

KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT LEUVEN  
FACULTEIT LETTEREN  
OPLEIDING TAAL- EN LETTERKUNDE



# **Appositive Constructions in Emotion Nouns:**

## **Anger, Frustration, Urge, Vow**

Prof. K. Davidse

Leuven, 15/06/2007

ingediend door

**KRISTOF PELEMAN**

# Appositive Constructions in “Emotion Nouns”

## Introduction

In this research paper I will focus on appositive constructions, of which the first noun phrase (NP) has a specific semiotic “emotion” noun for its head, viz. **urge**, **anger**, **vow**, or **frustration**. Now, Halliday has called the logico-semantic relation in such appositive constructions **projection**, a relation “whereby a clause comes to function not as a direct representation of (non-linguistic) experience but as a representation of a (linguistic) representation”, i.e. a **metaphenomenon** (Halliday 1985: 227-8). The projected clauses in appositive constructions with above-mentioned emotion nouns, might take on three several forms: finite *that* + indirect indicative, non-finite *of* + -ing form, or a non-finite *to* infinitive. All these possible forms will be investigated for all four emotion nouns. In order to do this, selected citations were taken from the Collins Wordbanks Online corpus. Starting from this, the following aspects will be discussed:

- the methodology in extracting relevant tokens
- an internal grammatico-semantic analysis of these appositive constructions
- a semantic profile of these nouns and their complementation

## 1. The Methodology of Extraction

### 1.1. Extraction of Potentially Useful Tokens

To make an extraction from the corpus, a search query was used to include appositive constructions preceded by different sorts of determiners and modifiers, however, restricting the range between determiner and emotion noun to two words, e.g. “DT+0,2anger+of|that|to”. The plural forms of the emotion nouns are also netted in, e.g. “DT+0,2vow|vows+of|that|to”. Table 1 shows a quantification of the extracted tokens following this procedure:

*Table 1:* A quantification of extracted tokens

Emotion nouns\ form	Of	That	To	TOTAL
Anger(s)	35	23	4	62
Frustration(s)	75	21	4	100
Urge(s)	3	9	212	224
Vow(s)	27	5	10	42
TOTAL	140	58	230	428

Of course, we are only interested here in the relevant appositive nominal constructions. The numbers in Table 1 merely quantify the tokens that match the query in a structural sense. These are not necessarily all appositive constructions, as we will see. Non-usable tokens had to be removed from the set, before we could proceed. The types of irrelevant data will be discussed separately for each emotion noun in section 1.2.

## 1.2. Discussion of non-usable tokens

The emotion noun **anger** had only one token in a plural form:

(1) *It was surprising, the angers that a person in his condition could stumble into*

Here, however, the *that*-clause is a restrictive relative clause (RRC): ‘that’ fulfils a function (i.c. direct object) in the clause complement of ‘angers’. So, the corpus doesn’t have any tokens at all of appositive constructions with ‘angers’ as head noun. Only the singular form can be of any further use to us. When we look at the “*of + ing*-form constructions of anger” (**OF-ang**), however, we see that almost all complements are “expanding” NPs, involving a direct representation of experience:

(2) *Al’s disappointment is matched only by the anger of the team manager*

(3) *...more threatening than the heated anger of the more passionate among us.*

Two remarks can be made here. First, note how these sentences can be paraphrased into RRCs as agnates:

(4) *Al’s disappointment is matched only by the anger that the team manager has*

(5) *...more threatening than the heated anger that the more passionate among us have*

Secondly, note how in some of these sentences phraseology plays a vital role, more particularly in phrases that allow for internal lexical variation, like “*to the X of*”, or “*the greatest X of all*”:

(6) *...much to his amazement and the anger of the Goodison crowd and the Blues’ bench*

(7) *But the greatest anger of all came from realizing that ...*

There was actually just one OF-ang construction with apposition:

(8) *...bleeding with the humiliation and anger of defeat.*

In **THAT-ang** constructions expanding complements were likewise in majority (9), but there were also some appositional constructions (10). All expanding complements were RRCs.

(9) *W.W. let loose all the anger that had been building within him for years*

(10) *...alongside a burning anger that she had in some way wasted her life*

The **TO-ang** constructions only had 4 tokens. Three of them simply were “non-complements” of the head noun: they belonged to another functional part of the sentence. In (11) the *to*-phrase fulfils the function of indirect object, for example.

(11) *The argument has been a source of anger to geologists and palaeontologist*

The emotion noun **frustration** had 32 tokens in its plural form. They made constructions with **that** and **of**. All combinations of “frustrations” with “that” were unuseful, for they always seemed to form RRCs, like in (12):

(12) *...the rewards and frustrations that child care involves ...*

Combinations of this plural head noun with “of” displayed some more diversity.

Complements either took an “*-ing* form” or an NP. When taking “*-ing* forms” the constructions were always appositive, like (13).

(13) *...the frustrations of working for a large agency ...*

When taking an NP, this NP could sometimes be paraphrased as an “*-ing* form” in its context (agnates), like in (14). In that case, they were useful.

(14) *...the frustrations of life in the city ...*

Sometimes, however, this transformation was impossible and it could only be paraphrased as an RRC. In those cases, they had to be discarded, like (15).

(15) *...the legitimate frustrations of the people*

In the singular form of frustration, now, the **OF-fru** constructions showed the exact same diversity as the plural form with “of”. So, only the sentences where NP complements could not be paraphrased as an “*-ing* form” in their context, but were more likely to be paraphrased as an RRC, had to be removed from the sample. Sentence (16) is an example.

(16) *The anger and frustration of teachers is understandable*

Here, too, phraseology seems to play a role somehow, like in (17).

(17) *...much to the frustration of Monaco's little general*

In **THAT-fru** constructions one might expect to find some appositive constructions. After all, it's not unimaginable to form an NP like: "the frustration that he did not pass the course". Nevertheless, **all** THAT-fru constructions had an RRC for a complement, like (18).

(18) *We want to help make sure that the frustration that once led to violence gives way to...*

Unexpectedly, we find no useful (appositive) tokens here. Yet, in the OF-ang class we inadvertently stumbled upon a token (18b) that can be put both under the THAT-ang class and the THAT-fru class as an appositional construction.

(18b) *The feelings of anger, of frustration, of rage that the world should conspire to rob her of the only part of her body that truly mattered*

The **TO-fru** constructions – which were 4 in total – had exactly one appositional complement (19) in them.

(19) *Lee Westwood fought back the frustration to soar into contention at the English Open*

The other three TO-fru tokens had to be removed, because their *to*-phrases were no complements of "frustration", but the sentence's indirect object (20).

(20) *Japan has proved a monumental frustration to foreign language instructors*

The emotion noun **urge** took 5 tokens in its plural form. Three of them were followed by "that". These had to be removed from the sample, because "urges" represented a homophone of the noun's plural here, i.e. the third person singular of the verb "to urge". The other two tokens – followed by "to" and "of" respectively – could be considered appositional and were therefore kept in the sample. In their singular form, the **OF-urg** constructions had one unuseful token (21), which could be "agnated" into an RRC.

(21) *...with the urge of a shipwrecked man (...) to ...*

Noticeable here, however, is that the "*to*-phrase" further on in the sentence is also a complement of the head noun "urge", and here it does give rise to an appositional construction! So, this token had to be shifted to the "TO-urg" class. The **THAT-urg** constructions showed one case of dubious apposition. In the other cases, either "urge" represented a verbal homophone of the head noun (22), or "that" introduced an RRC (23).

(22) *When given the opportunity to urge that ...*

(23) *The compelling urge that an addict experiences*

The **TO-urg** constructions all had the appositional construction. In almost all cases the complement was a verb phrase. Two tokens took a complement in the form of an NP. These could, however, be paraphrased into the form of a verb phrase. Nonetheless there was 1 token (24) that had to be removed.

(24) *He's a deep-seated urge to prove everyone wrong ...*

This token somehow suggests some non-semiotic sense of the noun "urge". Yet, the word does not have such type of meaning to my knowledge. It must be a fault in the corpus, i.e. leaving out the word "got" in the sentence. So, I removed this token from the sample.

The emotion noun **vow**, finally, had 9 tokens in its plural form – 8 of which were followed by "of". These were all somehow interpretable as appositions, though with some ambiguity here and there. This will be discussed later on, as will other ambiguities in the appositional constructions of previously mentioned classes. The last of the "plural" tokens was followed by "that", introducing an RRC (25). This token had to be discarded.

(25) *...most of the people undertake vows that really are very similar to ...*

The **OF-vow** constructions were always appositional. There was doubt for two tokens, however, containing the phrase “the vow of Amida”. Since Amida appeared to be a concept in Buddhism and not a proper name, it could not be paraphrased in terms like “the vow that Amida made”, which would have been an RRC. So, these tokens did not need to be omitted on the grounds of an expanding relation to the head noun. The **THAT-vow** constructions were all appositional. The **TO-vow** constructions sometimes had to be removed (26) because “vow” was used in its verbal sense.

(26) *Incensed, the Dingles vow to get their revenge on Chris by ...*

### 1.3. The Resulting Sample

Considering section 1.2, several tokens had to be omitted from the original extraction. After doing this, Table 1 had to be adjusted. Table 2 provides a quantification of the sample tokens, leaving only the relevant (appositional) ones.

Table 2: A Quantification of all Tokens with Apposition

Emotion nouns\ form	Of	That	To	TOTAL
Anger(s)	1	7	1	9
Frustration(s)	65	1	1	67
Urge(s)	2	1	212	215
Vow(s)	27	4	4	35
TOTAL	95	13	218	326

Seeing how 5 classes out of 12 are reduced to merely 1 token with apposition, it appears that these kinds of construction typically eschew apposition. This is especially so for the OF-ang class – which comes from 35 original tokens – and for the THAT-fru class – which comes from 21 original tokens. The other three types of construction were already quite scarce for one reason or another.

## 2. An Internal Grammatico-semantic Analysis

### 2.1. The Head Nouns

#### 2.1.1. Definiteness

To give a quantification of definite vs indefinite determiners for the first NP, each emotion noun will be given its own table. Afterwards they will be implemented into a larger, general table for definiteness (Table 4).

Table 3a: Proportions of Definiteness for Anger

ANGER	of	that	to
<b>Definite</b>	1 (100%)	2 (28,6%)	1 (100%)
<b>Indefinite</b>	0 (0%)	5 (71,4%)	0 (0%)

Table 3b: Proportions of Definiteness for Frustration

<b>FRUSTRATION</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Definite</b>	65 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Indefinite</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3c: Proportions of Definiteness for Urge

<b>URGE</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Definite</b>	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	159 (75%)
<b>Indefinite</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	53 (25%)

Table 3d: Proportions of Definiteness for Vow

<b>VOW</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Definite</b>	19 (70,4%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Indefinite</b>	8 (29,6%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)

The general picture here is that indefinites are less frequent. After all, a lot of classes in the sample lack indefinite representatives (7 out of 12). The emotion noun “frustration” even has no indefinite tokens whatsoever. Nevertheless, in three classes the indefinite pattern seems to be more attested than the definite pattern: THAT-ang, THAT-vow and TO-vow. This last class even lacks any definite representatives. Table 4 provides a general overview for definiteness.

Table 4: A Quantification of Definiteness in Emotion Nouns

<b>Classes \ Definiteness Scale</b>	<b>Definite</b>	<b>Indefinite</b>
<b>Anger - of</b>	1	0
<b>Anger - that</b>	2	5
<b>Anger - to</b>	1	0
<b>Frustration - of</b>	65	0
<b>Frustration - that</b>	1	0
<b>Frustration - to</b>	1	0
<b>Urge - of</b>	2	0
<b>Urge - that</b>	1	0
<b>Urge - to</b>	159	53
<b>Vow - of</b>	19	8
<b>Vow - that</b>	1	3
<b>Vow - to</b>	0	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	253 (77,6%)	73 (22,8%)

These numbers for the emotion nouns separately and the general overview show that Ronald Langacker’s (1991) and Willy Van Langendonck’s (1999) suggestion of “double definiteness” in apposition requires some rethinking.

### 2.1.2. Number

Like the procedure with definiteness, the quantification of number will first provide each emotion noun with its own table, before implementing them into a general overview of number (Table 6).

*Table 5a: Proportions of Number for Anger*

<b>ANGER</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Singular</b>	1 (100%)	7 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Plural</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

*Table 5b: Proportions of Number for Frustration*

<b>FRUSTRATION</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Singular</b>	41 (63,1%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Plural</b>	24 (26,9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

*Table 5c: Proportions of Number for Urge*

<b>URGE</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Singular</b>	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	211 (99,5%)
<b>Plural</b>	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (0,5%)

*Table 5d: Proportions of Number for Vow*

<b>VOW</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>that</b>	<b>to</b>
<b>Singular</b>	19 (70,4%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Plural</b>	8 (29,6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Appositional constructions seem to appear mostly with a singular form for the first NP. Table 6 provides a general overview for number.

*Table 6: A Quantification of Number in Emotion Nouns*

<b>Classes \ Number Scale</b>	<b>Singular</b>	<b>Plural</b>
<b>Anger - of</b>	1	0
<b>Anger - that</b>	7	0
<b>Anger - to</b>	1	0
<b>Frustration - of</b>	41	24
<b>Frustration - that</b>	1	0
<b>Frustration - to</b>	1	0
<b>Urge - of</b>	1	1
<b>Urge - that</b>	1	0
<b>Urge - to</b>	211	1
<b>Vow - of</b>	19	8
<b>Vow - that</b>	4	0
<b>Vow - to</b>	4	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	292 (89,6%)	34 (10,4%)

## 2.2. The Second Nominals

To investigate the second nominals, we'll make a distinction first between the ones that take the form of a clause and the ones that take the form of an NP. A quantification can be found in Table 7.

Table 7: A Quantification of Clause vs NP in the Second Nominals

Classes \ Nominal Form	Clause	NP
Anger - of	0	1
Anger - that	7	0
Anger - to	1	0
Frustration - of	34	31
Frustration - that	1	0
Frustration - to	1	0
Urge - of	0	2
Urge - that	1	0
Urge - to	210	2
Vow - of	0	27
Vow - that	4	0
Vow - to	4	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>263 (80,7%)</b>	<b>63 (19,3%)</b>

NPs seem to occur almost exclusively after “of”. Only the OF-fru class also has clausal tokens. Besides the *of*-configurations, there remain 2 other NP second nominals, which occur in the TO-urg class.

### 2.2.1. Clausal Second Nominals

Clausal second nominals take either the form of a *that*-clause, a *to*- infinitive, or an *-ing* form. Table 8 quantifies their numbers of occurrence in the sample.

Table8: A Quantification of Clausal Second Nominal Forms

Clauses Total	<i>That</i> -clause	<i>To</i> -infinitive	<i>-ing</i> form
263 (100%)	13 (4,9%)	216 (82,1%)	34 (12%)

The four emotion nouns can also be distinguished in terms of propositions and proposals. All of them have tokens for each of the two types of projecting nouns. So, it might be interesting to see whether this distinction might be linked to their formal realization. Table 7 has shown that three classes of appositive construction (OF-ang, OF-urg, Of-vow) don't have clausal second nominals. So, these will be left out when the distinction between propositions and proposals is investigated in Table 9.



Table 9: A Quantification of Propositions vs Proposals in Clausal Second Nominals

	Propositions	Proposals
<b>THAT-ang</b>	7	0
<b>THAT-fru</b>	1	0
<b>THAT-urg</b>	1	0
<b>THAT- vow</b>	4	0
<b>OF- fru</b>	34	0
<b>TO-ang</b>	0	1
<b>TO-fru</b>	0	1
<b>TO-urg</b>	0	210
<b>TO-vow</b>	0	4

This comes to show that there is a 100% correlation in emotion nouns between formal realization of the appositive construction and the distinction proposition/proposal. All *to*-constructions and only *to*-constructions turn these emotion nouns into proposals. For the rest, they are propositions.

### 2.2.2. NP Second Nominals

Here, it might be interesting to look at the definiteness of these second nominal NPs. Table 10 offers a quantification of this. Yet, bear in mind that NP second nominals are only represented in five constructional classes of the emotion nouns (Table 7). So, Table 10 will be restricted to these specific classes.

Table 10: A Quantification of Definiteness in Second Nominal NPs

Class \ Definiteness	Definite	Indefinite	TOTAL
<b>OF-ang</b>	0	1	1
<b>OF-fru</b>	12	19	31
<b>OF-urg</b>	0	2	2
<b>TO-urg</b>	1	1	2
<b>OF-vow</b>	1	26	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	14 (22,2%)	49 (77,8%)	63 (100%)

An interesting investigation here might be to examine tokens where the first NP is definite and the second NP indefinite. Following the claims of Langacker (1991) and Van Langendonck (1999) that appositional constructions involve two definite nominals, we should see whether these indefinite NPs always pragmatically refer to one specific instance, or not. If they do, then Langacker and Langendonck would be right.

Now, there certainly are instances that can be given a definite contextualization:

(27) ...*her heart must have been bleeding with the humiliation and anger of defeat*

(28) *Dr Casey's crime was not to break the vow of celibacy but ...*

After all, in these cases “defeat” and “celibacy” pragmatically refer to one specific instance. Nevertheless, there also seem to be cases where an interpretation in terms of a definite contextualization is out of the question.

(29) ...*the urge of combat, one man leading another, ...*

(30) ...*the urge to violence ...*

(31) ...*to transform the restless frustration of youth into ...*

In these examples, the second NPs all represent some concept, or an idea in a more or less “**generic**” meaning. It is exactly because of this semantic property that they lack the presence of an article (whether definite or indefinite). Also note how the second NP in (30) semantically allows a transformation to the verb phrase “act violently” or “become violent”. These kinds of examples at least require a modification of Langacker’s and Van Langendonck’s stipulation.

### 3. A Semantic Profile of Emotion Nouns and their Complementation

#### 3.1. Semantic Relations between Head Noun and Second Nominal

The emotion nouns will be discussed separately with regard to their semantic profile. A distinction will also be made in their formal realizations. Francis (1993) had already claimed a **causal** relation, concerning emotion nouns. This statement will be assessed.

##### 3.1.1. Anger

For the OF-ang class, Francis is certainly on the right track. In example sentence (27), “defeat” is unmistakably the **cause** for the “anger”. Also the THAT-ang class shows this causal link between head noun and complement (32).

(32) *...a banked anger that he should have allowed this to happen to ...*

The “allowing something to happen” is the **cause** for the anger. The TO-ang class (33), however, shows a different semantic relation: desideration.

(33) *The Almighty’s anger to disarm?*

This token shows a semantic component of intent, of will. So, the complement stands to its head noun as a **goal**.

##### 3.1.2. Frustration

The OF-fru class also displays a causal relationship between head noun and complement, whether the complement is an NP or a clause.

(34) *...the frustration of primitive travel has faded*

(35) *...the frustration of being hounded by the paparazzi*

(36) *...the frustration of searching for gold in such country*

In all these examples, the complement is the **cause** of frustration. Note, however, that the NP complement (34) can always be paraphrased into a corresponding verb phrase. Also note that the emphasis in the complement might also play a role in its semantics. In (36) it’s not “searching for gold” that causes frustration, but doing it “in such country”! Also the THAT-fru class shows a causal link in (18b), as stipulated by Francis (1993): that the world robbed her, caused frustration. The TO-fru class, has a different semantic relation, not unlike the TO-ang class. The semantics of “urge” and “will” are present in the complement of example sentence (19). The complement stands to “frustration” as a **goal**, or **intent**.

##### 3.1.3. Urge

All the formal classes of the head noun “urge” seem to display the same semantic relation between complement and head noun. The complement is always the **goal** of the agent(s), who feel an “urge”. Sentence (29) shows this for the OF-urg class, for example.

### 3.1.4. Vow

This noun's complements seem to have a more typical 'appositive' relation to the first NP. They always identify the content of the "vow". They don't really represent the goal, because the vow is actually in itself the goal of the agent, or at least "keeping the vow". This can be linked to the semantics of the word "vow" itself. Its goal is, in itself, usually to keep it. When this goal is not realized this is normally contrasted, using the verb "to break". So, the semantic role of the appositive complements of vow is **identification**. This semantic role is illustrated for all formal classes of "vow" in (37), (38) and (39).

(37) ...when you took on the vow of marriage.

(38) I made a vow that I would help them reach the top ...

(39) ...I took a vow to believe nothing more

Important here is also the specificity and particularity of the THAT-vow and the TO-vow constructions, in opposition to the more general, culturally-based basis for the OF-vow constructions. The second in fact refer to a promise or a set of promises that need to be held over time. This in contrast to the THAT-vow and the TO-vow constructions, which are usually very particular and limited in time.

### 3.2. Entries in COBUILD Dictionary

The Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (third edition 2001) is far from exhaustive when it comes to the emotion nouns of anger, frustration, urge and vow. "Anger" is accounted for in the phraseological patterns of "to feel anger at" and "to cry with anger and frustration", but none of the appositive constructions with "of", "that" or "to", discussed here, are accounted for. For "frustration" only the most common OF-fru pattern is listed. Also for "urge" only the most common pattern is taken in: the TO-urg class. The word "vow", on the other hand, seems to be quite well attested. Nevertheless, we can conclude that the Cobuild dictionary is inadequate in describing all the attested examples with metaphenomenal complements.

### References

- Francis, G. 1993. A corpus-driven approach to grammar. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.) *Text and Technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 138-156.
- Halliday, M. 1985/1994. *An introduction to Functional Grammar. Second Edition*. London: Arnold.
- Langacker, R. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume II: Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Van Langendonck, W. 1999. "Neurolinguistic and syntactic evidence for basis level meaning in proper names". In: *Functions of Language* 6.1: 95-138.