CO-ORDINATE AND EQUATIVE IMPLICATIONS IN APPOSITIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Charles V. Taylor
The University of Sydney

(Received July, 1971)

1. The use of the term apposition is by no means consistent. Types similar to the following have all appeared at various times as examples in English grammars:

   1. slave girl
   2. Peter the Hermit.
   3. John, the first to arrive...
   4. John was hungry, a fairly common condition for him.
   5. the question whether he should come or not
   6. die Stadt Hamburg

   In this study I exclude certain structures which are not normally called apposition, e.g.

   (i) the 'free adjunct': a shepherd boy, he rose to become Prior of Lindisfarne; which has a corresponding adjectival type: automatically calm, she sat by the bedside.

   (ii) noun-like qualifiers (if such they are): the sum total- cf. lion rampant, again a corresponding adjectival type

   (iii) specification: small cars, for example, the Volkswagen, which appears to me to be semantically different from my main examples

   (iv) structures with dummy subjects it or there, since the substituted clause may be regarded as a sentence element, so that these structures merit separate treatment.

2. Fries's original telephonic utterances[1] included some similar to (2) such as :

   7. we want you to come to the banquet the farewell dinner

   and others similar to (3) like

   8. J. L.my assistant will come for them about ten forty-five

   The inclusion of these examples shows that apposition is not merely a literary phenomenon but is part of the spoken language. Apposition of diverse types certainly occurs in pre-literate societies, e.g. Nkorekiga, an interlacustrine Bantu language, shows in a recorded folk-tale:

omukama warucuncu	'Lord Lion'
wakami omugurusi	'Old Man Rabbit' (lit: rabbit old man)

exemplifying two distinct apposition types.

3. Most languages exhibit a range of forms, usually identifiable as 'forms having the same referent', that is, 'intensive' in systemic grammar terms. Such a definition is, of course, open to different interpretations. Apart from the problem of 'same' there is the basic term 'referent', interpretable either as 'things in the world outside' or, following Halliday and avoiding assumptions about 'reality', 'extralinguistic experience'.[2] It is possible to define a little more closely and to specify 'different references to the same referent', with some gain in clarity, though in a trivial sense if meaning is then said to vary with each distinct form. Such a definition would have to be adopted, but might still not suffice, where apposition and co-ordination clearly occur together, as in :

9. John Ogdon the pianist and composer

where the community of reference between 'pianist' and'composer is dependent on their community of reference with 'John Ogdon', i.e. the appositional relationship determines the co-ordinate. This means that any attempt to classify apposition within co-ordination must be made independently of referential criteria. But this sentence also suggests that any compound apposition probably exhibits co-ordination between its appositive members. As we shall see, this does not support, but rather tends to go against the assignment of a co-ordinate relationship to simple apposition.

4. While I shall return to the contextual definition, I want to attempt classification in formal terms. Even the OED does this, producing two incompatible descriptions: (a) 'a word... in syntactic parallelism with another' and (b) 'the addition of one substantive to another, or to a main clause, as an attribute or complement'. Since 'parallelism' and 'attribution' do not seem to match, it is now clear that apposition poses a descriptive and explanatory problem concerning the relationship between forms, i.e. whether we assign equipollent or dependent structures, and,if the latter whether the structures are of a co-ordinate type or not. For example:

10. my brother the dentist

might realise (or expound) (a) a nominal group composed of two component nominal groups identically related to other textual elements of structure; or (b) a nominal

group consisting of two exponents my brother and the dentist, the former realising a head nominal group, the latter a qualifier nominal group, the two groups standing in co-ordinate relation; or (c) the head-qualifier interpretation might presuppose some additional elements like who is and assign to my brother the role of antecedent to the additioning subordinate clause the dentist. In systemic grammar symbolization we may represent the three possibly structures as:

(a) E_1E_2 or (b) $E\left[\begin{smallmatrix}+E\\ -E\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ or (c) $\alpha/\ldots Eh\ldots/\beta/$ (B=S|P) | C q ||

where E is an element of clause structure, and parentheses represent presupposition.

5. The third characterisation clearly implies a difference in meaning from the first two. What is more difficult to determine is whether there is a significant difference in meaning between the first and the second readings. The issue may turn out to be what has traditionally been called 'government', since the co-ordination relationship normally involves some conjunctival exponent like and, but, or, and the extent to which the textual relationship is equipollent in their absence depends on (a) their presupposition and (b) if presupposed, their governing function in relation to any but the first element in English or the last element in a postpositive language like Japanese. Dik[3] with Bloomfield and transformational generative grammarians, but against Nida, rejects any idea of government in co-ordination; for reasons of what he calls 'balance between co-ordinated members'; because he does not regard the co-ordinating particle as more deeply involved with the second member; because the use of 'and' is unimportant in co-ordinate patterning; and because co-ordination and subordination need to be distinct. His first and third reasons seem merely to be preferences dependent on his overall analysis; the fourth reason does not render it impossible to assign a relationship of government within co-ordination by particles; and the second reason is based on systems in postpositive languages. To my mind, a postpositive language like Japanese belies his conclusions, since the involvement of the particle is assymmetrical with that in prepositive languages. Thus in English, using '+' to represent the particle, we find three possible types : all member linked; none linked; or the type A, B, C, D+E. In Japanese we find: all members linked; none linked; or the type A, B, C, D, E+. Surely if the involvement of the particle were irrelevant to the relationship we could expect a type A+B, C, D, E in a postpositive language, but this is not the case. One would, however, expect a postposed co-ordinator to behave like a postposition if there were some kind of government involved, and this it does. In fact, in both postpositive

languages like Japanese and prepositive languages like the interlacustrine Bantu the same particle does the duty of the two English particles and and with. There are, of course, constructions usually labelled 'co-ordinate', such as listing, where the presupposition of conjunctival elements may be unwarranted, but the ascription of some form of depencence in co-ordination is not contingent upon the use of particles, as I hope to show later.

To return to the examples, our intuitions probably favour a co-ordinate relationship for types like (3), since they appear to exemplify what the OED calls syntactic parallelism. But if we look at co-ordination as a textual not a contextual relation, it is unlikely that 'the same relationship of two items to the context' will be proved necessarily to imply the sort of parallelism of items we normally associate with co-ordination. As we have indicated, co-ordination is not necessarily describable as a relationship of non-dependence, and the terms co-ordinate and dependent are not mutually exclusive.

7. Our first step in classifying the first six examples will be to siphon off (1) and (5). I exclude (1) because this, though regarded by descriptive grammarians like Strang as apposition, is certainly explicable in ordinary modifier terms, with girl as head and slave as noun modifier. Furthermore, it is best handled in lexis, or in that part of the grammar which has traditionally been called morphology. If lexis, it is parallel with non-appositional items like Sydney Harbour; if morphology, with morpheme compounds like fisherman. Number (5) is classed as apposition by normative writers who wish us to avoid questions of and questions as to, and some writers regard it as apposition because the question is omissible in a clause setting, but it is in fact more like a rankshifted clause with head question than an apposition.

8. We are now left with (2), (3), (4) and (6). Geographical items like (6) do not parallel the German form in English, where the preferred equivalent is the city of Hamburg, which like the isle of Skye is formally a nominal group with rankshifted dependent qualifier. Such 'genitive' constructions are by no means confined to English, having counterparts, e.g. in Japanese, where Roma no mati is either 'the city of Rome' as in English use or 'the Roman city', and describable as a modifier-head structure. There are some doubtful cases, however, e.g. a giant of a man; but to pursue this matter further would take us outside the present study.

If we take examples (2) and (6) as head-qualifier structures, the appositive being the qualifier, is similar in status to relative clause qualifiers in what is generally known as the 'defining' relative. We thus make our first classification on the basis that (2) and (6) are in some sense subordinate and (3) and (4) co-ordinate. Someone might wish to exclude (2) from apposition. In fact Halliday and others dealing with apposition appear to confine themselves to type (3) and similar types, but this may be because they prefer to treat (2) and (6) simply as part of a nominal group structure without assigning a name to them. I find it helpful to include them in the traditional way as apposition, and I do not find the borderline particularly clear. Number (2) also has aspects in common with what some grammarians treat as adverbial modifiers,[4] as in:

11. his speech yesterday was a failure

but we observe at once that the contextual reference here is dissimilar, and no-one so far has called this apposition.

9. The classification of (4) as apposition depends on some form of presupposition, (or as some would say, underlying structure), though it is not clear at what level or at what rank this should take place. Avoiding the semantic level, we have to select between a lexical matching of (be) hungry with a fairly common condition on the one hand, and on the other a grammatical matching either of (he) was hungry with (he was in) a fairly common condition at clause rank, or of (hunger) with condition at nominal group rank. Hungry is likely to be in tonal concord with condition (see later re tonal concord) and this could be a justification for including (3) in apposition. This seems to be a case of apparent community of reference without clear formal correspondence.

10. Apposition can be discontinuous. An example from Halliday[5] is:

12. he died a happy man

to which he assigns three structures: (i) apposition, with a happy man as attributive; (ii) and (iii) clause transitive with intensive complement, neutral or marked according to whether died implies a contrast. The first description tallies with :

13. John died, the builder

which, having a specific appositive, cannot be assigned a transitive structure. A somewhat similar structure:

14. there sat Pedro, old and ugly

where the corresponding 'Pedro sat there, old and ugly' shows discontinuity, is also assignable to apposition of an attributive kind, and is perhaps best described as closely associated with the category of commentary. Adjectives are of course a borderline

area, and a clause like:

15. they took all the precautions necessary

is less acceptable as a qualifying apposition, than as a reversed modifier structure.

11. One more possible candidate for apposition is the type in:

16. Reading, where I live, is over 100 miles from Bristol

because one can say it without 'Reading' and still make good sense. Systemic grammarians describe 'where I live' as an additioning subordinate clause, the traditional non-defining relative, though it becomes a rankshifted clause operating as nominal group or noun clause when 'Reading' is removed. If we restrict apposition to relationships between units of equal rank, we automatically exclude this type, but its resemblance to appositions suggests once more a parallelism between them and relative constructions.

12. Some transformationists assume a connection between 'relative' and 'appositive'. Lees mentions apposition in passing and appears to regard it as having an underlying relative form, derivable in stages:[6]

Under 'deletion of relative and following verb':

'Except for a small class of special determinatives and quantifiers preceding the pre-nominal adjective, all nominal modifiers are exactly matched by predicates which by this point have not only been generated in sentences but have even been positioned properly after their nouns, now that the relative clause has been introduced... by deleting relative + be we produce the following nominal modifiers: '(I here expand Lees' typographical arrangement)

'The man who is standing there is John	(-ing form)
The man standing there is John	
The man who is taken there is John	(-en form)
The man taken there is John	
The man who is to go there is John	(to + V)
The man to go there is John'	

(The above three would in systemic grammar be rankshifted clauses)

'The man who is over there is John	(adverbial)
The man over there is John	

The man who is for us is John (prep. + nom.)

The man for us is John

The man who is asleep there is John (adj. comp.)

The man asleep there is John

...The only other constitutent which can so occur in the above pattern is a predicate noun. If we also permitted deletion before predicate nouns (and allowed the ellipsis only in restrictive relatives) we ... avoid

John who is there is my son (non-restrictive)

* John there is my son

John who is my son is there (non-restrictive)

*John my son is there

But we have the anomalies:

The one who is there is my son

The one there is my son

against:

*The one who is my son is there

*The one my son is there'

But if we allow appositives to be generated only where non-restrictive relatives occur, we can generate: The boy, my son, is there from The boy, who is my son, is there, but we then have to eliminate certain titles without definite article:

Elizabeth, who was Queen, was there

*Elizabeth, Queen, was there

but these are possible using 'the Queen'. Thus Lees seems to me correct in his intuition that apposition is related to the relative, but incorrect in restricting the generation of apposition from non-restrictive relatives only. The problem of including the restrictive types is solved as soon as we posit lexical restrictions for the antecedent or the appositional head, i.e. by excluding proper names and possibly deictics and pronouns.

13. We turn now to certain alleged common properties of apposition and co-ordination. Halliday classes apposition with co-ordination as the two paratactic complexes of the logical sub-component of grammar[7] and in an early article offers three reasons for assigning to apposition a co-ordinate structure. The following is an interpretation of his rationale.[8]

(i) Both apposition and co-ordination are transitive in the logical sense, i.e. whereas in a subordinate relation, structure α is to structure β as structure β is to structure γ, this is not true of the relationship of structure α to structure γ. Thus in:

17. they left because the agents didn't arrive until it was too late

each of the three clauses depends serially on its immediate antecedent but the third does not depend on the first, whereas in co-odination the structures co-ordinate with each other irrespective of serial order, as in:

18. he panicked and ran up the ladder and fell from the top

where the second clause can be omitted without interference in the co-ordinate relationship.

(ii) An appositive, like a co-ordinate, is a 'free' form, i.e. is capable of operating as a simple structure of next higher rank, whereas subordinate structures are 'bound'.

(iii) Apposition, like co-ordination, uses 'tonal concord'[9] but with subordinate structures this is not a necessary feature.

14. Halliday does not regard the third point as a strong argument, and I find here no necessary opposition between apposition and dependence. There are in fact rather few 'non-defining' relations without tonal concord, and if our major classification of apposition types holds, we arrive at matching sets of appositives and relatives.

15. I also question Halliday's second point about bound and free forms. In common with most grammarians he distinguishes between subordinating and co-ordinating conjunctions, calling the former binders and the latter linkers. But here we are at the mercy of the realizations of these relationships in the English language. We have already seen that many languages cannot have their conjunctive particles so classified. In some, like certain Bantu languages and Japanese, one particle functions as English and and with ; in others, like those in Pacific areas, the distinction is still unclear but differently: causal and consecutive clauses, for example, are normally expounded paratactically, as is common enough in English anyway:

19. the wheel came off it was only loosely attached

20. the wheel was only loosely attached it came off

Since clause sequence does not necessarily imply causal connection in these languages,

we cannot with certainty identify a dependent relationship. The point is not therefore any semantic difference that may hold, but the logical dependent relation which may obtain whether a particle is present or not. In other words, co-ordination may appear consistently as a bound relationship and subordination as a free one. And (20) would be classed as apposition by some.

16. But the criterion 'capable of operating as a simple structure of next higher rank' is unclear. If 'structure operating at next higher rank' includes word operating as group, then this seems to be characteristic of both apposition and co-ordination, though Dik would place restraints on the way co-ordinates operate, and writes: [co-ordinations] 'have grammatical properties of their own which cannot be reduced to properties of their members' (such as the effect on number in verbal concord, etc.)[10] But if the criterion includes a group operating as a clause, then nominal group apposition clearly functions in a clausal manner, and in this sense is less than free.

17. From the point we have now reached it would appear that as soon as we examine free and bound relationships we are back in the contextual field. There seems in fact to be no criterion for establishing any distinction where there is no conjunctive element, and wherever the conjunctive particle is used we can hardly speak of free forms. Halliday, for example, takes the following two clauses:[11]

21. That's another thing I don't know yet.

Viewed as utterances he assigns to them structures of what he calls apposition, or dependence or co-ordination, according to the intonation patterns. It almost seems as if intonation (punctuation in writing) is the determining factor in assigning particular structures and hence meanings to such pairs of clauses. The relationship between the clauses here is as ambiguous as that for (20). However, some similar clause rank appositions are not ambiguous in the same way:

22. what I do I just get hold of the leaves and cut them off

which may be apposition since it is related to an equative sentence.

18. At this point it is worth asking whether the term 'apposition' is more usefully confined to cases below clause rank, so that instances like (21) would be excluded. But if we do this we must add a further contextual restraint, i.e. that the constituent clauses of the excluded apposition type must, without change of contextual meaning, be capable of

independent utterance. Otherwise (16) and (22) are excluded. We probably want to allow (16) as a rankshifted type anyway, and we might wish to include (22), or at least distinguish it from (21).

19. We have now to deal with Halliday's first point, logical transitivity as applied to apposition and co-ordination. It is predictable that (2) and (6), being similar to defining relatives, will not appear in a transitive relationship when a third component is present. Thus in:

23. Queen Elizabeth the First

the relation betwen Queen and the First is clearly dissimilar from that holding between either of these and Elizabeth. The same asymmetry is apparent in:

24. Peter the Hermit, preacher of the first crusade...

It does, however, seem that the majority of thought-up cases of (3) would exhibit a transitive relationship, and multiple apposition of this kind seldom occurs naturally. But if we allow:

25. John, the first to arrive, a somewhat late first....

the third element again exhibits no clear-cut grammatical relationship to John. The case of (4) needs special treatment, since the apposition needs presupposition, making it still less likely that a transitive relation could be established in any extended form. Thus the case for associating apposition with co-ordination becomes weaker even on logical grounds.

20. Further issues appear when the appositive role is reversed. In:

26. Harambee, their slogan, was painted on the wall

27. their slogan, Harambee, was painted on the wall

we note that (26) prefers tonal concord but (27) does not. Also the 'defining' relationship is asymmetrical: harambee acts as a kind of proper noun and is on a par with John in:

28. John, the dentist,...

corresponding with (26), or Elizabeth in (23) corresponding with (27). But (23) is like (2) and (28) is like (3). If the same forms can be interchanged and so involve a change of apposition type, this means that the relationship is determined by position, that there is asymmetry in appositional position, hence in the relationship, and that the primary exponent of the relationship is place-ordering. And where place is significant we are no longer in the strict realm of logically transitive relationships.

21. Co-ordination and apposition do in fact share certain irreversibility features, subject to contextual restraints, so that collocationally bread and butter is only reversible if strongly marked; so also with Peter the Hermit and John Bloggs. There are of course, examples in English of geographical names which appear to offer alternative patterns, such as the River Thames as against the Mekong River; but most language appear to select a structure and adhere to it. In any case parallel reversibility is not a sufficient criterion for equivalence, and even in reversible cases native speakers usually attest one form as marked.

22. We also note instances in English and similar languages (a) where co-ordination is practically irreversible, as in:

29. three dollars and fifty cents

30. ants and their ways

which represent hierarchically arranged measures and co-ordinations containing internal anaphoric textual reference respectively; and (b) where reversal clearly alters the meaning, as is common in book titles like:

31. Linguistics and Your Language

32. Le langage et la vie

33. Language and Languages

It is to be noted that what might appear to be cataphora within apposition:

34. His Highness the Duke of Savoy

turns out in fact to be deixis. In other words, apposition does not admit of internal anaphora or cataphora. In 'sayings' the co-ordinate particle at times seems intuitively to be a lexical item:

35. a short life and a merry one

and even the absence of particle

36. cold hands, warm heart

brings us in full circle back to type (20) with its dependent implications. For good measure, it is even possible to produce a kind of range of dependence relations, going something like this, from least to most dependent:

A and B — B may be independent; if there is dependence, its dependent status is flexible in that its relation to external textual features is normally identical with that of A

A as well as B	status of B ambiguous, but occurrence of as suggests some form of government; however, the group as a whole may occur at any element of structure, and the textual relationship of B is again similar to that of A
A is as good as/ better than B	the occurrence of the finite verb renders the status of B subordinate to that of A, i.e. with internal relationships such that B is restricted to two possibilities: subject of clause or complement of preposition
A without B	the prepositional government is clear, but B could still be a 'Z' element if followed by an -ing form
A less B	the government could be regarded as indirect, perhaps through a presupposed preposition such as by
A plus B	clear prepositional type government; verb be cannot be inserted before, nor another preposition after plus
A added to B	clear prepositional government; 'added to B' functions as qualifier to A

But this range is not a continuum or cline: discrete classification is still possible.

23. On the other side, however, we see a tendency at least in English towards attraction between items in apposition or co-ordination, as in the frequently attested utterances of the type 'that was for John and I', to which the following verbatim instances from the mass media belong:

37. it's all right for we professionals (apposition)

38. let us remember he and his family overseas (co-ordination)

24. In the course of investigating the nature of apposition we are bound to encounter a common ambiguity type, that in:

39. Lord Johnson, the Convenor, Sir Francis James and five others voted in favour of the motion

where the Convenor is either appositive to Lord Johnson or a list item. This is also a case where apposition rejects tonal concord to avoid confusion with listing. But the point at issue is that this kind of distinction implies an asymmetrical relationship

between the apparently co-ordinate items in the list. This suggests that some intermediate kind of dependence relationship is involved, and if so this goes for the similar type (3), which is less commonly associated with subordination than (2) or (6).

25. There is one distinct and well-known area of contrast between apposition and co-ordination: the logical category of disjunction. Earlier on I used the sentence: 'Furthermore, it is best handled in lexis, or in that part of the grammar which has traditionally been called morphology.' On reading or hearing sentences like this, my scanning device may start by taking or to mean 'in other words', and in reading over my script I at first defined lexis as 'that part of the grammar which...' and then wondered if it would be read unambiguously, that is, as exclusive not inclusive disjunction. This is a common enough ambiguity, perhaps less commonly seen as an ambiguity resolved by assigning appositive structure to the meaning 'in other words' and co-ordinate structure to the meaning 'alternatively'. The problem becomes even more subtle when speaker attitude is involved, as in:

40. John saw, or said he was going to see the play yesterday

which when unmarked exhibits a 'replacement' feature or what one might call an 'adversive' construction; when marked it resembles the 'alternative' type of co-ordination. Once more we are in the realm of 'commentary' (see § 10).

26. Exponents which apparently match at the formal level need not belong to the same category. For example:

41. Mrs Jones the Gas

in common with :

42. John Bloggs

and all similar sets of names, looks very much like (28) but is in fact more like (2). It is this feature of ambiguity which makes distinctions harder in cases like (10) where the same exponents realise different sub-systems. In (10) tonal concord implies that I have one brother, lack of it that I have more than one, and within tonal concord one tone implies that my brother is a dentist, another that my brother and the dentist are members in a list.

27. I will next try to relate the system of apposition to that of equation, of which identification is a sub-system. Halliday distinguishes three classes of 'process' or verbal item type, and assigns be to all three.[12] We are only concerned with classes 0 and 2:

Class 0: What is Mary's husband? He's a teacher.

What are you? I'm a teacher. NOT * A teacher is me.

This is the relation of attribution, with intensive complement.

Class 2 (a)	Which is John ?) Which John is it?)	John's the dentist (brother)
	Which are you?	I'm the dentist (man)
2 (b)	Which is John?	The dentist's John (in the photo)
	Which is you?	The dentist's me (in the photo)
2(c)	Who's the dentist?) Which dentist is it?)	The dentist is John The dentist is me (John)
2(d)	Which is the dentist?	John's the dentist I'm the dentist (can I help?)

Another way of distinguishing the four type 2s of the verb be is as follows:

What value is x ? (CPS), decoding/open-ended/explorer type: x = 7

Which of the values 6,7,8 is x? (SPC), encoding/multiple choice/detective type:

7 = x

What variable is 7? (CPS), decoding etc. type 7 = x

Which of x,y,z is 7? (SPC), encoding etc. type x = 7

The appositional equivalents of Class 0 are those which merely equate or indicate roles or attributes; of Class 2 those which identify. Sub-classes of 2 are concerned with whether the theme is identified - (a) and (b) - or to be identified-(c) and (d); and whether the identification is a matter of function recognition - (a) and (c) - or form recognition- (b) and (d). But in apposition, head is normally to be identified by appositive, which accordingly receives focal stress, so that there are only three types of interest, Class 0 and Classes 2-(a) and (c).

28. So if we examine (2) we find a related structure Peter is the Hermit, which is the answer to Which Peter is it? and is assigned to Class 2 (a). In the case of (6) however, the related structure is Hamburg ist die Stadt which is the answer to Welche Stadt ist es? and this is assigned to Class 2 (c). In (10c) we find a Class 0 process type. My brother is the dentist does not identify the brother, since I have only one brother in this meaning, but indicates role. My brother is attribuant and the dentist attribute. Number (27) can be like (6), but (26) is attributive and thus assignable to Class 0. So also

would be

43. Elizabeth our Queen

which is an answer to What is Elizabeth? not to Which Elizabeth? since the identification is presumed clear. But (27) can also be of this 'comment' type if the related sentence is not 'Harambee is what their slogan is' but 'their slogan is a word harambee'. Now if the equative identification structures related to nominal group apposition can only operate one way, so that the item to the left of the equation is a variable for which the value is identified on the right side and the operation is a decoding not an encoding operation, then the implied relationship between head and appositive is analogous to that obtaining between a nominal group and its dependent clause, whether additioning or rankshifted, i.e. a logically intransitive relationship.

29. Detailing the above more rigorously, and starting from the evidence in modern English of a two-way relationship in identificational structures (as exemplified by verbatim occurrences like: 'what the public badly needs are guarantees that these insurance companies are financially viable'), we note three distinct salience and intonation patterns (focus is underlined):

(a) Peter the Hermit

(b) Peter the Hermit Queen Elizabeth

(c) Oxford Street

but we do not find:

* Peter the Hermit or *Queen Elizabeth or *Queen Elizabeth

The example in (a)represents tonal concord, i.e. the tone on Pe-matches the tone on Her- . This runs parallel to the relative construction:

(d) Peter, who is a hermit... Elizabeth, who is the Queen...

but hardly:

*the Queen, who is Elizabeth

where the more likely correlate would replace is with is called etc.

From this we see that (a) like (d) is a defining type. The examples in (b) run parallel to the relative construction:

(e) that Peter who is a hermit that Elizabeth who is the Queen

although once again the third possibility is a little bizarre, though less so than the type (d) example:

?* that queen who is Elizabeth

Thus the examples in (e) correlate with those in (b) and individually with apposition types (2) and (6) respectively; (d) correlates with (a) and so with apposition type (3). Also, the example in (c) corresponds intonationally with (non-appositional) type (1) above. We can regard this as noun modification. Interestingly, the form:

(f) Oxford Road

and all such names ending in words other than 'street' (avenue, park, lane, etc.) would on this basis be assigned to apposition type (2). If (c) were related to equative clauses, it would best fit into the identificational category 2 (d) on intonational and thematic criteria. But this is excluded from apposition, so that here is a confirmatory example for our restriction of apposition to identificational categories 0, 2a and 2c.

Lees wanted to relate Oxford Street to a structure the Street (which is) named after Oxford, which is similar to slave girl from girl who is a slave. This is because he intentionally overlooks the suprasegmental differences.[13]

30. Some common examples exhibit relationships which involve logical considerations of comment, even though they appear to be of a 'defining' type, e.g.:

44. that rascal John

is hardly to be associated with an identifying question *What rascal? Such types appear to be a reversed and 'split' form of the attributive type, with related clause that John is a rascal, so that in the appositional form the deictic has transferred from appositive to head.

31. Some common clause-rank apposition types almost ask for a presupposed copula in the way that (22) does. The type is clearly more like (2) than (23) since what I do is specified by I just get hold... or, this is a characterisation of what I do, as Hermit is a characterisation of Peter, or Queen of Elizabeth, and the characterized element is head, not appositive. But this is rather concerned with the lexical nature of such words as rascal, idiot etc. and the restrictions on their collocation and entry into structure. The problem is somewhat similar to that of John is a dentist and its qualifying appositional counterpart John the dentist, which is treated more fully later.

32. If (3) is reversed as to head and appositive, the resultant form:

45. the first to arrive, John,...

contrasts with a form written with no comma after John . or spoken without tonal concord. The fact that this occurs only in 'marked' place-ordering again points to asymmetry between head and appositive.

33. Pronouns and deictics do not normally stand as appositives, but can act as head in the appositional relation:

46. I the undersigned...

47. this, the most vital matter of all,...

This is yet another example of asymmetry.

34. Reasons have been adduced for describing apposition as attributive or identificational, for subdividing the latter according to function or form recognition, and for rejecting or doubting arguments for regarding apposition as logically transitive, though affinity with co-ordination cannot thereby be ruled out, should co-ordination likewise prove to be non-transitive. If we now regard apposition (and probably co-ordination) as a partially dependent relationship, are we then to proceed to an assignment of apposition to a category which subsumes relative clauses and in which apposition functions as a minor or verbless clause entailing presuppositions which might involve the verb be? This may turn out to be the best solution, but first let us examine some apparently parallel structures of a 'defining' type:

48. John the Baptist preached here

49. that John who baptises preached here

50. the man who baptises preached here once

It is clear that (50) does not occur in appositional form unless we accept bizarre items like the man baptiser, reminiscent of Strang's slave girl, which we didn't accept as apposition. One characteristic of defining or rank-shifted clauses is that the head is frequently an 'empty' lexical item like man, person, one etc. and such items seldom act as unmodified unqualified subjects, objects etc. in clauses. With apposition, however, even the defining type normally requires something like a proper name or kinship term as head, and heads of this type do not easily lend themselves to clause-type rankshifted qualification, so that we have a possible lexical difference between head of qualified nominal group and head of apposition. Also, a group like John the Baptist lends itself more readily to head and qualifier treatment than does John, our first visitor to treatment as a subordinate clause. Nevertheless it is less serious in my

opinion to accept minor clauses in dependent relation than to introduce lexical complexities to account for asymmetry at one point in the grammar. We could of course start all over again and use collocational criteria for all cases, but that belongs to a different part of the theory.

35. It appears, then, that apposition is not wholly compatible with a system of co-ordination. It shares only some of its features with listing. It also selects between performing an identificational function and offering attributive data. In the identificational field it selects further between types of identification with the appositive normally fulfilling the role of 'item to be identified'.

36. Halliday relates attributes and conditions in his transitivity system to adverbial adjuncts or dependent clauses, thus : [14]

'she lay drowsy', parallel but contrasting in form
with 'she lay drowsily'

'they sell them new', parallel but contrasting in form with
'they sell them when they are new'

It would be perfectly possible on this basis to relate appositives to dependent clauses of the additioning type:

'John, the dentist,...' parallel but contrasting in form with
'John, who is a/the dentist'

and as we have seen, there is also a neat correspondence in the 'defining' area:

'Peter the Hermit', parallel and contrasting in form with
'the Peter who is a/the hermit'

37. In both cases it is interesting to note the ambivalence of the article in the appositional form, which has the capacity of representing a dentist or the dentist, a hermit or the hermit. We can, of course, use a in the attributive type:

51. John, a dentist

But the position seems rather to be that this article belongs in part to the head, so that we relate the structure further to something like 'the John, dental type' in the case of 'John, who is a dentist'; and to 'the hermit, Peter' in the case of 'Peter who is a hermit', answering the questions What sort of John? and Which Peter? respectively. It may in the last resort be difficult to maintain an absolute distinction between defining

and non-defining qualifiers, though languages do exist where it is possible to make such a distinction by modifying the form of the relative particle as e.g. in Nkorekiga:

ekitabo ekirikushemeza kiri aha meeza
the interesting book is on the table
(lit: which is interesting)

ekitabo kirikushemeza kiri aha meeza
the book, which is an interesting one,
is on the table

Considerations such as these suggest very strongly that there is a link of some kind in the particle between John and dentist in John, the dentist, so that although in a village with one dentist, for example, John is presumably the dentist, there is no restriction on applying this appositive where dentists abound. In formal terms this means that we may have two interpretations of:

52. John, the dentist, arrived yesterday

with constituent clauses:

52a. John arrived yesterday the dentist arrived yesterday

52b. John arrived yesterday a dentist arrived yesterday

The pair (52b) are shared with:

53. John, a dentist, arrived yesterday

But the implication in the (52b) meaning of (52) is that John is being identified, whereas in (53) he is merely being described. The existence of some linkage element in the article does not strengthen analogy with co-ordinate linkage but weakens it, since the article in apposition looks, as it were, both ways for different purposes; in co-ordination the linkers are either neutral or govern one of the elements.

38. The role of the definite article in apposition has some bearing on the equative system of the appositional relationship, as B.L. Robbins makes clear in his book on the article.[15] But Robbins uses the term apposition very comprehensively and only two pages are devoted to noun appositives. It seems reasonable to limit the structure to grammatically equivalent units, as I have done, and in this field I interpret Robbins as adding little to what I have already noted. One point should, however, be noted: the ambivalent use of the as 'phoric' rather than identificatory (or with reference external to the apposition rather than internal) in:

54. the colour, green, is not to my liking

55. Renoir, the artist, doesn't like the picture

56. my brother, the dentist, has no mechanic to help him

where in (56) at any rate there are the two possible meanings referred to in § 37 with 'phoric' reference equivalent to 'the village dentist' and identificatory reference equivalent to 'the dentist brother'.

39. To sum up, we may safely assign, as we have been doing, the category 'head' to the first appositional element in a structure and 'appositive' to any subsequent element of the same class which stands in the same relationship to the rest of the structure. When this is done we observe that in logical terms the head is more truly the subject, object etc. of the structure than are any of the appositives. In this respect apposition exhibits a distinctive relationship dissimilar from that obtaining in co-ordinate structures, where each item is a 'true' subject etc. of the proposition. For example in (8) the essential information is that J.L. will come; the assistantship is interesting but subsidiary. To reverse the appositional exponents would indicate the reverse situation in thematic terms, since 'theme' is a syntactic feature in English. It now appears that appositive reference is not merely different from head reference in contextual terms but also in syntactic terms, so that our earlier definition is back in favour: 'different references to the same referent', where 'referent' may now allude to textual features.

40. We thus have three clear types:

(i) Apposition of head-qualifier type, where head expounds form

(2) Peter the Hermit.

(ii) Apposition of head-qualifier type, where head expounds function

Queen Elizabeth

(iii) Apposition of minor dependent clause type

(28) John, the dentist

including non-matching types like

(4) John was hungry, a fairly common condition for him

Apposition involves equation, either of an attributive kind (iii) or an identificatory kind (i) and (ii). Cases like (9) where co-ordination and apposition combine suggest that the two systems are not parallel. Many examples exist where the appositive and head do not have the same relationship to the text. Thematically the head must take precedence over the appositive in subject position, and there seems to be no reason

to suppose that this relationship changes in other positions. I conclude therefore that apposition, though it contains some features similar to those of co-ordination such as irreversibility under certain restrictions and a hierarchy of elements where particles are involved, does not exhibit sufficient common features to be classed, apart from its general logical nature, together with co-ordination.

By assigning the appositive to a 'subordinate' role, I can also distinguish between the underlying equative implications, such that

Peter the Hermit (restrictive)

goes with

Peter is the/a hermit

but that

John, the dentist.... (non-restrictive)

goes with

the dentist is John

The intuition here is that where there is no pause, the equative implication occurs in the same linear order as that of the apposition; where there is pause, the underlying order is reversed.

REFERENCES:

1. Fries, C.C.: The Structure of English, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1952, p. 188

2. Halliday, M.A.K.: Transitivity, mood and theme, Journal of Linguistics, p. 199

3. Dik, S.C.: Co-ordination, Amsterdam, North Holland, 1968, pp. 52-55

4. Fries: Structure, p. 216 and Roberts, P.: Patterns of English, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1956 , p. 87

5. Halliday, M.A.K. : Intonation in English Grammar, Transactions of the Philological Society, 1963, p. 152

6. Lees, R.B. : A Grammar of Nominalizations, Bloomington, Indiana University, 1963, p. 91

7. In a recent article, "An Outlook on Modern English", privately circulated, Halliday relates apposition in two directions: (i) to

the 'experiential relation of "identity" ' and (ii) to the 'textual relation of "commentary" ', but this is characteristic only of our (3) and (4): our (2) and (6) relate to (i) but instead of (ii) they would relate rather to some kind of dependence relation.

8. Halliday, Intonation, p. 150

9. Halliday, Intonation, p. 150

10. Dik, Co-ordination, p. 23

11. Halliday, Intonation, p. 151

12. Halliday, Transitivity, p. 62

13. Lees, Nominalizations, p. 173

14. Halliday, Transitivity, p. 66

15. Robbins, B. L. : The Definite Article in English Transformations, The Hague, Mouton, 1968 esp. pp. 205 ff.