

# Contents

---

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Contributors</i>   | <i>page xi</i> |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i>  | <i>xiii</i>    |
| <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>       |
| LAURI KARTTUNEN<br>AND ARNOLD M. ZWICKY   |                |
| 1. Parsing in traditional grammar   | 1              |
| 2. New notions of parsing   | 2              |
| 3. Parsing in formal linguistics  | 3              |
| 4. Parsing in formal language theory  | 6              |
| 5. Parsing computer languages   | 6              |
| 6. Natural language parsing in artificial intelligence                                  | 7              |
| 7. Parsing in psycholinguistics   | 9              |
| 8. Summaries of the papers  | 10             |
| References  | 23             |
| <b>1. Measuring syntactic complexity relative to discourse context</b>                  | <b>26</b>      |
| ALICE DAVISON AND RICHARD LUTZ  |                |
| 1.1. Previous experimental studies of passive sentences, sentence<br>topic, and context | 27             |
| 1.2. Syntactic structures represented in the target sentences                           | 34             |
| 1.2.1. Passive  | 35             |
| 1.2.2. <i>There</i> Insertion   | 36             |
| 1.2.3. Adverb Preposing   | 37             |
| 1.2.4. Raising to Subject   | 37             |
| 1.2.5. Raising to Object  | 39             |
| 1.2.6. Summary  | 39             |
| 1.3. The experimental materials: context and target sentences                           | 40             |
| 1.3.1. Passive  | 41             |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1.3.2. <i>There</i> Insertion                            | 41        |
| 1.3.3. Adverb Preposing                                  | 42        |
| 1.3.4. Raising to Subject                                | 43        |
| 1.3.5. Raising to Object                                 | 44        |
| 1.3.6. Summary: features of context and target sentences | 44        |
| 1.4. Predictions   | 46        |
| 1.5. Defining sentence topic and discourse topic         | 47        |
| 1.6. The task  | 48        |
| 1.7. Results   | 49        |
| 1.8. Discussion  | 52        |
| 1.9. Concluding discussion and summary                   | 59        |
| Appendix 1: Instructions to subjects                     | 63        |
| Notes  | 64        |
| References   | 65        |
| <br>   |           |
| <b>2. Interpreting questions</b>                         | <b>67</b> |
| ELISABET ENGDAHL   |           |
| 2.1. Gap-filling   | 67        |
| 2.2. Questions with bound anaphors                       | 69        |
| 2.3. Relational interpretations of questions             | 71        |
| 2.4. Correlations between extraction and interpretation  | 73        |
| 2.4.1. Types of constraints                              | 74        |
| 2.4.2. The “ <i>that</i> -trace” effect                  | 76        |
| 2.4.3. Complexity constraints                            | 82        |
| 2.4.4. Overview of correlations                          | 84        |
| 2.4.5. <i>There</i> Insertion contexts                   | 88        |
| 2.5. Conclusion  | 89        |
| Notes  | 90        |
| References   | 92        |
| <br>   |           |
| <b>3. How can grammars help parsers?</b>                 | <b>94</b> |
| STEPHEN CRAIN AND JANET DEAN FODOR                       |           |
| 3.1. Possible relations between grammars and parsers     | 95        |
| 3.2. Filler-gap dependencies                             | 103       |
| 3.3. Experimental evidence                               | 107       |
| 3.3.1. The Freedman study                                | 107       |
| 3.3.2. The Frazier, Clifton, and Randall study           | 111       |
| 3.3.3. Our own experiment                                | 115       |
| 3.3.4. Methodological issues                             | 123       |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 3.4. Conclusion  | 126        |
| References   | 127        |
| <b>4. Syntactic complexity</b>   | <b>129</b> |
| LYN FRAZIER  |            |
| 4.1. Functional explanations   | 130        |
| 4.2. Ambiguity   | 135        |
| 4.3. Word order  | 145        |
| 4.4. Unambiguous sentences   | 148        |
| 4.4.1. The depth hypothesis – Yngve’s proposal   | 148        |
| 4.4.2. Problems with the depth hypothesis  | 152        |
| 4.4.3. The nonterminal-to-terminal node metric   | 156        |
| 4.4.4. The local nonterminal count   | 157        |
| 4.4.5. Applying the local nonterminal count  | 167        |
| 4.5. Syntactic complexity and semantic processing  | 172        |
| 4.6. Conclusion  | 180        |
| Notes  | 182        |
| References   | 187        |
| <b>5. Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching</b>  | <b>190</b> |
| ARAVIND K. JOSHI   |            |
| 5.1. Formulation of the system   | 192        |
| 5.2. Constraints on the switching rule   | 193        |
| 5.2.1. Asymmetry   | 193        |
| 5.2.2. Nonswitchability of certain categories  | 193        |
| 5.2.3. Constraints on complementizers  | 196        |
| 5.2.4. Structural constraints  | 198        |
| 5.3. Related work  | 198        |
| 5.4. Parsing considerations  | 200        |
| 5.5. Conclusion  | 202        |
| Notes  | 203        |
| References   | 204        |
| <b>6. Tree adjoining grammars: How much context-sensitivity is required to provide reasonable structural descriptions?</b> | <b>206</b> |
| ARAVIND K. JOSHI   |            |
| 6.1. Tree adjoining grammars   | 207        |
| 6.2. TAGs with “links”   | 214        |
| 6.3. TAGs with constraints on adjoining  | 217        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 6.3.1. Limited cross-serial dependencies            | 221        |
| 6.3.2. Constant growth property                     | 224        |
| 6.3.3. Polynomial parsing                           | 225        |
| 6.3.4. Formal remarks                               | 227        |
| 6.4. Some linguistic examples                       | 228        |
| 6.4.1. An English example                           | 228        |
| 6.4.2. Derivations in the TAG, $G = (I, A)$         | 238        |
| 6.4.3. Cross-serial dependencies in Dutch           | 245        |
| 6.5. Some further problems                          | 248        |
| Acknowledgments                                     | 249        |
| References  | 250        |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>7. Parsing in functional unification grammar</b> | <b>251</b> |
| MARTIN KAY  |            |
| 7.1. Functional unification grammar                 | 252        |
| 7.1.1. Compilation                                  | 253        |
| 7.1.2. Attributes and values                        | 255        |
| 7.1.3. Unification                                  | 257        |
| 7.1.4. Patterns and constituent sets                | 263        |
| 7.1.5. Grammar                                      | 265        |
| 7.2. The parser                                     | 266        |
| 7.2.1. The General Syntactic Processor              | 266        |
| 7.2.2. The parsing grammar                          | 269        |
| 7.3. The compiler                                   | 273        |
| 7.4. Conclusion                                     | 276        |
| Notes   | 277        |
| References  | 277        |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>8. Parsing in a free word order language</b>     | <b>279</b> |
| LAURI KARTTUNEN AND MARTIN KAY                      |            |
| 8.1. Data   | 281        |
| 8.1.1. Topic  | 282        |
| 8.1.2. Contrast                                     | 282        |
| 8.1.3. Nonemphatic contrast                         | 284        |
| 8.1.4. Final position                               | 285        |
| 8.1.5. Order of verbs                               | 286        |
| 8.1.6. Focus of negation                            | 286        |
| 8.1.7. Crossing clause boundaries                   | 287        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 8.1.8. Other sentence types  | 288        |
| 8.1.9. Summary   | 289        |
| 8.2. A unification grammar for Finnish   | 290        |
| 8.3. Parser  | 298        |
| Notes  | 305        |
| References   | 306        |
| <br>   |            |
| <b>9. A new characterization of attachment preferences</b>   | <b>307</b> |
| FERNANDO C. N. PEREIRA   |            |
| 9.1. Shift-reduce parsing  | 308        |
| 9.2. Oracles and conflicts   | 310        |
| 9.3. Example of an oracle  | 311        |
| 9.4. Preference  | 313        |
| 9.5. In defense of bottom-up parsers   | 317        |
| 9.6. Conclusion  | 318        |
| Notes  | 318        |
| References   | 319        |
| <br>   |            |
| <b>10. On not being led up the garden path: the use of context by the psychological syntax processor</b> | <b>320</b> |
| STEPHEN CRAIN AND MARK STEEDMAN  |            |
| 10.1. Preliminaries  | 322        |
| 10.1.1. On the concept of autonomy   | 323        |
| 10.1.2. "Strong" and "weak" interaction  | 325        |
| 10.1.3. A linguistic argument for nonautonomy and weak interaction                                       | 326        |
| 10.1.4. Summary  | 328        |
| 10.2. Local ambiguity resolution by the weak interaction   | 328        |
| 10.2.1. Serial versus parallel models  | 328        |
| 10.2.2. Plausibility, reference, and presupposition  | 330        |
| 10.2.3. Summary  | 337        |
| 10.3. Experiments  | 338        |
| 10.3.1. Experiment I: Avoiding garden paths  | 339        |
| 10.3.2. Experiment II: Creating garden paths   | 341        |
| 10.3.3. Experiment III: Are structurally based strategies used as well?                                  | 344        |
| 10.4. Conclusion   | 345        |
| Appendix 10A: Materials for Experiment I   | 346        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Appendix 10B: Materials for Experiment II                        | 349        |
| Appendix 10C: Materials for Experiment III                       | 350        |
| Notes  | 351        |
| References   | 354        |
| <br>   |            |
| <b>11. Do listeners compute linguistic representations?</b>      | <b>359</b> |
| MICHAEL K. TANENHAUS, GREG N. CARLSON,<br>AND MARK S. SEIDENBERG |            |
| 11.1. Comprehension and linguistic representations               | 361        |
| 11.1.1. Evidence against a linguistic level                      | 362        |
| 11.1.2. Modularity   | 364        |
| 11.2. Modularity and lexical access                              | 366        |
| 11.2.1. Lexical ambiguity  | 366        |
| 11.2.2. Loci and mechanism of priming                            | 369        |
| 11.2.3. Context and visual word recognition                      | 370        |
| 11.2.4. Monitoring for words in context                          | 372        |
| 11.2.5. Implications for parsing research                        | 375        |
| 11.3. Parsing and modularity                                     | 376        |
| 11.3.1. The linguistic system as a module                        | 377        |
| 11.3.2. Grammatical subsystems as modules                        | 378        |
| 11.3.3. Grammatical rules as modules                             | 381        |
| 11.4. Levels of representation and language comprehension        | 384        |
| 11.4.1. Rhyme priming and literal form                           | 385        |
| 11.4.2. Lexical priming and pronouns                             | 389        |
| 11.4.3. Priming and the constructed representation               | 393        |
| 11.4.4. Deep and surface anaphora                                | 395        |
| 11.5. Conclusion   | 400        |
| Notes  | 402        |
| References   | 404        |
| <br>   |            |
| <i>Index</i>   | <i>409</i> |