Are parentheticals syntactic orphans? Evidence from Spanish non-reduced parenthetical clauses

1. GOALS: The goal of this paper is twofold: empirically, we provide some new data concerning clitic realization in parenthetical clauses (PCs) in Spanish; theoretically, we propose a novel analysis for PCs under Uriagereka's (1999) Multiple Spell-Out system, which permits to formalize the intuition that some parentheticals are "syntactic orphans" (Haegeman 1988).

2. THE CONTRAST: We will refer to PCs with a clitic as *non-reduced parenthetical clauses* (non-RCPs), in contrast with the common term *reduced parenthetical clauses* (RPCs). In (1a) there is a RPC, whose verb lacks one argument that can be semantically recovered from the host clause (cf. Schneider 2007), while non-RPCs replace the missing argument by a clitic (correferent with the host clause), as shown in (1b). This clitic is obligatory when the parenthetical verb is 'strongly assertive' (*sensu* Hooper 1975) and conjugated in a determined form: 1st.p.sing. of the present.

(1)   a. María, *creo yo*, es una buena profesora.   **RPC**
        María believe I is a good teacher
        'María, I believe, is a good teacher'
       b. María, *te *(lo) prometo*, es una buena profesora.   **Non-RPC**
        María you it promise is a good teacher
        'María, I promise, is a good teacher'

Aside from the contrast in (1), there is a number of properties distinguishing RPCs from non-RPCs. The syntactic restrictions that typically affect RPCs do not hold in non-RPCs: they have more positional freedom (can be in initial position (2)), license negation (3) and S-V inversion is not obligatory (3).

(2)   *(Te **lo**) digo yo: tus padres te adoptaron.
        You it say I your parents you adopted.
        Lit.'I say (that to you): your parents adopted you.'
(3)   a. *Mi hijo, *el director (no) cree*, falta mucho a clase.
        My son the director not believes misses a lot to class
        'My son, the director (?doesn't) believe, skips classes a lot.'
       b. Mi hijo, *el director (no) **lo** sabe*, falta mucho a clase.
        My son the director not it knows skips a lot to class
        'My son, the director (doesn't) know (that), skips classes a lot.'

Moreover, non-RPCs, unlike RPCs, behave like root clauses. They may have a different illocutionary force from that of the host (4), allow *Main Clause Phenomena* (MCP), such as emphatic particles (5), and can be coordinated (6a): they allow conjunction (6a) but resist disjunction (6b), which is a propery of speech acts, according to Krifka (2001).

(4)   a. Tus padres, ¡*créete*(**lo**!*, te adoptaron.
        Your parents believe-you-it you adopted
        Lit:'Your parents, believe it!, adopted you.'
       b. Tus padres, *¿te *(**lo**) puedes creer?*, te adoptaron.
        Your parents you it can believe you adopted
        'Your parents, can you believe it?, adopted you'
(5)   Al final, **bien que** *te *(**lo**) dije*, se ha montado un gran revuelo.
        In-the end good that you I said SE has been a big stir
        Lit: 'In the end, sure I told you, there has been a big stir.'
(6)   a. Ayer, **(**lo**) dijo Juan **y** yo me *(**lo**) creo*, los bomberos hicieron un simulacro.

Yesterday it said Juan and I SE it   believe the firefigthers did   a drill
Lit: 'Yesterday, Juan said so and I believe it, the firefighters did a drill '
b. *Ayer, (**lo**) *dijo Juan **o** yo me (**lo**) creo*, los bomberos hicieron un simulacro.
Yesterday it said Juan or I SE it   believe the firefigthers did   a drill
Lit: 'Yesterday, Juan said so or I believe it, the firefighters did a drill '

3. ANALYSIS: The data above suggests that non-RCPs are independent clauses, while RPCs display some kind of syntactic attachment to their host clause. We propose an analysis for RPCs in the line of Corver & Thiersch (2002) or Potts (2002), which regard parenthesis as adjunction. Specifically, we analyze RPCs as specifiers of functional projections of the host clause. We further argue that non-RPCs are paratactically related to the host clause (Haegeman 1988, De Vries 2007), considering that being linearly integrated in the host can be just a consequence of Spell-Out. To do so, we adopt the MSO system (Uriagereka 1999 *et seq.*) together with a cyclic view of Spell-Out, taken from phase theory (Chomsky 2001). In a nutshell, we assume that the PC and the host are always derived in two separated derivational workspaces. In the case of RPCs, the parenthetical is spelled-out (which means that the it loses its phrase structure) before being attached to the main derivation as a specifier (the conservative version of MSO), as we represent in (8). We further argue that RPCs function as evidential modifiers (cf. Rooryck 2001), which explains why they must be integrated into the main derivation.

(8)   [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ María [$_{TP}$ **<*creo yo*>**[$_T$ es [$_{vP}$ ~~María~~ [$_v$ ~~es~~-[$_v$ ~~es~~ [$_{DP}$ una buena profesora]]]]]]]]

However, non-RPC never arrive to the derivational workspace of the host-clause: they are spelled-out separately and remain there. The semantics of these clauses confirms this hypothesis: they are speech acts, not modifiers of the host (unlike RPCs). We explain their linear interpolation into the host clause by assuming that derivations are spelled-out cyclically. The idea is that in the middle of the process of Spelling-Out the host clause (between a specifier and a phase head), the non-RPC can be spelled-out. Then Spell-Out will apply to the rest of the host clause. In syntax, we will have two derivations (8a), so the host and the PC only cross at PF (8b).

(8)   a. [$_{CP}$[$_{TP}$ María [$_T$ es [$_{vP}$ María [$_v$ ~~es~~ [$_{VP}$ ~~es~~ [$_{DP}$ una buena profesora]]]]]]]

[$_{CP}$[$_{TP}$ *pro* [$_T$ lo prometo [$_{vP}$ ~~lo prometo~~ [$_{VP}$ ~~prometo~~ [$_{DP}$ ~~lo~~]]]]]]

b. <María>(SpecTP) **<*lo prometo*>**(PC) <~~es~~>(TP) <~~María~~>(Spec-vP) <es una buena profesora>(vP)

4. CONCLUSIONS: We have shown that, aside from the well-known fact that PCs in general do not show connectivity effects within their host (cf. De Vries 2007 for a survey), non-RPCs behave like root clauses. We take that as a proof that at least some type of parenthetical clauses are syntactic orphans. Accordingly, we have sketched an analysis that solves the conflict between linearity and hierarchy that parentheticals represent by definition (Burton-Roberts 2005). To adopt this proposal we must only assume that Spell-Out proceeds cyclically (which is fairly agreed since Chomsky 2001) and accept the most radical version of MSO.

5. REFERENCES (selected): Haegeman, L. (1988). Parenthetical adverbials: the radical orphanage approach. In: Chiba, S. (Ed.), *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics.* Tokyo. **Potts**, C. (2002). The syntax and semantics of *as*-parentheticals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20: 623-689. **Schneider**, S. (2007). *Reduced parenthetical clauses as mitigators: A corpus study of spoken: French, Italian and Spanish.* John Benjamins Publishing. **Uriagereka**, J. (1999). Multiple Spell-out, In: S. Epstein y N. Hornstein (eds.), *Working Minimalism*, The MIT Press, 251-282. **De Vries**, M. (2007). Invisible constituents? Parentheses as B-merged adverbial phrases. In: N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (ed.) *Parentheticals.*Amsterdam: John Benjamins.