeeper.'
(NFJP)

The evaluative noun can often be replaced by an adjective, which suggests that it has the status of a modifier.

(19) a. *anielska dziewczyna* 'angelic girl, an angel of a girl' (NKJP)
b. *koszmarne biuro* 'nightmarish office'
c. *potworny kac* (lit. monstrous hangover) 'terrible hangover'
d. *wymarzony samochód* (lit. dreamed car) 'dream car'

The expressively loaded nouns in the N+N combinations *dziewczyna anioł* (lit. girl angel), *praca koszmar* (lit. job nightmare) or *samochód marzenie* (lit. car dream) attribute some property to their heads in a metaphorical manner. When paraphrasing the meaning of such combinations, the preposition *jak* 'like' can be used.[10] The basis of comparison can be established when extralinguistic knowledge or situational context is taken into consideration, e.g. an angelic girl is beautiful and calm (like an angel), a nightmare of a job is really exhausting or boring, a dream car is fast and stylish.

---

[9] There is one occurrence of *skarb dziewczyna* (lit. treasure girl) as a caption to a photograph on the website https://pocisk.org/52050/skarb_dziewczyna.html. Presumably this can be treated as a calque from English.

[10] Kallas (1980: 156) employs the paraphrase with the comparative element *jak* 'as, like' for explicating the meanings of such metaphorical N+N combinations in Polish as *kobieta-demon* (lit. woman demon) 'demon woman' and *serial-tasiemiec* (lit. series tapeworm) 'long-running TV series'.

(20) a. *dziewczyna jak anioł* 'a girl like an angel,'
     b. *biuro jak koszmar* 'an office like a nightmare,'
     c. *kac jak potwór* 'hangover like a monster,'
     d. *samochód jak marzenie* 'a car like a dream.'

Given the comparative paraphrases in (20), we can make the preliminary assumption that the N+N combinations in (17) are not intersective. We can expect the "IS A" condition to show that only the left-hand constituents of such N+N expressions function as semantic heads. The application of the "IS A" test to *utwór-potwór* (lit. piece_of_writing monster) 'a terrible piece of writing' and *kac-potwór* (lit. hangover monster) 'terrible hangover' confirms this expectation. The recognition of such Polish N+N juxtapositions as attributive complexes agrees with Gavriilidou's (2016) treatment of similar expressive combinations in Greek. Gavriilidou (2016) regards *γrafiokratia-teras* (lit. bureaucracy monster) 'monstrous bureaucracy', *idisi-sok* (lit. news shock) 'shocking news' and *erevna-mamuθ* (lit. research mammoth) 'monstrous research' as attributive N+N units.[11]

(21) a. *Utwór-potwór jest utworem.* 'A terrible piece of writing (lit. piece_of_writing monster) is a piece of writing.'
     b. ** Utwór-potwór jest potworem.*
        The intended meaning: 'A terrible piece of writing is a monster.'

(22) a. *Kac potwór jest kacem.*
        'A monstrous hangover (lit. hangover monster) is a hangover.'
     b. **Kac potwór jest potworem.*
        The intended meaning: 'A monstrous hangover is a monster.'

However, in the case of *biuro-koszmar* 'nightmare office' or *miasto-marzenie* 'dream city', the paraphrase '$N_1 N_2$ is an N_2' sounds awkward in Polish but is not totally unacceptable.[12] This is shown by the application of the "IS A" test in (23−25).

(23) a. *Biuro-koszmar jest biurem.*
        'A nightmare office (lit. office nightmare) is an office.'
     b. *?Biuro-koszmar jest koszmarem.*
        'A nightmare office is a nightmare.'

(24) a. *Miasto-marzenie jest miastem.*
        'A dream city is a city.'

---

[11] She does not discuss Greek combinations which would correspond to Polish coordinate-like expressives, e.g. *kierowca cham* 'a lout of a driver' or *dyrektor idiota* 'an idiot of a director.'

[12] The lexeme *marzenie* 'dream' can denote a strongly desired goal or (in colloquial usage) it can denote an ideal object. Sentence (24b) sounds odd to me since one would normally specify whose dream it is, e.g. *To miasto jest moim marzeniem.* 'This city is my dream.'

   b. *?Miasto-marzenie jest marzeniem.*
      'A dream city is a dream.'

Paraphrases of the type 'N$_1$N$_2$ is an N$_2$' sound fully natural in the case of the N+N combinations *matka-potwór* (lit. mother monster) 'a monster of a mother', *dziewczyna skarb* (lit. girl treasure) 'a treasure of a girl' or *żona anioł* (lit. wife angel) 'an angel of a wife'.

(25) a. *Matka-potwór jest matką.* 'A monster of a mother is a mother.'
      b. *Matka-potwór jest potworem.* 'A monster of a mother is a (real) monster.'

(26) a. *Dziewczyna-skarb jest dziewczyną.* 'A treasure of a girl is a girl.'
      b. *Dziewczyna-skarb jest skarbem.* 'A treasure of a girl is a treasure.'

(27) a. *Żona anioł jest żoną.* 'An angel of a wife is a wife.'
      b. *Żona anioł jest aniołem.* 'An angel of a wife is an angel.'

The expressive juxtapositions in (25–27) allow an intersective interpretation and come closer to coordinate combinations than the N+N complexes in (21–24). This is due to the metaphorical extension of the expressive nouns *potwór* 'monster', *skarb* 'treasure' and *anioł* 'angel'. Although the lexeme *anioł* 'angel' in its literal (and primary) sense denotes a spiritual being who is a messenger from God, in its extended (metaphorical) sense it can refer to anybody who is a paragon of virtue. The lexeme *skarb* 'treasure', apart from denoting a collection of valuable objects (such as jewellery or coins), can be interpreted as referring to a loved person. The word *potwór* 'monster' in its literal sense denotes a large, ugly and frightening imaginary creature. In its extended sense, it refers to a person of inhuman cruelty or extreme ugliness (cf. SJP PWN). The lexeme *potwór* 'monster' in its metaphorical reading does not encompass ugly or terrifying artefacts, events, feelings, hence the sentences in (21b) and (22b) are not acceptable.

    Thus, the boundaries between semantic-structural types of Polish juxtapositions, particularly between attributive and coordinate combinations, are rather fuzzy. This observation agrees with the conclusion reached by Radimský (2015) on the basis of Italian N+N compounds and by Gavriilidou (2016), who dicusses Greek N+N combinations.

    Radimský (2015: 187) notes that the default form for the modifier constituent of Italian irreversible ATAP compounds is the singular form.[13] The sentences in (28–29) show the variable behaviour of the right-hand constituents of metaphorical N+N combinations in Polish, such as *pociąg widmo* (lit. train ghost) 'ghost train' and *pacjent widmo* (lit. patient ghost) 'ghost patient'. In (28a) and (29a) the right-hand constituent agrees with the left-hand

---

[13] Reviewer 2 suggests that the number inflection within expressive combinations in Polish can be used as a diagnostic test in distinguishing between ATAP and coordinate juxtapositions.

noun in its number and case. In (28b) and (29b) the expressive element *widmo* 'ghost' retains the nominative singular form whereas the left-hand constituent exhibits the genitive plural form in (28b) and the nominative plural form in (29b).[14]

(28) a. *W sieci   pojawiła   się   strona   internetowa,*
in net-SG.F.LOC appear-PST.3SG.F R.CL site-SG.F.NOM internet.RA-SG.F.NOM
na którą   trafiają   numery
on which-SG.F.ACC land-PRS.3PL.F number-PL.F.NOM
telefonów   pacjentów-   widm,
telephone-PL.F.GEN patient-PL.M.GEN ghost-PL.F.GEN
którzy   rezerwują   wizyty   i   nie
who-PL.M.NOM book-PRS.3PL.M visit-PL.F.ACC and not
stawiają   się   na   nie.
come-PRS.3PL.M R.CL on they-ACC
'A website has appeared on the Internet, on which one can find phone numbers of ghost patients (patient-PL.GEN ghost-PL.GEN) who book appointments and do not come to the surgery.'
(https://pts.net.pl/infodent24-pl-czy-przyjmie-sie-baza-niesubordynowanych-pacjentow/)

   b. *Nie przyszedłeś   do lekarza?   Trafisz na*
not come-PST.2SG.M to physician-SG.M.GEN land-FUT.2SG.M on
czarną   listę   „pacjentów   widmo",
black-SG.F.ACC list-SG.F.ACC patient-PL.M.GEN ghost-SG.N.NOM
a   to   oznacza   kłopoty.
and this-SG.N.NOM mean-PRS.3SG.N trouble-PL.F.ACC
'You didn't come to your appointment with the doctor? You will be put on the blacklist of ghost patients (patient-PL.GEN ghost-SG.NOM) and this means trouble.'
(https://nczas.com/2018/08/10/nie-przyszedles-do-lekarza-trafisz-na-czarna-liste-pacjentow-widmo-a-to-oznacza-klopoty/)

(29) a. *W opowieściach   pociągi-   widma   najczęściej*
in story-PL.F.LOC train-PL.F.NOM ghost-PL.F.NOM mostly
wyłaniają   się   z   nocnej   mgły.
emerge-PRS.3PL.F R.CL from night.RA-SG.F.GEN fog.RA-SG.F.GEN
'In the stories, ghost trains (train-PL.NOM ghost-PL.NOM) most often emerge from the night fog.'
(https://facet.onet.pl › Strefa tajemnic › Duchy)

---

[14] The glosses of the sentences in (28–29) contain RA as the abbreviation for 'relational adjective' and R.CL as the abbreviation for 'reflexive clitic'. The specification PL.F is used to refer to plural non-virile forms and PL.M to refer to plural virile (i.e. masculine personal) forms.

b. *Straszne   historie   na faktach –   Czy*
terrible-PL.F.NOM story-PL.F.NOM on fact-PL.F.LOC if
pociągi   widmo   istnieją?
train-PL.F.NOM ghost-SG.N.NOM   exist-PRS.3PL.F
'Terrible stories based on facts –Do ghost trains (train-PL.NOM ghost-SG.NOM)
exist?'
(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oCLo2DKfGfc)

The occurrence of, or the lack of, the number and case agreement of expressive N+N combinations in Polish calls for a more in-depth investigation,[15] which will hopefully shed more light on the status of constituents of such juxtapositions.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have examined Polish N+N juxtapositions which exhibit characteristics of expressives, as discussed for English and German by Potts (2007) and Meibauer (2013). I have argued that Polish N+N combinations which belong to one subgroup of expressives, e.g. *kierownik idiota* (lit. manager idiot) 'an idiot of a manager' and *przemytnik oferma* (lit. smuggler wimp) 'a wimp of a smuggler', behave in many respects like coordinate compound-like units. The word order of their constituent parts is reversible, e.g. *dentysta sadysta* (lit. dentist sadist) and *sadysta dentysta* (lit. sadist dentist) 'a sadist of a dentist'. Such N+N expressive units are semantically transparent and call for an intersective interpretation. Therefore, the application of the "IS A" test indicates that they contain two semantic heads and can be regarded as coordinate structures. The opposite conclusion, i.e. that these are attributive structures, could be motivated (mainly) on the grounds that their expressive constituent denotes a property attributed to the head noun and can be replaced by an adjective, cf. *kierowca cham* (lit. driver lout) 'a lout of a driver' and *chamski kierowca* 'loutish driver'.

The second group of Polish expressives encompasses N+N combinations which exhibit properties of attributive units. The order of their constituents is not reversible, e.g. *biuro-koszmar* (lit. office nightmare) 'nightmare office' vs. unattested *koszmar-biuro* (lit. nightmare office). They can be semantically opaque and they call for the metaphorical paraphrase with the comparative element *jak* 'like', e.g. *kobieta anioł* (lit. woman angel) 'a woman who is like an angel' and *praca koszmar* (lit. job nightmare) 'a job which is like a nightmare'.

---

[15] As is pointed out by Reviewer 1, an additional factor which may influence the inflectional pattern of metaphorical juxtapositions in Polish is what values for the features [+/-animate] and [+/-personal] are exhibited by their constituents.

The application of the "IS A" test to Polish expressives which belong to this subgroup of N+N combinations brings equivocal results. The test shows that *biuro-koszmar* (lit. office nightmare) 'a nightmare of an office' has one semantic head, since the paraphrase ?*Biuro-koszmar jest koszmarem* 'A nightmare office is a nightmare' does not sound good. However, expressions such as *kobieta anioł* (lit. woman angel), *dziewczyna skarb* (lit. girl treasure) and *matka potwór* (lit. mother monster) allow the paraphrases *Kobieta-anioł jest aniołem* 'An angelic woman is an angel,' *Dziewczyna-skarb jest skarbem* 'A treasure girl is a treasure' and *Matka-potwór jest potworem* 'A monstrous mother is a monster,' due to the polysemy of their evaluative constituents (i.e. *anioł* 'angel', *skarb* 'treasure' and *potwór* 'monster'). It is difficult to apply another diagnostic test for the modifier (i.e. semantic non-head) status of the right-hand constituents of irreversible juxtaposition, namely the lack of number and case agreement. While both nouns in *kobieta anioł* (lit. woman angel) 'an angel of a woman' can be inflected for number and case, juxtapositions containing the noun *widmo* 'ghost' exhibit variable behaviour. Their right-hand constituents can either be inflected for number and case, or they can remain uninflected (occurring in the nominative singular form), e.g. *pociągi widma* (train-PL.NOM ghost-PL.NOM) 'ghost trains' and *pociagi widmo* (train-PL.NOM ghost-SG.NOM) 'ghost trains.'

The discussion above has highlighted the problem of assigning appositive (or appositional) N+N structures to a particular class of compounds, or compound-like units. The difficulty in determining whether N+N units with an intersective interpretation should be regarded as coordinate or attributive (i.e. ATAP) combinations results partly from the ambiguity of the term "apposition" as used in morphology and in syntax.

References

Acuña Fariña Juan Carlos (1996). *The Puzzle of Apposition*. Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

Allen Margaret R. (1978). *Morphological investigations*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut. PhD dissertation.

Arcodia Giorgio F., Grandi Nicola, Wälchli Bernard (2010). Coordination in compounding. In Scalise, Vogel (eds.), 177–198. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.311.15arc.

Arnaud Pierre J.L., Renner Vincent (2014). English and French [NN]$_N$ units: A categorial, morphological and semantic comparison. *Word Structure* 7, 1–28. DOI: 10.3366/word.2014.0054

Bisetto Antonietta, Scalise Sergio (2005). The classification of compounds. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 2, 319–332.

Cetnarowska Bożena (2019). Compounds and multi-word expressions in Polish. In *Complex Lexical Units. Compounds and Multi-Word Expressions*, Bar-

bara Schlücker (ed.), 279–306. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gryuter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110632446-010.

Damborský Jiří (1966). Apozycyjne zestawienia we współczesnej polszczyźnie. *Język Polski* 46 (4), 255–268.

Długosz-Kurczabowa Krystyna, Dubisz Stanisław (1999). *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego: słowotwórstwo*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Fabb Nigel (1998). Compounding. In *The Handbook of Morphology*, Andrew Spencer, Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), 66–83. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gavriilidou Zoe (2016). The semantics of NN combinations in Greek. In Ten Hacken (ed.), 94–109. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781316163122.006.

Grandi Nicola, Körtvélyessy Lívia (2015). Introduction: Why evaluative morphology? In *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, Nicola Grandi, Lívia Körtvélyessy (eds.), 3–20. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Haspelmath Martin (2004). Coordinating constructions: An overview. In *Coordinating Constructions*, Martin Haspelmath (ed.), 3–40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI 10.1075/tsl.58.03has.

Haspelmath Martin, Sims Andrea D. (2010). *Understanding Morphology*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Education.

Ten Hacken Pius (ed.) (2016). *The Semantics of Compounding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781316163122.

Kallas Krystyna (1980). *Grupy apozycyjne we współczesnym języku polskim*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

Karpowicz Tomasz (2009). *Kultura języka polskiego. Wymowa, ortografia, interpunkcja*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Lieber Rochelle (2009). IE, Germanic: English. In Lieber, Štekauer (eds.), 357–369. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199695720.013.0018.

Lieber Rochelle (2016). Compounding in the lexical semantic framework. In Ten Hacken (ed.), 38–53. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781316163122.003.

Lieber Rochelle, Štekauer Pavol (eds.) (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199695720.001.0001.

Masini Francesca, Benigni Valentina (2012). Phrasal lexemes and shortening strategies in Russian: the case for constructions. *Morphology* 22(3), 417–451. DOI: 10.1007/s11525-011-9200-y.

Meibauer Jörg (2013). Expressive compounds in German. *Word Structure* 6(1), 21–42. DOI: 10.3366/word.2013.0034.

Nagórko Alicja (2010). *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Olsen Susan (2001). Copulative compounds: A closer look at the interface between syntax and morphology. In *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*, Geert Booij, Jaap Van Marle (eds.), 279–320. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Potts Christopher (2007). The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2), 165–198. DOI: 10.1515/TL.2007.011.

Radimský Jan (2015). *Noun+Noun Compounds in Italian*. České Budějovice: Jihočeska Univerzita.

Ralli Angela (2013). *Compounding in Modern Greek*. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-4960-3.

Renner Vincent, Fernández-Domínguez Jesús (2011). Coordinate compounding in English and Spanish. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 47, 873–883. DOI: 10.2478/psicl-2011-0041.

Scalise Sergio, Bisetto Antonietta (2009). Classification of compounds. In Lieber, Štekauer (eds.), 49–82. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199695720.013.0003.

Scalise Sergio, Fábregas Antonio (2010). The head in compounding. In Scalise, Vogel (eds.), 109–125. DOI 10.1075/cilt.311.10sca.

Scalise Sergio, Vogel Irene (eds.) (2010). *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.311.

Szymanek Bogdan (1989). *Introduction to Morphological Analysis*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Szymanek Bogdan (2010). *A Panorama of Polish Word-Formation*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Wälchli Bernard (2005). *Co-Compounds and Natural Coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199276219.001.0001.

Willim Ewa (2001). On NP-internal agreement: A study of some adjectival and nominal modifiers in Polish. In *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*, Gerhild Zybatow, Uwe Junghanns, Grit Mehlhorn, Luka Szucsich (eds.), 80–95. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Corpora and dictionaries

NFJP = Narodowy Fotokorpus Języka Polskiego (http://nfjp.pl/)
NKJP = Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (nkjp.pl)
SJP PWN = *Słownik języka polskiego PWN* (https://sjp.pwn.pl/)

Instytut Języka Angielskiego
Wydział Filologiczny
Uniwersytet Śląski
ul. Grota Roweckiego 5
41-205 Sosnowiec
bozena.cetnarowska(at)us.edu.pl