

PHRASES

2. 53. 1. Types *mán in the streét / breáð and bútter / bláck márkét / hánger-ón*

In order to create a new lexical unit, language does not necessarily follow a pattern that is morphologically isolated. Any syntactic group may have a meaning that is not the mere additive result of the constituents. There are all degrees of semantic difference from a casual syntactic group (*black pencil*) to a syntactic group with a special meaning (*black market*: grammatical relation receding before lexicalization) to broken sign groups like *get up* consisting of distributionally independent speech units. The type *black pencil* would have no place at all in word-formation as it is a normal syntactical group, the type *get up* would not either as it is composed of pseudo-signs. We have excluded unmotivated groups from word-formation. The extreme cases are always easy to decide; it is those in between that offer difficulties.

We have thought fit to treat in word-formation combinations like *black market* where motivation is still obvious, whereas we have not included syntactic lexicalized groups in which synchronic analysis cannot discover any trace of motivation. The degree of motivation or non-motivation, however, is not always easily established, and borderline cases abound. It is with the express reservation that there are all degrees of motivation in lexical phrases that we have treated them in this marginal chapter of a book on word-formation. While *man in the street* is fully motivated, *man-of-war* is only motivated with regard to *war*, *master-at-arms* appears motivated to a limited number of speakers only. *Mother-of-pearl* and *mother-of-thyme* are as motivated as *butterfly*, i.e. by poetic comparison. We shall first give examples of nominal phrases.

Especially frequent are prepositional groups. Most cbs show the stress pattern of a syntactic group, i.e. the members have full stress. The stress indications of grammars and dictionaries vary insofar as the first members are often marked with lesser stress than the last member. This is very often the practice of the OED (followed by Webster) which is inclined to mark the stress as in *fellow soldier*, *dog-in-the-manger*. This obviously corresponds to an individual tendency and is not borne out by general usage. It is not denied that the first members are often heard with lesser stress, but this is a general phenomenon with syntactic cbs. The same variants occur with *good friend*, *prètty girl*, but the basic stress is not affected thereby.

2. 53. 2. Type *man in the street*: *man about town*, *man of the world*, *master of ceremonies*, *maid of honor*, *matron of honor*, *lady in waiting*, *tenant at will*, *bag of bones*, *dog-in-the-manger*, *hog in armor*, *ticket of leave* BE (= *parole* AE), *sleight of hand*, *mother-of-pearl*.

The type is especially common with plant and flower names: *love-in-a-mist*, *love-in-idleness*, *mother-of-thyme*, *snow-in-harvest*, *snow-in-summer*, *snow-on-the-mountains*.

Some combinations have unity stress, either on the first member as the *-in-law* words (*father-in-law*, *son-in-law* etc.), *stock-in-trade*, the exocentric phrases *good-for-nothing*, *four-in-hand* and others, or on some other member, as *cat-o'-mountain*, *cat-o'-nine-tails*.

2. 53. 3. The process of lexicalization is obvious in changes in the significant with those words also that are not characterized by unity stress. There is hesitation as to the place of the grammatical morphemes. The plural *-s* is often attached to the whole combination instead of to the determinatum (see Jesp. MEG II. 2. 53—57 and VI. 8. 83). This tendency is old. I will quote here the Quarto and Folio variants of King Lear IV. 6. 190 for *sons-in-law*: *sonne in lawes* (Q 1), *sonnes in law* (Q 2, Q 3), *Son in Lawes* (F 1), *Sonnes in Lawes* (F 2), *Sons in Laws* (F 3), *Sons-in-Laws* (F 4). The plural of *good-for-nothing* is *good-for-nothings*, not because "*goods-for-nothing* would suggest a wrong idea" (Jesp. VI. 17. 8 note) but because *good* is not the determinatum. The phrase is an exocentric combination.

2. 53. 4. Another phrase pattern is the type bread and butter. Exs are *brandy-and-soda*, *bubble-and-squeak* 'meat and cabbage fried up together', *carriage and pair*, *chaise and four*, *coach and six*, *cup and saucer*, *drum-and-fife*, *knife and fork* (plant name etc.), *lords and ladies* (plant name), *milk-and-water*, *pepper-and-salt* (kind of cloth), *whisky-and-soda* a.o.

The plurals, when they do occur, have no fixed pattern: we say *bread-and-butters*, but *cups-and-saucers*.

There are also adjs of the type, but they are few in number. Exs are *deaf-and-dumb*, *tried-and-true*, *rough-and-ready*, *hard and fast*, *cut and dried*.

Numerals like *five and twenty*, *hundred and twenty* etc. show the same syndetic formation.

2. 53. 5. Various other types are illustrated by *bláck márkét* (cp. *bláckbird*), *great aunt*, *common sense*, *free trade*, *free wheel*, *stained glass*, *magic lantern* | *fólding dóor* (cp. *dáncing-girl*), *fálling evil*, *Flying Dutchman*, *flying fish* | *bést séller* (cp. *néwcomer*), *best man*.

2. 53. 6. A derivative from a postparticle verbal phrase (verb followed by a locative particle, see 2. 58) is the type hanger-on. As the plural morpheme is not attached to the whole combination (cp. *rúnaboúts* as against *hángers-ón*), this type of phrase cannot be considered a compound. It is established by the Late Middle English period. Exs of this not very productive pattern are *looker-on*, *passer-by*, *listener-in*, *whipper-in*, *runner-up*, *diner-out*, *caller-out* 'one who announces the changes in steps in a dance' 1882 DA, *cutter-out* 'one who cuts out cattle from a herd' (western AE) 1910 DA, *puller-in* 'one who tries to induce passers-by to come into a store' (A slang) 1895 DA, *snapper-back* 'in American football, the player who pushes the ball in play' 1887 DA.

2. 54. Types *has-been* / I.O.U (sentence phrases)

are such units as contain a finite verb. Cbs of this kind are not numerous in English and have no fixed pattern. Exs are *has-been*, *might-have-been*, *never-was*, the plant name *love-lies-(a)-bleeding* 'amaranthus caudatus', *I. O. U.* fr. *I owe you*. The first three exs. have forestress, the fourth has two stresses, the last has endstress or double stress.

2. 55. 1. Types king-emperor / queen mother / prince-consort (copulative combinations)

Coordinative combinations do not usually enter the forestressed compound type (see 2. 1. 17), but are treated as syntactic groups. The additive type king-emperor is used to denote persons who are two (or sometimes more) things at the same time. Shakespeare has such coinages as *giant-dwarf*, *king-cardinal*, *uncle-father*, and in other writers of the early 17th century we find combinations like *king-God* and *queen-bride*. However, the type gains currency in the 19th century only. Coinages have a literary character, as *queen-empress*, *cherub-patriarch*, *clergyman-poet*, *king-bishop*, *king-poet*, *king-pedagogue*. Present usage tends to restrict the pattern to combinations denoting one who combines two professional or quasi-professional capacities, as in *historian-biographer*, *actor-director*, *actor-manager*, *author-producer*, *pianist-composer*, *composer-director*, *composer-conductor*.

Recently, the jargon of commerce has utilized the type in such coinages as secretary-stenographer, *secretary-treasurer*, *producer-distributor*, *contractor-builder*. We also find journalese combinations of more than two members: *actor-producer-director*, even *soldier-statesman-author-orator* (used in an editorial summing up of an article on Caesar by Robert Graves, *The New York Times Magazine*, March 10, 1957, p. 17).

2. 55. 2. There are other cbs in which the second-word is notionally dominant while the first-word is its *apposition*. Exs of this type are queen mother, *merchant-tailor*, *gentleman-commoner*, *gentleman-farmer*, *gentleman-usher*, the archaic words *merchant-adventurer* and *merchant-venturer*, such cbs as *sword-cane*, *desk-table* a.o.

The reader may sometimes find that one or the other instance may be interpreted either way. Transitions are, as everywhere, fluctuating. Is OE *werwolf* an additive or an appositional cpd? A *queen mother* is 'a mother who is at the same time a (one-time) queen', a *queen bee* is 'the bee which is the queen of the hive'. Kluge's explanation for appositional cpds "im allgemeinen erhält das 1. Wortglied durch das 2. Glied eine appositionelle Verdeutlichung" (§ 93) is misleading. It is quite contrary to the character of compounding that the first-word should be the main part and also against the linguistic principle (in Germanic languages) that the determinant precedes the determinatum.

2. 55. 3. Though the two members are notionally coordinated, there is a marked difference of importance between them, as is seen in *prince-elect*, *prince-bishop*, *prince-consort*, *prince-regent*, still more in *earl-marshal* (which originally was *marshal* only). The bearer of the respective title is an elector, bishop, consort, regent, marshal who is a prince (earl) at the same time. In *lieutenant-colonel*, *lieutenant-commander*, *lieutenant-general*, *lieutenant-governor*, obs. *lieutenant-captain* we have appositional cbs with the first-word having kind of prefixal value, comparable to *vice-*. Holder of such titles are no longer felt to be 'lieutenants', though this was the origin of the titles. They always take the group *-s* in the plural.

2. 56. Types *write down* / *come in* (verbal phrases)

With verbal phrases we observe the same state of affairs as with nominal groups. There are fully motivated combinations such as *write down*, *come in*, *go out* at one end of the line, and wholly unmotivated groups of pseudo-signs such as *get up*, *give up*, *carry out* (a plan), at the other end. Particles may develop a class meaning in combination which they do not have as independent words. Thus, *up* conveys the perfective or intensifying meaning 'to the end, completely' to verbs where the idea of a final aim or result is implied, as in *eat up*, *drink up*, *fill up*, *finish up*, *clear up*, *beat up*, *break up*, *tear up*. Many motivated phrases are entirely degrammaticalized (lexicalized), i.e. any modification can only apply to the whole combination while the constituents are no longer susceptible of characterization. *Cut short*, *take to pieces*, *bring to light*, *take into consideration*, *give the sack* belong here. Others are less lexicalized in that their elements still admit of grammatical modification. Such phrases as *take care*, *take notice*, *pay attention* fall under this group: *great care should be taken*, *he was not taken any notice of*, *no attention at all was paid* illustrate this point.