



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/139754/>

Version: Published Version

Conference or Workshop Item:

Grillo, Antonino, Fernandes, Bruno, Costa, João et al. (2014) Pseudo Relatives vs. Relative Clauses: Greater preference, lower costs. In: Architectures and Mechanisms of Language Processing, 03 Sep 2014 - 06 Dec 2018, University of Edinburgh.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

PSEUDO RELATIVES VS. RELATIVE CLAUSES: GREATER PREFERENCE, LOWER COSTS

NINO GRILLO*, BRUNO FERNANDES*, JOÃO COSTA*, AND ANDREA SANTI*

*Centro de Linguística da Universidade Nova de Lisboa, *University College London
nino.grillo@gmail.com, bruno86fernandes@gmail.com, jcosta@fcs.unl.pt, a.santi@ucl.ac.uk

RC ATTACHMENT ASYMMETRIES

Variation in Relative Clause (RC) attachment preferences across languages has posed problems for a universal parser. (a,b) ([2], a.o.) :


LOW ATTACHMENT, LA

a. Someone shot the maid₁ of the actress₂ that was standing on the balcony₂


HIGH ATTACHMENT, HA

b. Algúien disparó contra la criada₁ de la actriz₂ que estava en el balcón₁

a. Low Attachment



b. High Attachment



A number of factors have been shown to influence attachment (including e.g. *syntactic position, prosody, referentiality, animacy*), and several accounts for the asymmetry have been proposed. However, there is a general consensus that none of them is fully satisfactory [5, a.o.].

THE PR CONFOUND

Grillo & Costa (2012, 2014) [7]: In some languages and structures, apparent RCs can also be interpreted as Pseudo Relatives (PRs) (1-a). PRs and RCs are string identical, but have very distinct structural and interpretive properties:


- RCs are adjuncts of NPs and denote properties of entities.
- PRs, like English eventive Small Clauses (SC) denote events (1-b).

- (1) a. Ho visto [_{PR} Gianni che correva].
Have.I seen [Gianni that run.IMPF].
*I saw John that ran.
b. I saw [_{SC} John running].

Contrary to RCs, PRs can only be selected by a restricted set of predicates, including e.g. perceptual (*see, hear*) but not stative predicates (*live with, be married to*).

→ CRUCIALLY, WHEN PR IS PROJECTED IN COMPLEX NP CONTEXTS, DP2 IS NOT AN ACCESSIBLE SUBJECT :

- (2) a. Ho visto [_{SC} il figlio_i del medico_j che EC_i/s_j correva]
b. I saw [_{SC} the son_i of the doctor_j;running_i/s_j]




PR-first Hypothesis (Grillo & Costa 2014):

- When PRs are available, everything else being equal (e.g. lexical, contextual and prosodic factors), they will be preferred over RCs.
- Rationale: PRs (predicational) are both structurally and interpretively simpler than RCs (restrictive).
- Consequences:

- A. Low Attachment preference with genuine restrictive RCs, i.e. when PRs not available, across languages and structures.
B. High Attachment preference in languages and structures which allow PR.

PR-first correctly applies to Basque, Chinese, Dutch, English, European Portuguese, French, Galician, Greek, Italian, Korean, Japanese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish. The apparently problematic HA preference in German, Bulgarian and Russian can be reduced to independent principles such as *Anaphoric Binding* (Hemforth et al. 2000) and *Implicit Prosody* (Fodor 1998a,b, 2002).

Grillo and Costa 2014 [7] directly manipulated PR availability through verb type: event-introducing (PR ok) vs. states-introducing (*PR) Verbs (e.g. *see* vs. *live with*). The results are strongly supportive of *PR-first*:



Similar results were also obtained in other PR-languages, including **Portuguese** and **Spanish** (Grillo, Fernandes and Costa 2012, Fernandes 2012, Grillo, Tomaz, Lourenço Gomes and Santi 2013), **Greek** (Grillo and Spathas 2014) and **French** (Grillo, Pozniak, Hemforth and Santi, in preparation).

REFERENCES

- Cinque. 1992. The Pseudo-Relative and Acc-ing constructions after verbs of perception. *University of Venice WPL*.
- Cuetos & Mitchell. 1988. Cross-linguistic differences in parsing. *Cognition*, 30.
- Declerck. 1982. The triple origin of perception verb complements. *Linguistic Analysis*, 10.
- Fernandes. 2012. *O estatuto das PseudoRelativas em Português Europeu*. MA Thesis, UNL.
- Fernández. 2003. *Bilingual sentence processing: Relative clause attachment in English and Spanish*. John Benjamins.
- Fodor. 2002. Prosodic disambiguation in silent reading. In *Proceedings of NELS*.
- Grillo & Costa. 2014. A novel argument for the universality of parsing principles. *Cognition*, 133.

EXPERIMENT 1: FULL RELATIVES

PR-availability, however, covaries with the semantics of the main predicate (e.g., perceptual vs. stative). Factors other than PRs (including argument structure, event structure, and plausibility) could potentially be invoked to explain the results.

PR-first: significantly smaller effect of PR-availability in English than Italian.

GOAL Assess whether predicate distinction alone can alternatively account for prior results by testing a non-PR language, English.

To test the role of PR-availability in attachment preferences we manipulated:

- PR availability in the verbal domain contrasting event-introducing (✓PR) vs. states-introducing (*PR) predicates (e.g. *see* vs. *live with*)
- PR availability in the nominal domain contrasting event-introducing nouns (✓PR) vs. object denoting nouns (*PR) (e.g. *picture* vs. *house*).

Method: Questionnaire, PC running *Linger* (Doug Rodhe, <http://tedlab.mit.edu/dr/Linger>). *Participants*: (n=30) English Speakers. *Materials and Design*: 2x2 crossing *Verb Type*(PR and noPR) and *position* (object vs. subject); 24 sets of target sentences (4 versions each), 70 fillers; Counterbalanced materials and questions.

Stimuli

- A. *PR predicate / Verbal*
John heard the teacher of the boy that was singing. RC-only
- B. *PR predicate / Nominal*
The film of the teacher of the boy that was singing is of low quality. RC-only
- C. *RC-only predicate / Verbal*
John runs with the teacher of the boy that was singing. RC-only
- D. *RC-only predicate / Nominal*
The jacket of the teacher of the boy that was singing is red. RC-only

RESULTS

ATTACHMENT PREFERENCE




Table 2: Results of linear mixed model fit for Attachment Preferences in Experiment 1. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

contrast	coefficient	SE	z-value	p-value
Predicate Type	0.7387	0.2183	3.384	0.000714 ***

→ Overall LA across all conditions! (Contrary to Italian).

Nonetheless: Significant effect of *V-type*: Higher proportion of HA in PR-compatible than RC-only.

RESPONSE TIME

Table 3: Mean RT per Condition




Table 4: Results of linear mixed model fit for RTs. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value
PR vs. RC	0.092282	0.026429	-3.49

→ Significant effect of *Attachment*: Significantly shorter RTs for LA choices than HA choices across all conditions.

COMPARISON

To directly test this greater effect of grammar over predicate semantics, we ran a mixed model logistic regression adding *Experiment* to *predicate-type* and *Environment* as fixed factors, with random slopes and intercepts fit for the fixed effect.

ATTACHMENT COMPARISON

contrast	coefficient	SE	z-value	Pr(> z)
Predicate Type	1.50065	0.18544	8.092	5.85e-16 ***
Predicate Type*Experiment	-1.55802	0.36040	-4.323	1.54e-05 ***
Predicate Type*Environment*Experiment	1.25753	0.56927	2.209	0.0272 *

→ Stronger HA preference in the PR-compatible condition in Experiment II (SC/reduced RCs) than Experiment I (full RCs).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is part of the project 'Syntactic and lexical factors in processing complexity' funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia with the research grant PTDC/CLE-LIN/114212/2009 awarded to Nino Grillo. We gratefully acknowledge the FCT contribution.

EXPERIMENT 2: REDUCED RELATIVES

GOAL: *Can we take a LA language such as English and generate HA preferences by manipulating SC availability?*

MEANS: *Small Clauses of the Accusative+progressive -ing type* [Acc-ing] the English homologue of PRs (see Declerck 1982, Cinque 1992, Rafael 1999). As with PRs:

- Perceptual predicates introduce ambiguity between SC and reduced RC (3-a,b).
- SCs disallowed with Stative Verbs (3-c) and Object Nouns (3-d) with which only RCs survive.

To test the role of SC-availability in attachment of Reduced RCs we manipulated:

Method: Questionnaire, PC running *Linger* (Doug Rodhe, <http://tedlab.mit.edu/dr/Linger>). *Participants*: (n=30) English Speakers. *Materials and Design*: 2x2 crossing *Verb Type*(PR and noPR) and *position* (object vs. subject); 24 sets of target sentences (4 versions each), 70 fillers; Counterbalanced materials and questions.

Stimuli

- A. *PR predicate / Verbal*
John heard the teacher of the boy singing. SC/RC
- B. *PR predicate / Nominal*
The film of the teacher of the boy singing is of low quality. SC/RC
- C. *RC-only predicate / Verbal*
John runs with the teacher of the boy singing. RC-only
- D. *RC-only predicate / Nominal*
The jacket of the teacher of the boy singing is red. RC-only

RESULTS




Table 5: Results of linear mixed model fit for Attachment Preferences in Experiment 1. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

contrast	coefficient	SE	z-value	p-value
Predicate Type	2.3894	0.3238	7.380	1.58e-13 ***

→ Significant effect of *V-type*: Higher proportion of HA in SC than RC-only

RESPONSE TIME

Table 6: Mean RT per Condition




Table 7: Results of linear mixed model fit for RTs. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value
Predicate Type	-0.09584	0.02097	-4.57
Attachment	-0.07816	0.02100	-3.72
Predicate Type*Attachment	0.18952	0.04201	4.51

→ Significant effect of *Attachment*: Significantly shorter RTs for LA choices than HA choices across all conditions.

→ Further evidence of overall LA preference with full RCs.

→ Stronger HA preference in the nominal/RC-Only in Experiment I than II (RC-Length: Implicit Prosody [6]).

RT COMPARISON

contrast	coefficient	SE	t-value
Predicate Type*Attachment*Experiment	0.14135	0.06378	2.22

→ HA induces significantly longer RTs than LA but only for the RC-only condition across experiments. RTs for HA/LA do not differ in SC-compatible environments.

CONCLUSIONS

- No overall HA in nonPR language with full RCs!
- Lexical semantics (event structure, argument structure) or plausibility alone cannot explain the asymmetry between results in PR languages and nonPR languages.
- This demonstrates the central (*not exclusive!*) role of PR-availability in explaining asymmetries in RC-attachment.
- When SC analysis is available, HA emerges even in LA languages such as English.
- Attachment preferences are not *language dependent*, but are crucially dependent on *universal* grammatical factors, such as the availability of a Small Clause reading (among other universal factors such as *prosody, referentiality* etc.).
- Results partly explain relative weak LA in previous English studies (~ 60%).