

## Two types of apposition

JAMES GRIFFITHS

*University of Groningen, Netherlands*

In his innovative account of appositives, Potts (2005) argues that anchors compose with two predicates, the *supplement* and the remainder of the host clause. The result of composition is two independent clauses.

- (1)
- a. Terry, *the plumber*, is coming at three o'clock.
  - b. Terry is coming at three o'clock.
  - c. Terry is *the plumber*.

While Potts only examines a subset of appositions, Heringa (2011) proposes that a syntactic version of this theory (the 'underlying clause' analysis, UC) should be extended to all appositions. Following McCawley (1998), I will oppose this generalisation, and maintain that appositions must be bifurcated. Specifically, I argue for (2):

- (2)
- a. If both the apposition and its anchor are definite individual noun phrases, the apposition *may* be a UC (provided other conditions are met).
  - b. If an apposition is an indefinite noun phrase, and if its anchor is *not* an indefinite noun phrase, the apposition is a UC.
  - c. Otherwise, appositions are not UCs.

According to (2), all non-nominal appositions and the majority of nominal appositions display the same semantic type of their anchor. Thus, constructions that can be afforded the UC analysis (according to which the apposition is type t, and the anchor is type e) are the exception, not the norm. These exceptional cases should therefore be excluded from one's set of 'true' appositions, and instead be aligned with other clausal parentheticals, such as those in (3).

- (3)
- a. Terry – *he's the plumber* – is coming over at 13:00.
  - b. Kristian's bicycle, *which is a racer*, has a flat tyre.

I will present a number of diagnostics for 'true' appositionhood, along with observations that support the bifurcation that I propose. These include data from the realisation of morphological case, from the distributional of quantified elements, and from the possible presence of so-called *apposition markers*.

The UC analysis provides an obvious account of the semantic import of appositives: they contribute a secondary proposition. But if 'true' appositions are subclausal constituents of the same type as their anchor, how do they convey the meaning that they do? Time permitting, I will outline an approach that treats appositions as establishing a set-membership relation with their anchor (i.e. anchor  $\supseteq$  apposition).

### References

- Potts, C. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heringa, H. 2011. *Appositional constructions*. PhD thesis, University of Groningen.
- McCawley, J. 1998. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. London: University of Chicago Press.