

APPOSITIVES AS E-TYPE ANAPHORA

Introduction:

In this study I show that, differently from what is traditionally assumed (Chao 1968, Hashimoto 1971), Chinese relative clauses do not allow appositive readings. Building on previous proposals (Evans 1977, Sells 1985, Neale 1990, Demirdache 1991) I maintain that appositives are an instance of E-type anaphora. I observe that a precedence relationship between the antecedent and the E-type pronoun is needed, in order for the anaphoric link to occur. Since in Chinese relative clauses are prenominal, the “head” always follows the relative operator. The E-type anaphoric link cannot be established, hence no appositive reading is available.

The plan:

1. In Chinese a relative clause always precedes the noun it modifies, with no intonational break between the relative and the “head” noun. Traditionally, it is maintained that if the determiner follows the relative clause, this will be interpreted as restrictive, as in (1). If instead the determiner precedes the relative, the latter will be interpreted as appositive, as in (2). Making use of the properties traditionally ascribed to appositive relative clauses, I show that (1) and (2) are both restrictive.
2. The flavor of apposition in (2) comes from a different semantic composition. Following Bach and Cooper (1978) and Lin (1997), I assume the existence of a free property variable inside the denotation of the determiner. The denotation of the higher DP in (1) is obtained through the rule in (3). It is the different way of computing the semantics that gives us the observed different import of the determiner vs. the relative clause depending on the order in which they occur inside the nominal. This semantic account is the formal translation of Huang’s (1982) claim according to which the difference between (1) and (2) is due to the scope of modification.
3. The interaction of appositives with quantifiers yields the same results observed for E-type anaphora (Evans 1980, Neale 1990) (4-5). This leads me to propose that appositives are an instance of E-type anaphora (Sells 1985, Demirdache 1991).
4. My contribution lies on the observation that for the anaphoric link between the antecedent and the E-type pronoun to hold, the sentence that contains the antecedent has to be uttered before the sentence that hosts the E-type pronoun (6-7). On the assumption that the relative operator or pronoun in an appositive is the E-type pronoun, in order for it to be anaphoric onto the “head” of the appositive, it needs to follow it. In Chinese relative clauses are prenominal, the operator precedes the “head”, hence the unavailability of appositive readings (8-9).
5. Finally, I show that in Chinese even relative clauses modifying proper names cannot be appositive. Moreover, it is not possible to analyze them as either reduced relatives or free adjuncts (Krause 2001). My proposal is that relative clauses modifying proper names in Chinese are restrictives. The denotation of the entire nominal is given by the intersection of the predicate denoted by the relative clause and ‘stages’ of the proper names, along the lines of Paul (1994).

Conclusion:

Appositives are an instance of E-type anaphora. Such a proposal explains the similarity between appositives and E-type anaphora with respect to quantification. It also gives us an explanation for the unavailability of appositive in Chinese. The traditional distinction between appositives and restrictives in Chinese is accounted for semantically. The denotation of a nominal in which the relative precedes a proper name is given by the intersection of the property of the relative with ‘stages’ of the proper name. Finally, this study makes the strong empirical prediction that in all languages with prenominal relatives, the appositive reading should not be allowed.

Data

- (1) Zongshi chidao de nage ren shi wo pengyou.
always be-late DE that-CL person is my friend
'The person who is always late is my friend.'
- (2) Nage zongshi chidao de ren shi wo pengyou.
that-CL always be-late DE person is my friend
'That person, who is always late, is my friend.'
- (3) λR_1 [[DP₁]] ([[CP]])
- (4) a. *[Every congressman]_i voted for Kennedy. He_i is junior.
b. *[Every congressman]_i, who_i is junior, voted for Kennedy.
c. [Every congressman]_i who_i is junior voted for Kennedy.
- (5) a. [Only one congressman]_i voted for Kennedy. He_i is junior.
b. [Only one congressman]_i, who_i is junior, voted for Kennedy. .
c. [Only one congressman]_i who_i is junior voted for Kennedy.
- (6) I saw that movie_i. It_{i/j}* was good.
(7) It_{i/j}* was good. I saw that movie_i.
(8) I saw that movie_i, which_i t_i was a good one.
(9) Wo kanjian nayi ge [Op_i t_i hen hao de] dianying.
I saw that-one CL very good DE movie
'I saw that good movie.'
'*I saw that movie, which was a good one.'

Selected references:

- Bach, E. and R. Cooper (1978). "The NP-S Analysis of Relative Clauses and Compositional Semantics", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2: 145-150.
- Chao, Y.-R. (1968). *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Demirdache, H. (1991). *Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation structures*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.
- Evans, G. (1977). "Pronouns, Quantifiers, and Relative Clauses (I)", *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 7, 3, 467-536.
- _____ (1980). "Pronouns", *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 337-362.
- Hashimoto, A. (1971). *Mandarin Syntactic Structures*, Union 8, Princeton University.
- Huang, C.-T. J (1982). *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Krause, C. (2001). "When prenominal relatives cannot be appositives", WCCFL 20, Feb. 25th.
- Lin, Jowang (1997). "Some remarks on the Semantics of Prenominal Relative Clauses in Chinese", The Seventh International Conference on Chinese Linguistics, June 19-21, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Neale, S. (1990). *Descriptions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Paul, M. (1994). *Young Mozart and the Joking Woody Allen: Proper Names, Individuals and Parts*. SALT IV.
- Sells, P. (1985). *Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Modification*. CSLI Report No. CSLI-85-28. Stanford, Calif.