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Abstract
Floating parenthetical coordinate clauses exhibit a challenging behaviour: they disrupt the structure of the host sentence, do not present an overt first term, occur in different positions inside the host clause and, although notionally related to their host, they present syntactic autonomy. Taking into account data from European Portuguese, we claim that these clauses are derived from the core devices of the computational system: the coordinate structure is built up by Set Merge and takes, as first term, a null constituent denoting the host clause; then, Pair Merge operates by adjoining the parenthetical coordinated CP to a functional or verbal projection of the host sentence. Considering the autonomy of the parenthetical clause with respect to its host, we assume that this adjunction is an instance of Late Merge, a counter cyclic operation that applies at PF.
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1. Introduction
This paper focuses on floating parentheticals in European Portuguese. We restrict our study to sentence coordinate parenthetical clauses like (1)\(^2\), where @ in (1b) indicates the sites of occurrence of the parenthetical:

(1) a. Em primeiro lugar (e trata-se da conclusão mais forte) in first place and deal-PRS-3SG with the conclusion strongest parece indiscutível que se verificou um agravamento seems indisputable that occur-PST-3SG a worsening dos desequilíbrios.
of the-PL imbalances

“In the first place, and this is the main conclusion, it seems unquestionable that a worsening of the imbalances occurred.”

---

* This study has been developed within the project PTDC/LIN/66202/2006, financed by Fundaç"ao para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT). We thank the audience of Going Romance 2009 and especially two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on previous versions of this paper.

\(^2\) Most of the examples of this study are based on the corpus of CETEM/Público.
b. *Em primeiro lugar* parece indiscutível que se verificou um sério agravamento dos desequilíbrios

Floating parenthetical coordinate sentences raise several problems to syntax: they disrupt the structure of the host sentence and may occupy different positions inside their hosts; as coordinated sentences, they do not seem to satisfy the required structure for coordination, since the first term is apparently missing: thus, in (1), none of the overt material preceding the conjunction (for instance *em primeiro lugar* ‘in the first place’ in (1a)) qualifies as the first conjunct of the parenthetical clause (*e trata-se da conclusão mais forte* ‘and this is the main conclusion’).

In accordance with the characterisation of *floating parentheticals* as expressions that disrupt the host structure, we will admit that they are interpolations, as (tacitly) assumed by most authors (e.g. Kavalova 2007), and we will not consider appendages preceding or following the host sentence. In fact, we admit that appendages should be better analysed as anchored parentheticals. Thus, for instance, appositive clauses, which are anchored parentheticals, may be conceived as appendages that follow their hosts (cf. Safir 1986, Brito 2006, Matos 2009).

Floating parenthetical coordination is not a specific phenomenon of Romance languages or of Portuguese. However, its study in this language has considerable relevance, because until recently it has been neglected3 and it may be seen as a contribution to a systematic cross-linguistic investigation of this construction, which will lead to a more accurate understanding of parentheticals and of coordinate structures.

Trying to contribute to a better understanding of floating parenthetical coordinate sentences, this paper aims to answer the following questions: is there any evidence for the coordinated nature of the parenthetical expression, considering the core properties that define a category as a conjunction (section 2)? In case of a positive answer, what are the properties of the conjunction and the structure of the parenthetical coordination (section 3)? How is the floating parenthetical related to the host sentence (section 4)?

Although the first and the last questions have already been addressed for other languages within different frameworks (e.g., Blakemore 2005 and Kavalova 2007), the second one, as far as we know, has been neglected. Yet, all these questions are tightly connected.

---

3 As far as we know, there is no study of parenthetical coordination in other Romance languages. For European Portuguese, see Matos (2009), Colaço & Matos (2010), Matos & Colaço (2010).
2. The Conj status of the connector in parenthetical coordination

The lack of an overt first term of the coordination and the autonomy of the parenthetical clause with respect to its host sentence may suggest that the connectives that introduce these clauses are not coordinators, but specific discursive connectives. However, in Portuguese, as in other languages, there is evidence for their status as conjunctions. First of all, they exhibit the semantic value they present in non parenthetical coordination: addition (Blakemore 2005), e ‘and’ in (2), disjunction, ou ‘or’ in (3), and contrast, mas ‘but’ in (4):

(2) A Câmara ─ e o Público reconheceu-o ─
the city council ─ and the Público acknowledged it ─
debateu-se com dificuldades financeiras devidas a uma quebra
struggle-PST-3SG with difficulties financial due to a loss
das receitas.
of the revenues
“The city council ─ and Público acknowledged it ─ struggled with financial difficulties, due to a loss of revenues.”

(3) Esse político, que se orgulha de ter nascido em Braga
that politician, who RELF proud of have-born-PTCP in Braga
(ou, pelo menos, escreve-o) não recebeu apoio
(or, at least, write-PRS-3SG it) not receive-PST-3SG support
dos seus conterrâneos.
from the his fellow country-men
“That politician, who is proud of being born in Braga (or, at least, that is what he writes down) did not receive any support from his fellow countrymen.”

(4) Isto tornou-se claro quando os revoltosos (mas não eram
that become-PST-3SG clear when the rebels (but not be-PST-3PL
os capitães os verdadeiros insurrectos?) foram libertados.
the captains the true insurgents?) PST-3PL released
“That became obvious when the rebels (but weren’t the captains the true insurgents?) were released.”

In addition, these connectives may not occur in parentheticals where coordination is not allowed, (5)-(6):

(5) Ele devia ─ (*e) penso eu ─ visitar os pais mais vezes
he should ─ (*and) think-PRS-1SG I ─ visit the parents more times
“He should ─ I think ─ visit his parents more often.”
(6) *Podemos perguntar-lhes, (*ou) não é?, se assistem ao workshop.*

We may ask them, (*or) mayn’t we?, whether they will attend the workshop.”

In (5), the parenthetical *penso eu ‘I think’* may not assume the form of a coordinate sentence due to its pragmatic value: the parenthetical clause including the epistemic verb acts like a *mitigator* that aims to alleviate the speaker’s commitment on the content of his/her utterance, expressed in the host sentence (cf. Schneider 2007). Should the parenthetical present a different value, acting, for instance, as an additional comment of the speaker, and coordination would be available, as in *Ele devia ─ e estou realmente certo disso ─ visitar os pais mais vezes ‘he should ─ and I am indeed sure of it ─ visit his parents more often.’*

Similarly in (6), the *phatic value* of the expression is lost when the disjunctive coordinator occurs.4

Finally, the parenthetical status of a clause seems to be compatible either with its coordinate (1)-(4) or its subordinate (7) nature:

(7) *Esse médico, se não me engano, é excelente.*

That doctor, if not REFL mistake-PRS-1SG, be-PRS-3SG excellent

“We may ask them if they will attend the workshop or mayn’t we?”

Thus, we assume that parenthetical clauses introduced by Conj are indeed instances of coordination.

3. The coordinate structure in parenthetical coordination

Our next step is to analyse the properties of the conjunction, and, consequently, those of the resulting coordinate structure.

---

4 A reviewer remarks that the presence of the coordinate expression in (6) is less weird when it occurs at the end of the sentence, as in (i). Yet, the contrast between (i) and (6) shows that the coordinate structure in (i), while possible, is interpreted not as a phatic question like (6), but as a disjunctive coordination that asks about the truth value of the whole proposition in the first term of the coordinate structure:

(i) (?) *Podemos perguntar-lhes, se assistem ao workshop, ou não é?, se assistem ao workshop, ou não é?*

May ask them if attend-PRS-3PL to the workshop, (or) not be-PRS-3SG?,

“We may ask them if they will attend the workshop or mayn’t we?”
3.1. The exclusion of the preceding constituents from the ConjP

Canonical coordinate structures involve two conjuncts connected by a conjunction (Conj), (8):

(8) Eles viram o livro e compraram-no.
    they see-PST-3PL the book and buy-PST-3PL.
    “They saw the book and they bought it.”

In contrast, floating parenthetical coordination apparently presents a single coordinate term. In fact, as mentioned with respect to (1a), whose relevant parts are repeated in (9), the linguistic expression that precedes the parenthetical does not often have the appropriate content to qualify as a first conjunct:

(9) Em primeiro lugar (e trata-se da conclusão mais forte)...
    in first place and deal-PRS-3SG with the conclusion strongest
    “In the first place (and this is the main conclusion) …

Besides, even when it does, its exclusion from the coordinate structure may be attested: correlative coordinate expressions that delimit the beginning of the coordinate structure may not include the material preceding Conj in floating parentheticals, as shown by the contrast between (2) and (10):

(10) *Não só a Câmara — mas também o Público o reconheceu —
    not only the city council — but also the Público acknowledge-PST-3SG
    debateu-se com dificuldades financeiras devidas a uma quebra
    struggled-PST-3SG with difficulties financial due to a loss.
    das receitas.
    of the revenues
    “Not only the city council — but also Público acknowledged it —
    struggled with financial difficulties, due to a loss of revenues.”

This behaviour correlates with the fact that floating parenthetical coordinate clauses are notionally related to the whole host sentence, in spite of the different positions they occupy inside it — for instance, in (2), immediately following the subject, and in (11) after the inflected verb:

(11) A Câmara debateu-se — e o Público reconheceu-o —
    the city council struggled — and the Público acknowledge-PST-3SG—
    com dificuldades financeiras devidas a uma quebra das receitas.
    with difficulties financial due to a loss of the revenues
    “The city council struggled — and Público acknowledged it — with
    financial difficulties, due to a loss of the revenues.”
The relation held by the parenthetical with respect to its host is particularly obvious in these examples, because the clitic o ‘it’, inside the parenthetical, denotes the propositional content of the host sentence e o Público reconheceu-o ‘and Público acknowledged it’:

In sum, the ban of correlative coordination, as well as the fact that floating parenthetical clauses are related to the whole host sentence, precludes the hypothesis of treating the linguistic material preceding Conj as the first term of the coordination.

3.2. The structure of floating parenthetical coordination and the features of Conj

Within the Principles and Parameters framework, canonical integrated coordinate structures have been conceived as headed by a Conjunction (Conj), characterised as a binary functional head, which requires the merge of a specifier, then arising a specifier-head-complement configuration, as represented in (12) (Kayne 1994, Johannessen 1998, a. o.):

\[(12) \left[ \text{ConjP} \text{XP} \left[ \left[ \text{Conj} \right] \text{YP} \right] \right].\]

However, floating parenthetical coordination apparently requires a different characterisation of Conj, as a defective one-ary category, which prevents the merge of a specifier, (13):

\[(13) \left[ \text{ConjP} \text{ConjP\text{parent} \text{XP}} \right].\]

The choice between the Specifier-Head-Complement hypothesis and the Defective ConjP hypothesis relies on their adequacy to deal with two main problems: the assignment of the categorial value to the coordinate structure and the defining properties of Conj.

The first problem arises from the fact that Conj is an underspecified functional head which must receive its categorial value from (one of) the coordinate terms. In fact, as shown in (14), it is the categorial nature of the coordinate terms that satisfies or violates the syntactic frame of the predicator.

\[(14) \text{a. Ele falou \left[ PP da \text{Maria} \right] e \left[ PP do \text{João} \right] } \]

he talk-PST-3SG of the Maria and of the João

“He talked about Maria and João.”

\[\text{b. *Ele falou \left[ \left[ DP a \text{Maria} \right] e \left[ DP o \text{João} \right] \right] } \]

he talk-PST-3SG the Maria and the João

he talk-PST-3SG the Maria and the João
When coordination involves two different categorial terms, it is the first one that sets the categorial features of the coordination. Thus, the contrasts between (15a) and (15b) are due to the fact that *falar* ‘to talk’ in standard European Portuguese selects an oblique complement, not a CP:

(15)  a. (?) Ele falou [PP da sua investigação] e [CP que ganhara uma bolsa].
he talk-PST-3SG of the his research and that won-PST-3SG a grant
“He talked about his research and that he had won a grant.”

b. *Ele falou que ganhara uma bolsa*
he talk-PST-3SG that won-PST-3SG a grant

This fact suggests that the Specifier-Head-Conplement hypothesis, in (12), is more adequate than the Defective ConjP hypothesis, in (13): according to (12), the categorial value of Conj is valued during the syntactic derivation under Agree with the specifier of Conj (Colaço 2005, Johannessen 1998, Matos 1997), as in (16):

(16)  [ConjP=XP XP ConjX YP].

Nevertheless, when considering floating parenthetical coordination, a question arises: how to set up the categorial nature of the coordinate structure, in the absence of an overt specifier in ConjP?

Accepting (12), we would have to posit that a null category with propositional content (a proform or an elliptical CP) is externally merged in specifier of ConjP and, by Agree, values the categorial features of Conj, as in (17).

(17)  [ConjP=XP [XP Ø] [Conj [YP]]]

Alternatively, adopting (13), we would have to admit that Conj has its categorial features valued by its complement, as in (18):

(18)  [ConjP=YP Conj YP].

Thus, both hypotheses are able to account for the assignment of a categorial value to the coordinate structure.

---

5 Notice that a similar proposal has been adopted by several authors for Long Distance Agreement involving “subjects” in situ selected by unaccusative verbs:

(i) Chegaram os livros.
Arrive-PST-3PL the books
“The books have arrived.”

(ii) [CP C [TP chegaram] ... [VP chegaram [DP os livros] ] ]
However, the second problem challenges the adequacy of the Defective ConjP hypothesis: to what extent may we assume that there is a single term of coordination and still assume that we have a Conjunction? In fact, it is widely accepted, within different frameworks, that a coordinative conjunction connects (at least) two terms.

Accepting this claim to be correct, we will assume in the current paper that in floating parenthetical coordinate clauses Conj keeps its binary frame and a null specifier is merged. Hence, a full ConjP is derived, as in (17) above.

An empirical argument seems to support this claim: floating parenthetical coordinate sentences do not have a fronted counterpart (contrast (2), repeated in (19a), and (11) with (19b)), in opposition to floating parenthetical adverbial clauses (20):

(19) a. A Câmara — e o Público reconheceu-o —
    the city council — and the Publico acknowledge -PST-3SG it —
    debateu-se com dificuldades financeiras devidas a uma
    struggle-PST-3SG with difficulties financial due to a
    quebra das receitas.
    loss of the revenues

---

6 A reviewer asks in what way the adoption of the analysis illustrated in (17) differs from early analyses in the literature (Ross 1967 and Emonds 1979). First of all, we must be aware that these approaches seldom consider parenthetical coordination by itself. Thus, Ross (1967) and Emonds (1979), for instance, assume sentence coordination (cf. (i)) as the first step in the derivation of Appositive Relative Clauses (cf. (iii)), which would be followed by the insertion of the second conjoined sentence into the first one (cf. (ii)), and finally, by the replacement of the coordinate structure by the corresponding relative clause required elements (cf. (iii)):

(i) Enrico is the smartest of us all and he got the answer in seven seconds.
(ii) Enrico, and he is the smartest of us all, got the answer in seven seconds.
(iii) Enrico, who is the smartest of us all, got the answer in seven seconds.

The coordinate parenthetical construction would result from the apposition of the second term of the coordination to the relevant constituent (Ross:1967:239-240), or, alternatively, would be derived by right dislocation of all the linguistic material, with exception of the host constituent, to the end of the sentence (cf. Emonds 1979).

Notice that these proposals focus on appositive sentences, which are instances of anchored parentheticals. Still, even admitting that they could be adapted to handled floating parentheticals, it would be difficult to accommodate these proposals to the framework of the Minimalist Program, which assumes that sentence derivation proceeds bottom up. In fact, we would have to accept that, after having built the whole structure of the coordinate sentences, Internal Merge would apply to downgrade the second conjunct into the first one leaving a non-commanded copy. For recent approaches to floating parenthetical coordination see section 4 of this paper.

7 We are not claiming that this left peripheral constituent is interpreted as a case of floating parenthetical. Instead it may be merged in topic position, as defended by Costa (2004) for adverbs, following Duarte’s (1987) study on topic constructions in European Portuguese.
“The city council — and Público acknowledged it — struggled with financial difficulties, due to a loss of revenues.”

b. *E o Público reconheceu-o, a Câmara debateu-se and the Público acknowledge-PST-3SG it, the city council struggle-PST-3 com dificuldades financeiras. with difficulties financial

“And Público acknowledged it, the city council struggled with financial difficulties.”

(20) a. A Ana, se não me engano,atura chegahoje. the Ana, if not me mistake-PRS-1SG, arrive-PRS-3SG today “Ana, if I am not mistaken, arrives today.”

b. Se não me engano, a Ana chega hoje. If not REFL mistake-PRS-1SG, the Ana arrive-PRS-3SG today “If I am not mistaken, Ana arrives today.”

Since the parenthetical coordinate structure is notionally related to its host, we take this contrast as evidence for the existence of an omitted first term denoting the whole host sentence. The impossibility of (19), would result from the fact that the null specifier may not precede and c-command its antecedent. Also, we believe that the requirement on the null nature of this first conjunct is a consequence of economy: the occurrence of the overt material of the host clause would produce redundant information, which would constitute an unnecessary burden for interpretation at the interface levels.

Still, the status of this null specifier, as an ellipsis or a null proform with sentential content, is difficult to decide. Yet, the fact that the omitted first term must be preceded by at least a constituent of the host clause, marking the inclusion of the parenthetical inside its host, suggests that it requires a linguistic antecedent, a property often assigned to elliptical constituents. We will not develop this question further, leaving it for future investigation.

In sum, we assume that floating parenthetical coordinate sentences exhibit a null specifier with propositional content, interpreted as a CP denoting the host sentence at the level of semantic interpretation.

---

8 We are assuming that in examples like (19) the content of the host clause is recovered both by the null first term and the overt pronominal o ‘it’ inside the second term of the coordination. Notice that the repetition of propositional content inside the coordinate structure is not exceptional: in canonical (integrated) coordination the content of the first conjunct may also be denoted by a pronoun occurring inside the second conjunct:

(i) He is a very good student and everybody knows it.
4. The connection of the floating parenthetical with the host sentence

The structural autonomy of ConjP in coordinate parenthetical clauses raises the question of how they are related to their hosts. In recent work two main proposals have been put forward for different types of parenthetical constructions: the Radical Non-Integration hypothesis, and the Adjunction hypothesis.

4.1. The non-integration hypothesis and the Adjunction hypothesis

The Radical Non-Integration hypothesis claims that the parenthetical, in spite of being semantically connected to its host, is not integrated in its structure (Haegeman 1991, Huddleston at al. 2002, Safir 1986, a.o.). The association between parenthetical and host sentences would be postponed until the level of discourse interpretation.

This approach is problematic. As it has been emphasised (De Vries 2007, Kavalova 2007), parenthetical constituents may not be related to their hosts only at the semantic interface level or they would not be Spelled-Out at the level of phonological representation.

In turn, the Adjunction hypothesis assumes that parentheticals are syntactically integrated inside their hosts by Pair Merge. This hypothesis has been primarily proposed for other kinds of parenthetical constructions (e.g. Costa 2010, Jackendoff 1972, Potts 2002). We will extend it to floating parenthetical coordinate clauses.

4.2. Adjunction and the distribution of floating parentheticals

The Adjunction Hypothesis captures the fact that adverbials (Costa 2004) and floating parenthetical coordinate clauses present a similar distribution, as shown in (21) and (22):

\[(i) \ [XP XP \text{ConjP}]\]

Notice that Munn’s analysis is not able to account for floating parenthetical coordination since there is evidence that it prevents to take the linguistic expression preceding ConjP as the first term of the coordination.

Since we have adopted a restricted definition of floating parenthetical expression, which excludes its occurrence as an appendage, preceding or following the host sentence, we will not consider adjunctions to the left or right periphery of the host sentence. Besides, as we
The examples in (22) show that floating parenthetical coordinate sentences are left adjoined to the categories of the sentence and verbal domains, namely TP, AspP and vP\textsuperscript{12}. They also seem to indicate that left

\textsuperscript{12}Costa (2010) reaches similar conclusions for sentence modifying adverbs in European Portuguese, although he mainly considers the projections of Agr, T and VP.
adjunction to the lower projection including V and the indirect object produces slightly marginal results. This is unexpected according to the Bare Phrase Structure hypothesis, since the merge of the verb with the PP *aos pobres* ‘to the poor’ would produce a VP segment. Yet, the contrast between (22d) and (23) suggests that the problem has not to do with syntactic restrictions, but with the prosodic weight of the host constituent:

(23) *Essa instituição tem dado grande apoio, [VP e todos o reconhecem, [VP dado aos pobres que everybody it recognise-PTCP to the poor that vivem na rua] this year. live-PRS-3PL in the street*

“That institution has given great support, and everybody recognises it, to the poor that live in the streets, this year.”

As claimed in Frota and Vigário (2002) parenthetical clauses must be followed by a constituent that constitutes an Intonational Phrase. Thus, the following examples also contrast in acceptability, in spite of the fact that the parenthetical clause occurs in adjunction to TP:

(24) a. *As alunas, até onde sabemos, andam a estudar muito.*
    the students, as far as we know, are studying a lot
b. *?As alunas, até onde sabemos, estudam.*
    the students, as far as we know, study-PRS-3PL

In sum, the distribution of floating parenthetical clauses depends on the syntactic as well as on the prosodic properties of the host linguistic expression (Costa 2010, Frota and Vigário 2002, Martins and Mascarenhas 2004).

The characterisation of floating parenthetical as interpolations, which distinguish them from right appendages to the host sentence, leads us to the assumption that floating parenthetical coordinate clauses are instances of External Merge rather than Internal Merge. However, even if we had not excluded appendages from the floating parentheticals, it would be impossible to argue for a movement analysis positing a base position for the parenthetical, e.g., at the end of its host, (25), from where it would move and left adjoin to a syntactic category of the host clause.

(25) *Essa instituição tem dado grande apoio aos pobres that institution have-PRS-3SG give-PTCP great support to the poor este ano, e todos o reconhecem. this year, and everybody it recognise-PTCP* 

“That institution has given great support to the poor this year, and everybody recognises it.”
In fact, it is hard to see how the parenthetical could c-command its copy. As it is well known, a parenthetical clause blocks c-command from an external constituent, even when this constituent is not itself another parenthetical — see, for appositive relatives Brito 2006, De Vries 2006, 2007, Safir 1986 and for anchored appositive sentence coordination, Matos 2009. Thus, (26b), presenting canonical coordination, contrasts in acceptability with the floating parenthetical coordination in (27):

(26) a. *A Maria arranjou emprego em Lisboa e (ela) vive no Porto.
   The Maria get-PST_3SG job in Lisboa and (she) leave-PRS_3SG in the Porto.
   “Mary got a job in Lisboa and she lives in Porto.”
   b. *Ela arranjou emprego em Lisboa e a Maria vive no Porto.
   She get-PST_3SG job in Lisboa and the Maria leave-PRS_3SG in the Porto.
   “She got a job in Lisboa and Mary lives in Porto.”

(27) a. Ela, e a Maria vive no Porto,
   She and the Maria leave-PRS_3SG in the Porto.
   arranjou emprego em Lisboa get-PST_3SG job in Lisbon
   “She, and Mary lives in Porto, got a job in Lisbon.”
   b. Ela arranjou, e a Maria vive no Porto,
   She get-PST_3SG and the Maria leave-PRS_3SG in the Porto
   emprego em Lisboa job in Lisbon
   “She got, and Mary lives in Porto, a job in Lisbon.”

In (26) the subject DP in the first conjunct (Ela ‘she’) c-commands the second conjunct inducing a Principle C violation. In fact, when Agree operates, Conj assumes the category of its specifier and ConjP is understood as a segment of this specifier, in (26a) a TP: [ConjP=TP [TP DP…] Conj=T TP]; in this configuration, DP in specifier of the first conjunct c-commands the second conjunct. However, in (27), c-command from the subject DP of the host clause over the parenthetical sentence is blocked.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{13}\) A reviewer asks if the marginality of (26b) is due to c-command or is a consequence of precedence and pragmatic oddity.

The contrast between (26b) and (i) seems to confirm that c-command is involved – in (i) the preceding pronoun ela ‘her’ does not c-command the R-Expression, a Maria:

(i) Todos os amigos dela, trabalham no Porto e a Maria, só arranjou emprego
   all the friends of her work in Porto and the Maria only got job
4.3. The level of adjunction of the parenthetical

The blocking of c-command over the parenthetical clause clearly indicates its syntactic independence with respect to the host sentence. This fact seems to be easily accommodated by treating the parenthetical as an instance of Late Adjunction (Lebaux 1988)\textsuperscript{14}.

Still, this hypothesis raises a problem: How late must Late Adjunction apply? Considering that transfer operates only on vP or CP Phases, if we assume that Late Adjunction applies postcyclically (Stepanov 2001) in syntax before transfer to interface levels (Chomsky 2004, 2008), c-command over the adjunct would not be blocked and its effects with respect to binding and scope would not be prevented at the semantic interface.

In contrast, if we accept that Late Adjunction is a countercyclic operation that takes place after transfer to the phonological interface (Ochi 1999, Takahashi and Hulsey 2009, a. o.), we can account for the autonomy of the adjunct and the lack of c-command effects: the parenthetical clause and its host sentence will be separately derived in syntax and autonomously transferred to the semantic interface, where they will be semantically and pragmatically connected.

However, as a consequence of the point of application of Pair Merge, we

\textit{em Lisboa.}

in Lisboa

‘All her friends work in Porto and Maria only got a job in Lisbon.’

Besides, contrary to what the same reviewer claims, the availability of co-reference between the subjects in the English sentence in (iia), or its equivalent in Portuguese in (iib), is not exclusively due to pragmatic adequacy, but also to syntax:

(ii) \begin{itemize}
    \item a. She got a job in Lisbon, but Mary actually lives in Porto.
    \item b. Ela arranjou um emprego em Lisboa, mas a Maria \textit{realmente} vive no Porto.
\end{itemize}

she got a job in Lisboa, but Maria actually lives in Porto.

In fact, the comma pause turns the \textit{but}-sentence into a parenthetical, an appositive coordinate clause expressing a comment by the speaker. Notice that this interpretation is reinforced by the occurrence of ‘actually’, \textit{realmente}, in Portuguese.

Finally, the unavailability of a bound variable reading of the pronoun in (iii), is not a conclusive argument against the existence of c-command of the second conjunct by a specifier in the first conjunct. As a matter of fact, English has a more economical (thus privileged) strategy for bound variables in coordinate structures, the Across-the-Board strategy, illustrated in (iv):

(iii) \#Everyone laughed and he went home.
(iv) Everyone laughed and went home.

Assuming the vP Internal Subject hypothesis, each term of the coordination in (iv) exhibits a variable bound by \textit{everyone}, under c-command.

\textsuperscript{14} For a different approach to appositive parenthetical coordination, see Matos (2009).
may not expect that the different positions occupied by the adjunct determine any discursive or semantic effect on the parenthetical or the host clauses, due to the fact that the phonological level does not feed the semantic interface of the computational system. This expectation seems to be fulfilled by the data previously analysed (e.g. (22)), and the examples in (28)-(29):

(28) a. *Esta realidade (e quem dera que [pro] fosse ficção!) mostrou* this reality (and I wish [pro] were a fiction!) *show-PSt-3SG ao governo recém eleito todos os problemas que* to the government recently elected all the problems that *tinha de enfrentar.* have-PST-3SG to face

“That reality (and I wish it were fiction) made the recently elected government aware of all the problems it had to face.”

b. *Esta realidade mostrou (e quem dera que [pro] fosse ficção!) ao governo recém eleito todos os problemas que tinha de enfrentar.*

“That reality made (and I wish that it were fiction) the recently elected government aware of all the problems it had to face.”

c. *Esta realidade mostrou ao governo recentemente eleito (e quem dera que [pro] fosse ficção!) todos os problemas que tinha de enfrentar.*

“That reality made the recently elected government aware (and I wish it were fiction) of all the problems it had to face.”

In (29), the completive clause inside the parenthetical presents a null subject, [pro], which may ambiguously denote the subject topic, *esta realidade* ‘this reality’, or the predicative content of the host clause. This is evident in (29), where the overt counterparts of *pro* occur:

(29) a. *Esta realidade (e quem dera que [ela] / [isso]) fosse* this reality (and I wish that PRON-3SG-FEM/ it were *ficção!) mostrou ao governo recentemente eleito todos os problemas que tinha de enfrentar.* have-PST-3SG to face

That (he) have-PST-3SG to face
The availability of the pronouns *ela* and *isso* in (28)-(29) shows that the parenthetical clause may be interpreted as oriented to the subject or to the predication (the vP phase), independently of its site of adjunction inside the host clause. This ambiguity is expected, assuming that parenthetical clauses exhibit properties similar to those of adverbs. In fact, some adverbs may present subject or predicate oriented readings (e.g. Jackendoff 1972, Costa 2004). This is, for instance, the case of *erradamente* ‘wrongly’, which is interpreted either as “mistakenly”, (30a), or “in a wrong way”, (30b):

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Ela erradamente tinha resolvido todos os exercícios. She mistakenly have-PST-3SG solve_PTCP all the exercises “She mistakenly had solved all the exercises”
  \item b. Ela tinha resolvido erradamente todos os exercícios she have-PST-3SG solve-PTCP wrongly all the exercises “She had solved all the exercises in a wrong way”.
\end{itemize}

However, a property distinguishes parenthetical clauses from adverbs: in parenthetical clauses, the subject and the predication orientations do not seem to be so closely related to the place of adjunction of the parentheticals, revealing its autonomy with respect to the host clause.

In sum, there is no clear evidence that in floating parentheticals, the adjunction site inside the host has a semantic or discursive import over the parenthetical or the host sentences. Hence, Late Adjunction at PF seems to adequately account for the attachment of the parenthetical clause to its host.

6. Concluding remarks

We have argued that floating parenthetical clauses introduced by Conj constitute a specific case of coordination. They exhibit a full coordinate structure, but present a null constituent as the first the term of the coordination.

We assumed that floating parenthetical coordinate clauses are interpreted as CP-phases that modify the host sentence. They are left adjoined, by External Merge, to the functional and lexical projections available inside the CP- and v*P-phases. The adjunction approach allows us to assume that the parenthetical and its host are not structurally disconnected. However, due to the autonomy of the parenthetical clause, we considered they are Late Merged with their host at the phonological interface level.
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