Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի. Բանասիրություն
2026, Vol. 17, No. 2 (50), հունիս, 79-91
https://doi.org/10.46991/BYSU.B/2026.17.2.079

DISCOURSE-PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF APPOSITIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES AS PARENTHETICAL CONSTRUCTIONS

ASTGHIK CHUBARYAN[*]
Yerevan State University
MARINE EVOYAN[**]
Vanadzor State University

This paper examines the discourse functions of appositive relative clauses (ARCs) based on Chafe's (1976) information-packaging theory, which suggests that the information status of the main clause (MC) and that of the ARC differ significantly, inasmuch as the main clause conveys foreground content while ARCs provide background information, with the former playing a decisive role in the interpretation of the overall utterance. While ARCs have so far been thoroughly studied from morphological and syntactic points of view, their semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation have received comparatively less attention. Based on Loock's (2010) classification, three main types of ARCs are identified: continuative appositive relative clauses (CARCs), relevance appositive relative clauses (RARCs), and subjectivity appositive relative clauses (SARCs). While RARCs and SARCs generally provide supporting details and background information, CARCs are unique in that they present events on the same informational level as the main clause, effectively placing both parts of the sentence in the foreground. This blurry demarcation line between main and subordinate clauses shows that ARCs are far more than supplementary details; they considerably contribute to the meaning of the utterance through establishing a number of semantic and chronological relations between clauses. These inter-clause connections including, but not limited to, causality, consequence, contrast, or concession shape the semantic weight of ARCs and reveal variability of their illocutionary force across contexts and interlocutors.

Key words: *appositive relative clauses, information packaging, discourse pragmatics, foreground-background interplay, parentheticals.*

[*] **Astghik Chubaryan –** Professor at the Chair of English Philology of the YSU
Աստղիկ Չուբարյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի պրոֆեսոր
Астгик Чубарян – профессор кафедры английской филологии ЕГУ
Email: astghik.chubaryan@ysu.am ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4413-6044
[**] **Marine Evoyan –** Lecturer at the Chair of Foreign Languages and Literature of Vanadzor State University
Մարինե Էվոյան – Վանաձորի պետական համալսարանի օտար լեզուների և գրականության ամբիոնի դասախոս
Марине Эвоян – преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков и литературы Ванадзорского государственного университета
Email: marine.evoyan@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5108-4491

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Ստացվել է՝ 12.02.2026
Գրախոսվել է՝ 23.02.2026
Հաստատվել է՝ 09.06.2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Introduction

Among parenthetical constructions, appositive relative clauses (ARCs) stand out for their diverse discourse functions, conditioned both by the interplay between the foreground and background information they provide and by the way the speaker's perspective is introduced. Despite their communicative importance, ARCs have not been thoroughly examined from semantic and pragmatic perspectives. This paper addresses this gap by investigating the discourse-pragmatic roles of ARCs, using Loock's (2010) threefold classification as a theoretical foundation. Specifically, the study focuses on three primary types of ARCs: continuative, relevance, and subjectivity appositive relative clauses, each distinguished by their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties.

The article aims to explore how these three types of ARCs function as parenthetical constructions that enrich meaning, enhance discourse coherence, and guide interpretation across different communicative contexts. Drawing on data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), this study employs contextual-semantic and pragmatic analysis to examine how ARCs, despite their syntactic subordination, often display considerable pragmatic independence and significantly contribute to the semantic and rhetorical organisation of an utterance.

Theoretical Background

An enormous amount of research has been dedicated to relative clauses, exploring the well-established dichotomy between restrictive (also called defining or identifying) clauses (henceforth in this article RRCs) and non-restrictive (non-defining, non-identifying, or appositive) clauses (henceforth *ARCs*). Of these two types, ARCs are of particular interest as they straddle the boundary between RRCs and parentheticals, sharing certain structural properties with the former and pragmatic functions with the latter. ARCs have received considerable attention in the literature (Emonds 1979; Safir 1986; Fabb 1990; Burton-Roberts 1999; Del Gobbo 2007; Arnold 2007; Loock 2010; de Vries 2012b; Lee-Goldman 2012).

Regarding the syntactic status of ARCs, some researchers consider ARCs to be syntactically integrated in the main clause (henceforth MC) (Jackendoff 1977), while others argue that they are integrated only at discourse-level (Emonds 1979). Accordingly, both integrated (adjunct) and non-integrated ("orphanage" in Haegeman's term) (Haegeman 1991) syntactic approaches to ARCs have been suggested in the literature (de Vries 2006: 231–4; Loock 2010: 21–35; and Heringa 2011: 122–9). As far as their semantics and pragmatics are concerned, they have not been studied as extensively as their morphological and syntactic properties. Herein lies the actuality of this research, which falls within the scope of discourse pragmatics and aims to explore different pragmatic interpretations of ARCs from the perspective of the *information-packaging theory* proposed by Chafe (1976), who uses the term *packaging* to refer to "the kind of phenomena at issue, with the idea that they have to do primarily with how the message is sent and only secondarily with the message itself" (1976:28). What can be inferred from Chafe's *information-packaging theory* is that interlocutors make use of different syntactic means to express the same information and that their choices are governed by semantic and pragmatic constraints conditioned by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

Scholars generally agree that ARCs provide background information whereas the content of the MC is perceived as foregrounded. For example, Loetscher (1973) and

Cornilescu (1981) distinguish between *"hot news"* and *"not so hot news,"* using this contrast to assess the extent to which the informational content of each clause contributes to the overall communicative value of the utterance. Cotte (1997:134–135) evaluates the information status of ARCs by ascribing to them some value and some subordinate character, which highlights their partial integration into the main clause. Loock (2010) also maintains that ARCs serve as a syntactic means of backgrounding information and that the content they convey is less significant than that of the MC. He further poses the following questions to explore their role in discourse and to examine how they affect the information content of the MC in particular, and of the utterance as a whole: "Why do speakers use such a syntactic structure? What do they intend to convey when they make this particular linguistic choice?" To answer Loock's questions, it is essential to consider how the propositional contents of the MC and the ARC interact, as this inter-clausal link determines how the embedded information is understood, interpreted, and evaluated within the overall meaning of the utterance. According to Loock, ARCs enable speakers to connect two clauses in such a way that their implicit semantic relationship is left to be inferred by the listener. The informational contents of the main clause (P) and the ARC (Q) do not simply add up (*P & Q*). Instead, the meaning of the whole sentence extends beyond this simple combination. The different semantic relationships between MCs and ARCs such as causality, consequence, or concession explain why speakers prefer an ARC over, for example, a coordinated clause. The interpretation of the implicit link between the MC and the ARC heavily depends on the interplay with co-text and context, as well as on the addressees' presumed encyclopedic knowledge (Loock 2010).

Some researchers argue that ARCs represent a semi-independent clause, sometimes a completely independent clause. Fowler & Fowler (1949:85) consider ARCs as the insertion of an "independent comment, description or explanation". Emonds (1979) contends that ARCs are "interpolated" at discourse-level.

Thus, it becomes clear that although the content of ARCs is treated as background information, as opposed to the informational content of the main clause in the foreground, it substantially affects the informational status of the MC through the way in which the embedded information is perceived, ranked in importance, and integrated with the MC. This loose or partial syntactic integration is the feature that ARCs share with parentheticals, which is why many scholars classify them among the most thoroughly studied types of parentheticals (Jackendoff 1977: ch.7; Sells 1985; McCawley 1988: ch.13; Demirdache 1991; Del Gobbo 2003; Potts 2005). For example, Emonds (1979: 216) emphasizes the "essential similarity between parentheticals and appositive relatives". Safir (1986) considers both ARCs and parenthetical expressions 'extra' constituents which are attached to independently grammatical sentences and are accounted for at the level of his proposed LF.

In this paper, the analysis of ARCs from a pragmatic perspective is based on Loock's taxonomy (Loock 2010), which classifies the discourse functions of ARCs into three principal categories:

- Continuative Appositive Relative Clauses (CARC)
- Relevance Appositive Relative Clauses (RARC)
- Subjectivity Appositive Relative Clauses (SARC)

The main distinctive feature among these three types, when evaluated in terms of foreground/background interplay, is that CARCs have the same informational status as MCs,

presenting a further event in the narrative chain (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1064). Such an absence of hierarchy between the two clauses has led some authors to suggest that CARCs share syntactic characteristics with independent clauses (Emonds 1979). Despite their subordinate syntax, CARCs unlike RARCs and SARCs function at the same semantic and syntactic level as the main clause, with both clauses interpreted as foreground information despite their semantic dependence. From this perspective, the relative pronoun in CARCs functions more like a coordinator than a subordinator (Loock 2010).

Pragmatic Functions of Continuative Appositive Relative Clauses (CARCs)

The analysis of CARCs has been carried out within the framework of the *foreground vs. background interplay*, based on the notion of *grounding* developed by Hopper and Thompson (1980). They define foregrounded clauses (or *foreground*) as "comprising the backbone or skeleton of the text, forming its basic structure," whereas backgrounded clauses (or *background*) "put flesh on the skeleton, but are extraneous to its structural coherence" (Hopper & Thompson 1980:281). Clauses belonging to the foreground are generally ordered in a temporal sequence, and "a change in their order will result in a change in the temporal sequence of the original semantic interpretation" (Labov 1972:360). By contrast, background clauses are not ordered with respect to one another and can even be omitted without distorting the structural coherence of the utterance (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 282). This definition provides a solid basis for the investigation of discourse functions of CARCs in academic discourse, using examples drawn from the COCA linguistic corpus. Given the widely accepted view that relative clauses in English can convey foregrounded information (Depraetere 1996), we aim to show that CARCs can convey such information, aligning with what Thompson (1987) labels "narrative subordination." As shown in the examples below, the continuative nature of the CARCs is clear from the narrative dynamism they create.

(1) The constitution, passed in 1988, guarantees free health care and university education, and the country's minimum wage is now so high that it applies to one in three workers. And during the 1980s, prices rocketed out of control in part because the government attempted to ease the financial burden on its citizens by linking wage raises to price increases. This generated a vicious cycle ***whereby price spikes triggered wage increases, which then forced employers to further increase prices****. [COCA, Academic,2012]*

(2) The legation staff tried to entertain her but made it clear from the start that she should expect no help form them. In the meantime, she established contacts with prominent Swiss newspapermen and liberal intellectuals, ***who called her attention to the strict Swiss neutrality laws, a lesson that she would learn and use later****. [COCA, Academic,2002]*

(3) Perhaps the most telling way to assess the immigrant contribution is to ask what would happen if the influx stopped or if those already here left the country. Those who favor comprehensive reform believe this would be disastrous-in some regions, they say, whole sectors of the economy could collapse. Restrictionist opponents counter that a cutoff would mean at most a temporary inconvenience for a few employers, ***who would soon wean themselves from their dependence on foreign workers****. [COCA, Academic,2006]*

(4) The work of Ehman is specifically highlighted as a key to exploring the effects of a teacher's personality in the classroom on the student's attitudes and values. The author views as critically important Ehman's finding that teachers who allowed greater freedom of expression in the classroom were correlated with students who expressed more positive attitudes toward the political system. Freedom of expression is marked as a crucial teacher characteristic by the author, ***who then moves on to discuss studies of teacher experiences and the survey findings of those characteristics that teachers themselves saw as important for social studies instruction****. [COCA, Academic,1990]*

What all four examples have in common is their narrative dynamism; due to their continuative nature, the CARCs push the narrative forward from the proposition in the MC to that of the CARC without disrupting the smooth flow of ideas. Though the CARCs are syntactically subordinate and dependent on the MCs, they demonstrate a high degree of pragmatic independence, since they introduce new content that is important for readers or listeners to better understand the narrative or argument. As far as the semantic value of their foregrounded information is concerned, it is considerable, and its propositional importance is equal to that of the main clause. Pragmatically, all the CARCs maintain topical continuity and enhance discourse sequentiality, thereby boosting topical unity and discourse coherence.

Despite these similarities, the CARCs considerably vary in the type of inter-clausal relations they have with their MCs and in the way they advance the discourse.

The continuative nature of the CARCs in Example (1) is more evident due to the overt cause-effect sequence: the wage increases subsequently led to additional price rises. The two CARCs *whereby price spikes triggered wage increases* and which *then forced employers to further increase prices* are both foregrounded since they present **new propositional content** with strong causal and temporal links. The pragmatic value of the CARC is strong because it successfully completes the causal chain, foregrounding the consequences as an integral part of the explanation. The relative adverb *whereby* establishes the causal relationship, fulfilling an explanatory discourse function. The resumptive temporal marker *then* not only reinforces the temporal and causal sequence but also functions anaphorically, reconnecting the CARC to the ongoing discourse. Thus, the CARCs offer new propositional content, significantly enriching the semantic composition of the whole utterance rather than fulfilling a merely subordinate role, whether descriptive or restrictive.

In Example (2), the CARC *who called her attention to the strict Swiss neutrality laws* starts with the temporal adverbial *in the meantime* which pushes the narrative forward and maintains temporal and thematic continuity, thereby providing more simultaneity than causality or direct consequence. The CARC functions to enrich the narrative by contributing additional propositional content and provide foreshadowing

Example (3) stands out from (1) and (2) because the dynamism it creates is not temporal or causal; instead, it establishes a contrastive argumentative structure by setting up a clear opposition between two viewpoints. The CARC who *would soon wean themselves from their dependence on foreign workers* does not merely describe the noun phrase *a few employers*; it foregrounds a prediction and advances the discourse by clarifying consequences and stating a key justification. The CARC's pragmatic function is therefore rhetorical rather than chronological: it performs a rhetorical counterbalance, engaging the reader in the debate rather than progressing a narrative sequence.

Example (4) belongs in a more academic setting. The CARC *who then moves on to discuss studies of teacher experiences ...* is not merely descriptive; it pushes the discourse forward by introducing the next logical step in the author's reasoning. It serves as a discourse bridge, showing how the author moves from one focus (freedom of expression) to a new related topic (teacher experiences). The flow of ideas is enhanced by the resumptive pronoun *then*, which highlights the logical rather than temporal development of the discussion.

Overall, these examples demonstrate that although CARCs maintain narrative continuity and foreground new propositional content, their discourse-pragmatic functions vary considerably, ranging from causal relations and temporal progression to rhetorical contrast and logical sequencing.

Pragmatic Functions of Relevance Appositive Relative Clauses (RARCs)

RARCs are the most common subtype of appositive relative clauses found in both spoken and written texts (Loock 2010). They can be analyzed from the perspective of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, specifically the Maxim of Relation, which holds that any contribution to a conversation should be relevant, and the Maxim of Quantity, which states that the speaker should provide as much information as is needed without overestimating or underestimating the hearer's background knowledge about the topic of the conversation. This is important because there must be an appropriate balance between the speaker's message-encoding process and the listener's message-decoding process for communication to proceed smoothly. Here, the speaker's role is particularly significant, as the speaker should tailor the utterance to the hearer's presumed knowledge, adjusting the message so that it is neither too obvious nor too confusing for the hearer.

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986:158), relevance means that, first, the information the speaker wants to convey should be important enough to justify the listener's processing effort, and second, the intended message should be the most effective means of expressing that information. More precisely, relevance is a comparative property determined by two factors. An assumption is more relevant if it produces greater contextual effects and even more relevant if it requires less mental effort to process. The higher the effort, the lower the relevance, which means that if information processing takes a lot of effort, relevance decreases considerably (Sperber and Wilson 1986: 125). This theoretical framework is central to understanding why and how RARCs are used. A speaker often includes RARCs to make the message easier for the hearer to process. As Cornilescu (1981: 58) explains, RARCs generally help the speaker distinguish between "hot news," foregrounded primary information, and "not so hot news," backgrounded or supplementary material.

Thus, RARCs perform a dual role at the same time: (1) ensuring that the information is not irrelevant or confusing for those who lack background knowledge, and (2) avoiding redundancy for those who are already familiar with it.

To investigate the key pragmatic functions of RARCs, we have applied the three discourse strategies proposed by Loock (2010): leveling the shared cognitive space, legitimizing the antecedent, and providing explanation, justification, or concession.

The Leveling of the Shared Cognitive Space

Loock (2010) explains the main distinguishing feature of RARCs as follows: "The insertion of an ARC serves to provide supplementary information that compensates for discrepancies in shared knowledge. The addressees may not be familiar with the referent

or the content of the ARC (hearer-new information), so the speaker aims to level the shared knowledge and reduce the gap between informed addressees (for whom the information is hearer-old) and uninformed addressees (for whom it is hearer-new)."

Let's now examine how the strategy of *levelling of the shared cognitive space* allows the speaker to use RARCs to provide background information, ensuring that all listeners, whether familiar with the topic or not, can fully understand the message in the examples below.

(5) The Joint Commission, ***which accredits many U.S. hospitals and surgery centers****, issued a safety alert last year about disinfection and sterilization of medical devices in response to a growing rate of noncompliance. [COCA, News,2018]*

(6) " I think everyone, all the major carriers, are hiring flight attendants right now, " said Karen Watson, a spokeswoman for Dallas-based American Airlines, ***which stopped actively recruiting in 1993 but is now hiring again, in New York and around the country.*** *[COCA, News,1998]*

In both examples (5) and (6), RARCs are introduced to level the shared cognitive space between the speaker and the listeners. They provide essential background information that ensures that both informed and uninformed listeners or readers can follow the discourse with little or no misunderstanding or confusion.

In (5), the RARC *which accredits many U.S. hospitals and surgery centers* supplements the proper noun *The Joint Commission* with the aim of enhancing the overall coherence of the utterance. It assumes that the antecedent may not be familiar to all participants in the discourse. For informed interlocutors, this information is perceived as hearer-old (they already know what The Joint Commission is), whereas for uninformed ones, the RARC provides hearer-new information that is essential for successful decoding. Thus, the speaker attempts to compensate for a potential discrepancy in background knowledge between informed and uninformed listeners.

In (6), the RARC is *which stopped actively recruiting in 1993 but is now hiring again, in New York and around the country.* The antecedent *American Airlines* is arguably more widely known than *The Joint Commission* in (5); however, the company's hiring history may still be hearer-new for many listeners. To this end, the speaker introduces the RARC to indicate the shift from not recruiting to actively hiring, thereby emphasizing the relevance of the news being reported. The clause helps narrow any potential gap in shared knowledge: even if the audience is familiar with American Airlines, they may not be aware that it had not been hiring since 1993.

Thus, the RARCs in both examples significantly enhance the listeners' understanding of the antecedents by enriching their semantic value with information that is syntactically dependent and semantically backgrounded.

The Legitimacy of the Antecedent

The strategy of *legitimizing the antecedent* is a vital function of the RARC, as it justifies why this particular noun (the antecedent) is relevant and important to the discourse. Since the antecedent may often seem unfamiliar or unknown to some listeners, simply mentioning it in the MC may not be enough for them to identify it, let alone grasp the necessary information about it. The RARC provides additional details to establish the antecedent's credibility, authority, or relevance. By doing so, the RARC ensures that the antecedent is recognized as a legitimate participant in the conversation, someone or

something entitled to offer an opinion, judgment, or information, thus making the entire message more meaningful and coherent for all listeners (Loock 2010).

(7) If the players know you like them, they can take it, and all of my players know that underneath everything I love them. Nelson, ***who has won NBA Coach of the Year honors twice and come in second another time****, is the favorite to win the honor for an unprecedented third time this season.993 but is now hiring again, in New York and around the country. [COCA, News, 1992]*

(8) San Francisco police Capt. Denis O'Leary, ***who sits in on every session of the South of Market court to read police reports,*** *believes the city's existing approach is the right one because it gives perpetrators of crimes and the neighbors who are affected by them the chance to talk it out. [COCA, News,2007]*

In both examples, the RARCs are effective means of legitimizing the antecedents by providing information that justifies their authority or relevance. In (7), the RARC *who has won NBA Coach of the Year honors twice and come in second another time* legitimizes the antecedent *Nelson* by presenting his past achievements as justification for why he is a deserving candidate to win the award. Without this additional information, readers or listeners unfamiliar with Nelson might not understand why he receives such attention or recognition. Thus, this strategy has significant pragmatic value: the RARC reinforces the epistemic status of the antecedent, making the statement not only more authoritative but also more coherent, especially for those who lack contextual knowledge.

The RARC in (8) *who sits in on every session of the South of Market court to read police reports* **legitimizes O'Leary's authority to speak on the issue** by highlighting his ongoing expertise and firsthand knowledge **gained through his** active role in court proceedings. This helps listeners understand why his opinion on the city's approach to crime and community engagement is regarded as credible and well-founded.

Explanation, Justification, Concession

This strategy involves using RARCs to add extra information that explains, justifies, or contrasts with what is said in the MC. Unlike other types of clauses, the RARC does not contain conjunctions such as *because, although*, to explicitly emphasise the sematic relations between the MC and RARC. Instead, the connection between them is implicit, meaning the listener must infer it from the context.

For example, the RARC might explain why something in the MC happened, justify why the speaker considers something important or acceptable, or concede a point by showing a limitation or contrast. Because this link is not overtly stated, it sheds new light on the MC or the antecedent in a subtle way, making the whole message more relevant and informative. This implicit link enables the speaker to say more than the plain addition of the informational contents of the two clauses (Loock 2010).

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986), RARCs can form part of an explicature, a richer, context-based interpretation that arises through decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution, and other pragmatic processes. In other words, the meaning of an utterance with an RARC goes beyond simply adding together the content of the two clauses (Khalifa 1999: 27–28; Cornilescu 1981).

(9) *The difference these days is that while most of his younger Vietnam colleagues have moved on to more restful fields like editing, book writing and speechmaking, Arnett,* ***who's pushing 60****, is still out there on the ragged edge. [COCA, News,1991]*

(10) Jacey Norton and her husband, Joe, of Framingham, Mass., started the Korean Adoption Circle to help families like themselves. The Nortons adopted two Korean children, and as they visited with other white adoptive parents, they realized that the children, ***who had rarely seen an Asian adult,*** *were under the impression that they would grow up to be Caucasian. [COCA, News,2000]*

As can be seen from both examples, the inter-clausal semantic relationship between the main clause (MC) and the RARC is not expressed explicitly. In (9), the RARC *who's pushing 60* conveys concession, but the concessive meaning is implied (*though Arnett is nearly 60, he's still working actively in a risky field*), highlighting the contrast between age and activity. Hence, the RARC conveys more than just descriptive information; it implicitly reveals a contrast.

Though in (10) the RARC does not contain any causal connector like *because*, the **causal relation between the MC and RARC is still inferred.** The RARC explains **why** the children mistakenly believed they would grow up to be Caucasian: ***"Because*** *the children didn't often see Asian adults, they thought they would grow up to look like white people*". This type of implicit causal explanation is a means to express cause tentatively, leaving the correct interpretation for the listener to infer.

These examples illustrate how RARCs can enrich the utterance by implicitly expressing semantic relations such as concession and cause, making the message more informative and pragmatically coherent.

Pragmatic Functions of Subjectivity Appositive Relative Clauses (SARCs)

The third type of ARCs is the SARC, which expresses the speaker's or writer's subjective stance by conveying their personal judgment or attitude toward the proposition of the main clause. SARCs explicitly or implicitly add an evaluative, commentary, or attitudinal dimension that further describes or qualifies the content of the MC.

According to Loock (2010), speakers can use ARCs to introduce an opinion, a comment or a judgement on the propositional content of the MC sometimes without realizing that they digress temporarily from the natural course of discourse creating a discrepancy, "a break between two levels: the referential/objective level vs. the commentary/subjective level. The ARC contains markers of modality, such as modal auxiliaries, vocabulary denoting judgment or appreciation."

Loock (2010) distinguishes between explicit and implicit subjectivity in ARCs. Subjectivity can be explicit when speakers use clearly evaluative or judgmental words, as in the examples mentioned below, where they directly express their own or others' opinions.

(9) The expressed objectives of the Concord Lyceum, established in 1828, were the "improvement in knowledge, the advancement of Popular Education, and the diffusion of useful information throughout the community," words that could have been lifted from the constitution of the Mississippi Society. Despite the twenty-five years and fifteen hundred miles between them, the founders of both societies shared similar ideals, ***which perhaps should not be a surprise****, as these were widely-held nineteenth-century American ideals. [COCA, Academic, 2017]*

(10) Now I don't think this is the moment to attempt to unpack, repack, explicate, reaffirm, or criticize Benjamin. It is striking though that we still seem to be haunted, almost plagued, by the same concerns, and I mean not only what I might call the anthropological concerns of that essay but as well the political concerns of that essay, ***which I***

think we might simply say has aged relatively well in that it continues to irritate us thirty-five or forty years later. *[COCA, Academic,2004]*

Both examples use SARCs to add the speaker's personal opinion or judgment to a factual statement, drawing a clear demarcation line between the objective and subjective dimensions, namely between what is stated as fact and how the speaker wants the reader to interpret it. In Example (11), the SARC *which perhaps should not be a surprise…* tentatively suggests that the similarity of the nineteenth-century ideals is not surprising. With the help of the modal markers *perhaps* and *should*, the speaker offers a restrained and hedged evaluation of the situation, indirectly getting the reader to perceive and accept the similarity as normal or expected. This makes the comment feel more like a polite suggestion rather than a firm opinion.

In Example (12), the SARC *which I think we might simply say has aged relatively well…* explicitly expresses the speaker's personal evaluation. The author does not merely state a fact but offers a reflective judgment about the essay's ongoing impact. The pragmatic function is rather interesting since it balances the impact of the markers of modality used in close proximity: first, the epistemic marker *I think* shows a slightly stronger and more personal evaluation, which is followed by *we might simply say*, which considerably softens the assertion, making it tentative. Finally, the hedge *relatively* reduces the force of the evaluation. Although the speaker tries to soften the impact of the evaluation, the comment feels more direct compared with that of example (11).

Thus, both SARCs interrupt the factual flow to add personal judgment, but in example (11) it is done in a more subtle, tentative way, while in example (12) it is based on a clearer and more personal opinion. This difference affects how strongly the reader is guided to accept the speaker's viewpoint.

As far as implicit subjectivity is concerned, it does not directly express the speaker's or writer's personal attitude or evaluation; on the contrary, the author's opinion is implied and hidden within the language instead of being stated openly. This makes the statement sound objective, but it actually reflects a personal judgment. Because of this, readers might not notice it and may accept it as a fact. Unlike explicit subjectivity, implicit subjectivity seems neutral or factual but indirectly conveys a subjective perspective, which is perceived differently depending on the situational context and the interpersonal relations between interlocutors. It often involves presuppositions and may depend on the way the information is framed.

Here is how Loock (2010) classifies implicit subjectivity: "Sometimes the subjectivity is so implicit that we need to create an extra subcategory of ARCs between relevance and subjectivity ARCs. … We consider such ARCs as an exploitation of the complex inter-clausal link we mentioned earlier. Such a technique enables the speaker to say things without encoding them linguistically but paving the way for inferences that readers are meant to make."

Below is a classic example of **implicit subjectivity:**

(11) A little way down, standing water had turned an empty stretch of land into a pond, and a building under construction had gained a perfect moat. The farther south I went, the worse the smells became. In Stuy Town I spent some time with New York Cares and visited my father's 75-year-old cousin, ***who cheerfully talked about the relentless dark, sick neighbors, and watching the cars float by on the road that had become a river.*** *[COCA, Blog,2012]*

In this example, the SARC *who cheerfully talked about the relentless dark, sick neighbors, and watching the cars float by…* shows implicit subjectivity through irony. The word *cheerfully* functions as an ironic presupposition trigger and carries significant pragmatic value. It assumes that the cheerfulness is real or relevant. However, the grim circumstances *(the relentless darkness, sick neighbors, and flooded streets)* make this attitude doubtful, leaving it for the reader or the listener to notice the contrast. Thus, there is a clear mismatch between what is explicitly said and what is implied. This mismatch creates an ironic tone rather than an objective evaluation.

Thus, these examples demonstrate that SARCs are a powerful tool for explicitly and implicitly embedding the speaker's perspective into discourse. Their pragmatic functions can range from polite comment or remark to strong evaluation or irony, depending on how readers perceive, interpret, and respond to the MC's content.

Conclusion

This study has examined the discourse-pragmatic functions of ARCs as parenthetical constructions that extend well beyond their traditional peripheral role. The findings reveal that CARCs, although syntactically subordinate, frequently carry foregrounded information and actively advance the discourse by establishing causal, temporal, or contrastive relations. RARCs provide backgrounded details that clarify and legitimize antecedents, enriching their meaning through situational context and implicit semantic relations such as cause or concession, while SARCs convey the speaker's viewpoint, ranging from polite comments to irony, depending on the listener's interpretation of the main clause. Despite their structural dependence, all three types of ARCs demonstrate significant pragmatic independence, thereby enriching discourse across a variety of communicative contexts.

ԱՍՏՂԻԿ ՉՈՒԲԱՐՅԱՆ, ՄԱՐԻՆԵ ԷՎՈՅԱՆ – *Ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունների խոսույթային գործաբանական գործառույթները որպես միջանկյալ կառույցներ* – Հոդվածում վերլուծվում են ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունների խոսույթային գործառույթները՝ հիմնվելով Չեյֆի (Chafe, 1976) տեղեկատվության կառուցվածքավորման տեսության վրա, ըստ որի՝ գլխավոր նախադասության և ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասության տեղեկատվական կարգավիճակները էականորեն տարբեր են։ Մասնավորապես, գլխավոր նախադասությունը կրում է առաջնային բովանդակություն, մինչդեռ ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունը ապահովում է ֆոնային տեղեկատվություն։ Թեև ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունները լայնորեն ուսումնասիրվել են ձևաբանական և շարահյուսական տեսանկյուններից, դրանց իմաստաբանական արտահայտումը ու գործաբանական մեկնաբանությունը համեմատաբար սակավ ուշադրության են արժանացել։

Լուքի (Loock, 2010) դասակարգման հիման վրա տարբերակվում են ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունների երեք հիմնական տեսակներ՝ շարունակական (continuative appositive relative clauses, CARCs), առնչական (relevance appositive relative clauses, RARCs) և սուբյեկտիվ ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասություններ (subjectivity appositive relative clauses, SARCs)։ Եթե RARCs-ը և SARCs-ը, որպես կանոն, ապահովում են հավելյալ տեղեկություն և ֆոնային բովանդակություն, ապա CARCs-ը առանձնանում է այն բանով, որ իրադարձությունները

ներկայացնում է գլխավոր նախադասության հետ նույն տեղեկատվական մակարդակում՝ երկու նախադասություններն էլ դարձնելով առաջնային միավորներ։
Գլխավոր և երկրորդական նախադասությունների միջև ոչ հստակ տարբերակումը վկայում է այն մասին, որ ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունները չեն կարող դիտվել որպես զուտ լրացուցիչ կամ երկրորդական բաղադրիչներ. դրանք էականորեն նպաստում են ասույթի ընդհանուր իմաստին՝ հաստատելով իմաստաբանական և ժամանակագրական տարբեր հարաբերություններ նախադասությունների միջև: Այդ հարաբերությունները, որոնք արտահայտում են պատճառականություն, հետևանք, հակադրություն կամ զիջում, ձևավորում են ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասությունների իմաստաբանական կշիռը և բացահայտում դրանց իլոկուտիվ ուժի փոփոխականությունը տարբեր համատեքստերում և տարբեր խոսակիցների միջև։

Բանալի բառեր – *ոչ սահմանափակող որոշիչ երկրորդական նախադասություններ, տեղեկատվության կառուցվածքավորում, խոսույթային գործաբանություն, առաջնային–ֆոնային փոխազդեցություն, միջանկյալ կառույցներ*

АСТГИК ЧУБАРЯН, МАРИНЕ ЭВОЯН – *Дискурсивно-прагматические функции аппозитивных относительных предложений как вставных конструкций*. – В данной статье рассматриваются дискурсивные функции аппозитивных относительных предложений (АОП) на основе теории информационного структурирования, предложенной Чейфом (Chafe, 1976). Эта теория предполагает, что информационный статус главного предложения (ГП) и АОП значительно различается: главное предложение передаёт информацию переднего плана, тогда как АОП предоставляют фоновую информацию, при этом именно главное предложение играет решающую роль в интерпретации всего высказывания. Несмотря на то, что АОП подробно изучались с морфологических и синтаксических позиций, их семантическое представление и прагматическая интерпретация остаются относительно мало исследованными.
На основе классификации Лука (Loock, 2010) выделяются три основных типа АОП: континуативные аппозитивные относительные придаточные (continuative appositive relative clauses — CARCs), релевантные АОП (relevance appositive relative clauses — RARCs) и субъективные АОП (subjectivity appositive relative clauses — SARCs). В то время как RARC и SARC, как правило, предоставляют поддерживающую информацию и служат фоном, CARC представляют собой особый тип, поскольку они выражают события на том же информационном уровне, что и главное предложение, эффективно помещая обе части высказывания на передний план. Это размытое разграничение между главным и придаточным предложением указывает на то, что АОП — это не просто дополнительная информация, а полноценные элементы высказывания, вносящие значительный вклад в его значение путём установления различных семантических и хронологических связей между частями предложения. Эти межпредложенческие связи, включая, но не ограничиваясь причинностью, следствием, противопоставлением или уступкой, формируют семантическую значимость АОП и выявляют вариативность их иллокутивной силы в зависимости от контекста и участников речевого взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: *аппозитивные относительные придаточные, информационное структурирование, прагматика дискурса, соотношение переднего и фонового плана, вставные конструкции*

Ethics Statement
The authors confirm that all ethical requirements regarding the research have been met.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Arnold D. (2007). Non-Restrictive Relatives are not Orphans. Journal of Linguistics, 43, 2, 272– 309.
Burton-Roberts N. (1999). Language, linear precedence and parentheticals. The Clause in English, 33–52. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Chafe W. L. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. Subject and Topic, 25–55. New York: Academic Press.
Cornilescu A. (1981). Non-restrictive Relative Clauses, an Essay in Semantic
Description. Revue roumaine de linguistique, 26.1, 41–67.
Cotte P. (1997). Grammaire linguistique. Paris: CNED Didier Erudition.
Del Gobbo F. (2007). On the syntax and semantics of appositive relative clauses. Parentheticals,173–201. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Del Gobbo F. (2003). Appositives at the Interface. PhD dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
Demirdache H.K. (1991). Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives and dislocation structures. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Depraetere I. (1996). Foregrounding in English Relative Clauses. Linguistics, 34, 699–731.
Emonds J. (1979). Appositive Relatives Have No Properties. Linguistic Inquiry, 10.2, 241–243.
Fabb N. (1990). The Difference between English Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses. Linguistics, 26, 57–78.
Fowler H. W., Fowler F. G. (1949). The King's English. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Grice H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. Studies in Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts, 41– 58. New York: Academic Press.
Haegeman L. (1991). Parenthetical Adverbials: the radical orphanage approach. Aspects of Modern linguistics, 232– 254. Tokyo: Kaitakushi.
Heringa H. (2011). Appositional Constructions. Groningen: LOT: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.
Hopper P., Thompson S. A. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. Language 56, 251– 299.
Huddleston R., Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: CUP.
Jackendoff R. (1977). X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Khalifa J. C. (1999). A Propos des relatives appositives. Syntaxe, sémantique, pragmatique. Anglophonia, 6, 7–29.
Labov W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Lee-Goldman R.(2012). Supplemental relative clauses: internal and external syntax. Journal of Linguistics 48(3), 573–608.
Loetscher A. (1973). On the Role of Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses in Discourse. Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society (April 13–15), 356–368.
Loock R. (2010). Appositive relative clauses in English: discourse functions and competing structures. John Benjamins Publishing.
McCawley J. D. (1988). The Syntactic Phenomena of English, Volume 2, Chapter 13. Chicago: CUP.
Potts C. (2005). The Logic of Conventional Implicatures. Oxford: OUP.
Safir K. (1986). Relative clauses in a theory of binding and levels. Linguistic Inquiry 17(4), 663–89.
Sells P. (1984). Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Sperber D., Wilson D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Oxford: Blackwell.
Thompson S. A. (1987). Subordination and Narrative Event Structure. Coherence and Grounding in Discourse, 435– 454. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Vries M. de. (2006).The syntax of appositive relativization: on specifying coordination, false free relatives, and promotion. Linguistic Inquiry 37(2), 229–70.
Vries M. de. (2012). Parenthetical main clauses – or not? On appositives and quasi-relatives. Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons, 177–202. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Online sources

Davies, M. (2008–). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Retrieved from https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/