

Chapter 14

Unbounded Dependencies

Robert D. Borsley

University of Essex and Bangor University

Berthold Crysmann

CNRS, Laboratoire de linguistique formelle

Put abstract here.

1 Introduction

Since [Ross \(1967\)](#) and [Chomsky \(1977\)](#) it has been clear that many languages have a variety of constructions involving an unbounded (or long distance) dependency (henceforth UD). *Wh*-interrogatives and relative clauses are important examples, but, as we will see, there are many others. Typically these constructions contain a gap in the sense that a dependent is missing and some distinctive higher structure, and neither can appear without the other. The following illustrate:

- (1) a. What did you put ____ on the table?
- b. * You put ____ on the table?
- c. * What did you put it on the table?

In (1a) there is a gap (indicated by the underscore) in prepositional object position and the distinctive higher structure involves the interrogative pronoun *what* and the pre-subject auxiliary *did*. (1b), where the gap is present but not the distinctive higher structure, is ungrammatical, as is (1c), where the distinctive higher structure appears but not the gap.



The interrogative pronoun *what* in (1a) is what is known as a filler, a constituent in a non-argument position with the properties of the gap. But the distinctive higher structure does not always include a filler. English relative clauses may or may not have a filler.

- (2) the book [(which) you put ____ on the table]

As we will see below, there are also UD constructions which never have a filler.

When there is a filler in a UD construction, it normally has all the properties of the associated gap. Thus, in the following, filler and the gap are of the same category:

- (3) a. [NP Who] did Kim talk to ____ (NP)?
b. [PP To whom] did Kim talk ____ (PP)?
c. [AP How long] is a piece of string ____ (AP)?
d. [AdvP How quickly] did you do it ____ (AdvP)?

They typically match in other respects as well. For example, if they are nominal, they match in number, as the following illustrate:

- (4) a. [NP[sg] Which student] do you think ____ (NP[sg]) knows the answer?
b. [NP[pl] Which students] do you think ____ (NP[pl]) know the answer?

In languages with grammatical gender or morphological case, they also share these properties.

In addition to syntactic properties, unbounded dependencies also establish matching of semantic properties: i.e. in (1), the filler *what* is understood to fill an argument role of *put*, just as an in situ complement would.

The term unbounded is used here because the gap and the distinctive higher structure with which it is associated can be indefinitely far apart. The following illustrate:

- (5) a. What does she regret that she put ____ on the table?
b. What did she say she regrets that she put ____ on the table?
c. What do you think she says she regrets that she put ____ on the table?

There are, however, some restrictions here commonly referred to as island phenomena. These are discussed by Chaves (2019), Chapter 16 of this volume.

There are a few further points that we should make at the outset. We have focused so far on UD constructions where an obligatory dependent, a subject or

complement, is missing. But UDCs are certainly not restricted to subjects and complements. There are examples where the filler has an adjunct role such as (3d) or the following:

- (6) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Where} \\ \text{When} \\ \text{How} \\ \text{Why} \end{array} \right\}$ did you talk to Lee ____?

There are also UD constructions with no gap at all. Instead they have a so-called resumptive pronoun (RP). The following Welsh example with the RP in bold illustrates:

- (7) Pa ddyn werthodd Ieuan y ceffyl iddo **fo**?
 which man sell.PAST.3SG Ieuan the horse to.3SGM he
 ‘Which man did Ieuan sell the horse to?’

Finally, we should note that there are some cases where filler and gap do not match.

- (8) a. Kim will sing, which Lee won’t ____.
 b. * Which won’t Lee ____?

In (8a) the filler *which* is a nominal expression, but the gap is a non-finite VP. The *wh*-interrogative in (8b) shows that it is not normally possible to have a nominal filler associated with a VP gap, but in (8a) it is fine.

We explore the HPSG approach to these matters in the following pages. In Section 2, we outline the basic HPSG approach to UD. Then in Section 3, we focus on the nature of gaps, i.e. the bottom of the dependency, and in Section 4 we look more closely at the middle of UD. In Section 5, we consider the top of UD and highlight the variety of UD constructions. In Section 6, we look at resumptive pronouns. Then, in Section 7, we consider some further aspects of *wh*-interrogatives, including pied-piping and *wh*-in-situ phenomena, and, in Section 8, we take a look at filler-gap mismatches. Finally in Section 9, we summarize the chapter, followed by an appendix comparing HPSG to SBCG.

2 The basic approach

An analysis of UD needs an account of gaps, of the structures at the top of UD, and of the connection between them. Central to the HPSG approach is

the feature SLASH, occasionally called GAP in some recent works, which provides information about the presence of UD gaps inside a constituent.¹ Much HPSG work assumes the feature geometry in Figure 1, following (Pollard & Sag 1994):




Figure 1: HPSG feature geometry: nonlocal and local features

As this indicates, SLASH is part of the value of the feature NONLOCAL. Its value is a set of local feature structures. If we use traditional categories labels as abbreviations for local feature structures, we can say that a constituent containing an NP gap is [SLASH {NP}], a constituent containing a PP gap is [SLASH {PP}], and so on.

Turning to gaps, a central question is whether there is a phonologically empty element in the constituent structure or nothing at all. Both positions have been developed within HPSG, but probably the view that there is nothing at all in constituent structure is the more widely assumed position. We will adopt that for now and return to the issues in Section 3. Assuming this position, (1a) repeated here as (9), will contain a V with just a single complement sister, namely the predictive PP *on the table*.

- (9) What did you put ____ on the table?

Because the V contains an NP gap, it will be [SLASH {NP}], and so will the constituents that contain it with the exception of the complete sentence. Thus, we have the schematic structure illustrated in Figure 2.

Obviously, we need to ask what ensures that the SLASH feature plays just the right role here. First, however, we need to say more about gaps.

On the view of gaps we are focusing on here they are only represented in ARG-ST lists. Thus, the preposition *to* in (9) has a gap in its ARG-ST list but nothing in

¹The basic approach derives from the earlier Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG) framework (Gazdar et al. 1985) and can be traced back to Gazdar (1981). The feature's name equally derives from this heritage, referring to the GPSG notation whereby X/Y stand for a category X containing a gap of category Y.



Figure 2: Extraction by SLASH feature percolation

its COMPS list and therefore, no complement in constituent structure. Gaps have the feature make up given in (10):

(10) Representation of gaps:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOCAL} \quad \boxed{1} \\ \text{NONLOCAL} \quad \left[\text{SLASH} \{ \boxed{1} \} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Thus, *to* in (9) will have an element of this form in an ARG-ST list where $\boxed{1}$ is NP.

Returning now to SLASH, a widely assumed approach involves the following assumptions:

- (11) a. The SLASH value of a head is normally the same as the union of the SLASH values of its arguments.
- b. The SLASH value of a phrase is normally the same as that of its head.

We will consider how these ideas are formalized in Section 4. For now we will just discuss their implications for the analysis of (9). Essentially they mean that it has the following more elaborate analysis:

Clause (11a) is responsible for the SLASH values on P and both V's, while clause (11b) is responsible for the SLASH values on PP, VP and the lower S. This approach to the distribution of SLASH crucially involves heads and is commonly said to be head-driven.

The lower S in Figure 2 and 3 is the head of the higher S, but they do not have the same value for SLASH. This is because they represent the top of the dependency. If information about gaps was available above the top of the dependency, it would be possible to have another filler higher in the tree as in (12).



Figure 3: Head-driven SLASH feature percolation

- (12) * What do you wonder what Kim saw ____?

The top of the dependency in Figures 2 and 3 is a head-filler-phrase and the constraint on head-filler phrases needs to ensure that the higher S is [SLASH { }]. One might propose the following constraint:

- (13) Head-filler phrase (singleton SLASH set):

$$head-filler-ph \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} SLASH \quad \{ \} \\ HD-DTR \quad 1 \left[\begin{array}{l} phrase \\ SLASH \quad \{ 2 \} \end{array} \right] \\ DTRS \quad \langle [LOCAL \quad 2], 1 \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

This says that a head-filler-phrase is SLASH { } and has a head daughter which is a phrase with a single local feature structure in its SLASH set and a non-head daughter whose LOCAL value is the local feature structure in the SLASH set of the head. Standardly, however, a slightly more general constraint is assumed along the following lines:

- (14) Head-filler phrase:

$$head-filler-ph \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} SLASH \quad 3 \\ HD-DTR \quad 1 \left[\begin{array}{l} phrase \\ SLASH \quad \{ 2 \} \cup 3 \end{array} \right] \\ DTRS \quad \langle [LOCAL \quad 2], 1 \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

This allows the SLASH set of the head to contain more than one member and any additional members form the SLASH set of the whole phrase. This is necessary for

an example like (15) from Chaves (2012) where indices are used to link fillers and gaps.

- (15) This is the person who_i I can't remember [which papers]_j I sent copies of
 ____j to ____i.

Examples of this form often seem unacceptable, but this is probably a processing matter, see Chaves 2012, section 3 for discussion. See also Section 6 for long relativisation with resumption in Hausa or Modern Standard Arabic.

3 More on gaps

We now look more closely at the nature of gaps. The central question here is: what exactly are gaps? We noted in the last section that it has been widely assumed that gaps are only represented in ARG-ST lists but that some HPSG work assumes that they are empty categories, often called traces. There is a third possibility which might be considered, namely that gaps are represented in ARG-ST lists and in VALENCE lists, i.e. SUBJ and COMPS lists, but not in constituent structures. However, it seems that this position has rarely been considered. One complicating factor is that there seem to be differences between complement gaps and both subject and adjunct gaps. A consequence of this is that the question ‘what are gaps?’ could have different answers for different sorts of gaps, and in fact different answers have sometimes been given.

Complement gaps seem to have had rather more attention than subject or adjunct gaps, perhaps because there are many different kinds of complements, hence many different kinds of complement gaps. We will look first at complement gaps, and in particular, the gap in (1), repeated here as (16).

- (16) What did you put ___ on the table?

Probably the most widely assumed position is that gaps are only represented in ARG-ST lists (see Sag 1997; Bouma et al. 2001; Ginzburg & Sag 2000; Sag 2010). On this view, the verb *put* will have the following somewhat simplified structure: We ignore the COMPS feature and the issue of what ensures that the verb here has the same SLASH value as the gap. We will discuss the latter in the next section.

The view that gaps are empty categories was a feature of early HPSG work, notably Pollard & Sag (1994), and it has been assumed in some more recent work e.g. Levine & Hukari (2006); Borsley (2009; 2013b); Müller (2014). On this view, the VP will have the following structure:



Figure 4: Representation of a slashed preposition (traceless)



Figure 5: Representation of a slashed PP (with trace)

Again we ignore the *COMPS* feature and how the PP here has the same *SLASH* value as the gap.

It is not easy to choose between these two approaches. One argument in favour of the first view, advanced, for example, in Bouma et al. (2001), is that it makes it unsurprising that a gap cannot be one conjunct of a coordinate structure, as in the following:

- (17) a. * Which of her books did you find both [[a review of ____] and ____]?
 b. * Which of her books did you find [____ and [a review of ____]]?

It is not obvious why this should be impossible if gaps are empty categories.²

²Coordination is a problem for any empty category, not just the empty categories that represent gaps in some HPSG work. Various empty categories have been proposed in the HPSG literature, most prominently the empty relativiser of Pollard & Sag (1994). Sag et al. (2003: sec. 15.3.5) propose that African American Vernacular English has a phonologically empty form of the copula. This analysis requires some mechanism to prevent this form from appearing as a conjunct. It is likely that a mechanism that can do this will also prevent the empty categories that represent gaps from being conjuncts.

A second argument in favour of a traceless approach comes from languages which morphologically treat slashed transitives on a par with intransitives, like Hausa (Crysmann 2005) or Mauritian Creole French (Henri 2010). In Hausa and Mauritian, verbs morphologically register whether a direct object is realised locally or not: in both languages, a “short” form is used with locally realised direct objects, whereas the long form is used with intransitives as well as in the case of object extraction.

- (18) Sun hùtā.
 3PL.CMPL rest.A
 ‘They rested.’
- (19) a. Sun rāzàṇā.
 3PL.CMPL terrorise.A
 ‘They terrorised (someone).’ (Newman 2000: 632)
- b. Sun rāzàṇā fařar-hùlā.
 3PL.CMPL terrorise.C civilian(s)
 ‘They terrorised the civilians.’ (Newman 2000: 632)
- c. Fařar-hùlā nè sukà rāzàṇā.
 civilian(s) FOC 3PL.CMPL terrorise.A
 ‘The civilians, they terrorised.’

Hausa verbs are lexically transitive or intransitive, and they are classified into one of seven morphological grades.³ Intransitives only have a single form (A-form), which is characterised by a long vowel (in grade 1), cf. (18). Transitives, however, display an alternation depending on the mode of realisation of the direct object: if used intransitively, they pattern with intransitive in using the A-form (=long vowel in grade 1), but with an in-situ direct object (19a), they obligatorily surface in the C-form (19b), which has a short vowel in grade 1. Once the direct object is extracted, we find the long vowel A-form again, in parallel to the intransitive use of transitives and true intransitives: in sum, the morphology of Hausa treats complement extraction on a par with argument suppression or lexical intransitives, i.e. as if the direct object complement simply was not there. Similar observations appear to hold for Mauritian (Henri 2010). Thus, if nonlocal realisation corresponds to lexical valence reduction, the Hausa (and Mauritian)

³We restrict discussion here to grade 1, although the syntactic pattern is systematic across grades, only giving rise to different patterns of exponence. See the Hausa grammars by Newman (2000) and Jaggar (2001) for details, and Crysmann (2005) for evidence in favour of a morphological treatment.

facts are straightforwardly accounted for, whereas the generalisation would be lost, if gaps were considered phonologically empty syntactic elements.

However, the lexical approach to argument extraction has some possibly non-trivial implications for other lexical sub-theories of HPSG that make crucial reference to valence lists, which includes lexical theories of agreement and case. This is because gaps will not be present on the valence lists of word-level signs. E.g., the theory of ergativity proposed by Manning & Sag (1999) in terms of linking patterns between ARG-ST and valence lists is actually formulated as constraints on lexemes, since e.g. the linking of the highest argument to the first element on COMPS (=ergative subject) needs to be specified independently of whether this argument is realised by a local or a non-local dependency. The same holds of course for the linking of objects in accusative languages.⁴

Similar considerations apply to agreement: if agreement treats local and non-local arguments alike, it is clear that agreement controllers cannot be identified in a general fashion in terms of the valence features of word-level signs: thus, if agreement relations need make reference to valence rather than argument structure, this can only be established at the level of lexemes. The relevant evidence comes from languages, where the highest argument on ARG-ST does not necessarily correspond to the highest grammatical function, i.e. SUBJ valence: while some ergative languages display agreement with the highest argument on ARG-ST, like e.g. Udi (Harris 1984), Archi (Kibrik 1994) shows agreement with the absolutive argument, suggesting that SUBJ is the right place to establish the relation (Crysmann 2009). In Nias, we find agreement with SUBJ in the realis, and with the least oblique argument in the irrealis (ARG-ST). Finally, in Welsh, we observe a parallelism in the agreement between subjects of finite verbs and the objects of prepositions and non-finite verbs: according to Borsley (1989), a unified treatment can be given if subjects of finite verbs are the first element on COMPS, an assumption that directly captures Welsh VSO word order.⁵

Given the broad empirical support for valence lists as one of the loci of case and agreement constraints, it is clear that these constraints must hold for lexemes, not words under a traceless, lexical perspective of unbounded dependencies.

We turn now to subject gaps. Here a central question is: how similar or how

⁴Incidentally, Crysmann (2009) exploits the fact that extracted arguments do not appear on the valence lists of word-level signs and formulates local case assignment for Nias as a constraint on *word*, effectively exempting topicalised arguments from objective case assignment.

⁵Borsley (2016) argues on rather different grounds that agreement in the Caucasian language Archi involves constraints on constituent structure, which will favour a trace-based perspective on extraction.

different are they to complement gaps? The following illustrate a well-known contrast, which suggests that they may be significantly different:

- (20) a. Who do you think Kim saw ____?
 b. Who do you think ____ saw Kim?
- (21) a. Who do you think that Kim saw ____?
 b. * Who do you think that ____ saw Kim?

The examples in (20) show that a gap is possible in object position in a complement clause whether or not it is introduced by *that*. In contrast, the examples in (21) suggest that a gap is only possible in subject position in a complement clause if it is not introduced by *that*. Pollard & Sag (1994) approach this contrast by stipulating that gaps cannot appear in subject position. This accounts for the ungrammaticality of examples like (21b). Examples like (21a) are allowed by allowing verbs like *think* to take a VP complement and have a non-empty value for SLASH. Ginzburg & Sag (2000) offer a very different account, in which subject gaps appear both in ARG-ST list and SUBJ lists. They suggest that examples like (21b) are ungrammatical because *that* cannot combine with a constituent which has a non-empty SUBJ list.

An important fact about subject gaps is that they are not completely impossible in a complement clause introduced by *that*. In particular, they are acceptable if *that* is followed by an adverbial constituent. The following illustrates:

- (22) Who did you say that tomorrow ____ would regret his words?

Ginzburg & Sag (2000) offer an account of such examples, but Levine & Hukari (2006) argue that it is unsatisfactory. More generally, they argue that subject gaps are like complement gaps in various respects and therefore should have the same basic analysis. They propose an analysis with an empty category for both types of gap. Thus, their approach differs both from the widely assumed approach, which has no empty categories, and the approach of Pollard and Sag, which has them in complement position but not in subject position.

We turn now to adjunct gaps. It is not obvious that there is a gap in examples like (6) repeated as (23), because no obligatory constituent is missing.⁶

- (23) $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Where} \\ \text{When} \\ \text{How} \\ \text{Why} \end{array} \right\}$ did you talk to Lee ____?

⁶This position has initially been taken in Pollard & Sag (1994).

However, Hukari & Levine (1995) show that such examples may display what are often called extraction path effects, certain phonological or morphosyntactic phenomena which appear between a gap and the associated higher structure (see the discussion of example (28) on page 388). Hence, it seems that they must involve a filler-gap dependency, on a par with examples with a complement gap.

Of course there are a variety of positions that are compatible with this conclusion. Bouma et al. (2001) and Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 168, fn. 2) propose that verbal adjuncts are optional extra complements. On this view, the gaps in the examples in (23) are complement gaps. Levine (2003) and Levine & Hukari (2006) argue against this approach with examples like the following:

- (24) In how many seconds flat do you think that [Robin found a chair, sat down, and took off her logging boots]?

This is a query about the total time taken by three distinct events. Levine and Hukari propose that a fairly traditional analysis of verbal adjuncts in which they are modifiers of VP and combine this with the assumption that gaps are empty categories. The interpretation of examples like (24) follows straightforwardly on this analysis. If indeed argument extraction contrasts with adjunct extraction in terms of whether the gap is introduced lexically (on ARG-ST) or phrasally, this may provide a direct account of the fact that the use of a resumptive strategy in extraction is by and large restricted to arguments. As discussed by Crysmann & Reintges (2014), resumptives are obligatory for arguments in Coptic, whereas gap-type extraction is the only possibility for modifiers.

A rather different approach is developed in Chaves (2009). Like Levine & Hukari (2006), he assumes that verbal adjuncts are modifiers of VP, but he rejects the idea that gaps are empty categories. He shows in particular that the possibility for a filler to correspond to a group is neither limited to adjunct extraction nor to events, but may also be observed with NP complements whose gaps are properly contained within each conjunct, as shown by the following examples:

- (25) a. Setting aside illegal poaching for a moment, how many sharks_{*i+j*} do you estimate [[_{*i*} died naturally] and [_{*j*} were killed recreationally]]?
 b. [[Which pilot]_{*i*} and [which sailor]_{*j*}] will Joan invite _{*i*} and Greta entertain _{*j*} (respectively)?

He suggests that the treatment of coordination must be relaxed in such a way as to permit the creation of group individuals and group events on the mother's

SLASH where the daughters' SLASH values contain the individual or event variables of the group's members. This provides an account of complement extraction as in (25), but it also provides a straightforward account of the cumulative scoping facts in (24).

4 The middle of the dependency

In the middle of an unbounded dependency we typically have a phrase (or a clause) with the same value for SLASH as a non-head daughter. As we noted in Section 2, it is widely assumed that this relation is mediated by the head daughter. The SLASH value of a head is normally the same as that of its arguments, and the SLASH value of a phrase is normally the same as that of its head. However, as we will see, this head-driven approach to the distribution of SLASH hasn't always been adopted.

Central to the head-driven approach is the SLASH Amalgamation Principle, which we can formulate as follows, following Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 199):

(26) SLASH Amalgamation Principle:

$$word \rightarrow / \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SLASH } [\bar{1}] \cup \dots \cup [\bar{n}] \\ \text{ARG-ST } \left(\left[\text{SLASH } [\bar{1}] \right] \dots \left[\text{SLASH } [\bar{n}] \right] \right) \end{array} \right]$$

This is a default constraint, as indicated by the '/'. Essentially, it says that by default by default the SLASH value of a word is the union of the SLASH values of its arguments. Being merely a default constraint will accommodate examples like the following:

(27) The professor is hard [to talk to ____].

Here, the adjective *hard* takes an infinitival complement with a non-empty SLASH feature but should not have a non-empty SLASH feature itself since the complement is the top of the dependency.⁷

To ensure that the SLASH value of a phrase is normally the same as that of its head, much work employs a Slash Inheritance Principle, which stipulates that a phrase and its head have the same value for SLASH except at the top of a dependency (see, e.g. Bouma et al. 2001: 20). An alternative approach developed in

⁷The non-local nature of *tough*-constructions appears to be a peculiarity of English: similar constructions in German and French do exist, but they feature local (passive-like) dependencies. See Abeillé et al. (1998) and Aguila-Multner (2018) for French, as well as Müller (2002) for German.

Ginzburg & Sag (2000) uses the Generalized Head Feature Principle for this purpose. This says that a headed-phrase and its head daughter have the same *SYNSEM* values unless some other constraint requires something different. Among other things this ensures that a headed-phrase and its head daughter normally have the same value for *SLASH*.

One argument in favour of a head-driven approach to the distribution of *SLASH* is so-called extraction path effects, certain phonological or morphosyntactic phenomena which appear between a gap and the associated higher structure (see Hukari & Levine 1995; Bouma et al. 2001:3.2). Irish provides one of many examples that have been discussed. In Irish, the verbal particle *goN* only occurs with structures that do not contain gaps, while *aL* only occurs between a filler and a gap. The following illustrate:⁸

- (28) a. Shíl mé goN mbeadh sé ann.
 thought I VPART would-be he there
 ‘I thought that he would be there.’
 b. An fear aL shíl mé aL bheadh ann.
 the man VPART thought I VPART would-be there
 ‘the man that I thought would be here’

Within a head-driven approach to *SLASH* this is just a contrast between a verb which is [*SLASH* { }] and a verb which is [*SLASH* {[]}] and is completely unproblematic.

Early HPSG assumed an approach to *SLASH* which was not head-driven (see Pollard & Sag 1994: chapter 4), and related approaches are assumed in Levine & Hukari (2006) and Chaves (2012). A problem with a head-driven approach is that it says nothing about examples where an unbounded dependency crosses the boundary of a non-headed phrase such as a coordinate structure. Thus, it does not deal with examples of asymmetric coordination like the following:

- (29) a. How much can you [drink ____] and [still stay sober]]?
 b. How many lakes can we [[destroy ____] and [not arouse public antipathy]]?

Early HPSG (Pollard & Sag 1994) accounts for the distribution of *SLASH* by means of the Nonlocal Feature Principle, and related principles are proposed by Levine & Hukari (2006: 354) and Chaves (2012). These principles ensure that the *SLASH*

⁸In some accounts these particles are taken to be complementizers. The N indicates that *go* triggers nasal mutation while L indicates that *a* triggers lenition,

value of a phrase reflects the SLASH values of all its daughters (using set union) and apply equally to headed and non-headed structures. Thus, the examples in (29) are no problem for these latter approaches. However, they seem to require some extra element to handle extraction path effects. So it is not easy to choose between these approaches and the head-driven approach.

A further point that we should emphasize here is that both approaches to the distribution of SLASH allow structures like the following:




Figure 6: Across-the-board (ATB) extraction: conflation of SLASH values

In other words, both allow more than one daughter of a phrase with a non-empty SLASH value to have the same value. This means that we expect structures in which a single filler is associated with more than one gap. Thus, examples like the following are no problem:

- (30) a. What did Kim [[cook ____ for two hours] and [eat ____ in four minutes]]?
 b. Which person did you [invite ____ [without thinking ____ would actually come]]?

(30a), where the two gaps are in a coordinate structure is standardly said to be a case of across-the-board extraction. (30b) is traditionally seen as involving an ordinary gap followed by a parasitic gap. However, for HPSG all these gaps have essentially the same status (see [Levine & Hukari 2006](#) and [Chaves 2012](#) for extensive discussion).

5 The top of the dependency: The diversity of unbounded dependency constructions

We now look more closely at the top of unbounded dependencies. This is where diversity of unbounded dependency constructions resides. They are largely the same at the bottom of the dependency and in the middle, but at the top of the dependency they differ from each other in a variety of ways. We noted at the outset

that the distinctive higher structure in an unbounded dependency construction may contain a filler but does not always. In other words, it may be a head-filler-phrase, but it may not, and there are a number of other possibilities. Moreover, head-filler-phrases can have quite different properties in different constructions.

In the introduction to this chapter we mentioned *wh*-interrogatives and relative clauses as two examples of unbounded dependency constructions. In English the former always involve a head-filler-phrase,⁹ while the latter sometimes do but sometimes don't. There are *wh*-relatives and non-*wh*-relatives of various kinds. English *wh*-interrogatives and *wh*-relatives look quite similar. They seem to involve many of the same lexical items: *who*, *which*, *when*, *where*, *why*, and, as the following show both may be finite or non-finite:

- (31) a. Who should I talk to ____?
b. I wondered [who to talk to ____].
- (32) a. someone [who I should talk to ____]
b. someone [to whom to talk ____]

But there are differences. *Wh*-interrogatives but not *wh*-relatives allow *what* and *how*:

- (33) a. What did Kim say ____?
b. * the thing [what Kim said ____]
- (34) a. How did Lee do it ____]
b. * the way [how Lee did it ____]

In *wh*-interrogatives, *which* combines with a following nominal except in cases of ellipsis. Thus, in (5), repeated here as (35), *book* is necessary unless it is clear that books are under discussion.

- (35) Which book did Kim buy ____?

Notice also that non-finite *wh*-relatives only allow a PP as a filler. Thus, (36) is not possible as an alternative to (32c).

⁹On some analyses of example like the following, *who* is just a subject and not a filler:

(i) Who knows the answer?

However, for other work this is a filler just like the *wh*-elements in the text.

- (36) * someone [who to talk to ____]

Thus, the fillers in the two constructions differ in a number of ways. The heads also differ in that *wh*-interrogatives have auxiliary + subject order in main clauses (unless the *wh*-phrase is the subject), something which does not occur in *wh*-relatives.

Wh-interrogatives and *wh*-relatives are not the only unbounded dependency constructions that involve a head-filler phrase. Topicalization sentences such as the following are another:

- (37) a. BEER I like ____.
b. To LONDON I went ____.

Unlike *wh*-interrogatives and *wh*-relatives, these are always finite. Also required to be finite are what have been called *the*-clauses Borsley 2004; Sag 2010; Borsley 2011, the components of comparative correlatives such as (38).

- (38) The more I read ____, the more I understand ____.

The-clauses have the unusual property that they may contain the complementizer *that*:

- (39) The more that I read ____, the more that I understand ____.

Obviously, this is not possible in *wh*-interrogatives and *wh*-relatives.

- (40) a. * I wonder [who that Lee saw ____].
b. * the man [who that Lee saw ____]

Within HPSG the obvious approach to the sorts of facts we have just highlighted involves a number of subtypes of the type *head-filler-phrase*, as in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Hierarchy of head-filler phrases

As was noted in chapter 1, much HPSG work assumes two distinct sets of phrase types. Assuming this position, *wh-interr-cl* will not just be a subtype of




Figure 8: Hierarchy of extraction clause types (preliminary)

head-filler-ph but also a subtype of *interr-cl*, the type *wh-rel-cl* will also be a subtype of *rel-cl*, and *top-cl* and *the-cl* will both be subtypes of *decl-cl*. This gives the the type hierarchy in Figure 8

Constraints on *interr-cl* will capture the properties that all interrogatives share, most obviously interrogative semantics. Constraints on *rel-cl* will capture what all relatives have in common, especially modifying an appropriate nominal constituent.¹⁰ Finally, constraints on *decl-cl* will capture the properties on declaratives, especially declarative semantics. Constraints on *wh-interr-cl* and *wh-rel-cl* will ensure that their fillers take the appropriate form. Constraints on *top-cl* and *the-cl* will restrict their fillers and also require their heads to be finite. Further complexity is probably necessary to handle all the facts noted above. To ensure that non-finite *wh*-relatives only allow a PP filler while finite *wh*-relatives allow either an NP or a PP filler it is probably necessary to postulate two subtypes of *wh-rel-cl*. As for the fact that *the*-clauses may contain the complementizer *that*, one way to deal with this is to postulate a subtype of *head-filler-ph*, *standard-head-fill-ph* with *wh-interr-cl*, *wh-rel-cl*, and *top-cl* as its subtypes. This new type will be subject to a constraint preventing its head from containing a complementizer. The type *the-cl* will not be a subtype of this new type and hence will be able to contain a complementizer (see Borsley 2011 for discussion). All this suggests the type hierarchy in Figure 9. This is complex, but then the facts are complex,




Figure 9: Hierarchy of extraction clause types (final)

as we have seen. Crucially, such a hierarchy allows a straightforward account of

¹⁰Non-restrictive relatives can also modify various kinds of non-nominal constituents. See Arnold (2004) and Arnold & Borsley (2008).

both the similarities and the differences among these constructions.

We turn now to cases where there is no filler. We start with the so-called tough construction, exemplified by (27), repeated here as (41).

(41) The professor is hard [to talk to ____].

Here, there is a gap following the preposition *to*, and the initial NP *the professor* is understood as the object of *to*. But this NP is not a filler but a subject. Like any subject it is preceded by an auxiliary in an interrogative:

(42) Is the professor hard [to talk to ____]?

Moreover, it is clear that it cannot share a local feature structure with the gap since it is in a position associated with nominative case whereas the gap is in a position associated with accusative case. This suggests that adjectives like *hard* may take an infinitival complement with a SLASH value containing a nominal local feature structure which is coindexed with its subject. The coindexing will ensure that the subject has the right interpretation without getting into difficulties over case. It seems, then, that we need something like the lexical description in (43) in order to account for *hard* in examples like (41) and (42):

(43) Lexical representation of *tough* adjectives (preliminary):

SYNSEM	LOCAL CAT	HEAD	<i>adj</i>	
		SUBJ	$\langle \text{NP} [\text{INDEX } \bar{i}] \rangle$	
		COMPS	$\langle \text{VP} [\text{VFORM } \textit{inf}]$	
			$\text{SLASH } \{ \text{NP} [\text{INDEX } \bar{i}] \} \rangle$	

But there is more to be said here. *Hard* and its infinitival complement are the top of a dependency. It is essential that the AP *hard to talk to* should not have the same SLASH value as the infinitival complement *to talk to*. How this should be prevented depends on what approach is assumed to the distribution of SLASH values. However, if this involves a default SLASH Amalgamation Principle of the kind discussed in Section 4, it is a fairly simple matter. A default SLASH Amalgamation Principle ensures that the SLASH value of a word is normally the same as the SLASH value of its arguments. We can override the principle in the present case by giving adjectives like *hard* lexical descriptions of the following form:

(44) Lexical representation of *tough* adjectives (final):

SYNSEM	LOCAL CAT	HEAD	<i>adj</i>
		SUBJ	$\langle \text{NP} [\text{INDEX } \boxed{1}] \rangle$
		COMPS	$\langle \text{VP} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{VFORM } \textit{inf} \\ \text{SLASH } \{ \text{NP} [\text{INDEX } \boxed{1}] \} \cup \boxed{1} \end{array} \right] \rangle$
	NONLOCAL	SLASH	$\boxed{1}$

This ensures that SLASH value of such adjectives is the SLASH value of the infinitival complement minus the NP that is coindexed with its subject. Where this NP is the only item in the complement's SLASH value, the adjective will be [SLASH {}], and so will the AP that it heads. However, it is possible to have an additional item in the SLASH value, as in the following well-known example:

(45) Which violin is this sonata [easy to play ___ on ___]?

Here, *which violin* is understood as the object of *on* and *this sonata* as the object of *play*. The infinitival complement *to play on* will have two items in its SLASH set, one associated with *which violin* and one associated with *this sonata*. The constraint in Figure 44 will ensure that only the former appears in the SLASH set of *easy* and hence only this appears in the SLASH set of *easy to play on*.

The term lexical binding of SLASH is often applied to situations like this in which a lexical item makes some structure the top of a dependency. This is a plausible approach to adjectives like *hard* and also to adjectives modified by *too* or *enough*, as in the following:

(46) Lee is too important for you to talk to.

(47) Lee is important enough for you to talk to.

Lexical binding is also a plausible approach to relative clauses which have not a filler but a complementizer. This may include English *that* relatives such as that in (48) (although some HPSG work, e.g. Sag (1997), has analysed *that* as a relative pronoun and hence a filler):

(48) the man [that you talked to ___]

If relative *that* is a complementizer, and complementizers, are heads, as in much HPSG work, it can be given a lexical description like the one in (49):

- (49) Lexical representation of relative complementiser *that*:

$$\left[\text{SYNSEM} \left[\text{LOCAL} \left[\text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{complementizer} \\ \text{MOD NP} [\text{INDEX } \boxed{i}] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBJ} \langle \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \left\langle S \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{VF} \text{FORM } \textit{fin} \\ \text{SLASH } \left\{ \text{NP} [\text{INDEX } \boxed{i}] \right\} \cup \boxed{1} \right\} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \text{NONLOCAL} \left[\text{SLASH } \boxed{1} \right] \right] \right] \right]$$

This says that *that* takes a finite clause as its complement and modifies an NP, that the SLASH value of the clause includes an NP which is coindexed with the antecedent noun selected via MOD, and that any additional members of the complement's SLASH set form the SLASH set of *that*. Normally there will be no other members and *that* will be [SLASH {}].¹¹

Further issues arise with zero relatives, which contain neither a filler nor a complementizer, such as the following English example:

- (50) the man [you talked to ____]

For Sag (1997), these are one type of non-*wh*-relative and are required to have a MOD value coindexed with an NP in the SLASH value of the head daughter. But an issue arises about semantics. Assuming the main verb in a zero relative has the same semantic interpretation as elsewhere, a zero relative will have clausal semantics and not the modifier semantics that one might think is necessary for a nominal modifier. Sag's solution is to propose a special subtype of *head-adjunct-phrase* called *head-relative-phrase*, which allows a relative clause with clausal semantics to combine with a nominal and be interpreted in the right way. One might well wonder how satisfactory this approach is.

Sag (2010) shows that it is a simple matter to assign modifier semantics to a relative clause where the basic clause is the daughter of some other element, as it is when there is a filler or a complementizer. The basic clause can have clausal semantics and the mother can have modifier semantics. This suggests that zero relatives too might be analysed as daughters of another element with modifier semantics. One might do this, as Sag (2010: 531) notes, with a special unary branching phrase type (Müller 1999b: sec. 10.3.2). Alternatively, one might postulate a phonologically null counterpart of relative *that*.¹²

¹¹This is essentially the approach that is taken to relatives in Modern Standard Arabic in Alqurashi & Borsley (2012).

¹²This is the approach that is taken to zero relatives in Modern Standard Arabic in Alqurashi & Borsley (2012).

There are various other issues about the top of the dependency. Consider, for example, cleft sentences such as (51).

- (51) It was on the table that he placed the book ____.

Clefts consist of *it*, a form of *be*, a focused constituent, and a clause with a gap. In (51) the focused constituent is a PP and so is the gap. It looks, then, as if the focused constituent shares its main properties with the gap in the way that a filler would. However, there are also clefts where it is clear that the focused constituent does not share an index with the gap. Consider e.g. the following:

- (52) It's me that ____ likes beer.

Here the focused constituent is first person singular, but the gap is third person singular, as shown by the form of the following verb. Given the standard assumption that person, number and gender features are a property of indices, it follows that they cannot have the same index. There are important challenges here.

Agreement in German may shed some more light on this:

- (53) a. Da habe ich, der/die sonst immer rechtzeitig
 there have.1SG I who.SG.M/who.SG.F otherwise always on.time
 kommt, doch tatsächlich verschlafen.
 come.3SG, indeed verily overslept
 'I, who is otherwise always on time, have indeed overslept.'
- b. Da habe ich, der ich sonst immer rechtzeitig
 there have.1SG I who.SG.M I otherwise always on.time
 komme, doch tatsächlich verschlafen.
 come.1SG, indeed verily overslept
 'I, who is otherwise always on time, have indeed overslept.'

In (53a), we find a reduced agreement pattern in number and gender between the relative pronoun and the antecedent noun, to the exclusion of person. Within the relative clause, however, we find full person/number subject agreement on the verb. In (53b), however, the relative pronoun is post-modified by the pronoun *ich* 'I', triggering full agreement with both the antecedent noun and the embedded verb. French, by contrast, observes full agreement of all three INDEX features:

- (54) C'est moi qui suis venu(e).
 it's me who am come.M/F
 'It's me who came.'

Thus, relative pronouns and complementisers seem to differ cross-linguistically as to the features which undergo agreement with the antecedent.

Also quite challenging are free relatives. They look rather like head-filler-phrases. The initial constituent of a free relative behaves like a filler, reflecting the properties of the gap.

(55) whichever student you think knows/*know the answer

(56) whichever students you think know/*knows the answer

But the initial constituent also behaves like a head, determining the distribution of the free relative.

(57) a. Kim will buy what(ever) Lee buys.

b. * Kim will buy where(ever) Lee goes.

(58) a. Kim will go where(ever) Lee goes.

b. * Kim will go what(ever) Lee buys.

In case languages like German, the matching effect generally includes case specifications (Müller 1999a).

Most work on free relatives has assumed that it is a filler and not a head (Groos & van Riemsdijk 1981; Grosu 1989) or a head and not a filler (Bresnan & Grimshaw 1978). But the obvious suggestion is that it is both a filler and a head, a position espoused in Huddleston & Pullum (2002). This idea can be implemented within HPSG by analysing free relatives and head-filler-phrases as subtypes of filler-phrase, as follows:



Figure 10: Hierarchy of filler phrases

Filler-phrase will be subject to a constraint like that proposed earlier for head-filler-phrases except that it will say nothing about the head-daughter. Head-filler-phrases will be subject to a constraint identifying the second daughter as the head, while free-relatives will be subject to a constraint identifying the first daughter as the head (among other things).¹³

¹³The constraint on free relatives will also need to ensure that the first daughter takes the appropriate form and that the second daughter is finite.

Naturally, there may be complications here. German, for example, has some free relatives in which the case of the *wh*-element differs from that which the position of the free relative leads one to expect. This looks like a problem for the idea that the initial constituent is a head, but it may not be if heads and the associated phrases only share syntactic properties by default, as in much HPSG work.¹⁴

6 Resumptive pronouns

Ever since [Vaillette \(2001\)](#), resumption has been treated as an unbounded dependency within HPSG, on a par with SLASH dependencies, rather than as a case of anaphoric binding. The main motivation for treating resumption similar to extraction lies with the fact that in a variety of languages dependencies involving a pronominal at the bottom of the dependency behave similarly to UDCs involving a gap at the extraction site.

[Vaillette \(2001\)](#) investigates resumption in Hebrew and shows on the basis of across-the-board (ATB) extraction, parasitic gaps, and crossover that resumptive dependencies are indistinguishable from gap dependencies except for their reduced sensitivity to extraction islands. In order to reconcile the UDC-like properties of resumption with the difference in island sensitivity, he introduces a dedicated non-local feature RESUMP. While using separate features for resumptives and gaps easily makes them distinguishable for the purposes of island constraints, it certainly has the drawback that formulation of the ATB constraint becomes quite cumbersome. The following example illustrates mixing of gaps and resumptives in ATB extraction in Hebrew:

- (59) kol profesor_i še dani roce lehazmin _____i aval lo maarix ?oto_i
 every professor that Dani wants to-invite but not esteems him
 maspik
 enough
 ‘every professor that Dani wants to invite but doesn’t respect enough’ ([Sells 1984: 78](#))

Subsequent work on Persian ([Taghvaipour 2005](#)), Welsh ([Borsley 2013a](#)) and Hausa ([Crysmann 2012](#)) essentially follows Vaillette, using ATB extraction as

¹⁴[Müller \(1999a\)](#) pursues a rather different approach to free relatives: In order to reconcile mismatches between the case requirement that is internal to the relative clause and the one that is selected for the free relative as whole, he suggests a unary schema that mediates between the different case requirements.

the main indicator for treating resumptive dependencies similar to gap dependencies. What all these works have in common, though, is that they rely on a single non-local feature, namely SLASH for both types of dependencies. In particular these works suggest that mixing of strategies, as illustrated in (59) for Hebrew and in (65) for Hausa, suggests that both extraction strategies should be captured using a single non-local feature, i.e. SLASH. Despite this commonality, however, approaches differ as to how gap and resumptive dependencies are distinguished, if at all.

In his work on Welsh unbounded dependencies, Borsley (2010) observes that the choice between gap and resumptive is essentially determined by properties of the immediate environment of bottom of the dependency: i.e. while possessors of nouns and complements of prepositions require a resumptive element when extracted, subjects, as well as direct objects of finite and non-finite verbs only extract by means of filler-gap dependencies. Thus, the distribution of gaps vs. resumptives is practically disjoint.

Furthermore, he reports evidence that resumptives and gaps also pattern alike with respect to island constraints: while extraction out of the clausal complement in a complex NP is fine, with either a gap or a resumptive at the bottom, extraction out of a relative leads to ungrammaticality, again, independent of whether we find a gap or a resumptive.

- (60) Dyma 'r dyn y credodd Dafydd [y si [y
here-is the man PRT believe.PAST.3S Dafydd the rumour PRT
gwelodd Mair (o)]].
see.PAST.3S Mair he
'Here's the man who David believed the rumour that Mair saw.'
- (61) Dyma 'r dyn y credodd Dafydd [y si [y
here-is the man PRT believe.PAST.3SG Dafydd the rumour PRT
cest ti 'r llythyr 'na ganddo (fo)]].
get.PAST.2SG you the letter DEM with.3S.M him
'Here's the man who David believed the rumour that you got that letter from.'
- (62) *Dyma 'r ffenest darais i ['r bachgen [dorrodd (hi)
that-is the window hit.PAST.1S I the boy break.PAST.3S (she)
ddoe]].
yesterday

Moreover, with respect to the across-the-board (ATB) constraint resumptives and

gaps show the same behaviour as observed for Hebrew, easily permitting mixing. In addition, Welsh also has certain extraction path effects which are the same in gap and resumptive dependencies (see Borsley 2010: for details).

Given that the distribution of gaps and resumptives is regulated by the locally selecting head at the bottom of the dependency and that there is no need to distinguish the two types of dependencies along the extraction path (middle), Borsley (2010) formulates what is probably the most simple and straightforward approach to resumption. In essence, he proposes “that we need structures in which a slashed preposition or noun has not a slashed argument but a pronominal argument coindexed with its slashed value”. Consequently he extends SLASH AMALGAMATION to optionally include a SLASH element coindexed with an unslashed pronominal argument. This move licenses Welsh resumptives in a structure like the one in Figure 11 below:




Figure 11: Representation of Welsh resumptives

Thus, the only difference between gaps and resumptives on his account is that the former give rise to a reentrancy of an element in SLASH with a LOCAL value on ARG-ST, whereas the latter merely involve reentrancy of INDEX values (between an NP *local* on SLASH and an NP *synsem* on ARG-ST).

The respective distribution of gaps and resumptives are finally accounted for by means of constraints on the binding theoretical status of the element at the bottom of the the dependency, i.e. *ppro* for resumptives and *npro* for gaps.

Borsley’s decision to locate the resumptive function on the selecting head, rather than on the pronominal not only provides a good match for the Welsh data, but it also addresses McCloskey’s generalisation (McCloskey 2002) that resumptives are always the ordinary pronouns, since no lexical ambiguity between slashed and unslashed pronouns is involved here.

In contrast to Borsley, who developed his theory of resumption on the basis of a language where the distribution of gaps vs. resumptives is entirely regulated by the immediate local environment and no difference in island sensitivity could be observed, Crysmann (2012) developed an alternative account for Hausa, a lan-

guage where the distributions of gaps and resumptives partially overlap at the bottom of the dependency and where resumptive dependencies observe different locality constraints when compared to filler-gap dependencies.

Hausa patterns with a number of resumptive languages, including Welsh, in that use of a resumptive is obligatory for complements of a preposition or the possessor of a noun. With direct and indirect objects, however, both resumptives and gaps are possible:

- (63) a. mutânên dà sukà ki sayar wà ___ dà àbinci sukà fita
 men REL 3.P.CPL refuse sell to with food 3.P.CPL left
 ‘the men they refused to sell food to left.’ (Jaggar 2001)
- b. mutânên dà sukà ki sayar musù dà àbinci sukà fita
 men REL 3.P.CPL refuse sell to.them with food 3.P.CPL left
 ‘the men they refused to sell food to left.’ (Jaggar 2001)

In (63), both a bare dative marker *wà* ‘to’ is possible (with a gap), and a dative pronoun *musù* ‘to.them’.

Moreover, gap and resumptive dependencies do behave differently with respect to strong islands: while extraction out of a relative clause or *wh*-island is impossible for gap dependencies, relativisation out of these islands is perfectly fine with resumptives.

- (64) Gà tābōbī_j dà Àlī ya san mùtūmī_i dà zāi_i yī
 here.is cigarettes REL Ali 3.S.M.CPL know man REL 3.S.M.FUT do
 musù_j / *wà ____j kwālī
 to.them / to box
 ‘Here are the cigarettes that Ali knows the man that (he) will make a box for.’ (Tuller 1986)

Crysmann further emphasises that relativisation (which may escape strong islands) resembles anaphoric relations, whereas filler-gap dependencies, as observed with *wh*-fronting, give rise to a matching effect. He therefore correlates relative complementisers and resumptives with minimal INDEX sharing, whereas filler-head structures, as well as gaps will require sharing of entire LOCAL values: while filler-head structures impose this stricter constraint at the top of the dependency, gaps obviously do so at the bottom. In order to express constraints on locality, Crysmann (2012) proposes that SLASH elements (of type *local*) should be distinguished as to their weight: while the type *local* always minimally includes indexical information, its subtypes *full-local* and *weak-local* differ as to

the amount of additional information that must or must not be present. For *full-local*, which is appropriate for *synsem*, this includes categorial and full semantic information, whereas exactly this information is excluded for *weak-local*.




Figure 12: Hierarchy of *local* (Crysmann 2012)




Figure 13: Hierarchy of *synsem* objects (Crysmann 2012)

The hierarchy of *local* types provides for the possibility that *local* types on SLASH may only be partially specified: while gaps and filler-head structure require full reentrancy of a (*full-local*) LOCAL value, resumptives may be non-committal with respect to the weight distinction, only imposing the minimal index-sharing constraint. This ensures that both resumptives and gaps can be found at the bottom of a strong UDC with e.g. a *wh*-filler. Conversely, islands can narrow down the nature of SLASH elements to only pass on a SLASH set of *weak-local*, such that resumptives, but not gaps will be licensed at the bottom in the case of long relativisation.

Underspecification of *local* at the bottom of a resumptive dependency easily permits mixing of gap and resumptive strategies in ATB extraction, as illustrated

by the example below:

- (65) [àbōkī-n-ā]_i dà [[na zìyartà _____i] àmmā [bàn sāmē
 friend-L-1.S.GEN REL 1.S.CPL visit but 1.S.NEG.CPL find
 shì_i à gidā ba]]
 3.S.M.DO at home NEG
 ‘my friend that I visited but did not find at home’ (Newman 2000: 539)

The obvious question is of course how these two approaches can be harmonised in order to yield a unified HPSG theory of resumption. It is clear that the theory advanced by Crysmann (2012) makes a more fine-grained distinction with regard to SLASH elements and should therefore be able to trivially account for languages where there is no difference in locality restrictions between resumptive and gap dependencies. In the case of Welsh, it will suffice to strengthen the constraints of strong islands, such as relative clauses to block passing of any *local* on SLASH, rather than merely restricting to *weak-local*. The other area where the theories need to be brought closer together concerns the issue of McCloskey’s generalisation, which is straightforwardly derived by a syntactic theory of resumption, such as Borsley’s. Some work in this direction has already been done: Crysmann (2016) suggests replacing his original ambiguity approach with an underspecification approach, essentially following Borsley (2010) in locating the disambiguation between pronoun and resumptive function on the selecting head. While there are still differences of implementation, general agreement has been obtained that it should indeed be the head that decides on the pronominal’s function, whether this is done via disjunctively amalgamating the index of a pronominal argument (Borsley 2010; Alotaibi & Borsley 2013), or else via a more elaborate system of *synsem* types that integrates more nicely with standard SLASH amalgamation (Crysmann 2016).

Similar consensus has been reached with respect to the need to have more fine-grained control on locality, again irrespective of implementation details: while Alotaibi & Borsley (2013) exploited constraints on case marking in order to capture the difference in locality of resumptives and gaps in Modern Standard Arabic, the weight-based analysis by Crysmann (2017) provides a more principled account of the data, essentially obviating stipulative nominative case assignment that fails to correspond to any overtly observable case marking.

Some questions still remain: Taghvaipour (2005) claims that in Persian, the distribution of gaps vs. resumptives is partly determined by the constructional properties of the top of the dependency, showing different patterns for non-restrictive, restrictive and free relative clauses, and suggests that constructional

properties of the top need to be transmitted via SLASH. However, percolation of constructional information across the tree appears to does not play nicely with basic assumptions of locality within HPSG. It remains to be seen how the case of Persian can be analysed within the scope of the theories outlined above.

Another case study that deserves integration into the current HPSG theory of resumption concerns so-called hybrid chains in Irish (Assmann et al. 2010): in this language, the most deeply embedded complementisers register the difference between gaps and resumptives at the bottom, yet complementisers further up can switch between “resumptive marking” and “gap marking”. While the authors use a single SLASH feature for both types of dependency, the objects on this set remain incompatible, thereby necessitating a great deal of disjunction. In order to bring this analysis fully in line with current HPSG, underspecification techniques may be fruitfully explored.

7 More on *wh*-interrogatives

7.1 Pied piping

So far, we have concentrated on unbounded dependencies as witnessed by extraction, captured in HPSG by SLASH feature inheritance. Another type of unbounded dependency is featured by pied-piping, as illustrated in (66) and (67), taken from Ginzburg & Sag (2000).

- (66) a. I wonder [[*what*] inspired them].
b. I wonder [[*whose* cousin] ate the pastry].
c. I wonder [[*whose* cousin’s dog] ate the pastry].
d. I wonder [[to *whom*] they dedicated the building]
- (67) a. the book [[*which*] inspired them]
b. the person [[*whose* cousin] ate the pastry]
c. the person [[*whose* cousin’s dog] ate the pastry]
d. the person [[to *whom*] they dedicated the building]

In (66) the *wh*-word, a pronoun or determiner, that marks the (embedded) *wh*-interrogative clause may be arbitrarily deeply embedded inside the filler.

With relative clauses, as witnessed by (67), the relative pronoun may be embedded inside the filler, and, again, arbitrarily deep. Furthermore, regardless of the level of embedding, the relative pronoun is coreferent with the antecedent

noun, such that a mechanism is called for that can establish this token identity in a non-local fashion. This is most evident in languages where relative undergo agreement with the antecedent noun, as e.g. in German:

- (68) a. das Buch [*das* mich inspirierte]
 DEF.N.S book(N).S REL.N.S me inspired
 ‘the book that inspired me’
 b. die Person [*die* mich inspirierte]
 DEF.F.S person(F).S REL.F.S me inspired
 ‘the person that inspired me’
 c. das Buch [[*dessen*/**deren* Einband] mir gefiel]
 DEF.N.S book(N).S REL.N.S.POSS cover me pleased
 ‘the book the cover of which I like’
 d. die Autorin [[*deren*/**dessen* Roman] mir gefiel]
 DEF.F.S author(F).S REL.F.S.POSS novel me pleased
 ‘the (female) author whose novel I liked’

In order to capture the fact that the filler of a *wh*-clause must contain a *wh*-word, or that the relative pronoun contained within the filler of a relative must be structure-share its INDEX with the antecedent noun, HPSG builds on previous work in GPSG (Gazdar et al. 1985), postulating the non-local features QUE/WH and REL. Pollard & Sag (1994) have proposed a single NONLOCAL Feature Principle that generalises from SLASH feature percolation to inheritance of QUE and REL, defining the value of each non-local feature of the mother as the set union of the nonlocal features of the daughters. See, however, Sag (1997) and Ginzburg & Sag (2000) for head-driven formulation of nonlocal feature percolation.

One observation regarding pied piping in languages such as English or German pertains to the fact that *wh*-words tend to surface in the left periphery of the filler. Ginzburg & Sag (2000) suggest that amalgamation of QUE/WH is restricted to the least oblique element on ARG-ST. This enables them to rule out (69b) while still being able to account for standard pied-piping with prepositional phrases (66d).

- (69) a. I wonder [[whose picture] was on display].
 b. * I wonder [[my picture of whom] was on display].

Indeed, from a cross-linguistic perspective, pied-piping of prepositions appears to be the far less marked option when compared to preposition stranding, which

appears to be a peculiarity of English. This is supported not only by the ban on preposition stranding in German and many other languages (or its restriction to *avec/sans* ‘with’/‘without’ in French), but it is also corroborated by the distribution of resumptives (see section 6).

To summarise, pied piping in HPSG is understood as a phenomenon that involves a second unbounded dependency: in addition to a SLASH dependency between the pied-piped filler and the extraction site, just like the ones we have discussed throughout this chapter, QUE or REL establish dependencies within the filler itself.

7.2 Multiple *wh*-questions

While in languages such as English only one *wh*-phrase may be fronted per interrogative clause (and typically one phrase is indeed fronted), it is nevertheless possible to ask multiple questions, with additional *wh*-phrases remaining in situ, as witnessed by *what* in (70).

(70) Who asked who saw what?

According to the theory of Ginzburg & Sag (2000), only fillers in interrogative clauses are *wh*-marked, and *wh*-marking serves to ensure that a *wh*-quantifier contained in the filler is interpreted as a parameter of the local interrogative clause. In situ *wh*-phrases, by contrast, are still quantifiers, so they may scope higher than their syntactic position suggests. Ginzburg & Sag (2000) follow Polard & Sag (1994) in adopting a Cooper storage, which enables them to have the in situ *wh*-quantifier in (70) retrieved either as a parameter of the embedded interrogative clause, or as a parameter of the matrix question. The WH feature thus not only ensures that a *wh*-interrogative is marked as such by a filler containing a *wh*-word, but it also fixes the semantic scope of ex-situ *wh*-phrases to their syntactic scope.¹⁵ In situ *wh*-quantifiers, by contrast, are permitted to take arbitrarily wide scope.

In Slavic languages such as Russian or Serbo-Croatian (Penn 1999), there does not appear to be a constraint on the number of simultaneously fronted *wh*-phrases, as illustrated by the example in (71).

(71) a. Ko koga si mislio da je voleo?
 who whom CL-2s thought Comp CL-3s loved
 ‘Who did you think loved whom?’ (Penn 1999)

¹⁵Kathol (1998) uses the QUE feature in his analysis of partial *wh*-fronting in German.

- b. * Ko si koga mislio da je voleo?

Given that HPSG's nonlocal features, and in particular SLASH and QUE/WH, are set valued, multiple *wh*-fronting is a rather expected property. In fact, the grammar of English interrogatives as proposed by Ginzburg & Sag (2000) specifically stipulates that there be only a singleton WH set, and that head-filler structures cannot be recursive.

The point where Slavic multiple fronting poses a challenge is its interaction with second position clitics: it seems, as witnessed by the contrast in (71) that multiple fronted *wh*-phrases are treated as a constituent, as far as linearisation is concerned. Penn (1999) proposes a topological analysis based on extended word order domains (Reape 1990; Kathol 2000) in order to reconcile multiple fronted constituents with the second position property: in essence, multiple fillers are assigned to the same initial topological field and linearisation of clitics proceeds relative to that same initial field.

7.3 *Wh*-in-situ

In the previous subsections, as in most of this chapter, we have capitalised on ex situ *wh*-constructions. However, even in languages like English, and even more in French, we do find constructions with clear interrogative semantics where nonetheless the *wh*-phrase stays in situ. Moreover, in languages such as Japanese or Coptic Egyptian in situ realisation is the norm, rather than the exception. In this subsection we shall therefore discuss how HPSG's theory of unbounded dependencies has been put to use to account for this phenomenon.

In languages such as English, where standard *wh*-interrogatives are signalled by a *wh*-phrase ex situ (i.e. by a *wh*-filler), Ginzburg & Sag (2000) identify two types of in situ *wh*-questions in English: so called reprise (or "echo") questions, which typically mimic the syntax and semantics of the speech act they are modelled on (e.g. an assertion, an order etc.), and direct in situ interrogatives, the latter being more strongly restricted pragmatically.

However, *wh* in situ may even be an unmarked, or even the default option for the expression of *wh*-interrogatives: Johnson & Lappin (1997), studying Iraqi Arabic, made the important observation that *wh*-fronting is optional in this language, posing a challenge for transformational models at the time. In Iraqi Arabic, a *wh*-interrogative may be realised ex situ, as in (72a) or in situ, as in (72b).

- (72) a. Mona shaafat meno?
 Mona saw whom
 ‘Who did Mona see?’
 b. Meno shaafat Mona?
 Who saw Mona
 ‘Who did Mona see?/Who saw Mona?’ (Johnson & Lappin 1997)

They propose a straightforward analysis within HPSG, suggesting to drop what can be regarded as a parochial constraint of English and related languages and allow *QUE* feature percolation from the right clausal daughter.

What is more, they note that *wh* in situ and ex situ strategies do observe different locality restrictions, thereby lending further support to a difference in the type of nonlocal feature involved. While nonlocal feature percolation for in situ *wh*-constructions cannot escape finite clauses (cf. the contrast in (73a,b).

- (73) a. Mona raadat tijbir Su’ad tisa’ad meno?
 Mona wanted to.force Su’ad to.help who
 ‘Who did Mona want to force Su’ad to help?’
 b. *Mona tsawwarat Ali ishtara sheno?
 Mona thought Ali bought what
 c. Sheno tsawwarit Mona Ali ishtara?
 what thought Mona Ali bought
 ‘What did Mona think Ali bought?’ (Johnson & Lappin 1997)

However, ex situ *wh*-interrogatives, involving a *SLASH* dependency, are obviously not subject to this restriction, as witnessed by (73c).

Yet, even this constraint, while valid for Iraqi Arabic, must be considered language-specific: Crysmann & Reintges (2014) study Coptic Egyptian, where *wh* in situ is the norm. They observe that the scope of an in situ *wh*-phrase is determined by the position of a relative complementiser and note that it can easily escape finite clauses, as shown in (74).

- (74) ere əm=mæɛfe tʃo: əmmɔ=s [tʃe ang nim]?
 REL DEF.PL=crowd say PREP=3F.SG that I who
 ‘Who do the crowds say that I am?’ (Luke 9, 18)

In their analysis, they build on Johnson & Lappin (1997), yet suggest that *QUE* percolation in this language may be as unrestricted as *SLASH* percolation.

8 Filler-gap mismatches

As noted in the introduction, there are unbounded dependency constructions in which looks like a filler does not match the associated gap. In this section we will look briefly at two examples of such mismatches.

An interesting type of example is what [Arnold & Borsley \(2010\)](#) call auxiliary-stranding relative clauses (ASRCs). The following illustrate:

- (75) a. Kim will sing, which Lee won't ____.
 b. Kim has sung, which Lee hasn't ____.
 c. Kim is singing, which Lee isn't ____.
 d. Kim is clever, which Lee isn't ____.
 e. Kim is in Spain, which Lee isn't ____.
 f. Kim wants to go home, which Lee doesn't want to ____.

Which in these examples appears to be the ordinary nominal *which*, but the gap is a VP in (75a), (75b), (75c) and (75f), an AP in (75d), and a PP in (75e). One response to these data might be to propose that *which* in such examples is not the normal nominal *which* but a pronominal counterpart of the categories which appear as complements of an auxiliary, mainly various kinds of VP. It is clear, however, that ordinary VP complements of an auxiliary cannot appear as fillers in a relative clause, as shown by the (b) examples in the following:

- (76) a. This is the book, which Kim will read ____.
 b. * This is the book, [read which] Kim will ____.
- (77) a. This is the book, which Kim has read ____.
 b. * This is the book, [read which] Kim has ____.
- (78) a. This is the book, which Kim is reading ____.
 b. * This is the book, [reading which] Kim is ____.

Thus, this does not seem a viable approach.

[Arnold & Borsley \(2010\)](#) propose that these examples involve a special kind of gap. As noted above, in a normal gap the *LOCAL* value and the *SLASH* value match. However, as [Webelhuth \(2008\)](#) noted, there is no reason why we should not under some circumstances have what he calls a 'dishonest gap', one whose *LOCAL* value and *SLASH* value do not match. Developing this approach, [Arnold & Borsley \(2010\)](#) propose that when an auxiliary has an unrealized complement, the

complement optionally has a certain kind nominal as the value of SLASH, which is realized as relative *which*. When SLASH has the empty set as its value, the result is an auxiliary complement ellipsis sentence. When SLASH has the nominal value, we have a dishonest gap because the value of LOCAL is whatever the auxiliary requires, normally a VP of some kind, and the result is an ASRC.

A rather different type of example, discussed by among others [Bresnan \(2001\)](#), [Bouma et al. \(2001\)](#), and [Webelhuth \(2012\)](#), is the following:

(79) That he might be wrong, he didn't think of ____.

Here, the apparent filler is a clause, but as the following shows, only an overt NP and not an overt clause is possible in the position of the gap.

- (80) a. He didn't think of the matter.
b. * He didn't think of that he might be wrong.

The most detailed HPSG discussion of such examples is [Webelhuth \(2012\)](#). He argues on the basis of examples like the following that initial clauses cannot be associated with a clausal gap:

- (81) a. He was unhappy [that Sue was late again].
b. * [That Sue was late again] he was unhappy.
- (82) a. Mary informed Bill [that Sue was late again].
b. * [That Sue was late again] Mary informed Bill.
- (83) a. It seems [that John is guilty].
b. * [That John is guilty] it seems.

Thus, initial clauses can only be associated with a nominal gap. [Bouma et al. \(2001: 25–26\)](#) propose an analysis in which an NP gap has an S in its SLASH value. In other words, they propose a dishonest gap. [Webelhuth \(2012\)](#) argues against this approach and proposes an analysis in which an S[SLASH {NP}] in which the NP has a clausal interpretation can combine with a finite clause. Thus, [Figure 14](#) gives the schematic structure for (79).

On this analysis, the initial clause is not a filler, and the construction is not a head-filler phrase. However, the analysis involves a normal unbounded dependency except at the top. In contrast the Arnold and Borsley analysis of ASRCs outlined earlier involves a normal unbounded dependency except at the bottom.




Figure 14: “Dishonest” gap

9 Concluding remarks

The preceding pages have among other things highlighted the fact that there are some unresolved issues in the HPSG approach to unbounded dependencies. In particular, there is disagreement about whether or not gaps are empty categories and about whether or not the middle of a dependency is head-driven. It is important, therefore, to emphasize that a number of matters seem reasonably clear. In particular it is generally accepted that unbounded dependencies involve a set- or list-valued feature called `SLASH` or in some recent work `GAP`. It is also generally accepted that this is true of all types of unbounded dependencies including those with a filler and those without, those with a gap and those with a resumptive pronoun, and both standard dependencies, where filler and gap match, and dependencies with some kind of mismatch. Finally, it is generally accepted that the hierarchies of phrase types that are a central feature of HPSG provide an appropriate way to capture both the similarities among the many unbounded dependency constructions and the variety of ways in which they differ. The general approach seems to compare quite favourably with the approaches that have been developed within other approaches.

Appendix: Unbounded dependencies in Sign-Based Construction Grammar

This chapter has concentrated on the approach to unbounded dependencies that has been developed with construction-based HPSG. As has been discussed in a number of chapters, a version of HPSG called Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG) was developed in the 2000s, which differs from construction-based HPSG in a number of ways (Sag 2012). Among other things, this has a somewhat different treatment of unbounded dependencies. In this appendix, we outline the

main ways in which SBCG is different in this area.

Unlike construction-based HPSG, SBCG makes a fundamental distinction between signs and constructions. Constructions are objects which associate a mother sign (MTR) with a list of daughter signs (DTRS), one of which may be a head daughter (HD-DTR). They take the following form:

$$(84) \left[\begin{array}{ll} cx & \\ \text{MTR} & \text{sign} \\ \text{DTRS} & \text{list}(\text{sign}) \\ \text{HD-DTR} & \text{sign} \end{array} \right]$$

Constructions are utilized by the Sign Principle, which can be formulated as follows:

- (85) Signs are well formed if either
- a. they match some lexical entry, or
 - b. they match the mother of some construction.

Constructions and the Sign Principle are features of the SBCG which are lacking in construction-based HPSG. Hence, they are complications. But they allow simplifications. In particular, they allow a simpler notion of sign without the features DTRS and HD-DTR. This in turn allows to the framework to dispense with synsem and local objects. The ARG-ST feature and the VALENCE feature, which replaces SUBJ and COMPS, take lists of signs and not synsem objects as their value. More importantly in the present context, the GAP feature, which replaces SLASH, takes as its value a list of signs and not local objects.

One might suppose that this view of GAP would entail that a filler and the associated gap have all the same syntactic and semantic properties unlike within construction-based HPSG, where they only share the syntactic and semantic properties that are part of a local object and hence not the WH feature in *wh*-interrogatives. However, the framework allows constraints to stipulate that certain objects are the same except for some specified features. The constraint of the filler-head-construction, which corresponds to HPSG's head-filler-phrase, stipulates that the sign that is the filler is identical to the sign in the GAP list of its sister except for the value of the WH feature and the REL feature used in relative clauses. Thus, filler and gap differ in the same way in SBCG and construction-based HPSG but for different reasons.

At the bottom of dependency things are rather different. The SBCG analysis allows a member of the ARG-ST list of a lexical head to appear not as a member

of the word's VALENCE list bit as member of its GAP list. We can illustrate with read in the following examples:

- (86) a. I will read the book.
b. Which book will you read?

In (86a) read has the values in (87) for the three features:

$$(87) \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG-ST} & \langle \boxed{1}\text{NP}, \boxed{2}\text{NP} \rangle \\ \text{VALENCE} & \langle \boxed{1}, \boxed{2} \rangle \\ \text{GAP} & \langle \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

Here, ARG-ST and VALENCE have the same value and the value of GAP is the empty list. In (86b) the three features have the following values:

$$(88) \begin{bmatrix} \text{ARG-ST} & \langle \boxed{1}\text{NP}, \boxed{2}\text{NP} \rangle \\ \text{VALENCE} & \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \\ \text{GAP} & \langle \boxed{2} \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

Here, the second member of the ARG-ST list appears not in the VALENCE but in the GAP list. This is rather different from HPSG. As discussed in Section 2, HPSG gaps have a non-empty SLASH value. Here, gaps are just ordinary signs which appear in a GAP list and not in a VALENCE list.

References

- Abeillé, Anne, Danièle Godard, Philip Miller & Ivan Sag. 1998. French bounded dependencies. In Luca Dini & Sergio Balari (eds.), *Romance in HPSG*, 1–54. Stanford: CSLI publications.
- Aguila-Multner, Gabriel. 2018. *La pronominalisation sur l'auxiliaire comme exponence périphrastique*. Université Paris–Diderot MA thesis.
- Alotaibi, Mansour & Robert D. Borsley. 2013. Gaps and resumptive pronouns in Modern Standard Arabic. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar, freie universität berlin*, 6–26. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2013/alotaibi-borsley.pdf>.
- Alqurashi, Abdulrahman & Robert D. Borsley. 2012. Arabic relative clauses in HPSG. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Chungnam National University, Daejeon*, 26–44. Stanford, CA. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2012/alqurashi-borsley.pdf>, accessed 2019-6-5.

- Arnold, Doug. 2004. Non-restrictive relative clauses in construction based HPSG. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Center for Computational Linguistics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*, 27–47. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/5/arnold.pdf>, accessed 2019-11-2.
- Arnold, Doug & Robert D. Borsley. 2008. Non-restrictive relative clauses, ellipsis and anaphora. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, National Institute of Information and Communications Technology, Keihanna*, 325–345. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/9/arnold-borsley.pdf>, accessed 2019-6-5.
- Arnold, Doug & Robert D. Borsley. 2010. Auxiliary-stranding relative clauses. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Université Paris Diderot, Paris 7*, 47–67. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2010/arnold-borsley.pdf>, accessed 2019-6-5.
- Assmann, Anke, Fabian Heck, Johannes Hein, Stefan Keine & Gereon Müller. 2010. Does chain hybridization in Irish support movement-based approaches to long-distance dependencies? In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Morphology and Formal Grammar at the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG 2010)*, 27–46. CSLI Publications.
- Borsley, Bob. 2011. Constructions, functional heads, and comparative correlatives. In O. Bonami & P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics*, vol. 8, 7–20. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8>.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1989. Phrase-Structure Grammar and the Barriers conception of clause structure. *Linguistics* 27(5). 843–863.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2004. An approach to English comparative correlatives. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG-2004 conference, center for computational linguistics, katholieke universiteit leuven*, 70–92. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/5/.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2009. On the superficiality of Welsh agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27(2). 225–265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11049-009-9067-3>.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2010. An hpsg approach to Welsh unbounded dependencies. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *The proceedings of the 17th international conference on head-*

- driven phrase structure grammar, 80–100. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2010/>.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2013a. On the nature of Welsh unbounded dependencies. *Lingua* 133. 1–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.03.005>.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2013b. On the nature of Welsh unbounded dependencies. *Lingua* 133. 1–29.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2016. Hpsg and the nature of agreement in Archi. In Oliver Bond, M. Chumakina, Greville G. Corbett & Dunstan Brown (eds.), *Archi: complexities of agreement in cross-theoretical perspective*, 118–149. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bouma, Gosse, Rob Malouf & Ivan A. Sag. 2001. Satisfying constraints on extraction and adjunction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19(1). 1–65.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-functional syntax*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bresnan, Joan & Jane Grimshaw. 1978. The syntax of free relatives in english. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 331–391.
- Chaves, Rui. 2019. Island phenomena and related matters. In Stefan Müller, Anne Abeillé, Robert D. Borsley & Jean-Pierre Koenig (eds.), *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: The handbook*, 481–534. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:??
- Chaves, Rui P. 2009. Construction-based cumulation and adjunct extraction. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar, university of göttingen, germany*, 47–67. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2009/>.
- Chaves, Rui P. 2012. On the grammar of extraction and coordination. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(30). 465–512.
- Chomsky, Noam A. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In Peter Culicover, Tom Wasow & A. Akmajian (eds.), *Formal syntax*, 71–132. New York: Academic Press.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2005. An inflectional approach to Hausa final vowel shortening. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 2004*, 73–112. Kluwer.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2009. Deriving superficial ergativity in nias. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar, university of göttingen, germany*, 68–88. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2009/>.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2012. Resumption and islandhood in Hausa. In Philippe de Groote & Mark-Jan Nederhof (eds.), *Formal grammar. 15th and 16th international conference on formal grammar, fg 2010 copenhagen, denmark, august 2010, fg 2011 ljubljana, slovenia, august 2011*, vol. 7395. Springer.

- Crysmann, Berthold. 2016. An underspecification approach to hausa resumption. In Doug Arnold, Miriam Butt, Berthold Crysmann, Tracy Holloway King & Stefan Müller (eds.), *Proceedings of the joint 2016 conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar and lexical functional grammar, polish academy of sciences, warsaw, poland*, 194–214. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2016/headlex2016-crysmann.pdf>, accessed 2019-9-10.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2017. Resumption and case: a new take on modern standard arabic. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar, university of kentucky, lexington*, 120–140. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2017/hpsg2017-crysmann.pdf>.
- Crysmann, Berthold & Chris H. Reintges. 2014. The polyfunctionality of Coptic Egyptian relative complementisers. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University at Buffalo*, 63–82. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2014/crysmann-reintges.pdf>, accessed 2019-6-7.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1981. Unbounded dependencies and coordinate structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12. 155–184.
- Gazdar, Gerald, Ewan Klein, Geoffrey K. Pullum & Ivan A. Sag. 1985. *Generalized phrase structure grammar*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan A. Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives* (CSLI Lecture Notes 123). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Groos, A. & Henk van Riemsdijk. 1981. Matching effects in free relatives: a parameter of core grammar. In L. Brandi Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi (eds.), *Theory of markedness in generative grammar: proceedings of the ivth glow conference*, 171–216. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1989. A unified theory of ‘standard’ and ‘transparent’ free relatives. *NLLT* 21. 247–331.
- Harris, Alice. 1984. Case marking, verb agreement, and inversion in Udi. In David M. Perlmutter & Carol G. Rosen (eds.), *Studies in relational grammar* 2, 243–258. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Henri, Fabiola. 2010. *A constraint-based approach to verbal constructions in Mauritian*. University of Mauritius & Université Paris Diderot dissertation.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The cambridge grammar of the english language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hukari, Thomas E. & Robert D. Levine. 1995. Adjunct extraction. *Journal of Linguistics* 31. 195–226.
- Jaggar, Philip. 2001. *Hausa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johnson, David & Shalom Lappin. 1997. A critique of the minimalist program. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(4). 273–333.
- Kathol, Andreas. 1998. The scope-marking construction in German. In Gert Webelhuth, Jean-Pierre Koenig & Andreas Kathol (eds.), *Lexical and constructional aspects of linguistic explanation*, 357–371. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kathol, Andreas. 2000. *Linear syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1994. Archi. In Riëks Smeets (ed.), *Indigenous languages of the caucasus iv: north-east caucasian languages ii: presenting the three nakh languages and six minor lezgian languages*, 297–365. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.
- Levine, Robert D. 2003. Adjunct valents: cumulative scoping adverbial constructions and impossible descriptions. In Jongbok Kim & Stephen Wechsler (eds.), *The proceedings of the 9th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar*, 209–232. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/3/>.
- Levine, Robert D. & Thomas E. Hukari. 2006. *The unity of unbounded dependency constructions* (CSLI Lecture Notes 166). Stanford University: CSLI Publications.
- Manning, Christopher D. & Ivan A. Sag. 1999. Dissociations between argument structure and grammatical relations. In *Lexical and constructional aspects of linguistic explanation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://nlp.stanford.edu/~manning/papers/tuebingen97.ps>.
- McCloskey, James. 2002. Resumptives, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In Samuel David Epstein & T. Daniel Seely (eds.), *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*, 184–226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999a. An HPSG-analysis for free relative clauses in German. *Grammars* 2(1). 53–105. <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/~stefan/Pub/freeRel.html>.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999b. *Deutsche Syntax deklarativ. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar für das Deutsche* (Linguistische Arbeiten 394). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/~stefan/Pub/hpsg.html>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex predicates: verbal complexes, resultative constructions, and particle verbs in German* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 13). Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/~stefan/Pub/complex.html>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2014. Elliptical constructions, multiple frontings, and surface-based syntax. In Paola Monachesi, Gerhard Jäger, Gerald Penn & Shuly Wint-

- ner (eds.), *Proceedings of formal grammar 2004, nancy*, 91–109. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/~stefan/Pub/surface.html>.
- Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa language. an encyclopedic reference grammar*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Penn, Gerald. 1999. Linearization and *WH*-extraction: evidence from Serbo-Croatian. In Robert D. Borsley & Adam Przepiórkowski (eds.), *Slavic in Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism), chap. 6, 149–182. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Pollard, Carl J. & Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago & Stanford: University of Chicago Press & CSLI Publications.
- Reape, Mike. 1990. A theory of word order and discontinuous constituency in West Continental Germanic. In Elisabeth Engdahl & Mike Reape (eds.), *Parametric variation in Germanic and Romance: Preliminary investigations* (DYANA Deliverable R1.1.A), 25–39. University of Edinburgh: Center for Cognitive Science & Department of Artificial Intelligence. ESPRIT Basic Research Action 3175.
- Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. MIT dissertation.
- Sag, Ivan A. 1997. English relative clause constructions. *Journal of Linguistics* 33(2). 431–484. DOI:10.1017/S002222679700652X
- Sag, Ivan A. 2010. English filler-gap constructions. *Language* 86(3). 486–545. <http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/papers/xcons.pdf>.
- Sag, Ivan A. 2012. Sign-based construction grammar: an informal synopsis. *Sign-based construction grammar* 193. 69–202.
- Sag, Ivan A., Thomas Wasow & Emily M. Bender. 2003. *Syntactic theory: a formal introduction*. 2nd edn. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/site/1575864002.html>.
- Sells, Peter. 1984. *Syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns*. University of Massachusetts at Amherst dissertation.
- Taghvaipour, Mehran. 2005. *Persian relative clauses in Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. University of Essex dissertation.
- Tuller, Laurice A. 1986. *Bijective relations in Universal Grammar and the syntax of Hausa*. Ann Arbor: UCLA dissertation.
- Vaillette, Nathan. 2001. Hebrew relative clauses in hpsg. In Dan Flickinger & Andreas Kathol (eds.), *The proceedings of the 7th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar*, 305–324. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/1/>.

Webelhuth, Gert. 2012. The distribution of *that*-clauses in english: an sbcg account. In Hans Boas & Ivan A. Sag (eds.), *Sign-based construction grammar*, 203–227. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

