

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.05>

UDC: 81'37:811.111

Yuliia M. Puhach

PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor,
English Philology Department,
Foreign Philology Faculty,
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,
Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9890-1354>

e-mail: yu.m.puhach@npu.edu.ua



SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH POSSESSIVE SUBSTANTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Bibliographic Description:

Puhach, Yu. (2022). Semantic Features of English Possessive Substantive Constructions. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 24, 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.05>

Abstract

The paper deals with the category of possession as a linguistic category and the semantics of English possessive substantive constructions. Possession is a linguistic universal, a fundamental linguistic category with a complex and heterogeneous meaning and a plane of expression, therefore there are several directions of its study in linguistics. In a broad sense, possession expresses spatial relations between two objects, when one of them is considered as an element of the “personal sphere” of another object, or when one object (person) has the right to own, use and dispose of another object.

In this paper the author reveals relevant features of the category of possession (‘activity’ – ‘subordination’, ‘alienability’ – ‘inalienability’, ‘static’ – ‘dynamic’, ‘entry’ – ‘inclusion’) and outlines differences between possessive predicative and substantive constructions in English. It is noted that predicative constructions are unambiguous: the subject of the possessive relation is expressed, and the possessive information is embedded in the construction itself. Substantive constructions are polysemic: the object of the possessive relation is expressed, and possessive information is asserted.

The paper also examines the main semantic relations of possessive substantive constructions and the peculiarities of their functioning. The English language demonstrates the variability of lexical and grammatical means of expressing possessive relations. Models that represent the semantic relation of possession in substantive constructions include pre-nominal genitive and the post-nominal genitive. English has two canonical constructions for attributive possession. The first one uses the clitic /-'s/ or a possessive pronoun and it is known as ‘the s-genitive’ (or ‘Saxon genitive’). The second one uses the preposition /of/ and

it is known as 'the of-genitive'. The choice of one or another design depends on various factors, such as: possessor's belonging to the category of beings / non-beings; the number of the noun expressing the attribute; complexity of the attribute; the attribute / core significance, etc.

Keywords: the category of possession, possessive substantive construction, genitive construction, of-construction, possessive relations, lexical semantics.

1. Introduction.

The concept of ownership, property is one of the central in the process of human cognition of the surrounding reality and is reflected in all natural languages. This concept is, of course, strongly dependent on the culture and mentality of native speakers. The concept of ownership is based on the relationship between two different entities. These relations in society can be officially established and acquire an institutional character. Socio-cultural factors offer further motivations for expressing possessive meanings. These include the status of possessor and possessee, and their interactions with one another in the societal structure. Meanings encoded within possessive structures often reflect relationships within a society, and change if the society changes. In addition, language contact may affect the meanings and the forms of possessive constructions.

The category of possession is one of the universal conceptual categories of the language, the main meaning of which is the definition of the name of an object through its relation to a certain person or object (Milovanova, 2007, p. 95). This meaning of possession can be expressed by multilevel linguistic means, the set of which is individual for each language. The greatest characteristic in the linguistic literature was obtained by such language units expressing of possession as possessive pronouns. However, if possessive pronoun is something undeniable in many languages, then the issue of the semantic domain of possession in general still remains unexplored.

2. Literature Review.

Possession is a fundamental linguistic category, which is a linguistic universal. In modern linguistics, there are several directions for studying the category of possession, which is due to the heterogeneity and complexity of its content and plan of expression. Scientists understand possession as a functional-semantic (Abrosymova, Boldyrev, Bondarko, Danylchuk, Mishenina (2005), and others) or as a functional-syntactic field (Dolynina, Zhurynska, and others). From the standpoint of semantic syntax, possession is considered by Chanyшева, Holovachova, Kolechko, Konstantinova, Kreidler, Langacker, Lynch, Ogawa, Podolska, and others. As a category of cognitive linguistics, possession is studied by Aikhenvald & Storch, Heine (2006), Kibryk, Levina, Milovanova (2007), Taylor (1996), Velasquez-Castillo, and Zhabotynska.

The category of possession finds its expression in various languages of the world, as evidenced by numerous studies. On the material of English and German, possession was studied by Chanyшева, English and Uzbek by Chariiev, German and Ukrainian by Konstantinova. Based on the material of individual languages this category was studied by Komlyakova, Podolska, and others in English; Guivaniuk and Mishenina (2005) in Ukrainian; Stepanian and Sattarov in German; Abrosimova and Langacker in French; Alisova in Italian; Pysarkova in Polish.

3. Aim and Objectives.

The *aim* of the paper is to determine the means of realising possession with the help of possessive-substantive constructions in English, as well as to study the semantic features of possessive relations.

The set aim determines the solution of the following *objectives*:

- to analyse the features of the category of possession;
- to determine the actants of possessive relations;
- to reveal the semantics of possessive substantive constructions in English.

4. Methodology.

The *methodological* basis of the study are the works dealing with the category of possession analysis (Aikhenvald (2013; 2019), Bondarko, Guivaniuk (1977), Heine (2006), and Taylor (1996)) and the studies of individual possessive constructions (Kibryk, Milovanova (2007), Schneider (2018), Seliverstova, and Stefanowitsch (2003)).

The aim and objectives determined the use of the following *methods* of linguistic analysis: definitional and component analysis, descriptive method, and modelling.

The *material* of the research are possessive constructions selected by the method of continuous sampling from the texts of fiction and journalism, as well as Internet resources.

5. Results.

Scientists consider possession as a field containing ordered content elements, corresponding to formal means of expression (Guivaniuk, 1977; Toporov). Guivaniuk understands linguistic category of possession as the transfer of real possessive relations, that is, relations between the object (substance) of possession and its owner (possessor) by a certain set of grammatical means. Such possessive constructions include combinations with the adjective design of the possessor (possessive and some possessive-relative adjectives, possessive and other pronouns) and with the substantive expression of the possessor (genitive and dative cases, certain prepositional-exclusive combinations) (Guivaniuk, 1977, pp. 7–8). Possession may be marked in many ways, such as simple juxtaposition of nouns, possessive case, possessed case, or adpositions (possessive suffixes, possessive adjectives). English uses a possessive clitic /'s/, a preposition /of/ and adjectives *my*, *your*, *his*, *her*, etc.: *Mary's father*, *children's book*, *a friend of my mother's*, *my pencil*, *his address*.

Mishenina interprets possession as one of the “universal categories that manifests itself at the semantic-syntactic level as a functional-semantic category that reflects the relationship between two objects, when one object is perceived as an element of the personal sphere of another object (person) or when one object (person) has the right to own or use another object (material)” (2005, p. 5).

The referent in the possessive construction is the relationship between the object of possession and its owner, and the grammatical meaning is the possessive relationships as one of the types of attributive syntactic relationships. Possessive relations in the constructions to indicate the connection ‘possessor – object’ reveal the following semantic components: 1) the object of possession is a dependent substance, forming the space of the subject; 2) the subject of possession (possessor) is an independent substance and is the bearer of the predicative sign of possession; 3) the predicative sign of possession is presented as the direction of the relationship from the possessor to the object (Mishenina, 2005, p. 4).

The grammatical meaning of the possessive construction is formed by the following indicators: 1) lexical content of the components of the combination ‘subject + owner’; 2) their lexical-grammatical features (name of a creature or object, proper or general, concreteness or abstraction of semantics); 3) their morphological nature, especially the word-forming and semantic correspondence of the main component (subject) with other parts of the language; 4) presence or absence of a preposition in case form; 5) contextual environment of the syntactic function in the sentence (Guivaniuk, 1977, pp. 8–9).

The category of possession is based on the ‘possession situation’, the conceptual basis of which is interpreted in different ways. In a broad sense, possession expresses spatial

relations when one of the objects “includes” or “enters” another. Mishenina considers the possessive relationship as “a state of “entry” or “inclusion”, since the selection of the spheres of the possessor expands the boundaries of relations at the level of subject – objective reality” (Mishenina, 2005, p. 5). Guivaniuk believes that possession as a semantic-grammatical category should include constructions that express the relationship of belonging not only between a person (or a living being in general) and a specific object (*Olivia’s bag, John’s car*), but also the definition of the relationship between people (*the children’s parents, a friend of mine*). The researcher defines “subject of possession” as a substance under which the names of non-being and being, as well as substantivized (objectified) actions (*paternal protection*) and substantivized (objectified) qualities (*maternal kindness*) are subsumed. The owner of a certain substance can only be a living being (first of all, a person, much less often an animal) and only in the conditions of personification – a non-being (Guivaniuk, 1977, p. 9).

In the basic possessive construction, the subject of the relation is active, the object is passive, because the possessive relation is directed to it. Since in linguistic reality the model of possessive relations is anthropocentric, the subject of possession is expressed by lexemes to denote a person. In the semantic structure, such lexemes contain the relational meaning ‘owner’. Possessive space is formed by objects, events, phenomena, and other persons (Mishenina, 2005, p. 8).

Relevant features for possessive relations Mishenina calls the opposition ‘activity’ – ‘subordination’, ‘alienability’ – ‘inalienability’, ‘static’ – ‘dynamic’, ‘entry’ – ‘inclusion’. According to the nature of the possessive relationship, scientists distinguish between subordinate and dominant ownership. Subordinate belonging is a passive, uncontrolled relationship between two separate objects in which the possessive object or the very existence of the relationship is independent of the possessor. Dominant belonging is an active, controlled relationship between two separate objects in which the possessor or the presence of the relationship depends on the possessor. The sphere of alienability includes objects of the surrounding reality (specific object, material values, clothes, food, premises, and outbuildings). The understanding of inalienability is based on the fact that possessive relations arise between an independent substance (subjects) and a dependent (objects) – a given, mandatory component of the possessor. Relationships of belonging are also contrasted at the level of the opposition ‘permanence’ – ‘temporality’ of connection. Persistent ownership contains information about an object that is permanently associated with its possessor. Temporal ownership defines an object as being related to the possessor by a temporal relation. The concept of ‘permanence’ reflects homogeneity, identity, and integrity of relationships. ‘Impermanence’ is defined as splitting or one-act, breaking or restoring of connections. Therefore, in general sense, static characterises the relationship of own possession (Mishenina, 2005, p. 9).

In every usage the term ‘possession’ tends to be used in a restricted meaning of ‘ownership’, as pointed out by Lyons (1977, p. 722). ‘Possessive’ noun phrases may subsume a range of meaning within a broad concept of ‘association’ between entities (Aikhenvald, 2012, pp. 2–6). According to Aikhenvald, the recurrent core meaning of general associative noun phrases involve at least the following: 1) ownership (of property); 2) whole part relations which typically include body parts of humans and animals, and parts of plants and inanimate entities; 3) kinship relations, which cover blood or consanguineal relations (by birth) and affinal relations (through marriage); 4) association in general (*Michael’s dentist*); 5) location and orientation oftentimes based on extension of whole-part relation of inanimates (*bottom of the lake, side of the car*); 6) attribute of a person or another entity (*a man’s temperament, Michael’s joy*); 7) time, quantification, material, and property

((every) *minute of the day, a kilo of sugar, half of the beans, a house of stone, a stone of value*); 8) characteristics and classification of a person or an object (*a bear of a man, a slip of a girl*) (2019, p. 8).

Taking into account the criteria for the formation of the grammatical meaning of a syntactic construction with an adjectival or substantive expression of a possessor, Guivaniuk distinguishes eight main structural-semantic models within the defined type of possessive constructions: 1) constructions with a proper possessive meaning (*the girl's hat, Peter and Helen's flat*); 2) constructions with the meaning of agentive (author's) ownership (*Shakespeare's plays, works of Dickens*); 3) constructions with the meaning of possessive-partitive relations, or relations of immanent possession (*the horse's leg, girl's cheeks*); 4) constructions with a possessive-relational meaning (*Kate's friends, my friend's father*); 5) constructions with a possessive-subjective meaning (*grandmother's answer, judge's speech*); 6) constructions with a possessive-qualifying meaning (*a child's whim*); 7) constructions with a possessive-objective meaning (*the man's release*); 8) constructions of the possessive-nominative and connotative type (*Jane's beauty*) (Guivaniuk, 1977, p. 10).

Mishenina classifies possessive predicative structures according to the semantic component, namely: 1) constructions of organic belonging, conveying the relation of inalienability, which are understood as mandatory for each specific subject, and containing knowledge that each being has parts, body organs (an object is a part of a possessor; the space is an entry); 2) constructions of inorganic belonging, which reflect the relationship between a person and a thing; man and man; 3) diffuse-type constructions that reflect the relationship between a person and an abstract concept (relationships that convey the mental, intellectual properties of a person; relationships that reflect the results of spiritual development of reality) (Mishenina, 2005, pp. 8–11).

Depending on the specificity or generalization of possessive relations, single, group and generic belonging are distinguished. If a specific substance is associated with a single specific owner, then such belonging is individual (*the boy's shoes*), but if with a group of owners, then such belonging is group (*the workers' tools*). Generalized possessive relations (*a pack of lions*) are understood as family belonging. In addition, if the possessor is called by a proper name, then the possessive relations are more specific (individual singular belonging), and if the name of the possessor is general, the belonging is less specific (non-individualized).

Possessive-substantive constructions in English usually consist of two nominal components, where the object is always nominalized, and the possessor is represented by a possessive pronoun, adjective or noun. Certain abstract relations of cognitive compatibility are established between the components of substantive constructions, in particular, possessive relations, which are considered as any relations between two entities that is closer than the usual location in space (Kibryk, Milovanova, 2007; Seliverstova, and others). Such relations are transformed into a qualifier – signifier pattern, where the possessor-definition is not the subject of ownership, but serves to express the quality, property or condition of the object of ownership, for example: *a grocery shop*.

The concept of possession corresponds to various structures and meanings – predication and attribution, associated with the corresponding types of means of expressing possession – predicative (*This mobile phone is mine*) and attributive (*my mobile phone*), between which there are certain differences.

Dubchak gives the following differences between possessive predicative and substantive constructions of the English language: in predicative construction possessive information is embedded in the construction itself, the subject of the possessive relation is emphasized; such constructions are unambiguous. In substantive constructions possessive

information is affirmed, the object of the possessive relation is emphasized; these constructions are polysemic (Dubchak, 2012, p. 4).

Due to the ability to represent a wide range of possessive relations, linguistic means of expressing possession convey various components (aspects, features, characteristics, etc.) of this connection. Lexico-grammatical and structural linguistic means of expressing possession have the ability of variable and alternative description of similar situations.

6. Discussion.

Despite the universality of the category of possession the Ukrainian and English languages demonstrate the variability of the lexical and grammatical means they use to express possessive relations (Sitnov, 2005, p. 278). The differences in the means of expressing the possessive relation in English and Ukrainian, as well as the peculiarities of the functioning of these means in English, require detailed study. Therefore, the patterns representing the semantic relation of possession in English substantive constructions include the pre-nominal genitive and the post-nominal genitive (Keizer, 2007; Korunets, 2004).

Possessive constructions can be used to express a wide variety of semantic relations. English has two canonical constructions for attributive possession. The first uses the clitic /'s/ or a possessive pronoun and is known as the *s*-genitive (or Saxon genitive): e.g. *the car's / its windshield*. The second uses the preposition /of/ and is known as the *of*-genitive: *the windshield of the car*. These most common nominative means of expressing possession cause the main mistakes in speech when transmitting the possessive relation. The reason of mistakes is ignorance of the use of a certain construction in English, since in English there is a restriction on certain classes of words used in these constructions. A number of factors are known to play a role in the choice between construction with a pre-nominal genitive and with the preposition *of*: information structural, semantic, morphological, phonological and, structural ones.

Both constructions are highly polysemous as to the nature of the relation between the two noun phrases. A few of the semantic relations associated with possessives include:

- alienable possession: *John's computer*;
- kinship: *My sister was surprisingly late*;
- part-whole relations: *The car's windshield*;
- thematic roles: *The boy's murder was never reported*. (This is actually ambiguous: The role that the boy fills with respect to the predicate murder could be either agent or patient, depending on whether he was the victim or perpetrator) (Blodgett & Schneider, 2018, p. 1529).

Linguistic study has shown that possessive constructions in English can denote a number of semantic relations (Taylor, 1996; Rosenbach, 2002; Heine, 2006), in particular describes prototypical forms of possession (legal ownership, kinship, body parts, part-whole relations) and non-prototypical possession (other semantic relations) (Rosenbach, 2002; Wolk et al., 2013). Stefanowitsch demonstrates that *s*-genitive and *of*-genitive are not interchangeable, and further the genitive alternation is not fully predictable from animacy, givenness, or syntactic weight. *S*-genitive and *of*-genitive are each polysemous but not interchangeable (Stefanowitsch, 2003, pp. 418–419).

The existence of these two structures (*s*-genitive and *of*-construction) for the expression of possession in English does not involve that they are interchangeable. Rosenbach, for example, argues that factors such as animacy, topicality and possessive relation play a role in the choice between the Genitive and the *of*-construction (Rosenbach, 2002, p. 42). The more animate a possessor is, the more likely it is that the Genitive construction is used; if the possessor is topical, the Genitive construction is also more likely

to be chosen than the *of*-construction; if the relation between the possessor and the possessum is one of core possession, inalienable possession for instance, then the Genitive construction is the preferred expression (Rosenbach, 2002, p. 120). Rosenbach finds that when there is a conflict between the factors, for instance when a possessor is animate but not topical, animacy is the most influential factor, ahead of topicality, which in turn influences the choice of expression more than the nature of the possessive relation (Rosenbach, 2002). Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik also discuss animacy pointing out that possessors in Genitive constructions tend to refer to classes of gender nouns (human beings, higher animals, and collective nouns with personal gender characteristics in particular). Thus, as in example *The boy's new bicycle. / The new bicycle of the boy*, when the possessor has a [+ animate] feature, the Saxon genitive construction is preferably used; whereas when the possessor, as in example *The problem's part. / The part of the problem*, has an [- animate] feature, the *of*-construction is either the preferred option or the only possible option (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 323).

The alternation between Genitive constructions and *of*-constructions in the expression of possession in English often creates confusion among non-native speakers of English. This is so because even if speakers are familiar with the existence of the two constructions they might not be that familiar with their different distribution.

Schneider points out three main categories of English possessive constructions (Blodgett & Schneider, 2018, p. 1530):

1) CONFIGURATION subtypes. The most prototypical possessive scenarios are stative relationships between entities. Excluding relations of place and time (which may apply to static or dynamic scenes), these fall under the configuration portion of the supersense hierarchy. This category includes such supersenses: a) 'characteristic': *a place of beauty, a person of honour*, NP1 of NP2, where NP1 refers to an entity and NP2 to a quality of that entity; b) 'comparison': *the opposite of cheap*. This category exists primarily for *than, like, as*, and similar prepositions that can be used in various statements of comparison, contrast, similarity, or differentiation. Occasionally, a predicate like *opposite* uses *of* to mark such a role; c) 'gestalt': *her flexibility and accessibility, quality of work*; d) 'identity': *a neat gem of a restaurant*. This label is used for constructions that establish some sort of equation between the two noun phrases. With *of*, the head noun is a category being ascribed to the dependent. The above example can be paraphrased as *a restaurant that is a neat gem*; e) 'possession': *the owner of a new car*. For *of*-genitive and *s*-genitive, this is restricted to arguments of a predicate of ownership. In a way, this example is also a 'theme'. With *the car's owner*, the labels 'possession' and 'gestalt' both seem to apply (because the owner is a piece of information typically associated with cars); f) possessor: *her dog*; g) 'orgrole': *his firm, a customer of his store*. The dependent noun phrase is an organization / institution with which somebody (denoted by the head noun phrase) has an association; h) quantity: *plenty of parking*. The preposition *of* is frequently used in various expressions of quantity which cannot be paraphrased with the *s*-genitive; i) 'social relation': *her brother, a friend of mine*. This category covers relationships between persons, including kinship, friendship, and business or other social associations (e.g. *my teacher*). The *s*-genitive is far more popular than *of* for this relation; j) 'species': *that kind of behaviour*; k) 'stuff': *the piece of metal*; l) 'whole': *judge a book by its cover, the inside of my car*;

2) PARTICIPANT subtypes. Nominalization and other processes result in the realisation of participant roles with possessive marking. This category includes such supersenses: a) 'agent': *her help, the fault of the parts supplier*; b) 'beneficiary': *children's clothes*; c) 'causer': *the fire's damage, victim of adversity*; d) 'cost': *a tax bill of \$6 000*; e) 'experience': *will exceed your expectations, a favourite of our family*; f) 'instrument':

usage of product barcodes; g) ‘originator’: *his advice, in the words of my son*. Originator is defined as “animate who is the initial possessor or creator / producer of something, including the speaker / communicator of information” (Schneider et al., 2017, p. 17); h) ‘recipient’: *my delivery*; i) ‘stimulus’: *a fear of snakes*; j) ‘topic’: *kept me apprised of status*; k) ‘theme’: *my next haircut, spraying of pesticides, a dish full of filler vegetables*. ‘Agent’, ‘experiencer’, and ‘originator’ are not infrequently expressed with the *s*-genitive. ‘Stimulus’, ‘theme’, and ‘topic’ are not infrequently expressed with *of*. The rest are rarely observed in possessive constructions;

3) CIRCUMSTANCE subtypes. Rarely expressed with possessive constructions. This category includes such supersenses: a) ‘duration’: *a year’s worth of dirty clothes*; b) ‘locus’: *Miami’s best beach; I am just south of Walnut*. ‘Locus’ is used for concrete as well as abstract locations, including states and values; c) ‘extent’: *a production increase of 10%*; d) ‘manner’: *My room reeks of old cigarette smoke*; e) ‘time’: *today’s tough times, March of 2010*.

Possessive constructions are also recorded in multiword expressions, including proper names and idioms. We did not apply supersenses to possessives used within a completely fixed phrase, such as the proper name *Ben’s Chili Bowl* or the shorter ‘local genitive’: *Ben’s is a great restaurant* (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, pp. 329–330).

In addition, various idioms license a noun phrase constituent that is required to be possessively marked (but the noun phrase itself is not fixed). These include possessed idioms, where the pronoun in the possessive slot agrees with a noun phrase in another syntactic position (Bond et al., 2013, 2015): e.g. *try (one)’s best* (which can be instantiated as *I tried my best*, not *I try Mary’s best* or *I try her best*); *be quick on (one)’s feet*; *be on (one)’s own*. Other idiom with a possessive slot does not enforce agreement: e.g. *(one)’s hour / time of need (I help in Mary’s hour of need)*.

7. Conclusion.

Apart from occasional disagreements about the semantic boundaries of categories, annotating the *s*-genitive can feel counterintuitive: it is easy to accidentally focus on the role of the head noun and apply the inverse label, i.e. ‘possession’ instead of ‘possessor’ or ‘characteristic’ instead of ‘gestalt’ (Blodgett, Schneider, 2018, p. 1532).

There are noticeable differences in distribution of supersenses between *of* and genitive case markers (*’s* and possessive pronouns). Supersenses that are only attested for */of/* include ‘characteristic’, ‘identity’, ‘quantity’, ‘species’, ‘stimulus’, ‘stuff’, and ‘topic’. Supersenses that are only attested for *’s/* and possessive prepositions include ‘beneficiary’, ‘orgrole’, ‘recipient’, and ‘possessor’.

The definition of possession as a category is confirmed by the presence of such oppositions as the internal / external nature of possession, real / virtual belonging, alienable / inalienable, absolute / relative belonging, provided by heterogeneous means of expression.

In English the most common nominative means of expressing possession are the pre-nominal *s*-genitive and the post-nominal *of*-genitive. The analysis has established that two syntactic patterns that both express possession as a time-stable and presupposed relation are not equivalent semantically or pragmatically and, therefore, cannot be treated simply as structural variants of a single possessive schema. Each pattern encodes a distinct conceptualization of possessive relations, compatible with different communicative context.

An existing broad-coverage semantic annotation scheme for adpositions can be applied to English possessive constructions. Annotation reveals major distributional differences between prepositional *of* and the *s*-genitive.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2013). Possession and ownership: a cross linguistic perspective. *Possession and ownership: a cross-linguistic typology*, 1–64. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199660223.003.0001.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2019). Expressing 'possession': motivations, meanings, and forms. *Possession in languages of Europe and North and Central Asia*, 7–25. doi:10.1075/slcs/206.
- Blodgett, A. & Schneider, N. (2018). Semantic supersenses for English possessives, 1529–1534. Retrieved October 05, 2022 from <https://aclanthology.org/L18-1242.pdf>.
- Bond, F., Ho, J., & Flickinger, D. (2015). Feeling our way to an analysis of English possessed idioms. *Proc. of HPSG*, 61–74.
- Bond, F., Sameha, Sh., & Flickinger, D. (2013). Making English possessed idioms our own. *Proc. of HPSG*. Berlin.
- Dubchak, I. P. (2012). Lihvistychni osoblyvosti anhliiskykh substantyvnykh konstruktssii u monolohichnomu movlenni [Linguistic peculiarities of English substantive constructions in monologic speech]. *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho lihvistychnoho universytetu*, 21, 161–170. [in Ukrainian].
- Guivaniuk, N. V. (1977). Sredstva vyrazheniia pritiashatel'nosti v ukrainskom literaturnom yazyke (na material proizvedeniia pisatelei XIX-XX vv.) [Means of expressing possession in the Ukrainian literary language (based on the works of writers of the 19th – 20th centuries)]. *Avtoreferat*, 24 p. [in Russian].
- Heine, B. (2006). *Possession: cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Keizer, E. (2007). *The English noun phrase. The nature of linguistic categorization*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 379 p.
- Korunets, I. V. (2004). *Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian languages*. Vinnytsa: Nova Knyha, 460 p.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics: Volume 2*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 897 p.
- Milovanova, M. V. (2007). Poniatiie possessivnosti: problem opredeleniia i struktury [The concept of possession: problems of definition and structure]. *Vestnik VolGU*, 6, 95–102. [in Russian].
- Mishenina, T. M. (2005). Strukturno-semantychni osoblyvosti syntaksysnykh konstruktssii posesyvnosti v suchasni ukrainskii movi [Structural and semantic features of syntactic constructions of possession in modern Ukrainian]. *Avtoreferat*, 20. [in Ukrainian].
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A concise grammar of contemporary English*. Harcourt School.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Harlow, Essex : Longman.
- Rosenbach, A. (2002). *Genitive variation in English: conceptual factors in synchronic and diachronic studies*. Berlin: Mouton the Gruyter, 361. doi:[10.1515/9783110899818](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110899818).
- Sitnov, Y. A. (2005). Kommunikativno-kognitivnyi podkhod k razvitiu grammaticheskoi kompetentsii studentov-lingvistov (na materiale slozhnykh grammaticheskikh yavlenii ispanskogo yazyka) [Communicative-cognitive approach to the development of grammatical competence of linguistic students (on the material of complex grammatical phenomena of Spanish)]. *Dissertatsiia*, 345 p. [in Russian].
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2003). Constructional semantics as a limit to grammatical alternation: The two genitives of English. *Topics in English linguistics*, 43, 413–444.
- Taylor, J. (1996). *Possessives in English: An exploration in cognitive grammar*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Wolk, Ch., Bresnan, J., Rosenbach, A., & Szmrecsanyi, B. (2013). Dative and genitive variability in late modern English: Exploring cross-constructural variation and change. *Diachronica*, 30 (3), 382–419.

Бібліографічний опис:

Пугач, Ю. М. (2022). Семантичні характеристики англійських посесивних субстантивних конструкцій. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 24, 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.05>.

Анотація

У статті досліджено посесивність як лінгвістичну категорію та семантику англійських посесивних субстантивних конструкцій. Посесивність є мовною універсалією, фундаментальною лінгвістичною категорією зі складним і неоднорідним змістом та планом вираження, тому в лінгвістиці існує декілька напрямів її вивчення. У широкому розумінні посесивність виражає

просторові відношення між двома об'єктами, коли один із них розглядається як елемент 'особистої сфери' іншого об'єкта, або коли один об'єкт (особа) має право володіння, користування і розпорядження іншим об'єктом.

Виявлено релевантні ознаки категорії посесивності ('активність' – 'субординативність', 'відчужуваність' – 'невідчужуваність', 'статичність' – 'динамічність', 'входження' – 'включення'), відмінності посесивних предикативних та субстантивних конструкцій в англійській мові (у предикативних конструкціях виражається суб'єкт присвійного відношення, посесивна інформація закладена в самій конструкції, ці конструкції однозначні; у субстантивних конструкціях виражається об'єкт присвійного відношення, посесивна інформація стверджується, ці конструкції полісемічні).

Розглянуто основні семантичні відношення посесивних субстантивних конструкцій та особливості їх функціонування. Англійська мова демонструє варіативність лексичних і граматичних засобів для вираження посесивних відношень. До моделей, які представляють семантичне відношення посесивності в субстантивних конструкціях, належать моделі з преномінальним означенням та моделі з постномінальним означенням. В англійській мові існують дві канонічні конструкції для вираження атрибутивної приналежності: *s-генітив* та *of-генітив*. Вибір тієї чи іншої конструкції залежить від різних факторів, а саме: належності посесора до категорії істот/неістот; числа іменника, що виражає означення; складності означення; значимості означення/ядра тощо.

Ключові слова: категорія посесивності, посесивно-субстантивна конструкція, конструкція з родовим відмінком, конструкція з прийменником *of*, посесивні відношення, лексична семантика.