

## SEMANTIC EQUIVALENCE IN ENGLISH APPositIVES

Hero Gunawan

Widyatama University Bandung, English Department  
hero.gunawan@widyatama.ac.id

### ABSTRACT

*This research-based article discusses semantic equivalence in English appositives. This topic discussion has a particular power of attraction to insightfully investigate. Semantic equivalence provides quality of relatedness between an anchor and its appositive in a construction of apposition. If perceived from the syntactic viewpoint only, the existence of an appositive can be omitted due to the additional information seemingly deemed not to be important but if perceived from semantic viewpoint, it will serve something different in terms of the quality of information. The appositive, viewed from the semantic point of view, offers meaningful bonus information for its anchor (Gunawan, 2020). This information may clarify the anchor through various forms of equivalence. Therefore, this research serves two aims: 1) to identify the types of semantic equivalence in the appositional constructions, and 2) to explain the sense relations in the appositional constructions. The data sources are taken from English printed media within three levels of distributional coverage, i.e. national coverage that is daily news *The Jakarta Post*, regional coverage that is monthly magazine *Reader's Digest*, and international coverage, namely, weekly magazine *TIME*. The data are analysed through employing the method of qualitative research, that is, the method presenting descriptive data, both written and oral data. To analyse such descriptive data, the distributional method of analysis with the following techniques is used, namely, the deleting technique, the extracting technique, the intruding/inserting technique and the substituting technique. The results of this research uncover that: 1) four types of semantic equivalences are found, i.e., appellation, identification, designation and reformulation; 2) the sense relations in the constructions of apposition cover two sense relations: syntagmatic (in presentia) relation and paradigmatic (in absentia) relation. By syntagmatic relation, appositional construction has syntactic linear relatedness. By paradigmatic relation, the constituents in the constructions of appositions have sense closeness so as they are substitutable.*

**Keywords:** appositives, anchor, semantic equivalence, appositional constructions, sense relations

### INTRODUCTION

In appositional constructions, appositives can be perceived as the bonus information that has semantic equivalence to anchors as their antecedents. If an anchor is represented by A, and the appositive is represented by B, then A is equivalent to B. This can also be understood that A has a semantic relationship of equivalence. Therefore, semantic relationship of equivalence is the relationship which indicates the existence of equal meaning between an anchor and an appositive. This semantic relationship of equivalence has certain types, namely, appellation, identification, designation, and reformulation (Quirk *et al.*, 1999: 1309). Appellation refers more to the naming aspects; identification provides the clarification to the anchor which is still generic in nature; designation gives explanation in the form of the status of relationship between an anchor and an appositive; reformulation tends to emphasize on rewording aspects, restating in different way but the meaning is still the same.

Appellation can be understood as naming relationship between the anchor which is definite in nature, and the appositive in the form of proper names which cover wide-ranged names, namely: names of persons, names of institutions, names of publications, names of places (buildings, regions, cities, countries, *etc.*), names of tribes, names of animals, names of communities or social classes, and names of objects both concrete and abstract ones. The signal words that are usually used to indicate the existence this semantic relationship of appellation are the words like *namely*, *that is (to say)* and *in other words*, for examples:

- (1) *The company commander*, that is to say *Captain Madison*, assembled his men and announced their mission.

The appositive in (1) is in the form of a person, and both the anchor and the appositive indicate one-to-one correspondence. In other words, the referent of the anchor and the appositive is the same – the name of person as seen in (1a) below after a little bit modification by inserting the relative pronoun *who* and the copulative verb *be*.

- (1a) *The company commander*, who is *Captain Madison*, assembled his men and announced their mission.

Identification is a part of semantic relationship of equivalence which provides the explanation of specific meaning to the anchor which tends to be indefinite in nature, for example:

- (2) *A company commander*, (namely) *Captain Madison*, assembled his men and announced their mission.

The sample of appositive (2) above does not have one-to-one correspondence between the anchor and its appositive. This can be seen from the existence of the anchor which is generic in nature while the existence of appositive is specific, identifying the generic anchor.

Designation, as its name, this appositive explains the meaning through designating the status of relationship between the very specific anchor and the specific appositive. The forms of designation can be professions, positions, social relations (friendship), organizations, and the like. The relators that may potentially be inserted between the two (the anchor and the appositive) are *that is to say*, for examples:

- (3) *Captain Madison*, (that is to say) *the company commander*, assembled his men and announced their mission.

Appositive in (3) is the designation in the form of position held by the one in the anchor that is very specific. The construction (3) can be changed into a relative clause by using a copulative verb (*be*) as indicated in (3a) below.

- (3a) *Captain Madison*, (who is) *the company commander*, assembled his men and announced their mission.

Being able to change into a relative clause as in (3a) indicates that the anchor and its appositive are coreferential.

The relationship of reformulation tends to emphasize on rewording aspects, restating in different way but the meaning stays the same. The appositive of reformulation provides the formulation of the same meaning with different way (rewording). This reformulation may cover: 1) synonymous words/phrases, 2) factual knowledge included knowledge of the external world, 3) more precise formulation, 4) revisions, and many other rewording forms. This appositive reformulation usually uses linguistic markers such as (*more*) *simple*, *in scientific terminology*, *in more technical terms*, *technically*, and the other similar markers, for example:

- (4) *Sound units of the language*, *technically phonemes*, are usually surrounded by slant lines: /p/.

The semantic equivalence of the appositive in (4) above indicates the equivalent substance in the anchor which is specific in nature and the substance of appositive in the form of synonymous expression using linguistic marker *technically*.

### Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Sense Relations

The two types of sense relations discussed here cover syntagmatic and paradigmatic ones. Syntagmatic sense relation can be understood as the one which occurs among constituents within the same sentence, particularly the sentence which holds the syntactic relatedness, (Djajasudarma, 2013: 141). Hence, it is obvious that sense relations focus more on syntactic relations in which the sense relation constructs, for examples:

- (5) *The girl ran across the field*. (normal and acceptable)  
 (5a) *The girl sat across the field*. (abnormal and unacceptable)  
 (5b) *The smell ran across the field*. (abnormal and unacceptable)

The combination between the phrasal verb *sat across* and noun phrase *the field* (the verb phrase *sat across the field*) in (5a), and the combination between the subject *the smell* and the phrasal verb *ran across* (*the smell ran across*) in (5b) do not show the existence of syntactic relatedness. However, it is normal and acceptable if we say “*We sat across the table*.”

Syntagmatic and paradigmatic sense relations have mutual relationship in constructing a sentence. If syntagmatic sense relation is illustrated as a horizontal axis, then paradigmatic sense relation is as vertical one. Paradigmatic sense relation is a kind of sense relation of certain structural expressions which is operationally constructed through mechanism of choice (Djajsudarma, 2013: 113&141). Because of this, paradigmatic sense relation is called *in absentia* sense relation, as shown in (6) below:

- (6) *He bought a bottle of liquid*.

Conceptually, in English, anything that is drinkable is categorized into liquid so that the constituent *liquid* can be substituted with any other names of drinking, e.g., *milk*, *juice*, *beer*, *lemonade*, *brandy*, and many other drinking names, for examples:

- (6a) *He bought a bottle of [milk, juice, beer, lemonade, brandy]*.

Therefore, construction (6) has paradigmatic (*in absentia*) sense relation since one of the constituents in it enables to experience the substitution process with any other words having the same concept.

From the illustration regarding the phenomena of the appositive uses above, the parts that become centre of attention in this paper are 1) the types of semantic equivalence found in the appositional constructions, and 2) sense relations between appositive and its anchor in the appositional constructions.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is descriptive in nature because the data used are not judged to be true-false but they are viewed as the true phenomena as they are, ...*determines and describes the way the things are through collecting data to answer questions about the current subject of study* (Gay, 2009: 601). It is in line with Suryabrata's (2010: 75) notions, saying that the objectives of descriptive research are to make systematic, factual, and accurate description regarding the facts and certain accumulated nature.

The data are analysed through employing the method of qualitative research, that is, the method presenting descriptive data, both written and oral data. To analyse such descriptive data, the distributional method of analysis with the following techniques is used, namely, deleting technique, extracting technique, intruding technique, and substituting technique.

Based on this method, the author depicts the existing phenomena explicitly covering collecting and identifying the data, defining, and explaining the problems naturally (Seliger, 1989: 125), and as carefully and comprehensively as possible (Fraenkel, 1990:11). This method is not dedicated to find out the relationship among variables or causalities (Lodico, 2006:173).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

With regard to the brief explanation in the introduction above, two main important points are raised in this paper. They are 1) the types of semantic equivalence in the appositional constructions included how to demonstrate the existence of semantic equivalence in the appositional constructions, and 2) the sense relations between appositives and their anchors in the appositional constructions. The semantic equivalence that becomes the centre of discussion covers appellation, identification, designation, and reformulation.

### Appellation

The analysis of appellation mainly focus on 1) the naming contents of appellation in the appositional constructions, and 2) the sense relations between appositive of appellation and its anchor. Therefore, this analysis may reveal what naming contents of appellation are found in the appositional constructions, and the sense relations are constructed in the appositional constructions.

Variety of naming contents, namely the proper names (the names of persons and institutions), the name of the occupation, the name of the social class, the names of the objects and the name of the collection. However, only one of the data to be discussed here is the sample to represent the others.

(7) Jokowi, and *his running mate*, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, were backed by the rich, the middle class and the poor, she added.

The naming contents of appellation in the appositional constructions in (7) is the name of the person. In other words, the referent of each anchor and appositive are the same – the names of such appellative contents. To demonstrate that the appositives of appellations and the anchors have semantic equivalences are by intruding or inserting relative pronouns as indicated in (7a), and by extracting the anchor and the appositive from the contexts of the data (7) as in (7b) below.

(7a) Jokowi, and *his running mate*, (**who is**) Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, were backed by the rich, the middle class and the poor, she added.

(7b) *His running mate* is Basuki Tjahaja Purnama.

The appositive *Basuki Tjahaja Purnama* in the appositional construction has syntagmatic relation in the form of a proper name (personal name). The two constituents indicate syntactic closeness between the position and the person.

Perceiving the existence of syntagmatic relation above, the appositive *Basuki Tjahaja Purnama* in (7) enables to be replaced by another personal name. In other words, substitution process may occur in the syntactic cooccurrence. The substitution process can be done through replacing the word *Basuki Tjahaja Purnama* with another absolutely personal name such as *Tori* or *Didik*. If the substitution of *Tori* or *Didik* is used to denote the name of an animal, then the substitution process is not in line, and such a

substitution is also called *semantic clash* because it is abnormal for a governor candidate running mate with an animal. Therefore, *Basuki Tjahaja Purnama* also has paradigmatic relation (*in absentia*) since it is very possible to be replaced by the other personal names so that the sense relation constructed deals with persona and personal names.

### Identification

Data collected related to this type of equivalence involve concrete and abstract nouns, animate and inanimate objects, proper nouns (personas, places, institutions), statements, activities/events, slogans, mottos, and statements of dilemmas. The appositive of identification explains specific meaning to the anchor in such forms. Here is a sample of identification.

(8) *An annual jazz event, the Acacia festival*, was launched.

Sample (8) above is the appositive in the form of an activity (*event*). This appositive has semantic equivalence – identification. It can be seen from the equivalence in substance of the anchor (*an annual jazz event*) which is generic in nature and of the appositive (*the Acacia festival*) which is specific in nature. Both the anchor and the appositive are coreferential – referring to the same activity. To demonstrate that the appositive of identification and the anchor have semantic equivalences can be done through intruding or inserting a proper signal word *namely* as indicated in (8a), and by extracting the anchor and the appositive from the contexts of the data (8) as in (8b) below.

(8a) *An annual jazz event, (namely) the Acacia festival*, was launched.

(8b) *The Acacia festival is an annual jazz event.*

The appositive *the Acacia festival* in (8) has syntagmatic relation (*in presentia*) in the form of event (music performance – jazz) due to the close syntactic relatedness with its anchor. The appositive of identification *the Acacia festival* enables to have substitution with any names of activities of music performance which has relatively the same genre. If in the process of substitution, the name of the music event is replaced by the name of nothing to do with music genre, then the process of substitution will experience what the so-called semantic clash. Therefore, appositive *the Acacia festival* has paradigmatic relation (*in absentia*) because it is very possible to have another name of other activities of music performance.

### Designation

Unlike appellation and identification, designation gives the explanation of word meaning through designating the relationship status between the very specific anchor and the specific appositive. Therefore, in such a semantic relationship, it seems not to be able to insert the relator *namely* between an anchor and its appositive. The very possible relator that enables to use in between is *that is to say*.

The data found cover the variety of designation in terms of relationship status between an anchor and its appositive in the form of qualities (degrees/levels), social relations (friendships), professions (job titles), functions, organizations (agencies/offices), nicknames, economic relations (e.g., the biggest soybean importer country for Indonesia, proper nouns (religions, personas, objects, places, organizations/companies), and the qualities of presidential positions and candidates. Here is a sample of designation:

(9) The seafront promenade in *Benghazi, Libya's second city*, is a busy, vibrant place these days.

The contents of designation in the appositional construction in (9) is degree of a city. The referent of the anchor and appositive are the same – Benghazi city as the second-most populous city in Libya. It means that this appositive has semantic equivalence – designation. The substance of the very specific anchor (*Benghazi*) and the substance of the specific appositive (*Libya's second city*) are coreferential – referring to the same quality of the place (Benghazi city). To demonstrate that the appositive of designation and the anchor have semantic equivalences can be done through intruding or inserting a proper signal word *that is to say* as indicated in (9a), and by extracting the anchor and the appositive from the contexts of the data (9) as in the following (9b).

(9a) The seafront promenade in *Benghazi, (that is to say) Libya's second city*, is a busy, vibrant place these days.

(9b) ...*Benghazi is Libya's second city*, is a busy, vibrant place these days.

The appositive *Libya's second city* in (9) has syntagmatic relation (*in presentia*) in the form of degree (degree of a city). It is juxtaposed with its anchor in a syntactic co-occurrence. The appositive of designation *Libya's second city* enables to have substitution with any degrees of a city which has relatively the like. If in the process of substitution, the degree of the city is replaced by the degree that has nothing to do with the city such as *Libya's second person*, then the process of substitution will experience

the so-called semantic clash. Therefore, the appositive *Libya's second city* has paradigmatic relation (*in absentia*) because it is very possible to have another degree of other quality of a city.

### Reformulation

Appositives of reformulation provide the expression of equivalent meaning to the anchor in different way so that this is able to explain the nuance of meaning more clearly and simply. The signal word that may be used in between is *in other words* (with other variation like *in simple(r) words*).

Data related to this type of equivalence (reformulation) involve metaphor, factual knowledge, expressions (dealing with revision, accuracy, emphasis through negative reformulation and repetition, synonym, and simplification), acronyms, and translation. Here is a sample for this appositive of reformulation:

- (10) Three days ago, they administered *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, a drug to combat the constant nausea*.

Sample (10) above contains two appositives of reformulation using the conjunction *and*. The two appositives are in the form of the expression of simplification. This appositive has semantic relationship of reformulation. This relationship indicates the value of equivalence between the substance in the anchor and the one in the appositive. The equivalent relationship has coreference on the extra linguistic level, that is, the medicine for chemotherapy. The anchors *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan*, and *Zofran* become the referents of the contents of the appositives in the form of reformulation that explain the anchors in a simpler way, and in such a way that can possibly make it easy to understand. Therefore the two (the anchors and the appositives) have coreference in the form of the simpler formulation of explanation compared with the contents of the anchor *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan*, and *Zofran* as the chemotherapy medicine.

To demonstrate that the appositives of reformulation and the anchors have semantic equivalences can be done through intruding or inserting a linguistic marker *in simpler words* between the anchors and the appositives as seen in (10a), and through independently-extracting the anchors and the appositive from the contexts as shown in (10b).

- (10a) Three days ago, they administered *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, (in simpler words) a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, (in simpler words) a drug to combat the constant nausea*.
- (10b) *A 570-cc pouch of melphalan is a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran is a drug to combat the constant nausea*.

The appositives in the appositional constructions in (10) *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, a drug to combat the constant nausea* have syntagmatic relations (*in presentia*) in the form of medicines and the simple explanation about them since the two parts (the anchors and the appositives) denote the existence of the close syntactic relatedness. The constituents in the appositional constructions *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, a drug to combat the constant nausea* enable to have substitutions for other relevant medicines. The substitution process can be done, for examples, by replacing the words *kills* and *combat* with the words *destroys* and *prevent* respectively so that these constructions become *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, a high-dose chemotherapy that destroys everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, a drug to prevent the constant nausea*. Therefore, the appositional constructions *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan, a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow*, and *Zofran, a drug to combat the constant nausea* have paradigmatic relations (*in absentia*) because the constituents in the constructions still enable to be replaced with the other relevant constituents.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the focus of attention discussed in this paper (semantic equivalences and sense relations in the appositional constructions), the relevant conclusions are drawn, and the recommendations are provided.

All types of semantic equivalences are found in the research data derived from the selected data sources, *i.e.*, appellation, identification, designation and reformulation. Each type has its own sense relations respectively in the constructions of apposition, namely, syntagmatic (*in presentia*) relation, and paradigmatic (*in absentia*) relation. By syntagmatic relation, appositional construction has syntactic linier

relatedness. By paradigmatic relation, the constituents in the constructions of apposition have sense closeness so that they are substitutable.

This paper only discusses one aspect of appositives from the semantic viewpoints. So, to keep sustainable research, it is very possible to conduct the research with similar topics from a syntactic perspective. This notion will become an interesting niche of research for any readers/researchers so as to make the research complete because of being viewed from the two perspectives. If done so, this will bring comprehensive understanding towards the complexity of the appositives. Therefore, the appositional constructions can effectively and informatively provide the added values of understanding towards sentences and or texts.

## REFERENCES

- Borjaars, Kersti, Kate Burridge. 2001. *Introducing English Grammar.*, London. Arnold
- Carnei, Andrew. 2007. *Syntax: A Generative Introduction.* 2nd Edition. Oxford, UK. Blackwell Publishers.
- Crystal, David. 2001. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* Fourth Edition. Backwell Publishers. Oxford, UK.
- Fabb, Niggel. 1990. *The Difference between English Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses,* Journal of Linguistics 26, 57-78.
- Fraenkel, Jack R., Norman E. Wallen. 1990. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education.* McGraw-Hill Inc. New York.
- Gunawan, Hero, 2015. *The Construction of English Apposition in Printed Media,* Doctoral Dissertation. Post Graduate Program Padjadjaran University, Bandung.
- Gunawan, Hero, 2020. *Multiappositives as the Bonus Information for Their Anchor.* PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology, 17(10), 3278-3289. Retrieved from <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/5491>
- Heringa, Herman, 2010. *A Multidominance Approach to Appositional Construction.* Research Project. Unpublished.
- O'Grady, William, et al.1997. *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction.* London Longman.
- Quirk, Randolph, et al.1999. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* England. Longman.
- Seliger, Herbert W. and Elana Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Method.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1964. *Determiners and Relative Clauses in a Generative Grammar of English.* Language 40, 37-52.
- Sudaryanto, 2015. *Metode dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik.* Yogyakarta. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Vries, Mark de. 2002. *The Syntax of Appositive Relativization: On Specifying Coordination, False Free Relatives, and Promotion,* Linguistic Inquiry 37, 229-270.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

Complete Name : Hero Gunawan  
Institution : English Dept. Widyatama University Bandung  
Education : S-3 Linguistics  
Research Interests: Syntax, Semantics, Sociolinguistics, and Critical Thinking