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1. Introduction to appositional constructions

- Apposition: non-restrictive postmodifier of a constituent: the anchor

(1) Appositional construction
My sister, Elizabeth, lives in Leiden.
"Comma intonation"

- Apposition involves a secondary message (Berckmans 1994; Dever 2001; Potts 2003)

(2) a. Christine, a clever girl, won the quiz.
   b. Christine won the quiz.
   c. Christine is a clever girl.

- Semantic classification (Quirk et al. 1985; Heringa & De Vries 2008)

(3) a. My only brother, Pieter, is a member of the student council. (identification, =) 
   b. His girl friend, a modest person, laughs about that. (attribution, >)

- The classes of apposition relate to types of predication (Higgins 1979; Partee 1998)

(4) a. My only brother is Pieter. (specificational)
   b. His girl friend is a modest person. (predicational)

- Apposition involves coordination (Kraak & Klooster 1968; De Vries 2006)

   o The anchor and the apposition form one constituent together (illustrated with V2)

(5) a. Maaike, een slim meisje, heeft de quiz gewonnen.
   b. * Maaike a smart girl has the quiz won.

   a. Maaike heeft, een slim meisje, de quiz gewonnen.
Coordinators can be used as apposition markers (Quirk et al. 1985)

6. a. The United States of America, or America for short...
b. You could cut the atmosphere with a knife, and a blunt knife at that.
c. John is interested in science, but especially linguistics.

7. a. Spojené Státu Americké, neboli Amerika ...
   [Czech] (Radek Šimík p.c.)
   United States Amer.-ADJ or America
b. Viděl jsem něco krásného, a to zlatý dům.
   saw AUX-1SG-PAST something beautiful and it golden house
   ’I saw something beautiful, namely a golden house.’
c. Všechny opice, ale/a především orangutani, jsou ohroženým druhem.
   All apes but/and mainly orang-outans are threatened species

- Appositions show paratactic/cross-Clausal behaviour
  
  o ellipsis

8. a. Jij hebt twee violen, antieke exemplaren, en ik heb er drie [e]. [Dutch]
   you have two violins antique specimens and I have there three
b. (i) = ... and I have three violins
   (ii) ≠ ... and I have three violins, antique specimens
   c. Jij hebt twee violen. Dat zijn antieke exemplaren. Ik heb er drie [e].

  o semantic operator interaction (Dever 2001)

9. a. John did not kiss Mary, his girlfriend.
b. (i) = ... Mary is his girlfriend
   (ii) ≠ ... Mary is not his girlfriend
c. John did not kiss Mary. She is his girlfriend.

  o speaker-oriented (Potts 2003, 2007)

10. a. Sheila says that Chuck, a confirmed psychopath, is fit to watch the kids.
b. ≠ Sheila says that Chuck is a confirmed psychopath
   c. Sheila says that Chuck - he is a confirmed psychopath - is fit to watch the kids.

2. Syntactic structure: predication, coordination and multi-dominance

2.1. Predication

→ Is the secondary message really there in syntax? If so, what status does it have?
✓ Yes, it is there, and it is a full CP.
  
  - The apposition is a (nominal) predicate; not an argument.
  - The tense of the secondary message can differ from the tense of the matrix.
  - Sentential adverbs show up in appositions.
  - Subordinators show up in appositions.
  - The secondary message can have a separate illocutionary force.

- The apposition is a (nominal) predicate; not an argument. (Doron 1994)
The Case of appositions

- Appositions can be i-within-i

(11) a. John, [his, own worst enemy], lost the elections again.
    b. John, is [his, own worst enemy].
    c. * [His, own worst enemy] lost the elections again.

- Appositions can be negated

(12) a. Orville Wright, not Wilbur, made the first flight at Kitty Hawk.
    b. * Not Wilbur made the first flight at Kitty Hawk.

- The tense of the secondary message can differ from that of the matrix

(13) a. Keith, once a drug addict, now leads a rehabilitation centre.
    b. I never realised that appositions, my current subject, could be so interesting.

- Sentential adverbs show up in appositions (Quirk et al. 1985)

(14) a. Your brother, obviously an expert on English grammar, is praised in this book.
    b. They elected as chairman Edna Jones, also a Cambridge graduate.

- Counterargument: high adverbs are possible in DP’s (Klein 1977)

(15) a. De vermoedelijk blonde daders zijn nog niet gevonden. [Dutch]
    the supposedly blond offenders are yet not found
    b. De helaas nog te jonge vader mag voorlopig niet trouwen.
    the unfortunately yet too young father can temporarily not marry

But: never outside the D, modifying either adjective or noun; not the relation with an argument.

- Speech act adverbs are impossible, but subordinators can be present (O’Connor 2008)

(16) a. * Mr. Minghella, frankly not particularly excited by the prospect of the book, was hooked by the time he finished it.
    b. The road, though no longer an officially designated route, has been celebrated in books (‘The Grapes of Wrath’), song (‘Get Your Kicks on Route 66’) and a TV series (‘Route 66’). (Los Angeles Times, 26-12-02, page B2, col. 1)

- The secondary message can have a separate illocutionary force

(17) a. Is Jane, the best doctor in town, already married?
    b. ?Jane, perhaps the best doctor in town?, is already married.

Conclusion: The predicate status of the apposition leads to the idea that the secondary message is present in syntax. Since appositions have their own tense, which can also be modified by adverbs, we need at least a TP. The presence of subordinators and the independent illocutionary force suggest that even CP is there.

2.2. Coordination and parenthetical construal

How is it possible to combine coordination and a secondary message?
- Adjoin a paratactic clause behind the second conjunct in a CoP.
- Coordination Phrase, where the head is an apposition marker, the specifier is the anchor and the complement is the apposition.
- Type of coordination: specifying coordination (colon Phrase)
- Parenthetical construal of the appositional clause accounts for cross-clausal behaviour.
- Problem: the anchor and the apposition are represented twice.
To represent coordination, we use a Coordination Phrase (Johannesen 1998) of the type &:P:

(18) This section is about the Coordination Phrase, or the CoP.

- The &:P, or colon phrase, represents a special type of coordination, different from additive, disjunctive, and adversative coordination. It is called specifying coordination (Koster 2000, De Vries 2006).

(19) a. the Netherlands and Belgium (additive)
    b. the Netherlands or Belgium (disjunctive)
    c. not the Netherlands, but Belgium (adversative)
    d. the Netherlands, or Holland (specifying)

- To represent the secondary message, we use a parenthetical construed clause, following De Vries (2007)

Parenthetical construal (dotted lines):
- parenthetical merge: no dominance relation
- non-subordination
- non-restrictive
- parallel structure
- Par head

(20) This section is about the secondary message, an interesting element.
2.3. Multiple dominance

→ How can we solve the double representation of the anchor and the apposition?
✓ The anchor is a little pro; the apposition is shared.

- Similarity to appositive relatives and parentheses suggests pronoun for anchor.
- The anchor takes over scope from the matrix; the apposition does not.
- Sharing results in a loop. This is solved by using layered DPs.
- This explains that attributive appositions are strong and predicative at the same time.
- Non-nominal appositions have other layers.
- Unbalanced appositions are interthoughts.

- There are two possibilities to solve the double representation of the anchor and the apposition. One is to use little pro's in the appositional clause. The other is to have only one instance of each element and share this between the matrix and the secondary clause.

- Similarity to appositive relatives and parenthetical clauses suggests the use of a pronoun to represent the anchor in the secondary message:

(21) a. Maaike, a nice girl, lives in Groningen. (aposition)
    b. Maaike, who is a nice girl, lives in Groningen. (appositive relative clause)
    c. Maaike - she is a nice girl - lives in Groningen. (parenthetical clause)

- Appositions differ in interpretation with appositive relatives and parentheticals.
  (Wang et al. 2004)

(22) a. John wants a car, a red one, for his birthday. (specific/non-specific)
    b. John wants a car, which is red, for his birthday. (specific)
    c. John wants a car - it is a red one - for his birthday. (specific)

- The interpretation of the anchor in the secondary message can take over the scope of the anchor in the matrix. This suggests that it behaves like an E-type pronoun referring over sentence boundaries.

(23) a. Maaike is watching a movie, a thriller.
    b. = The movie Maaike is going to watch is a thriller.
    c. Maaike is watching a movie. It is a thriller.

- Represent anchor in secondary message by silent pronoun: little pro.
Properties:
  • antecedent does not need to be specific
  • E-type: takes over scope of antecedent

- The apposition does not show this behaviour. It seems that a copy of it is available in both the matrix and the secondary clause.

(24) a. Maaike is watching a movie, a thriller.
    b. ≠ The movie Maaike is going to watch is a thriller Maaike is going to watch.
- Share apposition between matrix and appositional clause.

Sharing / Multiple dominance:
- One node has two mothers: it is directly dominated by two different nodes
- One element is merged twice
- Sharing has also been suggested for: movement, right node raising, amalgams:

(25) a. Which apple did John eat _? (movement)
b. John hates _ , but Mary loves spiders. (right node raising)
c. John went to _ I think it’s Groningen. (amalgam)

- internal remerge
  α is remerged with γ
  (γ in same root as α)

- external remerge
  α remerged with ζ
  (ζ in another root than α)


(26) Maaike is watching a movie, a thriller.
The secondary clause contains two empty elements: little pro and the verb. An empty verb is always interpreted as a copula and many languages have an empty copula in normal copular sentences as well (Stassen, 2008). The combination of little pro and the copula can be spelled out as *that is* (Latin *id est*, abbreviated *ie*).

(27) a. Tonight, we will meet the king of the jungle, *that is the lion*.
   b. This section is about sharing, *ie. multiple dominance*.

- The structure in (26) contains a loop, since the remerged DP projects to the higher DP, containing the secondary clause with the remerged DP. To solve this problem, we use a layered DP, inspired by Zamparelli (2000).

Layered DP:
- Two layers: S(trong)DP and P(redicative)DP
- SD contains feature [+/- strong], indicating the interpretation of the PDP. [+strong] results in type-lifting the DP from type <e,t> to type <e>.
- The apposition (PDP) can be interpreted strong in the matrix and weak in the appositive

(28) Mary kissed her friend, *a linguist*.

- If we take this approach, the Law of Coordination of Likes (LCL; Williams 1981, Munn 1993) is obeyed, even in attributive appositions like (28).
- This approach explains for attributive appositions the difference in interpretation between the matrix and the secondary clause.

(29) a. Mary kissed her friend, a linguist.
    b. Mary kissed her friend. (friend = strong)
    c. Mary kissed a linguist. (linguist = strong)
    d. Her friend is a linguist. (friend = strong; linguist = predicative)

- For identification the features on SD have the same value. This means that the copula construction in this case is specification/equative, where the subject and the predicate are of the same type (Heycock & Kroch 1999)

- Non-nominal appositions are possible as well.

(30) a. I met my neighbour over there, in the garden. (PP)
    b. My wife is nice, even wonderful. (AP)
    c. That rabbit kicked the bucket, that is, it died. (CP)

- This seems to result in a problem, because other categories don't have the distinction between strong and predicative interpretations. However, other categories can have different functional layers. For adjectives, for example, Zamparelli (2000) argues that they can have a DegP, comparable to the SDP for DP's.

- However, there are also categorically unbalanced appositions, such as predicative postmodifiers.

(31) a. The monkey, angry, showed its teeth.
    b. The children, in a bad mood, ruined everything.

- The position of these modifiers is more flexible, though. Therefore, we consider them to be interthoughts (cf. De Vries, 2008), which means that they do not involve coordination, and therefore no sharing.

(32) a. John, drunk, knocked at the door.
    b. John knocked, drunk, at the door.
    c. John knocked at the door, drunk.

(33) a. John, a nice guy, knocked at the door.
    b. * John knocked, a nice guy, at the door.
    c. * John knocked at the door, a nice guy.

**Conclusion**: Appositional constructions involve both coordination and predication. The appositive message is represented by a full CP, which is parenthetically related to the matrix. Also the apposition is coordinated to the anchor using specifying coordination. The apposition functions simultaneously in the coordinative structure and in the predicative structure by using multiple dominance. The appositive DP consists of layers, where only the lower layer is shared. The upper layer takes care of the right interpretation of the apposition in the matrix and the appositive clause: strong or predicative.
3. Predictions for case marking

- Apposition is multiply dominated → functions in two positions at once: second conjunct and non-verbal predicate

- Matching effects? What about case marking?

- Second conjunct: 1. same case as first conjunct  
  2. default/emphatic case (Schütze 2001)

(34) a. Er sah den blauen Himmel und den Ocean. [German]  
   he saw the:ACC blue:ACC sky and the:ACC ocean
   
   b. Ja znaju Dimu i Mishu. [Russian]  
   I know Dima:ACC and Misha:ACC

(35) a. Did your parents or him pick up Mary?  
   b. Ha nog meg var sammen om det. [Stavanger dialect]  
   he:NOM and me:ACC were together about it
   'He and I were in it together.'

- Non-verbal predicate:  
  1. no case (Japanese)  
  2. agreement with subject (nominative, Icelandic)  
     note: in secondary predication, the predicate can get any case, as in coordination  
  3. predicative case (instrumental, ..., Polish)
   (Citko 2008)

   John:TOP fine mathematician COP
   'John is a fine mathematician.'
   
   b. Hún er kennari. [Icelandic]  
   she:NOM is teacher:NOM
   
   c. Jan jest studentem. [Polish]  
   Jan:NOM is student:INSTR

- What happens in appositions?

  Suppose (similar mechanism in Matushansky 2008):  
  o XP can receive more than one value for case.  
  o PF chooses which case to realise morphologically.

- Apposition gets case from both coordination and predication.

| Predicts four possibilities: | 1. apposition gets same case as anchor  | 2. apposition gets default/emphatic case  | 3. apposition gets predicative case  | 4. difference in case features results in crash |
4. A cross-linguistic survey

4.1 Apposition gets same case as anchor

**Russian**

(37) a. Džon, lingvist, yvestupil s dokladom ob Aranae.
   John: NOM linguist: NOM talked with report about Aranae
   'John, a linguist, gave a talk on Aranae.'
   
   b. V 1973, Skylab vzjal v kosmos dvux životnyx, paukov
   In 1973 Skylab took in space two: ACC animals: ACC spiders: ACC
   Arabellu i Anitu.
   Arabella: ACC and Anita: ACC
   'In 1973, Skylab took two animals, the spiders Arabella and Anita, into space.'

**Czech**

(38) a. Astronauti dali Arabelle, zahradnímu pavoukovi, vodu a maso,
   astronauts gave Arabella: DAT garden spider: DAT water: ACC and meat: ACC
dobrou pavoučí pochoutku.
   good spider delicacies: ACC
   'The astronauts gave Arabella, a garden spider, water and meat, a nice spider meal.'
   
   b. Deinopida, pavouk, zahlédl kořist svýma očima, dvěma
   Deinopida: NOM spider: NOM spotted prey his eyes: INSTR, two
enormous compound lenses: INSTR
   enormous compound lenses: INSTR
   'Deinopida, a spider, spotted a prey with his eyes, two enormous compound lenses.'

- Russian and Czech:
  IF Case[1] = acc|dat|gen|instr AND Case[2] = nom|instr THEN SPELLOUT (Case[1])

4.2 Apposition gets default/emphatic case

**English** (Schütze 2001)

(39) a. The best athlete, her, should win.
   b. The teacher said that the smartest student, namely me, should give a speech.

**Norwegian** (Schütze 2001)

(40) Laereren sa at den smarteste studenten, altså meg / jeg,
   the-teacher said that the smartest student, thus me / I,
   skulle gi en tale.
   should give a speech.

- English and Norwegian:

note: the optionality in Norwegian comes from coordination; not from this rule.

- The only difference between Russian/Czech and English/Norwegian is the case that a second conjunct receives: same as first conjunct vs. default/emphatic
4.3 Apposition gets predicative case

Romanian identification

(41) a. În 1973, Skylab a luat două animale, pe păianjenii Arabella și Anita, în spațiu.  
In 1973, Skylab took two animals, the spiders Arabella and Anita, into space.

b. Ea de asemenea a făcut astronautilor, în special oamenilor de știință, o pânză.  
'She too made the astronauts, in particular the scientists, a web.'

Romanian attribution

(42) a. Astronautii au dat Arabelei, un păianjen de grădină, apă și carne, o masă frumoasă pentru un păianjen.  
The astronauts gave Arabella, a garden spider, water and meat, a nice spider meal.

b. Aspectul Deinopidei se aseamănă cu cel al lui Shreck, ogre:modern.  
The appearance of Deinopida is similar to that of Shrek, the modern ogre.

Romanian identification/attribution

(43) Au dat-o și Anitei, celulalt / celuilalt păianjen.  
'They gave it Anita, the other spider, as well.'

- Romanian:
  IF Interp = [-strong] AND Case[1] = nom THEN SPELLOUT (Case[1])

4.4 Difference in case features results in crash

Icelandic identification

(44) a. Hann sagði að áttfætur, það er köngulær, hefðu tvískiptan búk  
‘He said that Araneae:spiders had two divided body segments.’

b. Deinopida kastaði vefnum yfr bráð sín, lirftuna hans Jóns.  
'Deinopida cast the net over her prey, John's caterpillar.'
Icelandic attribution

(45) a. Arabella bjó til fyrsta vefinn, *(sem var) ófullkomin
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF ACC that was incomplete:NOM
construction
'Arabella made the first web, which was an incomplete construction.'
b. *(Arabella bjó til fyrsta vefinn, ófullkoma smíð.
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF:ACC, incomplete:ACC construction
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF:ACC, ófullkoma smíð.
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF:ACC, incomplete:ACC construction
 constr."
'Arabella made the first web, which was an incomplete construction.'

Hungarian attribution

(46) a. Azt mondta, hogy az Araneaknak, vagyis a pókoknak, két testtájuk van.
that:ACC said:3SG that the Aranea:PL:DAT or the spiders:DAT two body.area is
'He told that Aranae, ie spiders have two body segments.'
b. Valószínűleg egy finom rovart akart csapdába ejteni, például egy
probably a delicious insect:ACC wanted trap:ILL drop for.example a
space-fly:ACC

Hungarian identification

(47) a. János, egy nyelvész, a pókokról tartott előadást.
John:NOM a linguist:NOM the spiders:DEL held lecture
'John, a linguist, gave a talk on spiders.'
b. Az űrhajósok Arabellának, a kerti pókon vizet és húst adtak,
the astronauts Arabella:DAT the garden spider:DAT water:ACC and meat:ACC gave,
*(ami) kitünő pókétel.
which lovely spiderfood:ACC
'The astronauts gave Arabella, the garden spider, water and meat, which is a nice
spider meal.'

- Hungarian/Icelandic

IF Case[1] = acc|dat|gen|instr|etc. AND Case[2] = nom THEN SPELLOUT (Case[1])
IF Interp = [-strong] AND Case[1] ≠ nom THEN CRASH
4.5 Future research

Japanese

(48) a. Gengogakusya-no Johnga Aranaeni tuite kooeno sita.
   linguist-NOM John: NOM Aranae:DAT about lecture did
   'John, a linguist, gave a talk on Aranae.'

b. Korerano taisetu-kanno tunagino bubun-dearu kubirewa
   these:GEN body:segments-between:GEN connection:GEN part:DEARU waist:TOP
   very thin
   The connection between the body segments, the waist, is very thin.

c. 1973-nen-ni Skylabwa ni-hikino doobutu, sunawati kumo-no Arabella to
   1973-year-at Skylab:TOP two:CT:GEN animal, that.is, spider:NO Arabella and
   Anitao utyuu-ni turetitta.
   Anita:ACC space-to took.
   'In 1973, Skylab took two animals, the spiders Arabella and Anita into space.

- NP₁-no NP₂/ NP₁-dearu NP₂: relative clause or apposition?
- No case marking on NP₁: predicative case or case marking on one element of constituent?
- Relation between restrictive and non-restrictive apposition?
- Word order in 'sunawati'-clauses?

German

(Durrell 1996), (Molitor 1979)

(49) a. Es spricht Herbert Werner, der Vorsitzende des Vereins.
   it speaks Herbert Werner, the chairman: NOM the society:GEN
   'The speaker is Herbert Werner, the chairman of the society.'

b. in Michelstadt, einem kleinen Städtchen im Odenwald …
   in Michelstadt, a:DAT little:DAT town in the Odenwald …

(50) a. Ich habe Peter, früher mein bester Freund, sehr enttäuscht.
   I have Peter formerly my: NOM best: NOM friend highly disappointed

b.* Ich habe Peter, früher meinen besten Freund, sehr enttäuscht.
   I have Peter formerly my:ACC best:ACC friend highly disappointed

- Prescriptive: coordinative case, like Russian
- Use for part of the speakers: predicative case in attribution, like Romanian

Arabic (Loock 2005): like Romanian or Norwegian?

Finnish/Estonian (Myrthe Faber & Jessica Overweg): like Hungarian?
5. Conclusion

- The apposition is multiply dominated in coordination and predication.
- Multiple dominance leads to matching effects.
- Morphology chooses between case values.
- Four possibilities predicted and present:
  1. Apposition gets same case as anchor: Russian/Czech
  2. Apposition gets default/emphatic case: English/Norwegian
  3. Apposition gets predicative case: Romanian
  4. Difference in case values leads to crash: Icelandic/Hungarian
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