1 Introduction: comment clause, parentheticals, and pragmatic markers

1.1 Introduction

The reader of an Early or Late Modern English text, upon encountering the expressions highlighted in (1), might well be reminded of the discourse markers – *pragmatic markers*[1] – of Present-day English:

(1) a. A practise which **I trust** shal shortely come to light (1539 Cromwell in Merriman, *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell* (1902) II. 199 [*OED*]).
   b. A cat maie looke on a king,[2] **ye know** (a1562 Heywood, *Woorkes. A Dialogue Conteynyng Prouerbes and Epigrammes* (1867) 57 [*OED*]).
   c. They follow the dead corpse to the graue with howling and barbarous outcries, pitifull in apparance: whereof grew, **as I suppose**, the prouerbe: To weepe Irish [orig. Hibernice lacrimari] (1586 Stanyhurst, *A Treatise Contayning a Playne and Perfect Description of Irelande* viii. 44/2 in Holinshed [*OED*]).
   d. But some then will demaund, where had Pope Alexander . . . that map or net at Rome wherin (**it is said**) the napkin of our Sauiour Christ is preserued (1608 Topsell, *The Historie of Serpents* 220 [*OED*]).

A pragmatic marker is defined as a phonologically short item that is not syntactically connected to the rest of the clause (i.e., is parenthetical), and has little or no referential meaning but serves pragmatic or procedural purposes. Prototypical pragmatic markers in Present-day English include one-word inserts such as *right, well*, *okay*, or *now* as well as phrases such as *and things like that* or *sort of*. Such pragmatic markers have been extensively studied in contemporary English (see the pioneering work of Schiffrin 1987), and increasingly in the history of English. Other parenthetical items of a clausal nature, such as *I mean*, *I see*, or *you*

---

[1] For reasons set out in Brinton (1996:40), I prefer the designation "pragmatic marker." On the various names that have been proposed, see Brinton (1996:29) and Schourup (1999:228–230).

[2] "A cat may look on a king" is a figure of speech that may be glossed 'there are certain things which an inferior may do in the presence of a superior.'

1

2   The Comment Clause in English

know, are also typically identified as pragmatic markers, but the history of these
forms has received considerably less attention. Following Quirk *et al.* (1972:778)
in *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, I will refer to these clausal pragmatic
markers as "comment clauses." Unlike non-clausal pragmatic markers, comment
clauses – as will be shown in the following study – arise primarily in the EModE
and LModE periods.

Clausal pragmatic markers include a wide variety of formal structures. A
preliminary classification is the following:

(a)   first-person pronoun + present-tense verb/adjective: *I think, I suppose, I
      guess, I reckon, I fear, I hope, I hear, I feel, I understand, I admit, I see, I'm
      sure, I'm convinced, I'm afraid*;
(b)   second-person pronoun + present-tense verb/adjective: *you know, you see*;
(c)   third-person pronoun + present-tense verb/adjective: *it seems, they say,
      they allege, one hears*;
(d)   conjunction + first-/second-/third-person pronoun + present-tense
      verb/adjective: *as I'm told, as I understand (it), as you know, so it seems,
      as everybody knows*;
(e)   imperative verb: *look, say, listen, say, mind you, mark you*; and
(f)   nominal relative clause: *what's more, what's more {surprising, annoying,
      strange, etc.}, what annoys me*.

Modalized forms (*I dare say, I must say, I can see, you must admit, you may know*),
passive forms (*it is said, it is claimed, it is rumored, as was pointed out*), perfect
forms (*I have read, I have heard*), and negative forms (*I don't know, I don't doubt*)
also exist, as do some interrogative tag forms (*wouldn't you say?, don't you think?*).
The majority of comment clauses attested in contemporary English belong to
category (a), namely, first-person forms. Note that in most cases the clause to
which the parenthetical attaches could serve as the missing complement to the
verb or adjective (that is, *John has been promoted, I'm told ∼ I'm told that John
has been promoted*).

This chapter will begin by situating comment clauses (§1.4) among the larger
categories of sentence adverbial (§1.2) and disjunct (§1.3). It will then seek to
elucidate the nature of a "parenthetical" (§1.5). Section (§1.6) argues that the
parenthetical comment clauses are best understood as pragmatic markers. The
chapter ends with details concerning the structure of the study that follows and
a description of its methodology (§1.7).

1.2   Sentence adverbial

The broadest category to which comment clauses could be said to belong is
that of "sentence adverbial." These are forms which function either as sen-
tence modifiers, or "disjuncts" (e.g., *frankly*), or as connectors, or "conjuncts"

(e.g., *moreover*).[3] Sentential adverbials have three distinctive characteristics (see Swan 1988:29; Bussmann 1996:s.v. *sentential adverb*). They are speaker-oriented, expressing, as Bussmann notes, "the subjective attitude of the speaker towards some state of affairs." They have sentential scope, and they have clausal properties or can be understood as reduced sentences; that is, *frankly* can be understood as expressing the clause 'I am being frank when I say . . . .' In the category of sentence adverbial, Bussmann includes modal adverbs such as *maybe* and prepositional phrases such as *without a doubt*. Jackendoff (1972:95–100) argues for classifying comment clauses such as *I think, I assume, I don't think*, or *I doubt* as "speaker-oriented" sentence adverbials.

Swan's semantic typology of sentence adverbials distinguishes evaluative adverbs (*predictably, remarkably*), modal adverbs (*certainly, actually, supposedly*), subject disjuncts (*cleverly, stupidly, wisely*), and speech act adverbs (*precisely, bluntly, frankly*) (1988:30–77). González-Álvarez (1996:219–220) provides a similar typology, which combines Swan's first and third categories:

(a) evaluative adverbs, which indicate the speaker's attitude towards the statement, both agent-oriented (*wisely, cruelly*) and content-oriented (*happily, regrettably*);[4]
(b) epistemic adverbs, which indicate the speaker's attitude towards the statement, including logical (*certainly*), evidential (*clearly*), distancing (*allegedly*), and performative (*admittedly*) adverbs; and
(c) illocutionary adverbs, which modify an implicit illocutionary verb, including attitude (*frankly, simply*), presentation (*briefly, simply*), and participant (*privately, confidentially*) adverbs.

Ifantidou (2001:97–99) divides the epistemic category into evidential adverbs, which denote the source or strength of the speaker's evidence (e.g., *clearly, obviously*), and hearsay adverbs, which claim that the source of knowledge is not the speaker's (e.g., *allegedly, reportedly*).

Hansen (1998:57–62) shows that sentence adverbials bear many similarities to pragmatic markers. They do not have referential or propositional function, they typically occupy sentence-initial position, they mainly serve to comment on the clause to which they are attached, they are not integrated fully into the syntactic structure of the clause, and they often carry an independent tone. Moreover, these qualities account for the non-focalizability of sentence adverbials (in clefts,

---

[3] On the distinction between conjunct and disjunct, see Quirk *et al.* (1985:501ff.). Hansen (1998:57–62) suggests that although the tests to distinguish these two categories are not foolproof, disjuncts but not conjuncts may generally serve as answers to *yes/no* questions: *Will John be attending the lecture? Yes, unfortunately/*besides.*

[4] The difference between these two is that in the case of content-oriented adverbs the speaker's evaluation does not apply to the subject.

interrogatives, negatives); for example, {*Predictably, certainly, wisely, bluntly*} *he left early* > ∗*It was* {*predictably, certainly, wisely, bluntly*} *that he left early*.[5]

1.3   Disjunct adverbial

Of the two types of sentence adverbials, Quirk *et al.* (1985:612ff.) classify disjuncts as adverbial elements that convey either the speaker's comment on the style or form of what is being said ("style" disjuncts) or the speaker's observations on the content of the utterance ("content" disjuncts). Each class has two subclasses. Style disjuncts may express either modality/manner (e.g., *truthfully*) or respect (e.g., *generally*), while content disjuncts may express the degree of or conditions for truth, such as conviction, doubt, truth, or falseness (e.g., *really, certainly*), or a value judgment on the content, that is, a judgment applied to the subject (e.g., *wisely, to my regret, what is even more important*).

Quirk *et al.* note that disjuncts have a "superior role in respect to other sentence elements"; they are syntactically more detached, they have scope over entire sentences, and they are "in some respects superordinate" (1985:613). While the position of disjuncts is flexible, initial position is most common; in this position, disjuncts are typically set off by comma punctuation (González–Álvarez 1996:233). In contrast with prototypical adverbial elements – i.e., adjuncts – disjuncts cannot be in focus position in a cleft, they cannot be in contrast in interrogation, they cannot be within the scope of predication of pro-forms, and they cannot be focused by a focusing subjunct (Quirk *et al.* 1985:613). Style and content disjuncts display somewhat different syntactic behavior as the former can generally modify questions and imperatives whereas the latter cannot (627–628). Finally, Quirk *et al.* (1985:618–620) observe that style disjuncts may be put to metalinguistic use as comments on the form of the linguistic utterance itself (e.g., *strictly speaking, if I may say so, so to say*).

According to Quirk *et al.* (1985:617), disjuncts may also be realized as PPs (e.g., *in all seriousness*), infinitives (e.g., *to everyone's surprise*), *-ing* participles (e.g., *putting it bluntly*), *-en* participles (e.g., *crudely put*), and finite clauses (e.g., *if I may say so*). They note that these more expanded expressions are often formed with the same lexical base as the simple adverb.

1.4   Comment clause

Quirk *et al.* (1972:778; 1985:1114ff.) use the term "comment clause"[6] to describe parenthetical disjuncts that have a clausal structure and comment on the clause

---

[5] By Hansen's (1998) definition of pragmatic markers ("non-propositional linguistic items whose primary function is connective, and whose scope is variable" [73]), conjuncts are pragmatic markers, but disjuncts are not (59). Cf. §1.6.

[6] For a brief history of the term see Peltola (1982/1983:103). Quirk *et al.* (1972:778) describe comment clauses as disjuncts or conjuncts, while Quirk *et al.* (1985:1112) describe them as disjuncts.

to which they are attached. These include forms such as *I suppose, you know, as
you say,* and *what is more surprising.*

The notion of COMMENT is understood in a variety of ways. For Quirk *et al.*
(1985:1114–1115) comment clauses are both style and content disjuncts; they
function as hedges expressing tentativeness over truth value, as expressions of
the speaker's certainty, as expressions of the speaker's emotional attitude towards
content of the matrix, and as claims to the hearer's attention. According to Peltola
(1982/1983:103) comment clauses are "metacommunicative": they "comment
on the truth value of a sentence or a group of sentences, on the organization of the
text or on the attitude of the speaker." Biber *et al.* (1999:197, 864–865, 972) see
comment clauses as markers of "stance," or the expression of personal feelings,
attitudes, value judgments, or assessments (966), denoting epistemic stance (*I
think, I guess*), attitude (*as you might guess*), or style (*if I may say so*) (853ff.).[7]
Palacas (1989) likewise sees parentheticals as primarily subjective; they express
"a self, a first person, expressing reflections for the benefit of the implied second-
person listener/reader, thus drawing the latter into the communicative event"
(516). Urmson (1952:484), in a discussion of what he calls "parenthetical verbs"
(i.e., comment clauses), observes that they "prime the hearer to see the emotional
significance, the logical relevance, and the reliability of our statements." Bolinger
(1989:190–191) sees comment parentheticals as qualifying "in some way the
intent or import of the frame sentence or some part of it" by referring to truth
value, pointing out incidentalness, making comparisons, expressing degree, or
describing a protagonist. Finally, Espinal (1991) sees parenthetical disjuncts
as serving as a "sort of metalinguistic COMMENT" (760) in that they can
connect to the speaker or addressee, provide information about the attitude of
the communicator, introduce assumptions, or provide information about the
context of interpretation.

In medial and final position comment clauses are parenthetical, or loosely
connected syntactically with the anchor clause (see Peltola 1982/1983:102). In
initial position, especially in conversation where *that* deletion is frequent, the
syntactic status of expressions such as *I think* may be indeterminate between
main clause and parenthetical (Biber *et al.* 1999:197, cf. 1076–1077; Kaltenböck
2005:43–45). As parentheticals, comment clauses generally form a separate tone
unit and are marked by increased speed and lowered pitch and volume (Peltola
1982/1983:102; Quirk *et al.* 1985:1112, 1113).

Some comment clauses are quite "stereotyped" or "formulaic" (Quirk *et al.*
1985:1114; Biber *et al.* 1999:197), while others are much freer. They are char-
acteristic of oral discourse. Biber *et al.* note that while certain comment clauses

---

[7] Biber *et al.* (1999:981, 1086, 1136n) argue that *I mean, you know, you see, mind you,* and *now then*,
because they are primarily interactive rather than markers of stance, are discourse markers ("finite
verb formulae" [1086] or "unanalysable wholes" [1078]) but not comment clauses. However, they
inconsistently cite these same forms as examples of comment clauses (197), and they observe that
in final position, they are more like comment clauses (1136n).

6 The Comment Clause in English

are very common, overall their rate is low (1999:983). *I think* is common in conversation on both sides of the Atlantic, but British English favors *I suppose* and *you see* while American English prefers *I guess*, *I mean*, and *you know* (982, 1096–1097). Second-person forms are typical of conversation and fiction (862).

Biber *et al*. distinguish between non-adverbial and adverbial comment clauses (*I think*, *I suppose*, *I guess* vs. *as you say, as I've said, as you might expect, to be honest, to tell the truth*). The former typically consist of first- or second-person pronouns, not third-person pronouns, with simple present-tense verbs (*I think, I guess, I bet, I suppose, I believe*, but also *I would say, who knows, it seems, it appears*) (865, 983). Quirk *et al*. (1985:1112–1120) identify three types of comment clauses formed with finite verbs:

(a) those such as *I believe* which resemble matrix clauses with a transitive verb or adjective otherwise requiring a *that*-clause complement;
(b) those such as *as you know* which resemble finite adverbial or relative clauses; and
(c) those such as *what is more important* which resemble nominal relative clauses.

Type (a) comment clauses are syntactically defective since the verb or adjective lacks its normal complementation. Type (b) clauses are often intermediate between a relative and an adverbial construction, with *as* meaning either 'which' or 'in so far as' (1116). *It* may or may not be present (e.g., *as (it) seems likely*). Less often, comment clauses may be formed with *to*-infinitives, *-ing* participles, and *-ed* participles.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002:1350ff.) identify a class of "supplements" which bears similarity to Quirk *et al*.'s comment clauses. These are expressions which occur in linear sequence but are not integrated into syntactic structure. They are either interpolated or appended, they are intonationally separate or set off by punctuation, they are semantically related to the clause with which they occur (they must be compatible), and they are semantically non-restrictive. Huddleston and Pullum (2002:1356) recognize a wide variety of supplements, including among others, relative clauses, verbless clauses, non-finite clauses, and interjections. The main clause type of supplement departs from the canonical structure of main clauses because it is structurally incomplete (1356).

Peltola (1982/1983:103ff.) provides an extensive typology of comment clauses:[8]

(a) inserted main clause, e.g. – *there's no harm in naming him* –
(b) sentence apposition, e.g., – *worse luck!*
(c) non-additive *and* clauses, e.g., *and I know that they are great*
(d) non-alternative *or* clauses, e.g., *or so it seems*

---

[8] One should note that a number of these categories (e.g., i–k) are not clausal at all. Peltola seems to be giving a list of parentheticals rather than comment clauses, strictly speaking.

(e) non-conditional *if* clause, e.g., *if I refrain from discussing these questions, if you'll forgive the expression*

(f) parenthetic *as* clause, e.g., *as I had thought, as far as I can tell*

(g) parenthetic relative clause, e.g., *what is more, which sometimes happens*

(h) elliptical predicative in front position, e.g., *no wonder, more important*

(i) interjection, e.g., *thank God*, 'fortunately'

(j) adverb, either opinionative, e.g., *understandably* (< *it is understandable*), signaling, e.g., *honestly*, or modal, e.g., *possibly* (cf. *I think/suppose/imagine*)

(k) prepositional phrase, e.g., *in summary* (cf. *to sum up*)

(l) parenthetic epistemic main clause, e.g., *I guess, one wonders, it is asserted, he argues*

(m) absolute use of the infinitive, either modal, e.g., *truth to tell*, opinionative, e.g., *to give him his due*, or signaling, e.g., *to begin with*

(n) absolute use of the present participle, e.g., *judging by the headlines*.

1.5   Parenthetical

Before proceeding it is important to examine in more detail what is meant by the concept of parenthetical and how the form and syntactic status of parentheticals can best be understood. Parentheticals are frequently attributed to disfluency or performance difficulties, but many are deliberately selected for stylistic reasons or as a communicative or pragmatic strategy (Wichmann 2001:191; Blakemore 2005:1167).

1.5.1   Definition of a parenthetical

Parentheticals may be succinctly defined as "syntactically unintegrated elements which are separated from the host clause by comma intonation and function as comments" (Rouchota 1998:105, also 97).[9] Huddleston and Pullum (2002:895) point out another general quality of parentheticals, namely that they have non-parenthetical uses in which the anchor serves as complement rather than main clause.

Parentheticals are defined by their **lack of syntactic connection** with the clause to which there are attached (their "anchor"; see Huddleston and Pullum 2002:1351n). Syntactically, parentheticals are described as "peripheral" to, "unintegrated" with, "independent" of, or "loosely linked" to their anchor. Their relation is one of linear adjacency, but the parenthetical and anchor do not form a single grammatical construction, nor is the parenthetical an immediate constituent of the anchor (Peterson 1998; Schelfhout *et al.* 2004:331). As a result, a parenthetical cannot be the focus of a cleft, cannot be questioned, does not follow sequence of tense, and so on (Espinal 1991:730–733). It does not participate

---

[9] A volume on parentheticals appeared too late to be included in the following discussion (Dehé and Kavalova 2007).

in any syntactic processes in the anchor domain (Dehé and Kavalova 2006:293); for example, it is passed over by VP deletion (McCawley 1982:96), it is not subcategorized by verbs in the anchor (Espinal 1991:735), and initial position of a parenthetical does not cause inversion in the anchor in a verb-second language (Schelfhout 2000; Schelfhout *et al.* 2004).[10] Nonetheless, Blakemore (2005:1166) observes that parentheticals must be "licensed by grammar even though they have no syntactically specified function in the structure that contains them."

A consequence of the syntactic independence of parentheticals is their **positional mobility**. They may be either "juxtaposed" (sequentially ordered before or after the main clause) or "interpolated" (Peterson 1998), what Schelfhout *et al.* (2004:331) call "intercalations." Although the position of the parenthetical is assumed to be free, there are some syntactic constraints on its position; it cannot occur between a verb and its complement (Jackendoff 1972:98) nor within the premodifier of an NP or between a P and its complement (Schelfhout 2000; Potts 2002:645–646). Kaltenböck (2005:42) suggests that there are certain "weak spots" which more readily admit the insertion of parentheticals than others. There are discourse constraints as well: a parenthetical cannot occur before non-focused constituents (Peterson 1998:24) and it rarely interrupts new information or a major constituent (Schelfhout *et al.* 2004).

The parenthetical's independence from the anchor is also reflected prosodically. A parenthetical is marked by "comma intonation" (pauses in speech, or actual commas in writing) that separates it from its anchor. Bolinger (1989:186) identifies three prosodic characteristics of parentheticals, relating these to their syntactic and semantic qualities: lower pitch (denoting their "incidentalness"), set off by pauses (denoting their "separation"), and rising terminal (denoting their "link up" with the anchor). However, he notes that all three of these features may be missing or reduced in any given case. Wichmann (2001) raises further doubts concerning the prosodic features of parentheticals. She observes that while some parentheticals show the canonical features of lowering pitch along with lack of accent (what she calls "compression"), others show "expansion," or the raising of pitch, while still others show "integration," or continuation of the pitch direction of the previous tone (thus not representing a prosodically separate entity) (see also Kaltenböck 2005:28).

Semantically, parentheticals exhibit independence from their anchor as well. The parenthetical is a separately planned utterance (Palacas 1989:514; Wichmann 2001:181), giving information that is "related to but not part of the main message" (Biber *et al.* 1999:137–138). The parenthetical provides second-order reflection, commentary, or evaluation upon the anchor (Palacas 1989:514) and is backgrounded semantically in respect to the anchor, which communicates

---

[10] Even those aspects of parentheticals that might point to some degree of syntactic incorporation, such as (occasional instances of) sequence of tense, backwards pronominalization, and constraints on negative and interrogative parentheticals, are likely independently motivated by pragmatic principles (Kaltenböck 2005:31–34).

the important information (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:896). Focusing on the
semantic function of parentheticals, Bolinger (1989:190) identifies three types:
comment, revision (e.g., *I mean, rather*), and decision (*well, let's say*) parenthet-
icals. Comment parentheticals are the largest class, often providing additional
information or afterthought. Revision parentheticals provide self-corrections or
metalinguistic repairs in which "the speaker makes a ceremony of correcting
himself" (190–191). Decision parentheticals are concerned with word-finding.

According to Biber *et al.* (1999:1067), a parenthetical's being independent
entails that it "could be omitted without affecting the rest of that structure
or its meaning." Wichmann (2001:181) likewise suggests that were parenthet-
icals edited out, the utterance would remain well-formed (see also Hübler
1983:114). In respect to semantics, both statements would point to the **non-
truth-conditionality** of parentheticals; that is, they are not relevant to the
conditions that must hold in any possible world for the anchor sentence to be
true.[11] A test for non-truth-conditionality that has been proposed (see Asher
2000:32) is the impossibility of embedding the parenthetical in the protasis of a
conditional clause. We see that this test is valid for comment clauses:

If he's not working, he's not happy, {frankly, as far as I can tell}.
?If {frankly, as far as I can tell} he is not working, he's not happy.

The non-truth-conditionality of parentheticals is a position maintained in speech
act theory (see Rouchota 1998:109), but it has come into question more recently
(see §2.2).

1.5.2   *Types of parentheticals*

Kaltenböck (2005) notes a lack of consensus about what is delimited by the term
parenthetical, listing seventeen different categories ranging from main clauses to
discourse markers that have been included among the category of parentheticals.
In an early study, Corum (1975) includes sentential adverbs, adverbial phrases,
parentheticals (e.g., *I believe, Harvey says*, etc.), some non-restrictive relative
clauses, and rhetorical tag questions (e.g., *isn't it?, doesn't he?*) in a category called
"parenthetic adjuncts."[12] The members of this category share functional as well
as syntactic properties in that they may all be used for speaker evaluation, soften-
ing, and what she terms a "sneaky" or deceptive use "to seduce the addressee into
believing the content of the proposition" (135). Espinal (1991:726–727) provides
an extensive list of structures that may function as grammatical parentheticals:
these include sentences (e.g., *I guess, that is*), appositive relatives (sentential, non-
restrictive), adjectival phrases (e.g., *difficult to quantify*), adverbial clauses (e.g.,
if that makes you feel any better), adverbial phrases (e.g., *frankly*), noun phrases

---

[11] Another way to understand the non-truth-conditionality of parentheticals is to understand them
as having no propositional status (Hübler 1983:115).

[12] By the criteria given above, these would be disjuncts, not adjuncts.

10   The Comment Clause in English

(e.g., *ladies and gentlemen*), propositional phrases (e.g., *on the contrary*), and com-
bined structures. Asher's (2000:31) list of non-truth-conditional items includes
many of the same items, such as mood indicators, interjections (e.g., *gee, too bad*),
discourse adverbials (e.g., *allegedly*) and adverbial clauses (e.g., *as Mary assures
us*), pragmatic conditionals (e.g., *If you know what I mean*), discourse particles
and discourse connectors (e.g., *but, therefore*),[13] and parentheticals missing a
verbal complement (e.g., *I hear*).

Espinal sees parentheticals as falling into three types on the basis of form:
those containing a pronominal expression linking the parenthetical to the main
clause (e.g., *which was a good thing*), those with a syntactic gap filled conceptu-
ally by the main clause (e.g., *I think*), and those which are self-contained (e.g.,
frankly) (729). Focusing on clausal parentheticals, Kaltenböck (2005) deter-
mines that that are two main types: asyndetic and syndetic. Asyndetic clausal
parentheticals include coordinated main clauses (introduced by *and* or *or*), non-
restrictive relative clauses (adnominal, nominal, and sentential), appositive or
content clauses, adverbial clauses, and right-node raising. Syndetic clausal par-
entheticals include three types: (a) self-contained parentheticals (independent
main clauses, semantic gap-filling clauses); (b) reduced or gap-containing paren-
theticals (main clause-like comment clauses, reporting clauses); and (c) amalga-
mated clauses. He divides category (b) of reduced parentheticals into two types:
commenting and reporting. After some deliberation, he limits the latter to third-
person forms such as *he says, she reported*.[14] The former includes all first- and
second-person forms as well as evidentials such as *it is said* and *I was told*.

1.5.3 Syntactic derivation of parentheticals

According to Kaltenböck (2005:22) there are three ways in which the syn-
tactic "dilemma" of parentheticals – the fact that they do not enter into any
syntactic hierarchical relation with their host clause but intervene in its linear
order[15] – can be accommodated: by adding an extra level of syntactic struc-
ture, by elaborating transformations, or by excluding parentheticals from the

---

[13] Rouchota (1998) provides a detailed argument for considering adverbial discourse connectives
(*however, nevertheless*) as parenthetical: they are relatively free in position, they are separated from
their host by a pause, they have low tone (are backgrounded), they function as a comment or gloss
on the clause, they take the whole clause within their scope, and their position affects their scope
and interpretation (see also Potts 2002). She argues further that they are procedural in meaning and
function as parenthetical discourse markers. According to the perspective of Relevance Theory,
discourse connectives "fulfil the commenting function by encoding procedural meaning and by
constraining the implicatures of an utterance" (1998:113).

[14] Inquits or reporting clauses, such as *she said*, are not included in this study as they appear to
function rather differently (see, e.g., Banfield 1982).

[15] On the conflict between linearity and hierarchy in parentheticals, see also Burton-Roberts
(2006:181).