In a Collins Conjunction (CC, Collins 1988), a sentential adverb occurs in an argumental nominal conjunct (1). It has a weak and strong reading (Munn 1993, Condoravdi et al 2019).

(1) a. John, Bill and *maybe Mary went to the store.
   Weak: ‘J and B, or J, B and M.’  Strong: ‘J, B and x and x may be M.’
   b. John, Bill and *{allegedly/sometimes} Mary get together on Friday nights.

A binding problem: No c-command relation is seen between the binder and variable in (3b).

(3) a. They have praised each professor, and *perhaps his best student. (both str & wk readings)
   b. *[They have praised each professor, and [perhaps they have praised his, best student].

An NP CC problem: (4a) is not derived from (4b).

(4) a. *My [friend and maybe future colleague] will also attend.
   b. *My friend will attend and maybe future colleague will also attend.

An adverb problem: the approach fails to explain the acceptability contrast in (5).

(5) John, Bill went to the store and *{maybe/*quickly} Mary went to the store.

A cleft approach (also the clausal coordination approach) has a collective predicate problem (the capitalized forms are PF-null in (6)). The clause modified by the adverb has no VP ellipsis.

(6) *John, Bill and [maybe IT BE Mary WHO went to the store together] went to the store together.

A transparent relative clause (RC) approach (Bogal-Allbritten & Weir 2017) fails to explain why the post-adverb DP is definite if it is assumed to be a predicate of a PRO subject in the approach.

Proposal: The Adverb-Containing Conjunct (ACC) in a CC is a reduced specification clause (RSC). Unlike in a predicational clause, in a specification one, the post-copula nominal is of type e (e.g., den Dikken 2006, Mikkelsen 2011). The full form of the ACC in (1a) is (8).

(7) a. Jane Austen was a novelist. [pred.]
   b. The author of *Emma was Jane Austen. [specif.]

(8) [ACC maybe [A PERSON BE Mary]]

The RSC analysis explains the ban of a manner adverb (9a), (5) (Collins 1988), and an event-token modifier (9b) (cf. Rothstein 1999). Event kind ones (sometimes; Gehrke 2019) are fine (1b).

(9) a.*Kim and *intelligently Mary avoided the teacher.  b.*Kim and yesterday *Mary went to the store.

The RSC in an ACC is not contained in a DP. It is not a complement of a noun. It is not a non-restrictive RC, since it is prosodically integrated into the CC (Collins 1988). It is not a Headless (free) RC, which must start with a wh-form in English (Little et al. 2024; I read what he writes).

The RSC analysis is fine for an ACC when the adverb modifies a definite NP (10). They put *what appeared to be a steak to me on my plate. (van Riemstik 2000)

In (1a), when Mary is targeted by and, its containing clause in (8) is pied-piped.

Both the Graft and Bud theories satisfy the selection in the matrix clause, but violate the Extension Condition; however, the two theories can be viewed as pied-piping in external merge.

In (11), what should move is which, but the PP is pied-piped. Similarly, in a CC, what the matrix clause targets is a DP, but the clause that contains the DP is merged, instead.

This study suggests that keeping the selection of the syntactic context and recognizing a flexibility of the Extension Condition can lead to a further unification of external and internal merge.
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