

Reformulative appositions and clausal ellipsis

James Griffiths

Department of Languages, Literature and Communication, Utrecht University

jamesegriffiths@gmail.com

[Published version: *Lingua* 165: 70-91]

I claim that, from a syntactic perspective, reformulative appositions and their host clause anchors are coordinated in the same standard manner as the DPs in a sentence like *Bill and Ben slept*. I demonstrate that this ‘what you see is what you get’ low coordination account of reformulative apposition confers greater explanatory power than analyses that propose that reformulative appositions are contained within parenthetical clauses to which clausal ellipsis is applied.

Keywords: apposition, clausal ellipsis, coordination, reformulation, stripping

1. Introduction

The functional distinction between *attributive* and *reformulative* apposition has been influential in many generative analyses of the syntax of apposition.¹ According to this distinction, attributive appositions ascribe properties to their **anchors** (1a), while reformulative appositions provide additional and often more informative names for their anchors (1b).

- (1) a. *The Big Apple, a magical place*, is a huge city.
b. *The Big Apple, New York*, is a huge city.

While there is still disagreement about the exact nature of their subjects (cf. Del Gobbo 2007, O’Connor 2008, Heringa 2011, Griffiths 2015b), recent consensus has been reached that attributive appositions like (1a) are derived from finite predicative copular clauses whose subjects, auxiliary verbs (if any), and copulas are unpronounced (O’Connor 2008, Cardoso & De Vries 2010, Heringa 2011, Döring 2014, Griffiths & Güneş 2014, Ott 2014, Griffiths 2015b, *contra* Potts 2005) (see (2), where unpronounced material is enclosed in chevrons).

- (2) [The Big Apple,_i <{which/it}_i; is> *a magical place*, is a huge city.

¹ Heringa (2011) traces this distinction as far back as Poutsma (1904). For discussion of this distinction and formal analyses based thereupon, see Smith (1964), Motsch (1966), Burton-Roberts (1975), Klein (1976), McCawley (1998), Heringa & De Vries (2008), Cardoso & De Vries (2010), Heringa (2011), Griffiths (2015b), among others.

No consensus has been reached about the syntax of reformulative appositions like (1b), however. Analyses of these structures can be grouped into two camps: those that analyse reformulative appositions as displaying ‘what you see is what you get’ (WYSIWYG) syntax (McCawley 1998, Cardoso & Vries 2010, Griffiths & Güneş 2014, Griffiths 2015b, among others), and those that analyse reformulative appositions as contained within parenthetical clauses in which ellipsis occurs (Döring 2014, Ott 2014, also mentioned briefly in Potts 2005:109) (3).

- (3) **The Big Apple**, *New York* <*is a huge city*>, is a huge city.

Because subclausal units cannot be utilised as independent speech acts,² WYSIWYG analyses are forced to maintain that a syntactic connection pertains between reformulative appositions and the host clauses into which they interpolate. In De Vries (2007) and Cardoso & De Vries (2010), it is claimed that reformulative appositions and their anchors are parenthetically coordinated (4).³ For them, parenthetical coordination, unlike its ‘regular’ counterpart, results in the apposition being invisible to c-command, and hence any syntactic or semantic dependency based thereupon.

- (4) [&_P [_{DP} **The Big Apple**,] &⁰_{PAR} [_{DP} *New York*]], is a huge city.

Because finite clauses **can** be utilised as independent speech acts, clausal ellipsis analyses of reformulative apposition may – and Döring (2014) and Ott (2014) indeed *do* – maintain that no syntactic connection pertains between the appositional and host clauses that are postulated in (3). On this *orphanage* analysis of appositions,⁴ the precedence relation that pertains between *apple* and *new* in (3) is necessarily established by non-syntactic means. The adoption of a clausal ellipsis analysis of reformulative appositions does not necessarily demand the adoption of orphanage, however. One might argue that appositional and host clauses are coordinated and that

² With the possible exception of vocatives (i) and exclamative epithets (ii); see Güneş (2015) for discussion.

(i) Sebastian will, *my dear*, be late.
(ii) Connor has, *the lucky sod*, won the lottery.

³ Whether coordination involves X'-schematic binary branching (Johannessen 1998) or ternary branching is irrelevant for my purposes. As such, I adopt a ternary branching representation of coordination for expository purposes alone. However, I maintain throughout that coordination phrases display the same semantic type as their conjuncts (Zhang 2010), and that conjuncts must display the same semantic type as each other (in accordance with a semantic formulation of William’s 1981 *law of coordination of likes*). Also, I assume that asyndetic conjuncts are always separated by an unpronounced coordinator. This assumption arises from the observation that such coordinators are always optional:

(i) Baz {,/and} Maddy {,/and} Frank, and Polly have been fired.

⁴ While all orphanage approaches to appositions (and parenthesis more generally) maintain that *orphans* and their host clauses are syntactically unconnected, the technicalities of individual approaches to orphanage differ substantially. See Safir (1986), Haegeman (1991), Espinal (1991), Burton-Roberts (1999), and Peterson (1999) for possible implementations.

ellipsis and a reordering operation derives the observed surface word order (cf. Emonds 1979, Del Gobbo 2007) (see (5), where Ω represents the base position of the reordered host constituent, which has been reordered rightwards).

- (5) $[\&P [CP_1 [DP \text{The Big Apple}] \Omega_1], \&^0 [CP_2 New\ York <is\ a\ huge\ city>]]$ [is a huge city]₁.

In this paper, I support a WYSIWYG analysis of reformulative appositions. Like De Vries (2007) and Cardoso & De Vries (2010), I argue that reformulative appositions and their anchors are coordinated. However, unlike these authors, I claim that this coordinative relationship is not parenthetical. Rather, the coordinative relationship into which reformulative appositions and their anchors enter is, from a syntactic perspective, identical to the relation into which *Bill* and *Ben* enter in a sentence like *Bill and Ben slept*. In other words, I claim that reformulative appositions display the syntax in (6), which is identical to the representation in (4) minus the ‘PAR’ that accompanies $\&^0$ in (4).⁵

- (6) $[\&P [DP \text{The Big Apple},] \&^0 [DP New\ York]]$, is a huge city.

This novel approach to the syntax of reformulative appositions has immediate taxonomic repercussions, as it implies that attributive and reformulative appositions are wholly dissimilar. While attributive appositions are still parenthetical in a theoretically relevant sense – as they are part of a clause that denotes a proposition that is ‘secondary’ to the proposition that the host clause denotes – and consequently form a natural class with exemplary cases of parenthesis such as *and*-parentheticals (Kavalova 2007) (7), reformulative appositions are not parenthetical in any theoretically relevant sense on the current approach, unless of course one deems non-initial conjuncts of regular coordination to be ‘parenthetical’ too. Thus, the current approach maintains that reformulative appositions contribute – albeit redundantly – to the narrow semantic composition of their host clauses. As such, the theory that I advocate, if correct, provides novel opposition to the inclusion of reformulative appositions in classificatory works on parenthesis, such as Dehé & Kavalova (2007).

- (7) New York – *and it’s a magical place* – is a huge city.

The remainder of the paper is structured as followed. After controlling for an ambiguity that is observed with certain nominal appositions in §2, I apply my

⁵ Although reformulative apposition and regular coordination (conjunction, disjunction, etc.) fit the same syntactic schema (or so I will argue in §3-5), the coordinators in these structures do not exhibit the same lexical semantics. While I do not discuss the lexical semantics of reformulative $\&^0$ in this paper, it should be noted that Koster (2000), De Vries (2009), and Lassiter (2011) contain pertinent remarks on this topic.

WYSIWYG coordination analysis to reformulative appositions in §3. In §4, I explore the (almost) virgin empirical landscape that emerges from the interaction of reformulative apposition constructions and ellipsis. The conclusions reached in §4 serve as the conceptual backdrop for §5, in which I discuss the two variants of the clausal ellipsis analysis of reformulative appositions that are exemplified by (3) and (5) (i.e. the ‘orphanage’ and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses) and demonstrate that they are inferior to the WYSIWYG coordination analysis from §3. In §6, I return to the taxonomy of appositions outlined in this section (i.e. reformulative versus attributive) and discuss some more general issues for the study of clausal ellipsis that arise from exploring this dichotomy’s implications. §7 concludes the paper.

2. Ambiguity in nominal appositions

In order to accurately test this paper’s claim – namely, that reformulative apposition involves WYSIWYG coordinative syntax – one must be certain that one is dealing with reformulative apposition. However, in the absence of sufficient context, nominal appositions such as *the capital of England* in (8) are ambiguous between a reformulative and attributive interpretation. To ensure that this ambiguity does not obstruct the discussion presented in §3-4, a reformulative interpretation must be forced in such cases.

- (8) **London**, *the capital of England*, is great.

The reformulative interpretation of (8) can be forced by inserting a *reformulation marker* into the apposition (cf. Burton-Roberts 1975, Gülich & Kotschi 1995, and Blakemore 1993, 1996, 2007).⁶ Reformulation markers, whose presence is optional, can be fixed or floating. Fixed markers must precede the apposition, and are hence understood as the phonological exponents of &⁰ on the current approach. In English, fixed markers include *i.e.* and *or*. Floating markers may precede or follow the apposition. These markers are parentheticals that modify appositions qua their property of being strings of sounds or symbols. Examples are *that is (to say)*, {*roughly/formally/mathematically*} *speaking*, and *in other words* (for a more comprehensive list of fixed and floating reformulation markers, see Heringa 2011:56). Upon inserting a marker into the apposition in (8), a reformulative interpretation is forced, as (9) shows.

- (9) **London**, or *the capital of England*, is great.

⁶ Acuña-Fariña (2000) claims that certain reformulation markers can be inserted into attributive appositions. For arguments that this claim is spurious for English, see Griffiths (2015b, §2.2.5).

Now that this ambiguity can be controlled for, I can fulfil the main objective of this paper, which is to support the claim that reformulative appositions are coordinated with their anchors in a WYSIWYG manner. However, before I do this, I wish to mention that, for the sake of brevity, I will hereafter refer to *reformulative appositions* simply as *appositions* in unambiguous contexts (which occur mostly in §3–4).

3. Reformulative appositions as coordinated with their anchors

In this section (§3), I provide evidence to support my claim that reformulative appositions are conjoined with their anchors in a WYSIWYG manner.

3.1. Semantic balance

Constraints on extraction aside (see §3.2), the demand for semantic balance is the sole constraint that is placed on what can be coordinated. If balance is obtained, elements of any semantic type can be coordinated:

- (10) a. The *red and white* flag was raised.
- b. She went *out and around* the building.
- c. He was *tarred and feathered*.

If appositions are non-initial conjuncts (as I claim), one expects that appositions can display any semantic type, provided that balance between anchors and their appositions pertains. This expectation is met, as the examples in (11) show.

- (11) a. **The Big Apple**, *New York*, is a huge city.⁷
- b. **Pete**, i.e. *the guy that we met in the pub last night*, is at the door.
- c. **All campanologists**, i.e. *all bell ringers*, dream of ringing at St. Paul's.
- d. **Every unmarried man in the room**, *every bachelor*, is here for a date.
- e. **No philatelist**, that is to say *no stamp collector*, would willingly sell her Perot Provisional.
- f. Ben drew a **stereometric**, i.e. *three-dimensional*, representation.
- g. Brendan **confusticates**, that is to say *perplexes*, Swantje.
- h. The wind blows **abaft**, or *behind*, the boat.
- i. Alan studied **there**, *at Oxford*, for four years.

⁷ Note that the copula in (11a) in the main text displays singular rather than plural agreement because the coordinated subjects refer to the same singular entity.

To my knowledge, there are two potential counterexamples to my claim that appositions and their anchors are always semantically balanced. I will now show that these counterexamples are only apparent, and that in each case semantic balance actually does pertain.

Constructions exemplified by (12) provide the first potential counterexample. Here it looks like a referential noun phrase anchor is coordinated with a propositional apposition.

- (12) **The rumour**, namely *that the company is firing staff*, is false.

In such constructions, the clause in the apposition is interpreted as modifying an implicit noun phrase that is coreferent with the anchor. That these appositional clauses are modifiers is demonstrated by the obligatory presence of the complementiser *that* and the nominal affix {-mA} in English and Turkish respectively, as (13) and (14) show.⁸ Thus, I treat such appositions as noun phrases that are modified by restrictive relative clauses, following Aboh (2005), Kayne (2010), Arsenjević (2009), and Haegeman (2012).

- (13) **The rumour**, namely *(the rumour) *(that) the company is firing staff*, is false.

(14)	Politikacı-nın	vaad-i-ne,	parti-si-nin	vergi-ler-i
	politician-GEN	pledge-POSS-DAT	party-POSS-GEN	tax-PL-ACC
	düşür-*(me)-si-ne,	inan-mak	zor.	
	lower-NM-POSS-DAT	believe-INF	hard	

‘The politician’s pledge, that his party will lower taxes, is hard to believe.’

If the analysis outlined above is correct for examples like (12) then semantic balance is restored, as in such constructions two referential noun phrases are coordinated (as in (13)).

The second potential counterexample comes from constructions exemplified by (15). Here, a copula anchor appears to coordinate with a non-constituent that includes the raising verb *deem* and an infinitival clause minus its predicate. This is another case of apparent imbalance.

- (15) The Spartans **were** (or *were deemed to be*) a fierce race of warriors.

⁸ The abbreviations used in glosses are as follows: Ø = null morpheme, ABL = ablative case, ACC = accusative case, COP = copula, DAT = dative case, GEN = genitive case, INF = infinitival, LINK = linker, LOC = locative case, NEG = negation, NM = nominaliser, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PROG = progressive aspect, PST = past tense, REFL = reflexive, RM = reformulation marker.

I suggest that such cases display *right node raising* (RNR, Postal 1974), which I treat as backwards deletion here (Wilder 1997).⁹ RNR can be used to derive constructions in which balanced but non-constituent anchors and appositions appear to be coordinated (where chevrons represent deletion):

- (16) a. **Just before Gigi's <defence>**, that is to say *just after Jimmy's*, defence, we drank some tea.
- b. Joe met **the sovereign of <England>**, i.e. *the queen of*, England on Saturday.

Once an RNR analysis is applied to the example in (15), semantic balance is restored, as both conjuncts are underlyingly unary predicates.^{10 / 11}

- (17) The Spartans **were <a fierce race of warriors>** (or *were deemed to be*) a fierce race of warriors.

3.2. C-command and extraction

One observes that appositions can be bound by many of the same c-commanding binders that non-initial conjuncts of regular coordination can, as a comparison of the *a*-examples (appositional constructions) and *b*-examples (regular coordination) in (18) and (19) demonstrate. This observation provides further support for equating the two construction types.

⁹ Note that no aspect of the argument presented in the main text rests upon analysing RNR as backwards deletion rather than (say) extraction (Ross 1967) or multidominance (McCawley 1982).

¹⁰ Note that the RNR analysis utilised in the main text also extends to what Döring (2014:136) calls *multiple-argument* appositions in German, such as (i). Specifically, the construction in (i) can be analysed as involving coordinated verb phrases, where the participle verb has undergone RNR, as in (ii).

(i) Ich habe jemandem etwas, nämlich dem Karl das Buch gegeben.
I have someone.DAT something.ACC namely the.DAT Karl the.ACC book given
'I have given **something to somebody**, namely *the book to Karl*.'

(ii) Ich habe [&P [VP jemandem etwas <gegeben>] nämlich [VP dem Karl das Buch gegeben]].

¹¹ As an anonymous reviewer points out, the fact that RNR may apply in reformulative apposition constructions gives rise to the possibility that all reformulative appositions are derived from coordinated clauses to which RNR applies (i) (for more in-depth discussion of constructions like (i), see §4-5).

(i) [&P [CP The Big Apple <is a huge city>] &⁰ [CP New York is a huge city]].

If all reformulative apposition constructions were to fit the schema exemplified by (i), then utterances that appear to display subclausal appositions on the surface would display the same properties as utterances that display clausal appositions (as the former would be derived from the latter). In reality, this is not the case. Certain reformulative markers such as *or* can only introduce subclausal appositions, for instance, as (ii) and (iii) show. The fact that differences between subclausal and clausal appositions are observed suggests that the former are not merely RNRed versions of the latter. Rather, it appears that the grammar opts for the simplicity of utilising low WYSIWYG coordination to derive appositional constructions.

(ii) The Big Apple, or New York, is a huge city.

(iii) * The Big Apple is a huge city, or NEW YORK is a huge city.

(18) *Negative polarity items* (NPIs)

- a. Paul hasn't received **penny-one**, *anything*, from his bank.
- a'. Paul hasn't received **anything**, *penny-one*, from his bank.
- b. Grant doesn't own any knives or any forks.

(19) *Quantifiers*

- a. Every competitor on the cookery TV programme was told that **his entry**, that is to say *his jam roly-poly with custard*, was too stodgy.
- b. Every cricketer remembers his first century and his first maiden over.

C-command is a prerequisite for extraction, as the landing site of extraction must c-command its base position. In regular coordination, extraction is licit only if applied equally to both conjuncts or to subconstituents thereof (Ross 1967). This is demonstrated in (20) to (22) below. In the *a*-examples extraction occurs equally (i.e. ‘across the board’) and acceptability is retained, while in the *b*-examples extraction does not apply across the board and unacceptability arises.

- (20) a. [Sturgeon eggs and truffles]₁ I've tried t_1 before, but foie gras I haven't.
b. * [Sturgeon eggs]₁ I've tried t_1 and truffles before, but foie gras I haven't.
- (21) a. [Which country]₁ do you hate the roads of t_1 and the traffic of t_1 the most?
b. * [Which country]₁ do you hate the roads of t_1 and the traffic of {it/that country} the most?
- (22) a. It's [England]₁ that we hate the roads of t_1 and the traffic of t_1 the most.
b. * It's [England]₁ that we hate the roads of t_1 and the traffic of {it/that country} the most.

Extraction from appositions is constrained in precisely the same manner as regular coordination: it must occur across the board. This is illustrated in the examples below, which fit the same template as those in (20) to (22).

- (23) a. [**Sturgeon eggs**, i.e. *caviar*]₁, I've tried t_1 before, but foie gras I haven't.
b. * [**Sturgeon eggs**]₁ I've tried t_1 , i.e. *caviar*, before, but foie gras I haven't.
- (24) a. [Which country]₁ do you hate **the motorways of** t_1 , or as the Americans say *the 'highways' of* t_1 , the most?
b. * [Which country]₁ do you hate **the motorways of** t_1 , or as the Americans say *the 'highways' of* {it/that country}, the most?

- (25) a. It's [England]₁ that we hate **the motorways of** *t₁*, or as the Americans say *the 'highways' of* *t₁*, the most.
 b. * It's [England]₁ that we hate **the motorways of** *t₁*, or as the Americans say *the 'highways' of {it/that country}*, the most.

3.3. Morphological case

Heringa (2011) provides a detailed overview of how morphological case is realised on reformulative and attributive nominal appositions in a number of languages, including Icelandic, Norwegian, English, German, Czech, Hungarian, Russian, and Japanese. From the resulting data, which constitute his chapter six, he concludes that the case realised on reformulative nominal appositions is identical to the case realised on their anchors. I refer the reader to Heringa (2011:175-213) for examples.

The sentence in (26) provides an example from German (ibid.:178).

- (26) Ich habe mit unserem Chef, d. h. Herrn Müller, gesprochen.
 I have with our.DAT manager i.e. Mr.DAT Müller spoken.
 'I spoke to **our manager**, i.e. *Mr. Müller*.'

This distribution of case is expected on an approach that treats anchors and their appositions as coordinated, as *ceteris paribus* conjuncts of regular coordination realise the same case, as (27) shows.

- (27) Ich habe mit Herrn Müller und Herrn Weber gesprochen.
 I have with Mr.DAT Müller and Mr.DAT Weber spoken.
 'I spoke to Mr. Müller and Mr. Weber.'

It is worth pointing out that Heringa's conclusion extends from inflectional languages to agglutinative ones like Turkish, in which morphological case is an adphrasal reflex of structural CASE. In (28) for example, the apposition *karısı* must display the same case as the anchor *Havva*, which is accusative.

- (28) Adem Havva-yı, yani kari-sı-{ni/*Ø}, düğün-de öp-me-di.
 Adem Havva-ACC RM wife-POSS-{ACC/NOM} wedding-LOC kiss-NEG-PST
 'Adem did not kiss **Havva**, i.e. *his wife*, at the wedding.'

3.4. Presuppositions

The existential presuppositions that are triggered by referential noun phrases coordinated by *and* can be plugged, as the examples below show. In (29aB), *mana* and *life-force* can be understood as existing only in the minds of the cult members. In (29b), a de dicto reading is available for the noun phrases *an Italian* and *a Spaniard*,

according to which Leanne does not know the specific men that she wants to date simultaneously; she only knows that one should be Italian and the other should be Spanish. In (29c), the existence of *Timon* and *Pumbaa* can be trapped inside the hypothetical world of their own christening, while in (29d) the professor and the actresses' accrual of wealth may occur inside the world of their book's publication.

- (29) a. A: That cult believes some silly stuff.
B: I know! I heard they think that mana and life-force are in the air around us!
b. Leanne wants to date an Italian and a Spaniard simultaneously.
c. If two children are christened Timon and Pumbaa and Disney Inc. finds out about it, they will sue Timon and Pumbaa's parents.
d. If a professor and a famous actress publish a book, they will make a lot of money.

If anchors and appositions are coordinated as I claim, then two expectations arise. First, appositions should be plugged in all environments in which their anchors are plugged, and second, both anchors and appositions should be plugged in those environments in which regular conjuncts are usually plugged (such as those environments exemplified in (29)). As the examples in (30) demonstrate, both expectations are met. In each example, the plugged reading observed for regular coordination in (29) is available for the anchor and apposition, as the reader may confirm herself.

- (30) a. A: That cult believes some silly stuff.¹²
B: I know! I heard they think that **mana**, that is to say *magical power*, is in the air around us.
b. Leanne wants to date **an Italian**, that is to say *a rich one*.
c. If a child is christened Bambi and Disney Inc. finds out about it, they will sue **Bambi**, that is *the child*'s parents.
d. If **a professor**, that is to say *a famous one*, publishes a book, he will make a lot of money.

It is worth reminding ourselves at this point that presupposition projection and semantic scope are different phenomena. In (31a) for instance, *Mr. Smith* is within the scope of negation, while the existential presupposition that it triggers (*there exists Mr. Smith*) is not plugged by it. Appositions show identical behaviour to this, as (31b) illustrates.

¹² Note that the examples in (30b-d) are modified from examples discussed in Wang et al. 2005 ((30b) and (30d)) and Geurts 1997 (30c).

- (31) a. It's false that Mr. Smith is now in prison for fraud.
 b. It's false that **Mr. Smith**, that is to say *the Stock-Market Slasher*, is now in prison for fraud.

It seems to me that, since Potts (2005), there has been confusion in the literature about the presupposition projection behaviour of both reformulative and attributive appositions (cf. Wang et al. 2005, Harris & Potts 2009, Nouwen 2014). This confusion has in part arisen from the fact that nominal appositions are often ambiguous between their attributive function (in which case they are derived from parenthetical predicative copular clauses, see §1) and reformulative appositions (see §2). On their attributive reading, appositions are necessarily interpreted as unplugged, which is a consequence of their compositional-semantic isolation (Potts 2005). As I have shown in this subsection, this unplugged reading is not inherent to all nominal appositions, however, as reformulative appositions can be plugged. The presence of a reformulation marker resolves any ambiguity, and disambiguates otherwise ambiguous nominal appositions as reformulative, as discussed in §2.

3.5. *Appositions as coordinated with their anchors: a summary*

In this section (§3), I demonstrated that anchors and appositions display the same behaviour as non-initial conjuncts of regular coordination with respect to semantic balance, c-command effects, the realisation of morphological case, word order, and how their existential presuppositions are resolved.

That ‘regular’ coordination phrases and anchor/apposition phrases display the same behaviour follows naturally from my proposal that anchor/apposition phrases display the same syntax as coordination phrases.

4. Ellipsis in reformulative appositions

Having outlined my WYSIWYG coordination analysis of reformulative appositions in §3, this section (§4) and the next (§5) are devoted to demonstrating that this analysis confers greater explanatory power than its competitors, which are the orphanage and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses exemplified by (3) and (5) from §1. Because these analyses invoke clausal ellipsis, I must first investigate how clausal ellipsis and reformulative appositions interact. This investigation is undertaken in this section (§4). In §4.1, I delimit the subclass of reformulative appositions to which clausal ellipsis may apply (I call this subclass *vacuous appositions*) and briefly describe the forms of ellipsis that may apply to them. In §4.2, I describe and analyse the distribution of clausal ellipsis in vacuous appositions. The conclusions reached in this section will provide the backdrop for §5’s critique of the orphanage and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses.

At current, empirical and conceptual considerations favour ‘silent structure’ approaches to ellipsis, according to which ellipsis is the absence of vocabulary-insertion onto syntactic feature bundles (see Merchant 2013 for a summary of these arguments). While I assume that silent structure approaches to ellipsis are correct, my critique of the orphanage and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses of reformulative appositions does not require me to adhere to a particular formulation of the silent structure approach to ellipsis. As such, I will continue to enclose elided material in chevrons, and will retain a conservative representation of ellipsis sites in which the elements that comprise them remain in the structural position that they would occupy if ellipsis had not applied. (Also, when it is obvious what has been elided, elided material will not be represented at all.)

4.1. *Vacuous appositions and ellipsis*

The previous section (§3) focussed on utterances in which the entire apposition reformulates the entire anchor. Unmentioned in §3 was the fact that a reformulative relationship may also pertain between subconstituents of reformulative appositions and their anchors, as the examples in (32) exemplify.

- (32) a. [&P [_{CP} That **he** was fired] &⁰ [_{CP} – *that Bob was fired –*]] is real shame.
- b. The rumour that John [&P [_{VP} kissed **Norma**] &⁰ [_{VP} – *kissed Marilyn Monroe*, that is to say –]] has no truth to it.
- c. [&P [_{DP} The **last** slice] &⁰ [_{DP} – *the sixth slice –*]] was reserved for me!

In (32a), for instance, although the anchor and apposition are both clauses, only the DPs *he* and *Bob* enter into a reformulative relationship (hereafter, I refer to these items as the **subanchor** and the **subapposition** respectively).¹³ Prosodic prominence is observed on the subapposition, while the rest of the apposition is deaccented. These deaccented elements repeat the non-subanchor elements of the anchor.

This class of appositions is restricted in the following manner. Firstly, these appositions disallow the addition of ‘new’ elements (i.e. elements that are not repeated from the anchor):¹⁴

- (33) That **he**’s leaving – in other words *that Toby’s* (*unfortunately) *leaving* – is upsetting to hear.

¹³ Even though the true anchor in (32a) is the entire first clause (i.e. *that he was fired*), I reserve boldface for the subanchor in these appositions. I also refrain from denoting with small caps the focal prominence that subappositions bear. I do this to avoid mark-up overkill.

¹⁴ This prohibition on new elements does not extend to subappositions, which replace their corresponding subanchor, fixed reformulative markers, which are the phonological exponents of &⁰ (as already mentioned in §2), or floating reformulative markers such as *that is to say*, which are parentheticals.

Secondly, these appositions must repeat the entirety of their anchors. This is shown in (34), where the entire clause *Jean gave x to Simone* must be repeated. Merely repeating a portion of the anchor that contains the subanchor is illicit.

- (34) Jean gave **it** to Simone, that is to say *he gave the book**(*to her*).

Thirdly, these appositions cannot repeat material that linearly follows them, as the examples in (35) demonstrate. In (35a), for instance, the precedent material *because x had been rude* can be echoed in the apposition, but the successive constituent *Pete was angry* cannot.

- (35) a. Because **she**'d been rude – *because the waitress had been rude* (**Pete was angry*) – Pete was angry.
 b. That **someone** had to be fired – *that the cleaner had to be fired* (**is unfortunate*) – is unfortunate.

The nature of these restrictions suggests that this class of appositions are echoic. The deaccented elements in these appositions merely provide syntactic and compositional-semantic scaffolding for the subapposition: they are utilised for their form alone, and are otherwise vacuous with respect to illocutionary impact. As such, I refer this class of reformulative appositions as *vacuous appositions* (VAs), following Griffiths (2015b).

From the observations in (33) to (35), the following generalisation about VAs emerges:

- (36) Vacuous appositions must display syntactic and semantic parallelism with the anchors with which they are coordinated, *modulo* the deviation that pertains between subappositions and their subanchors.¹⁵

Unlike the regular appositions discussed in §3, the constituents that comprise VAs are divided into two groups: discourse-old (specifically, *echoic*) and discourse-new (*focussed*). Because it may apply in phrases that display this informational-structural configuration, one expects that ellipsis may apply in VAs. This expectation is met: many familiar forms of ellipsis are observed in English VAs, including predicate ellipsis (37a), noun phrase ellipsis (37b), and gapping (37c-d) (but not pseudogapping, see (37e))

¹⁵ While this definition of parallelism is sufficient for the purposes of this article, it is in reality too simple. Other deviations from total parallelism are indeed permitted, such as dative and deixis shift (both of which are shown in (i)), and the omission of optional adjuncts (ii).

(i) Maude gave **it** to Jeffrey; that is to say *she gave him the book*.
 (ii) Jackie saw **his ex** yesterday; *he saw Bunny*, in other words.

- (37) a. That **he**'ll be late (*that Godot* will <be late>) is hardly surprising.
 b. The **last** pizza slice, *the sixth* <*slice*>, was reserved for me!
 c. **He** went **there** last year – *Sting* <*went*> *to New York*, I mean.
 d. ? **A certain guy** kissed **a certain girl** at the weekend: *Tony* <*kissed*> *Cleo*!
 e. * That he hasn't read **it** (*that he hasn't* <*read*> *the play*) is unprofessional.

An ellipsis mechanism that applies to clausal VAs and leaves a lone survivor is also observed (38). For want of a better theory-neutral term that is familiar from the literature, I refer to this ellipsis mechanism as *clausal ellipsis* (as it deletes a clause minus one constituent).

- (38) **It**'s a nice game, *chess* <*is a nice game*>.

Recall that my aim in §4-5 is to critique the orphanage and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses of reformulative appositions, which both invoke clausal ellipsis in VAs, as (39a) and (39b), which are repeated from (3) and (5) in §1, show.

- (39) a. **The Big Apple**, *New York* <*is a huge city*>, is a huge city. (orphanage)
 b. [&_P [CP₁ [DP **The Big Apple**] Ω₁], &⁰ [CP₂ *New York* <*is a huge city*>,]] [is a huge city]₁. (clausal coordination plus reordering)

Bearing this in mind, I will focus exclusively on examining clausal ellipsis in VAs hereafter, and leave investigations of predicate ellipsis, noun ellipsis, and gapping in VAs for future research.¹⁶

4.2. Ellipsis in clausal vacuous appositions

Clausal ellipsis is licensed only in VAs that are ‘immediate’ conjuncts. In other words, the clausal ellipsis that applies in VAs is licensed in CP₂ in (40a), but not CP₃ alone in (40b).

- (40) a. ... [&_P [CP₁ ...] &⁰ [CP₂ ...]] ...
 b. ... [&_P [CP₁ ...] &⁰ [CP₂ ... [CP₃ ...]]] ...

Evidence that this *no-embedding* constraint holds is provided in (41) and (42) (see De Vries 2012 for similar constructions from Dutch).¹⁷

¹⁶ It is worth noting here that MaxElide (Merchant 2008), or some similar constraint to it, is operative in clausal appositions, as (iB) demonstrates:

(i) A: What a brawl! Students were hitting students, lecturers were hitting lecturers, students were hitting lecturers... it was crazy!
 B: And so **who** did Bob hit? That is to say, *which students* (**did he*)?

- (41) I think **he**'s a good candidate for the job, (**I think (that)*) *Donny*.

- (42) a. * That **he** was fired is a shame, *the cleaner*.
 b. * Because **they** liked his work, Pete was happy: *Penguin*.

The no-embedding constraint on clausal ellipsis is obviated in VAs in which the subanchor and subapposition are contrastively focussed and nothing but the subapposition survives ellipsis (cf. Ott & De Vries 2012, 2014, and De Vries 2013). The fact that contrastive focus saves otherwise deviant clausal ellipsis constructions is shown by comparing the *a*- and *b*-examples in (43) and (44). The fact that contrastive focus only saves otherwise deviant clausal ellipsis constructions if nothing but the subapposition survives ellipsis is shown in (45B).

- (43) a. * That **Bill** was fired is shame, *the deputy manager*.
 A: That Bob was fired is a shame, you say?
 b. B: No, that **BILL** was fired is a shame, *THE DEPUTY MANAGER*.
- (44) a. * Because Bob kissed **Lucy**, Pete's jealous: *my sister*.
 A: Because Bob kissed Olivia, Pete's jealous, you say?
 b. B: No, because Bob kissed **LUCY**, Pete's jealous – *MY SISTER*.
- (45) A: * You think the fact that Bob was fired is a shame, you say?
 B: No, I think the fact that **BILL** was fired is a shame, (**I think*) *THE DEPUTY MANAGER*.

From the data presented in (41) to (45), the following generalisation on clausal ellipsis in VAs emerges:

- (46) Non-contrastively focussed subappositions in vacuous appositions to which clausal ellipsis is applied must be *immediately contained* in clauses that are conjuncts (where α is *immediately contained* in a clause β iff α is not contained in a clause γ that β embeds).

Aside from the fact that the presence of contrastive focus on the subanchor allows for the obviation of the no-embedding constraint (which is unique to VAs and for which an explanation is not provided in this paper), the clausal ellipsis operation that applies

¹⁷ The asterisk that accompanies (42a) is challenged by Jan-Wouter Zwart (p.c.), who deems (42a) acceptable. I must therefore note that the judgement reported for (42a) reflects Gundel's (1988:133), with which I and the vast majority of my British English consultants agree (though whether or not the results of an experiment with a sample size large enough to obtain statistical significance supports this judgement is another matter entirely).

in VAs can be equated with *stripping* (Hankamer & Sag 1976), which obeys the no-embedding constraint (47) and is operative only in coordination environments.

- (47) a. I think Ken is a fool, and (*I think) Bill <is a fool>, too.
- b. * That Earl was fired is a shame, and <that> Ad <was fired is shame>, too.
- c. * Because Penguin liked his work, Pete was happy, and <because> Routledge <liked his work, Pete was happy>, too.

Armed with the generalisation about clausal ellipsis in VAs in (46) and the knowledge that the clausal ellipsis operation that applies in VAs equates to stripping, I can now proceed to critiquing the orphanage and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ accounts of reformulative appositions.

5. Alternative analyses of reformulative appositions

5.1. The ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ approach

The ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ approach maintains that subclausal appositions such as *New York* in (48a) are derived from stripped VAs such as (48b), whose underlyingly syntax is shown in (48c).

- (48) a. **The Big Apple**, *New York*, is huge.
- b. **The Big Apple** is huge, *New York*.
- c. [&P [_{CP} **The Big Apple** is huge] &⁰ [_{CP} *New York* <is huge>]].

To derive the word order in (48a), *stylistic reordering* must derive (48a) from (48b). This operation, like other stylistic reordering operations (Sauerland 1998, Chomsky 2001, Sauerland & Elbourne 2002, Embick & Noyer 2001, Göbbel 2007), reorders a phrase (in this case, *is huge*) rightwards without semantic repercussions (and often in violation of Ross’ 1967:185 *right roof constraint*), as (49a-b) demonstrate, where ‘ Ω ’ represents the reordered element’s base position.

- (49) a. *Before reordering*:
[&P [_{CP} **The Big Apple** is huge] &⁰ [_{CP} *New York* <is huge>]].
- b. *After reordering*:
[&P [_{CP} **The Big Apple** Ω_1] &⁰ [_{CP} *New York* <is huge>]] [is huge]₁.

In this subsection, I show that the derivation exemplified by (49b) cannot be correct for reformulative appositions.

Starting with its strengths, this clausal coordination analysis of appositions captures many of the properties that I utilised in §3 to support the WYSIWYG low coordination analysis of appositions. In §3.1, I used the observation that semantic

balance must pertain between appositions and their anchors (see the examples below that are modified from (11)) to support the notion that appositions and their anchors are directly coordinated.

- (50) a. **All campanologists**, *all bell ringers*, dream of ringing at St. Paul's.
- b. **Every unmarried man in the room**, *every bachelor*, is here for a date.

On the clausal coordination analysis, the fact that semantic balance pertains between appositions and their anchors is accidental, and arises from the fact that subappositions and their subanchors occupy identical positions in their respective clauses:

- (51) a. [<&P [CP **All campanologists** Ω_1], &⁰ [CP *all bell ringers* <*dream of ringing at St. Paul's*>]], [*dream of ringing at St. Paul's*]₁.
- b. [<&P [CP **Every unmarried man in the room** Ω_1], &⁰ [CP *every bachelor* <*is here for a date*>]], [*is here for a date*]₁.

In §3.2, I demonstrated that appositions can be bound by c-commanding binders (see the examples below, which are repeated from (18) and (19)). I considered these data as evidence for the WYSIWYG low coordination approach, as non-initial conjuncts of regular coordination can be c-commanded into, too.

- (52) a. Paul hasn't received **penny-one**, *anything*, from his bank.
- b. Every competitor on the cookery TV programme was told that **his entry**, *his jam roly-poly with custard*, was too stodgy.

The clausal coordination approach would also account for the data in (52) in a straightforward manner. On this analysis, appositions like *anything* in (52a) are bound by unpronounced instances of their binders within elliptical clauses, as (53) shows. Resultantly, *anything* is not c-commanded by the pronounced token of negation in the host clause after all.

- (53) [<&P [CP Paul hasn't received **penny-one** Ω_1], &⁰ [<*Paul hasn't received*> *anything* <*from his bank*>]], [*from his bank*]₁.

The same argument seems to apply to the extraction data from (24), which are repeated in a modified form in (54) below. In §3.2, I utilised the observation that only 'across the board' extraction of appositions (or subconstituents thereof) is licit to support my claim that appositions and their anchors are coordinated in a low manner.

- (54) a. Which country do you hate **the motorways of**, or *the 'highways' of*, the most?
- b. * Which country do you hate **the motorways of**, or *the 'highways' of {it/that country}*, the most?

According to the clausal coordination approach however, the parallelism constraint from (36) gives the impression that ‘across the board’ extraction is permitted in appositional constructions. In (55), *wh*-movement occurs separately in two independent clauses:

- (55) [&P [CP [Which country]₁ d'you hate **the motorways of** $t_1 \Omega_2$], or [CP <[which country]₃ d'you hate> *the 'highways' of* $t_3 <\text{the most}>$]], [the most]₂?]

Thus, (54b) is unacceptable because the anchor and the VA are not parallel. As (56) demonstrates, the anchor is a *wh*-question, while the VA is a declarative clause.

- (56) * [&P [CP [Which country]₁ do you hate **the motorways of** $t_1 \Omega_2$], or [CP [<*you hate*> *the 'highways' of* {it / that country} <*the most*>]], [the most]₂?]

Each of the other *connectivity effects* (Merchant 2001) that were used to support the low coordination analysis of appositions in §3 receive an explanation on the clausal coordination approach that parallels the explanation provided above to explain the observations that appositions can be c-commanded and extracted. This includes the fact that appositions receive the same case as their anchors and the fact that appositions are plugged in the same intensional environments as their anchors.

While the clausal coordination analysis can capture many of the properties displayed by subclausal appositions, the strict similarities between subclausal appositions and clausal VAs that it predicts to pertain are not observed. To see proof of this, let us first consider the constructions in (57).

- (57) a. The **chief**, or *main*, problem is the military.
 b. Bren **confusticates**, i.e. *perplexes*, Swantje.
 c. The wind blows **abaft**, or *behind*, the boat.

On the clausal coordination analysis, the examples in (57) are structurally identical to the unacceptable constructions in (58) *modulo* the reordering operation that brings the purported subapposition adjacent to its subanchor. (Note that the examples in (58) are unacceptable regardless of whether the italicised elements are contrastively focussed or not.)

- (58) a. * The **chief** problem is the military, or *main*.
 b. * Bren **confusticates** Swantje, i.e. *perplexes*.
 c. * The wind blows **aboard** the boat, or *behind*.

The difference in acceptability between the examples in (57) and (58) is unexpected on the clausal coordination account. To account for this discrepancy, an advocate of the clausal coordination analysis must claim that reordering *feeds* ellipsis. In other words, she must claim that the ellipsis that derives the examples in (57) is licensed only when a reordering operation brings the VA adjacent to its subanchor:

- (59) *Ellipsis licensed:*
 [&P [CP Bren **confusticates** Ω_1], [CP Bren *perplexes* Swantje]], [Swantje]₁.
 Ellipsis not licensed:
 [&P [CP Bren **confusticates** Swantje], [CP Bren *perplexes* Swantje]].

However, it appears that the converse holds in other environments; that reordering *bleeds* ellipsis. In constructions like (60) for instance, the presence of the preposition contained within the apposition is mandatory:

- (60) Which country do you hate **the motorways of**, or rather *the 'highways' (*of)*, the most?

Interestingly, *of*'s absence is strongly preferred in regular stripped clausal VAs, as (61) demonstrates.¹⁸ Thus, it seems that ellipsis of *of* is licensed only if reordering does **not** occur.

- (61) Which country do you hate **the motorways of** the most; or rather *the 'highways' (??of)?*

Although theories of feeding and bleeding could be fashioned so that the clausal coordination analysis of all appositions can be maintained, the hypothesis from §3-4 that WYSIWYG coordination derives subclausal appositions while clausal coordination derives stripped clausal VAs is more parsimonious on this occasion. On this more parsimonious hypothesis, the examples in (58) are unacceptable simply because attributive adjectives, transitive verbs, and prepositions never make for suitable remnants of stripping (as the regular stripping constructions in (62) illustrate). Conversely, the examples in (57) are acceptable because subclausal constituents of any

¹⁸ For my British English consultants, the presence of *of* in constructions like (61) give rise to unacceptability in cross-speaker environments:

(i) A: Which country do you hate the motorways of the most?
 B: You mean *the 'highways' (*of)*, right?

type can be coordinated, provided that semantic balance pertains. The mandatory presence of *of* in (60) can be explained in exactly the same manner.

- (62) a. * Our most urgent problem is the military, and <our> main <problem is the military>, too.
- b. * In his frustration, Brendan punched a wall yesterday, and <he> kicked <the wall yesterday>, too.
- c. * Fred sat on the cardboard box for most of the day, and <he sat> in <the cardboard box>, too.

The clausal coordination approach also predicts that a strict correspondence pertains between regular subclausal appositions and stripped clausal VAs with respect to the elision of prepositions in languages like German. As is well-known, German disallows the elision of prepositions in clausal ellipsis environments if the preposition's noun phrase complement displays the same case as its correlate in the antecedent clause (Merchant 2001, 2003, 2004):

- (63) Sie hat mit jemandem geredet, aber ich weiß nicht *(mit) wem.
She has with someone.DAT spoken, but I know not with who.DAT
'She has spoken with someone, but I don't know who.'

If both subclausal appositions and stripped clausal VAs were derived from clausal ellipsis, then the same constraint observed in (63) should apply to them. While prepositions cannot be omitted in stripped clausal VAs, as the example in (64) that is modified from Ott & De Vries (2012:129) shows, they **can** be omitted in subclausal appositions, as (65) demonstrates ((65) is based on an example from Döring 2014:132, who judges such constructions as slightly degraded).

- (64) Ich habe den ganzen Tag auf ihn gewartet, *(auf) den Ad.
I have the whole day for him.DAT waited, for the.DAT Ad.
'I waited **for him** the whole day, *for Ad.*'
- (65) Peter hat mit jemandem, (mit) einem Jamaikaner, gesprochen.
Peter has with someone.DAT with a.DAT Jamaican.DAT spoke
'Peter spoke with **someone, a Jamaican.**'

The fact that the preposition can be omitted in the subclausal apposition example in (65) but not in the stripped clausal VA example in (64) is difficult to account for if one adopts the notion that both constructions involve clausal ellipsis. This discrepancy is straightforwardly explained on the low coordination approach from §3, however: (65) does not involve clausal ellipsis. Rather, it involves low coordination of either PPs (in

the case where the preposition is present in the apposition) or DPs (in the case where the preposition is absent from the apposition).

In addition to incorrectly predicting that strict similarities pertain between subclausal appositions and stripped clausal VAs, the clausal coordination approach requires that reordering renders ellipsis obligatory. In (66a), in which no reordering occurs, ellipsis is optional, while in (66b), reordering occurs and ellipsis becomes obligatory.¹⁹

- (66) a. That **Andy**'s been fired, (*that*) my brother (*has been fired*), is sad.
b. That **Andy**, (*that*) my brother (**has been fired*),'s been fired is sad.

Again, an advocate of clausal coordination can claim that stylistic reordering bleeds optional ellipsis in constructions like (66b). However, when one considers that stripping is an optional process in all other VA environments, such a claim must be met with suspicion. Coupled with the fact that a simpler analysis is available (namely, that subclausal appositions are derived from WYSIWYG low coordination), the ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analysis of appositions must be rejected.

5.2. *The orphanage approach*

I now turn to discuss the orphanage approach to reformulative appositions, which was first mentioned in §1. To recap, this analysis maintains that, regardless of whether they arise adjacent to their anchors or at the edge of the clauses that contain their anchors, appositions are the remnants of clauses in which clausal ellipsis has applied and which are syntactically unconnected to their host clauses (cf. Döring 2014, Ott 2014). On such an analysis, the examples in (67) display the syntax in (68), where no coordination is observed.

- (67) a. Janice visited **the Big Apple**, *New York*, at Easter
b. Janice visited **the Big Apple** at Easter, *New York*.
- (68) a. Janice visited **the Big Apple**, [_{CP} <*Janice visited*> *New York*], at Easter.
b. Janice visited **the Big Apple** at Easter, [_{CP} <*Janice visited*> *New York*].

Let us assume here that orphanage is conceptually desirable (for conceptual arguments against orphanage, see Griffiths 2015b). In the remainder of this

¹⁹ The fact that *that* can be retained in (66a-b) in the main text demonstrates that RNR is possible in VAs (this is expected, see §3.1). Thus, in (i) below, *been fired* is shared by both *that Andy has* and *that my brother has*. Although the possibility of RNR greatly increases the number of possible surface permutations for sentences that contain VAs, it does not impact upon the discussion in the main text. Because of this, I will ignore the influence of RNR hereafter.

(i) [That **Andy** has, *that my brother has*, *been fired*] is sad.

subsection, my objective is to illustrate that the orphanage analysis of reformulative appositions that is exemplified by (68) is, like ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analysis discussed in §5.1, inferior to the low coordination analysis that was advanced in §3.

With respect to connectivity effects, the orphanage analysis is identical to the clausal coordination analysis from §5.1. As such, the clausal coordination and orphanage analyses capture equally well the behaviour of appositions with respect to semantic balance, c-command and extraction, morphological case matching, and presupposition projection. In one respect the orphanage analysis is favoured over the clausal coordination analysis, as its advocates need not make recourse to a nebulous ‘stylistic reordering’ operation to ensure that appositions can appear adjacent to their anchors. Rather, a pragmatic condition dictates that orphaned elliptical clauses can only interpolate into their hosts either adjacent to their anchors, or at the edge of the clauses that immediately contain their anchors (Onea & Ott 2014).

Along with inheriting the deficiencies that afflict the clausal coordination account (as such deficiencies afflict all clausal ellipsis accounts of subclausal appositions), two additional deficiencies afflict the orphanage analysis.

Firstly, because the orphanage approach maintains that appositional clauses are unconnected to their hosts, advocates of orphanage cannot claim that the postulated clausal ellipsis operation that applies to orphaned appositional clauses is stripping, as stripping is reserved for conjuncts. As such, the postulated clausal ellipsis operation must be *sluicing*, which can apply to non-coordinated clauses.

Adherence to the notion that sluicing creates subclausal appositions gives rise to an incorrect prediction, however. In English, sluicing with non-*wh*-remnants is allowed in certain embedded clauses, such as the complements of bridge verbs (Weir 2014, Griffiths 2015a), as (69B) shows.

- (69) A: Who are they gonna hire?
B: I reckon <they'll hire> Kerry. She was the best candidate.

However, as already discussed in §4.2, the appositional variant of (69B) is unacceptable, contrary to the orphanage approach’s prediction (see (70)). The unacceptability of the example in (70) reiterates the fact that clausal ellipsis in VAs obeys the no-embedding constraint, and hence should be equated with stripping, not sluicing.

- (70) * I think Kristian will present **the gift**, that is to say *I think <he will present> the diamond necklace <to Joanna>*, to Joanna after the speeches are over.

The second issue with the orphanage analysis is that it requires ellipsis that is sometimes optional, sometimes partly optional and partly obligatory, and sometimes obligatory. To see this, first consider the example in (71) below.

- (71) Lucy wonders whether **he**'s the right choice, *this candidate*.

The derivation for (71) cannot be (72) on the orphanage account, as independent clauses cannot be introduced by complementisers like *whether*.

- (72) * Lucy wonders whether he's the right choice, [_{CP} <*whether*> *this candidate* <*is the right choice*>].

Bearing this in mind, one might entertain the notion that the correct derivation for (71) is (73), where the elliptical clause is a root clause.

- (73) Lucy wonders whether **he**'s the right choice, [_{CP} *this candidate* <*is the right choice*>].

Problematically, the root clause source in (73) provides the incorrect interpretation. The derivation in (73) is equivalent in meaning to (74a), while the construction in (71) is actually interpreted as equivalent to (74b).

- (74) a. Lucy wonders whether [this candidate]_i is the right choice. He_i is the right choice.
b. Lucy wonders whether [this candidate]_i is the right choice. She wonders whether he_i is the right choice.

Another possibility is that the elliptical clausal is copular clausal:

- (75) Lucy wonders whether **he**'s the right choice, [_{CP} <{*he/it*} *is*> *this candidate*].

However, such constructions are not only nonsensical if ellipsis does not occur (as the example in (76) shows), but they incorrectly predict that the appositions in the constructions exemplified by (71) are always assigned predicate case. While this claim cannot be tested in English, the fact that Turkish appositional constructions that are structurally similar to the example in (71) must be assigned a non-predicate case (i.e. **not** nominative case) provides evidence that the claim is false (see (77), where Ayşe's pregnancy exists in Ali's mental world alone).

- (76) # Lucy wonders whether he's the right choice; {*he/it*} *is this candidate*.

- (77) Ali Ayşe-nin Can-dan hamile ol-duğ-u-nu san-iyor,
 Ali Ayşe-GEN Can-ABL pregnant be-NM-POSS-ACC think-PROG
 yani kendi öz kardeş-i-{nden/*Ø}.
 LINK REFL own sibling-POSS-{ABL/NOM}
 ‘Ali thinks that **Can** got Ayşe pregnant, *his own brother*.’

Resultantly, it appears that orphaned elliptical clauses must always be full-fledged. In other words, the elliptical clause in the derivation of (71) must be the complex clause observed in (78) on the orphanage approach.

- (78) Lucy wonders whether **he**'s the right choice, [CP <*Lucy wonders whether* this candidate <*is the right choice*>].

As the reader can confirm, the derivation in (78) is acceptable (albeit redundant-sounding) when ellipsis does not occur. The same cannot be said for the derivation that the orphanage approach dictates underlies the construction in (79a) however, which is (79b). As (79b) shows, ellipsis appears to be partly optional and partly obligatory in such examples; *had to be fired* is optionally elided, while *is unfortunate* is obligatorily elided.

- (79) a. That **someone** had to be fired (*the cleaner*) is unfortunate.
 b. That **someone** had to be fired [[(*that*) *the cleaner* (*had to be fired*)] (**is unfortunate*)] is unfortunate.

In the variation upon (79a) that is provided in (80a), ellipsis is no longer partly optional. Rather, it is obligatory, as (80b) shows.

- (80) a. That **someone** (*the cleaner*) had to be fired is unfortunate.
 b. That **someone** [[(*that*) *the cleaner* (**had to be fired*)] (**is unfortunate*)] had to be fired is unfortunate.

To my knowledge, no form of clausal ellipsis is fully optional (78), partly optional and partly obligatory (79b), and fully obligatory (80b) depending upon the linear position of the elliptical clause. While interpolated yet unconnected elliptical clauses might prove to be an exception to this generalisation, the most parsimonious conclusion to draw from the data in (78) to (80) is that the orphanage approach is infeasible because it places *ad hoc* constraints on ellipsis. A simpler analysis is the one advocated in this paper: those appositions that arise on the right edges of clauses that contain their anchors are remnants of stripped clausal VAs, while those appositions that arise adjacent to their anchors are directly coordinated with their anchors in a low, WYSIWYG fashion.

5.3. Ellipsis in reformulative appositions: a summary

In §4, I discussed ellipsis in vacuous appositions (VAs) and demonstrated that clausal ellipsis in VAs should be equated with stripping. In §5.1, I explored the feasibility of the idea that subclausal, non-vacuous appositions of the type that were analysed in §3 are derived from stripped clausal VAs, and concluded that this idea is infeasible. The same conclusion was reached in §5.2 about the *orphanage* approach to reformulative appositions, which utilises ‘biclausal plus ellipsis’ syntactic derivations in a similar manner to the ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analysis from §5.1.

6. Extensions: non-reformulative appositions and obligatory ellipsis

Recall that, in the discussion of ellipsis in reformulative appositions in §4 and §5, I introduced a subclass of reformulative appositions that I called *vacuous appositions* (VAs). In §4.1, I claimed that clausal vappositions must obey the following parallelism constraint (repeated from (36)):

- (81) Vacuous appositions must display syntactic and semantic parallelism with the anchors with which they are coordinated, *modulo* the deviation that pertains between subappositions and their subanchors.

On closer inspection, one sees that the definiens of *reformulative apposition* can be fashioned from this constraint. In other words, one can define all reformulative appositions with respect to their potential vacuity:

- (82) If an apposition α is *parallel* to its anchor, then α is a reformulative apposition.
- (83) A syntactic constituent α is *parallel* to a linearly precedent syntactic constituent β if semantic and syntactic isomorphism pertain between α and β , *modulo* the deviations that pertain between a subconstituent of α ($S\alpha$) and a subconstituent β ($S\beta$), where $S\alpha$ and $S\beta$ denote the same referent or concept.

Note that each of the (vacuous) appositions that I have treated as reformulative in the preceding sections of this paper are accurately described by the definiens in (82). As such, each can license *reformulation markers*, which are hallmarks of reformulative appositions (see §2). For instance, ignoring the deixis shift that occurs in (84) (as *Laura* in the anchor is denoted as *her* in the VA), the VP VA is parallel with its anchor, as, aside from the deviation that pertains between the underlined subapposition and its boldfaced subanchor, the lexemes that comprise the appositional VP are identical to those that comprise the VP anchor. Resultantly, the VA in (84) can license the parenthetical phrase *that is to say*, which is a marker that is reserved for reformulative appositions alone.

- (84) Dale [_{&P} [_{VP} gave **Rumours** to *Laura* -] &⁰ [_{VP} *gave a Fleetwood Mac album to her*, that is to say]].

The definition in (82) straightforwardly extends from VAs such as (84) to regular reformulative appositions like (85), in which no vacuous material is observed. This is because the definition in (82) does not demand that reformulative appositions must display vacuous material, *as per* the definition of parallelism in (83).

- (85) [_{&P} [_{DP} **Rumours**,] i.e. [_{DP} *the Mac's best album*,]] is being re-issued today.

Defining reformulative appositions in this manner has direct repercussions for how ‘non-reformulative’ appositions are understood: non-reformulative appositions are parenthetical insertions that are not described by (82); they are the elsewhere case. As such, the definition in (82) accords with our intuitions that *attributive appositions* such as (1a) from §1 (repeated below in (86a)) constitute a subclass of non-reformulative appositions that are, from a syntactic perspective, wholly dissimilar to the reformulative appositions with which §3-5 were concerned. This accord arises from the fact – which was mentioned in §1 – that attributive appositions are derived from underlying parenthetical predicative copular clauses (see (1b) from §1, which is repeated in (86b) below), which display a non-parallel structure to their anchors. In (86b), for instance, the subject (relative) pronoun and copula that are present in the parenthetical clause have no correspondents in the anchor, which is merely the DP *the Big Apple*.

- (86) a. **The Big Apple**, *a magical place*, is a huge city.
 b. [**The Big Apple**_i, <{which/it}_i is> *a magical place*, is a huge city.]

The definition in (82) also equips us with a means to make subtle taxonomic judgements about a certain set of complicating data that went unmentioned in the preceding sections. These data involve *truncated cleft* (Mikkelsen 2005) parenthetical clauses. In the domain of nominal appositions, Griffiths (2015b) demonstrates that, in the absence of indicators for disambiguation, constructions whose apposition is a referential DP and whose anchor is an indefinite DP (87a) or a generic definite individual concept DP (87b) are structurally ambiguous between a coordinative derivation (i.e. the syntax that is associated with *reformulative* appositions, see (88)) and a derivation that involves a parenthetical truncated cleft copular clause (89).

- (87) a. **Someone**, *Pete*, danced with *Miranda*.
 b. **This year's winner**, *Pete*, will be awarded €50.

- (88) a. [[_{DP} **Someone**,] &⁰ [_{DP} *Pete*,]] danced with Miranda.
 b. [[_{DP} **This year's winner**,] &⁰ [_{DP} *Pete*,]] will be awarded €50.
- (89) a. **Someone**, [_{CP} <*it was*> *Pete*,] danced with Miranda.
 b. **This year's winner**, [_{CP} <*it {is/will be}*> *Pete*,] will be awarded €50.

This structural ambiguity arises because, from a functional perspective, *Pete* in both (88) and (89) functions to reformulate *someone* or *this year's winner*, insofar as *Pete* provides an alternative name for the referent that the speaker intends to denote with *someone* or *this year's winner* in the contexts in which (88) and (89) are uttered. However, according to the definition in (82), the parentheticals in (89) are not truly 'reformulative', as they are not parallel with their anchors. As such, the non-elliptical counterparts of (89) do not license reformulation markers, as the examples in (90) show.²⁰

- (90) a. **Someone**, (*i.e.) *it was Pete*, danced with Miranda.
 b. **This year's winner**, (*namely) *it {is/will be} Pete*, will be awarded €50.

The discussion in §1 and the paragraphs above have demonstrated that at least two elliptical parenthetical clauses – namely, predicative and truncated cleft copular clauses – are sources for non-reformulative appositions. An obvious question that arises from the above discussion is this: can non-copular parenthetical clauses be sources for non-reformulative apposition? In other words, are the representations in (91) possible exemplars for utterances that display non-reformulative appositions?

- (91) a. [**Kristian's bicycle**]_i, [_{CP} *a racer*_i <*was stolen*>], was stolen.
 b. **Someone**, [*Pete* <*was talking to Bill*>], was talking to Bill.

Preliminary evidence suggests that the schemata exemplified by (91) are not utilised (by speakers of English, at least) to form utterances that contain non-reformulative appositions. The first piece of evidence that supports this conclusion comes from the distribution of predicate ellipsis. To see this, consider the dialogues in (92) and (93).

²⁰ Assurance that the schema in (89) is indeed utilised by the grammar is provided by the existence of utterances like (i), in which a speaker-oriented adverb is observed within the apposition. Because such adverbs must modify propositions, they expose the underlying clausal structure represented in (89). The fact that reformulation markers cannot be licensed in examples like (i) provide further evidence that these examples do not involve the coordinative syntax associated with reformulative appositions like (88). As such, the apposition in (i) is 'non-reformulative', despite what first appearances might suggest.

(i) **Someone**, (*namely) { unfortunately/probably/allegedly} *Pete*, danced with Miranda.

- (92) A: I heard that someone will kiss Juliet tonight.
 B: Yeah, Romeo will <kiss Juliet tonight>.
- (93) A: I heard that someone was disciplined by the headmaster.
 B: Yeah, Ben was <disciplined by the headmaster>.

Note that predicate ellipsis is licit in (92B) and (93B). The same deletion operation is unavailable in the appositional counterparts to (92) and (93) however, as the utterances in (94) show.

- (94) a. * I heard that **someone**, *Romeo will*, will kiss Juliet tonight.
 b. * I heard that **someone**, *Ben was*, was disciplined by the headmaster.

The unacceptability of (94a-b) casts doubt on the idea that non-copular clauses make for suitable sources for non-reformulative appositions. If such clauses did make for suitable sources, then the predicate ellipsis observed in the parenthetical clauses in (94a-b) would be licit.

The second piece of supporting evidence comes from the distribution of dependent tag questions (DTQs) in English. In non-parenthetical environments, DTQs display strict isomorphism with the clauses to which they attach:²¹

- (95) a. Ben was disciplined by the headmaster, {*wasn't he?/*isn't it?*}?
 b. A: I heard that someone we know has won the lottery.
 B: Yeah, it was Pete, {*wasn't it?/*didn't he?*}²²

²¹ Note that the isomorphism condition associated with DTQs is obviated when the licensing clause contains a contrastively-focussed element, as (i) shows (Sailor 2009).

(i) Bob went to CHICAGO, wasn't it?

I tentatively suggest that, contrary to appearances, the isomorphism condition on DTQs is not actually obviated in (i). Rather, utterances like (i) involve *Horn amalgams* (Lakoff 1974, Kluck 2011) (ii), in which *it was* is rendered unpronounced (iii). Support for this suggestion comes from the fact that DTQs may immediately follow contrastively-focussed elements that arise clause-medially, as (iv) shows. Because DTQs must otherwise linearly follow their licensing clause (as (v) shows), the pattern of interpolation seen in (iv) ceases to be anomalous on a *Horn amalgam* account, as the DTQ **does** fully succeed its licensing clause, which is the reduced interpolated clause *it was Chicago*.

(ii) [Bob went to [Ø [it was CHICAGO, wasn't it?]]].

(iii) [Bob went to [Ø [<it was> CHICAGO, wasn't it?]]].

(iv) [Bob went to [Ø [<it was> CHICAGO, wasn't it?,]] on Saturday?]

(v) * Bob kissed, didn't he, Sally?

²² Craig Sailor (p.c.) points out that (95bB) in the main text is acceptable if the following context pertains:

(i) A: I heard that someone we know has won the lottery.
 B: Yeah, Pete. [Speaker B turns to speaker C]: Didn't he?

I suggest that, in this scenario, the DTQ modifies an inferred 'host', whose LF is identical to (iA), as in (iiB). An initial hint that this analysis is correct comes from the observation that, to be licensed, *didn't he?* must be prosodically isolated from the fragment *yeah, Pete* in (iB), which is suggestive of the DTQ's syntactic isolation from it. I exclude this 'inferred host' interpretation of DTQs from the discussion in the main text.

When ellipsis occurs to create a non-reformulative apposition, only the ‘*wasn’t it?*’ DTQ is licit, as (96) illustrates.

- (96) **Someone** – *David*, {*wasn’t it/*didn’t he?*} – hit Sam today.

That *didn’t he?* is illicit in (96) suggests that the non-reformulative apposition in (96) cannot be derived from a non-copular clausal source (such as (97)). If such a source were available, *didn’t he?* would be licensable, contrary to observation.

- (97) **Someone** – *David hit Sam today* – hit Sam today.

If my suggestion that these observations from English are indeed indicative of the fact that non-reformulative appositions cannot be derived from underlying clausal sources aside from copular clauses, then an additional question arises: why can only copular clauses underlie non-reformulative appositions?

A plausible explanation (and one which I uphold here) revolves around obligatory ellipsis. The common factor that unites the impossible underlying non-copular sources for non-reformulative appositions is that they give rise to unacceptability if pronounced. In other words, if the representations in (91) were indeed correct for non-reformulative appositions, then the ellipsis that would occur in these examples would be *obligatory*. This contrasts with the copular clausal sources for (91) (which are provided in (98) below), where ellipsis is optional.

- (98) a. [Kristian’s bicycle]_i, [_{CP} <it’s> a racer_i], was stolen.
b. **Someone**_i, [<it was> Pete_i], was talking to Bill.

Thus, it appears that only parenthetical clauses that are optionally elided make for suitable sources for non-reformulative appositions. Considering that all of the sources for ellipsis that I have endorsed in this paper may be pronounced without giving rise to unacceptability, the following generalisation emerges:

- (99) Only optional ellipsis may apply to (non-)reformulative appositions.

If the generalisation in (99) is true, then this paper can be treated as performing two tasks simultaneously. Firstly, it demonstrates that reformulative apposition is derived from coordinative syntax, and secondly it shows that obligatory ellipsis is not involved in deriving certain appositive structures (*contra* Döring 2014, Ott 2014).

(ii) A: I heard that [someone we know has won the lottery].
B: Yeah, Pete. [Speaker B turns to speaker C]: Ø, didn’t he?

The simplest explanation for (99) is that obligatory ellipsis simply does not exist. However, this explanation can only be upheld if other analyses that rely upon the existence of obligatory ellipsis (for ellipsis in parenthetical environments, see Kluck 2011 and Griffiths 2015a; for ellipsis in non-parenthetical environments, see Merchant 2004) can be amended to make no recourse to it. If these analyses resist such alteration (as may be expected in the case of polarity ellipses such as negative stripping), then an alternative explanation for why the clausal sources in (91) are barred in appositive environments must be sought.

It should be noted here that evidence from the distribution of case-marking in German questions the veracity of (99). In this language, non-reformulative appositions that are referential and whose anchors bear accusative case must themselves bear accusative case, as (100) shows (Ott 2014).²³

- (100) Sie haben einen Obdachlosen, ich glaube den Peter, verhaftet.
 They have a.ACC homeless I think the.ACC Peter arrested
 ‘They have arrested a **homeless person**, I think *Peter*.’

Assuming for a moment that the generalisation in (99) is correct, the only viable source for the apposition in (100) is the truncated cleft source in (101). Problematically however, the relevant DP bears nominative case in (101), rather than accusative case.

- (101) Sie haben einen Obdachlosen, ich glaube es ist der Peter, verhaftet.
 They have a.ACC homeless I think it is the.NOM Peter
 arrested
 ‘They have arrested a **homeless person**, I think it’s *Peter*.’

There are two ways to explain these data. The first explanation says that (100) is actually derived from the non-copular clausal source in (102), rather than from (101). Because the underlying source in (102) cannot be acceptably pronounced, this explanation denies the veracity of (99) and hence permits obligatory ellipsis in appositive environments after all.

- (102) Sie haben einen Obdachlosen, *ich glaube <sie haben> den Peter <verhaftet>*, verhaftet.

²³ Assurance that the apposition in (100) is indeed non-reformulative is obtained from the observation that (100) cannot host a reformulation marker such as ‘*d. h.*’, which is the German equivalent of *i.e.* in English:

(i) Sie haben einen Obdachlosen, (*d. h.) ich glaube den Peter, verhaftet.
 They have a.ACC homeless i.e. I think the.ACC Peter arrested
 ‘They have arrested a **homeless person**, i.e. I think *Peter*.’

The second explanation upholds the generalisation in (99), and says that the (non-)pronunciation of *es ist* affects the distribution of morphological case in the same way that the (non-)pronunciation of the ellipsis sites in (103) affect whether the contracted auxiliary *has* is pronounced as the unvoiced /s/ (as in (103a)) or as the voiced /z/ (as in (103b)): although ellipsis is optional in both cases, its application has repercussions for morphological operations that take the phonological exponents of syntactic termini as their input. (See Heringa 2011 for an explanation of the discrepancy between the case marking on (100) and (101) that follows along these lines.)

- (103) a. That **he** was beaten, <that> Mark <*was beaten*>,’s been troubling me all day.
- b. That **he** was beaten, *that* Mark *was beaten*,’s been troubling me all day.

Two pieces of evidence favour the second explanation. The first comes from the observation that the generalisation in (99) holds for other types of ellipsis in German. Specifically, *modal complement ellipsis* (MCE), which is exemplified in (104), is unacceptable in non-reformulative appositions in German, as (105) shows.

- (104) Ich wollte Hans das Buch nicht geben, aber ich musste <Hans
I wanted Hans the book not to.give but I must.PST Hans
das Buch geben>.
the book to.give
‘I didn’t want to give Hans the book, but I had to.’

- (105)* Jemand, Alina musste, musste Hans das Buch geben.
Someone Alina must.PST must Hans the book to.give
‘**Someone, Alina had to, had to give Hans the book.**’

The unacceptability of (105) suggests that the ban on obligatory ellipsis in appositive constructions that is observed in English also extends to German. If this is true, then (102) cannot be a suitable syntactic source for (100).

The second piece of evidence to support the idea that the morphological case exhibited by *the Peter* in (100) and (101) is affected by the (non-)pronunciation of *es ist* comes from the observation that the (non-)pronunciation of *es ist* affects the morphological case exhibited by nominal remnants in non-appositive elliptical environments. This is straightforwardly shown with unconditional clauses, which must often be copular clausal (e.g. *no matter who it is*) to be semantically coherent, as a comparison of the German examples in (106) and (107) demonstrate (Elliott & Murphy 2015).

- (106) * Der Idiot würde jedem vertrauen, egal wem er
 the idiot would anyone.DAT trust, no.matter who.DAT he
 vertrauen würde.
 trust would
 ‘The idiot would trust anyone, no matter who he would trust.’
- (107) Der Idiot würde jedem vertrauen, egal wer es ist.
 The idiot would anyone.DAT trust, no.matter who.NOM it is
 ‘The idiot would trust anyone, no matter who it is.’

In (108), clausal ellipsis has applied to the clause in which the *wh*-phrase was base-generated. As one observes, only the dative-marked *wh*-phrase is acceptable in (108), even though the elided clause must be an otherwise nominative-marking copular clause (as only the copular clausal source can yield a semantically coherence utterance, as (106) and (107) have shown).

- (108) Der Idiot würde jedem vertrauen, egal {wem/*wer}.
 the idiot would anyone.DAT trust, no.matter who.DAT/who.NOM
 ‘The idiot would trust anyone, no matter who.’

Thus, the distribution of clausal ellipsis in unconditionals demonstrates that, in German, (non-)pronunciation may affect the distribution of morphological case in an utterance whose syntax is otherwise unchanging. As such, the syntax of German clausal ellipses cannot be reliably inferred from the morphological case exhibited by their remnants, and consequently the distribution of morphological case in German appositions cannot reliably question the veracity of the generalisation in (99).

To summarise: in this section (§6), I advanced a definition of reformulative apposition that subsumes both regular and vacuous reformulative appositions. I also demonstrated that non-reformulative appositions can only be derived from parenthetical copular clauses. I appealed to the distinction between optional and obligatory ellipsis to explain this constraint, and formulated the generalisation that obligatory ellipsis is prohibited in appositional environments. This generalisation hints towards the conclusion that, universally, obligatory ellipsis is ‘prohibited’, simply because it does not exist as a linguistic operation.

7. Conclusion

I argued that utterances that contain reformulative appositions are derived from the standard coordinative syntax that coordinates the DPs in an utterance like *Bill and Ben slept*. In §3, I supported this claim by demonstrating that (i) ‘across the board’ extraction is permitted from within reformulative appositions and their anchors, (ii)

NPIs and quantified DPs can be licensed across the host clause/apposition boundary, and (iii) the existential presuppositions triggered by nominal reformulative appositions can be plugged in the same intensional environments that regularly coordinated DPs can. In §4, I explored the (almost) virgin landscape of elliptical reformulative appositions, and demonstrated that (i) ellipsis may apply to *vacuous appositions* (VAs) and (ii) the ellipsis that applies to clausal VAs should be equated with stripping. In §5, I demonstrated that two alternative approaches to the syntax of reformulative appositions that utilise clausal ellipsis – namely, the ‘orphanage’ and ‘clausal coordination plus reordering’ analyses – are empirically inferior to the syntactic analysis advanced in §3. In §6, I formulated an encompassing definition of reformulative appositions. I also demonstrated that non-reformulative appositions can only be derived from parenthetical copular clauses to which sluicing or generalised whiz-deletion (Ross 1967) applies, and suggested that this observation arises from the fact that obligatory ellipsis is banned in appositive environments.

References

- Aboh, E. 2004. Deriving relative and factive clauses. In L. Brugè, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert & G. Turano (eds.), *Contributions to the thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Venice: Cafoscarina, 265-285.
- Acuña-Fariña, J. C. 2000. Reduced Relatives and Apposition. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 20(1): 5-22.
- Arsenjević, B. 2009. Clausal Complementation as Relativization. *Lingua* 119: 39-50.
- Blakemore, D. 1993. The relevance of reformulations. *Language and Literature* 2(2): 101-120
- Blakemore, D. 1996. Are apposition markers discourse markers? *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 325-347
- Blakemore, D. 2007. ‘Or’-parentheticals, ‘that is’-parentheticals and the pragmatics of reformulation. *Journal of Linguistics* 43: 311-339.
- Burton-Roberts, N. 1975. Nominal apposition. *Foundations of language* 13: 391-419.
- Burton-Roberts, N. 1999. Language, linear precedence and parentheticals. In P. Collins & D. Lee (eds.), *The Clause in English: In honour of Rodney Huddleston*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 33-52.
- Cardoso, A. & M. de Vries. 2010. *Internal and External Heads in Appositive Constructions*. Manuscript, University of Lisbon & University of Groningen.
[let.rug.nl/dvries/pdf/2010-appositive-constructions-webversion.pdf, accessed 02/15.]
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1-52.

- Dehé, N. & Y. Kavalova. 2007. Parentheticals: An introduction. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-22.
- Del Gobbo, F. 2007. On the syntax and semantics of appositive relative clauses. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 173-202.
- Döring, S. 2014. Parentheticals are - presumably - CPs. In M. Kluck, D. Ott & M. de Vries (eds.), *Parenthesis and Ellipsis. Cross-linguistic and Theoretical Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 109-145.
- Elliott, P. & A. Murphy. 2015. Optimizing the Ellipsis Site. Paper presented at *Grasping Ellipsis: its syntax, semantics, acquisition and processing*. University of Campinas, Brazil, May 2015.
[\[academia.edu/12708010/Optimizing_the_Ellipsis_Site\]](https://academia.edu/12708010/Optimizing_the_Ellipsis_Site), accessed 06/15]
- Embick, D. & R. Noyer. 2001. Movement Operations after Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(4): 555-595.
- Emmons, J. 1979. Appositive Relatives Have No Properties. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10(2): 211-243.
- Espinal, M. T. 1991. The representation of disjunct constituents. *Language* 67(4): 726-762.
- Geurts, B. 1997. Good news about the description theory of names. *Journal of Semantics* 14: 319-348.
- Göbbel, E. 2007. Extraposition as PF Movement. In E. Bainbridge & B. Agbayani (eds.), *Proceedings of Western Conference on Linguistics* 17. Fresno: Department of Linguistics at California State University, 132-145.
- Griffiths, J. 2015a. Parenthetical verb constructions, fragment answers, and constituent modification. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33(1): 191-229.
- Griffiths, J. 2015b. *On appositives*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Griffiths, J. & G. Güneş. 2014. *Ki* issues in Turkish. Parenthetical coordination and adjunction. In M. Kluck, D. Ott & M. de Vries (eds.), *Parenthesis and Ellipsis. Cross-linguistic and Theoretical Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 173-217.
- Gundel, K. 1988. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. London: Garland.
- Gülich, E. & T. Kotschi. 1995. Discourse production in oral communication. In U. Quasthoff (ed.), *Aspects of oral communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 30-66.
- Güneş, G. *Deriving prosodic structures*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

- Haegeman, L. 1991. Parenthetical Adverbials: The Radical Orphanage Approach. In S. Chiba, A. Ogawa, Y. Fuiwara, N. Yamada, O. Koma and T. Yagi (eds.), *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 232-254.
- Haegeman, L. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hankamer, J. & I. Sag. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:391-426.
- Harris, J. & C. Potts. 2009. Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32(6): 523-552.
- Heringa, H. 2011. *Appositional constructions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Heringa, H. & M. de Vries. 2008. Een semantische classificatie van apposities. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 13: 60-87.
- Johannessen, J. B. 1998. *Coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. S. 2010. *Comparisons and Contrasts*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kavalova, Y. 2007. And-parenthetical clauses. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 145-172.
- Klein, M. 1976. Appositionele NP's in het Nederlands. *De nieuwe taalgids* 69: 139-153.
- Kluck, M. 2011. *Sentence amalgamation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Koster, J. 2000. *Extraposition as Parallel Construal*. Manuscript, University of Groningen.
[let.rug.nl/koster/papers/parallel.pdf, accessed 06/15]
- Lakoff, G. 1974. Syntactic amalgams. In M. Galy, R. Fox & A. Bruck (eds.), *Papers from the 10th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 321-344.
- Lassiter, D. 2011. Anaphoric properties of which and the syntax of appositive relatives. In N. Myler & J. Wood (eds.), *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 69-94.
- McCawley, J. D. 1998. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Merchant, J. 2003. *Remarks on stripping*. Manuscript, University of Chicago.
[home.uchicago.edu/merchant/pubs/stripping.pdf, accessed 02/15]
- Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(6): 661-738.
- Merchant, J. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In K. Johnson (ed.), *Topics in ellipsis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 132-153.

- Merchant, J. 2013. Ellipsis: A survey of analytical approaches. Manuscript, University of Chicago.
 [home.uchicago.edu/merchant/pubs/ellipsis.formatted.pdf, accessed 06/15]
- Mikkelsen, L. 2005. *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication and Equation*. *Linguistik Aktuell* 85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Morgan, J. 1973. Sentence Fragments and the Notion ‘Sentence’. In B. Kachru, R. Lees, Y. Malkiel, A. Pietrangeli & S. Saporta (eds.), *Issues in Linguistics: Essays in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 719-751.
- Motsch, W. 1966. Untersuchungen zur Apposition im Deutschen. *Studia Grammatica* 5: 87-132.
- Nouwen, R. 2014. A note on the projection of appositives. In E. McCready, K. Yabushita & K. Yoshimoto (eds.), *Formal approaches to semantics and pragmatics: Japanese and Beyond. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 95. Dordrecht: Springer, 205-222.
- Onea, E. & D Ott. 2014. On the form and meaning of appositives. Paper presented at The 45th annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society 45. MIT, October 2014.
 [amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~ottdenni/handouts/nels45.pdf, accessed 06/15]
- O’Connor, K. M. 2008. *Aspects de la syntaxe et de l’interprétation de l’apposition à antécédent nominal*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lille 3.
- Ott, D. 2014. *Ellipsis in appositives*. Manuscript, Humboldt University of Berlin.
- Ott, D. & M. de Vries. 2012. Thinking in the right direction: an ellipsis analysis of right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 29: 123-133.
- Ott, D. & M. de Vries. 2014. A biclausal analysis of right-dislocation. In H.-L. Huang, E. Poole & A. Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of North East Linguistic Society* 43,. Amherst: Graduate Linguistic Student Association, 41-54.
- Peterson, P. 1999. On the boundaries of syntax: Non-syntagmatic relations. In P. Collins & D. Lee (eds.), *The Clause in English: In honour of Rodney Huddleston*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 229-250.
- Postal, P. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Potts, C. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poutsma, H. 1904. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Groningen: Noordhoof.
- Ross, J. R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Safir, K. 1986. Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 663–689.
- Sailor, C. 2009. *Tagged for deletion: a typological approach to VP ellipsis in tag questions*. MA thesis, University of California Los Angeles.
- Sauerland, U. 1998. *The meaning of chains*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sauerland, U. & Elbourne, P. 2002. Total reconstruction, PF-movement, and the derivational order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 283–319.
- Smith, C. S. 1964. Determiners and Relative Clauses in a Generative Grammar of English. *Language* 40: 37–52.
- Vries, M. de. 2007. Invisible Constituents? Parentheses as B-Merged Adverbial Phrases. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203–234.
- Vries, M. de. 2009. Specifying Coordination: An Investigation into the Syntax of Dislocation, Extraposition and Parenthesis. In C. Dreyer (ed.), *Language and Linguistics: Emerging Trends*. New York: Nova, 37–98.
- Vries, M. de. 2013. Locality and right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 30: 160–172.
- Wang, L., B. Reese & E. McCready. 2005. The projection problem of nominal appositives. *Snippets* 10:13–14.
- Weir, A. 2014. *Fragments and clausal ellipsis*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Wilder, C. 1997. Some Properties of Ellipsis in Coordination. In A. Alexiadou (ed.), *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 59–107.
- Zhang, N. 2010. *Coordination in Syntax*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics Series 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.