## The Distribution of Parentheticals is not (Purely) Syntactic!

Keywords: Parentheticals, Syntax, Workspace, Syntax-Phonology Interface

**Issues**: Parentheticals (*P*s) appear to be syntactically independent in a number of ways; e.g. they are "invisible to c-command" (see de Vries, 2007), suggesting that *P*s are syntactically "unintegrated" in some sense. At the same time, *P*s are pronounced and interpreted, meaning they *are integrated* at the Conceptual-Intentional and Sensorimotor (SM) interfaces.

There exist two broad hypotheses addressing this puzzle, (i) the "unintegrated" approach (e.g. Haegeman, 2009), which considers *P*s to be essentially interpolated separate sentences, unconnected syntactically with their Hosts (*H*s), and (ii) the "integrated" approach, which holds that *P*s are integrated in Narrow Syntax (NS) via the application of special mechanisms (e.g. de Vries, 2007; 2012). Ott (2016) argues that integrated approaches should be rejected on conceptual grounds. For example, de Vries (2007; 2012) proposes that *P*s are integrated with their *H*s via construction specific rule, a form of Merge applied only to parentheticals (which he terms "par-Merge") having the inherent property of blocking c-command relations. Ott argues that this is an *ad hoc* syntactic device which does little to "reduce the complexity of the original problem in an enlightening way" (p.37). Nonetheless, any unintegrated approach will suffer its own conceptual problem; namely, how can a *P*, *unintegrated* in NS, become *integrated* at the interfaces? Griffiths & de Vries, (in press) claim that this problem is insurmountable for the unintegrated approach. However, I propose here both a formal, and I believe parsimonious analysis of the prosodic integration of *P*s required by any non-integration model.

**Empirical Contribution**: The empirical focus of this paper is the distribution of Ps in their Hs. Traditionally, the distribution of Ps has been characterized in syntactic terms. Here, I instead characterize the distribution of Ps in terms of the syntax-phonology interface. I present data showing that a P is licensed in any position in its H that doesn't interrupt a *phonological phrase* ( $\phi$ , a constituent of the *Prosodic Hierarchy*). i.e. I propose the simple and natural generalization:

- (1) Ps are acceptable at all and only  $\varphi$  boundaries.
- This natural generalization is best illustrated by the fact that a P can appear between a verb and object only if the object is "heavy" (Peterson, 1999; Kaltenböck, 2007), as in (2). In (2)b, the "heavy" object licenses a  $\varphi$  boundary between verb and object, where one wouldn't normally appear (Truckenbrodt, 2007).
- (2) a. \*(Terry) $\varphi$ (pushed \_\_ a bicycle) $\varphi$ (into the street) [Par they claimed]
  - b.  $(Terry)\phi(pushed)\phi$  \_\_ (a red bicycle with a new set of wheels) $\phi(into the street)\phi$  [Par they claimed]
- (2) is an example of a prosodic manipulation which can license *P*s in otherwise unlicensed positions. It also illustrates the insufficiency of purely syntactic accounts of P distribution, since a P 'cannot appear between V and object' (2a), and 'can' (2b). I also analyze and present evidence regarding prosodic emphasis and pause-duration, yielding similar effects on prosodic structure (Truckenbrodt, 2007) with corresponding *P*-licensing effects.

**Proposal**: Next, I show how *P*s' distribution is predicted if one adopts a derivational approach to *P*s' syntax which takes into account *the syntactic workspace* (WS). In particular, I argue that *P*s are (naturally) constructed in a separate WS, remaining unintegrated with their *H*s in NS, but are linearly/phonologically integrated with *H* at SM when both the *H*'s WS and the *P*'s WS are terminated. I argue that the *P* is integrated with the *H* at SM in a manner that is constrained by the principles in 3 below, but is otherwise free.

(3) *Properties of the syntactic WS:* [a. A secondary WS can be initiated freely; b. A secondary WS must be terminated before operations can target the primary WS; c. A secondary WS can be terminated (i) by being consolidated with the primary WS, or (ii) by Transfer of the root] *Consequences of the No Tampering Condition (NTC) applying at SM:* [d. Prosodic constituents cannot be altered once established at SM; e. Precedence relations cannot be altered once established at SM] *Properties of the syntax-phonology mapping (Dobashi, 2004; 2018):* [f. A φ is established at SM when Transfer targets a phase in NS; g. A ι is established at SM when Transfer targets the root in NS]

In summary, I argue that Ps are constructed in a secondary WS (2WS), as complex specifiers are (Nunes & Uriagereka, 2000). Portions of the primary WS (IWS) may have already been sent to the interfaces by the point when the 2WS is initiated (3a). Instead of being consolidated with the IWS, this 2WS is terminated by transfer of the root (3c). Because any material from the H already present at SM will have been assigned to a  $\varphi$  (3f), the P will be placed between the  $\varphi$ s of the H already present at SM, so as not to interrupt an already-established  $\varphi$ , which would be a violation of NTC (3d). The derivation then continues in the IWS (3b). WS termination encapsulates the transferred material within an intonation phrase ( $\iota$ ) at SM, meaning the P forms its own  $\iota$  when the 2WS is terminated (3g). NTC will thus prevent material from the H from intervening in the P after such material has been transferred (3d). In this way, my proposal predicts that Ps  $\underline{are}$  acceptable at  $\varphi$  boundaries in the H (and only there, see (1)).

Conceptual Advantage: This phonosyntactic approach captures the phenomenon of "niching" (Ross, 1973), the observation that some syntactically-defined positions are more susceptible to *P*-insertion than others (e.g. *P*s are generally acceptable between subject DP and the VP, not between a D head and its NP complement), while simultaneously capturing the fact that *Ps can*, under the right circumstances, occupy *any* position (e.g. a *P can* occur between a D and NP, see e.g. Espinal, 1991, fn17; Dehé, 2014, ex1.29b)). Under my approach, the positions available to *P*-insertion are determined by prosodic structure. The syntax-phonology mapping exhibits strong tendencies for φ boundaries to correlate with XP boundaries, which explains why certain syntactically-defined positions are more often than not available for *P*-insertion. However, these tendencies are not strict; non-syntactic considerations can lead to deviations from the most common mapping (Selkirk, 2000; 2005). It therefore makes sense that *Ps* can sometimes be inserted in otherwise odd positions, because non-syntactic properties (e.g. prosodic heaviness, emphasis, and pause-insertion (and pragmatic properties, which I do not discuss)) can modify prosodic constituent structure in such a way as to make *P* insertion possible in those positions.

**Selected Abridged References**: Dehé, N. (2014). *Parentheticals in spoken English: The syntax-prosody* relation. Cambridge University Press. || Dobashi, Y. (2014). Prosodic Domains and the Syntax-Phonology Interface. The Routledge Handbook of Syntax, 365-387. || Dobashi, Y. (2018). Termination of derivation and intonational phrasing: a preliminary study. *Phonological Externalization*, 3, 9-23. || Espinal, M. T. (1991). The representation of disjunct constituents. Language 67(4), 726-762. || Griffiths, J., & de Vries, M. (in press). Parenthesis: Syntactic Integration or Orphanage? A Rejoinder to Ott (2016). Linguistic Inquiry. | Haegeman, L. (2009). Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach. In Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Semantic, Syntactic, and Pragmatic Perspectives, 331-347. || Kaltenböck, G. (2007). Spoken parenthetical clauses in English. In *Parentheticals*, 25-52. || Nunes, J. & Uriagereka, J. (2000). Cyclicity and extraction domains. Syntax, 3(1), 20-43. || Ott, D. (2016). Ellipsis in appositives. Glossa: a journal of general linguistics, 1(1), 34. || Peterson, P. (1999). On the boundaries of syntax. In The Clause in English: In Honour of Rodney Huddleston, 229-250. || Ross, J. R. (1973). Slifting. In The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages, 133-169 | Selkirk, E. (2000). The interaction of constraints on prosodic phrasing. In *Prosody: Theory and experiment*, 231-261 || Selkirk, E. (2005). Comments on intonational phrasing in English. Prosodies: With special reference to Iberian languages, 11-58. || Truckenbrodt, H. (2007). The syntax-phonology interface. The Cambridge handbook of phonology, 435-456. || de Vries, M. (2012). Unconventional mergers. In Ways of Structure Building, 143-166.