

## Subjects and floating quantifiers in non-finite non-restrictive modification

Kathleen M. O'Connor

Université de Lille 3 & UMR 8163 Savoirs, Textes, Langage

Non-finite non-restrictive modifiers of the type illustrated in (1), though they appear to consist of a single constituent (see e.g. DeVries (2006)), have sometimes been analysed as more or less clausal in nature.

- (1) a. NP: John, my best friend, lives down the street.  
b. PP: John, in hospital with flu, won't be coming to the meeting.  
c. AP: John, happy about the report, congratulated everyone on a job well done.

For example, Doron (1992) proposes that these modifiers, which she considers to be appositives, consist minimally of a predicate, while McCawley (1995) derives such examples from an underlying appositive relative clause. In both analyses, the presence of potentially floating quantifiers is advanced as evidence for this underlying clausal structure:

- (2) a. The men, **both/all** doctors, were awarded medals. (Doron, 1992: 31)  
b. Sauter is...living with his lawyer-wife Kathleen – the daughter of Pat Brown and sister of Jerry Brown, **both** former governors of California. (Parade, 5 October 1987 in McCawley, 1995)

However, such examples are ambiguous: they are consistent with a stranding analysis of FQs, as in (3a) and (b), and with an analysis in which the Q is a subject, as seen in (3a') and (b'), for finite clauses.

- (3) a. They are **all/both** doctors.  
a'. **Both/All** are doctors.  
b. They are **both** former governors.  
b'. **Both** are former governors.

Obviously, the absence of a finite verb makes it difficult to determine the position of the Q in these modifiers. One piece of evidence that can be exploited in determining the position of the Qs relates to the presence of adverbs. In the present paper it is shown that the interplay between adverbs and DP positions can be used to determine the status of these Qs.

Under a cartographic analysis of adverb placement such as that proposed by Cinque (1999), each class of adverbs is restricted to a fixed position in the clause in the IP layer. Moreover, the adverb classes are assumed to be ordered in a strict hierarchy. Cinque (1999) also suggests that different DP positions that can host subjects and FQs are found among these adverb positions. Finally, he argues that subjects are confined to positions to the left of the adverb *already* and all adverbs lower down, i.e. *no longer*, *still*, *always*, *soon*, *briefly* and *almost*.

- (4) a. John has **already** seen this film.  
b. \***Already** John has seen this film.

Previous work has shown that these appositives are capable of hosting adverbs (e.g. McCawley, 1995). Thus, given the assumptions from Cinque (1999), the relative positions of adverbs and Qs in finite clauses can be used as a diagnostic for the position of the Q in an appositive. Specifically, if Qs can be found to the right of *already*, then they cannot be

subjects and must therefore be floated from a subject position. In the present paper it is shown that this is indeed the case. Quantifiers can be found to the right of *already* and lower adverbs. Examples are given in (5).

- (5) a. The beneficiaries of the consolidation, **already both** Colgate agencies, are Young & Rubicam and Foote, Cone & Belding. (*New York Times* online, 2 June 1986)  
b. The wage, not **always all** in cash, is far lower than urban or industrial levels of payment. (*New York Times* online, 15 December 2010)

Moreover, Qs also occupy higher positions, consistent with a subject or FQ analysis. Examples are shown in (6). In (6a) the FQ *both* appears higher than the adverb *already*, which means that the FQ is potentially located in a subject position, as in (6b), or in a higher FQ position, as in (6c).

- (6) a. They were a year apart – Mr. Solarz was 70 when he died, Mr. Holbrooke 69 – **both already** out of college and in the very real world when the campus rebellions of the '60s came along. (*New York Times* online, 14 June 1985)  
b. **Both** were **already** out of college.  
c. They were **both already** out of college.

Additional evidence for the potential of an FQ to occupy a subject position derives from the presence of non-floating Qs, e.g. *some* or *many*, in appositives. Examples are given in (7).

- (7) a. At the book signing, the brothers engaged each autograph seeker, **some** obviously nervous, with smiles and banter. (*New York Times* online, 25 October 2006)  
b. Though he tried to evade an impeachment conviction by resigning before the Senate reached a verdict, the lawmakers, **many** openly angry at his conduct in office, insisted on holding the trial. (*New York Times* online, 31 December 1992)

In the present paper, it is posited that FQs and non-floating Qs can, in fact, occupy a subject position and that they take a PRO complement (see Lobeck (1995)). Furthermore, FQs can also be located in a lower DP position related to a PRO subject, evidence for which is adduced from the presence of anaphors within an appositive.

These conclusions have implications for the overall analysis of appositives. First, *contra* DeVries (2006), it is clear that appositives are not single constituents but have a much more extensive structure resembling that of a finite clause. Second, the paper provides support for analyses such as McCawley (1995), whereby appositives are derived from or related to other types of clauses. Finally, the broader implication is that adverbs can be used as a tool for detecting the presence of other structures within the clause.

## References

- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
DeVries, M. 2006. The syntax of appositive relativization: On specifying coordination, false free relatives, and promotion. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 37, 229-270.  
Doron, E. 1992. Appositive predicates. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 7, 23-33.  
Lobeck, A. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing and identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
McCawley, J. D. 1995. An overview of “appositive” constructions in English. *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 12, 195-211.