

Czech nominal attributive apposition

Radek Šimík, r.simik@rug.nl
University of Groningen

Workshop on parenthesis and sentence amalgamation
19-10-2007

Object of inquiry

- (1) a. potkal jsem Martu, krásnou to ženu
met aux.1sg Marta.acc beautiful.acc it woman.acc
'I met Marta, a beautiful woman'
b. anchor[NP_{Case1/φ1}] &: apposition[*Mod*_{Case1/φ2} *to*_{Case/φ} *NP*_{Case1/φ2}]

Terminology

Martu anchor
krásnou pre-*to* modifier
to invariable *to* ('it' but also 'this/that')
ženu apposition NP

Concerning the basic types of apposition, i.e. **attributive**, **inclusive**, and **identificational** (proposed by Heringa and de Vries 2006), appositions of the *Mod-to-NP* pattern are exclusively attributive.

- (2) Africká trypanosomiáza, *nebezpečná to nemoc* [attribution]
African trypanosomiasis, dangerous it sickness
'African trypanosomiasis, a dangerous sickness.'
- (3) Africké nemoci, (*například/mezi nimi*) *spavá (*to) nemoc* [inclusion]
African sicknesses for example/among them sleeping it sickness
'African diseases, for example/among them the sleeping sickness'
- (4) Africká trypanosomiáza, (*jinými slovy*) *spavá (*to) nemoc* [identification]
African trypanosomiasis, other words sleeping it sickness
'African trypanosomiasis, in other words sleeping sickness'

Goals of this talk

- presenting observations
- speculations about explanations
- state some relevant questions for further research

Organization of the talk

Section 1 illustrates the properties of the apposition

Section 2 illustrates the properties of the anchor

Section 3 shows how *to* is distributed within the apposition

Section 4 shows that there are some restrictions on the interpretation of the pre-*to* modifier

Section 5 summarizes the observations and gives possible explanations

Section 6 poses questions

1 Properties of the apposition

The obligatoriness/optionality of *to*. Attributive apposition reading can be achieved also without *to* but the acceptability is reduced, especially in “bare” *Mod-to-NP* appositions like (5a). If *to* is omitted in (5b), the apposition is arguably (re)interpreted as a case of identification/specification.

- (5) a. skupina budov zvaná Špalíček, *historická* ??(*to*) *památka*
 group buildings called Š. historical it monument
 ‘a group of buildings called Špalíček, a historical monument’
 b. skupina budov zvaná Špalíček, *historická* (*to*) *památka v centru Brna*
 group buildings called Š. historical it monument in centre Brno
 ‘a group of buildings called Špalíček, a historical monument in the centre of Brno’

A reflexive anaphor embedded in the nominal apposition can be bound by an expression in the matrix clause, see (6). There is a clear contrast with a sentential (finite) apposition, see (7).

- (6) **Pavel_i** potkal **Petra_j**, *dobrého to učitele svého_{i/j}* syna
 Pavel met Petr good it teacher his-refl son
 ‘Pavel met Petr, a good teacher of his [Pavel’s/Petr’s] son’
 (7) **Pavel_i** potkal **Petra_j**, *což je dobrý učitel svého_{*i/j}* syna
 Pavel met Petr which is good teacher his-refl son
 ‘Pavel met Petr, which is a good teacher of his [*Pavel’s/Petr’s] son’

Modification by modal (*actually*), temporal (*then*), and sentential (*by the way*) adverbials is possible

- (8) Špičkové modelky J. K., E. B. a B. Q., *jinak krásné to ženy*, se propůjčily
 top models otherwise beautiful it women refl lent
 k předvádění módy, která vůbec není půvabná
 to showing fashion which at all not.is lovely
 ‘The top models ..., otherwise beautiful women, have lent themselves to showing fashion which is not lovely at all.’
 (9) *avšak od čeho tu máme kontrolory, mimochodem slabé to místo právě zdravotních pojišťoven*
 but for what here have.1pl inspectors by the way weak it place just health insurance companies
 ‘but what do we have inspectors for, by the way a weak point of health insurance companies’
 (10) *za ztrátu lodi vyplatili 1,2 miliónu dolarů, tehdy velikánskou to sumu.*
 for loss ship paid.3pl 1,2 million dollars, then great it amount
 ‘for the loss of a ship they paid 1,2 million dollars, then a great amount (of money)’
 (11) *neb bychom spíše potřebovali „Ligu na ochranu lidí“ před nezodpovědnými majiteli psů,*
 because aux.1pl rather need association for protection people from irresponsible owners dogs
vlastně nebohých to zvířat držných v bytech a panelákových domech.
 actually poor it animals held in flats and panel houses
 ‘because we would rather need an “association for protecting people” from the irresponsible owners of dogs, actually poor animals, held in flats and prefab houses’

If such an adverbial is present, it has to precede the whole apposition.

- (12) 1,2 miliónu dolarů, {*tehdy*} *velikánská* {**tehdy*} *to* {**tehdy*} *suma* {**tehdy*}
 1,2 million dollars then great then it then amount (of money) then
 ‘1,2 million dollars, then a great amount of money’

2 Properties of the anchor

The referential properties of the anchor do not play a decisive role: it ranges from proper names to non-specific DPs and even non-nominal XPs. As Heringa and de Vries (2006) show, this property of anchors is characteristic of attributive apposition.

proper names

- (13) Do **Anglie či Itálie**, *mateřských to zemí dalších soutěžících*
to England or Italy motherly it countries other competitors
'To England or Italy, home countries of other competitors.'

definite/generic

- (14) nedává najevo odpor k **ruské vodce**, *národnímu to nápoji*
not.give.3sg obvious aversion for Russian vodka national it drink
'he doesn't show his aversion for the Russian vodka, a national drink.'

non-specific

- (15) musí najít **bílého netopýra**, *posvátné to zvíře jednoho mírumilovného kmene*
must.3sg find white bat holy it animal one peaceful tribe
'they have to find a (non-specific) white bat, a holy animal of a (certain) peaceful tribe'

non-nominal (VP)

- (16) Měl bych [...] **bourat mýty**, *oblíbené to zaměstnání mladíků s mlékem na bradě*
had aux.1sg destroy myths popular it occupation young boys with milk on kin
'I should be destroying myths, a popular occupation of young boys who are wet behind the ears.'

3 Placement of *to* within the apposition

Both the prenominal modifier and the NP must be present, i.e. there is a strict *Mod-to-NP* pattern

- (17) a. **Jiří**, *přítel (*to) mé matky*
Jiří friend it my mother
'George, a/the friend of my mother'
b. **Jiří**, *nebojácný a odvážný (*to), ...*
Jiří fearless and brave it
'George, (a) fearless and brave (man), ...'

To follows the whole AP constituent, not the first word

- (18) **parthenon z růžového mramoru**, *nepřilíš { *to } šťastná { to } replika idylických rezidencí*
Parthenon from pink marble not-very it happy it replica idyllic residences
'Parthenon made of pink marble, not a very well-done replica of idyllic residences'

More adjectives can sit in the pre-*to* position only if they are coordinated

- (19) **Marie**, *krásná *(a,) inteligentní to učitelka*
Marie beautiful and/, intelligent it teacher
'Mary, the alleged beautiful teacher'

When more adjectives are present, then the structurally highest one must be in the pre-*to* position.

- (20) a. Britney Spears je slavná americká zpěvačka
B. S. is famous American singer
b. *Britney Spears je americká slavná zpěvačka
B. S. is American famous singer
'Britney Spears is a famous American singer'
- (21) a. Britney Spears, slavná/americká to zpěvačka
B. S. famous/American it singer
b. Britney Spears, slavná to americká zpěvačka
B. S. famous it American singer
c. *Britney Spears, americká to slavná zpěvačka
B. S. American it famous singer
'Britney Spears, a famous American singer'

4 Nature of the pre-*to* modifier

The modifier must be an adjective. No demonstratives, possessives, quantifiers, or postnominal (genitive) modifiers are acceptable, even though they exploit the adjectival inflectional morphology in Czech.

- (22) a. Martin-a, dobré-ho/*mé-ho/*to-ho/*jedno-ho/*matk-y to přítele ze studií
Martin-acc good-acc my-acc that-acc some-acc mother-gen it friend from studies
'Martin, a good/my/that/some/mother's friend from studies'

Various kinds of adjectives can be used in the pre-*to* position. In a corpus examination, I have found the following (among others):

individual property (*krásný* 'beautiful', *známý* 'well-known', *historický* 'historic(al)', *klasický* 'classic(al)')
temporal property (*dávny* 'old/long past', *nedávny* 'recent')
speaker attitude (*údajný* 'alleged', *pochybný* 'doubtful')

A typology of nominal modifiers (selected from Cinque 2003)

intersective vs. non-intersective

- (23) a. musí najít bílého netopýra, *posvátné* to zvíře
must.3sg find white bat holy it animal
'they have to find a (non-specific) white bat, a holy animal'
b. {x | x is holy and x is an animal}
- (24) a. Kaddáfí, *známý* to sponzor mezinárodního terorismu
Kaddafi well-known it sponsor international terrorism
'Kaddafi, a well-known sponsor of the international terrorism'
b. ? {x | x is well-known and x is a sponsor of international terrorism}
c. {x | x is well-known because he gives money to international terrorists}

restrictive vs. non-restrictive

- (25) a. Koupil jsem kávovar a mixér, *vhodné* to doplňky do mé kuchyně
bought aux.1sg coffee-machine and mixer suitable it accessories in my kitchen
'I bought a coffee-machine and a mixer, suitable accessories for my kitchen.'
(there are no other, unsuitable accessories in the discourse)

Radek Šimík **Czech nominal attributive apposition**

- (26) a. Koupil jsem kávovar a mixér, ty *vhodné doplňky* do mé kuchyně
bought aux.1sg coffee-machine and mixer the suitable accessories in my kitchen
'I bought a coffee-machine and a mixer, suitable accessories for my kitchen.'
(there are some other, unsuitable accessories in the discourse)

stage vs. individual (Carlson 1977, Kratzer 1995)

If adjectives are ambiguous between an S-level and I-level interpretations, then they obligatorily receive an I-level interpretation

- (27) a. Pavel, *nemocný* to muž
Pavel sick it man
'Pavel, a sick man'
b. *Pavel is currently sick
c. Sickness (e.g. mental) is a permanent property of Pavel

This is in contrast with specifying/equative appositions

- (28) a. Pavel, *ten nemocný* muž
Pavel that sick man
'Pavel, that sick man'
b. Pavel is currently sick
c. Sickness is a permanent property of Pavel

This correlates with two types of copular predications: true predication and specification (Heycock and Kroch 1999)

- (29) a. Pavel je nemocný muž ≈ (27), I-level
Pavel is sick man
b. Pavel je ten nemocný muž ≈ (28), I-level or S-level
Pavel is that sick man

Inherent S-level predicates (e.g. present participles) are expected to be unacceptable

- (30) a. #Honzík, *spící* to chlapec
Honzík sleeping it boy
'Johnny, a sleeping boy'
b. *Honzík is currently sleeping
c. Honzík has the permanent property being asleep

- (31) a. Honzík, *ten spící* chlapec
Honzík that sleeping boy
'Johnny, that sleeping boy'
b. Honzík is currently sleeping
c. Honzík has the permanent property of sleeping

Individual-level predicates lack argument slots for spatio-temporal locations (Kratzer 1995).

- (32) a. Tato budova, *kdysi dobrá* to škola
this building once good it school
'This building, once a good school'
b. *This building is a school which was once good
c. This building was once a school, by the way a good one

- (33) a. To byla kdysi dobrá škola
 it was once good school
 ‘This used to be a good school’
 b. This is a school, which used to be good
 c. This used to be a school, by the way a good one

5 Summary of the Observations. Possible Explanations

- O1 The apposition and the anchor have the same case, assigned in the matrix clause; (1) (and all others)
 O2 Anaphors contained in the nominal apposition (as opposed to a sentential apposition) can be bound by expressions in the matrix clause; (6), (7)
 O3 The apposition can be modified by all kinds of sentential adverbs, which must precede the nominal apposition; (9), (10), (11), (12)

PE1 The nominal apposition is a NP/DP, i.e. a structure which is transparent for external case assignment and anaphor binding. Modification by sentential adverbs is possible but they must be placed outside the DP itself (arguably because it does not provide the necessary adjunction sites).

- O4 If *to* is present then the apposition is attributive (but not necessarily the other way round), i.e. the apposition has the semantic status of a nominal predicate; (2), (3), (4), (5)
 O5 *To* is in complementary distribution with demonstratives, possessives, quantifiers; (22)
 O6 The referential properties of the anchor range from proper names and definites to non-specific DPs and even non-nominal XPs; (13), (14), (15), (16)

PE2 The nominal apposition is a “defective” DP, presumably lacking specificity layers. Its syntactic properties equal those of nominal predicates.

- O7 The placement of *to* within the apposition is sensitive to syntactic criteria, namely, it sits behind the hierarchically highest AP, two (or more?) APs are only licit if also coordinated; (18), (19), (20), (21)

PE3 The placement of *to* is directly accounted for if a movement analysis is assumed (targeting constituents, respecting relativized minimality). More particularly, the situation is reminiscent of V2 or clitic-second phenomena; this is an indirect support for the assumption that *to* is a left-peripheral head with a specifier slot for (operator) phrases.

- O8 The pre-*to* modifier can be both intersective and non-intersective, the actual interpretation is decided on pragmatic and lexical grounds; (23), (24)
 O9 The pre-*to* modifier must be non-restrictive; (25), (26)
 O10 The pre-*to* modifier must be an I-level predicate (if predicate at all). If the analogous identification apposition is used, the S-level interpretation becomes available; (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (32), (33)

PE4 The lack of specificity layers in the apposition DP (PE2) may be responsible for the lack of S-level readings.

6 In place of conclusion: Questions with *Unsatisfactory Answers*

Q1 What is *to*?

Q2 Why does *to* appear in attributive appositions but not in inclusive and identificational ones?

Q3 How relevant is the fact that *to* has no ϕ -features and case, even though it is essentially a demonstrative pronoun?

UA1 *To* is intuitively coindexed with the apposition. In this respect it could be regarded as the equivalent of the subject in corresponding full-fledged copula constructions:

(34) (Marta,) **to** je (krásná/ moje) žena
Marta it is beautiful my woman
'(Marta), that's a (beautiful/my) woman/wife'

What is good

- There may be a common reason for the fact that both cases require an NP as a (part of the) predicate

What is problematic

- As opposed to the subject in (34), *to* in nominal appositions does not qualify as a binder of (reflexive) anaphors; see the relevant contrast between (6) and (7).
- In copula constructions the predication may also be specificational.
- In copula constructions the predicate needs no prenominal modifier.
- *To* in copula constructions can be contrastively stressed, focalized, topicalized, and can even bear *wh*-features (in both questions and relative clauses). *To* in nominal appositions is obligatorily unstressed and behaves as a clitic.

Q4 What is the motivation for the movement of the prenominal modifier?

UA2 There are constructions exploiting the same schematic pattern, i.e. *Mod-to-NP*. The constructions include cleft-like questions, exclamations, and appositive relatives with an internal head:

(35) *Jaký to chleba* si chceš koupit?
what-kind-of it bread refl want buy
'What kind of bread is it that you want to buy?'

(36) (*Jak*) *krásná to žena* (za námi přišla)!
how beautiful it woman to us came
'What a beautiful woman (came to us)!'

(37) *Tato pistole, kterouž to zbraní* zabil svého otce
this pistol which it weapon killed.3sg his-refl fater
'This pistol, with which weapon he killed his own father.'

Problems

- One apparent problem in unifying these constructions is the semantics. In (35) and (36) the semantics of the movement to the pre-*to* position seems to be invoking alternatives. Thus, the structure underlying (35) generates an existential presupposition a set of types of bread; in (36), there is a set of degrees of beauty where the maximal one is focused. However, a similar semantics is hard to "graft" onto the relative clause case in (37), as well as the nominal apposition case under discussion.

Reference List

- Carlson, Greg N. 1977. *Reference to kinds in English*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. 'The dual source of adjectives and XP vs. N-raising in the Romance DP.' Talk presented at NELS 34.
- Heringa, Herman and Mark de Vries. 2006. 'Een semantische classificatie van apposities.' Manuscript. University of Groningen.
- Heycock, Caroline and Anthony Kroch. 1999. 'Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 365–397.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. 'Stage-level and individual-level predicates.' G. N. Carlson and F. J. Pelletier (eds). *The generic book*, 125–223. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.