Parenthetical main clauses – or not?
On appositives and quasi-relatives
(final draft, Nov. 2011)

Mark de Vries
University of Groningen

Abstract. Syntactic and semantic characteristics canonically associated with main clauses do not always go together. This paper discusses two puzzling construction types from this perspective: appositive relative clauses (ARCs) and quasi-relatives. I argue that ARCs and appositions are related, and that relativization as such and parenthesis are independent effects. Specifically, an analysis of attributive construal as restrictive relativization of an abstract specific indefinite head explains the syntactically subordinated status of ARCs; on the other hand, the semantic main clause effects attested in ARCs are due to their construal as parenthetical specifications of the anchor, comparable to identificational appositions. Like ARCs, quasi-relatives seem to involve an E-type link with the anchor, but they lack a relative operator, and qualify as main clauses that are either coordinated to the host at the sentence level or inserted as regular parentheticals.

Keywords: parentheticals, appositive relative clauses, appositions, V2-relatives, specific indefinite semantics, scope, main clause phenomena

1. Introduction

What have been referred to as *main clause* or *root phenomena* (dating back to seminal work by Emonds 1970, Hooper & Thompson 1973, Green 1976, and others) are not a coherent set of characteristics.[*] Consequently, it does not come as a surprise that they can be found in various contexts. This chapter discusses some of these characteristics and contexts, and in particular the effect of parenthesis. The incentive for this study is a well-known puzzle, illustrated in Dutch in (1):

(1) Joop,   die   nu   overigens   in Amsterdam   woont,   komt
     Joop   who   now   by.the.way   in Amsterdam   lives   comes
     tomorrow   home
     morgen   thuis.
     'Joop, who now lives in Amsterdam, by the way, is coming home tomorrow.'

The appositive (i.e. non-restrictive) relative clause acts like a main clause in that it contains a speaker-oriented, discourse-regulating adverb *overigens* 'by the way', among other things. At the same time, it is formally a subordinate clause because it is verb final, whereas regular main clauses have verb second (V2) in Dutch, contrary to subordinate clauses. This immediately shows that semantic and syntactic criteria for main clause status may contradict each other (see also the overview in Heycock 2006). Therefore, these are independent of each other at least to some extent, even though one might expect *a priori* that they would go along.

After some initial remarks in Section 2, Section 3 discusses the puzzle concerning appositive relative clauses from the perspective of a more general theory on parenthesis. Parentheses can be seen as more or less autonomous parts of a larger sentence or utterance; they are semantically independent. What is surprising then, given their full clausal status, is syntactic V-final in appositives. Based on earlier work (De Vries 2006), I propose that this is because they are structurally embedded in an abstract DP, thereby generalizing over appositions and appositive relative clauses (see also Cardoso & De Vries 2010). Section 4, then, shows that there are nevertheless quasi-relative constructions, both restrictive and appositive, that do display V2 (building on Gärtner 2001 and Zwart 2005). Section 5 is the conclusion.

2. Some preliminary remarks

What is a main clause? In most cases, we have a clear intuition about it. Normally, it is the highest clause, which involves the structural root. However, the question is not always trivial. For instance, if we coordinate two clauses, we get $[_{CoP} CP_1 [Co CP_2]]$, presupposing a common analysis for coordination. Here, the second clause is structurally embedded in a way, but it is not a subordinate clause. In a comparable hierarchical configuration with a noun as the head, the clause does count as subordinate: e.g., *the claim $[_{CP}$ that...]*. Also, a clause within a clause is a subordinate clause: *He said $[_{CP}$ that ...]*. But what about parentheticals, many of which are clearly main clauses? An example is *John said – $[_{CP}$ Who am I to contradict him?] – that the earth is flat*. Perhaps non-selectedness is a criterion. But then again, we have adverbial clauses, which are subordinate but not selected for. Linear order is also irrelevant; for one, sentences can start with a subordinate clause, e.g. a subject clause or a preposed adverbial clause. Finally, the pragmatic notion of 'assertion' is not really helpful in clarifying the issue. For instance, in response to the question *What did you say?* the answer *I said that John bought a new car* contains an assertion that is expressed in a subordinate clause.

Thus, rather than trying to find the ideal definition of main clauses, let us consider some of the characteristics that are considered prototypical.

Roughly, there seem to be three groups, the structural ones, the ones that have a primary semantic or pragmatic aspect to it, and the prosodic ones:

(2)   Typical (potential) characteristics of main clauses
   I   structural and morphological criteria (language-dependent)
             – verb second
             – fronting
             – inversion
             – left dislocation
   II   semantic/pragmatic criteria
             – speaker orientation
             – 'high' adverbs or adverbial phrases
             – illocutionary force, speech act
             – scopal independence
   III   prosodic criteria
             – separate intonational phrase /
                 phonological disintegration
             – independent pitch accent

Some of these are virtually obligatory or predetermined (e.g., speaker orientation, or V2 in Dutch), others merely reflect a *potential*: for instance, the presence of a high adverb is an indication for main clause status, but the absence does not necessarily imply anything.

Needless to say, a semantic criterion may very well be related to certain structural properties. Scope is probably related to c-command, there may be structural positions for certain adverbs, etc. All of this involves theoretical assumptions. What can be directly detected, however, is the semantic characteristic at issue; therefore this is the primary criterion in these cases. Reversely, syntactic operations can obviously have a semantic or pragmatic effect. Nevertheless, fronting, etc. are directly reflected in the word order or another formal aspect of the clause, and as such easily detectable; hence their categorization in group I.

An interesting topic of discussion are so-called embedded root phenomena, attested in various ways in various languages, for instance embedded V2 (see below), or peripheral adverbial clauses (see for instance the papers by Endo, Frey, Haegeman, Laskova, and Tomaszewicz in this volume). From a syntactic perspective, there are a number of possible approaches. The first is that the clause under consideration is not regularly embedded but attached to the matrix at some higher level. The extreme case would then involve adjunction or coordination at the sentence level. The second possibility, which can also be combined with the first, is that the clause involves additional levels of projection that facilitate root phenomena. The third possibility is that the relevant clause only apparently involves hypotaxis, but rather constitutes a parenthetical.

I consider it likely that all or at least several of these possibilities are real. This implies that there is no unified approach to root phenomena. As is now well-known, different construction types across different languages and registers display different behavior, which can then be attributed to diverse analyses. Moreover, it is hard to see from a theoretical perspective how the various structural options mentioned can be categorically blocked from the generative language system without resorting to otherwise undesirable rules or constraints.

As a concrete example, consider embedded V2 in German and Frisian complement clauses (for discussion and references, see also Reis 1997, De Haan 2001, Heycock 2006, and Franco, this volume). Both languages are like Dutch in that they normally have V2 in main clauses and V-final in embedded clauses. In addition, embedded V2 is possible in restricted contexts, mainly involving bridge verbs. In these cases the complementizer cannot surface for most German speakers (thus, V2 and C are in complementary distribution), but Frisian allows for V2 below a complementizer as well in some cases. It can and has been argued that these construction types are qualitatively different from 'integrated' embedded V2 constructions. Consider, for instance, the possibility of binding a variable in the complement clause by a quantifier in the matrix, which is fine in German; see (3). This suggests low-level embedding. By contrast, the impossibility of precisely this in the Frisian example in (4a) implies that the alleged complement clause takes high scope, and is probably attached at a higher level. (Moreover, the retention of the complementizer in combination with V2 points to an additional clausal projection level below CP.) Thanks to Dennis Ott and Ger de Haan for their judgments.

(3) Jeder_i hat gesagt, er_i wüsste es nicht.
     everyone_i has said he_i knew it not
     'Everyone$_i$ said that he$_i$ didn't know it.'

(4) a. * Eltsenien_i hie sein **dat** hy_i **wist** it net.
           everyone_i had said that he_i knew it not
           'Everyone$_i$ said that he$_i$ didn't know it.'
     b. Eltsenien_i hie sein dat hy_k wist it net.
     c. Eltsenien_i hie sein dat hy_i it net **wist**.
     d. Eltsenien_i hie sein hy_i wist it net.

Just for comparison, the examples in (4b-d) show that an unbound reading is fine, that binding is acceptable in a regular subordinate clause with V-final, and that the bound reading is acceptable with complementizer-less embedded V2, as in German, provided that there is an integrated intonational pattern, which does not seem to be available in (4a).

In the next section, I will return to appositive relative clauses, and show to which extent they meet the criteria in (2).

3. Appositive constructions

3.1 *The Janus-faced behavior of appositive relative clauses*

The Dutch data below show that appositive relative clauses (ARCs) behave exactly like restrictive relative clauses – which are undoubtedly subordinate – with respect to the structural criteria in (2.I); on the other hand, they behave like main clauses according to the semantic/pragmatic criteria in (2.II).

The examples in (5) illustrate the fact that both restrictive (5c) and appositive (5d) relative clauses, like complement clauses (5b), are obligatorily V-final, contrary to the situation in main clauses (5a), where the finite verb is moved to the second position.

(5)   a.   Joop (heeft) vandaag een huis   (*heeft) gekocht.
             Joop has   today   a house   has   bought
             'Joop bought a house today.'
       b.   Ik hoorde dat Joop (*heeft) vandaag een huis   (heeft)
             I heard that Joop has   today   a house has
             bought
             gekocht.
             'I heard that Joop bought a house today.'
       c.   Ik groette de man die   (*heeft) vandaag een huis
             I greeted the man who   has   today   a   house
             (heeft) gekocht.
              has   bought
             'I greeted the man that bought a house today.'
       d.   Ik groette Joop, die   (*heeft) vandaag een huis
             I greeted Joop who   has   today   a   house
             (heeft) gekocht.
              has   bought
             'I greeted Joop, who bought a house today.'

Fronting of an object or in fact any other constituent to the left periphery preceding the subject, which is possible in main clauses, where it triggers inversion (compare (6a) to (6a′)), is excluded in complement clauses (6b), and restrictive (6c) and appositive (6d) relative clauses:

(6)   a.   Een boek heb jij   de man gegeven.
             a   book have you the man given
             'It is a book that you gave the man.'

      a.′   Jij   hebt de man een boek gegeven.
            you   have the man a   book given
            'You gave the man a book.'

      b.   Ik hoorde (*een boek) dat (*een boek) jij   de man
            I   heard   a   book that a   book you the man
            (een boek) had gegeven.
             a   book   had given
            'I heard that you gave the man a book.'

      c.   Ik sprak   de man (*een boek) die   (*een boek)
            I spoke.to the man a   book who   a   book
            jij (een boek) had   gegeven.
            you a   book had given
            'I spoke to the man who you had given a book.'

      d.   Ik sprak   Joop, (*een boek) die   (*een boek) jij
            I spoke.to Joop, a   book who   a   book you
            (een boek) had   gegeven.
            a   book had   given
            'I spoke to Joop, who you had given a book.'

Left dislocation, whether contrastive or hanging topic, is generally not allowed in verb final clauses;[1] (7) illustrates this for ARCs only:

(7) a. * Ik sprak   Joop, (een boek, dat) die   (een boek, dat)
         I spoke.to Joop a   book DEM who a   book DEM
         jij had   gegeven.
         you had   given.
         intended: '[*] I spoke to Joop, who it was a book that you had given.'

      b. * Ik sprak   Joop, (dit boek) die (dit boek) jij 't
         I spoke.to Joop this book who thisbook you it
         had   gegeven.
         had   given
         intended '[*] I spoke to Joop, who this book, you had given it.'

Thus, it is evident that ARCs are internally structured like subordinate clauses in all respects.

---

[1] Nevertheless, an anonymous reviewer reports that left dislocation in a subordinate V-final clause under a bridge verb in German is more or less acceptable (that is, for some speakers, since my own informants rejected the sentence):

    (i) (?) Ich denke, unseren Chef, dass den   viele bewundern.
         I   think our:ACC boss   that   DEM:ACC many admire
         'I think that many people admire our boss.'

Remarkably, the dislocated phrase in (i) precedes the complementizer, and the resumptive demonstrative pronoun is in the middle field following it.

We already saw in the introduction that ARCs may contain high adverbs. They are speaker-oriented. This becomes particularly clear in examples such as (8), where the speaker's belief contradicts the subject's belief:

(8)   Joop thinks that Jaap, who is actually a millionaire, is very poor.

In a restrictive construction, this would be incoherent or at least involve creative thinking:

(9)   (#) Joop thinks that someone who is a millionaire is very poor.

Furthermore, ARCs are usually simple declarative assertions. Interestingly, it is also possible to construe examples in which they express an independent illocutionary force. I illustrate this in Dutch:

(10)   Joop, die   toch zeer rijk is,   nietwaar?, gaat een Ferrari
       Joop, who PRT very rich is,   not.true   goes a   Ferrari
       kopen.
       buy
       'Joop, who is very rich, isn't he?, is going to buy a Ferrari.'

(11)   Joop, die   nu   zijn kamer gaat opruimen!,   komt   straks
       Joop who now   his room goes clean   comes later
       buiten   spelen.
       outside play
       'Joop, who is now going to clean his room!, will come play outside later.'

Sentence (11), for instance, might be uttered by little Joop's mother, talking to his friend at the door. Indirectly, she is giving an order to Joop. Note that such examples underline the need to distinguish between formal syntactic clause type and illocutionary force, which is essentially pragmatic.
        The following sentence shows that even an explicit speech act is possible, for instance in a contract:

(12)   De eigenaar zal de sleutel overhandigen aan
       the owner   will the key   hand.over   to
       ondergetekende, die   hierbij de huur van het huis
       undersigned,   who hereby the rent of the house
       aanvaardt.
       accepts
       'The owner will hand over the key to the undersigned, who hereby accepts the rent of the house.'

With restrictive (relative) clauses, meaning aspects such as in the above examples can never be obtained.

Last but not least, (13) illustrates that an appositive relative clause is not in the scope of elements higher up in the matrix. Therefore, a variable cannot get a bound reading (13b), contrary to the situation in restrictives (13a):

(13) a. [Geen enkele klimmer]$_i$ sprak over   de berg
          no   single climber   spoke about the mountain
          die   hij$_i$ vorige maand bedwongen had.
          which he   last   month   conquered   had
          '[No single climber]$_i$ spoke about the mountain he$_i$ conquered last month.'

    b. [Geen enkele klimmer]$_i$ sprak over de K2, die hij$_{k/*i}$ vorige maand bedwongen had.
          '[No single climber]$_i$ spoke about the K2, which he$_{k/*i}$ conquered last month.'

In short, this overview confirmed the conception that ARCs are internally structured as subordinate clauses (in particular, restrictive relative clauses), but are semantically/pragmatically comparable to main clauses. The next two subsections are an attempt to explain this.

3.2   On parenthesis

ARCs are a particular kind of parenthesis – more specifically, they are closely related to (non-restrictive) appositions, as we will see in some more detail below. Parentheses are generally considered more or less independent additions to the sentence. They interact with the host clause pragmatically, but not obviously in any syntactic or semantic way. Furthermore, they add information on a level of communication that is secondary with respect to the 'at issue' context, if I may borrow a term from Potts (2005). There are many different types of parentheses (see Dehé & Kavalova 2007 for an overview), but at least this characteristic is what they all have in common, it seems to me.

Parentheses of various kinds have been described as structural 'orphans' (Haegeman 1988, Peterson 1999, Burton-Roberts 2006), 'independent lambda terms' (Potts 2005), as directly attached to the root (Emonds 1973, McCawley 1982), or otherwise non-embedded (Espinal 1991), to state just a few proposals. One would expect full parentheticals to behave as main clauses, then. That this is indeed the case is illustrated in (14) in Dutch.

(14) Joop is gisteren – het verbaast me trouwens niets –
Joop is yesterday it surprises me by.the.way nothing
gezakt voor het tentamen.
failed for the exam
'Joop has – it doesn't surprise me at all – failed the examination
yesterday.'

The intervening clause is structurally V2, it contains the high adverb *trouwens* 'by the way', and is clearly speaker-oriented. Furthermore, parentheticals are strong islands for both movement and scope (see also De Vries 2007).[2] The example in (15b) shows that a pronoun cannot get a variable reading bound from outside the parenthetical, contrary to the situation in a regular embedded clause (15a).

(15) a. [Niemand van ons]$_i$ zei dat hij$_i$ miljonair was.
nobody of us said that he millionaire was
'[Nobody of us]$_i$ said that he$_i$ was a millionaire.'
b. [Niemand van ons]$_i$, zei hij$_{k/*i}$, was miljonair.
nobody of us said he was millionaire
'[Nobody of us]$_i$ was a millionaire, he$_{k/*i}$ said.'

Similarly, a parenthetical boundary can shield off a potential Principle C effect; compare (16b) to the (16a), where *Joop* is regularly c-commanded by the first subject pronoun:

(16) a. Hij$_{k/*i}$ zei dat Joop$_i$ zijn hoed zou opeten als hij
he said that Joop his hat would up.eat if he
ongelijk had.
wrong had
'He$_{k/*i}$ said that Joop$_i$ would eat his hat if he would be wrong.'
b. Hij$_i$ zei – dat is typisch Joop$_i$ – dat hij zijn
he said DEM is typically Joop that he his
hoed zou opeten als hij ongelijk had.
hat would eat if he wrong had
'He$_i$ said – this is typical for Joop$_i$ – that he would eat his hat if he would be wrong.'

---

[2] I am abstracting away from the fact that under certain discourse conditions ('modal subordination', cf. Roberts 2006) there can be scopal effects even between subsequent main sentences, i.e. across discourse, which might therefore also affect parentheses – though probably not in any particular way; see Heringa (2011) for some discussion concerning appositions.

In short, parentheticals are structurally and semantically comparable to main clauses. Nevertheless, they are linearly integrated with the host clause (also note that appositive constructions form a constituent with the anchor/antecedent), and they have a different information-structural status, presenting side-information. This, too, is paradoxical.

It seems a priori clear that a pure orphanage approach to parenthesis explains the independency effects illustrated in (14) through (16), but does not provide a solution to the paradox just mentioned. Interestingly, it is possible to insert parentheses within each other in a recursive fashion. An example involving multiple layers is (17):

(17) Yesterday, Joop asked Anna – and I might add that she, who in fact loves Jaap (also a nice guy, as you will agree), didn't see this coming – to marry him, the poor fellow.

What is necessary, therefore, is a special device to relate clauses (or phrases) to some host projection in a way that turns the additional material into a parenthesis relatively to its context, without creating subordination effects. Crucially, it is the connection between the matrix and the parenthetical that is special; parenthesis is no inherent property of the relevant clauses or phrases themselves. Heringa (2011) and previously Potts (2005) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1351ff) refer to such a special relationship as 'supplementation'; see also Ackema & Neeleman (2004), among others, for discussion. It is fair to state that the notion of parenthetical insertion, in whatever way it is worked out, inevitably involves a major stipulation at some point in the grammatical system. Nevertheless, it seems intuitively plausible that parethetical construal in some way involves a primitive of the grammar.

In previous work, I implemented these general ideas along the following lines. Every parenthesis is the syntactic complement of a functional parenthetical head Par. Being a dependent of Par, and hence embedded inside a ParP, the parenthesis can be recognized as such by other modules of the grammar. As is argued nicely by Kluck (2011), Par – being a functional lexical item – can then have a selection effect on its complement, in particular [+SD] (speaker deixis) for clausal parentheticals, which accounts for several main clause effects. Furthermore, the projection directly containing Par and the parenthetical XP needs to act like a syntactic and semantic barrier: movement, c-command and standard semantic composition across it are excluded. Technically, this might be achieved by defining an operation 'parenthetical Merge' – whose application is triggered by Par – that creates constituency without the regular dominance relation between the more inclusive object and the original objects. The alternative relationship may be called par-inclusion (or supplementation). If c-command remains to be defined over dominance (note that it can be viewed as a direct function of regular merge: an object c-commands its

'merge-mate' and everything transitively dominated by it), the desired scope effects follow, since par-Merge (by definition) breaks the line of dominance. For reasons of space, I cannot go into details here, but see especially De Vries (to appear) for a more formal characterization.

In the case of a parenthetical, the ParP can be adjoined to some projection of the host clause. Syntactic adjunction warrants the positional freedom of parentheticals. In practice, this freedom may be constrained by pragmatic and prosodic considerations, but not by purely grammatical factors, it seems (see Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk 2003, and Stoltenburg 2003 for frequency effects concerning potential parenthetical 'niches' in spoken Dutch and German, respectively). The situation is somewhat different if a parenthesis is anchored to a particular constituent of the host, as in appositional constructions, for instance. In such cases, Par can be considered bivalent. The anchor is then in the specifier position of the ParP: $[_{ParP}$ XP$_{anchor}$ [Par YP$_{parenthesis}$]]. A concrete example is *my best friend, Joop*. This configuration is similar to coordination: $[_{CoP}$ XP [Co YP]], where XP functions as the anchor for a second conjunct YP, and where the relationship between the two conjuncts is mediated – or rather, determined – by a functional head; see also Koster (2000) and Heringa (2011, to appear).[3] Observe that both in coordinate and appositive constructions the functional projection takes over the categorial distribution of the anchor, so Par and Co are underspecified in this respect. On a final note, let me point out another similarity. In some cases, it appears that Par can be spelled out as a regular coordinator. Certain parentheticals can be introduced by *and* or *or* (see (17), for example), and certain appositional constructions contain a coordinator, as in *The Netherlands, or Holland*.

3.3   Appositives as embedded parentheticals

Let us now return to appositive relative clauses. In Section 3.1 we saw that they behave semantically as main clauses. This would follow if they are analyzed as parentheticals. By definition, the complement of the linking head Par starts a new grammatical domain, which is interpreted as an independent lambda term, as outside the scope of the host clause, etc. By default, parentheticals are syntactic main clauses as well, unless there is an internal reason for an embedded pattern. Is there such a reason in appositive

---

[3] The bivalent use of ParP is inspired by Koster's work on 'parallel construal' (specifying coordination). A recent continuation and discussion of his work on extraposition in these terms is De Vries (2011); see also Kluck & De Vries (to appear). Note, however, that Koster himself did not clearly distinguish between appositive and non-appositive (or restrictive) construction types. In my view, we need both specifying coordination, and an appositive variant thereof, which involves not only a coordination-like configuration, but also something to the effect of parenthetical Merge, as mentioned in the main text. In this section on ARCs, only the parenthetical version of parallel construal is of interest.

relative clauses? A comparison with appositions suggests that indeed there is, depending on certain theoretical assumptions.

At first sight, ARCs are very similar to appositions. In fact, there is no obvious difference in meaning between *Joop, a nice guy* on the one hand, and *Joop, who is a nice guy* on the other hand. It is tempting to think that either an ARC is an elaborate apposition (De Vries 2006), or an apposition is a reduced ARC (a familiar intuition, which goes back to at least Smith 1964). I will argue that in a way both are true at the same time. This paradoxical view requires some elaboration; it is based on the distinction between attributive and identificational contrual. First, consider the approximate overall structure for non-restrictive nominal appositions in (18a), where the anchor determines the position of ParP as a whole within the host clause. If we were to generalize this to ARCs, the actual relative clause would have to be embedded in an abstract DP; see (18b):

(18) a. $[_{\text{host\_clause}} ... [_{\text{ParP}} [_{\text{DP}} \text{anchor}] [\text{Par} [_{\text{DP}} \text{apposition}]]] ...]$

b. $[_{\text{host\_clause}} ... [_{\text{ParP}} [_{\text{DP}} \text{antecedent}] [\text{Par} [_{\text{DP}} \text{D} [_{\text{CP}} \text{relative clause}]]]] ...]$

The anchor/antecedent is grammatically and semantically a true part of the host clause, and the apposition/ARC, being the complement of Par, is interpreted as a parenthetical specification of this phrase. On this view, the relative construction *Joop, who is a nice guy* is interpreted roughly as *Joop: someone (a certain person) who is a nice guy*. Note that the abstract D in (18b) must be associated with a specific indefinite semantics.[4] Thus, *Joop* in this case is enriched with a parenthetical alternative description, namely a certain person of whom a particular property is highlighted.

There are important conceptual advantages to this hypothesis, I believe, even apart from the generalization over various appositive construction types (see Cardoso & De Vries 2010 for a detailed discussion). First of all, the analysis tears apart the two meaning components involved, namely the relativization part and the appositive part. The former is identical to restrictive relativization, the latter is equated with the much more general parenthetical construal at the constituent level. As such, then, there is no theoretically separate 'appositive relative construction' – though of course acceptable as a descriptive label –, and (18b) is in fact a restrictive relative construction in apposition to an antecedent; in particular, what is involved here is a semi-free relative, i.e. a restrictive relative clause with a

---

[4] There is no uniqueness involved, so a paraphrase like 'i.e. *(s)he* who' in de Vries (2006: 248) is a bit unfortunate. Furthermore, a non-specific reading is excluded because then no E-type link with the antecedent could be established, as non-specific elements are non-referential.

pronominal or 'light' head.[5,6] A related theoretical benefit is that relative pronouns are now always interpreted in the same way, namely as bound operators.

Not all appositions are alike, however. There is a crucial distinction between the attributive (predicative) and the identifying (specificational) type.[7] The example *Joop, a nice guy* is clearly attributive, whereas the reverse – *a nice guy, Joop* – is identifying. Another example of the last type is *Joop's age, sixteen*, where *sixteen* is not predicated of *Joop's age*, but provides the value that identifies it. Now consider (18a), where appositions are analyzed as parenthetical specifications of the anchor. For identifying appositions this makes sense. In terms of semantic types, we are comparing <e> with <e>. Attributive appositions, however, are interpreted as predicates, and hence of type <e,t>. It seems simply wrong to conjoin the <e>-typed anchor with an <e,t> attribute. Interestingly, the solution almost presents itself. For this, we have to look again at the ARC construction in (18b). Notably, the attribution is entirely within the parenthetical part, *in casu* the relative clause is predicated of the relative head abstracted over. At a higher level, the entire relativized DP is parenthetically related to the overt anchor/antecedent. Since the complex parenthetical DP is specific (and hence referential), as was discussed above, this relationship is identificational. One could say that the relative clause is type-shifted by syntactic means. If we would apply the same method to attributive appositions, the problem disappears. Thus, such appositions are indeed 'reduced relatives', in the sense that they imply a plain predicative relative construction, with an abstract relative operator and an empty copula or small clause configuration.

If the proposed analysis is correct, we would predict that attributive appositions can be paraphrased with a relative clause, but identifying ones cannot. This is indeed correct; see (19):

---

[5] Though nothing crucial depends on it for the main points here, I am assuming that the external determiner becomes pronominal only in combination with a raised head noun (compare English *some-one*).

[6] Interestingly, there are certain cases in which D is necessarily overt. For instance, in French ARCs with a non-nominal antecedent; see (i), taken from Canac-Marquis & Tremblay (1998:133), glosses mine.

    (i)   Marcelle est arrivée en retard, **ce** qu'elle ne fait jamais.
          Marcelle is arrived late, DEM that-she NEG does never
          'Marcelle arrived late, (something) which she never does.'

[7] Notice that definite descriptions can be ambiguous between a referential reading and a type reading (an 'individual concept'), depending on the context. Similarly, proper names, though canonically referential, are often used predicatively (as a label), e.g. in *May I introduce you to my boss, John*.

(19) a.   Joop, (who is) a nice guy / my neighbor / sixteen years old

                                                            [attributive]

        b.   a nice guy, (*who is) Joop   [identifying]

        b.′   Joop's age, (*which is) sixteen

Of course, full ARCs contain a lexical verb and hence can internally express any relationship between the arguments; therefore, only copular ARCs can be reduced to an attributive apposition.

Furthermore, as has been argued independently, attributive appositions have an independent propositional value (Potts 2005, among others), and even involve full syntactic clauses (O'Connor 2008, Heringa 2011). An important reason is that they can contain adverbs and complementizers of various types. Some examples are in (20):

(20) a.   Joop, *then/once* a student, is now a full professor of linguistics.

        b.   Joop, *whether* a nice guy or not, will be asked to leave to building.

        c.   Joop, *frankly/unfortunately* no Einstein, failed his exams.

As expected, this is normally not the case in identifying appositions:

(21) a. * Joop's age, then/once/unfortunately sixteen

        b. * a nice guy, whether Joop or not

To sum up, it seems not unreasonable to assume that all attributive appositions involve a predicative (copular) relative construction. In turn, these and other appositive relative clauses can be analyzed as semi-free relatives (i.e., nominalized clauses) in apposition to the visible external antecedent/anchor. And all appositive constructions represent a parenthetical specificational/identificational relationship between two constituents by means of a bivalent ParP.[8]

Finally, let us come back to the puzzle that we started out with: why are ARCs syntactically subordinate clauses but semantically comparable to main clauses? The answer falls out naturally from the proposed analysis of appositive constructions. Within the parenthetical dimension there is no higher proposition, and hence semantically ARCs have a main status – recall (8) through (13). By contrast, the actual relative clause of an appositive relative construction is embedded within a DP inside the complement of Par, and hence syntactically subordinate (like the situation in

---

[8] As is discussed in detail in Cardoso & De Vries (2010), ARCs and regular appositions do not exhaust the possibilities. There are also appositive constructions with an additional internal or external head NP, and overt semi-free appositive constructions. All of these fit the proposed structural analysis quite neatly.

any complex noun phrase). Thus, ARCs resist V2, fronting, etc. (shown in (5) through (7)) for the same reasons that restrictive relatives do.[9]

4. Quasi-relatives

In this section, I would like to highlight some aspects of what I shall call *quasi-relatives*. There is a very limited amount of literature on certain constructions referred to as 'V2-relatives' in Dutch and German (essentially, Gärtner 2001, Endriss & Gärtner 2005, Zwart 2005), the most important conclusion of which is that these are syntactically not relative clauses at all. The name is therefore unfortunate. The mentioned authors show that they are coordinated main clauses with a preposed demonstrative that is coreferent with a noun phrase newly introduced in the preceding clause. A possible example in Dutch is (22):

> (22) Joop zag een huis [dat was erg   mooi].
>   Joop saw a   house DEM was very nice
>   'Joop saw a (particular) house which was very nice.'

Apparently, the clause between brackets is a relative clause modifying *een huis* 'a house'. However, there are a several caveats. First, notice that the relevant clause is V2, whereas normal relative clauses are V-final, as was shown in (5) above. Second, the 'antecedent' is obligatorily indefinite – *het huis* 'the house' would be impossible in (22) – provided that there is an integrated intonational pattern making sure that we are not dealing with subsequent main sentences (which would be fine, of course). This pattern, familiar from extraposed modifiers, among other things, is such that the main accents are perceived on *huis* and *mooi* (also the semantic foci), the pitch raises on *huis*, and the final fall of pitch is postponed until the end of the second clause. Thus, we have the following contrasts in (23), with rough indications of accents in capitals and pitch movement /, ¯¯, \ (and where RRC stand for restrictive relative clause):

> (23) a.   Joop zag een /HUIS¯¯ dat was erg MOOI\.
>   [quasi-RRC (V2)]
>   a.′ * Joop zag het /HUIS¯¯ dat was erg MOOI\.
>   b.   Joop zag een /HUIS\. Dat was erg /MOOI\.
>   [subsequent main sentences (V2)]
>   b.′   Joop zag het /HUIS\. Dat was erg /MOOI\.

---

[9] I have left aside a detailed discussion of the left periphery of relative clauses. What may be relevant from the present perspective is that many languages use an overt complementizer in such constructions, even in appositive relative clauses.

c. Joop zag een /huis dat erg /MOOI\ was.

[regular RRC (V-final)]

c.′ Joop zag het /huis dat erg /MOOI\ was.

Third, in Dutch – but apparently not in German, for reasons that are unclear to me – the quasi-relative can optionally be preceded by *en* 'and' in most cases, without any meaning difference. Of course, a subsequent main sentence can also be introduced by *and*, but a regular restrictive relative clause cannot. Compare (24a/b/c) to (23a/b/c), respectively:

(24) a. Joop zag een /HUIS⁻⁻ en dat was erg MOOI\.

[quasi-RRC (V2)]

b. Joop zag een /HUIS\. En dat was erg /MOOI\.

[subsequent main sentences (V2)]

c. * Joop zag een /huis en dat erg /MOOI\ was.

[regular RRC (V-final)]

Fourth, the linker in a quasi-relative – *dat* in (22/23a/24a) – is arguably a demonstrative, and not a relative pronoun as in (23c/24c), for instance. In these particular examples, they happen to be homophonous, and it is therefore hard to tell the difference, but that is not always the case. In Dutch, certain *wh*-forms can be used as a relativizer (depending on the antecedent), namely *waar* 'where', *wat* 'what', and *wie* 'who', but these are impossible in quasi-relatives, where the corresponding demonstratives *daar* 'there', *dat* 'that' [DEM:NTR], and *die* [DEM:NONNTR] must be used, respectively. An illustration is (25):

(25) a. Ik weet een café **waar/*daar** je lekkere koffie kunt
I know a cafe where/*there you tasty coffee can
krijgen.   [RRC]
get
'I know a cafe where one can get good coffee.'

b. Ik weet een café **daar/*waar** kun je lekkere
I know a cafe there/*where can you tasty
koffie krijgen.   [quasi-RRC]
coffee get
'I know a (particular) cafe where one can get good coffee.'

Fifth, a quasi-relative is always sentence-final. Unlike regular relative clauses, they can never surface in the middle or initial field of the host clause; see (26), for instance. Related to this, it can be shown that a quasi-relative does not form a constituent with the noun phrase it relates to.

16

(26) a. Joop heeft een vrouw *die   veel geld   <u>bezit</u>*
          Joop has   a   woman who much money owns
          ontmoet.   [RRC]
          met
          'Joop met a woman who possesses a lot of money.'
     b. * Joop heeft een vrouw *die <u>bezit</u> veel geld* ontmoet.
                                                    [quasi-RRC]
     b.′ Joop heeft een vrouw ontmoet *die <u>bezit</u> veel geld*.
          'Joop met a (particular) woman who possesses a lot of
          money.'

For all these reasons, it is likely that a quasi-relative is syntactically a main clause that is coordinated to the host sentence as a whole:

(27) [$_{CoP}$ [$_{host\_clause}$ ... DP$_i$ ...] [Co [$_{quasi\text{-}RC}$ DEM$_i$ ...]]]

The particular type of coordinate structure at stake represents an asymmetric relationship of specification. Although there is no parenthesis involved, this is reminiscent of the situation in appositive constructions discussed in the previous section.

The analysis in (27) straightforwardly explains the structural and morphological properties of the quasi-relative − but this is only half of the story. What does the semantics of a quasi-relative amount to? At first sight, the pertinent clause acts as a restrictive modifier of the nominal anchor (at a distance). However, unlike the situation for regular restrictive relative clauses, there are restrictions on the type of anchor (23a′) and its environment (see below). The key to the special semantics, I think, is that the 'antecedent' DP is to be interpreted as a specific indefinite. Notice that noun phrases introduced in presentative clauses (canonically, *there + be +* NP) are normally specific indefinite (unless they are in a modal context, of course): specific because they introduce an element that is to be referentially accessible, and indefinite because they are new in the discourse.

The difference in interpretation between specific and non-specific indefinites is determined by the context. In a negative context, for instance, the existence of the relevant element is denied, hence it cannot be referential, as is shown in (28a). For the exact same reason, a quasi-relative is impossible here; compare (28b) to (22). The problem is that the demonstrative cannot find a possible referent. By contrast, a restrictive relative clause is fine (28c) because a relative operator attributes a property to the relative head *below* the referential level of the DP. The picture is completed in (28d), where it is shown that an appositive relative clause does suffer from the problem of non-referentiality; this is consistent with the analysis in the previous sections.

(28) a.   Niemand zag een huis. * Het was erg   mooi.

                                          [subsequent sentences]

         nobody   saw a   house   it was very nice

         'Nobody saw a house. *It was was very nice.'

    b. * Niemand zag een huis dat was erg mooi.   [quasi-RRC]

         'Nobody saw a (particular) house which was very nice.'

    c.   Niemand zag een huis dat erg mooi was.   [restrictive RC]

         'Nobody saw a house that was very nice.'

    d. * Niemand zag een huis, dat erg mooi was.   [appositive RC]

         'Nobody saw a house, which was very nice.'

Similarly, a modal context that excludes a referential reading does not license a quasi-relative (where a regular restrictive would be fine):

(29) * Ik   zou   wel eens een   huis   willen zien dat   is

      I   would PRT   once a   house want see   DEM is

    erg   mooi.

    very   nice

    'I would like to see a house sometime that is very nice.'

Furthermore, we would expect the existential quantifier associated with the specific indefinite in quasi-relatives to take high scope, simply because it needs to be referential. This corresponds to an obligatory *de re* reading, which is indeed what we find.[10] So in (30a), there is only one and the same house that everyone likes. By contrast, the *de dicto* reading (normally correlated with low scope for the existential) is available in regular relative clauses (30b). Again, the quasi-RC patterns with ARCs, since these also allow for the *de re* reading only; see (30c).

(30) a.   Iedereen zag een huis   dat   was erg   mooi.

                                         [quasi-RRC]

         everyone saw a   house DEM was very nice

         'There was a particular house that everyone saw and which was very nice.'

    b.   Iedereen zag een huis   dat   erg   mooi was. [RRC]

         everyone saw a   house which very nice was

         1. 'For everyone it was the case that (s)he saw a house that was very nice.'

         2. 'There was a particular house that was very nice that everyone saw.'

---

[10] I am glossing over some semantic intricacies concerning specific indefinites that are irrelevant for the present discussion. See Farkas (2006) for a concise discussion and further references.

    c.   Iedereen zag een huis, dat erg mooi was.   [ARC]
           'There was a particular house that everyone saw and which was very nice.'

Similarly, the existential quantifier necessarily outscopes the deontic modal in (31). The quasi-relative therefore disambiguates the first clause, like an appositive relative clause would; by contrast, a regular restrictive relative would allow for two readings.

(31)   Joop moet een huis   kopen dat   is erg   duur.
         Joop must a   house buy   DEM   is very expensive
         'Joop has to buy a (particular) house which is very expensive.'

There are related scope effects worth mentioning. Consider (32), where suddenly the quasi-relative patterns with the RRC instead of the ARC. The interpretation in (32a/b) differs from (32c/d). In the last two examples, all the many young people in Groningen are students. In the first two examples, it is only stated that many of the young people in Groningen are students. This is a relative statement. In (32a) this is due to the fact that the quantifier $many\ x_{young\ people(x)}$ takes scope over the entire complex sentence (in accordance with the *de re* effect just discussed);[11] in (32b) the quantifier *many* takes scope minimally over the combined nominal head plus relative clause.

(32) a.   In Groningen wonen veel jonge mensen die
             in Groningen live   many young people DEM
             zijn   student.   [quasi-RRC]
             are   student
             'Many young people who are students live in Groningen.'
     b.   In Groningen wonen veel jonge mensen die student zijn.
                                    [RRC]
             'Many young people who are students live in Groningen.'
     c.   In Groningen wonen veel jonge mensen. Die zijn student.
                                     [subsequent Ss]
             'Many young people live in Groningen. They are students.'
     d.   In Groningen wonen veel jonge mensen, die student zijn.
                                      [ARC]
             'Many young people, who are students, live in Groningen.'

---

[11] Informally described: there is a particular, relatively large set of young people, of who it is predicated that they live in Groningen, and they are students.

Why is this different in ARCs and subsequent sentences? The reason is that scope does not normally extend beyond full sentences and parenthetical boundaries, as discussed in Section 3. Thus, the reference of the quantified phrase is established exclusively within the host clause proper.[12]

It can hardly be a coincidence that the scope effect just established correlates with the prosodic domains indicated in (23). If there is one extended intonational contour, as in quasi-relatives, the scope of the (generalized) existential quantifier is widened (I will leave aside the noteworthy question what causes what). If there are two contours, as in separate sentences or appositive constructions, this is not the case. Interestingly, it is more generally the case that a specific indefinite semantics has a cataphoric ring to it. The speaker posits a referential variable in the form of an indefinite noun phrase or pronoun, to whose specific interpretation the hearer has to accommodate; this is often facilitated by (complex) postmodifiers, which linearly follow the (pro)nominal head, e.g. *I saw someone yesterday with a T-shirt that had "Spylocogist" on the front*.

In effect, then, quasi-relatives show behavior that has resemblances with both RRCs and ARCs. Clearly, they are syntactic main clauses, but what about the semantic/pragmatic criteria? These are surprisingly hard to test, but there are some indications that quasi-relatives are indeed speaker-oriented. Consider (33).[13] First note that the sentence concerns a specific book (title). In (33a), the subject *Joop* may not know that the book is sold out, so this is an addition by the speaker. By contrast, the regular relative in (33b) is interpreted in the scope of the intensional context evoked by the matrix verb *zoeken* 'look for', so the subject is aware of the problem.

---

[12] It is now evident how to explain the difference in interpretation between the famous pair of examples in (i) and (ii), due to Gärtner (2001).

    (i)   Das   Blatt hat eine Seite, die ist ganz   schwarz.
           the   sheet has a   page DEM is completely black
           'The sheet has a page that is completely black'
    (ii) (#) Das Blatt hat eine Seite. (und) Die ist ganz schwarz.
           'The sheet has a page and that is completely black.'

In (i), *eine Seite* 'a/one page' is specific, and the existential quantifier takes high scope, which includes the second clause (which is structurally part of the complete sentence). In (ii), there are two separate sentences (according to the intonational pattern, not necessary the orthography). Thus, scope extension to the second clause is impossible here, and the first becomes pragmatically odd, since a sheet has two sides per definition. A non-specific reading of the indefinite would solve that, but this reading is unavailable because the demonstrative pronoun in the second sentence requires a referent.

[13] It is also possible to show speaker orientation by means of certain modal particles (see also Coniglio & Zegrean, this volume). A relevant example from German is *Hans hat einen Hund, der is aber <u>wohl</u> schon sehr alt* [literally, Hans has a dog, DEM is but AFFIRMATIVE already very old], meaning roughly 'Hans has a dog, but I [=the speaker] strongly suspect it's a very old dog.'

(33) a.   Joop zoekt   een boek dat <u>is</u> al   uitverkocht.

                                                                 [quasi-RRC]

        Joop looks.for a   book that is already out.sold

        'Joop is looking for a (particular) book which is already sold out.'

b.   Joop zoekt een boek dat al uitverkocht <u>is</u>.   [RRC]

        'Joop is looking for a book that is already sold out.'

Felicitous follow-up sentences could be *"So he will never find it"* in (33a) and *"So he is checking out the antiquarian book trade"* in (33b).

     Next, I would like to point out that there is another, related construction type that we may call *quasi-relative parenthetical* or *quasi-ARC*. An example is (34a), which can be compared to the regular ARC repeated in (34b):

(34) a.   Joop – die   <u>woont</u> nu   overigens   in Amsterdam –

        Joop   DEM   lives   now   by.the.way   in Amsterdam

        komt   morgen   thuis.

        comes   tomorrow home

        'Joop, who now lives in Amsterdam, by the way, is coming home tomorrow.'

b.   Joop, die   nu   overigens   in Amsterdam   <u>woont</u>,

        Joop who   now   by.the.way   in Amsterdam   lives

        komt   morgen   thuis.

        comes   tomorrow home

        'Joop, who now lives in Amsterdam, by the way, is coming home tomorrow.'

Quasi-ARCs are parenthetical quasi-relatives. They relate to a constituent of the host, and contain a preposed demonstrative that is coreferent with this expression. They are undoubtedly main clauses: they are V2, have a separate intonational contour, are speaker-oriented, etc. Due to the fact that they are parenthetical, and hence provide information on another level of communication, they behave differently from quasi-RRCs in a number of respects. Most importantly, the anchor does not have to be indefinite, as is evident from (34a), and related to this, if it is indefinite, the existential quantifier does not take scope over the quasi-ARC; thus, (35) would have to mean that all the many young people are students.

(35) Veel jonge   mensen – die   zijn student – wonen in

     many young   people   DEM   are student   live   in

     Groningen.

     Groningen

     'Many young people – these are students – live in Groningen.'

If the parenthetical happens to be sentence-final, there would be virtually no difference with a situation involving subsequent sentences, as in (32c), for instance.

In conclusion, there are two construction types, quasi-relatives and quasi-relative parentheticals, that are reminiscent of restrictive and appositive relative clauses, respectively. Despite some similarities, they are actually V2 main clauses with a preposed demonstrative (not a relative pronoun).

6. Conclusion and outlook

Main clause behavior is not a uniform phenomenon, in the sense that syntactic, semantic, and prosodic characteristics canonically associated with main clauses do not always go together. Appositive construction types are particularly interesting in this respect. A familiar puzzle is the fact that appositive relative clauses are structurally subordinate clauses, but semantically behave like main clauses, as was illustrated in some detail, here. This can be explained if they are analyzed as parentheticals with a somewhat complex internal structure. I argued that ARCs have the overall architecture of identificational appositions. This implies that what seems to be a clause is in fact a semi-free relative construction, and hence it is nominalized. Consequently, relativization implies restrictive construal in all cases, and all relative operators can be analyzed the same. The E-type connection between the appositive and the anchor/antecedent lies in the abstract pronominal head of the relative construction, not in the operator. All appositive constructions alike are parenthetical specifications of an anchor. It is therefore the way a relative construction is inserted in the syntactic context that determines whether it becomes appositive or not; thus, appositive relative clauses are not a separate construction type. Furthermore, I proposed to generalize over attributive appositions and ARCs such that the former are relative clauses with an overt predicate and an abstract clausal structure. This explains the fact that attributive appositions have various properties normally associated with clauses, e.g. the possibility of inserting a high adverb or a complementizer.

Appositives are phrases that are parenthetically related to an anchor at the constituent level. The type of relationship itself is brought about by a specialized functional head (transparently called Par), whose complement is interpreted as a separate syntactic and semantic domain; this is the case for all types of parenthesis. Semantic main clause phenomena can straightforwardly be derived from this property – albeit that the theoretical background concerning the Par projection, discussed elsewhere in more detail, is of course less trivial. What is directly relevant here is that the analysis of ARCs now makes the right distinction between semantic/pragmatic and syntactic main clause phenomena: semantically,

ARCs are the highest proposition in the parenthetical dimension; syntactically, the appositive clause is nominalized, that is, projects a DP, within which the relative clause proper is embedded.

A hallmark of main clauses in Dutch and German is that they are verb second, contrary to subordinate clauses. As expected, both regular restrictive and appositive relative clauses, being embedded, are verb final. Interestingly, there turn out to be quasi-relative constructions that are nevertheless V2. I reviewed the properties of these constructions, and concluded that they are not relative clauses, but coordinated main clauses with a preposed demonstrative, in line with previous literature. I also tried to informally explain their special semantics on the basis of the fact that the anchor receives a specific indefinite interpretation. Furthermore, I showed that there is a second type of quasi-relative, namely the parenthetical variant of it, which has somewhat different properties due to its status as a parenthesis.

So far, I have discussed semantic and syntactic effects, but only alluded to prosodic properties of main clauses. A general question that needs to be addressed is whether prosody correlates with main clause status, and also whether parentheticals can be detected as such. Current research suggests that there is no straightforward answer. Depending on the position within the host and the length of the parenthesis at hand, there can be prosodic integration effects (Güneş 2012, Dehé 2009). Further puzzles arise concerning instances of so-called sentence amalgamation (Lakoff 1974, Kluck 2011), and, somewhat oppositely, the status of fragments (see also De Cat, this volume). I will leave this for future work. If anything, however, the picture that arises seems to confirm the general conclusion I started out with.

References

Ackema, Peter & Neeleman, Ad. 2004. *Beyond Morphology: Interface Conditions on Word Formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton-Roberts, Noel. 2006. Parentheticals. In *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* [2nd edition, Vol. 9], Keith Brown (ed), 179-182. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Canac-Marquis, Réjean & Tremblay, Mireille. 1998. The wh-feature and the syntax of restrictive and non-restrictive relatives in French and English. In *Theoretical analyses on Romance languages*, José Lema & Esthela Treviño (eds), 127-141. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cardoso, Adriana & De Vries, Mark. 2010. Internal and external heads in appositive constructions. Manuscript, University of Lisbon & University of Groningen.

Coniglio, Marco & Zegrean, Iulia. This volume. Splitting up Force: evidence from discourse particles.

De Cat, Cecile. This volume. Towards an interface definition of root phenomena.

Dehé, Nicole. 2009. Clausal parentheticals, intonational phrasing, and prosodic theory. *Journal of Linguistics* 45, 569-615.

Dehé, Nicole & Kavalova, Yordanka (eds). 2007. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Emonds, Joseph. 1970. *Root and Structure-preserving Transformations*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Emonds, Joseph. 1973. Parenthetical clauses. In *You take the high node and I'll take the low node*, Claudia Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark & Ann Weiser (eds), 333-347. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Endo, Yoshio. This volume. The syntax-discourse interface in adverbial clauses.

Endriss, Cornelia & Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2005. Relativische Verb-Zweit Sätze und Definitheit. In *Proceedings of the Symposium Deutsche Syntax: Empirie und Theorie*, Franz-Josef d'Avis (ed), 195-220. Göteborg: Göteborger Germanistische Forschungen.

Espinal, M. Teresa. 1991. The representation of disjunct constituents. *Language* 67, 726-762.

Farkas, Donka. 2006. Specificity. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* [2nd edition], Keith Brown (ed), 633-635. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Franco, Irene. This volume. Minimality and embedded V2 in Scandinavian.

Frey, Werner. This volume. On the different licensing conditions of two types of adverbial clauses allowing root-phenomena.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2001. Are there V2 relative clauses in German? *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3, 97-141.

Green, Georgia. 1976. Main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses. *Language* 52, 387-97.

Güneş, Güliz. 2012. Prosodic Parenthesis and Prosodic Integration: A Case Study in Turkish. Manuscript, University of Groningen.

Haan, Ger de. 2001. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4, 3-38.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1988. Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach. In *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics: Papers Presented to Masatomo Ukaji on His 60th Birthday*, Shuji Chiba et al. (eds), 232-254. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. Speculations on the syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120, 628-648.

Haegeman, Liliane. This volume. The syntax of MCP: Deriving the truncation account.

Heringa, Herman. 2011. *Appositional Constructions.* PhD dissertation, University of Groningen. LOT Dissertation Series 294.

Heringa, Herman. To appear. A multidominance approach to appositional constructions. *Lingua*. (doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2011.07.003)

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax. Vol II*, Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), 174-209. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hooper, John & Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of Root Transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465-497.

Huddleston, Rodney & Pullum, Geoffrey. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lakoff, George. 1974. Syntactic amalgams. In *Papers from the 10th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Michael La Galy, Robert Fox & Anthony Bruck (eds), 321-344.

Laskova, Vesselina. This volume. Subjunctive mood, Epistemic modality and Main clause phenomena in the analysis of adverbial clauses.

Kluck, Marlies. 2011. *Sentence amalgamation*. PhD dissertation, University of Groningen. LOT Dissertation Series 285.

Kluck, Marlies & De Vries, Mark. To appear. Cumulative rightward processes. In *Rightward Movement from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Heike Walker, Manfred Sailer & Gert Webelhuth (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koster, Jan. 2000. Extraposition as parallel construal. Manuscript, University of Groningen.

McCawley, James D. 1982. Parentheticals and discontinuous constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 91-106.

O'Connor, Kathleen. 2008. *Aspects de la syntaxe et de l'interprétation de l'apposition à antécédent nominal*. PhD dissertation, Université Charles de Gaulle, Lille 3.

Peterson, Peter. 1999. On the boundaries of syntax – Non-syntagmatic relations. In *The Clause in English*, Peter Collins & David Lee (eds), 229-250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reis, Marga. 1997. Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze. In *Sprache im Fokus*, Christa Dürscheid, Karl-Heinz Ramers & Monika Schwarz (eds), 121-144. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Roberts, Craige. 1996. Anaphora in intensional contexts. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, Shalom Lappin (ed), 215-246. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Ross, John R. 1973. Slifting. In *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages. Proceedings of the First International Conference*, Maurice Gross, Morris Halle & Marcel-Paul Schützenberger (eds), 133-169. The Hague: Mouton.

Schelfhout, Carla, Peter-Arno Coppen, & Nelleke Oostdijk. 2003. Positions of parentheticals and interjections: A corpus-based approach. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 20, 155-166.

Smith, Carlota. 1964. Determiners and relative clauses in a generative grammar of English. *Language* 40, 37-52.

Stoltenburg, Benjamin. 2003. Parenthesen im gesprochenen Deutsch. *InLiSt – Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, No. 34.

Tomaszewicz, Barbara. This volume. The syntactic position of Slavic *by* and its effect on Main Clause Phenomena.

Vries, Mark de. 2006. The syntax of appositive relativization: On specifying coordination, false free relatives and promotion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 229-270.

Vries, Mark de. 2007. Invisible Constituents? Parentheses as B-Merged Adverbial Phrases. In *Parentheticals*, Nicole Dehé & Yordanka Kavalova (eds), 203-234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vries, Mark de. 2011. Extrapositie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16, 273-306.

Vries, Mark de. To appear. Unconventional Mergers. In *Ways of Structure Building*, Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria & Vidal Valmala (eds), 143-166. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2005. Iets over zgn. V2-relatieven in het Nederlands. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 10, 59-81.