

Dušková, Libuše

## **Noun modification in fiction and academic prose**

*Brno studies in English*. 2009, vol. 35, iss. 2, pp. [29]-51

ISSN 0524-6881 (print); ISSN 1805-0867 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/105145>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.



LIBUŠE DUŠKOVÁ

## NOUN MODIFICATION IN FICTION AND ACADEMIC PROSE

### Abstract

The article examines noun modification in fiction and academic prose with a view to ascertaining features classifiable as style markers. Noun phrases in two text samples were classified according to whether or not they contained modification, and in the case of modified noun phrases with respect to the types, realization forms and distribution of the modifiers. Noun phrases devoid of modifiers displayed a significant distinction in the relatively high representation of proper names in fiction as compared with their marginal occurrence in academic prose. Modified noun phrases revealed qualitative, rather than quantitative differences, especially in the semantics of premodifiers. In academic prose premodifying adjectives and *ing*-participles were mostly classifiers constituting components of zoological terms, while premodifiers in fiction were largely descriptive or evaluative. The differences in the quantitative results compared with the data in *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* are to be ascribed to the limited amount of the research material and the specific features of the employed text sample within the respective text genre.\*

### Key words

*Noun modification; realization forms; semantics; style markers; fiction; academic prose*

---

### 1. Introduction

The following discussion is concerned with the occurrence, structural variety and semantics of modification of complex noun phrases, defined as NPs containing, in addition to a determiner and a head noun, one or more modifiers. Two sorts of texts were examined from these aspects, a sample of fiction (Ishiguro) and a sam-

ple of academic prose (Morris), see *Sources*. They are attached in the Appendix.<sup>1</sup> The study attempts to confront the results of an analysis of the two texts with the description of noun phrase modification in different text sorts as presented in representative grammars, in pursuit of uncovering some less investigated, potentially novel, albeit minor points, and thus to contribute to the overall description. Admittedly, the findings of the analysis are limited both by the number of the samples and the number of excerpts. Moreover, authors' styles vary, especially in fiction, and so does the style in academic prose, in particular between different fields of study. Nevertheless where the differences are consistent with the character of the respective text sort, they can be afforded some stylistic relevance.

The overall material of the study comprises 510 noun phrases all but equally drawn from the running text of the fiction sample (256 instances) and running text of academic prose (254 instances). All noun phrases, i.e. both with and without modification, were counted except nouns in complex prepositions of the type preposition + noun + preposition (e.g. *on behalf of, for the sake of, etc.*) and nouns in fixed phrases (like *of course, for example, etc.*). Since the point under study was the structure of the noun phrase, nouns in the possessive case are included among modifiers, although they mostly operate as determiners (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 326). Accordingly, the concept of determiner is here limited to the articles and the determinative function of pronouns and quantifiers.

The material includes some noun phrases with non-substantival heads, mostly indefinite pronouns, numerals and demonstrative pronouns functioning as substantival proforms. These instances, generally regarded as noun phrases<sup>2</sup>, were registered where the head was modified and noted as NPs with non-substantival heads. As regards non-substantival NPs without modification, they lack either defining feature of the type of NP here studied. Containing neither a determiner, nor a noun in their structure, they were left out of account, i.e. they are not included in the group of non-modified NPs. Though this structure is of interest from the viewpoint of which non-substantival heads allow modification and what modification types, this aspect was not followed because in the examined samples the structure is marginal.<sup>3</sup> Noun phrases with non-substantival heads are illustrated in (1).

- (1) a. nothing objectionable [Ishiguro 89]  
 b. one of my pupils who first brought it to my attention [Ishiguro 47]  
 c. those who had not wished the house to pass out of the family [Ishiguro 115ib]

In the analysis a problem sometimes arose as to how to class a prepositional phrase following an object, or the subject in existential construction. Some prepositional phrases in this position presented neither a clear-cut instance of postmodification, nor of an adverbial. In these cases the adopted solution is only one of the ways of dealing with the problem and other solutions may be preferred. Conveniently for the quantitative data, these instances are again statistically insignificant. Compare (2):

(2) There is a label [1] on a cage [2] at a certain zoo [2b] (Morris)

Is the prepositional phrase [2] to be regarded as a modifier of *a label* (There is a label located on a cage...) or as an adverbial of place (on a cage there is a label...); and similarly does *at a certain zoo* modify *the cage* (a cage which is at a zoo...) or are both prepositional phrases separate locative adverbials (At a zoo, on a cage, there is a label...)? Or finally do they both successively postmodify the head noun (a label stuck on a cage located at a zoo)? As shown by the marking in square brackets, the solution adopted here is classing the two prepositional phrases as one locative adverbial in which the second specifies the first. The tests applied here were alternative word order *On a cage at a certain zoo there is label* and the question test (*where is there a label?*). As pointed out above and shown by the other alternative forms, instances of this kind are mostly indeterminate and may be treated differently.

## 2. Realization forms of noun phrases

Noun phrases in the two samples under study were first grouped according to whether or not the head noun was modified. The respective figures are given in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1.** Realization forms of noun phrases: Ishiguro

<b>Noun modification</b>		
Nouns without modifiers	<b>91</b> (100%)	<b>35.5%</b>
Common nouns	81 (89%)	
Proper names	10 (11%)	
Nouns with modifiers	<b>165</b>	<b>64.5%</b>
Total	<b>256</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 2.** Realization forms of noun phrases: Morris

<b>Noun modification</b>		
Nouns without modifiers	<b>78</b> (100%)	<b>30.7%</b>
Common nouns	77	
Proper names	1	
Nouns with modifiers	<b>176</b>	<b>69.3%</b>
Total	<b>254</b>	<b>100%</b>

The figures in Tables 1 and 2 show more or less expectable results, viz. that the noun phrase in academic prose is more complex than that in fiction: in the former,

noun phrases without modification are by 5% more frequent. However, when we take into account the proportion of the two groups of nouns subsumed under non-modified nouns, this distinction appears in a different light. While non-modified noun phrases in academic prose are almost exclusively accounted for by NPs with determiners, there being only one proper noun (a geographical name, for that matter, cf. *Africa*, Morris [8]), in fiction the proportion of proper names is much higher (10 instances, 11%). Evidently, this reflects the nature of fiction: all proper nouns are here personal names referring to the characters of the story being told. If proper nouns are subtracted, the representation of non-modified NPs in the two samples differs only by 1% (77 instances out of 254 [30.3%] in academic prose, and 81 out of 256 [31.6%] in fiction). The relatively high representation of proper names in fiction may play a role in the relatively lower representation of modified NPs in this sample insofar as modification of proper names is in general greatly restricted, and hence rare (the examined sample contains no instance of a modified proper name). Thus the only distinction between the two texts sorts emerging from the group of non-modified NPs is the relatively high representation of proper names as a feature of fiction. This is doubtless one of fiction's general features, more or less independent of the style of the author and the role of the narrator.

### 3. Realization forms of modifiers

The second point of potential relevance for the present discussion concerns the realization forms of the modifiers. The forms found in the two samples are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

**Table 3.** Realization forms of modifiers: Ishiguro

Types of modification	Abs.	%
Adjective	71	36.4
Prepositional phrase	61	31.3
Relative clause	18	9.2
Converted noun	12	6.2
Possessive case	9	4.6
<i>ed</i> -participle	9	4.6
Gerund	5	2.6
<i>ing</i> -participle	4	2.1
Infinitive	2	1.0
Apposition	3	1.5
Adverb	1	0.5
Total	195	100.0

**Table 4.** Realization forms of modifiers: Morris

Types of modification	Abs.	%
Adjective	92	45.3
Prepositional phrase	55	27.1
<i>ing</i> -participle	12	5.9
Relative clause	12	5.9
Converted noun	9	4.4
Apposition	9	4.4
Gerund	6	2.9
Possessive case	3	1.6
<i>ed</i> -participle	2	1.0
Adverb	2	1.0
Infinitive	1	0.5
Total	203	100.0

The differences in the totals between Tables 1 and 2 on the one hand, and Tables 3 and 4 on the other, are due to instances of multiple modification, i.e. noun phrases with one head noun modified by more than one modifier none of which contains an NP in its structure, cf. the examples listed under (3):

- (3) a. the fine cedar gateway [Ishiguro 21]  
 (adjective + converted noun)  
 b. the special food of the district [Morris 43, 43b]  
 (adjective + prepositional phrase)  
 c. The great advantage we have when studying... [Morris 64]  
 (adjective + relative clause)

### ***3.1. Noun modification by adjectives and prepositional phrases***

The two realization forms ranking highest in both samples are the adjective and the prepositional phrase, 36.4% and 31.3% in Ishiguro, and 45.3% and 27.1 in Morris, respectively. These results are in agreement with the data in Biber et al.: “Common adjectives (i.e. non-participial adjectives) are the most common category of premodifiers in all registers” (1999: 589). “Prepositional phrases are by far the most common type of postmodification in all registers” (1999: 606). In the examined texts prepositional phrases were more frequently registered in fiction than in academic prose. Here Biber et al. do not offer comparable data, relative frequencies of occurrence being presented only for the different forms of pre- and postmodifiers separately. Similarly, the considerable difference between the representation of adjectives and prepositional phrases in fiction and academic prose (5% and 18%, respectively) cannot be related to comparable data in Biber et al. As regards the noticeably higher representation of adjectives in academic

prose than in fiction, partly comparable data can be found in Figure 8.7 (Biber et al. 1999: 589), but the difference between the two registers in this respect does not appear to be so prominent.

3.1.1 In the academic sample, the higher representation of adjectival premodification may be partly accounted for by the recurrence of collocates of the descriptive adjective *new* + *form* (3 instances), *species* (3 instances), *squirrel(s)* (2 instances), *type* (one instance) in reference to the hypertheme of the passage. The adjective *new* has altogether 11 occurrences in the text, its use with other head nouns being also connected with the novelty feature of the hypertheme, cf. (4) a. and b.

- (4) a. new form [Morris 22, 28, 51], new species [46, 55, 102], new squirrel(s) [35, 73], new type [45b]  
 b. new trend [23], new medium [138]

Another factor contributing to adjectival modification in the academic sample is the realization form of some zoological terms, which includes, in addition to the head noun, a classificatory adjective denoting a subclass of the species designated by the head noun. The adjective performs this function alone or in conjunction with other premodifiers, cf. the examples listed under (5):

- (5) a. black-footed squirrel [Morris 9, 65], the African black-footed squirrel [60]  
 b. aquatic animals [146], human animal [67], human being [71], tailless great apes [83b], reptilian ancestors [119], the naked mole rat [144b]

While the recurrence of the adjective *new* is connected with the treatment of a new hypertheme and is derivable from the text build-up, the two-word structure of zoological terms is a noticeable terminological feature in general and may be assigned stylistic relevance.

3.1.2 The relatively higher representation of adjectives in academic prose than in fiction is also apparent in instances of multiple premodification, the prevalence of this type in the former being commensurate with the overall predominance of adjectival premodification in this sample (15 vs. 10 instances). In the examined samples, apart from coordinated adjectives multiple premodification includes converted nouns, participles and the possessive case, cf. (6) a. and b.

- (6) a. this old and hidebound family [Ishiguro 91], certain interesting rumours [Ishiguro 107]; various other anatomical features [Morris 75d], their protective furry covering [Morris 117]  
 b. the city's most respected and influential men [Ishiguro 19]; a constant high body temperature [Morris 121b], a thick hairy, insulating coat [Morris 127b].

The fiction sample contained two instances of a coordination type characteristic of informal speech, viz. modification with *or so* to express approximation (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 981). Compare (7).

(7) for a year or so [Ishiguro 44]

Two instances of multiple modification by adjectives deserve to be mentioned for displaying special features. Fiction provides an example of discontinuous adjectival premodification due to the insertion of a comment clause in the function of parenthetical disjunct (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1112–1117), a configuration indicative of the style of fiction.

(8) a most curious – some may say – foolish procedure [Ishiguro 28]

The other instance of discontinuous modification, found in the academic sample, represents a case of complex modification structure constituted by multiple adjectival coordination and multiple apposition. The discontinuity involves two of three coordinated adjectives, and the entire multiple apposition, cf. (8).

(9) a new species [Morris 46] would have evolved, separate and discrete, a unique form [46b] of life [46ba], a three hundred and sixty-seventh kind [46c] of squirrel [46cα]

As regards other instances of postposed adjectives, apart from obligatory postposition in the case of indefinite pronoun heads (cf. ex. (1) a., altogether three instances) and two occurrences of the adjective *worth* (cf. (20) c.), the texts under study did not provide any examples.

3.1.3 Potential stylistic relevance was further sought in the semantics of the modifying adjectives. Following the semantic classification in Biber et al. (1999: 508–515), the adjectives were first classed as descriptors or classifiers, the distinction between the two groups consisting in the delimiting or restricting function with respect to a noun's referent in the case of classifiers, while descriptors prototypically denote such features as colour, size, weight, age, etc. Needless to say, semantic classification, whatever model may be used, is hardly ever univocal. Hence the quantitative data are of the more-or-less kind rather than representing exact figures. In consequence of the overall larger number of adjectival modifiers in the academic sample, all semantic groups number more examples in this text, the only measure of comparison thus being the relative representation of the different semantic groups within each sample.

According to the corpus findings in Biber et al. (1999: 510–511) evaluative descriptors are equally represented in both fiction and academic prose, whereas the greatest difference is found in the case of relational classifiers, where the ratio of their representation in fiction and academic prose is 2:18 (cf. Table 7.2, p. 511).



In the texts under study nearly a half of the adjectives found in fiction are evaluative, about 30% descriptive and 20% classificatory. In academic prose this scale is reversed: about 47% are classifiers, 35% descriptors and 18% evaluators. The semantic characteristics of adjectival modification in the two samples thus appear to consist in the prevalence of evaluators in fiction in contrast to the predominance of classifiers in academic prose. This has already been suggested by the adduced examples of adjectival modification. A qualitative distinction moreover emerges when the evaluators in the two text samples are compared. While fiction displays emotive or attitudinal evaluation, the evaluators in the academic sample are intellectual. Compare examples (3) a., (6), (8) and (10) a. with (3) c. and (10) b.

- (10) a. the roof with its elegant tiles [Ishiguro 21c $\alpha$ ], two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c], an eccentric procedure [88], some bitter arguments [110]  
 b. a primate of a very odd kind [Morris 76c], of vital importance [126], simple observation [104ib], a slight advantage [29]

Notably, the evaluator *simple* occurs three times (Morris 104, 59). Evaluating adjectives comparable with those found in the fiction sample are few: in addition to *odd* in (10) b., a clear example is *drastic* (this drastic step [136]).

### 3.2 Premodification of nouns by converted nouns and possessive case

Other realization forms of premodifiers found in the texts under study comprised converted nouns and the possessive case (see Tables 3 and 4). The representation of these forms in the two samples (converted noun and possessive case in Ishiguro 12 and 9 instances, respectively; in Morris 9 and 3 instances, respectively) suggests that only the possessive case may have some stylistic relevance.

3.2.1 According to Biber et al. (1999: 589) converted nouns account for c. 30% of all premodifiers in academic prose and judging from figure 8.7 (ibid.), they are approximately twice as common in this text sort as in fiction. Neither of these corpus findings corresponds with the data given in Tables 3 and 4. In the total of all premodifiers converted nouns account for some 8% in academic prose and for over 12% in fiction. As in several previous points, the fiction sample here appears to be rather atypical. Of the many semantic relations obtaining in the noun + noun sequences (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 590–591), most premodifying nouns in the academic sample express the genitive relation (*of*-relation), cf. (11) a. Other relations are illustrated in (11) b.

- (11) a. squirrel family [Morris 16b $\alpha$ ], primate species [93], skin surface [92], body temperature [121ib], body processes [122b]  
 b. heat loss (object relationship [129]), hair covering (source/composition [145])

The semantic relations expressed by noun modifiers in fiction are more varied, some of them fitting in none of the types listed in Biber et al.

- (12) garden wall (location [21b $\alpha$ ], marriage negotiation (content [90]), ginkgo trees (kind [4b], cedar gateway (material [21], family members (partitive [150]), ink brush (purpose [75id]), art enthusiast (object [106b])

Whether variety of semantic relations in this form of premodification has stylistic relevance remains to be ascertained on the basis of larger and more varied text samples.

3.2.2 The possessive case appears to be more suggestive in this respect. Although the absolute figures do not exceed ten, there is a marked difference in the representation of this form in favour of fiction: nine vs. three occurrences (see Tables 3 and 4). This is expectedly connected with the nature of the head nouns in the two examined text sorts. Over a half of the instances drawn from fiction refer to the characters of the story, the remaining forms being comparable both in number and semantic type with the head nouns of the genitives found in academic prose, cf. (13) a. b. and c.

- (13) a. our children's marriage prospects [Ishiguro 39b], Akira Sugimura's house [48b], their late father's house [60c $\alpha$ ], the younger sister's words [104b $\alpha$ ], the Sugimuras' high-handedness [148b]  
 b. his patient's disease [Morris 54b $\alpha$ ], one's moral conduct [Ishiguro 137ib $\alpha$ ], one's purse [Ishiguro 137ifa] (generic personal head)  
 c. the animal's history [Morris 58b], the sun's rays [Morris 132b $\alpha$ ], the city's most respected and influential men [Ishiguro 19b], half the property's true value [Ishiguro 26b $\alpha$ /a] (genitive of non-personal nouns)

As can be seen, the adduced instances of possessive genitive largely reflect the relatively high representation of proper names in fiction, noted in 1 as its special feature, thus contributing to this feature's stylistic relevance.

### ***3.3 Modification forms occurring in both pre- and postmodification***

Of the realization forms that occur both as pre- and postmodifiers the texts under study contain *ing*- and *ed*-participles and the gerund. Biber et al. (1999) offer relative frequencies of occurrence only for each of these forms with respect to the other pre- and postmodifiers, but not for each form in regard to its occurrence in pre- and postmodification. While postmodifying past participles are described as more common in academic prose than in any other register (Biber et al. 1999: 606), occurrence in premodification is noted "as somewhat more common in academic prose than in the other registers" (Biber 1999: 589). Within fiction,

the representation of *ing*- and *ed*-participle appears to be approximately equal, whereas in academic prose *ed*-participles predominate (cf. Biber et al 1999: 606, Fig. 8.13). The figures for the premodifying *ing*-participle presumably also include the gerund, since this category is not recognized. The occurrence of post-modifying gerunds can be only guessed at from the data for *of* + *ing* in comparison to *to*-infinitive, content *that*- and interrogative *wh*-clauses (ibid. 647, Fig 8.23), where *of* + *ing* is shown to be three-to-four times more frequent in academic prose than in fiction.

3.3.1 In the texts under study the *ing*-participle has 12 occurrences in academic prose and 4 in fiction. In the former it ranks third on the frequency scale, following the two most frequent modifiers, whereas in fiction with four occurrences it falls in the group of the four least frequent forms. Out of the 12 *ing*-participles in Morris, seven occur in premodification and all operate here as classifiers, cf. (14):

- (14) living species [Morris 15], independent breeding population [19], starting point [57], living mammals [116ba], flying mammals [139], burrowing mammals [143]

The fiction samples displays two *ing*-participles in premodification, both of which convey evaluative, qualifying meaning, cf. (15):

- (15) a commanding position on the hill [Ishiguro 5, 5b], the imposing air of the house [10, 10b]

The semantic distinction appears to be connected only with the premodifying function of the *ing*-participle. In postmodification no similar distinction has been noted, cf. (16) a. and b.:

- (16) a. special modifications, making interbreeding with other kinds... unlikely [Morris 41ib]; a starting point, telling us... [57i]  
 b. the steep path leading [2i] up from the little wooden bridge [Ishiguro 2i]; its stylishly carved ridgepole [21cβ] pointing [ii] out over the view

As shown in (14), most premodifying *ing*-participles constitute components of zoological terms, thus performing the same function as many classifying adjectives (see 3.1) and may be regarded as style markers.

3.3.2 Noun modification by the *ed*-participle in the two texts presents a reversed picture, at least with respect to relative frequency of occurrence: there is considerable prevalence of *ed*-participles in fiction, viz. nine occurrences against two in academic prose. This result is presumably due to the limited length of the samples, or else the relatively high representation of the *ed*-participle may be a specific feature of the style of the novel's author. Most *ed*-participles here oc-

cur in postmodification, again without evaluative colouring of meaning, cf. (17) a. and b.

- (17) a. a simple descriptive name based [Morris 104i] on a simple observation  
 b. the little wooden bridge still referred to [Ishiguro 2ibii] around here as the Bridge of Hesitation

The fiction sample contains three premodifying *ed*-participles, one of which conveys evaluative meaning by itself, and another is evaluatively modified, cf. (18):

- (18) a. the exaggerated [Ishiguro 51i] respect my pupils always had for me  
 b. its stylishly carved [Ishiguro 21cβ] ridgepole

3.3.3 The gerund is represented about equally, having five occurrences in fiction and six in academic prose (see Tables 3 and 4). While all instances in fiction illustrate the postmodifying function, the academic sample contains three premodifying gerunds (in one case gerunds in coordination) which, in connection with what has been observed about a notable number of premodifying adjectives and *ing*-participles in this sample, appears to be of stylistic relevance, cf. (19):

- (19) their mating calls and displays [Morris 44ia, ib], heating and cooling problems [Morris 153id], on the dissecting table [Morris 72bαi]

These gerunds fall in the semantic class of classifiers, the instances themselves being well on the way to becoming terms.

Gerunds in the postmodifying function were found after several prepositions, of which only *of* had more than one occurrence (three instances), and two gerunds occurred as complements of *worth*, cf. (20) a. b. c.

- (20) a. the importance of our having a house [Ishiguro 37i], the great physiological advantage of being able [Morris 121i] to maintain a constant, high body temperature  
 b. my surprise at receiving [Ishiguro 55i] such personal attention, a very powerful reason for abolishing it [Morris 134i]  
 c. one worth having suffered [Ishiguro 143i] a few inconveniences for, something worth pursuing [Morris 57non-sb head iii]

As noted in the case of adjectives and *ing*-participles, also here it is the premodifying use that appears to play a role as a marker of stylistic distinction.

### 3.4 Postmodification by apposition, relative clauses, infinitives and adverbs

The remaining noun modifiers occurred only in postmodification. Two of these, apposition and relative clauses, are represented by a number of examples that allows drawing some conclusions.

3.4.1 As regards apposition, in Biber et al. (1999: 639) it is described as a maximally abbreviated form of postmodification characteristic of registers with the highest informational density, viz. news and academic prose, where it accounts for about 15% of all postmodifiers. This is in agreement with the findings of the present study, apposition being represented by 9 examples in academic prose as against three in fiction (cf. Tables 3 and 4). In the total of all postmodifiers, in the academic text under study apposition accounts for 10%, which is less than the figure adduced in Biber et al., but still more than three times higher than the representation of apposition among the postmodifiers in fiction, viz. 3%.

However, as noted in several cases before, more illustrative than the quantitative findings are the qualitative differences in the types of apposition found in the two texts. Of the three instances of apposition drawn from fiction, two are of the kind most frequently displayed by this text sort, viz. equivalence involving appellation (Quirk et al. 1985: 1309), cf. (21) a.; a title in pre-position (ibid. 1319), cf. (21) b.; the third example expresses equivalence of the identification kind (ibid. 1309), cf. (21) c.

- (21) a. Setsuko, our eldest [Ishiguro 41b]  
 b. Mr. Ono (in direct speech as a form of address [Ishiguro 99])  
 c. a nominal sum – a figure [Ishiguro 26b] probably not even half the property's true value

The examples found in the academic text express identification that further specifies the first appositive, cf. (22) a., exemplification or enumeration (22) b., and a consequence of the content of the first appositive, which is a finite clause (22) c.

- (22) a. the symptoms, the rash [Morris 52b] that gives a doctor a clue; the markings of its fur – its black feet [Morris 50c]; another species, a strange form [Morris 72b] of life; the flying mammals, the bats [Morris 139b]  
 b. the tailless great apes such as the chimpanzee and the gorilla [Morris 83c, d]; the burrowing mammals – the naked mole rat, the aardvark and the armadillo [Morris 144b, c, d]; the aquatic animals such as the whales, dolphins, porpoises, dugongs, manatees, and hippopotamuses [Morris 146b, c, d, e, f, g]; those abnormally heavy giants, the rhinos and the elephants [Morris 153b, c]  
 c. we ourselves are not black-footed squirrels – a fact [Morris 65b] which forces us into an attitude of humility

Equivalence through identification that further specifies the concept denoted by the first appositive is found in both texts, but appears to be more frequent in academic prose. An obvious factor that plays a role here is the inherent need of academic texts to express meaning with maximal exactness. The other two types appear to be specific to the respective text sort, especially title in pre-position to fiction, cf. (21) b., and enumeration/exemplification in academic prose, as in (22) b.

3.4.2 Relative clauses are more numerous in the fiction sample than in academic prose in the texts under study, viz. 18 vs. 12 instances. This is in agreement with the data in Biber et al. (1999: 606, Fig. 8.13) which show relative clauses to be most frequent in news and least frequent in conversation, with fiction and academic prose ranking in between, the former taking the place next to news. Even the distribution of the relativizers and the registered types of relative clauses correspond with the description therein (ibid. 607–611). In the fiction sample a half of the relative clauses (9, i.e. 50.0%) identify or characterize personal antecedents. In all but one of these clauses the relative pronoun is *who* in the subject function. The only other relativizer with a personal antecedent is zero in the object function, cf. (23) a. and b.

- (23) a. two haughty grey-haired ladies who turned out to be the daughters of Akira Sugimura [Ishiguro 54bi]; the younger sister, who had barely spoken [Ishiguro 73i]  
 b. the house... should pass to one our father would have approved of [Ishiguro 68ibi]

Inanimate entities were antecedents of relative clauses mostly where the relativizer performed the object function, viz. six instances, all displaying zero, cf. (24) a. As antecedents of subject relativizers inanimate entities occurred twice cf. (24) b. In one clause the relativizer performed adverbial function, cf. (24) c.

- (24) a. the exaggerated respect my pupils always had for me [Ishiguro 51i]; the house our father built [Ishiguro 68i]  
 b. In the days which followed [Ishiguro 102i]; things that will be to our advantage [Ishiguro 128i]  
 c. such a contest, in which one's moral conduct and achievement are brought as witnesses [Ishiguro 137i]

In the sample of academic prose the difference in the syntactic function of the relativizers is more prominent, cf. 9 subjects / 2 objects (within the total of 12 relative clauses) vs. 10 subjects / 7 objects in fiction (within the total of 18 relative clauses). As in the fiction sample, one relative clause contains an adverbial relativizer, *when*. Compare (25) a., b. and c.

- (25) a. i. Even for the zoologist, who is used to calling an animal an animal [Morris 68i]  
 ii. a special kind of locomotion which has modified its basic form [Morris 88i]; an attitude of humility that is becoming to proper scientific investigation [Morris 65icii]  
 iii. abnormally heavy giants which have heating and cooling problems [Morris 153i]; other species that appear to be closely related [Morris 74i]  
 b. all we can be certain about [Morris 49i]; The great advantage we have when studying such animals [Morris 64i]  
 c. the moment would eventually arrive when it would be advantageous for them to become isolated [Morris 37i]

As regards the realization form of the relativizer, the two samples are basically comparable. In both the object relativizer is invariably zero (cf. (24) a. and (25) b.), while the subject function is implemented by *who* (referring to a personal antecedent, cf. (23a. and (25) a. i.), and *which* and *that* (in reference to non-personal inanimate and animate antecedents, cf. (24) b. and (25) a. ii and a. iii). Whether *that* or *which* is favoured in the fiction sample cannot be judged since each occurred only once, there being two examples in all. In the academic sample *that* was found to be more common (five vs. three instances of *which*). This differs from the data in Biber et al. (1999: 611), where *which* is characterized as the most frequent relativizer in all registers of academic prose. Looking for potential factors motivating the choice between the two relativizers in the academic sample, a point that presents itself is the nature of non-personal antecedents, viz. animate vs. inanimate. However, the registered examples fail to suggest any tendency in this respect insofar as both *that* and *which* are used to refer to either antecedent type.

As suggested by the representation of the subject relativizers, the greatest difference between the two samples, apart from the prominent prevalence of the subject function over the object function in academic prose, appears to involve the antecedents of the subject relativizers. Whereas in fiction the antecedents are mostly personal, viz. the individual characters of the story, in academic prose there is only one instance of this kind, illustrated in (25) a. i. Notably, even in this instance the antecedent differs in having general reference. In the academic sample a large majority of the antecedents of subject relativizers were inanimate (6 instances), as in (25) a. ii., and non-personal animate (2 instances, cf. (25) a. iii).

Another point characteristic of formal writing is found in the modification structure of the noun phrase in (25) c. in that the postmodifying relative *when*-clause is discontinuous, the intervening element being the verb. Discontinuous postmodification as a feature of formal writing has also been noted in the case of apposition, cf. (9).

3.4.3 The two remaining realization forms of postmodification, the infinitive and the adverb, each represented by three examples, are mentioned for the sake of completeness.



- (26) a. it is not a property to be endangered or discarded lightly [Morris 124i]; nothing further to do with them [Ishiguro 121i]; no attempts to hide [Ishiguro 151i] their hostility  
 b. the particular conditions there [Morris 251c $\alpha$ ]; their relatives nearby [Morris 27i]; all others nearby [Ishiguro 6b]

Here a comment can be made on the passive form of the infinitive in academic prose, which is suggestive of formal text sorts, and on the phraseological nature of the infinitive *to do* postmodifying an indefinite pronoun in fiction.

### 3.5. Complexity of the modification structure

The last point to be mentioned is the complexity of the modification structure by which is meant expansion through coordination and subordination. Both have been partly treated before, viz. coordination in the case of premodification (cf. 3.1.2) and enumerative apposition (cf. (22) b.), and subordination in the case of all modifiers on the first level of dependence. What remains to be discussed concerns coordination in the noun phrase structure occurring in the head noun and/or in postmodification, and subordination on lower dependence levels than the first.

Coordination appears to be more common in the academic sample than in fiction, cf. coordination in the head noun in (27) a. and in different kinds of postmodification in (27) b. Coordination in fiction is illustrated in (28).

- (27) a. their mating calls and displays [Morris 44a, b]; overheating and damage [Morris 131, 131b] to the skin;  
 b. other living species already known and described [Morris 15i]; every aspect of its behaviour and structure [Morris 61b, c]; species of monkeys and apes [Morris 78b $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ]; conspicuous tufts of hair on the head, in the armpits and around the genitals [Morris 91b $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ]; small naked patches of skin on their rumps, their faces, or their chests [Morris 97b $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ]
- (28) a. one's moral conduct and achievement [Ishiguro 137ib, ic]; the state of the house and alterations [Ishiguro 159b, c]  
 b. on grounds purely of good character and achievement [Ishiguro 66, 66b]; a closer investigation of my background and character [Ishiguro 86b, c]

As regards instances of modification with more than one level of subordination, most examples in both texts display two subordination levels in different combinations. A frequent configuration comprises two prepositional phrases in successive dependence, cf. (29).

- (29) at some point in the evolution of the squirrel family [Morris 16, 16b, 16b $\alpha$ ], a rapid survey of the whole range of the living mammals [Morris 116, 116b, 116b $\alpha$ ], at one end of the row of the skins [Morris 82,



82b, 82b $\alpha$ ]; the idea of an ‘auction of prestige’ [Ishiguro 133, 133b, 133b $\alpha$ ], the sentiments of a family with such a distinguished history [Ishiguro 118, 118b, 118b $\alpha$ ]

Other configurations, illustrated in (30), are rarer, e.g.

- (30) a. the symptoms, the rash that gives a doctor a clue (apposition + relative clause) [Morris 52bi]  
 b. the steep path leading up from the little wooden bridge still referred to around here as ‘the Bridge of Hesitation’ [Ishiguro 2, 2i, 2ii] (*ing*- and *ed*-participle)  
 c. a visit [Ishiguro 54] one afternoon [54b] from two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c] who [/R clause/ i] turned out to be the daughters (prepositional phrase + relative clause)

Postmodification in noun phrases as constituents of non-finite clauses involves an additional dependency level, cf. (31).

- (31) no attempts [Ishiguro 151] to hide [151i] their hostility [151ib] towards us [151b $\alpha$ ]

Still more complex instances of postmodification are illustrated in (32).

- (32) a. a fact which [Morris 65bi] forces us into an attitude [65ic] of humility [65ic $\alpha$ ] that [65icii] is becoming to proper scientific investigation (two relative clauses in successive dependence, combined with postmodification by prepositional phrase);  
 b. another species [Morris 72]. a strange form [72b] of life [72b $\alpha$ ] on the dissecting table [72b $\alpha$ i], awaiting [72ibi] analysis (two prepositional phrases in successive dependence, followed by a postmodifying *ing*-participle, the whole structure occurring in apposition);  
 c. the fine cedar gateway [21], the large area [/Co-Ord/ 21b] bound [/ed/ i] by the garden wall [21b $\alpha$ ], the roof [/Co-Ord/ 21c] with its elegant tiles [21c $\alpha$ ] and its stylishly carved [/ed/ i] ridgepole [/Co-Ord/ 21c $\beta$ ] pointing out [/ing/ ii] over the view [21ii $\beta$ d] (coordination of head nouns combined with postmodification by non-finite clauses and prepositional phrases)

According to Biber et al. (1999: 578–579), the complexity of noun phrases increases across registers with conversation at one extreme and academic prose at the other. Of the other registers the one closest to academic prose is news. The results of the present study diverge in that the modification structure of the two samples does not essentially differ but rather shows a fairly comparable degree of complexity. The differences that have been found consist in a greater representa-

tion of modified noun phrases in the academic sample, which provides ground for a higher representation of NPs with complex modification structure. As regards the complex modification structure itself, the most noticeable difference is the combination of multiple coordination and subordination in the academic sample, especially in the case of apposition. The similarity between the two text sorts in this respect is to be ascribed to the rather formal tenor of the fiction sample, shown in addition to the adduced features, even by one instance of discontinuous structure (cf. (30) c.)

#### 4. Conclusion

The conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing discussion concern both non-modified and modified noun phrases. The higher representation of the former in fiction appears to be at least partly due to a relatively high frequency of occurrence of proper names, whose modification is greatly restricted in general. In the academic sample this category is marginal. On the other hand the higher representation of modified noun phrases in the latter sample appears to be at least partly connected with the structure of technical terms, which are frequently two-word formations, with the modifier specifying the meaning of the head noun or designating a subcategory of the concept denoted by the head noun.

Another feature of stylistic relevance was noted in the semantics of the pre-modifiers. While in the academic sample these modifiers, including not only adjectives, but also premodifying participles and gerunds, express classificatory meaning and often function as components of technical terms, in fiction they convey descriptive or evaluative meaning, and non-finite forms are rarer in this function.

Both quantitative and qualitative differences reflecting the subject matter of the texts were further noted in the case of the possessive case and apposition. While the possessive case, in connection with the relatively frequent occurrence of proper names, appears to characterize fiction, apposition, especially of the enumerative/exemplificatory type, reflects the expository nature of the examined academic text.

Minor differences connected with the subject matter were also found in the case of relative clauses. The syntactic functions of the relativizers differed in a marked prevalence of the subject function in the academic sample, whereas the fiction sample displayed great predominance of personal antecedents of the subject relativizers. In academic prose there was only one instance of this kind, a large majority of the antecedents of subject relativizers being inanimate.

As regards the degree of complexity in the modification structure, no major differences, either quantitative or qualitative, were noted in the two texts. This is ascribable to the formal, rather than informal tenor of the narrative, and may be classed as a feature of the author's style. Similarly, the high representation of apposition and the particular types in the academic sample may be due to the

particular field of study from which the text is drawn. Nevertheless, some of the points that have been made, notably the role of proper names, the distribution and semantics of premodifiers, and possibly some others, may be afforded more general stylistic relevance.

## Notes

- \* Stylistics being one of the major spheres of Associate Professor Ludmila Urbanová's academic pursuits, my paper for the present occasion deals with a topic from this field, as a way of paying her a modest but heart-felt tribute.
- 1 In the appended texts noun phrases containing one noun are denoted successively by Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, ...); noun phrases functioning as components of modification structures are marked by Arabic numerals and letters (1b, 1c, ...). Clausal modifiers (non-finite and finite) are denoted by small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, iv, ...), and lower dependency levels are indicated by Greek letters ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , ...). The marking is given in square brackets after each noun.
- 2 According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 326ff.), pronouns are a subcategory of nouns.
- 3 For example, there were no instances of adjectival heads, such as *the poor*, *the city poor*.

## Appendix

### Text Ishiguro

If on a sunny day [1] you climb the steep path [2] leading up [/-ing/ i] from the little wooden bridge [2ib] still referred to [/-ed/ ii] around here as 'the Bridge [2iic] of Hesitation' [2iic $\alpha$ ], you will not have to walk far before the roof [3] of my house [3b] becomes visible between the tops [4] of two ginkgo trees [4b]. Even if it did not occupy such a commanding [i/-ing] position [5] on the hill [5b], the house [6] would still stand out from all others [non-sb head] nearby [6b], so that as you come up the path [7], you may find yourself wondering what sort [8] of wealthy man [8b] owns it. But then I am not, nor have I ever been, a wealthy man [9]. The imposing [-ing/ i] air [10] of the house [10b] will be accounted for, perhaps, if I inform you that it was built by my predecessor [11], and that he was none other than Akira Sugimura [12]. Of course, you may be new to this city [13], in which case [14] the name [15] of Akira Sugimura [15b] may not be familiar to you. But mention it to anyone [non-sb head] who [R clause/ i] lived here before the war [16i] and you will learn that for thirty years or so [17], Sugimura [18] was unquestionably amongst the city's [19b] most respected and influential men [19]. If I tell you this, and when arriving at the top [20] of the hill [20b] you stand and look at the fine cedar gateway [21], the large area [Co-Ord/ 21b] bound [/-ed/ i] by the garden wall [21bi $\alpha$ ], the roof [Co-Ord/ 21c] with its elegant tiles [21c $\alpha$ ] and its stylishly carved [/-ed/ i] ridgepole [Co-Ord/ 21c $\beta$ ] pointing out [/-ing/ ii] over the view [21ii $\beta$ d], you may well wonder how I came to acquire such a property [22], being as I claim a man [23] of only moderate means [23b]. The truth [24] is, I bought the house [25] for a nominal sum [26] - a figure [26b] probably not even half the property's [26ba/ $\alpha$ ] true value [26ba] at that time [27]. This was made possible owing to a most curious - some may say foolish - procedure [28] instigated [i/ -ed] by the Sugimura family [28ib] during the sale [29]. It is now already a thing [30] of some fifteen years [30b] ago. In those days [31], when my circumstances [32] seemed to improve with each month [33], my wife [34] had begun to press me to find a new house [35]. With her usual foresight [36], she had argued the importance [37] of our having [gerund/ i] a house [37ib] in keeping [gerund/ ii] with our status [37iic] - not out of vanity [38], but for the sake of our children's [39b] marriage

prospects [39]. I saw the sense [40] in this, but since Setsuko [41], our eldest [41b], was still only fourteen or fifteen, I did not go about the matter [42] with any urgency [43]. Nevertheless, for a year or so [44], whenever I heard of a suitable house [45] for sale [45b], I would remember to make enquiries [46]. It was one [non-sb head] of my pupils [47b] who [R clause/ i] first brought it to my attention [47c] that Akira Sugimura's [48b] house [48], a year [48c] after his death [48ca], was to be sold off. That I should buy such a house [49] seemed absurd, and I put the suggestion [50] down to the exaggerated respect [51] [R clause/ i] my pupils [51b] always had for me. But I made enquiries [52] all the same, and gained an unexpected response [53]. I received a visit [54] one afternoon [54b] from two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c] who [R clause/ i] turned out to be the daughters [54id] of Akira Sugimura [54ida]. When I expressed my surprise [55] at receiving [gerund/ i] such personal attention [55ib] from a family [56] of such distinction [56b], the elder [57] of the sisters [57b] told me coldly that they had not come simply out of courtesy [58]. Over the previous months [59], a fair number [60] of enquiries [60b] had been received for their late father's [60ca] house [60c], but the family [61] had in the end [62] decided to refuse all but four [non-sb head] of the applications [63b]. These four applicants [64] had been selected carefully by family members [65] on grounds purely of good character [66] and achievement [Co-Ord 66b]. 'It is of the first importance [67] to us', she went on, 'that the house [68] [R clause/ i] our father [68ib] built should pass to one [non-sb head] [R clause/ 68ibi] he would have approved of and deemed worthy of it. Of course, circumstances [69] oblige us to consider the financial aspect [70], but this is strictly secondary. We have therefore set a price [71]. At this point [72], the younger sister [73], who [R clause/ i] had barely spoken, presented me with an envelope [74], and they watched me sternly as I opened it. Inside was a single sheet [75] of paper [75b], blank but for a figure [75c] written [/-ed/ i] elegantly with an ink brush [75id]. I was about to express my astonishment [76] at the low price [76b], but then saw from the faces [77] before me [77b] that further discussion [78] of finances [78b] would be considered distasteful. The elder sister [79] said simply: 'It will not be in the interests [80] of any [non-sb head] of you [80b] to try to outbid one another. We are not interested in receiving anything [non-sb head] beyond the quoted [/-ed/ i] price [81b]. What we mean to do from here on is to conduct an auction [82] of prestige [82b].' They had come in person [83], she explained, to ask formally on behalf of the Sugimura family [84] that I submit myself - along, of course, with the other three applicants [85] - to a closer investigation [86] of my background [86b] and credentials [Co-Ord/ 86c]. A suitable buyer [87] could thus be chosen. It was an eccentric procedure [88], but I saw nothing [non-sb head] objectionable about it [89b]; it was, after all, much the same as being involved in a marriage negotiation [90]. Indeed, I felt somewhat flattered to be considered by this old and hidebound family [91] as a worthy candidate [92]. When I gave my consent [93] to the investigation [93b], and expressed my gratitude [94] to them, the younger sister [95] addressed me for the first time [96], saying: 'Our father [97] was a cultured man [98], Mr Ono [99]. He had much respect [100] for artists [100b]. Indeed, he knew of your work [101]. In the days [102] which [R clause/ i] followed, I made enquiries [103] of my own [103b], and discovered the truth [104] of the younger sister's [104ba] words [104b]; Akira Sugimura [105] had indeed been something [non-sb head] of an art enthusiast [106b] who [R clause/ i] on numerous occasions [106ic] had supported exhibitions [106id] with his money [106ie]. I also came across certain interesting rumours [107]: a significant section [108] of the Sugimura family [108b], it seemed, had been against selling the house [109] at all, and there had been some bitter arguments [110]. In the end [111], financial pressures [112] meant a sale [113] was inevitable, and the odd procedures [114] around the transaction [114b] represented the compromise [115] reached [/-ed/ i] with those [115ib non-sb head] who [R clause/ ii] had not wished the house [115ic] to pass out of the family [115iid]. That there was something [non-sb head] high-handed about these arrangements [116b] there was no denying; but for my part [117], I was prepared to sympathize with the sentiments [118] of a family [118b] with such a distinguished history [118ba]. My wife [119], however, did not take kindly to the idea [120] of an investigation [120b]. 'Who do they think they are?' she protested. 'We should tell them we want nothing [non-sb head] further to do [inf/ 121i] with them.' 'But where's the harm [122]?' I pointed out. 'We have nothing [non-sb head] [R clause/ i 123] we wouldn't want them to

discover. True, I don't have a wealthy background [124], but no doubt [125] the Sugimuras [126] know that already, and they still think us worthy candidates [127]. Let them investigate, they can only find things [128] that [R clause/ i] will be to our advantage [128ib].<sup>7</sup> And I made a point [129] of adding [/gerund/ i]: 'In any case [130], they're doing no more than they would if we were negotiating a marriage [131] with them. We'll have to get used to this sort [132] of thing [132b]. Besides, there was surely much to admire in the idea [133] of 'an auction [133b] of prestige' [133ba], as the elder daughter [134] called it. One wonders why things [135] are not settled more often by such means [136]. How so much more honourable is such a contest [137], in which [R clause/ i] one's [137iba] moral conduct [137ib] and achievement [Co-Ord 137ic] are brought as witnesses [137id] rather than the size [137ie] of one's [137ifa] purse [137if]. I can still recall the deep satisfaction [138] [R clause/ i] I felt when I learnt the Sugimuras [139] - after the most thorough investigation [140] - had deemed me the most worthy of the house [141] [R clause/ i] they so prized. And certainly, the house [142] is one [non-sb head] worth having suffered [/gerund/ 143i] a few inconveniences [143ib] for; despite its impressive and imposing [/ing/ i] exterior [144], it is inside a place [145] of soft, natural woods [145b] selected [/ed/ i] for the beauty [145ib] of their grains [145iba], and all [non-sb head] of us [146b] who lived in it [R clause/ i] came to find it most conducive to relaxation [147] and calm [Co-Ord 147b]. For all that, the Sugimuras' [148b] high-handedness [148] was apparent everywhere during the transactions [149], some family members [150] making no attempts [151] to hide [/inf/ i] their hostility [151ib] towards us [151iba], and a less understanding buyer [152] might well have taken offence [153] and abandoned the whole matter [154]. Even in later years [155] I would sometimes encounter by chance [156] some member [157] of the family [157b] who [R clause/ i], instead of exchanging the usual kind [157b] of polite talk [157bia], would stand there in the street [158] interrogating me as to the state [159] of the house [159b] and any alterations [Co-Ord 159c] I had made [R clause/ i]. These days [160], I hardly ever hear of the Sugimuras [161]. I did, though, receive a visit [162] shortly after the surrender [163] from the younger [non-sb head b] of the two sisters [162ba] who [R clause/ i] had approached me at the time [162baic] of the sale [162baica]. The war years [164] had turned her into a thin, ailing old woman [165].

## Text Morris

THERE is a label [1] on a cage [2] at a certain zoo [2b] [R clause/ i] that states simply, 'This animal [3] is new to science' [4]. Inside the cage [5] there sits a small squirrel [6]. It has black feet [7] and it comes from Africa [8]. No black-footed squirrel [9] has ever been found in that continent [10] before. Nothing is known about it. It has no name [11].

For the zoologist [12] it presents an immediate challenge [13]. What is it about its way [14] of life [14b] that has made it unique? How does it differ from the three hundred and sixty-six other living [/ing-participle/ i] species [15] of squirrels [15b] already known and described [Co-Ord /ed-participle/ i]? Somehow, at some point [16] in the evolution [16b] of the squirrel family [16ba], the ancestors [17] of this animal [17b] must have split off from the rest [18] and established themselves as an independent breeding [/ing-participle/ i] population [19]. What was it in the environment [20] that made possible their isolation [21] as a new form [22] of life [22b]? The new trend [23] must have started out in a small way [24], with a group [25] of squirrels [25b] in one area [25ba] becoming [/ing-participle/ i] slightly changed and better adapted to the particular conditions [25c] there [/adverb/ a]. But at this stage [26] they would still be able to interbreed with their relatives [27] nearby [/adverb/ i]. The new form [28] would be at a slight advantage [29] in its special region [30], but it would be no more than a race [31] of the basic species [31b] and could be swamped out, reabsorbed into the mainstream [32] at any point [33]. If, as time [34] passed, the new squirrels [35] became more and more perfectly tuned-in to their particular environment [36], the moment [37] would eventually arrive when [R clause/ i] it would be ad-

vantageous for them to become isolated from possible contamination [38] by their neighbours [38b]. At this stage [39] their social and sexual behaviour [40] would undergo special modifications [41], making [*/ing-participle/ i*] interbreeding [41b] with other kinds [41c] of squirrels [41ca] unlikely and eventually impossible. At first, their anatomy [42] may have changed and become better at coping with the special food [43] of the district [43b], but later their mating [*/gerund/ i*] calls [44a] and displays [Co-Ord 44b] would also differ, ensuring that they attract only mates [45] of the new type [45b]. At last, a new species [46] would have evolved, separate and discrete, a unique form [46b] of life [46ba], a three hundred and sixty-seventh kind [46c] of squirrel [46ca].

When we look at our unidentified squirrel [47] in its zoo cage [47b], we can only guess about these things [48]. All [non-sb head] [*/R clause/ 49i*] we can be certain about is that the markings [50] of its fur [50b] – its black feet [50c] – indicate that it is a new form [51]. But these are only the symptoms [52], the rash [52b] that [*/R clause/ i*] gives a doctor [53] a clue [54] about his patient's [54ba] disease [54b]. To really understand this new species [55], we must use these clues [56] only as a starting [*/-ing participle/ i*] point [57], telling [*/-ing participle/ ii*] us there is something worth pursuing [non-sb head] [*/gerund/ iii*]. We might try to guess at the animal's [58b] history [58], but that would be presumptuous and dangerous. Instead we will start humbly by giving it a simple and obvious label [59]: we will call it the African black-footed squirrel [60]. Now we must observe and record every aspect [61] of its behaviour [61b] and structure [Co-Ord 61c] and see how it differs from, or is similar to, other squirrels [62]. Then, little by little, we can piece together its story [63].

The great advantage [64] we [*/R clause i*] have when studying such animals [64b] is that we ourselves are not black-footed squirrels [65] – a fact [65b] which [*/R clause i*] forces us into an attitude [65c] of humility [65ca] that [*/R clause/ ii*] is becoming to proper scientific investigation [65iid]. How different things [66] are, how depressingly different, when we attempt to study the human animal [67]. Even for the zoologist [68], who [*/R clause/ i*] is used to calling an animal [68ib] an animal [68ic], it is difficult to avoid the arrogance [69] of subjective involvement [69b]. We can try to overcome this to some extent [70] by deliberately and rather coyly approaching [*/gerund/ i*] the human being [71i] as if he were another species [72], a strange form [72b] of life [72ba] on the dissecting [*/gerund/ i*] table [72bai], awaiting [*/-ing participle/ i*] analysis [72ibi]. How can we begin?

As with the new squirrel [73], we can start by comparing him with other species [74] that [*/R clause/ i*] appear to be most closely related. From his teeth [75], his hands [Co-Ord 75b], his eyes [Co-Ord 75c] and various other anatomical features [Co-Ord 75d], he is obviously a primate [76] of some sort [76b], but of a very odd kind [76c]. Just how odd becomes clear when we lay out in a long row [77] the skins [78] of the one hundred and ninety-two living [*/-ing participle/ i*] species [78b] of monkeys [78ba] and apes [Co-Ord 78bβ], and then try to insert a human pelt [79] at a suitable point [80] somewhere in this long series [81]. Wherever we put it, it looks out of place. Eventually we are driven to position it right at one end [82] of the row [82b] of skins [82ba], next to the hides [83] of the tailless great apes [83b] such as the chimpanzee [83c] and the gorilla [Co-Ord 83d]. Even here it is obtrusively different. The legs [84] are too long, the arms [85] are too short and the feet [86] are rather strange. Clearly this species [87] of primate [87b] has developed a special kind [88] of locomotion [88b] which [*/R clause/ i*] has modified its basic form [88bic]. But there is another characteristic [89] that [*/R clause/ i*] cries out for attention [89ib]: the skin [90] is virtually naked. Except for conspicuous tufts [91] of hair [91b] on the head [91ba], in the armpits [Co-Ord 91bβ] and around the genitals [Co-Ord 91bγ], the skin surface [92] is completely exposed. When compared with the other primate species [93], the contrast [94] is dramatic. True, some species [95] of monkeys [95b] and apes [Co-Ord 95c] have small naked patches [96] of skin [96b] on their rumps [97ba], their faces [Co-Ord 97bβ], or their chests [Co-Ord 97bγ], but nowhere amongst the other one hundred and ninety-two species [98] is there anything [non-sb head] even approaching [*/-ing participle, i*] the human condition [99i]. At this point [100] and without further investigation [101], it is justifiable to name this new species [102] the 'naked ape' [103]. It is a simple, descrip-



tive name [104] based [/-ed participle/ i] on a simple observation [104ib], and it makes no special assumptions [105]. Perhaps it will help us to keep a sense [106] of proportion [106b] and maintain our objectivity [107].

Staring at this strange specimen [108] and puzzling over the significance [109] of its unique features [109b], the zoologist [110] now has to start making comparisons [111]. Where else is nudity [112] at a premium [113]? The other primates [114] are no help [115], so it means looking farther afield. A rapid survey [116] of the whole range [116b] of the living [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [116ba] soon proves that they are remarkably attached to their protective, furry covering [117], and that very few [non-sb head] of the 4,237 species [118b] in existence [118ba] have seen fit to abandon it. Unlike their reptilian ancestors [119], mammals [120] have acquired the great physiological advantage [121] of being [/gerund/ i] able to maintain a constant, high body temperature [121ib]. This keeps the delicate machinery [122] of the body processes [122b] tuned in for top performance [123]. It is not a property [124] to be [/-infinitive/ i] endangered or discarded lightly. The temperature-controlling devices [125] are of vital importance [126] and the possession [127] of a thick, hairy, insulating [/-ing participle/ i] coat [127b] obviously plays a major role [128] in preventing [/gerund i] heat loss [129]. In intense sunlight [130] it will also prevent over-heating [131] and damage [Co-Ord 131b] to the skin [131ba] from direct exposure [132] to the sun's [132ba] rays [132b]. If the hair [133] has to go, then clearly there must be a very powerful reason [134] for abolishing [/gerund/ i] it. With few exceptions [135] this drastic step [136] has been taken only when mammals [137] have launched themselves into an entirely new medium [138]. The flying [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [139], the bats [139b], have been forced to denude their wings [140], but they have retained their furriness [141] elsewhere and can hardly be counted as naked species [142]. The burrowing [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [143] have in a few cases [144] – the naked mole rat [144b], the aardvark [Co-Ord 144c] and the armadillo [Co-Ord 144d], for example – reduced their hair covering [145]. The aquatic animals [146] such as the whales [Co-Ord 146b], dolphins [Co-Ord 146c], porpoises [Co-Ord 146d], dugongs [Co-Ord 146e], manatees [Co-Ord 146f] and hippopotamuses [Co-Ord 146g] have also gone naked as part [147] of a general streamlining [147b]. But for all the more typical surface-dwelling mammals [148], whether scampering about on the ground [149] or clambering around in the vegetation [150], a dense hairy hide [151] is the basic rule [152]. Apart from those abnormally heavy giants [153], the rhinos [153b] and the elephants [Co-Ord 153c] (which [R clause/ i] have heating and cooling [/gerund/ ii] problems [153id] of their own [153ida], the naked ape [154] stands alone, [marked off by his nudity from all the thousands of hairy, shaggy or furry land-dwelling mammalian species.]

## Sources

Desmon Morris, *The Naked Ape*. Triad Grafton Books. London, 1977. Pp. 13–16.

Kazuo Ishiguro, *An Artist of the Floating World*. Faber and Faber. London, 1990. Pp. 7–11.

## References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

LIBUŠE DUŠKOVÁ is Professor Emerita of English Language at the Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Charles University, Prague. Her books include *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (A Grammar of Contemporary English against the background of Czech) and two volumes of *Studies in the English Language*. She is the author of the translation of Vilém Mathesius' *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistickém* (A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis), editor of the English translation of *Dictionnaire de l'École linguistique de Prague* (Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics) and chief editor of the international academic journal *Linguistica Pragensia*. Her recent research concentrates on the relations between syntax and information structure, with extension into text organization.

Address: Prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, Dr.Sc., Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic. [e-mail: libuse.duskova@ff.cuni.cz]



