

## Reduced Parenthetical Clauses in Portuguese - a comparative approach

Gabriela Matos

(Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa/Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa)

1. Reduced Parenthetical Clauses (Schneider 2007), henceforth RPC, in Romance and non-Romance languages present a specific structural configuration: they may exhibit a verb complement gap and display Subject-Verb Inversion, obligatorily or optionally depending on the language/language variety, as shown for quotation verbs in European and Brazilian Portuguese (=EP, BP) and in Dutch and English: EP patterns with Dutch in not allowing preverbal subjects (cf.(1)-(3)), BP behaves like English by accepting preverbal and post-verbal subjects (cf.(2)-(4)):

- (1) a. *Esse autor, disse o repórter, escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.* (EP)  
 ‘That author, said the reporter, wrote a book on that subject.’  
 b. \**Esse autor, o repórter disse, escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.*  
 that author, the reporter said, wrote a book on that subject.
- (2) a. *Você tá me ouvindo?, disse Kátia [e eu me senti flagrado].* (Ventura 1998) (BP)  
 you are me hearing? said Kátia and I felt trapped.  
 ‘Are you hearing me? said Kátia [and I felt trapped].’  
 b. *O homem procura motivos de indignação para alimentar sua inveja, ele disse.* (BP)  
 ‘Man looks for motives of indignation to feed his envy, he said.’ (Ventura 1998)
- (3) a. *“Ik heb een nieuwe baan,” vertelde Joop me gisteren.* (De Vries 2006) (Dutch)  
 ‘I have a new job’ told Joop me yesterday  
 b. \**“Ik heb een nieuwe baan,” Joop vertelde me gisteren.*
- (4) a. *“Don’t turn back!” warned Marcel.* (Collins & Branigan 1997) (En)  
 b. *“Who’s on first?” Joe demanded.*

The required V-S order in EP seems to indicate that there is a correlation between the object gap and V-Movement in this language; a similar claim has been made for Dutch, where RPCs have been related to the V2 phenomenon. In opposition, the alternation S-V/V-S in English and BP suggests that the object gap and V-Raising in RPCs are unrelated phenomena. Considering Portuguese, these word order patterns are problematic for both varieties: in EP the obligatory V-S order may hardly be conceived as V2 effect, given that in neutral declarative sentences SVO in main and embedded clauses typically occurs. As for BP, the problem arises of explaining how the V-S order produces acceptable results, considering that: V to C has been lost in wh-questions (e.g. Ribeiro 2001, Mito & Kato 2005); V-S in declarative sentences is (almost) lost (Galves & Gibrail 2012), except with unaccusative verbs; and V movement out of vP targets a low functional category with aspectual content (Cyrino 2013).

2. Early analyses on RPC have presented two main hypotheses. The complement hypothesis claims that the parenthetical originates as a main clause, whose verb takes the host sentence as its complement; this complement is fronted in sentences like (4) (Ross 1973); then, an optional rule of parenthetical formation derives sentences like (5) (Emonds 1970, Ross 1973). Alternatively, the modifier hypothesis takes the host sentence as autonomous and assumes that the parenthetical is related to it as a modifier (Jackendoff 1972).

- (5) *Mary will, John said, see you tomorrow.*

The complement hypothesis apparently directly accounts for the correlation between the parenthetical verb gap and the host sentence. Also, in languages like Dutch, it seems to argue for the V2 analysis. Yet, in the current framework, it does not easily account for the interpolated and floating nature the parenthetical, illustrated in (5) and (6). In addition, it faces with empirical problems, illustrated for Portuguese in (7): the host sentence may not exhibit an overt complementizer, as required in embedded finite sentences in this language, (7a); and the tense (mood) and person features of the host clause are not restricted by the parenthetical verb, as they would be in an indirect speech reporting clause, (7b):

- (6) *Eu vou (disse ele) comprar (disse ele) esse livro.*  
 I will (said he) buy (said he) that book
- (7) a. *Ele disse \*(que) ia comprar esse livro. ≠ b. Ele disse que eu vou comprar esse livro.*  
 He said (that) (he) would buy that book He said that I will buy that book.

Thus, current analyses mostly reject the complement hypothesis, despite of developing different proposals to deal with the correlation between the parenthetical and its host (e.g., Espinal 1991, Collins & Barningan 1997, Cover & Tiersh 2002, De Vries 2006).

3. Focusing on EP, Ambar (1992), conceives the complement gap in RPCs as a variable bound by a null operator in CP, as proposed for Null Objects in EP by Raposo (1986):

(8)  $[_{CP} Op_j [_C disse_k [_{TP} ele t_k [t_k t_j ]]]]$

This analysis does not explain the obligatory V-S order in RPC in EP. To deal with this problem we could assume that EP is a residual V2 language, considering that representations akin to (8) have been proposed for RPCs in V2 languages (Cover & Tiersh 2002, De Vries 2006). Still, the motivation for this residual V2 effect in EP should be explained.

A possible outcome would be to adopt some version of Collins & Branigan's (1997) analysis of quotative inversion. These authors claim that in English a quotative null operator is merged in Spec CP and binds a variable in complement position of the parenthetical. The V-S order arises when the DP subject remains in Spec of the verbal phrase and the main verb, in overt Syntax, moves to the most local functional category, according to them AgrO, (as shown by the ban of sentence negation and the position of VP adverbial modifiers in RPCs) to check the case of the Quotative operator. They explain the V-S/S-V patterns in terms of C features: only a  $C_{[+quote]}$  with an uninterpretable V-feature may attract the main verb to a functional projection.

Extending this proposal to Spanish, Suárez (2000) claims that the Quotative operator always occurs in F(orce)P, a functional category that exhibits a [+focus] feature when the quote is fronted; the V-S order arises because an expletive *pro* is merged in Spec TP to check the EPP-features of T in Spanish, a Null Subject Language, or a null R-expression (a null definite description) is merged in Spec TP in English.

Elaborating on these proposals, I will alternatively claim that a RPC with a  $C_{[+quote]}$  selects for a Focus(P) with an underspecified N-feature. This captures the fact that in RPC the subject is interpreted as informational focus, a discursive property that seems to be related to the pragmatic reporting value of these parentheticals. In languages like English and BP, the informational focus feature is usually valued, during the derivation, by Agree with a DP-subject raised into Spec FocusP, as in (9a), thus resulting the S-V order (cf. (2b) and (4b)). Yet, as shown in (2a) and (4a), under the scope of a  $C_{[+quote]}$ , BP and English still allow, in the current (written) language, that the focus feature be valued at long distance by Agree with a DP-subject in Spec vP, provided that local V-raising into AspP has applied (cf. (9b)), producing the required discursive effects. This analysis captures the English data and is compatible with Cyrino's evidence that the verb in BP raises to a low projection, below TP.

(9) a.  $[_{CP} Op_j [_C +quote][[_{FocP} JOE_k [_{Foc} +Focus][[_{TP} t_k [_{vP} t_k [demanded t_j ]]]]]]$

b.  $[_{CP} Op_j [_C +quote][[_{FocP} [_{Foc} +Focus][[_{TP} [_{AspP} demanded_i [_{vP} JOE t_i t_j ]]]]]]$

In contrast, in languages like EP (or Spanish), preverbal focus is restricted to contrastive focus, and informational focus occurs in post-verbal position, typically remaining in Spec vP (Costa 1998). Thus, in EP only the latter strategy is available, despite the fact that V-raising is not confined to the lower functional category above vP, and may move to T and C.

**References:** Ambar 1992 *P<sup>a</sup> uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito-Verbo em Português*, Lisboa: Colibri. Collins & Barningan 1998 Quotative inversion, *NLLT* 5:1. Costa 1998 *Word Order Variation*. The Hague: HAG. Cover & Tiersh 2002 Remarks on parentheticals. <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books>. Cyrino 2013, On the richness of tense and verb movement in BP, *Information Structure and Agreement*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. De Vries 2006, Reported Direct Speech in Dutch, *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23: 212-223. Emonds Parenthetical Clauses. *You take the high node and I'll take the low node*. Chicago: CLS. Galves & Gibrail 2012, Subject inversion from Classical to Modern EP, *DiGS14*, Lisboa. Espinal 1991 The representation of disjunct constituents, *Language*, 67:4. Jackendoff 1972, *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press. Mioto & Kato 2005, As interrogativas-Q em PB. *Revista da ABRALIN* 4:1&2. Raposo 1986 On the Null object in EP, *Studies on Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications. Ribeiro 2001, Sobre a perda de Inversão do sujeito no PB. *P<sup>a</sup> História do PB*, v.2, t.1, Humanitas: FFLCH/USP. Ross 1973 Slifting, *The formal analysis of natural languages*, de Hague-Mouton. Schneider 2007, Reduced parenthetical clauses in Romance languages, *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins. Suárez 2000 The syntax of direct quotes with special reference to Spanish and English, *NLLT* 18:525-578.