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Overview

1. Introduction to appositional constructions
   - Apposition: non-restrictive postmodifier of a constituent: the anchor

(1) Appositional construction
   My sister, Elizabeth, lives in Leiden.
   Anchor → Apposition
   '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. (specification)
    b. His girl friend is a modest person. (predication)

   - 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.
    Maaike a smart girl has the quiz won.
    b. * 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, nebo 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. Links ziet u een oude kerk, een prachtig gebouw, [Dutch]
      left see you an old church a wonderful building
      en rechts ziet u een nieuwe [e].
      and right see you a new
      'On the left, you see an old church, a wonderful building, and on the right, you see a new one.'
   b. (i) = ... on the right you see a new one
      (ii) ≠ ... on the right you see a new one, a wonderful building
   c. Links ziet u een oude kerk. Dat is een prachtig gebouw.
      left see you an old church that is a wonderful building
      Rechts ziet u een nieuwe [e].
      right see you a new

  o semantic operator interaction (Dever 2001)

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

  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?

- The apposition is a (nominal) predicate; not an argument.
- The tense of the secondary message can differ from that of the matrix.
- Sentential adverbs show up in appositions.
- Subordinators show up in appositions.

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

  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.

- The apposition 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 vermeedelijk blonde daders zijn nog niet gevonden. [Dutch]
    b. De helaas nog te jonge vader mag voorlopig niet trouwen. [Dutch]

  But: never preceding 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, I use a Coordination Phrase (Johannesen 1998) of the type &:P:

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

```
    &:P
   /   \
Anchor &.'
   \   /  the coordination phrase
  DP   &:'
    /   /  or
App. Marker Apposition &: DP
    /    /  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
2.3. Multidominance

- 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.
  - Attributive appositions are interpreted strong in coordination and weak in predication.
  - Therefore, we use layered DP’s with a strong interpreted higher layer and a weak interpreted lower layer. Only the weak layer is shared.
  - Non-nominal appositions have other layers.
  - Unbalanced appositions do not exist.

- There are two possibilities to solve the double representation of the anchor and the apposition.
  One is to use (silent) pronouns 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. (apposition)
    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)
- Appositive relatives can only paraphrase one type of apposition: attribution. Conclusion: there is no relative operator in appositional constructions. Appositions are (like) parenthetical clauses.

(22)  a. My neighbour, the man with the blue hat over there, seems very glad.
    b. *My neighbour, who is the man with the blue hat over there, seems very glad.
    c. My neighbour – that’s the man with the blue hat over there – seems very glad.

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

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

- Represent anchor in secondary message by silent pronoun: little pro. This is an E-type pronoun: it takes over the scope of its antecedent.

  o Problem: specificity readings (cf. Wang et al. 2004):
    How do we get in the modal?

(24)  a. John wants a car, a red one. (specific, non-specific)
    b. John wants a car, which is red. (specific)
    c. John wants a car - it is a red one (specific)
    d. John wants a car - it should be a red one (non-specific)

- Unlike the anchor, the apposition does not show E-type behaviour. This suggests that a copy of it is available in both the matrix and the secondary clause.

(25)  a. Maaike is watching a movie, a thriller.
    b. ≠ The movie Maaike is going to watch is a thriller Maaike is going to watch.
    c. ≠ the movie is a thriller Maaike is going to watch.

- Share apposition between matrix and appositional clause.

  Sharing / Multidominance:
  • 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:

(26)  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)
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.).

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

- We have to obey the Law of Coordination of Likes (LCL; Williams 1981, Munn 1993)
Predicative DPs and strong DPs are different: types <e,t> and <e> respectively

(30) a. The giraffe is an herbivore and a good runner.
   b. * My favorite animal is the giraffe and an herbivore.

→ How can an attributive apposition be interpreted strong in the matrix and predicative in the secondary message?
√ Every strong DP contains a predicative DP (Zamparelli 2000). Therefore, we can share just the predicative core, while coordinating at the higher, strong, level.

Layered DP (inspired by Zamparelli 2000):
- Two layers: S(tring)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

(31) Mary kissed her friend, a linguist.

[final version]
- Note: for identification, the features on SD have the same value. The copula construction in this case is specification/equative, where the subject and the predicate are of the same type: \(<e>\) (Heycock & Kroch 1999)

- Positive side effect: intuitively, the structure in (27) was hard to generate. The appositive clause, including the apposition DP adjoined to this very same apposition DP. The structure in (31) does not have this intuitive problem.

- Non-nominal apposities are possible as well.

(32) 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 in interpretation that DP's typically have. 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 seem to be also categorially unbalanced appositions, such as predicative postmodifiers.

(33) 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, they are no appositions: they do not involve coordination, and therefore no sharing.

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

(35) 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 multi 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

- Interaction effects? What about case marking?

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

(36) a. Er sah den blauen Himmel und den Ozean. [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

(37) 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)

(38) a. John-wa sugureta suugakusha-Ø da [Japanese]
   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 three possibilities:

1. apposition gets coordinative case
2. apposition gets predicative case
3. difference in case features results in crash
4. A cross-linguistic survey

4.1 Apposition gets coordinative case

**Russian**

(39) a. Džon, lingvist, vystupil 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 Anita.

Arabella: ACC and Anita: ACC

'In 1973, Skylab took two animals, the spiders Arabella and Anita, into space.'

**Czech**

(40) 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

obrovskými složenými očkami.

enormous compound lenses: INSTR

'Deinopida, a spider, spotted a prey with his eyes, two enormous compound lenses.'

- Russian and Czech: apposition gets same case as anchor

**English** (Schütze 2001)

(41) a. The best athlete, her, should win.

b. The teacher said that the smartest student, namely me, should give a speech.

**Norwegian** (Schütze 2001)

(42) 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: appositions get default/emphatic case

- Russian, Czech, English and Norwegian: an element with two case features, one of them being predicative, is spelled out with morphology for the non-predicative case

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
4.2 Apposition gets predicative case

Romanian identification

(43) 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 science a web.  
   *She too made the astronauts, in particular the scientists, a web.*

Romanian attribution

(44) a. Astronautilii 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,  
   *The appearance of Deinopida is similar to that of Shrek, the modern ogre.*

Romanian identification/attribution

(45) Au dat-o și Anitei, celălalt păianjen.  
   *They gave it Anita, the other spider, as well.*

- Romanian: an element with two case features, one of them being predicative, is spelled out with morphology for the non-predicative case
but: spell out predicative (nominative) case for [-strong] predicates.

4.3 Difference in case features results in crash

Icelandic identification

(46) a. Hann sagði að áttfætlur, það er köngulær, hefððu tviskiptan bük  
   *He said that araneae: NOM that is spiders: NOM had two divided body segments.*

   b. Deinopida kastaði veðnum yfir bráð sina, lirfuna hans Jóns.  
   *Deinopida cast the net over her prey, John's caterpillar.*
**Icelandic attribution**

(47) a. Arabella bjó til fyrsta vefinn, *(sem var) ófullkomin
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF:ACC that was:ACC incomplete:NOM
smíð.
construction
‘Arabella made the first web, which was an incomplete construction.’

b. *Arabella bjó til fyrsta vefinn, ófullkomna smíð.
Arabella made to first:ACC web:DEF:ACC, incomplete:ACC construction

The shape of the web, which is a complex construction, differs from species to species.’

c. Lögun vefjarins, *(sem er) flókin smíð, er mismunandi frá tegund
Shape web:DEF:GEN, that is complex: NOM construction, is different from species
til tegundar.
to species
‘The shape of the web, which is a complex construction, differs from species to species.’

**Hungarian identification**

(48) 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 attribution**

(49) 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 póknak vizet és húst adtak,
the astronauts Arabella:DAT the garden spider:DAT water:ACC and meat:ACC gave,
*(ami) kitűnő pókétel.
which lovely spiderfood: NOM
‘The astronauts gave Arabella, the garden spider, water and meat, which is a nice
spider meal.’

- Hungarian/Icelandic: an element with two case features, one of them being predicative, is
spelled out with morphology for the non-predicative case
if a DP is [-strong], no other case feature than nominative may be assigned to this DP

Note: attributional appositions with a nominative anchor are possible: (47a)
4.4 Future research

Japanese

(50) 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 utuu-ni turetteitta.
'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)

(51) 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 ...

(52) 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

- Appositional constructions involves coordination and predication
- Coordination is represented by a CoP of a special type: &:P, specifying coordination
- The predication relation, a secondary message, is represented by a complete CP structure, parenthetically adjoined to the second conjunct of the &:P
- The anchor is represented in the secondary clause by a silent pronoun
- The apposition is shared by the coordinative structure and the predicative structure
- The appositive DP has two layers, a higher, strongly interpreted one and a lower, predicatively interpreted one. Only the lower one is shared, which accounts for the interpretation of attributive appositions
- This approach predicts three possibilities for case marking on appositions, which are all present:
  1. Apposition gets coordinative case: Russian/Czech, English/Norwegian
  2. Apposition gets predicative case: Romanian
  3. Difference in case values leads to clash: Icelandic/Hungarian
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