

In Search of the ‘Lost’ Grammatical Description: The Case of Apposition in Malay

Harshita Aini Haroon

*Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Education
Universiti Utara Malaysia*

Abstract: *The paper attempts to describe the relation of apposition in Malay. Whilst other relations such as coordination, modification and relative clauses have been widely discussed in the grammatical description of Malay, apposition has been largely left out. The isolation, as a guess, may be due to the fact that some appositional constructions may lie on boundary with other well-established relations, thus lessening the need for its explicit mention. We show in this paper the boundaries of apposition with these relations. Then, using data extracted from a 450,000 word corpus, we put forward the realizations of apposition in the Malay language from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives in order to close the structural gap currently existing in Malay grammatical relations. We end the paper by briefly mentioning some possible implications of this ‘discovery’.*

INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a study, which depicts apposition in Malay. Whilst Malay grammarians have discussed relations such as coordination, modification and relative clauses, apposition has never been shown to exist in Malay, and neither has it been documented in any grammatical description of the language. Apposition in Malay, however, is not a new phenomenon. Its description may have been ‘lost’ due to the overall complexity in defining an appositive construction. That some appositional constructions may lie on boundary with other well-defined relations has, to some extent, lessened the need for an explicit discussion of apposition, as there has always been the easy option of classifying the construction as that of the established relations. The paper attempts to illustrate realisations of apposition in Malay from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives. In doing so, the structural gap currently existing in Malay will be addressed, resulting in possible linguistics and pedagogical implications.

APPOSITION IN OTHER LANGUAGES

Although there have been numerous descriptions and discussions on apposition in other languages, defining apposition remains to be a demanding task. The general consensus seems to be that for units to be in apposition, they must be normally two noun phrases (NPs) which are identical in reference and are juxtaposed to each other (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1972, 1985; Burton-Roberts, 1975, 1994; Matthews, 1981; Koktová, 1985; Meyer, 1992). However, beyond this traditional conception, what further constitutes an appositive construction seems to be a mixed-bag of grammatical constructs that do not seem to fit into established relations, such as co-ordination and complementation (Acuña Farina, 1996).

Matthews (1981) characterised apposition as a relationship of juxtaposition, contending that the relationship is used for a variety of constructions not having a set of criteria for the purpose of classification. He claimed that apposition is an undifferentiated relation and that therefore “we may expect boundary problems between it and fully differentiated type” (p.224). In establishing the field of apposition, Matthews talked about degrees of codification of apposition, and its limits particularly with the relations of attribution, complementation and co-ordination. Matthews’ paradigm case of apposition is illustrated in the example

1. I met *your brother, the poet*

The poet is apposed to *your brother* and is the object of *met*. The relationship is by sequence, where both NPs are juxtaposed to each other. However, Matthews argued that apposition could also involve words that function in other cases, as co-ordinators, as in (1985,p.225):

2. *Larus argentatus, or the herring gull*

Matthews’ contention, in fact has been earlier argued by Quirk et al. (1972) and Burton-Roberts (1975), when they talked about apposition having apposition markers. Quirk et al.’s classic example of explicit indicators of apposition is

3. The passenger plane of the 1980s, namely the supersonic jet, will transform relations....

Namely, in the example, is an explicit marker of apposition. Quirk et al. (1972) closely linked their discussion of markers with the notion of full

and partial apposition, in which three conditions were set as a basis for the interpretation (p.621):

- a) Each of the appositives can be separately omitted without affecting the acceptability of the sentence.
- b) Each fulfils the same syntactic function in the resultant sentences.
- c) There is no difference between the original sentence and either of the resultant sentences in extra linguistic reference.

They argued that the presence of a marker does not affect the full apposition status of a construction even though it may affect the ability of the construction to adhere to all the conditions. Burton-Roberts (1975, 1994) placed extreme importance on apposition markers due to the opinion that it is the markers that actually characterise apposition.

Quirk et al.'s (1972) notions of apposition have been supported by Meyer (1992) who set three criteria in establishing structural dependency of units in apposition. These criteria are:

- a) The first unit can be optionally deleted.
- b) The second unit can be optionally deleted.
- c) The units can be interchanged.

These criteria are similar to Quirk et al.'s (1972) full and partial apposition. To extend this notion, Meyer (1992) introduced the idea of central and peripheral apposition. Central apposition can only take two forms: certain types of nominal apposition and certain types of non-nominal apposition. Peripheral appositions, on the other hand, are so called because firstly they do not fulfil all the three syntactic criteria, and secondly, because they are on a par with other types of relations (e.g. co-ordination and modification). Meyer placed importance on units being structurally independent, as it is this criterion that makes a construction appositional. The extent of the independence is such that it seems to supersede semantic dependency.

From the semantic point of view, in line with Bitea (1977) who focused on semantics in his description of apposition (by stating that it should be the cornerstone of any description of apposition), Quirk et al. (1972, 1985) claimed that there are three main types of semantic relationship between appositive units, which are that of equivalence, attribution and inclusion. However, Koktová (1985) contended that appositional structures only have one semantic type, and because relation between units is usually vague, it cannot be subjected to rigid categorisation. Meyer (1992) nevertheless argued that a successful analysis of apposition, in addition to its syntactic analysis, has to consider the semantics of the units in apposition. Meyer

categorised semantic relations to reference, synonymy, attribution and hyponymy, while the semantic classes were categorised into whether the second unit provides more specific, less specific or equally specific information about the first unit.

In terms of pragmatics, apposition is “a relation in which the second unit of the apposition wholly or partially provides new information about the first unit” (Meyer, 1992, p.92). Thus, there is a non-equivalent relationship between the two units. The pragmatics of apposition is also linked to the idea of given and new information (Quirk et al., 1985) where the two are connected with theme and focus, with new information regarded as the focus of the message. That new information comes after given information is based on the idea that new information “often needs to be stated more fully than the given” (Quirk et al., 1985, p.1361). This notion is closely linked to the principle of end-focus. The focus in a clause or sentence marks where the new information is, and thus, the principle implies that new information will usually come at the end of the clause or sentence, after the given information. With regard to apposition, the first unit will be taken to be old or given, and the second consisting of new information.

NO APPPOSITION IN MALAY?

At this stage, it seems to be an almost impossible task to achieve one agreed definition of what constitutes an appositive construction. For the purpose of this study, however, a considered choice is made as to what appears to be the most acceptable notion of apposition. We use the following framework for identifying appositive constructions (Quirk et al., 1972, 1985; Meyer, 1992):

- 1) Either unit is omissible
- 2) Both units are interchangeable
- 3) The units perform the same syntactic function
- 4) There is no change in extra linguistic reference in the resultant sentences due to omission or interchange of units

We now show that constructions pertaining to this framework, which are defined as apposition elsewhere, cannot be accounted for by any of the currently existing established relations in Malay grammar. In doing so, we are in effect positing the gap currently existing in the description of Malay grammar.

Co-ordination and apposition

We begin with setting a paradigm case of Malay apposition, as below:

4. Lina menelefon *abangnya*, *pemilik kedai* itu.
(Lina phones her brother, the shop owner). (created)¹

The NP *pemilik kedai* itu is in apposition to the preceding NP *abangnya*, both NPs being the object of the verb *menelefon*. The two NPs are co-referential as they refer to the one and the same person. The status of apposition, in this case, is clear as the NPs are juxtaposed and co-refer, which are traditional criteria of the construction. However, specific words or markers, as in example 5, can also mark the relation:

5. Bunga kegemaran saya ialah *bunga raya* atau *hibiscus*.
(My favourite flower is bunga raya or hibiscus). (created)

Atau is used to mark the relation of apposition. *Bunga raya* is the vernacular term for the species of flower scientifically known as *hibiscus*. Thus, the relationship between the two is that of co-reference. So, the question is whether apposition is in fact part of coordination. The problem lies in the use of *atau*, which incidentally, is a coordinative conjunction used to mark coordination in Malay, such as in two entities, which are not co-referential, as in

6. Sebarang pertanyaan boleh dikemukakan kepada *Salmah* atau *Zarina*.
Any queries can be forwarded to Salmah or Zarina. (created)

At this point of the discussion, it seems that the relation of coordination cannot account for constructions such as that in Example 4, as they pass the co-reference test.

Relative clauses and apposition

Relative clauses in Malay require the insertion of *yang* (that/which/who is/are) to link two or more clauses, as in

- 7a. Saya membeli baju.
(I bought a dress.) (created)

- 7b. Baju itu berwarna merah.
(That dress is red.) (created)
- 7c. Saya membeli baju yang berwarna merah.
(I bought that red dress.) (created)

Appositional constructions however, do not require this element to link its units. The main differences between a relative construction and an appositional construction, in short, are firstly, appositional constructions do not involve the embedding of clauses, while relative constructions do. Secondly, appositional constructions contain units that are co-referential while units in relative constructions are not related in such a way. These differences thus show that in Malay, relative clauses cannot account for appositional constructions.

Complementation and apposition

Complementation in Malay is marked by *bahawa* (that) and *untuk* (for). The nature of the relation is such that the second unit is important for the meaning of the whole sentence, hence the first unit relying heavily on the second. It is this particular point that makes apposition distinct from complementation. If we go back to our paradigm case of apposition (4), the sentence operates in such a way that either one of the apposed NPs *abangnya* dan *pemilik kedai itu* can be eliminated without affecting the meaning of the sentence, given the same contextual evidence. Therefore it would be semantically and grammatically acceptable to say

- 4a. Lina menelefon abangnya.
- 4b. Lina menelefon pemilik kedai tu.

However, in a relationship of complementation, the omission of either unit linked by *bahawa* or *untuk* is not possible, more so for semantics reason than any others. The second unit is vital in the understanding of the message being conveyed:

- 8. Tuduhan bahawa dia iri hati tidak benar.
(The accusation that he is jealous is not true) (created)

The omission of the second unit *dia irihati* would result in a grammatically acceptable sentence but one which bears quite a different seman-

tic implication than that carried by the original sentence. In other words, the meaning becomes obscure:

- 8a. Tuduhan tidak benar.
(Accusation is not true.)

In complementation, different values are accorded to units linked by the complement marker and the units are dependent on each other. In apposition, however, the units carry the same value, hence, it is possible to omit either of the units at any one time without affecting the extra linguistic reference in the resultant sentence.

In addition, the paradigm also enables its units to be interchangeable, thus allowing the following:

- 4c. Lina menelefon pemilik kedai itu, abangnya.

Interchangeability in complementation, however, is not possible:

- 8b. *Bahawa dia iri hati, tuduhan tidak benar.²
or
8c. *Dia iri hati bahawa tuduhan tidak benar.

Thus, apposition cannot be treated as a type of complementation due to firstly, in complementation, the units are not accorded equal values, that is, the first unit relies heavily on the second to achieve the intended meaning. This kind of dependency of units on each other simply does not occur in appositional constructions. Secondly, while units in apposition can interchange with no semantic implications, the same cannot be said to be true with complementation.

Modification and apposition

The relationship of modification is one that is between a head and its modifiers, where the modifiers are dependent on the head. The extent of the dependency is evident when a head is eliminated from a modified NP, as in:

9. Pelajar buta itu telah pulang.
(The blind student has returned.)

- 9a. *Buta itu telah pulang.³
(That blind has returned).

As seen from previous examples, the elimination of either unit in apposition does and should not result in an erroneous construction. It is this criterion, therefore, that we use to draw the distinction between the relation of modification and apposition. A complication occurs however, when we are dealing with constructions with titles as modifiers. In Malay, title modifiers always take the pre-head position, as in:

10. Datuk Ali
(where *Datuk* is an honorary title)

We find that although the title is dependent on the head, the degree of dependency seems to be minimal. While either unit is omissible, the units are not interchangeable:

- 10a. Datuk Ali menghirup kopinya.
(Datuk Ali sips his coffee.) (created)
10b. Datuk menghirup kopinya.
10c. Ali menghirup kopinya.
10d. *Ali Datuk menghirup kopinya.

The units still have characteristics of an appositional construction due to the possibility of omission of either unit. However, without contextual clues, the resultant sentence in Example 10b might cause some degree of uncertainty as to which *Datuk* is being referred to. The point being made here is that as far as the relation between modification and apposition is concerned, the only area of doubt that exists is when titles are used to premodify NPs. Otherwise, the distinction between the relations is quite transparent.

What we have sought to demonstrate thus far is how the well-established relations in Malay, which are co-ordination, relative constructions, complementation and modification, are not able to fully account for appositional constructions. This realisation underlies the need for a definition and description of appositional constructions in Malay in greater depth. Not to do so, we argue, would be denying the language of its wealth in grammatical complexities.

METHODOLOGY

The study employs the use of a computerized text database and the use of an Interactive tagging program 'TAGGER' (Meyer & Tenney, 1993) to tag appositional constructions. The tagging framework draws from various definitions of appositional construction. The Appendix enlists all the features used in the coding of appositional constructions found in the text database, with seven variables in total: text, syntactic form, syntactic function, positioning of units, semantic relation, semantic category and pragmatic characteristic. Each variable contains value, which are given numerical codes. The codes form the output of the analysis and will be used in the frequency counts of the semantic features of appositional constructions found in the texts.

As the study investigates appositional constructions in written Malay, three major text types were employed to make up the text database: journalistic texts, academic texts and fictional texts, with each text containing approximately 150,000 words, making up a total of 450,000 words for the corpus. The inclusion of these three text types is based on the differing aspects of the text types as proposed by Biber (1988). The journalistic texts "involve considerable effort towards maintaining a relationship with its audience, and are concerned with temporal and physical situations in addition to abstract information" while the fictional texts are accessible to a broad audience, nevertheless still requiring "a considerable amount of shared cultural assumptions and builds its own internal shared physical and temporal context" (Biber, 1988, p.70-71). With academic texts, meanwhile, the range of audience is narrower than that of the journalistic texts, as the texts contain specialized areas of knowledge. The choice of the texts is also made based on the assumption that given the contrasts between the three text types in terms of communication, there may be different uses of linguistic features pertaining to apposition. It is felt thus that the distribution of appositional construction is well represented in terms of numbers and variation in the three chosen varieties of written texts.

FINDINGS

Overall distribution of apposition in the corpus

Table 1 depicts the distribution of apposition in the corpus, which consists of the three text types, each containing approximately 150,000 words.

Table 1

Overall Distribution of Apposition in the Corpus

Text type	Frequency of apposition
Journalistic	1704
Academic	1308
Fictional	215
Total	3227

The majority of cases (53%) are found in the journalistic text type, in comparison to 41% in the academic texts and only 7% in the fictional texts. That apposition seems to feature much more highly in journalistic and academic texts than in the fictional texts suggests that there could possibly be semantic, pragmatic and stylistic purposes in the employment of the construction.

Overall distribution of syntactic forms of apposition

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of syntactic forms of apposition in Malay.

Table 2

Overall Distribution of Syntactic Forms of Apposition

Form	Total frequency	%
Other	275	8.5
Nominal	941	29.2
Nominal with marker	1064	33
Verbal	1	0
Verbal with marker	41	1.3
Adjectival	5	0.2
Adjectival with marker	18	0.5
Prepositional	2	0.1
Prepositional with marker	50	1.6
Numbers	31	0.9
Symbols	361	11.2
Abbreviation	438	13.5
Total	3227	100

The top syntactic form of apposition is nominal with marker (from hereon, combined nominal apposition), followed closely with nominal apposition. Examples of both combined nominal apposition and nominal apposition are illustrated in (11) and (12) respectively:

11. Dialah yang memisahkan emak daripada *Dising*, *anak kesayangannya itu*. [F:Hijrah1]⁴
(She was the one who separated mother form Dising, her beloved son).

12. Kerajaan tidak akan membenarkan *institusi kewangan* termasuk *bank, syarikat kewangan atau broker-broker* melepaskan tanggungjawab mereka ... [J:9Dis1]
(The government will not allow financial institutions including banks, financial companies and brokers to escape from their responsibilities...)

Overall distribution of syntactic functions of apposition

Table 3 shows the distribution of syntactic functions of apposition in the corpus.

Table 3

Overall Distribution of Syntactic Functions of Apposition

Function	Total frequency	%
Other	261	8.1
Subject	998	30.9
Object	485	15
Object of preposition	853	26.4
Subject complement	19	0.6
Object complement	4	0.2
Adverbial	42	1.2
Modifier	565	17.6
Total	3227	100

The top function of apposition here is that of subject, followed by object of preposition. Following from our previous findings, that combined nominal apposition appear to be the typical appositive structure, it is hardly surprising that appositions usually take the subject and prepositional object positions. Examples of apposition functioning both as subject and prepositional object are illustrated in (13) and (14) respectively:

13. *Cikgu Long, guru penolong kanan* menasihati aku supaya berpakaian kemas...[F:Anak1]
(Mr. Long, the Assistant Head, advided me to dress well...)

14. Saya pernah bertugas di *Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)*.
[J:25Nov2]
(I have worked at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM).)

Overall position of appositional units

In Table 4, the majority of appositions in the corpus have units that are juxtaposed to each other:

Table 4

Overall Positioning of Appositional Units

Position	Total frequency	%
Other	0	0
Juxtaposed	3153	97.7
Unjuxtaposed: end-focus	65	2.0
Unjuxtaposed: syntactic constraints	9	0.3
Total	3227	100

15. Seminar itu telah dirasmikan oleh *Menteri Luar, Datuk Abdullah Ahmad Badawi*. [J:26Nov2]
(The seminar was officiated by the External Affairs inister, Datuk Abdullah Ahmad Badawi.)

When units are not juxtaposed, they are accounted for by two possibilities. The units may be unjuxtaposed due to specific syntactic constraints (16), or due to reasons of end-focus (17). However, the overall result leaves us in no doubt about the position of units in a typical appositional construction.

16. *Chavalit Kittipan, 70, seorang pegawai awam* berkata ...[A:25Oktober3]
(Chavalit Kittipan, 70, a civil servant said...)

The element 70 has to be placed after the main NP or the head it modifies, hence the reason it is placed after the first unit of apposition and thus causing the physical separation of the two units. This construction, incidentally, is a very specific journalistic syntax.

17. Dalam hal ini, *satu lagi sifat biji benih* menjadi penting dalam menentukan mutu biji benih, iaitu *kecergasan biji benih*. [A:Benih1]
(In this matter, another characteristic of the seed is important in determining its quality, which is how active the seed is.)

The second unit is placed so in order to focus the reader's attention to this item, which Meyer (1992, p.38) calls the "emphatic end-position of the sentence".

Overall distribution of semantic relations of apposition

A study of Table 5 reveals that the majority of 45.7% of cases in the corpus are apposition with units in strict co-referential position.

Table 5

Semantic Relation of Apposition

Relation	Total frequency	%
Other	36	1.0
Strict co-reference	1474	45.7
Speaker co-reference	3	0
Part/whole	368	11.4
Anaphoric reference	183	5,7
Cataphoric reference	108	3.44
Synonymy	736	22.8
Hyponymy	282	8.8
Attribution	39	1.2
Total	3227	100

18. *Perdana Menteri, Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir* berkata ...
[J:9Dis1]
(The prime Minister, Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir said ...)

Whilst this is the most common semantic relation, the other prominent relation in the corpus is that of synonymy:

19. Jika perbuatan *menyepak* atau *menendang* sesuatu diterima sebagai permulaan permainan ini ...[A:Sukan1]
(*If the act of kicking or kicking something is accepted as marking the beginning of this game ...)

An interesting observation in this example is that *menyepak* and *menendang* are not translatable into two different lexical items in English. One English word is used to carry the meaning intended by the two words in Malay. If we were talking about the purpose of repeating the same notion in this sentence, we could argue that it is possibly for the reason of emphasis, but that is not what we are doing here. This observation is relevant here

insofar as to exhibit that the synonymy of the two Malay words is evident when we translate them into English.

Overall distribution of semantic categories of apposition

From Table 6, the category of appellation tops all the other categories in terms of frequency of occurrence in the corpus.

Table 6

Semantic Categories of Apposition

Category	Total frequency	%
Other	2	0.1
Identification	195	6.1
Appellation	846	26.3
Exemplification	467	14.5
Particularization	224	7
Characterization	239	7.4
Paraphrase	728	22.5
Self-correction	1	0
Re-orientation	525	16.3
Total	3227	100

26.3% of all appositions have second units that name the first, an example of which is shown below:

20. *Peserta dari New Zealand, Salita Tusitala Marsh*
berpendapat sudah tiba masanya Asia Pasifik mempunyai
... [J:Dis2]

(The participant from New Zealand, Salia Tusitala Marsh
felt that it was time that Asia Pacific has ...)

In this category, the second unit names the referent in the first unit.
The other top category after appellation is the category of paraphrase:

21. ...wanita cenderung bersikap lebih *asertif (berkeras)*
daripada lelaki. [J:26Nov2]

(...*women are more prone to be assertive (assertive) than
men.)

The need to paraphrase the meaning of the word emanates from the idea that some readers may not understand the meaning of the first unit if they do not understand the meaning carried by the original *assertive*.

Overall view of the pragmatics of apposition

Table 7 illustrates that the prevalence of apposition in which the second unit provides new information to the first is striking, with 90% of total appositions in this category.

Table 7

Pragmatic Characteristics of Apposition

Structure type	Total frequency	%
Other	0	0
New information	2906	90
Partially new information	321	10
Total	3227	100

An example of apposition behaving in this pragmatic fashion is:

22. *Ketua kumpulan The Nation, Suthichai Yoon* nampaknya telah mula longgar dengan konsep perjuangan ...[J:25Oct3]
 (The leader of The Nation, Suthichai Yoon seems to be shaky in his principle...)

The second unit *Suthichai Yoon* provides totally new information about the first unit by naming the referent mentioned in the latter. The rest of the appositions have within them second units that provide partially new information about the first unit. The information distribution is such that either old or partially new information is repeated and placed at the beginning of the second unit. This ordering of information is in line with the manner of information distribution expressed by Quirk et al., that is, from “low to high information value” (1985, p.1356-7). In an appositional construction, “old information which has low information value is placed at the beginning of the second unit and is followed by the new information, which has higher information value” (Meyer, 1992, p.84). An example of apposition of this type is

23. Puak ini terbahagi kepada *dua golongan* iaitu *golongan ahli hadis and golongan ahli pemikir*. [A:Islam4]
 (This group is divided into two factions, that is the hadis faction and the thinkers faction.)

In the example, the word *golongan* is repeated and placed at the beginning of the second unit followed by the new information consisting of the name of the groups, which is newly introduced into the discourse.

TYPICAL APPOSITION IN MALAY

The previous section sought to provide a description of the typical or near-typical case of apposition in Malay. This has been done by detailing the most prominent findings of the study with respect to the syntactic, semantic and pragmatics make up of the constructions in the corpus. By putting together the findings, the make-up of a typical apposition in Malay is depicted in Table 8.

Table 8

The Make-Up of a Typical Apposition in Malay

Aspect of apposition	Description
Syntactic form	Two noun phrases, with or without marker
Syntactic function	Subject position
The positioning of units	Juxtaposed to each other
Semantic relation	Strict co-referential relation
Semantic category	Appellation
Pragmatic characteristics	Second unit provide new information about first unit

In sum, a typical apposition in Malay is constructed with two juxtaposed noun phrases in subject position, whose units are co-referential, and where the second unit names the first unit, therefore providing new information to it. An example from the corpus of the typical apposition is:

24. Pengerusi Eksekutif FCW, Datuk Nik Kamaruddin Ismail berkata [J:26Nov2]
(FCW Executive Chairman, Datuk Nik Kamaruddin Ismail said.....)

APPOSITION ‘FOUND’: SOME IMPLICATIONS

Our findings have two particular contributions: firstly, it highlights to linguists and Malay grammarians specifically that appositions do exist in Malay. In doing so, the gap in the grammatical description in Malay is addressed. Constructions that cannot be accounted for by any of the established relations in Malay can be taken into consideration as possible appositional constructions. Secondly, it provides evidence for the need to review and rewrite Malay grammar to include the relation. Apposition in Malay should be regarded as a valid relation on par with various well-established relations in Malay grammar, such as co-ordination, complementation and modification. Accounting for the description of apposition in Malay will portray the wealth of the linguistic system of the language.

Implications for the teaching and learning of Malay

Whilst Malay addresses well-established relations such as those mentioned above, none has been said about appositive constructions. The fact that these constructions exist, and that they fail to be accounted for by any of the existing relations create a gap in the learners' paradigm. The teaching of Malay has to bring to the fore the notion of apposition. Differences between appositional constructions, and coordination and modification, for example, need to be highlighted and discussed. One may opine that the knowledge of terms is quite irrelevant to the use of the constructions in Malay, and we support this argument. However, it is imperative that the 'operations' of apposition be made distinct from that of other relations. By formalising apposition, the learner's language learning is aided by allowing the learner to compartmentalise his/her knowledge of constructions in Malay.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we set out to show the typical realisations of apposition. Underlying this task was the primary belief that in not doing so, we are allowing for the gap in grammatical description currently existing in Malay grammar. While we realise the value of having in-depth discussion on apposition and all its distinctive syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features, it is not the place for a paper of this purpose. Insofar as we intended, the paper has demonstrated that appositions do exist in Malay. We have shown that a formal description has to account for the constructions as they cannot fit into any of the well-established relations described in Malay grammar. The pedagogical implications of this study's 'discovery' are also significant in the teaching and learning of the Malay language.

REFERENCES

- Acuna, F. J.C. (1996). *The puzzle of apposition- on so-called appositive structure in English*. Universidade De Santiago De Compostela.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bitea, I.N. (1977). An attempt at defining apposition in modern English. *Reveu Romaine de Linguistique*, 433-477.

- Burton-Roberts, N. (1975). Nominal apposition. *Foundations of Language*, 391-419.
- Harshita Aini Haroon. (1999). *A corpus-based study of apposition in written Malay*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds.
- Koktová, E. (1998). Ellipsis. In Mey (Ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, 280-281. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Matthews, P.H. (1981). *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, C. (1992). *Apposition in contemporary English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, C., & Tenney, R.L. (1993). Tagger: An interactive tagging program. In Souter & Atwell (Eds.), *Corpus-based computational linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1972). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

APPENDIX

Features Used in the Coding of Appositional Constructions

Variables	Values
Text	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Journalistic2. Academic3. Fictional
Syntactic form	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Other2. Nominal3. Nominal with marker4. Verbal5. Verbal with marker6. Adjectival7. Adjectival with marker8. Prepositional9. Prepositional with marker10. Numbers11. Symbols12. Abbreviation
Syntactic function	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Other2. Subject3. Object4. Object of preposition5. Subject complement6. Object complement7. Adverbial8. Modifier
Positioning of units	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Other2. Juxtaposed3. Unjuxtaposed: end-focus4. Unjuxtaposed: syntactic constraints
Semantic relation	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Other2. Strict co-reference3. Speaker co-reference4. Part/whole5. Anaphoric reference6. Cataphoric reference7. Synonymy8. Hyponymy

	9. Attribution
Semantic category	1. Other 2. Identification 3. Appellation 4. Exemplification 5. Particularization 6. Characterization 7. Paraphrase 8. Self-correction 9. Re-orientation
Pragmatic characteristics	1. Other 2. New information 3. Partially new information

End notes

¹ (created) indicates constructions that have been created for exemplification purposes.

² The symbol * is used to mark erroneous sentences.

³ This sentence, however, is acceptable if *buta* is a term/name used in a derogatory manner to refer to a person. This meaning nevertheless is different from that intended in (9).

⁴ [F:Hijrah1] indicates the convention used throughout the paper to mark that the example was extracted from the *Fictional* text named *Hijrah1*. Whilst F refers to the Fictional text, J refers to the Journalistic text and A the Academic text.